

Beyond Literal Equivalence: Pragmatic Adaptation of Euphemisms in English-Russian and English-Uzbek Literary Translation

BOLTABOYEVA UMIDA MAXAMADJANOVNA
Turan International University, Namangan, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

*Euphemisms represent a particularly challenging category in literary translation because their meaning extends beyond the lexical content of an individual expression. In addition to mitigating or avoiding direct reference to sensitive subjects, euphemistic expressions may convey pragmatic intentions, interpersonal attitudes, evaluative meanings, and culturally specific associations. Consequently, their translation requires not only semantic accuracy but also attention to pragmatic effect and the cultural expectations of the target readership. This study examines the pragmatic and linguocultural aspects of translating euphemisms from English into Russian and Uzbek in literary discourse. The analysis is based on euphemistic expressions identified in Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre*, and George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, together with their Russian and Uzbek translations. The study employs descriptive, contextual-pragmatic, comparative, linguocultural, and translation-oriented methods. Particular attention is given to the relationship between pragmatic intention, functional equivalence, and translation strategy. The analysis demonstrates that literal transfer does not always preserve the communicative effect of euphemistic expressions. Depending on contextual and cultural conditions, translators may employ functional equivalents, descriptive rendering, compensation, contextual modification, or other forms of pragmatic adaptation. The findings suggest that successful translation of euphemisms depends on the preservation of their*

communicative function and pragmatic potential rather than on formal similarity alone. The study contributes to a better understanding of euphemistic translation as a form of cross-cultural mediation and highlights the importance of pragmatic and linguocultural considerations in achieving functional equivalence.

Keywords: Euphemism; literary translation; pragmatic adaptation; pragmatic equivalence; functional equivalence; linguocultural meaning; English–Russian translation; English–Uzbek translation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Euphemism is one of the linguistic means through which speakers and writers regulate the way sensitive, socially marked, or potentially offensive meanings are expressed. Rather than referring to a particular phenomenon directly, euphemistic expressions allow language users to soften, conceal, mitigate, or reframe meanings that may be regarded as unpleasant, taboo, impolite, or socially inappropriate. Their communicative value, however, cannot be reduced to the substitution of one lexical item for another. In many contexts, a euphemism simultaneously reflects the speaker's communicative intention, the relationship between interlocutors, the social norms governing a particular speech situation, and culturally determined attitudes towards the subject being discussed.

These characteristics make euphemisms a significant problem for translation studies. In literary discourse, the difficulty is particularly evident because an author's choice of an indirect expression may contribute to characterization, interpersonal relations, narrative perspective, irony, politeness, social distance, or the representation of culturally specific attitudes. Consequently, a translation that reproduces the denotative meaning of an euphemistic expression may nevertheless fail to reproduce its pragmatic effect. Conversely, a translator may depart from the formal structure of the source

expression in order to preserve its communicative function for target readers.

The problem becomes more complex when translation takes place between languages and cultures with different conventions of politeness, taboo, indirectness, and social evaluation. English, Russian, and Uzbek do not necessarily employ the same linguistic resources for mitigating sensitive meanings. An expression that functions as a natural euphemism in English may have no direct equivalent in Russian or Uzbek. In such cases, the translator has to make a choice between preserving the source form, replacing it with a functional equivalent, explaining its implicit meaning, modifying its degree of indirectness, or compensating for the lost pragmatic effect elsewhere in the target text.

Previous research has demonstrated the importance of euphemisms in translation and has examined problems associated with their semantic, cultural, and pragmatic interpretation. Studies devoted to English-Uzbek and Uzbek-Russian translation have also emphasized the role of cultural specificity and the translator's ability to preserve the communicative character of euphemistic expressions. At the same time, research on euphemism translation has often focused on particular categories of euphemistic expressions, individual translation techniques, or specific types of discourse. Pragmatic evaluation of euphemisms in translation has also been explored in other contexts, demonstrating that preservation of indirectness, politeness, and communicative intention may be more important than formal correspondence.

Despite these contributions, further attention is required to the interaction between pragmatic adaptation and linguocultural transfer in literary translation, particularly when the same source-language euphemistic expressions are considered through their Russian and Uzbek translations. Literary texts provide an especially productive field for such research because euphemisms frequently operate simultaneously at several levels: lexical, pragmatic, stylistic, interpersonal, and cultural. A comparative examination of different target-language solutions therefore makes it possible to identify not only whether an

euphemism has been translated, but also whether its communicative purpose and culturally conditioned effect have been retained, transformed, weakened, or compensated for.

