



Similarities and Dissimilarities in Euphemisms in Turkish and Russian

Türkçe ve Rusçada Benzer ve Ayrılan Yönleriyle Örtmeceler

Hanife Saraç¹, Eda Havva Tan Metreş²



ABSTRACT

This study discusses and compares the subject of euphemisms in Russian and Turkish. It first categorizes and then examines euphemisms based on ‘meaning’ and ‘structure’ in both languages. As a result of the examination, the study determined that items such as ‘semantic shift’, ‘simile’, ‘hyperbole’, ‘using common nouns’, and ‘domestication’—which were created for Turkish and included in the ‘meaning-based euphemisms’ classification—were absent in the ‘lexical meaning-based euphemisms’ classification in Russian. Similarly, the study also revealed that the items such as ‘the way of using paronyms’, ‘the ellipsis method’, ‘meiosis method’, and ‘interjection method’, which occur in the Russian vocabulary, do not have equivalents in the categorization created for Turkish. In this sense, the study semantically analysed one of the common aspects of the two languages in depth, the ‘metaphorization method’ (in Russian) and ‘idiom transfer and metaphors’ (in Turkish), and determined that meaning-based transfers in Russian were formed through commonalities of colour, shape, and function, while Turkish made transfers through the nature–human cycle. In contrast, the study evaluated ‘structure-based euphemisms’ in both the Russian and Turkish vocabulary based on similar and divergent items in the two languages, which were explained through examples. The study results show that euphemisms, which are frequently used in daily life, politics or, literature, also appear in different languages and show differences/similarities at the morphological and semantic levels. As one of the elements that reveal this universal characteristic of *language*, euphemisms constitute one of the significant tools of the language phenomenon with their use to aestheticize vulgar terms or mask intended meaning.

Keywords: Euphemisms, language, Russian, Turkish, semantics, morphology

ÖZET

Bu çalışmada Rusça ve Türkçede örtmeceler konusu karşılaştırmalı olarak ele alınmakta ve her iki dilde “Anlam” a ve “Şekil” e dayalı olmak üzere kategorize edilerek incelenmektedir. Yapılan inceleme neticesinde, Türkçe için oluşturulan ve “anlama dayalı örtmeceler” sınıflandırmasında yer alan “Anlam Kayması”, “Benzetme, Teşbih”, “Abartma”, “Tür Adı Kullanma” ve “Yerlileştirme” gibi maddelerin Rusçadaki “sözcüksel anlama dayalı örtmece” sınıflandırmasında bulunmadığı saptanmıştır. Benzer bir biçimde Rusça sözcüklerinde yer etmiş olan “Eş Köklü Kelime Kullanım Yöntemi”, “Eksiltme Yöntemi”, “Meiosis Yöntemi” ve “Ünlem Kullanımı Yöntemi” gibi maddelerin de Türkçe için oluşturulan kategorizasyonda karşılığının bulunmadığı ortaya konmuştur. Bu anlamda iki dilin ortak yönlerinden biri olarak ise “Metaforlaştırma Yöntemi” (Rusçada) ve “Deyim Aktarması, İğretileme, Metafor” (Türkçede) anlamsal derinlikleriyle ele

¹Assoc. Prof. Russian Language and Literature, Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon, Türkiye

²Assist. Prof. Russian Language and Literature, Akdeniz University, Antalya, Türkiye

ORCID: H.S. 0000-0001-8280-4624;
E.H.T.M. 0000-0001-6350-7296

Corresponding author/Sorumlu yazar:

Hanife Saraç,
Russian Language and Literature, Karadeniz
Technical University, Trabzon, Türkiye
E-mail: caylakhhanife@gmail.com

Submitted/Başvuru: 30.05.2022

Accepted/Kabul: 01.12.2022

Citation/Atf:

Saraç, H., & Tan Metreş E. H. (2022). Similarities and dissimilarities in euphemisms in Turkish and Russian. *TUDED*, 62(1), 455–487.
<https://doi.org/10.26650/TUDED2022-1123441>



alınmış, bu başlık özelinde Rusçadaki anlam odaklı aktarımların renk, şekil, işlev gibi benzerlikler üzerinden oluşturulduğu, Türkçede ise doğa-insan döngüsü üzerinden bir aktarma yolu izlendiği saptanmıştır. Diğer yandan hem Rusça hem Türkçe söz varlığında yer alan “Şekle Dayalı Örtmeceler” de iki dildeki benzer ve ayrışan maddeler üzerinden değerlendirilmiş ve örnekler üzerinden açıklanmıştır. Çalışmadan elde edilen sonuçlar göstermektedir ki günlük hayatta, politikada ya da edebiyatta sıklıkla başvurulan örtmeceler farklı dillerde de vücut bulmakta, morfolojik ve anlamsal düzeyde farklılıklar/benzerlikler sergilemektedir. Dilin bu evrensel olma özelliğini ortaya koyan unsurlardan biri olarak örtmeceler, kaba olanı estetize etme ya da asıl söylenmek isteneni maskeleyen amaçlı kullanımlarıyla dil olgusunun önemli araçlarından birini teşkil etmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Örtmeceler, dil, Rusça, Türkçe, anlam, morfoloji, kültürel farklılıklar

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

The concept of ‘euphemism’, which is *euphémisme* in French, *verhüllung/euphemismus* in German, and *eufemismo* in Spanish, in some western languages comes from the Greek word *εὐφημισμός* (euphemismus) and means ‘to say a nice word about something, to say good and auspicious words’ (Aksan, 1990, p. 98). Euphemisms occur in the socio-psychological dimension of languages, and they are and should be considered valuable.

Borrowing, as a form of censorship, denotes social control mainly by replacing inappropriate, harsh expressions with soft and convoluted ones. In this sense, individual and social events such as fear, sadness, respect, pressure, belief, and illness that cause the controlled use of the language are areas that require in-depth studies specific to each language. Euphemisms differ in their subject matter. Although their degree of importance and density differs from language to language, the most common topics are religion, sexuality, excretion, some organs of the body, politics, money/social status, race, death, etc. This study established the concept of euphemisms, which have their linguistic features, and discussed the semantic features and the formation of euphemisms that are widely used in Russian and Turkish. This study focuses on euphemisms that emerged from the pressure of taboos and were defined as implicit expressions. The logic and manner of forming euphemisms, which also have national, local, traditional, and historical dimensions, will be evaluated with two different cultures and languages. In this context, the study attempts to explain the logic behind euphemisms in Turkish and Russian with their differences and similarities through examples.

This study first examined the methods from the aforementioned studies to create a table of euphemisms in Turkish. In the light of these methods, euphemisms in the Turkish vocabulary were determined and a Turkish-specific table was created. The words in this table are categorized under three main headings: ‘structure-based euphemisms’, ‘meaning-based euphemisms’, and ‘borrowings’. Additionally, a detailed examination of the euphemisms in Russian and Turkish was conducted by creating sub-headings under these main headings.

In the examination conducted under this heading, the euphemisms used in Russian, and Turkish are reviewed in the tables created for both languages. As per the classification, meaning-based euphemisms can be grouped under 11 and 12 titles in Turkish and Russian, respectively. Because of the semantic and structural differences between the languages, Table 1 comprises ‘meaning-based euphemisms’ in Turkish and ‘lexical meaning-based euphemisms’ in Russian and offers the opportunity to view all meaning-based euphemism types in both languages collectively. After presenting the general view, the main and sub-headings are explained. Table 2 presents the titles containing all the structure-based euphemisms in Turkish and Russian. The classifications for Turkish and Russian were obtained from the Turkish and Russian literature, respectively; they were compared, grouped, and matched. In this context, the study attempts to explain the logic behind euphemisms in Turkish and Russian with their differences and similarities through examples.

The study results show that euphemisms, which are frequently used in daily life, politics, or literature, also appear in different languages and show differences/similarities at the morphological and semantic levels. Euphemisms, which are utilized in every language for psychological, pragmatic, or sociological reasons, constitute a different dimension of the language phenomenon. This study compared the two languages technically through euphemisms and revealed the differences and similarities between these languages through various examples. Although the usages have different names, it can be stated that the concept of language reflects the common aspects observed in the different cultures of different geographies. The usages that differ from each other and are unique to each language can be seen as a manifestation of the cultural diversity in the world. In both ways, this indicates the reflection of cultural differences or commonalities in societies on language through euphemisms.

