ESSENCE AND PROPERTIES OF EUPHEMISM
FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF COGNITIVE LINGUISTICS

Logvina S. A.

Институт филологии (структурное подразделение)
ФГАОУ ВО «Крымский федеральный университет им. В. И. Вернадского»,
Симферополь, Республика Крым, Российская Федерация
E-mail: svet.logvina@mail.ru

The article discusses the unique properties of euphemism from the perspective of cognitive linguistics, which characterise the specific activity of cognitive processes and human abilities, thereby ensuring the difference between euphemism and other forms of knowledge objectification. The authors refer to the basic properties of euphemism that determine its status: denotative amelioration, which corresponds to the basic feature of euphemism, subjective, formal "emendation" of a denotatum, enhancement of meaning. Denotative amelioration (neutralisation of pejorative signs of a denotatum) is a unique cognitive property that characterises the specific activity of cognitive processes and human abilities and objectifies the knowledge in a specific way. As a result of the analysis of empirical material, where the verbal euphemia was considered from the point of view of one of the main properties of euphemism, denotative amelioration, three key linguistic and cognitive models were identified. These models reflect the transformation of the denotative basis within the framework of a euphemistic rethinking of the picture of the world: according to the bijective, injective and counter-referential types of semantic relations.
Keywords: euphemism, properties of euphemism, cognitive linguistics, denotative basis, metaphorization, cognitive models, euphemistic rethinking.

INTRODUCTION

In modern philology, whose priorities at present shift towards communicative, discursive and cognitive linguistics, the structural, semantic and pragmatic features of euphemisms are studied in new aspects, classifications of euphemisms being developed on various grounds. The way knowledge is structured in a language, "packed" into different-format linguistic signs of different lengths, is one of the main issues of cognitive linguistics, the research core of which is "language as a general cognitive mechanism, as a cognitive tool – a system of signs that play a role in representation (coding) and in the transformation of information" [9, p. 188].

Within the scope of the article, euphemisms are considered among diverse linguistic phenomena used to name various objects of reality, which they relate not directly, but

indirectly, and are understood as signs of an indirect nomination, intended to code certain objects, phenomena, events or actions for various purposes (according to the characteristics of the signs). A feature of euphemisms is that the basis of their formation is the principle of secondary nomination. The principle of indirect nomination is understood as a deliberately allegorical designation of an object or the conscious use of such a naming, which indicates the object of the nomination not directly, but indirectly, describes it veiled. Nowadays, linguistics sees a resurgence of scientific interest in the problem of indirect (secondary) nomination. This might be explained by the fact that being an integrative discipline, cognitive linguistics has become a rightful part of the science of language, and has introduced its own theoretical and methodological means for a deeper study of indirect nomination. Linguistic phenomena falling into the circle of attention of indirect communication (sign formations) have previously been described fractionally from the point of view of indirect nomination. Cognitive linguistics, with its new research tools, expands significantly the empirical base of linguistics. Explication of the cognitive structure of the phenomenon under study makes it possible to reveal the logic and methods of encoding a denotatum of a euphemism.

That a euphemism is a means (one of the linguistic forms) of representing knowledge in the processes of categorizing and conceptualizing the world raises no doubts among the representatives of the scientific community. However, this statement cannot serve as irrefutable evidence of the unique role of euphemism in creating an array of human knowledge about reality. Thus the thesis about euphemization as a "special case of conceptual derivation" formulated by Boldyrev N.N. and Aleksikova Yu.V. [3, p. 6] outlines the essence of the primary task of the euphemistic "transition" from an unacceptable verbal form to an appropriate one ad hoc in the context of a "humanistic request", the transformation of the dramatic (semantic) component of the systemic and structural organization of human knowledge, which cannot be performed by other means of language. In modern linguistics, the question of how to describe individual fragments of the linguistic picture of the world is being raised and actively resolved. In this case, various sets of linguistic units are used as research material, which differ from each other primarily in the volume and criteria underlying their unification.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Peculiarities of interpretation of the concept of "euphemism"

The universal scientific definition of the notion of "euphemism" remains the subject of constant debate. While conducting an analytical review of the sources reflecting the current state of the study of a euphemism as a phenomenon, we have revealed the interpretive heterogeneity of the central notion (a euphemism). Both predecessors and contemporaries have carried out many researches in order to provide a thorough description and classification of euphemisms in terms of linguistic, psychological, pragmatic, stylistic, cultural and other approaches.

This work is devoted to one of not yet fully studied issues, namely, the study of a euphemism as a mental phenomenon mediated by the internal mental activity of the human mind. The sphere of interests of cognitive linguistics as far as this phenomenon is concerned includes a euphemism as a result of the synthetic unity of individual and national mentality, as well as the dynamics of social and cultural human activity, as a way to achieve harmony, when a euphemism is synthesized intentionally to meet the needs of society (social convention), by synchronizing external and internal reality *ad hoc* (discursive convention). In general, being characterized by multipurpose motivational determinants (which is characteristic of all languages – at that every single language reflecting specific cultural and national features (linguistic and cultural universals) characteristic of a particular community or ethnos [23] the euphemism realizes an individual request within the framework of the discursive convention. The scenario of euphemistic realization reflects the dialectics of the public and the private, of the universal and the particular, of the common and the unique, of the possible and the indeed. Semiotic euphemistic representation of each individual concept is carried out through a powerful verbal resource, "one of the semiotically most universal ways of conceptualization" [28, p. 9] offered by the language system and speech practice. The semiotic euphemistic substrate of the concept chosen by the Speaker appeals to a number of synonyms, lexical and semantic fields, metaphorical images, precedent names, symbols, works of art, rituals, objects of material and spiritual culture. Despite the fact that there is no exhaustive description capable of expressing the entire content of the concept,

the scale of the semiotic euphemistic environment is directly related to the significance of this concept for the linguocultural community, to the axiological or theoretical value of that extra-linguistic phenomenon that is embodied in all its cognitive-semantic volume, as well as to the scale of assessments and measures which the individual uses to evaluate the events and conditions of their own life. Under the cognitive research priority of euphemisms is the metaphor which acts as the main cognitive mechanism for the formation of euphemisms. The conceptual metaphor has also proved to be one of the most productive ways to form euphemistic nominations [1, p. 127], since it avoids the use of direct nomination by referring to the means of representing another concept [1, pp. 127–130]. According to Yu.V. Aleksikova, in order to ensure that the interlocutor understands the euphemistic name, the euphemism should contain significant components of the content of the original concept.