The present study addresses this problem through the analysis of English euphemistic expressions and their Russian and Uzbek translations in three canonical works of English literature: Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre*, and George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. The choice of these works makes it possible to consider euphemistic usage across different literary periods, narrative contexts, and thematic domains while maintaining a common focus on English literary discourse.

The study aims to identify the pragmatic and linguocultural characteristics of English euphemisms and to determine the ways in which their pragmatic potential and linguocultural component are preserved or transformed in Russian and Uzbek translations.

To achieve this aim, the study pursues several objectives: to clarify the theoretical foundations for analysing euphemisms from a translation-studies perspective; to examine the relationship between equivalence, adequacy, and pragmatic effect in euphemistic translation; to identify and classify strategies of pragmatic adaptation; and to establish the principal ways in which the linguocultural component of euphemistic expressions is transferred in Russian and Uzbek literary translations.

The central argument of the study is that the translation of euphemisms cannot be adequately evaluated on the basis of semantic or formal correspondence alone. Functional equivalence in this area depends largely on the translator's ability to recognize the pragmatic intention of the source expression and reproduce an appropriate communicative effect in the target language. Thus, pragmatic adaptation is viewed in this study not as a departure from equivalence, but as one of the mechanisms through which functional equivalence may be achieved when direct correspondence is unavailable or insufficient.

By examining English euphemisms alongside their Russian and Uzbek translations, the study seeks to contribute to the understanding of euphemistic translation as a form of pragmatic and linguocultural mediation. It also aims to demonstrate that the

preservation of meaning in literary translation involves not only the transfer of what an expression denotes, but also the transfer of how and why that meaning is communicated.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Euphemism has long attracted the attention of linguists because it reflects the interaction between language, social norms, communicative intentions, and cultural values. One of the most influential approaches to euphemism is associated with the study of taboo and linguistic avoidance. Allan & Burridge (2006) consider euphemism within the broader system of tabooed and socially sensitive language, emphasizing that euphemistic expressions allow speakers to refer to potentially offensive or unpleasant subjects in a less direct manner. From this perspective, euphemization is not simply a lexical substitution but a socially motivated communicative practice.

The pragmatic dimension of euphemism has also been addressed within theories of politeness, indirectness, and communicative interaction. Leech (1983) emphasizes the relationship between linguistic choice and politeness, while Grice's (1975) theory of conversational implicature provides a useful basis for understanding how speakers communicate meanings that are not explicitly stated. Euphemistic expressions frequently depend on such implicit interpretation: their literal wording may be relatively neutral, whereas the intended meaning becomes clear through contextual knowledge and shared cultural assumptions. Thus, the interpretation of a euphemism requires attention to both its linguistic form and the communicative situation in which it occurs.

Lakoff & Johnson's (1980) work on conceptual metaphor is also relevant to the analysis of euphemistic language because many euphemistic expressions rely on metaphorical or figurative conceptualization. A euphemistic expression may therefore create a conceptual distance between the direct reference and the socially acceptable form in which that reference is presented. This distance may be particularly significant in literary discourse, where figurative language can simultaneously contribute to

characterization, tone, irony, and the representation of social attitudes.

In translation studies, the concept of equivalence provides an important theoretical framework for examining the transfer of euphemistic meaning. Nida (1964) distinguished between formal and dynamic equivalence, drawing attention to the response of the target reader as an essential aspect of translation. This perspective is particularly applicable to euphemisms because a formally similar translation does not necessarily produce an equivalent communicative effect. A translation may reproduce the lexical structure of the source expression while failing to preserve its degree of indirectness, politeness, emotional colouring, or social appropriateness.

Newmark (1988) similarly emphasizes the importance of communicative considerations in translation and distinguishes between semantic and communicative approaches. For euphemistic expressions, the communicative dimension is especially important because their function is often determined by the relationship between the expression and its intended audience. Baker (2018) further demonstrates that equivalence in translation should be considered at several levels, including the lexical, textual, pragmatic, and communicative levels. These approaches support the view that euphemistic translation cannot be adequately assessed through word-for-word correspondence.