1. Introduction

Each society has created some material and moral rules to keep its individuals together, reinforce their desire to live together, and ensure that the agreement continues uninterrupted. These rules have affected language in different ways. In this context, the language that an individual explores for socialization also becomes restrictive for the socialized individual. The individual who needs to name concepts is often exposed to pressure when transferring the phenomenon they named to the social environment. This pressure, which can be explained through the concept of taboo, actually has individual and social dimensions. In the most general term, taboo, which is defined as ‘the set of rules that are not welcome in society’ (Freud, 2002, p.36; Örnek, 2000, p. 219), is often considered negative, and this negativity significantly affects the language. Social taboo is prohibitive and normative. As a result of the taboo, the individual/society has to create another internal/sub-language field within the language for communication. This resulting linguistic field is called euphemism (implicit expression) (Karabulut & Ospanova, 2013, p. 122).

The concept of ‘euphemism’, which is *euphémisme* in French, *verhüllung/euphemismus* in German, and *eufemismo* in Spanish, in some western languages, comes from the Greek word *εὐφημισμός* (euphemismus) and means ‘to say a nice word about something, to say good and auspicious words’ (Aksan, 1990, p. 98). To express the concept of euphemism, which is the term used in the international literature, terms such as ‘edebî kelâm’ (Ospanova, 2014, p. 9), ‘güzel adlandırma, iyi adlandırma’ (nice naming) (Aksan, 1990, p. 98), ‘hüsütâbir’ (Condon, 1998, p. 101), ‘güzelleme’ (Bilginer, 2011, p. 441), ‘örtmeceli değinmece’ (euphemistic mentioning), ‘ad aktarımları’ (name transfers) etc. were used in Turkish. In Russian, the term ‘evfemizm’ (эвфемизм) is used. According to Russian researcher Katsev, euphemisms are words that directly serve to tone down words that are unacceptable in terms of the accepted norms and morals in society (Katsev, 1988, p. 7). Researcher Krysin states that the use of euphemism has three main functions: 1) toning down what sounds vulgar and unpleasant, 2) masking reality, and 3) concealing reality (Krysin, 2004, p. 265). For linguist Seničkina, author of *The Russian Dictionary of Euphemisms*, euphemisms are ‘expressions used in place of a word that is inappropriate to use or which people do not want to pronounce for several reasons’ (Seničkina 2006, p. 5). Researcher Aliya Almoldina mentions that the use of euphemisms has four interrelated dimensions: linguistic, psychological, sociological, and pragmatic (Aymoldina, 2012, p. 2). Yelena Šeygal regards the pragmatic dimension as ‘the reflection of the speaker’s interests’ (Šeygal, 2000, p. 249). In other words, euphemisms, which are a language phenomenon, should be examined with a special approach that considers the psychological and social lives and mentality of people.

Euphemisms differ in their subject matter. Although their degree of importance and density differs from language to language, the most common topics are religion, sexuality, excretion, some organs of the body, politics, money/social status, race, death, etc. The first studies in the field of euphemism were conducted by Scottish anthropologist James Frazer and Russian linguist

Dmitry Zelenin. Frazer examined every aspect of taboos and euphemisms present in the cultures of all countries (types of taboos, reasons for and results of their development, beliefs based on them, etc.). Zelenin, in contrast, studied taboos and euphemisms in the cultures of people living in Eastern Europe and Northern Asia (Güngör, 2006, p. 71). In Turkey, Doğan Aksan was the first person to include the concept of euphemisms in a scientific book. Aksan preferred to use the term ‘nice naming (güzel adlandırma)’ for euphemism and evaluated this subject under ‘Nice Naming’ in the ‘Onomatology’ section of his book *All Aspects Linguistics: The Main Lines of Language (Her Yönüyle Dil: Ana Çizgileriyle Dilbilim)*. Researcher Nizamettin Uğur included euphemisms under ‘References’ and ‘Name Transfers’ in his book *Semantics: The Semantic Expansion of the Word (Anlambilim: Sözcüğün Anlam Açılımı)*, classifying euphemisms and dealing with them under headings such as ‘euphemistic references, euphemistic name transfers, euphemistic complementarity-based name transfers, euphemism-oriented verb transfers, and euphemistic complementarity-based verb transfers’. A master’s thesis titled ‘Charles Bukowski and his women and analysis of the two translations of the novel through euphemism and dysphemism’, written by Ilgın Aktener in 2011, is a study that reveals the effect of the concept of ‘gender’ on ‘use of euphemisms’. Additionally, Gülmira Ospanova’s doctoral thesis titled ‘Türkiye Türkçesi’nde Örtmeceler’ (Euphemisms in Turkey Turkish!) includes examples of euphemisms in Turkish dialects and Russian as well as euphemisms in Turkey Turkish. Based on the euphemism data she obtained, Ospanova created and added a ‘Turkey Turkish Euphemism Dictionary’ at the end of her study.

Euphemisms occur in the socio-psychological dimension of language, and they are and should be considered valuable. This study focuses on euphemisms that emerged from the pressure of taboos and were defined as implicit expressions. The logic and manner of forming euphemisms, which also have national, local, traditional, and historical dimensions, will be evaluated with two different cultures and languages. In this context, the study attempts to explain the logic behind euphemisms in Turkish and Russian with their differences and similarities through examples.

2. The Formation of Euphemisms

People use euphemisms by establishing a common coordination relationship between the speaker’s idea and the listener’s perception strategy. Attempts to define the basic functions of euphemisms were realized because of the studies of researchers such as Warren (1992), Allen and Burridge (2006), Krysin (1994), Turganbaeva (1989), and Bosacheva (1989). These researchers were interested in the social and political functions of euphemisms (Demirci, 2008, p. 30). In this context, the functional-thematic classification proposed by Moskvin for euphemisms is significant. The first group included here is euphemisms that refer to frightening events (Moskvin, 2010, p. 82). Such euphemisms are about sickness, death, threats, and divine powers. The euphemisms included in this group are generally formed by nominalization through direct or implicit denial: *poluçit’ travmy* (to get injured) and *nesovmestimye s žizn’ju* (incompatible

1 Turkish which is spoken in Turkey.

with life). Another group is euphemisms that are frequently used in daily life. They are used as an escape from an unpleasant, disgusting, and unappealing reality. There are numerous different classifications of euphemisms in the modern Russian language. That said, there are three very detailed and widespread classifications by Vasily Moskvın, Yelena Seniçkina, and Leonid Krysin. Krysin is one of the first individuals to make thematic classifications of euphemisms. In his work, he classifies euphemisms under the following four groups (Krysin, 1990, p. 268):

1. some physiological processes and conditions.
2. certain body parts related to the genitals.
3. relationships between the sexes and
4. diseases and death.

The first linguist to list how euphemisms are formed in Russian linguistics, in general, was Janna Varbot. Some types of euphemisms mentioned in this list are borrowed words, descriptive expressions, definitions, collective nouns, and euphemisms formed through modifying pronouns (Varbot, 1979, p. 345). The table for Russian euphemisms that make up the topic of this study was based on the euphemism classification of Russian linguistics researcher Muhammed Hassen Sammani Mansur.

According to Çabuk, a researcher who studies the formation of euphemisms used in Turkish, '[a]lthough the formation of euphemisms changes from culture to culture, there are commonalities between different societies in the studies conducted on this subject' (Çıftođlu, 2015, p. 139). To create a structural scheme of the words and phrases used as euphemisms in Turkish based on these approaches, it is necessary to refer to first these studies. In this context, researcher Ahat Üstüner mentions how to form euphemisms under 12 headings in Adil Ahmedov's study titled 'Taboos and Euphemisms in Turkish Languages (Türki Dilderindeđi Tabu men Evfemizmder)': euphemistic metaphors, euphemistic metonyms, irony, euphemistic figures of speech, euphemisms comprising phrases, euphemisms comprising pronouns, other influences that form euphemisms, deformation, ellipses, borrowed words, ellipses (three dots instead of syllables of the word) and resulting from the respectful expressions (Üstüner, 2009, p. 173).

This study first examined the methods from the aforementioned studies to create a table of euphemisms in Turkish. In the light of these methods, euphemisms in the Turkish vocabulary were determined and a Turkish-specific table was created. The words in this table are categorized under three main headings: 'structure-based euphemisms', 'meaning-based euphemisms', and 'borrowings'. Additionally, a detailed examination of the euphemisms between Russian and Turkish was conducted by creating sub-headings under these main headings.