Euphemism as a phenomenon of the psycho-linguistic-cultural order takes its conceptual origin from perceptual-figurative associations, integrates organically into cultural schemes and finds its material embodiment in symbolic forms. There is no uniformity between the ideal essence of euphemism and its material and semiotic embodiment, since the linguistic implementation of a certain concept is not tied to a certain word. The concept is a heterogeneous mental formation: having a wide variability among linguistic signs, it can be expressed by a number of verbal and non-verbal means and arise as a code-variable phenomenon, which retains the conceptual essence in each communicative act, but changes the form of expression depending on the type of conventional relationship.

The implementation of the euphemistic function testifies to the symbiosis of the process and the result: a euphemism, as a result of the cognition process, as a result of the forecasting process, as a result of the process of linguistic association, demonstrates the transition from linguistic and cultural potency to contextual implementation.

Most of the existing definitions reflect *a substitutional approach* to euphemisms, according to which a euphemism is a substitute for any undesirable word in a given situation (Yu.S. Baskova, L.V. Grekhneva, G.A. Makarova, A.A. Nefedova). Providing the definition of this phenomenon, some scientists build it on the basis of such an identifier as

"an indirect substitute for the names of the terrible, shameful or odious" [12, p. 5]. R. Dilts writes about the phenomenon of re-identification as the replacement of one of the elements of approval by a new word or phrase that means approximately the same thing, but entailing different consequences. "One way to explore the <…> pattern of redefining is by making "one-word reframes" of other words. This is done by taking a word expressing a particular idea or concept and finding another word for that idea or concept that puts either a more positive or negative slant on the initial term. As the philosopher Bertrand Kussell humorously pointed out, "I am firm; you are obstinate; he is a pigheaded fool" [33, p. 37].

As a result of *the nominative variation*, the euphemism is attributed to the secondary nomination on the basis of additional, redesigned signs of the denotatum [12; 27]. In a broad sense, euphemisms are "another name, renaming (Yu.S. Maslov, L.I. Osipova) of an object or a phenomenon based on a plurality of ways to describe the same situation using different linguistic means" [cited in: 19, p. 24]. Yu.V. Shcherbinina considers euphemisms in the aspect of renomination as a redefinition, circumlocution of an already signified linguistic sign, an object or a phenomenon [31, p. 352]. In her scientific arguments, L.N. Vavilova relies on the term "euphemistic isosemy" as "semantic identity or proximity of utterances that differ in the ways of naming reality" and suggests the idea of "semantic equality or semantic similarity" [5, p. 41].

Krysin sees in the euphemism "a way of indirect, peripheral and at the same time softening designation of an object, property or action" [16, p. 388]. A. M. Katsev understands euphemisms as "contributing to the effect of softening indirect substitutes for the names of the terrible, shameful or odious, brought to life by moral or religious motives" [13, p. 5].

M. L. Kovshova, considering a euphemism as a speech act, defines it as "a fact language oriented to speech communication; speech turnover, semantics which is made up of the relationship between a sign, a meaning and a speaker; a turnover that is used for a very specific action - softening speech" [14, p. 29]; euphemisms are described in further researches of the author as "permitted words and expressions that used instead of those that are prohibited or restricted in use etiquette, ethical, legal, ideological norms and customs, accepted in this cultural and linguistic community" [15, p. 36].

129

Euphemisms have been considered within the framework of the structural-semantic approach as well; the main linguistic methods of the formation of euphemisms have been determined and the communicative conditions for their functioning have been outlined (A. M. Katsev, L. P. Krysin). Thus, euphemism can be taken as a linguistic mechanism, affiliated with intrasystemic relations:

- between units of language (such as synonymy, syntactic parallelism, hyper-hyponymy, antonymy, etc.); there are such definitions of euphemisms as "… a kind of synonyms brought about by social reasons" [6; 7; 21].

- between speech constructions to give speech stylistic significance, imagery, expressiveness and emotionality, where, in a narrower sense, the euphemism is "substitution of a lower word with a more decent one" [8], interpreted as a special case of paraphrase. The understanding of euphemism as a kind of trope is also reflected in the scientific literature [2, p. 284]. In the dictionary of linguistic terms, euphemism is defined as follows: "Euphemism (antiphrasis) <…>. A trope consisting of an indirect, covered, polite, softening designation of an object or a phenomenon" [2, p. 521]. G.G. Kuzhim reduces euphemisms to melioratives that are "used for humorous purposes" [17, p. 13]. Thus, we are to state that it is the variety of ways of meaning transformation that plays an important role in the analysis of the semantic component of euphemism.

The wide range in the interpretation of this phenomenon contributed to the lack of uniformity in the selection of criteria for identifying a euphemism. There is also an opinion that it is generally impossible to single out clear criteria for "identifying a linguistic unit as a euphemism" [26, p. 74], and only highlighting the features of the phenomenon under study can be considered legitimate.