The relationship between euphemism and translation has been examined in a number of more specific studies. Research on the translation of euphemisms has shown that lexical choice may be influenced by face-saving, politeness, situational context, and the cooperative nature of communication. Such findings indicate that the translation of euphemistic and dysphemistic expressions involves pragmatic decision-making rather than simple lexical replacement.

Studies devoted specifically to literary translation have likewise demonstrated that euphemisms may carry meanings that extend beyond their denotative content. A pragmatic analysis of English euphemisms in literary translation, for example, emphasizes the importance of contextual interpretation and the comparison of pragmatic functions across different versions of a

literary work. More recent research on the translation of euphemisms in fiction has also examined the relationship between euphemistic forms, translation techniques, and the resulting effect in the target text.

The cultural dimension of euphemism becomes particularly important in cross-linguistic translation. Euphemistic expressions are shaped by culturally specific attitudes towards taboo, politeness, social hierarchy, age, illness, death, bodily functions, sexuality, and other sensitive domains. Consequently, the absence of a direct equivalent does not necessarily indicate a deficiency in the target language; rather, it may reflect differences in the ways cultures organize and express socially sensitive meanings.

This issue has received increasing attention in research involving Uzbek and Russian. Kadirova (2023), for instance, examines the ethno-cultural characteristics of euphemisms and dysphemisms in Uzbek and Russian literary translation and emphasizes the role of the translator's understanding of the mental and cultural background of the source text. Her later study also identifies a range of translation procedures used in transferring euphemistic units between Uzbek and Russian, including equivalents, analogues, modulation, paraphrase, and descriptive techniques.

Recent studies have further investigated the communicative and pragmatic characteristics of euphemisms in Russian and Uzbek, indicating that euphemistic units are closely connected with culturally conditioned communicative behaviour and social conventions. Research on English and Uzbek has similarly demonstrated that cultural asymmetry, semantic divergence, and differences in politeness conventions can create substantial difficulties in the translation of euphemisms.

Although these studies provide valuable insights into the linguistic, cultural, and pragmatic dimensions of euphemism, several aspects remain insufficiently explored. First, a considerable part of the existing research concentrates on individual languages or on a single direction of translation. Second, studies of euphemism translation frequently focus on identifying translation techniques without sufficiently examining

how the selected technique affects the pragmatic function of the source expression. Third, the interaction between pragmatic adaptation and linguocultural transfer remains particularly important when more than one target language is considered. The present study addresses this gap by examining English euphemisms through their Russian and Uzbek literary translations.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. *Research design and material*

The study employs a qualitative comparative research design combining descriptive, contextual-pragmatic, comparative, linguocultural, and translation-oriented approaches. The choice of these methods is determined by the multidimensional nature of euphemistic meaning, which involves not only semantic content but also pragmatic intention, stylistic characteristics, and culturally conditioned associations.

The empirical material comprises euphemistic expressions identified in three English literary works: Jane Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre*, and George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Their Russian and Uzbek translations constitute the target-language material. The selected literary works provide diverse contexts in which euphemistic expressions perform communicative, interpersonal, stylistic, and culturally conditioned functions.

The material was collected through continuous sampling. Euphemistic units were selected when their use in the source text involved indirect, mitigated, or socially conditioned reference to a potentially sensitive concept. Particular attention was given to expressions whose pragmatic or linguocultural meaning could be modified in translation.

3.2. *Analytical framework*

The analysis is based on a multidimensional understanding of euphemistic meaning. Four principal analytical dimensions are considered.

1. First, the *semantic dimension* concerns the referential meaning conveyed by the euphemistic expression.
2. Second, the *pragmatic dimension* concerns the communicative intention of the speaker or narrator and the anticipated effect on the addressee.
3. Third, the *stylistic dimension* involves register, tone, degree of indirectness, and the role of the expression within the literary context.
4. Fourth, the *linguocultural dimension* concerns culturally specific associations, social conventions, and attitudes underlying the euphemistic reference.

Each euphemistic unit was therefore examined within its immediate textual context before being compared with its Russian and Uzbek translation. This procedure made it possible to distinguish between the preservation of referential meaning and the preservation of pragmatic and cultural meaning.

3.3. Procedure of comparative analysis

The comparative analysis was conducted in three stages.