To reveal the prominent similarities and differences in Russian and Turkish, two separate euphemism tables were created, and these tables were analyzed together under the headings of 'structure-based euphemisms' and 'meaning-based euphemisms'.

3. Meaning-based euphemisms specific to Turkish and Russian

In the examination conducted under this heading, the euphemisms used in Russian, and Turkish are reviewed in the tables created for both languages. As per the classification, meaning-based euphemisms can be grouped under 11 and 12 titles in Turkish and Russian, respectively. Because of the semantic and structural differences between the languages, Table 1 comprises ‘meaning-based euphemisms’ in Turkish and ‘lexical meaning-based euphemisms’ in Russian and offers the opportunity to view all meaning-based euphemism types in both languages collectively. After presenting the general view, the main and sub-headings are explained.

Table 1. Meaning-based euphemisms

Meaning-based euphemisms (in Turkish)	Lexical meaning-based euphemisms (in Russian)
1. Idiom transfer and metaphor A) Transfer from humans to nature B) Transfer from nature to humans C) Transfer from nature to nature	1. Metaphorization method A) Based on colour similarity B) Based on shape similarity C) Based on location similarity D) Based on functional similarity E) Based on impression
2. Noun transfer, metonymy	2. Metonymization method
3. Using synonyms	A) Naming an object with the substance of which that object was made B) Transferring a place name to a group of people C) Referring to a place with a movement or event that occurred there D) Naming an action with its result
4. Semantic change A) Semantic restriction in euphemisms B) Semantic extension in euphemisms C) Semantic shift*	3. The method of using synonyms 4. The method of using antonyms 5. The method of using paronyms**
5. Allegory and connotation	6. Semantic extension method
6. Simile*	7. Semantic restriction method
7. Irony and humour	8. Ellipsis method**
8. Hyperbole* A) To seem smaller or less B) To seem bigger or more	9. Meiosis method**
9. Using common nouns	10. Allegory method
10. Generalization of proper nouns	11. The method of attributing proper nouns
11. Domestication*	12. Interjection method**
Note: *Denotes items that are in Turkish but not in Russian. **Denotes items that are in Russian but not in Turkish.	
Source: The authors created the list by examining the different classifications in the literature.	

The study starts by expanding on and giving examples of the Russian titles in Table 1. While examining, priority is given to the common titles in both languages. To simplify the narration, first, their general views are presented under the examined headings; then, detailed examples are presented.

Metaphorization Method/Idiom Transfer, Metaphor

In Russian	In Turkish
Metaphorization method A) Based on colour similarity B) Based on shape similarity C) Based on location similarity D) Based on functional similarity E) Based on impression	Idiom transfer and metaphor A) Transfer from humans to nature B) Transfer from nature to humans C) Transfer from nature to nature

In Russian, the metaphorization method functions in terms of describing and naming objects (people, events, etc.) by establishing a similarity in any way. Some of these euphemisms are classified as follows (Mansur, 2015, pp. 57–59):

A) Based on colour similarity:

- ‘red days’ (*krasnye dni*) instead of *menstruation* (*menstruatsiya*).
- ‘clay’ (*glina*) instead of *feces* (*kal*).

B) Based on shape similarity:

- banana (*banan*)—male genitalia.
- *female bosom* (*ženskoye lono*)—female genitalia.

C) Based on location similarity:

- ‘pupa’ (*korma*) instead of *butt* (*zadnitsa*).
- *wagging tail* (*vertet’ hvostom*) for a woman of low morals seeking sexual adventure.

D) Based function similarity:

- ‘priestess of love’ (*žiritsa ljubvi*) meaning *prostitute* (*prostitutka*), the common feature is devotion to a service.
- ‘roof’ (*kryša*), meaning *the person responsible for protecting prostitutes*, the common feature is protection.

E) Similarity based on impression:

- to ‘spoil the air’ (*isportit’ vozduh*), meaning *to expel gas from the intestines* (*ispuskat’ gazy iz kišečnika*), the common feature is to create an unpleasant situation.
- ‘Tax manoeuvre’ (*nalogyve manevry*) in the sense of tax evasion, the common feature is cheating and cunning.

In Turkish, this usage is defined as follows: ‘It is the event of transferring a word to a concept by establishing a relationship between the concept expressed by the word, what it signifies and another concept, often by analogy’ (Aksan, 1990, p. 185). Examples and explanations

regarding the three types of classification for this usage, which are transfers from humans to nature, from nature to humans, and from nature to nature, are as follows:

A) Transfer from humans to nature

The use of human body parts, organ names, clothing parts and human attributes for beings in nature is a type of transfer from humans to nature; for example, ‘kocaoğlan’ (big boy) instead of the *bear* (Çiftoğlu, 2015, p. 153).

B) Transfer from nature to humans

It is the use of elements that exist in nature, or that are related to nature, for humans (Çiftoğlu, 2015, p. 154). Consider the following examples: *boynuzlu* (horned)—(A man) who is tolerant of the unchastity of his wife or one of his female acquaintances (Turkish Dictionary, 2005, p. 308) and ‘çam yarması’ (split pine tree) instead of a *very big man* (Özder, 1981, p. 25).

C) Transfer from nature to nature

It is the transfer of a feature belonging to an element in nature to another element in nature. For example, *yıldırım* (lightning): *stroke, paralysis*.

When these meaning- and lexical-meaning-based euphemism methods are evaluated in the context of the two languages, it was determined that meaning-oriented transfers in Russian are formed through similarities such as colour, shape, and function, whereas in Turkish, transfers occurred through the nature–human cycle.

Metonymization Method, Noun Transfer

In Russian	In Turkish
Metonymization method	Noun transfer, metonymy
A) Naming an object with the substance of which that object was made	
B) Transferring a place name to a group of people	
C) Referring to a place with a movement or event that occurred there	
D) Naming an action with its result	

Metonymy is the transfer of the name of an object to other objects based on their similarities (Krysin, 2007, p. 54). The metonymy types that form euphemisms in Russian are as follows (Mansur, 2015, p. 60):

A) Naming an object with the substance of which that object was made:

For example, ‘rubber’ (rezinka) instead of a condom (prezervativ).

(1) Does he not want to be protected? But you want it... Then you buy a condom yourself and tell him that ‘you can’t get anything if you don’t put the **rubber** on’. Ne hočet predohranjatsja? A ty hočeš... Togda sama prezervativy kupii yemu skaji: ne nadeneš’ **rezinku** – ničego ne polučiš.

B) Transferring a place name to a group of people:

For example, using a city, capital names, etc. instead of the name of a group, government or state in diplomatic language.

(2) ‘*Ankara will respond to the USA with similar sanctions*’, Erdogan said. ‘**Ankara ovetit**’ SŞA zerkal’nymi sanktijami’, - skazal Erdogan.

C) Referring to a place with a movement or event that took place there:

(3) *The Iranian leader’s adviser threatened Trump that Iran would become the ‘Second Vietnam’ for them. Sovetnik verhovnogo lidera İrana prigrozil Trampu ‘Vtorym V’etnamom’;*

‘to support, to be a supporter (bolet’ za svoj karman)’ instead of *being stingy (žadničat’)*;

(4) *A bureaucrat will be a supporter of own his pocket, not of the state (Činovnik ne budet za gosudarstvo bolet’, tol’ko za svoj karman).*

D) Naming an action with its result:

Instead of *sexual intercourse* (polovoj akt), ‘fertilization (*plodotvorenje*)’, ‘progeny production (*proisvodstvo potomstva*)’.

According to Aksan (1990, p. 190), this usage, which is termed as ‘noun transfer, metonym’ in Turkish, is the expression of a concept with another concept—another indicator—without using itself. For example, the expression ‘to get sick’ is not used directly in the idioms of *Yataklara döşenmek, yatağa (veya yataklara) düşmek, yatak yorgan (veya döşek) yatmak* (laying on the beds, falling on the bed (or beds), lying on a quilt (or mattress)), and this expression, which is not intended to be direct, is expressed with a covert transfer (Osanova, 2014, p. 239).

The euphemisms are formed in Russian by making connections between the material an object is made of or through association for a location and a group of people. In Turkish, these euphemisms formed through the associated concept, under the title of ‘Noun Transfer’, give a veiled expression to the things that the speaker does not want to say directly.