Solodilova I.A. and Sokolova T.Yu. conducted a retrospective comparative analysis of existing points of view and approaches to the study of euphemism [26] and, as a result, identified a number of essential features that define a euphemism. In other words, in order for a lexical unit to be considered a euphemism, it must have all of the following features, namely: the stigma of the denotatum, the presence of positive connotation, the preservation of the truth of the statement, semantic uncertainty and the formal nature of improving the denotatum [26]. Despite the objectivity and high quality of the presented consolidation, we

feel it indispensable to make a number of clarifications. The signs indicated above do reflect the categorical features of the euphemism; however, in our opinion, they describe similar characteristics of the phenomenon under study, thereby duplicating the content components of each other, such as semantic ambiguity and indirection of the name. It is also important to add that the fulfillment of all conditions or, in our case, compliance with all the necessary features at the same time makes the implementation of the selection of clear criteria impossible. To solve these problems, we suggest to turn to the foundations of mathematical logic, namely, to the concept of necessary and sufficient conditions as types of conditions that ensure the implementation of a euphemism. According to V. G. Boltyanskiy, "a necessary condition is a sign, and a sufficient condition is a property" [4]. That is, the entire list of signs necessary for a lexical unit to be a euphemism can be narrowed down to a sufficient number of conditions to be considered as such. In contrast to the necessary conditions, sufficient conditions (properties) may contain significantly fewer "requirements" necessary for a lexical unit to be considered a euphemism. Despite the epistemological pessimism regarding the objectively unambiguous interpretation of the notion of "property" [37], in our work, it is the philosophical potential of the notion PROPERTY that is able to provide a logical explanation of the system-structural organization of the euphemism (through a set of essential features, characteristics and properties that give it definiteness). Properties characterize the features of the cognitive sphere of an object, thereby determining the difference between some objects from others, without leading to a paradox.

Basic properties of euphemisms

Taking into account the above-mentioned characteristics, we suppose that in order for a lexical unit to have the status of a euphemism, it is necessary to implement three sufficient conditions for a minimum, i.e., a lexical unit must have certain properties, namely: *denotative amelioration*, which corresponds to the basic property of euphemism of a subjective, formal "emendation" of denotatum, improvement of meaning; *semantic contensivity* (strategy of morpho-syntactic coding with a transition from meaning to form), which corresponds to the basic property of veiling, "expression with a hint", semantic

ambiguity, semantic reduction; and *information traduction* (a property of a transferred characteristic), which reflects such a basic property of a euphemism as reliability, preservation of the truth and information content of the original concept. The basic properties of a euphemism can be explicated through various elements that represent lexemes, words, phrases, which in various conditions and in their own contexts can form complex figurative structures, such as a paraphrase, antithesis, metaphor.

Denotative amelioration

Denotative amelioration, a property that directly relates to the conceptosphere, the nuclear component of which is the denotatum, while the peripheral layer is represented by a connotative diversity and concerns everything "that we know about the object" [27, p. 40]. In our opinion, it is in the conceptosphere, a mental basis for designating the totality of knowledge and ideas about a specific extra-linguistic phenomenon in the human mind where the individual's ideas about the facts of reality are formed and verbalized; these depend on the individual's education (collective knowledge) and experience (individual knowledge), i.e., on the individual's knowledge, images, and associations that are evoked in consciousness in connection with a particular concept.

Analyzing the patterns and sequence of transformations of denotative information necessary to create a euphemism, we base our assumptions on the scientific views and ideas of V.N. Telia, more precisely, on her reflections on the ways of categorizing and conceptualizing knowledge in language [27; 28]; on the ideas about the synonymous subjectivation of concepts in different cultures, which causes different denotative descriptors [24]; on the analysis of the features of the semantic-cognitive concept of language through the correlation of semantic processes with cognitive ones [22]; as well as on the views of modern authors who develop the idea that "the increment of new meanings is associated with the complication of the semantic structure of the linguistic unit" [20] due to the enhancement of imagery (metaphor, metonymy), the basis of which is "a mental image transmitted into the recipient's mind network" [10, p. 87], which also depends on the main mythologemes of a particular linguistic culture and models of their explication,

reflecting value orientations. So, these are the theoretical foundations, on which we build our hypothesis of the organization of the cognitive space of the euphemism.

According to the scientists, in order for a linguistic unit to become a euphemism, one requires the so-called "formal improvement of the denotatum" [25], i.e., transformation of a number of conceptual features (focus shift [23] included in the denotative basis, in other words, the display of the elements of the denotative basis (in whole or in part) in the derived invariant (euphemism); moreover, the quality level of the euphemistic potential of the linguistic unit "depends on the location of the negative component in archiseme, hyposeme, or on the periphery of meaning" [30, p. 454] and on the degree of realization (explication) of the basic properties of an intellectual object, euphemism [18].

The transformation of the denotative basis within the framework of euphemistic reconsideration, in our opinion, consists in the degree of preservation of the connection between the euphemism and the primary denotatum, while the secondary meaning (euphemism is a unit of secondary nomination), in the terms of M. Heidegger, is rooted in the primary pre-understanding [34]. Endowing the referent (which is undesirable to be called directly) a secondary meaning, the individual independently determines and chooses the degree of reflection (pre-understanding) of the primary meaning in the new (secondary) meaning, or its absence. As an example, we suggest to consider the concept of TRAMP, where the elements of the set of the conceptual environment will have a conventional sequence, namely: nuclear components, components of the near and far periphery. Having analyzed the content of etymological, encyclopedic and explanatory dictionary entries [36; 38; 39], we have identified the following nuclear components that form the denotative basis of the concept of TRAMP: no home, no money, no work; aimless movement on foot, acts of begging and crime (prostitution, drug addiction, etc.). This set is not constant and potentially infinite.

Bijective type of denotative amelioration

The first model we have outlined is based on combining the maximum number of focal components of the denotatum, activated by the meanings of the euphemistic unit. Such a model of denotative transformations found in the theory of euphemia is bijective in nature,

demonstrating a one-to-one correspondence of the elements of the original denotatum and the derived form. The features of this model can be considered using the following examples: *Who's gonna believe what a little tramp writes to herself? He lives in the mountains now, like a vagabond. He eats like a vagrant and dresses like a barber.* As can be seen from the definitions, all the components of the denotative basis of the concept of TRAMP coincide: ***tramp***, *a person with no home or job who travels from place to place, usually asking people in the street for food or money* [38];

 vagabond, *who wanders from place to place and has no home or job* [32];

vagrant, *a person with no home or job who travels from place to place, usually asking people in the street for food or money* [38].

