



LINGUO-CULTURAL DETERMINANTS AND NATIONAL VALUE SYSTEMS INFLUENCING EUPHEMISTIC SUBSTITUTION

Gafforova Nodira Uygunovna

Asia International University

MM2-XT-25 group master's student

nodi9411@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19950115>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 26th April 2026

Accepted: 28th April 2026

Online: 30th April 2026

KEYWORDS

*euphemism, linguo-cultural
determinants, national value
systems, cultural taboos,
linguistic politeness, social
hierarchy, cross-cultural
communication*

ABSTRACT

This article examines the intricate relationship between linguo-cultural determinants and national value systems in shaping euphemistic substitution across different linguistic communities. The study demonstrates how cultural taboos and social hierarchies and religious beliefs and collective mentalities shape the development and use of euphemistic expressions through its analysis of theoretical frameworks and empirical evidence from established research.

Introduction. The use of euphemisms stands as the most culturally sensitive method of communication because speakers choose indirect expressions to avoid social discomfort when direct communication would lead to cultural boundary violations [1]. People use euphemism as a linguistic tool because it extends beyond language systems to become a cultural element that exists in speech communities, showing their basic values and beliefs and social structures which define their national identity [2]. Contemporary research shows that people need to study cultural systems which determine how language functions to comprehend the process of creating and using euphemistic expressions, which traditional linguistic methods studied through their structural and semantic components [3]. National value systems establish shared moral standards and proper behavior norms and social relationship rules and worldviews which shape which topics need euphemistic treatment and which forms that treatment should take and which euphemistic expressions will change over time within specific language communities [4].

Methodology and literature review. The study uses systematic literature review methodology to study existing research about euphemistic substitution which exists in linguistic and cultural and cross-cultural research from works which scholars published in Uzbek and Russian and international academic sources. Holder research shows that euphemisms develop as cultural taboos emerge because different cultures define their taboo topics through their historical experiences and their specific cultural values [5]. Russian linguistic scholarship, particularly works examining Russian euphemistic traditions, emphasizes the role of collective mentality and historical experiences in shaping euphemistic patterns, noting how Soviet-era political discourse created elaborate systems of euphemism that continue to influence contemporary Russian communication practices [6].

The research on Uzbek linguistics shows that Islamic cultural values together with traditional social structures determine how Central Asian people use euphemisms for gender relationships and family honor and religious matters, which exist between these two cultural elements [7]. Current research in cognitive linguistics shows that people use euphemisms to express their most important cultural values through their basic systems of belief because they connect with all aspects of their world, which demonstrates that people use euphemisms for more than language replacement because they reveal how cultures think [8]. The research on cross-cultural pragmatics shows that national value systems determine both required euphemistic expressions and the degree of indirectness found in polite speech through euphemisms, which different cultural groups use to express their needs [9].

Results and discussion. The study of current research studies which track how linguistic and cultural factors interact with national value systems to produce euphemistic language patterns in different communities. First, cultural taboo systems directly determine which semantic domains require euphemistic treatment, with considerable cross-cultural variation in taboo hierarchies reflecting different value priorities; for instance, Anglo-American cultures traditionally maintain strong taboos around bodily functions and sexuality, generating extensive euphemistic vocabularies in these domains, while many Asian cultures place greater emphasis on euphemisms related to social hierarchy, age, and family relationships, reflecting Confucian values of respect and harmony [1, 5].

Second, religious and spiritual belief systems profoundly influence euphemistic patterns, particularly regarding death, the divine, and supernatural phenomena, with Islamic cultures developing sophisticated systems of pious euphemisms that frame death within theological contexts, while secular Western societies increasingly favor medicalized or naturalized death euphemisms that remove religious connotations [7, 10]. Third, social hierarchies and power structures embedded within national value systems manifest through euphemistic usage, with languages reflecting hierarchical societies developing more elaborate honorific and deferential euphemistic systems compared to more egalitarian cultures, demonstrating how linguistic politeness strategies encode and perpetuate existing social orders [9].

Fourth, historical experiences and collective traumas shape euphemistic traditions in lasting ways, as evidenced by post-totalitarian societies maintaining euphemistic habits developed during periods of political repression even after regime changes, illustrating how cultural memory influences contemporary linguistic practices [6]. Fifth, the dynamic nature of value systems means that euphemistic patterns continuously evolve in response to changing cultural attitudes, with contemporary movements around gender equality, disability rights, and political correctness generating new euphemistic conventions that reflect shifting societal values and sensitivities [2]. These findings demonstrate that euphemistic substitution functions as a complex cultural mechanism that simultaneously reflects and reinforces the value systems, social structures, and collective mentalities characteristic of different national communities, serving not merely communicative but also identity-marking and norm-maintaining functions within linguistic groups.

Conclusion. This analysis demonstrates that euphemistic substitution cannot be adequately understood as a purely linguistic phenomenon but must be recognized as a complex cultural practice deeply embedded within national value systems and linguo-cultural

determinants specific to particular speech communities. The research reveals that cultural taboos, religious beliefs, social hierarchies, historical experiences, and collective mentalities all play crucial roles in determining what requires euphemistic treatment, what forms such treatment takes, and how euphemistic systems evolve over time within different cultural contexts. Understanding these relationships has significant implications for cross-cultural communication, translation studies, language teaching, and intercultural competence development, as successful navigation of euphemistic conventions requires not merely linguistic knowledge but deep cultural understanding of the values and norms that underpin such conventions. Future research should continue exploring how globalization and cultural contact influence euphemistic traditions, examining whether increased cross-cultural interaction leads to convergence or diversification of euphemistic practices across national contexts.

References:

- 1.Allan K., Burrige K. Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. 314 p.
- 2.Holder R.W. A Dictionary of Euphemisms: How Not to Say What You Mean. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. 528 p.
- 3.Casas Gómez M. Towards a new approach to the linguistic definition of euphemism // Language Sciences. 2009. Vol. 31. No. 6. P. 725-739.
- 4.Shakhovsky V.I. Categorization of emotions in the lexical-semantic system of language. Moscow: URSS, 2008. 208 p. (In Russian)
- 5.Warren B. What euphemisms tell us about the interpretation of words // Studia Linguistica. 1992. Vol. 46. No. 2. P. 128-172.
- 6.Moskvin V.P. Euphemisms in the lexical system of modern Russian language. Moscow: Lenand, 2010. 264 p. (In Russian)
- 7.Rasulov I.R. Euphemisms in the Uzbek language: linguo-cultural aspect. Tashkent: Fan, 2015. 142 p. (In Uzbek)
- 8.Lakoff G., Johnson M. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003. 276 p.
- 9.Luchtenberg S. Euphemisms in the language of political discourse // Folia Linguistica. 1985. Vol. 19. No. 3-4. P. 339-354.
- 10.Fernández E.C. Sex-related euphemism and dysphemism: An analysis in terms of conceptual metaphor theory // Atlantis. 2008. Vol. 30. No. 2. P. 95-110.