The method of using synonyms

Euphemisms are considered ‘one of the varieties of synonymy’ in the literature of linguistics. The speaker chooses neutral synonyms to lighten the situation and not create negative emotions for the respondent (Boldrev & Aleksikova, 2010, p. 5; Karasik, 1991, p. 174): ‘Plump (polnen’kij)’ instead of *fat* (tolstji); ‘discomfort (nedomoganiye)’ instead of *sickness* (bolezn’). When considering this method, which is expressed with the same title in Turkish and Russian in the table created, it should be noted that the examples presented in Russian are also available in Turkish. In Turkish, the expression ‘plump (toplu)’ is used instead of *fat*, and the expression ‘discomfort (rahatsızlık)’ is used instead of *sick*.

The method of using antonyms

In Russian	In Turkish
Using antonyms	Irony, humour

In some contexts of the euphemism process, a statement that is opposite to what is meant is preferred. Such examples in Russian are as follows:

- ‘smart (umnyj)’ instead of *stupid (glupyj)*.
- ‘perceptive, intelligent (ponjativlyj)’ instead of *bonehead, dim witted (bestolkovyj)*.

Lexical units have only one meaning; antonymous meanings such as irony, pessimism, optimism, and superstition emerge for social and psychological reasons. These kinds of emotional (pessimism, irony, etc.) euphemisms, which are addressed under a separate title in Russian, are under the heading ‘Irony, Humour’ in the table for Turkish. The irony is described as ‘[making] fun of a person or event by implying the opposite of what is said’ in the Turkish Dictionary (2005, p. 980). In irony, the meaning implicitly indicated by the speaker is completely different from the apparent meaning and is usually the total opposite (Karaağaç, 2013, p. 346). For example, ‘cici anne (cute mom)’ instead of *stepmother. Kaldırım mühendisi* (pavement engineer) (used sarcastically about an unemployed person).

The method of using paronyms

One of the language phenomena in the euphemism table created for Russian is the use of paronyms words, that is, the use of puns (Jaskevič, 2007, p. 160), also known as *paronyms* in the literature. Paronyms are words that do not match each other in terms of meaning; however, they are similar in terms of a sound, root, and word–grammar relation (Višnjakova, 1984, p. 14). For example, ‘promyšlennik (industrialist)’ instead of the word—with a similar sound—*moščennik (deceiver, trickster)* and ‘alkonavt’ instead of *alcoholic (alkogolic)*. There is no such title in the euphemism table created for Turkish.

Semantic change

In the table created in Turkish, ‘semantic restriction’ and ‘semantic extension’ and their usages are presented under the heading of ‘Semantic Change’. In the table in Russian, they are not presented under one main title but under separate headings. Additionally, ‘semantic shift’, another one of these sub-headings, is not found in the table in Russian. Examples and explanations of such uses are as follows.

Semantic restriction

This method restricts the meaning of a word (Kovşova, 2007, p. 50). The word expresses only a part of its meaning in the context through the restriction of its extensive semantic volume (Mansur, 2015, pp. 57–59). For example, the word *člen (member, personnel)* is used in the sense of male genitalia (Ojegov, 1990, p. 884). However, there are four definitions of

the word in the Russian Language Dictionary: 1) person included in any union; 2) one of the parts that make up a whole; 3) A body part and 4) article, member of the family or an element of a sentence (Ojegov, 1990, p. 884). The word *cell* (*kamera*) is used to mean ‘ward’, the word *hall* (*salon*) is used to mean ‘brothel’, and the word *performer* (*ispol’nitel’*) is used to mean ‘executioner’.

Evaluating this usage specifically in Turkish, Aksan states that ‘[a] word describing only a part or a type of what it used to describe, a narrowing in its meaning compared to its original form’. For example, *akşamcı* (evening person) (*person who is in the habit of drinking in the evening, tippler*) and *sıkışmak* (to be jammed) (*having to use the toilet*). The use of this euphemism shows similarities in both languages.

Semantic extension

Euphemisms are also created by extending the semantic volume of a word because semantic extension enables the word to not be expressed openly (Mansur, 2015, p. 63). Russian examples of this usage are as follows:

- ‘institution (učrejdenie)’ instead of *prison* (*tjurma*).
- ‘male honour (mujskoye dostoinstvo)’ instead of *male genitalia* (*polovoj organ*).
- ‘operations (dejstvija)’ instead of *acts of terrorism* (*terakty*) or *acts of violence* (*bojevye akty*).
- ‘herbs (travki)’ instead of *narcotics* (*narcotiki*).

The semantic extension is ‘when, in time, words that are used to describe a type or a part of an entity and denote its narrow usage areas start to describe the whole of that entity, all its types, reflecting aspects that are used in broader terms’. (Aksan, 1990, p. 120) For example, the expression *Bakırköy’ü boylamak*, which means ‘to go crazy’ in Turkish, indirectly describes the negative situation in question by referring to a mental and neurosurgery hospital in Bakırköy, a district in Istanbul (Osanova, 2014, p. 163). This meaning-based euphemism exists similarly in both languages.

Semantic shift

In the table created in Turkish, under the heading ‘semantic change’, the semantic shift is also known as ‘transition to another meaning’, which refers to a word reflecting a new concept separate from the concept it used to reflect. These changes, which are sometimes linked to changes in social life and sometimes directly to psychological effects or other reasons, occur in every language. It has been observed that the expressions ‘makineyi bozmak (breaking the machine)’ and ‘motoru bozmak (breaking the engine)’, which are not very pleasant to say directly and used when expressing an illness, means to have ‘an intestinal disorder, a diarrhea’, which are completely different from their original meanings (Osanova, 2014, pp. 165, 166). There is no such title in the euphemism table created in Russian.

Ellipsis method

Using semantic ellipsis is also one of the ways to generate euphemistic codes. Ellipsis softens negative connotations by reducing the worrisome factors (Šeygal, 2000, p. 256). In the euphemism of *losing one's virginity* (*poterjat' nevinnost'*), the meanings of 'sexual intercourse' or 'rape' are removed. Moreover, in the euphemism of 'if something happens to me' (*esli so mnoj čto-nslučitsja*) the meanings of *death* (*smert'*) and *sickness* (*bolezni*) are removed, and when talking about dogs in the phrase 'raising one's leg' (*podnjat' nožku*) (o sobake) the meaning of 'peeing' (*pomočitsja*) is removed (Mansur, 2015, pp. 57-59). These examples, transferred from Russian, are also found in Turkish; however, such a title is not included in the meaning-based table of euphemisms of this language.

Meiosis method

The method of meiosis, which means the deliberate toning down of an expression to reduce its intensity, is similar to that of semantic ellipsis (Šahovskij & Tahtarova, 2008, p. 336). Meiosis has a slightly negative connotation that prevents the receiver from being nervous (Mansur, 2015, pp. 57-59). Examples of this usage in Russian are as follows:

- instead of *criminal, sinful* (*grešnyj, vinovnyj*) 'not without sin (ne bez greha)'.
- 'to not like that much (nedoljubit')' instead of to *hate* (*nenavidet'*) and
- 'error (nestykovočki)' instead of *serious problems* (*ser'joznye problemy*).

Meiosis euphemisms are often used in diplomatic language to mitigate what is meant. Consider the following example:

- (5) *Vorob'yev stated that the situation regarding COVID-19 around Moscow is not that easy* (*Vorob'yev nazval 'očen' neprostoj' situatsiju s COVID-19 v Podmoskov'e*) (Rutkovskaja, 2020).

In the euphemism table created in Turkish, there is no title for this usage; however, the act of lightening some difficult situations is also present in this language, such as 'pek sevmemek (not being fond of something)' instead of *hating*; consider the following example:

- (6) *Reuters'a konuşan ve isminin açıklanmasını istemeyen üst düzey bir AKP yetkilisi ise 'Bu karar Davutoğlu'nun parti üstündeki gücünü zayıflatacak. Davutoğlu'nun işi bundan sonra kolay olmayacak' dedi* (*A senior AKP official, who spoke to Reuters and asked not to be named, said, 'This decision will weaken Davutoğlu's power over the party. Davutoğlu's job will not be easy from now on.'*) ("Davutoğlu gücünü kaybediyor," 2016)

- (7) *Doncaster halkı politikacıları pek sevmez. Vaatlerin yerine getirilmesinin -eğer gerçekleşirse- çok uzun sürdüğünü bilirler; bu nedenle de yapmaları gereken bir şey olduğunda başlarının çaresine bakarlar* (*The people of Doncaster do not*

like politicians very much. They know that promises can come true; if they come true, it takes too long; that's why they take care of themselves when they have to. (“Avrupa’nın Gündemi | Fransa’da sosyal güvencesizlik yangını,” 2009).