Being coreferent, the objects of such a euphemistic renaming belong to the same denotative class, but the type of such semantic relations can be presented rather as synonymous than euphemistic, since we are not talking about a sign transformation (a kind of "improvement"), which contradicts one of the main features of a euphemism, namely, "formal improvement of the denotatum" [19; 20; 25; 26]. An analysis of the model we have considered allows us to conclude that such a model is equivalent to the simplest and most easily deduced form of euphemism, since it demonstrates the greatest degree of similarity between denotative and derived (euphemistic) meanings. The more coincidences are found among the focal components of the denotatum and the components representing those meanings of the lexical unit that are realized in the euphemism, the less denotative transformations are detected when decoding the meaning of the euphemism, which, in turn, indicates the actual absence of the ameliorative effect.

As the complexity increases, the models demonstrate more significant denotative transformations (for example, the transformation affects the structure of the focal components involved in the formation of a euphemism), which contributes to a more radical pre-reformatting and a change in the euphemistic meaning. A special place in such transformations is occupied by the cognitive operations of analogy and polarization, generalization, de-perspectivization, etc., which an individual resorts to purposefully (implementing pragmatic strategies) when transforming one of the focal components of the denotatum. Such cognitive operations are based on imagery and metaphorization, which

allows this imagery to be presented as part of the emerging meaning of a euphemism and then to be verbalized in one of the figures of speech classified as a trope by the language system.

Injective type of the denotative amelioration

The second model of denotative transformations, within the framework of the euphemistic rethinking of the picture of the world, can be called *injective*, when at least one component of the denotative basis is "reflected" in the euphemism; this is a type of relationship which highlights non-obvious features of the object-oriented paradigm, but at the same time a visible connection with the denotative core is preserved.

For example, one of the nuclear components of the concept of TRAMP, 'no home' can be taken into consideration. From the point of view of psychological research, a dwelling is a space of special significance, and an individual matches everything that happens inside this space up and seeks to control it by themselves. And, despite the rather neutral wording in the dictionary entry, *the place where one lives permanently, especially as a member of a family or household* [38], the denotatum of this concept evokes mainly positive emotions. Accordingly, within the framework of the euphemistic transformation, any reference to the concept of HOUSE will "improve" the denotatum of the concept of TRAMP and have a positive meaning.

(1): *Prolonged periods of **rough sleeping** have a significant impact on someone's mental and physical health. The longer someone experiences rough sleeping for, the more likely it is they will develop additional mental and physical health needs* [41].

The expression *rough sleepers* appeals to the idea of home comfort associated with sleep, but *rough – hard, coarse –* indicates its absence.

(2): *Precise numbers for the homeless youth population are not known because young people are highly mobile and many **couch-surf** among relatives and friends, stay out on the streets or return home*[35]. Expression 'couch surf' [38] contains the idea of a free overnight stay in an impromptu home-like place.

*(3): We see people **'experiencing homelessness'**, and use the phrase **'moving through homelessness'** and 'experiencing homelessness' as much as possible, as it's more accurate* [40].

*(4): Homeless and **vulnerably housed** individuals often have worse health outcomes because they have less access to health and social services compared to those in stable housing conditions.* [English online. URL: https://english-grammar.biz]. Expressions such as 'experiencing homelessness' and 'moving through homelessness' focus on the temporal course of events, as they carry a time limit in their semantic meaning that has a positive connotative meaning of relative heroism and endurance. So, if someone is experiencing difficulties now, then it probably has a deadline and deserves credit for being resilient in difficult situations. The softening of the initial denotatum occurs due to the metonymic transfer.

The model under consideration takes into account structural changes in the focal features of the primary denotatum (for example, the undesirable feature of absence of a home is neutralized by a feature expressed by the description of problems associated with housekeeping), which contributes to the creation of a new, more complex, euphemistic meaning, the reproduction and understanding of which is a creative task and may require additional cognitive effort, as well as cause difficulties for the interpreter.

Counter-referential type of denotative amelioration

The conditions for the formation of a euphemism, when the logically deducible connection between the primary denotative meaning and the derived euphemistic invariant, the so-called *counter-referential type* of relations, has been lost, are equated with antonymic ones and serve as an example of the third model of denotative transformations within the framework of euphemistic transformations. The third model we have identified assumes that, when combined in one context, focal features go back to different denotata, which leads to the emergence of a new, third meaning, and the generation of new knowledge based on existing concepts <...> can be considered as processes of "conceptual derivation" [29, p. 39]. Accordingly, with the interaction of focal features by the type of conceptual

integration, a new meaning is formed, which incorporates the features of the often opposite initial denotata. This statement can be clarified with the following example.

(5): *It all started with a discussion on what 'home' really means, says Clara Pinsky, senior program manager for* **Skywatchers** *– a growing arts nonprofit that aims to help Tenderloin residents find and project their voices on personal, local and national issues through regular group discussions and artistic performances* [40]. The meaning of the lexical unit 'Skywatcher' or 'stargazer' refers to the profession of an astronomer, whose direct occupation is observing the sky. Also, this definition can be used in relation to those people who, in a romantic setting, spend the night in the open, watching the stars. As can be seen from the example, the substitution of the notion of 'stargazers' for the notion of 'homeless' is ironic, if not derogatory, since the reasons that prompted them to look at the stars at night are different. Covering up the social problem by appealing to romantic acts cannot be humane, which violates the basic philosophical principle of euphemia.

(6): *Let the blow fall soon or late,*

Let what will be o'er me;

Give the face of earth around,

And the road before me.

Wealth I ask not, hope, nor love,

Nor a friend to know me.

All I ask, the heaven above

And the road below me. (R.L. Stevenson. The Vagabond)

The expression 'Give the face of earth around' performs a metaphorical transfer based on the socio-communicative characteristics associated with the notion of a vagrant, namely, this is a person who does not need to communicate with people; instead, he feels himself sufficiently supported by the road on which he is going, and by the 'face of the earth'. This image, in close proximity to the discussion of friendship, gives a glimpse of the Earth as a living being with personality and soul that looks like a tramp's friend. In this example, the cognitive potential of the euphemism is enhanced by the highly imaginative metaphor, which might make interpretation difficult. "As a result, the abstractness and generality inherent in the language system acquire a single concreteness, characteristic and relevant

for its speech functioning. At the same time, we propose to consider cognitive structures as intermediate predication, providing the semantic variability of the sign in the language field" [11, p. 26].