1. At the first stage, the euphemistic expression was identified and interpreted in the English source text. Its semantic meaning, pragmatic function, stylistic characteristics, and linguocultural associations were established on the basis of contextual analysis.
2. At the second stage, the corresponding Russian and Uzbek translations were examined. Attention was paid to the lexical and structural form of the target expression, its degree of explicitness or indirectness, stylistic register, and communicative effect within the target-language context.
3. At the third stage, the source and target expressions were compared in order to determine the degree and type of transformation involved in translation. Particular attention was given to cases in which formal correspondence was absent but a comparable pragmatic function was maintained, as well as to cases in which semantic content was preserved while the euphemistic or pragmatic effect was weakened.

3.4. *Identification of translation strategies*

The study identifies several recurrent strategies used to transfer euphemistic meaning across linguistic and cultural boundaries, including functional equivalence, descriptive translation, compensation, contextual modification, and other translation transformations.

1. **Functional equivalence** refers to the use of a target-language expression that performs a communicative function comparable to that of the source euphemism, even when the two expressions differ formally.
2. **Descriptive translation** involves the expansion or clarification of an implicit meaning when the source euphemism has no sufficiently transparent counterpart in the target language.
3. **Compensation** occurs when a pragmatic, stylistic, or expressive effect that cannot be reproduced at the same textual position is conveyed through another linguistic element in the target text.
4. **Contextual modification** refers to changes in lexical choice, degree of explicitness, register, or stylistic form motivated by the communicative situation and the cultural expectations of the target readership.

These strategies are not treated as mechanically independent categories. Their selection is interpreted in relation to the pragmatic potential of the source euphemism, the literary context, and the linguistic and cultural characteristics of the target language.

3.5. *Criteria for evaluating equivalence*

The translation solutions are evaluated according to four interconnected criteria: semantic, pragmatic, stylistic, and linguocultural correspondence.

1. **Semantic correspondence** concerns the preservation of the basic referential content of the source expression.

2. **Pragmatic correspondence** concerns the preservation of communicative intention, degree of indirectness, politeness, mitigation, and intended effect.
3. **Stylistic correspondence** concerns the preservation of register, tone, and the expressive role of the euphemism within the literary context.
4. **Linguocultural correspondence** concerns the extent to which culturally relevant associations and socially conditioned meanings are retained or appropriately adapted.

On this basis, a translation may be considered functionally successful even when its formal structure differs from the source expression. Conversely, formal similarity is not regarded as sufficient evidence of equivalence if the pragmatic or linguocultural effect of the original has been substantially altered.

3.6. Reliability and validity of the analysis

The reliability of the findings is supported by the systematic comparison of source and target texts, contextual interpretation of euphemistic units, and the application of established theoretical concepts from euphemism studies, pragmatics, and translation studies.

The analysis does not rely on isolated lexical meanings. Each translation solution is interpreted within its literary and communicative context, allowing the relationship between linguistic form, pragmatic intention, and cultural meaning to be considered simultaneously.

The methodological framework thus enables the study to examine euphemistic translation as a process of pragmatic and linguocultural mediation rather than as a purely lexical operation. It also provides a basis for identifying the conditions under which translation transformations contribute to the preservation of functional equivalence.

4. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Euphemism as a pragmatic unit in literary discourse

The analysis of the selected literary material demonstrates that euphemisms function as context-dependent pragmatic units

rather than as isolated lexical substitutes. Their interpretation is determined by the interaction of the linguistic expression with the communicative situation, the relationship between the characters, the subject being discussed, and the cultural expectations underlying the interaction.

In literary discourse, euphemization may serve several functions simultaneously. It may reduce the directness of a statement, protect the interlocutor's social face, avoid an explicitly taboo reference, express politeness, conceal an unpleasant reality, or create a particular stylistic effect. In some cases, the euphemistic expression also contributes to characterization by indicating the speaker's social background, education, emotional attitude, or relationship with the addressee.

This multifunctionality explains why the translation of a euphemism cannot be evaluated solely according to lexical correspondence. A target-language expression may be semantically close to the source expression while differing substantially in its pragmatic force. Conversely, a formally different expression may perform a similar communicative function and therefore constitute a more successful translation solution.

The literary texts examined in the present study demonstrate that euphemistic meaning is particularly sensitive to context. The same semantic field may be euphemized through different linguistic resources depending on the character, communicative situation, narrative perspective, and degree of social distance. Consequently, the translator must interpret the function of the euphemism within the whole communicative situation rather than translate the expression independently of its context.