Allegory method

In Russian	In Turkish
Allegory method	Allegory, connotation

In the use of this euphemism in Russian, the receiver is expected to make a deduction about a certain person, object, event, etc. For example:

(8) Afghanistan is *second Vietnam* for the USA (Afghanistan – eto *vtorojV’etnam dlja SŞA* (the second defeat of the USA) (Armejskij Vestnik, 2018). When examining the usage of this euphemism in Turkish, connotation refers to ‘indirect speech, implicitly specifying, marking, allusion, hinting’ (Turkish Dictionary, 2005, p. 960). When not wanting to express the name of an entity or a concept, which is feared and harmful, an implicit expression is adopted. Instead of *Cinler*(*Demons*), ‘İsmi lazım değiller (That which shall not be named)’ or ‘iyi saatte olsunlar (Let them come at good time)’ are preferred (Çiftoğlu, 2015, p. 148).

Attributing proper nouns

In Russian	In Turkish
Attributing proper nouns	Generalization of proper nouns

One of the euphemisms used in Russian is attributing proper nouns. Nikitina (1999, p. 1584) has defined this as the use of ‘eponyms’. Consider the following example:

- *Kamelija*, for a woman of easy virtue (typically representing women from the highest class of promiscuous women who are usually lovers of rich men).
- for a man who is a womanizer, *Don Juan* (this name is first mentioned in *The Trickster of Seville and the Stone Guest*, written by Tirso de Molina, and is a widely used name today in the sense of a flirtatious person).
- for a foolish person, *Ivanuşka* (in Russian folklore, he is a blond, blue-eyed, simple-minded, and lucky but is also a stupid character).
- for a stingy person, *Pljuşkin* (Stepan Plyushkin is the name of a stingy salesman in Nikolay Gogol’s *Dead Souls*).

In some of the uses of these euphemisms in Russian, proper nouns turn into abstract nouns to form euphemisms:

(9) *We have no doubt that this school psychologist is a fifth-degree Plyushkin* (U nas njet somnenij, etot škol’nyjpsiholog– ‘*pljuşkin*’ pjatoj stepeni). In Turkish, these euphemisms, which are included under the title of ‘Generalisation of Proper Nouns’, are formed by gaining a general meaning of any entity called by a proper name.

The proper nouns of people or entities reach a general level when any feature of the people and entities they refer to becomes available to everyone (Karaağaç, 2013, p. 328); for example, ‘beberûhî’ instead of a *short, unlikable man* and ‘Karafatma’ instead of *cockroach*.

Interjection method

Although relatively few, Russian interjections also serve as euphemisms. Interjections have the power of expressing worrisome or prohibited matters, especially etiquette (Mansur, 2015, pp. 65–66). Consider the following examples:

-*t’fu t’fuis* used to avoid the evil eye.

-*pli!* in the sense of ‘shoot’ is used in the military; *ah ve eh* instead of words that directly express emotions of shame, sadness, etc.

(10) *We’re in luck now, tu tu tu (Poka, t’fu t’fu, nam vezet).*

The table created in Turkish does not specify such an item. However, the interjection ‘tu tu’, which is used to avoid the evil eye, is also present in Turkish and is similar to the one in Russian.

Simile

This title, which is included in the table created in Turkish, is not included in the euphemism table in Russian. A simile is the description of an object or entity through the similarity it shares with another object or entity (Sev, 2012, p. 499). For example, ‘İmamın kayığı (the imam’s boat)’ instead of a *coffin*, and ‘tahtalı köy (wooded village)’ instead of a *cemetery*.

Hyperbole

The title of ‘Hyperbole’ that is included in the euphemism table created in Turkish is not included in the Russian table. Hyperbole is the exaggeration of an existing being and events by taking them beyond their real dimensions. Here, an entity becomes a signifier to another entity with an overstatement or understatement relationship (Karaağaç, 2013, p. 46). The meaning of an object or concept in euphemisms formed in this way in Turkish is either smaller, less, and lighter, or larger, more, and stronger than usual. Examples and explanations of these classifications are as follows.

Understatement

Understatement is to present something as smaller or lesser than it is, to lighten the intensity of meaning by naming an object or a concept outside of its true meaning and dimensions. For example, ‘çorba parası (soup money)’ instead of *bribery* and ‘ahiret uykusü (afterlife sleep)’ instead of *death*.

Overstatement

Overstatement is to present something as more or as bigger than it is, to increase the intensity of meaning by naming an object or a concept outside of its real meaning and dimensions. For example, *Allah deveşi* (*God's camel*) (is a kind of fly with long legs, a long body, and wings).

Using common nouns

This euphemism method used in Turkish refers to an undesirable word with a common noun that it is associated with in terms of concepts such as illness, pain, wounds, animals, or birds. For example, 'akıl hastası (mentally ill)' instead of *deli* (*crazy*) and 'yarasa (bat)' instead of *ağşam kuşu* (*evening bird*). Such a title is not included in the table created in Russian.

Domestication

Domestication, which is a euphemism method in Turkish, is defined as 'pronouncing a word in a foreign language by assimilating it with the words in the mother tongue in terms of sound, shape, and meaning'. Euphemisms created through domestication exist in slang vocabulary. For example, *Âmâ* (*Ar. Blind*), *Diyabet* (*Lat. Diabetes*). Such a title is not included in the euphemism table created in Russian based on lexical meaning.

4. Structure-based euphemisms specific to Turkish and Russian

Table 2 presents the titles containing all the structure-based euphemisms in Turkish and Russian. The classifications for Turkish and Russian were obtained from the Turkish and Russian literature, respectively; they were compared, grouped, and matched.

Table 2. Structure-based euphemisms in Turkish and Russian

1. Structure-based euphemisms in Turkish	1. Structure-based euphemisms in Russian
<p>A. Through word building</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Composition/compound word 2. Derivation/derived noun <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1. Examples of nouns derived from verbs 2.2. Examples of nouns derived from nouns 2.3. Examples of verbs derived from nouns 3. Acronyms* 4. Onomatopoeia 5. Euphemisms created by changing a letter of a word 6. Word groups <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6.1. Curse* 6.2. Prayer* 6.3. Idiom* 6.4. Hendiadys* <p>B. Euphemisms formed through sound changes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Abbreviation 2. Child language* 3. Sound derivation <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1. Prothesis 3.2. Epenthesis 3.3. Epithesis 4. Haplogy 5. Ellipsis 6. Sound duplication and gemination 	<p>A. Methods of morphological euphemisms</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affixation <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1. Suffixal method 1.2. Prefixal method 1.3. Prefixal-suffixal method 2. Compositions/compound word <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1. Word-building clean composition <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1.1. Formations with the connecting vowels (o/e) 2.1.2. Formations without a connecting vowel 2.2. Compounds with suffixes 3. Abbreviation <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1. Abbreviations comprising the first letters or sounds of words 3.2. Abbreviations formed through combinations of syllables <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3.2.1. Euphemisms formed through the combination of two stems 3.2.2. Euphemisms formed through the combination of a part of a word stem and an entire other word <p>B. Morphological-syntactic methods</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nominalized adjectives 2. Nominalized verbal adjectives 3. Nominalized numbers 4. Nominalized pronouns <p>C. Lexical-syntactic methods**</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paraphrasing** 2. Parenthesis and collocation** 3. Syntactic ellipsis 4. Comparative method ** <p>D. Euphemisms created on the basis of letters</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Spelling error 2. Indicating what one wants to say with the ellipsis symbol** 3. Transformation** 4. Use of various fonts and symbols** <p>E. Phonetic euphemism methods**</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aposiopesis** 2. Sound similarity 3. Phonetic distortion ** 4. Onomatopoeia <p>F. Borrowing</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Borrowed words (loanwords) from a foreign language 2. Borrowed terms 3. Euphemisms of book language
<p>Note: *Denotes items that are in Turkish but not in Russian. **Denotes items that are in Russian but not in Turkish.</p>	
<p>Source: The authors created the list by examining the different classifications in the literature.</p>	

Structure-based euphemisms exist in both Russian and Turkish vocabulary. In this study, this section will be explained through items in Russian. Presenting the usages in question in

a certain sequence was deemed appropriate to make the subject more understandable. This sequence is as follows:

1. First, Russian structure-based euphemism sub-headings will be discussed together with the items similar to Turkish, that is, the similarities will be explained through Russian items.
2. Afterwards, Turkish structure-based euphemisms, which are not included in the Russian table, will be analysed. In other words, there will first be an analysis of similar overlapping items in both languages and then divergent items. In Table 2, in the ‘structure-based euphemisms in Turkish’ column, euphemisms that are unique to Turkish are marked.