As can be seen from the above model, the result of the interaction of focal features set by different denotata is the formation of a new mental space that integrates the characteristics of the original concept and its connotative components, as a result of which this model demonstrates a relatively high degree of imagery and, as a consequence, context dependence, which can lead to certain difficulties in decoding a euphemism with such parameters and may require additional (political, historical, economic, etc.) knowledge. It is important to consider that within the semantic space such units can be distinguished and grouped, the values of which fix separate sides of the same natural object, information about which is fixed in the meaning of the set units in the form of a certain denotative component

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, we can conclude that a euphemism, being a means of categorizing the world, allows not only to systematize ideas about the surrounding reality, but also to characterize the object itself, expressing the author's attitude while choosing a feature/features (general and deviant) and the structural complexity of its transformation, to which the focus of attention will be shifted in the process of euphemistic reconsideration of the world. The selection of semantic zones or semantic fields can be carried out by combining several denotative classes, if the name assigned to each of them objectively contains a feature that indicates their commonality.

Such a property of a euphemism as denotative amelioration (neutralization of pejorative signs of a denotatum) is a unique cognitive property that characterizes the specific activity of cognitive processes and human abilities, thereby ensuring the difference between euphemism and other forms of knowledge objectification. We also see the prospect of a linguo-cognitive study of euphemism in an in-depth analysis of the other basic properties of euphemism that we have singled out: semantic contensivity (strategy of morphosyntactic coding with a basic transition from meaning to form), which corresponds to the basic features of veiling, 'expression with a hint' semantic indeterminacy, semantic reduction and

information traduction (a property of a transferred feature), which corresponds to such a basic feature of euphemism as reliability, preservation of the truth and informativity of the original concept.

By the totality of its characteristics, euphemism can be considered a mental unit, since, being a nominative means, albeit of the second order, it participates in the processes of reflection and interpretation of reality, purposefully and uniquely objectifying the concept. Further study of the essence and properties of euphemism from the standpoint of cognitive linguistics will allow to determine the role and place of euphemism in the processes of conceptualization and categorization of the world.

References

1. Aleksikova Yu. V.*Kognitivnye Osnovy Formirovaniya Evfemizmov v Sovremennom Angliiskom Yazyke* [Cognitive Bases of Euphemism Formation in the Modern English Language]. *Voprosy Kognitivnoi Lingvistiki,* 2010, no. 3 (24), pp. 126–132.
2. Akhmanova O. S. *Slovar' Lingvisticheskikh Terminov* [A Dictionary of Linguistic Terms]. Moscow: Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya Publ., 1966. 256 p.
3. Boldyrev N. N., Aleksikova Yu. V. *Kognitivnyi Aspekt Evfemizatsii* [Cognitive Aspect of Euphemisation in the English Language]. *Voprosy Kognitivnoi Lingvistiki*, 2010, no. 2 (23), pp. 5–11.
4. Boltyanskii V. G., Sidorov Yu. V., Shabunin M. I. *Lektsii i Zadachi po Elementarnoi Matematike* [Lectures and Problems on Elementary Mathematics]. Moscow: Nauka Publ., 1971. 592 p.
5. Vavilova L. N. *K Voprosu ob Evfemizatsii Sovremennoi Russkoi Rechi* [On the Euphemization of Modern Russian Speech]. *Russkaya i Sopostavitel'naya Filologiya. Sistemno-Funktsional'nyi Aspekt.* Kazan: Kazan University Publ., 2003, pp. 40–44.
6. Widłak S. *Problema Evfemizma na Fone Teorii Yazykovogo Polya* [The Problem of Euphemism against the Background of the Theory of the Language Field]. *Etimologiya. 1965.* Moscow: Nauka Publ., 1967, pp. 267–285.
7. Gal'perin I. R. *Ocherki po Stilistike Angliiskogo Yazyka* [Essays on Stylistics of the English Language]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Literatury na Inostrannykh Yazykakh Publ., 1958. 459 p.
8. Gasparov M. L. *Perifraz* [Periphrasis]. *Bol'shaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya.* Available at: https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/bse/119760/ (accessed 23August 2021).
9. Dem'yankov V. Z. *Freim* [Frame]. *Kratkii Slovar' Kognitivnykh Terminov* (ed. by E. S. Kubryakova). Moscow: Filologicheskii fakul'tet MGU im. M.V. Lomonosova Publ., 1996, pp. 187–189.
10. Zubkova O. S. *Spetsifika Funktsionirovaniya Meditsinskoi Metafory i Meditsinskoi Metafory-Termina v Individual'nom Leksikone* [The Specificity of Functioning of Medical Metaphor and Medical Metaphor-Term in Individual Lexicon]. *Voprosy Kognitivnoi Lingvistiki*, 2006, no. 3 (8), pp. 84–89.
11. Zubkova O. S. *Funktsionalnaia Relevantnost Kontekstualnoi, Sotsialnoi, Institutsionalnoi i Ideologicheskoi Oznachivaiushchikh Praktik (Popytka Rasshireniia Poniatiinogo Apparata)* [Functional Relevance of Contextual, Social, Institutional and Ideological Signifying Practices

(An Attempt to Expand the Conceptual Apparatus)]. *Teoriya yazyka i mezhkul'turnaya kommunikatsiya,* 2013, no. 2 (14), pp. 23–33.

12. Katsev A. M. *Evfemizmy v Sovremennom Angliiskom Yazyke: Opyt Sotsiolingvisticheskogo Opisaniya*: Dis. … Kand. Filol. Nauk [Euphemisms in Modern English: An Experience of Sociolinguistic Description. Thesis]. Leningrad, 1977.

13. Katsev A. M. *Yazykovoe Tabu i Evfemiya* [Language Taboo and Euphemia]. Leningrad, LGPI Publ., 1988. 80 p.

14. Kovshova M. L. *Semantika i Pragmatika Evfemizmov. Kratkii Tematicheskii Slovar'* [Semantics and Pragmatics of Euphemisms. Brief Thematic Vocabulary]. Moscow: Gnozis Publ., 2007. 318 p.