4.2. Functional equivalence and pragmatic preservation

One of the principal findings of the analysis is that functional equivalence is more relevant to euphemistic translation than formal similarity. When a direct equivalent exists but does not carry the same degree of indirectness or social mitigation, its use may result in pragmatic weakening.

The preservation of pragmatic potential involves several interconnected characteristics. These include the degree of

directness, emotional and evaluative colouring, politeness, social appropriateness, and the intended effect on the target reader. A successful translation therefore does not necessarily reproduce the same linguistic form. Instead, it seeks to reproduce a comparable communicative relationship between the expression, its context, and its recipient.

This observation is consistent with the broader distinction between formal and dynamic or functional approaches to equivalence. In the case of euphemisms, the communicative response of the target reader becomes particularly significant because the very purpose of euphemization is connected with the management of potentially sensitive information.

The comparison of English euphemisms with their Russian and Uzbek translations shows that translators may legitimately modify the source form when direct transfer would sound unnatural, excessively explicit, or culturally inappropriate in the target language. Such modification should not automatically be regarded as a loss of equivalence. When the transformation preserves the communicative intention and the relevant pragmatic effect, it may represent a form of functional equivalence.

4.3. Pragmatic adaptation as a translation strategy

The analysis identifies pragmatic adaptation as one of the principal mechanisms through which euphemistic meaning can be transferred across linguistic and cultural boundaries. Pragmatic adaptation becomes necessary when the source and target languages employ different conventional means of expressing socially sensitive meanings.

Several recurrent strategies can be distinguished.

1. **Functional substitution** involves replacing the source euphemism with a target-language expression that performs a comparable communicative function. Formal similarity may be absent, but the target expression maintains an appropriate degree of indirectness, politeness, or mitigation.
2. **Descriptive rendering** becomes relevant when a culturally specific euphemism has no sufficiently transparent

counterpart in the target language. In such cases, part of the implicit meaning may be made more explicit so that the target reader can interpret the reference correctly. Although this procedure may reduce the compactness or indirectness of the original, it can prevent a more serious loss of meaning.

3. **Compensation** is used when the pragmatic or stylistic effect of the source expression cannot be reproduced at the same textual position. A comparable effect may then be introduced through another linguistic element in the target text. Compensation is therefore particularly relevant to euphemisms whose communicative force depends on a combination of lexical choice and contextual implication.
4. **Contextual modification** involves adapting the expression to the communicative situation of the target text. Such modification may concern register, degree of explicitness, emotional colouring, or culturally appropriate terminology. The translator's decision is determined not only by the source expression itself but also by the expectations of the target readership. These strategies demonstrate that pragmatic adaptation should not be understood as a single translation technique. It represents a broader decision-making principle under which different translation procedures may be selected according to the communicative requirements of a particular context.

4.4. Russian and Uzbek translations: convergences and differences

The comparison of Russian and Uzbek translations is particularly informative because the two target languages do not necessarily provide identical pragmatic or culturally conventional resources for euphemization. Russian translations may in some contexts preserve the semantic content of an English euphemism while modifying its stylistic or emotional colouring. The translator can rely on established Russian euphemistic expressions, contextual synonyms, descriptive constructions, or stylistically marked alternatives. The choice depends on the literary context and the degree to which the source expression is culturally transparent to the Russian reader. Uzbek translations may require a different

degree of cultural adaptation. In addition to lexical equivalence, the translator must consider culturally established patterns of indirectness, respect, social hierarchy, and avoidance of sensitive references. Consequently, a target expression that appears formally more distant from the English original may nevertheless be pragmatically more appropriate for Uzbek readers.

This difference does not imply that one target language is inherently more or less capable of reproducing euphemistic meaning. Rather, it demonstrates that equivalence is conditioned by the resources and conventions available within each linguistic and cultural system. The translator therefore operates between two systems of communicative expectations rather than between two sets of dictionary equivalents.

The comparison also indicates that the same source euphemism may lead to different translation solutions in Russian and Uzbek. Such divergence is not necessarily evidence of inconsistency. It may reflect differences in cultural convention and demonstrate that pragmatic equivalence is target-oriented by nature.

4.5. Linguocultural transfer and pragmatic loss

The linguocultural component represents one of the most difficult aspects of euphemistic translation. Euphemisms frequently emerge from culturally specific attitudes toward subjects that are regarded as sensitive or socially undesirable. Their interpretation may depend on shared historical experience, social norms, religious or moral conventions, and established patterns of politeness.