First, the Russian vocabulary explains ‘**1. Affixation**’, which is discussed under the main heading of ‘**A. Methods of morphological euphemisms**’ in the Russian part of Table 2, with the following words: ‘one of the methods of euphemisms is affixing’. These affixes are divided into the following subgroups (Mansur, 2015, pp. 66–67):

Suffixal method: Euphemisms, formed with the suffixes **-en’k-**, **-on’k -**, **ovat’ - / -evat’**, **-nič-**, **-ašk-**, **-ušk - / -jušk -**, **-ik**, etc. and which reflect the speaker’s subjective view, are used quite often: ‘*strašnovatyj* (strangish)’ instead of *strašnyj* (*strange*) and ‘*strogon’kij* (hardish)’ instead of *strogij* (*hard*).

Prefixal method: In euphemisms, prefixes that indicate the limitations of the verb (**po-**, **pod-**, **pri-**, etc.), especially the **no-** prefix, are frequently used:

‘**poisportit’**, **poportit’** (to spoil a little)’ instead of *-isportit’* (*to spoil, to ruin*);
‘**pribolet’** (get a little sick) instead of *bolet’* (*to get sick*).

Prefixal-suffixal method: Some words form euphemisms by adding two different affixes to the stem, such as a prefix and a suffix. For example, the French word *ferlakur* (philanderer) forms the euphemism **poferlakurničat** (to act flirtatious, in Russian) with the prefix **po-** and the suffixes of **-nič-** and **-a-**. With the **po-** prefix and **-stv-**, **-ova-** suffixes added to the proper noun Don Juan, which is generally used to mean flirtatious, form the euphemism ‘**podonžuanstovvat’** that refers to the action of courting women.

The Turkish equivalent of the main title of ‘**Methods of morphological euphemisms**’ and the ‘**1. Affixation**’ sub-heading in the Turkish table is ‘sound derivation’, which is presented in the third item under the main title of ‘euphemisms formed through sound changes’:

Sound derivation:

This title included in the structure-based euphemism table created in Turkish refers to the subsequent emergence of a sound that does not exist in a word. The sound derivation is divided into three groups: prosthesis, epenthesis, and epithesis (Yüksekkaya, 2012, p. 106).

Prothesis: Prothesis occurs when a vowel or consonant that does not exist in a word appears at the beginning of the word (Yüksekkaya, 2012, p. 106). For example, *İşporta* (*Ital. sporta*) (Aktunç, 1998, p. 152)

Epenthesis: Epenthesis is the appearance of a vowel or consonant within a word that does that was not present before (Yüksekkaya, 2012, p. 106). For example, *Kakanoz* (*Pers. Kaknūs 'tan*): 1. *Ugly, unlikable (female)* and 2. *Old, weak, withered (person)* (Aktunç, 1998, p. 159).

Epithesis: Epithesis occurs when a vowel or consonant that does not exist in a word appears at the end of the word (Yüksekkaya, 2012, p. 106). For example, *Iskata* (*from Ar. iskāt 'tan meaning dropping, throwing down*) (Aktunç, 1998, p. 144).

The Use of 'Compositions/Compound Words' in the A/2 item of the Russian Part and the A/1 item of the Turkish Part in Table 2

In Russian	In Turkish
2. Compositions and compound words 2.1. Word-building clean composition 2.1.1. Formations with the connecting vowels (o/e) 2.1.2. Formations without a connecting vowel 2.2. Compounds with suffixes	1. Compositions/compound word

This euphemism form, which is expressed as 'compositions/compound words' in both languages, is a group of words produced by combining and standardizing more than one word in certain ways following Turkish word patterns to refer to a new concept (Yüksekkaya, 2012, p. 168). For example, 'sözebesi (word midwife)' instead of *chatty*, and 'abdesthane (ablusion division)' instead of *toilet*. Compounding (slovoşloginiye) word groups formed in Russian are primarily analysed under the main title of 'Morphological Euphemism Methods'. This structure occurs when two or more meaningful words come together to form a single word. Consider the following examples:

- 'pravonarüşitel', meaning *criminal (prestupnik)*.
- 'slaboslyşaščij', meaning *deaf (glukhoj)*.

There are structural and formal categories in words that contribute to the formation of euphemism in Russian (Mansur, 2015, p. 67-68). These are as follows:

Word-building clean composition:

- Those formed by the connecting vowels (o/e): *jenoljub* (womanizer) and *preljubodejaniye* (sexual intercourse outside of marriage).
- Formations without a connecting vowel: 'ekonom-klass', meaning *relatively cheap* (otnositel'no deşevye) and 'şury-mury', meaning *love affair, sexual intercourse* (polovye otnoşenija).
- Compounds with suffixes: 'band for mirovaniye' for criminal groups, 'prazdnoljubets' for lazy and 'dobrojelatel' in the sense of a snitch.

‘Composition’, one of the structure-based euphemism methods has a narrow field under a single title in Turkish. However, in Russian, the method in question has a field that includes creation through the use of connecting vowel (o/e) letters and suffixes.

Abbreviation:

As one of the methods of forming euphemisms in Turkish, ‘abbreviation’ is referred to as an ‘abbreviated noun or word, shortening’ in the Turkish Dictionary (2005, p. 1165). Unlike ‘acronyms’, abbreviations are read letter by letter, and not as a word. The euphemisms formed with abbreviations, which are few in Turkish, have originated from foreign languages. For example, ‘WC’ (Eng. water closet) instead of the *toilet* (Güngör, 2006, p. 79). One of the exceptional types of composition in euphemisms in Russian is an abbreviation. The tendency for euphemistic abbreviations can be explained by the fact that they are catchy and do not have negative connotations. Additionally, abbreviations created in Russian are divided into two types (Mansur, 2015, pp. 68–69):

Abbreviations comprising the first letters or sounds of words: *B/U* in the sense of used, second hand and *ČP* (emergency situation) instead of stray, undesirable event or accident.

Abbreviations formed through combinations of syllables: There are two types of abbreviations and euphemisms that are formed by the combination of syllables:

- Euphemisms formed through the combination of two stems: *spetslag* (spetsial’nij lager’) for the prisons for political prisoners.
- Euphemisms formed by combining a part of a word stem with another word: *Orgvyvody*, *spetsmery* for punishments or special measures and *ispravdom* for prison.

In Russian, ‘Nominalized Adjectives’ that are under the main title of ‘**B. Morphological-syntactic methods**’ are similar to euphemisms formed with derived nouns in Turkish:

- ‘start of the month (mesjačnye)’, meaning *menstruation*.
- ‘without a nose (beznosaja)’, meaning *death*.

- ‘tip (čayeveye)’ instead of *bribery*, etc. In other words, while the structure of euphemisms produced in Turkish is in the form of a derivation from verbs and nouns, the derivation form in Russian is focused on nominalization. Nominalization is the method in morphological-syntactic methods, which refers to ‘transferring various types of words to noun forms’ (Matveyeva, 2010, p. 467). Unlike derivations in Turkish, euphemisms formed in Russian can also be in the form of the nominalization of various word types. These are usually adjectives, verbal adjectives, pronouns, and even numbers. The examples and explanations of these structures are as follows (Mansur, 2015, pp. 69–70):

(1) Nominalized adjectives.

(2) Nominalized verbal adjectives: drinker (*p'juščij*) for *drunk*, for a person with psychological disorders (*nevmenjaemyj*) and for a poor person (*maloimuščij*).

(3) Nominalized numbers: *the second ninety* (*vtorye devjanosto*) for the butt. The standard female physique measurement of '90-60-90' is referred to in the second 90, which indicates the female hip measurement in centimetres. The military jargon uses the euphemisms of *two hundredth* (*dvuhsotyj*) for a deceased soldier and *three hundredth* (*tryohsotyj*) for a wounded soldier.