15. Kovshova M. L. *Evfemizmy i Frazeologizmy: Ustoichivye Struktury v Aspekte Evfemizatsii* [Euphemisms and Phraseological Units: Frozen Structures from the Standpoint of Euphemisation]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo Gosudarstvennogo Oblastnogo Universiteta. Seriya: Russkaya Filologiya*, 2019, no. 4, pp. 35–48. DOI: 10.18384/2310-7278-2019-4-35-48.

16. Krysin L. P. *Evfemizmy v Sovremennoi Russkoi Rechi* [Euphemisms in Modern Russian Speech]. *Russkii Yazyk Kontsa XX Stoletiya (1985-1995)* (ed. by E.A. Zemskaya). Moscow: Yazyki Russkoi Kul'tury Publ., 1996, pp. 384–408.

17. Kuzhim G. G. *Universal'nyi Lingvisticheskii Zakon Triady. Melioratsiya i Deterioratsiya v Sovremennom Angliiskom i Russkom Yazykakh. Yavlenie Evfemii v Svete Zakona Triady*: Avtoref. Dis. … Kand. Filol. Nauk [The Universal Linguistic Law of the Triad. Amelioration and Deterioration in the Modern English and Russian Languages. The Phenomenon of Euphemia in the Light of the Law of the Triad. Abstract of Thesis]. Krasnodar, 2003.

18. Logvina S. A. *Realizatsiya Evfemisticheskogo Potentsiala Leksicheskoi Edinitsy v Ramkakh Relyatsionnoi Modeli* [Manifestation of the Euphemistic Potential of a Lexic Unit in the Framework of a Relational Model]. *Vestnik TvGU. Seriya: Filologiya*, 2020, no. 4 (67), pp. 31–43. DOI: 10.26456/vtfilol/2020.4.031.

19. Nikitina A. M. *Evfemizmy v Rechi Uchitelya Kak Sredstvo Garmonizatsii Pedagogicheskogo Diskursa:*Dis. … Kand. Filol. Nauk [Euphemisms in the Teacher's Speech as a Means of Harmonizing Pedagogical Discourse. Thesis]. Moscow, 2015.

20. Nikitina V. V. *Problema Razgranicheniya: Znachenie vs Smysl vs Ponyatie vs Kontseptkak Metayazyk Opisaniya Semanticheskoi Struktury Yazykovogo Znaka* [Problem of Differentiation: Meaning vs Idea vs Notion vs Concept as Meta-Language to Describe Semantic Structure of Linguistic Sign]. *Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki*, 2020, no. 13 (6), pp. 238–242.

21. Norman B. Yu. *Evfemizmy v Istorii i v Sovremennom Obshchestve* [Euphemisms in History and in the Modern Society]. *Russkii yazyk*, 2011, no. 9 (608), pp. 4–5.

22. Popova Z. D., Sternin I. A.*Semantiko-Kognitivnyi Analiz Yazyka* [Semantic-Cognitive Analysis of Language]. Voronezh: Istoki Publ., 2007. 250 p.

23. Porokhnitskaya L. V. *Kontseptual'nye osnovaniya evfemii v yazyke*: Avtoref. Dis. … Doktora Filol. Nauk [Conceptual Foundations of Euphemia in Language. Abstract of Thesis]. Moscow, 2014.

24. Prikhod'ko A. N. *Kontsepty i Kontseptosistemy* [Concepts and Concept Systems]). Dnepropetrovsk: Belaya Publ., 2013. 307 p.

25. SenichkinaE. P. *Evfemizmy v Prizme Tekstovoi Real'nosti* [Euphemisms in the Light of Textual Reality]. Available at: http://www.rusinst.uni.lodz.pl/pliki/Konferencja/Sieniczkina%20E.pdf. (accessed 23 August 2021).

26. Solodilova I. A., Sokolova T. Yu. *Kriterii Identifikatsii Evfemizmov* [Euphemism Identification Criteria]. *Vestnik Orenburgskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta*, 2017, no. 11 (211), pp. 73–78.

27. Teliya V. N. *Vtorichnaya Nominatsiya i Ee Vidy* [Secondary Nomination and Its Types]. *Yazykovaya Nominatsiya (Vidy Naimenovaniya).* Moscow: Nauka Publ., 1997, pp. 129–221.

28. Teliya V. N. *O Fenomene Vosproizvodimosti Yazykovykh Vyrazhenii* [On the Phenomenon of the Reproducibility of Linguistic Expressions]. *Yazyk, Soznanie, Kommunikatsiya.* Moscow: MAKS Press Publ., 2005, pp. 4–42.

29. Teliya V. N. *Konnotativnyi Aspekt Semantiki Nominativnykh Edinits* [The Connotative Aspect of the Semantics of Nominative Units]. Moscow: Nauka Publ., 1986. 141 p.

30. Uvarova E. A. *Semanticheskii Mekhanizm Evfemizatsii* [Semantic Mechanisms of Euphemisms]. *Izvestiya Tul'skogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta. Gumanitarnye Nauki*, 2010, no. 2, pp. 452–460.

31. Shcherbinina Yu. V. *Verbal'naya Agressiya* [Verbal Aggression]. Moscow: KomKniga Publ., 2006. 355 p.

32. Collins Online Dictionary. Available at: https://www.collinsdictionary.com. (accessed 19 August 2021).

33. Dilts R. *Sleight of Mouth: The Magic of Conversational Belief Change.* Capitola: Meta Publications, 1999. 350 p.

34. Heidegger M. *Being and Time.* Translated by J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001. Available at:https://kupdf.net/download/heidegger-being-and-time_58e7e4e9dc0d607b48da97e1_pdf. (accessed 19 August 2021).

35. Navarro M. *Housing Homeless Youth Poses Challenge for Mayor de Blasio.* The New York Times. March 27, 2015.Available at: https://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/28/nyregion/housing-homeless-youth-poses-challenge-for-mayor-de-blasio.html?module=inline.(accessed 19 August 2021).