When such culturally embedded meanings are transferred into another language, the translator may encounter a semantic or pragmatic gap. A formally equivalent expression may exist, but it may not activate the same cultural associations. Alternatively, the target language may contain an expression with a similar function but a different degree of social markedness.

The analysis therefore distinguishes between “semantic preservation” and “pragmatic preservation.” Semantic preservation concerns the transfer of the referential content of the source expression. Pragmatic preservation concerns the transfer

of its communicative intention and effect. Linguocultural preservation additionally concerns the cultural associations that accompany the euphemistic expression.

These dimensions do not always coincide. A translation may preserve the basic reference while weakening the euphemistic character. Another translation may preserve the mitigating function but alter the cultural associations. Such cases demonstrate that equivalence in euphemistic translation is multidimensional rather than absolute.

4.6. *The role of literary context*

The literary context plays a decisive role in interpreting euphemistic expressions. Unlike isolated lexical items, literary euphemisms frequently participate in larger stylistic and narrative structures. Their function may be connected with characterization, irony, social criticism, narrative distance, or the construction of interpersonal relationships.

For this reason, the translation strategy should be evaluated in relation to the surrounding text. A solution that appears semantically adequate at the sentence level may become inappropriate when considered within the character's speech style or the broader narrative context.

The three literary works examined in this study demonstrate different possibilities for euphemistic usage. In Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, euphemistic language may interact with social etiquette, interpersonal distance, and the conventions of polite conversation. In Brontë's *Jane Eyre*, euphemistic and indirect expressions can participate in the representation of morality, social relations, emotional restraint, and personal experience. In Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, indirect or politically conditioned language may acquire an additional ideological dimension, demonstrating how linguistic choices can influence the representation and interpretation of reality.

The diversity of these contexts confirms that euphemistic translation requires a context-sensitive approach. The translator must identify not only what the expression refers to but also what communicative and literary function it performs.

4.7. Discussion

The findings support the central proposition that euphemistic translation should be approached as a process of pragmatic and linguocultural negotiation. The translator is not simply transferring a lexical unit from one language into another but reconstructing a communicative relationship for readers who may not share the same cultural assumptions.

This perspective also allows a more precise understanding of translation adequacy. A translation should not be considered inadequate merely because its linguistic form differs from the original. Conversely, formal similarity should not automatically be interpreted as evidence of successful equivalence. The decisive question is whether the target expression performs a sufficiently comparable communicative function in its new linguistic and cultural environment.

The analysis further demonstrates that pragmatic adaptation and equivalence are not mutually exclusive. Adaptation may in fact be necessary for equivalence when the source and target languages organize sensitive meanings differently. Functional substitution, descriptive rendering, compensation, and contextual modification can therefore be regarded as mechanisms for maintaining communicative continuity rather than as deviations from the source text.

The English-Russian and English-Uzbek comparison additionally demonstrates that translation strategies are influenced by the cultural distance between the source and target systems. The same English euphemism may require different solutions in Russian and Uzbek because the target languages differ in conventional ways of expressing politeness, social sensitivity, and indirectness. The translator's competence consequently involves both linguistic knowledge and intercultural pragmatic awareness.

Overall, the results indicate that the translation of euphemisms is best understood through a multidimensional model of equivalence in which semantic, pragmatic, stylistic, and linguocultural factors interact. Such a model provides a more comprehensive explanation of why certain translations preserve

the communicative effect of the source expression while others retain only its referential meaning.

5. CONCLUSION

The study has examined euphemism as a pragmatically and linguoculturally marked phenomenon in English literary discourse and has explored the ways in which euphemistic meaning is transferred into Russian and Uzbek. The analysis confirms that euphemistic expressions cannot be adequately understood or translated as isolated lexical units. Their communicative value is determined by the interaction of semantic content, pragmatic intention, stylistic characteristics, literary context, and culturally conditioned expectations.

The findings demonstrate that the achievement of equivalence in euphemistic translation does not necessarily depend on formal similarity between the source and target expressions. In many cases, the preservation of communicative function requires modification of the linguistic form. A target expression can therefore be considered functionally equivalent when it reproduces an appropriate degree of indirectness, mitigation, politeness, evaluative meaning, or other relevant pragmatic effect, even when its lexical structure differs from that of the source expression.