(4) Nominalized pronouns: some (*nekotorye*) instead of forbidden or unwelcome nouns; *not one of us* (*ne naš*) for an enemy; that thing (*eto samoe*) for sex and It/Him (*on*) for God (*bog*), devil (*čert*) and bear (*medved'*).

Lexical-syntactic methods:

This structure is examined under the main heading of 'Lexical-syntactic Methods' in Russian. There is no such main title in the euphemism formation table in Turkish. Some of the lexical-syntactic euphemism methods in Russian are paraphrasing (Mironina, 2012), transitive verbs (Uvarova, 2012), parenthesis (Kovšova, 2007), comparison (Moskvin, 2010) and ellipsis (Šeygal, 2000). The table in Turkish does not have such usages.

Paraphrasing:

Paraphrasing is to express what is meant to be said through descriptions or slight changes (Ahmanova, 1969, p. 312). In this case, for euphemisms to form, the phrases must be paraphrased. For example, instead of 'invalidity' for people with disabilities, *litsa s ograničennymi vozmožnostjami* (people with limited means); for gaining weight *narodvesa* (*weight gain*) instead of 'ožireniye (obesity)'; instead of he is always drunk (on *vsegda p'janyj*) he is never sober (*on nikogda ne byvayet trezvyj*) and *ne polučajuščiezarplaty* (unpaid people) instead of 'bezrabotnye' for the unemployed (Mansur, 2015, p. 70). The table in Turkish does not have this usage.

Parenthesis and collocation:

These words or collocations are included in the sentence; however, they do not establish a syntactic relationship with the other elements of the sentence. They are used as signal words that add a euphemistic meaning to the speech to not disturb the receiver: *myajgkho vyražajas'* (to put it mildly), *čestno govorja* (to be honest), *kak by skazat'* (how to say it), etc. The table in Turkish does not have such usages.

Syntactic ellipsis:

In Russian	In Turkish
3. Syntactic ellipsis	5. Ellipsis

As abovementioned, this structure, which exists in the structural euphemism table created in Turkish and Russian, can comprise very different structures, such as sound ellipsis, utterance, affix or sentence element ellipsis seen in every plane of the Turkish language (Elm, 2012, p. 74). In this sense, euphemisms in slang vocabulary have end-of-word sound ellipsis. *Köpoğlu*, which emerged from the ‘köpek oğlu (dog son)’, is an elliptical structure used for a scoundrel and trickster and is formed by the elision of sound (Osanova, 2014, p. 201). In Russian, this form of euphemism, which is titled ‘Syntactic Ellipsis’, is the dropping (skipping) of an easy-to-understand word in the context (Ojegov, 1990, p. 907). In other words, unlike semantic ellipsis or skipping, syntactic ellipsis omits some elements of the sentence to tone down the expression, but the receiver can easily surmise these unspoken elements. For example, *he/she is taking (on brjet)*, the omitted word here is ‘bribery (vzjatku)’, and *it does not get up (ne stoit)*, the word omitted here is the male genitalia ‘člen’.

Comparative method:

Researcher Vasily Moskvina categorizes comparisons as direct and indirect. In Russian, there are linguistic markers (the suffixes of *-ee*, *-ej*; the conjunctions of *kak*, *budto* and the verbs *napominat’*, *pohožij*, *shodnyj*, etc.) that predicate comparison in direct comparison:

(12) The flat looked like it had been through several wars (*Kvartira vygljadit tak, budto perežila ne odnu vojnu*).

In indirect comparison, this is not the case (Moskvina, 2010, p. 173). Consider the following examples:

- dela, kak sažabela* (things are clean as soot), meaning that things are bad.
- *čist kak trubočist* (as clean as a chimney sweep), meaning that very dirty.

Euphemisms created on the basis of letters:

Another language phenomenon in forming euphemisms in Russian is ‘**Euphemisms are created based on letters**’. According to Sannikov (1999, p. 537), it is the least uninspired (interesting) type of euphemism, which is formed with letters and ‘because the receiver can immediately make associations’ (Tišina, 2006, p. 8). The speaker makes use of certain letters to soften their speech and avoid the negative reaction of the receiver (such as resentment, fear, uneasiness, and anger). The sub-headings of this structure are as follows (Mansur, 2015, pp. 73–74):

Spelling errors:

In Russian	In Turkish
Spelling error	Euphemisms created by changing a letter of a word

This sub-heading, which is referred to as ‘Spelling Error’ in Russian, is formed by omitting the middle (syncope) or the end of a word (apocope) as this euphemism is used to avoid swearing or an inappropriate word (Uvarova, 2012:10) For example, *bl..*, *idi ty v J...*, *idi na h...*, *eb..*.

It is possible to talk about a similar structure under the heading of ‘Euphemisms based on of letters’. This structure can be observed in Table 2 in the item ‘Euphemisms Created by Changing a Letter of a Word’. In this context, when using euphemisms in the form of nouns—such as *salça* (tomato paste), meaning ‘kalça (hip)’ in Turkish slang; ‘döt (referring to *göt*, which means butt)’; ‘mök (referring to *bök*, which means shit)’ etc.—it is easy to understand the intended meaning. For example, *Herife bak be!... Ooh, mis gibi hayat, mök gibi para vardır valla (Look at the guy!... Ooh, he has such a good life, he must have an ish load of money)* (Çiftioğlu, 2015, p. 203).

Indicating what one wants to say with the ellipsis symbol:

This method is mostly preferred in written language.

(13) – *Ty što... Sovsem... Kakaja možet byt’ devuška?* (What are you saying... All of it... What type of girl could she be?)

There is no such item in the euphemism table created in Turkish. However, it can be observed that ellipses (three dots) are preferred in some abusive expressions or uses that are considered vulgar. However, there is no consensus on this subject in academic studies.

Transformation:

In the transformation method, the euphemism is formed by changing the appearance of a word. Consider the following examples:

-ež tvoju jat’ instead of a vulgar curse.

-pipetsya or *kopets* instead of *pi*dets*, which is a vulgar word. There is no item in the Turkish table that includes the use of such examples.

Use of various fonts and symbols:

In Russian, this method occurs by consciously using some symbols instead of obscene words.

(14) *Menja eto, mjağkko vyražajas’*, «&^%\$#@!» (Mansur, 2015, p. 74). There is no such item in the euphemism table created in Turkish.

Phonetic euphemism methods:

One of the main headings in the structure-based euphemism table created in Russian is Phonetic euphemism methods. In the table created in Turkish, there is no such title. When forming euphemisms in Russian, phonetic means are also used to correspond to a forbidden

concept. These means ensure that words that will evoke negative emotions in the receiver are skipped. Some of the phonetic means in question are as follows (Mansur, 2015, pp. 74–76):

Aposiopesis:

Deliberately not ending a sentence instead of stating it entirely is a euphemism method wherein the receiver is expected to understand the meaning of the situation or context so that they are not offended. For example:

(15) After a couple of glasses of drinks, I think you all can... (Po-mojemu, vy vse togda možete, kak by skazat' ... posle pary bokalov piva). Here, sexuality is being referred to (Sovetskiy Sport, 2010). There is no such sub-heading in the structure-based euphemism table created in Turkish.

Sound similarity:

In Russian	In Turkish
2. Sound similarity	6. Sound duplication

This structure, which is expressed with the sub-title of ‘sound similarity’ in Russian, can be integrated with the title of ‘sound duplication’ in Turkish as it is a euphemism realized over the sound. While there is repetition in the euphemism created in Turkish, what is meant in the structure in Russian is a phonemic allusion by using similar-sounding words instead of the word (Baskova, 2006, p. 12). In Russian usage, similar-sounding word change usually occurs with rhyming slang. Consider the following examples:

-similar to *eb..a mat*, which is a vulgar profanity, is *japana mat* (name of a restaurant in Moscow);

-similar to *k čertu, čert s nim* (damn) is *nu ego kšutuya dašut s nim* (expressions used when reluctantly showing agreement and forced concession).

-similar to *rygal* (He puked), *ego vyrvalo is poyekhal v Rigu* (He went to Riga), which exemplifies this type of euphemism. In Turkish, in euphemistic words formed by sound duplication, some consonants between two of the inner sound vowels are repeated on the condition that they belong to two separate syllables. For example, *güççük* (the smallest raki bottle) (Karaağaç, 2012, p. 80).