36. Online Etymology Dictionary. Available at: https://www.etymonline.com. (accessed 21 August 2021).

37. Orilia F., Paoletti M. P. Properties. The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Available at: https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2020/entries/properties/.(accessed 21 August 2021).

38. Oxford English Dictionary. Available at: https://www.oed.com/. (accessed 21 August 2021).

39. Oxford Learners' Dictionary. Available at: https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com. (accessed 21 August 2021).

40. Park J. Is 'Homeless' the Right Word for Those Living on the Street? Available at: https://hoodline.com/2016/12/is-homeless-the-right-word-for-those-living-on-the-street/. (accessed 21 August 2021).

41. Rough Sleepers and Complex Needs. Available at: https://www.crisis.org.uk/ending-homelessness/rough-sleeping/rough-sleepers-and-complex-needs/. (accessed 21 August2021).

42. Supportive Housing Helps Vulnerable People Live and Thrive in the Community. . Available at: https://www https://www.cbpp.org/research/housing/supportive-housing-helps-vulnerable-people-live-and-thrive-in-the-community/. (accessed 21 August2021).

Список литературы

1. Алексикова, Ю. В. Когнитивные основы формирования эвфемизмов в современном английском языке [Текст] / Ю. В. Алексикова // Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. – 2010. – № 3(24). – С. 126–132.

2. Ахманова, О. С. Словарь лингвистических терминов [Текст] / О. С. Ахманова. – М.: Советская энциклопедия, 1966. – 256 с.

3. Болдырев, Н. Н. Когнитивный аспект эвфемизации (на материале английского языка) [Текст] / Н. Н. Болдырев, Ю. В. Алексикова // Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. – 2010. – № 2(23). – С. 5–11.

4. Болтянский, В. Г. Лекции и задачи по элементарной математике [Текст] / В. Г. Болтянский, Ю. В. Сидоров, М. И. Шабунин. – Москва: Наука, 1971. – 592 с.

5. Вавилова, Л. Н. К вопросу об эвфемизации современной русской речи [Текст] / Л. Н. Вавилова // Русская и сопоставительная филология: Системно-функциональный аспект. – Казань, 2003. – С. 40–44.

6. Видлак, С. Проблема эвфемизма на фоне теории языкового поля [Текст] / С. Видлак // Этимология. 1965. – М.: Наука, 1967. – С. 267–285.

7. Гальперин, И. Р. Очерки по стилистике английского языка [Текст] / И. Р. Гальперин. – М.: Издательство литературы на иностранных языках, 1958. – 459 с.

8. Гаспаров, М. Л. Перифраз [Текст] / М. Л. Гаспаров // Большая Советская энциклопедия. Режим доступа: https://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/bse/119760/. – (Дата обращения: 23.08.2021).

9. Демьянков, В. З. Фрейм [Текст] / В. З.Демьянков // Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов / Под общей редакцией Е.С. Кубряковой. – Москва: Издательство Московского государственного университета, 1996. – С. 187–189.

10. Зубкова, О. С. Специфика функционирования медицинской метафоры и медицинской метафоры-термина в индивидуальном лексиконе [Текст] / О. С. Зубкова // Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. – 2006. – №3 (8). – С.84–89.

11. Зубкова, О. С. Функциональная релевантность контекстуальной, социальной, институциональной и идеологической означивающих практик (попытка расширения понятийного аппарата) [Текст] / О. С. Зубкова // Теория языка и межкультурная коммуникация. – 2013. – № 2 (14). – С. 23–33.

12. Кацев, А. М. Эвфемизмы в современном английском языке (Опыт социолингвистического описания.) [Текст]: дис. … канд. филол. наук: 10.02.04 / А. М. Кацев. – Ленинград, 1977. – 190 с.

13. Кацев, А. М. Языковое табу и эвфемия [Текст] / А. М. Кацев. – Ленинград: ЛГПИ, 1988. – 80 с.

14. Ковшова, М. Л. Семантика и прагматика эвфемизмов: краткий тематический словарь современных русских эвфемизмов [Текст] / М. Л. Ковшова. – М.: Гнозис, 2007. – 318 с.

15. Ковшова, М. Л. Эвфемизмы и фразеологизмы: устойчивые структуры в аспекте эвфемизации [Текст] / М. Л. Ковшова // Вестник Московского государственного областного университета. Серия: Русская филология. – 2019. – № 4. – С. 35–48. – DOI 10.18384/2310-7278-2019-4-35-48.

16. Крысин, Л. П. Эвфемизмы в современной русской речи [Текст] / Л. П. Крысин // Русский язык конца XX столетия (1985-1995) / ответственный редактор Е.А. Земская. – 2-е изд. – М.: Языки русской культуры, 2000. – С. 384–408.

17. Кужим, Г .Г. Универсальный лингвистический закон триады. Мелиорация и детериорация в современном английском и русском языках. Явление эвфемии в свете закона триады [Текст]: автореф. дис. … канд. филол. наук: 10.02.19 / Г. Г. Кужим. – Краснодар, 2003. – 28 с.

18. Логвина, С. А. Реализация эвфемистического потенциала лексической единицы в рамках реляционной модели [Текст] / С. А. Логвина // Вестник ТвГУ. Серия: Филология. – 2020. – № 4 (67). – С. 31–43.

19. Никитина, А. М. Эвфемизмы в речи учителя как средство гармонизации педагогического дискурса: дис. … канд. филол. наук: 13.00.02 / Никитина А. М. – Москва, 2015. – 214 с.

20. Никитина, В. В. Проблема разграничения: значение vs смысл vs понятие vs концепт как метаязык описания семантической структуры языкового знака [Текст] / В. В. Никитина //

Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. – 2020. – Т. 13. – № 6. – С. 238–242. – DOI 10.30853/filnauki.2020.6.45.

21. Норман, Б. Ю. Эвфемизмы в истории и в современном обществе [Текст] / Б. Ю. Норман // Русский язык. – 2011. – № 9 (608). – С. 4–5.

22. Попова, З. Д. Семантико-когнитивный анализ языка / З. Д. Попова, И. А. Стернин. – 2-е издание, переработанное и дополненное. – Воронеж: Издательство Истоки, 2007. – 250 с.