The study has also shown that pragmatic adaptation constitutes an important mechanism of euphemistic translation. Functional substitution, descriptive rendering, compensation, and contextual modification provide translators with means of overcoming lexical and cultural asymmetry. The selection of a particular strategy is determined by the pragmatic potential of the source euphemism, the literary context, the cultural distance between the languages, and the expectations of the target readership.

The comparison of Russian and Uzbek translations demonstrates that equivalent translation solutions cannot always be expected to coincide across target languages. Differences in cultural conventions, politeness patterns, social norms, and established euphemistic resources may require different forms of

adaptation. Such differences should not be interpreted simply as deviations from the source text; they may represent necessary adjustments aimed at achieving comparable communicative effects.

The research further confirms the importance of the linguocultural component in euphemistic translation. Euphemisms frequently encode culturally specific attitudes toward socially sensitive subjects, and these associations may not have direct counterparts in another language. Consequently, successful translation requires the translator to recognize both the explicit reference and the implicit cultural meaning associated with the source expression.

The analysis of *Pride and Prejudice*, *Jane Eyre*, and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* demonstrates that literary context is essential to the interpretation of euphemistic language. Euphemistic expressions may participate in characterization, interpersonal communication, social representation, stylistic organization, and, in some cases, ideological meaning. Their translation should therefore be evaluated within the broader narrative and communicative context rather than at the lexical level alone.

The principal theoretical implication of the study is that equivalence in euphemistic translation should be regarded as multidimensional. Semantic correspondence represents only one component of the translation relationship. Pragmatic effect, stylistic value, and linguocultural associations must also be considered when evaluating the success of a translation.

From a practical perspective, the findings may be useful for literary translators, translation students, and researchers working in pragmatics, linguoculturology, and translation studies. The proposed analytical framework may also be applied to other culturally sensitive linguistic phenomena whose successful translation depends on the relationship between linguistic form, communicative intention, and cultural interpretation.

The study ultimately demonstrates that translating euphemisms is not a matter of choosing the closest lexical equivalent. It is a process of reconstructing communicative meaning across linguistic and cultural boundaries. The

translator's ability to identify the pragmatic purpose of an euphemistic expression and to reproduce an appropriate effect in the target language is therefore central to achieving functional equivalence.

REFERENCES

- Allan, K. & Burridge, K. 2006. *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Austen, J. 1813. *Pride and Prejudice*. T. Egerton.
- Baker, M. 2018. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Brontë, C. 1847. *Jane Eyre*. Smith, Elder & Co.
- Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Eshchanova, M. Kh. 2025. Linguacultural problems in translating euphemisms in Uzbek and English media discourse. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations*, 4/5, 678-684. <https://doi.org/10.71337/inlibrary.uz.jmsi.122670>.
- Fayzieva, N. 2025. The communicative-pragmatic features of euphemisms related to political process in English and Uzbek political discourse. *The Lingua Spectrum*.
- Grice, H. P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics: Vol. 3. Speech Acts* (pp. 41-58). Academic Press.
- Kadirova 2023. [Study on ethno-cultural characteristics of euphemisms and dysphemisms in Uzbek and Russian literary translation]. *Language and Culture*.
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.
- Leech, G. N. 1983. *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman.
- Newmark, P. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. A. 1964. *Toward a Science of Translating*. E. J. Brill.
- Matyakubov, Z. M. 2025. Linguapragmatic analysis of euphemisms in interpersonal relations in Uzbek and foreign languages. *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal*, 112-118.
- Orwell, G. 1949. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Secker & Warburg.
- Radjabkulov, O. R. 2026. Euphemistic substitution as a cross-cultural pragmatic strategy: Contrastive analysis of English and Uzbek. *Science Time*, 4/4. <https://doi.org/10.66345/stj.v4i4/2.5940>

Radjabov, N. N. 2025. Translation problems of euphemisms in the English and Uzbek languages. *Latin American Journal of Education*.

Sodikova, Sh. B. 2025. Morphological and semantic features of medical euphemisms in English and Uzbek language. *Shokh Library*.

BOLTABOYEVA UMIDA MAXAMADJANOVNA

PHD STUDENT,

TURAN INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY,

NAMANGAN, UZBEKISTAN.

E-MAIL: <UMIDABOLTABAEVA50@GMAIL.COM>