23. Порохницкая, Л. В. Концептуальные основания эвфемии в языке: автореф. дис. … д-ра филол. наук [Текст]: 10.02.19, 10.02.20 / Л. В. Порохницкая. М., 2014. – 45 с.

24. Приходько, А. Н. Концепты и концептосистемы [Текст] / А. Н. Приходько. – Днепропетровск: Белая Е.А., 2013. – 307 с.

25. Сеничкина, Е. П. Эвфемизмы в призме текстовой реальности [Электронный ресурс] / Е. П. Сеничкина. – Режим доступа: http://www.rusinst.uni.lodz.pl/pliki/Konferencja/Sieniczkina%20E.pdf. – (Дата обращения: 23.08.2021).

26. Солодилова, И. А. Критерии идентификации эвфемизмов / И. А. Солодилова, Т. Ю. Соколова // Вестник Оренбургского государственного университета. – 2017. – № 11(211). – С. 73–78.

27. Телия, В. Н. Вторичная номинация и ее виды [Текст] / В. Н. Телия // Языковая номинация (Виды наименований). – М.: Наука, 1977. – С. 129–221.

28. Телия, В. Н. О феномене воспроизводимости языковых выражений [Текст] / В. Н. Телия // Язык, сознание, коммуникация. – М.: ООО «МАКС Пресс», 2005. – С. 4-42.

29. Телия, В. Н. Коннотативный аспект семантики номинативных единиц [Текст] / В. Н. Телия. – М.: Наука, 1986. – 141 с.

30. Уварова, Е. А. Семантический механизм эвфемизации [Текст] / Е. А. Уварова // Известия Тульского государственного университета. Гуманитарные науки. – 2010. – № 2. – С. 452–460.

31. Щербинина, Ю. В. Вербальная агрессия [Текст] / Ю. В. Щербинина. – М.: URSS, 2006. – 355 с.

32. Collins Online Dictionary [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа:https://www.collinsdictionary.com. – (Дата обращения: 19.08.2021).

33. Dilts, R. Sleight of Mouth: The Magic of Conversational Belief Change [Текст]. – Capitola: Meta Publications, 1999. – 350 p.

34. Heidegger, Martin. 2001. Being and Time [Электронный ресурс] / Translated by J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson. – Oxford: Blackwell. – Режим доступа: https://kupdf.net/download/heidegger-being-and-time_58e7e4e9dc0d607b48da97e1_pdf. – (Дата обращения: 19.08.2021).

35. Navarro M. Housing Homeless Youth Poses Challenge for Mayor de Blasio [Электронный ресурс] // The New York Times. – March 27, 2015. – Режим доступа: https://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/28/nyregion/housing-homeless-youth-poses-challenge-for-mayor-de-blasio.html. – (Дата обращения: 19.08.2021).

36. Online Etymology Dictionary [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа:https://www.etymonline.com. – (Дата обращения: 21.08.2021).

37. Orilia, F., Paoletti, M. P. Properties [Электронный ресурс] //TheStanfordEncyclopediaofPhilosophy.– Режим доступа: https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/properties/#:~:text=Properties%20are%20those%20entities%20that,characteristics”%2C%20“types. – (Дата обращения: 21.08.2021).

38. Oxford English Dictionary [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: https://www.oed.com/. – (Дата обращения: 21.08.2021).

39. Oxford Learners’ Dictionary [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа:https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com. – (Дата обращения: 21.08.2021).

40. Park J. Is 'Homeless' the Right Word for Those Living on the Street? [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: https://hoodline.com/2016/12/is-homeless-the-right-word-for-those-living-on-the-street/. – (Дата обращения: 21.08.2021).

41. Rough Sleepers and Complex Needs [Электронный ресурс]. – Режим доступа: https://www.crisis.org.uk/ending-homelessness/rough-sleeping/rough-sleepers-and-complex-needs/. – (Дата обращения: 21.08.2021).

42. Supportive Housing Helps Vulnerable People Live and Thrive in the Community. . Available at: https://www https://www.cbpp.org/research/housing/supportive-housing-helps-vulnerable-people-live-and-thrive-in-the-community/. (accessed 21 August 2021).

СУЩНОСТЬ И СВОЙСТВА ЭВФЕМИЗМА
С ПОЗИЦИИ КОГНИТИВНОЙ ЛИНГВИСТИКИ

Логвина С. А.

В статье рассматриваются уникальные свойства эвфемизма с позиции когнитивной лингвистики, которые характеризуют специфическую деятельность познавательных процессов и способностей человека, тем самым обеспечивая отличие эвфемизма от других форм объективации знаний. Актуальность риторики в данной работе соответствует предположению о том, что для того, чтобы лексическая единица имела статус эвфемизма необходима реализация трех минимально достаточных условий, т.е. лексическая единица должна обладать определенными свойствами, а именно: денотативной амелиорации, семантической контенсивности (стратегия морфосинтаксического кодирования с базовым переходом от значения к форме) и иинформационной традукции (свойство переносимого признака). В частности, в рамках статьи автор рассматривает одно из базовых свойств эвфемизма, определяющим его статус, а именно денотативную амелиорацию, что соответствует базовому признаку эвфемизма – субъективное, формальное «улучшение» денотата, улучшение значения. Денотативная амелиорация (нейтрализация пейоративных признаков денотата), является уникальным когнитивным свойством, характеризующим специфическую деятельность познавательных процессов и способностей человека, особым образом объективировать знания. В результате проведенного анализа эмпирического материала, где способы вербализации эвфемизма была рассмотрена с точки зрения одного из основных свойств эвфемизма – денотативной амелиорации, были выделены три ключевые лингвокогнитивные модели, отображающие преобразование денотативной основы в рамках эвфемистического переосмысления картины мира: по биективному типу, инъективному и контрреферентному типу семантических отношений.

Ключевые слова: эвфемизм, свойства эвфемизма, когнитивная лингвистика, денотативная основа, метафоризация, когнитивные модели, эвфемистическое переосмысление.

144