Phonetic distortion:

Changing the form of words or phonetic transformations is often done to cover up obscene words. In these cases, the receiver immediately understands the distortion. It is as if the speaker makes a mistake during pronunciation but deliberately creates a euphemism. For example, ‘blin’ (*damn, dammit*) instead of the rude word *bl’*. There is no such sub-heading in the structure-based euphemism table created in Turkish.

Onomatopoeia:

Although this structure has a different equivalent in every language, the onomatopoeias formed in Russian are imitations of the sounds made by living or inanimate beings in nature and the description of the movements of these beings. Consider the following examples:

-*tararakhat'*, *tararakhnut'*, denoting the powerful sound of a gun being fired.

-*pis-pis*, used to encourage children to pee. The current onomatopoeia structure in Turkish is a usage that expresses the sounds and noises in nature through imitation or description (Topaloğlu, 1989, p. 127). In Turkish, euphemism with reflexive words is mostly observed in the names of diseases: 'cıcır' instead of *diarrhea*. Some structures created from sounds imitating nature can correspond to the expressions and words that people avoid saying directly. Such euphemisms are as follows (Osanova, 2014, p. 202): *çiş*, *kaka* (*pee, poop*) and its derivatives *kakalamak* (*pooping*) in children's language and *cıvcıv* (*chick*) (*young, inexperienced, easily deceived girl, woman, or boy*) in slang.

Borrowing:

Borrowing also appears as a euphemism method in Russian. These borrowed words are mostly foreign terminologies and words taken from language books. They have a structure that comprises the following headings (Mansur, 2015, pp. 76–79):

Borrowed words (loanwords) from a foreign language:

Borrowed words from a foreign language do not arouse negative feelings in the receiver because these words have a nice timbre and (Krysin, 2004, p. 188) generate a neutral connotation. Some examples of this usage are as follows:

Words borrowed from Latin: *genitalii* for genitals, *letal'nyj* for lethal and *reformatorij* for juvenile prison.

Words borrowed from English: *topless* for bare female breasts, *džentel'men* for the impotent and *vaterklozet* for toilet.

Words borrowed from French: *linžeri* for lingerie, *bonvian* for flirtatious and *podşofe* for half-crocked.

Words borrowed from German: *şvah* for bad, nasty and *tripper* for gonorrhoea.

Words borrowed from Italian: *putana* for prostitute, *bandit* for the bandit and *katafalk* for a funeral vehicle.

Words borrowed from Spanish: *maçete* for cold weapon, *hunta* for political formation or rulership formed by an army or businessmen.

Words borrowed from Arabic: *şajtan* for the devil.

Borrowed terms:

In the euphemism process, terms lose their terminological properties and obtain general usage. The tendency for terms to be used euphemistically is explained through the way these words eliminate negative connotations. For example, ‘pedikulez’ instead of *lice*, ‘kantser’ instead of *cancer tumour*, *konstipatsija* for constipation, *ponos* for diarrhea, *flatus* for flatulation, *defekatsija* for defecation and *defloratsija* for losing one’s virginity.

Euphemisms of book language:

Instead of neutral words, words that are not encountered in daily life and that do not contain any emotional connotation also form euphemisms. These words are used in the language of science, literature, and the media. For example, *mzdoimets* for bribe taker and *armida* is for seducer. In church language, *apokrif* for doubtful, fabricated things, and *katavasija* is for confusion.

The counterpart in the borrowing table created in Turkish, which stands out as one of the three main headings under the name of ‘Borrowing Words’, is defined as follows: ‘words taken by a person or society from another person or society into their language is called loanwords’ (Karaağaç, 2013, p. 112). Loanword in this definition corresponds to borrowing. This usage, which is underlined in the table below, is analysed under two sub-headings:

In Turkish		
1. Meaning-based euphemisms	2. Structure-based euphemisms	3. Borrowings a) Borrowed nouns b) Borrowed words formed with Turkish auxiliary verbs

a) Borrowed nouns: *Fobi* (Fr. fear) (Steel, 2011, p. 100); *obez* (Eng. very fat) (Turkish Dictionary, 2005, p. 1487).

b) Borrowed words formed with Turkish auxiliary verbs: *eks olmak* (to die) (Çelik, 2011, p. 35); *merhum olmak* (to die) (Turkish Dictionary, 2005, p. 1373).

Up until now, the overlapping items in the two languages have been analysed; however, as aforementioned, some uses are not included in the table in Russian, which is in the euphemism table in Turkish. According to the order in the relevant table, these items are as follows:

Derivation/derived noun:

This euphemism form with the title of ‘Derivation/Derived Noun’ in Turkish, is described as ‘nouns formed by adding suffixes to noun roots and stems and corresponding to a new concept’ (Çiftoğlu, 2015, p. 141). The use of this structure in Turkish is explained with the following sub-headings and examples:

Example of nouns derived from verbs: Inme (stroke) (medicine: loss of movement and feeling in a part of the body, paralysis, palsy).

Example of nouns derived from nouns: röntgenci (voyeur) (slang: man with a habit of spying on women, peeper).

Example of verbs derived from nouns: ağırlaşmak (getting heavier) (a pregnant woman's birth approaching).

Acronyms:

In the euphemism table created in Turkish 'acronym' refers to creating a catchy, shortened word by adding a vowel when necessary by making use of the vowels and consonants of the word or words that will be shortened (Turkish Dictionary, 2005, p. 1167). In Turkish, the formation of a euphemism with an acronym is mostly observed in the names of diseases and slang vocabulary. For example, KOAH (Kronik Obstrüktif Akciğer Hastalıkları) as in COPD (Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Diseases). There is no such heading in the structure-based euphemism table created in Russian.

Word groups:

This is a title in the euphemism table created in Turkish. There is no such main/sub-heading in the table created in Russian. The classification of word groups is as follows:

Curse: *Beddua* (curse) is the combination of the Persian word *bed* (bad) and the Arabic word *dua* (prayer, invocation) and is the name given to stereotyped words that mean 'wholeheartedly wanting someone to get into a bad situation' (Turkish Dictionary, 2005, p. 231). Curses used in the absence of a person, without mentioning the person's name, are examples of veiled speech. For example, *adı batasınca* (as in *bloody or damn*), *domuz* (pig), *yılan* (Snake).

Prayer: Contrary to curses, prayers are people's asking favours for each other and themselves from beings that are sacred to them. In veiled speech in the form of a prayer, there is a wish that sickness and death should be far from the person. For example, *size / sizlere ömür* (life to you) (a word used to inform that someone has died) (Sözlük, 2005, p. 1780). *Yaşı benzemesin* (don't be of matching age) (a word that means 'don't die at the same age' for a person who, in any aspect, resembles someone who died prematurely) (Turkish Dictionary, 2005, p. 2142).

Idiom: The indirect expressive power of idioms provides a very convenient way to make implicit euphemisms. In other words, euphemisms and idioms have many common qualities. The purpose of idioms to express a concept in a specific manner or with an interesting expression (Osanova, 2014, p. 210). For example, *içeri düşmek* (to fall in; to go to jail), *ağır anlamak* (to understand slowly; to be obtuse), *adres değiştirmek* (to change address; to die, to go to another world) (Aktunç, 1998, p. 30).

Hendiadys: Hendiadys is a group of words formed by the juxtaposition of two or more words with the same, close or opposite meaning, which have a certain sound order and are related to each other in form and meaning, that present a meaning like a single word, for example, *aşna fişna* (secret friend, flirt or paramour) (Çiftoğlu, 2015, p. 147).

Euphemisms formed through sound changes:

Child language:

This title, which is included in the structure-based euphemism table created in Turkish, is the expression used by young children who start to speak and learn their mother tongue by distorting some words in terms of sound structures or by applying their names to some objects to overcome speaking difficulties (Çiftoğlu, 2015, p. 143). Euphemisms in the language of children are mostly in the form of same-syllable repetition. For example, *uf* (wound). There is no title or sub-title in the structure-based euphemism table created in Russian.

Haplology:

This title in the structure-based euphemism table created in Turkish is defined as ‘the dissolution of one of two syllables consisting of similar or equal sounds over time’ (Elm, 2012, p. 74). For example, *ayol*, *ay oğul* (passive gay man) (Aktunç, 1998, p. 49). There is no such title in the structure-based euphemism table created in Russian.

5. Conclusion

Borrowing, as a form of censorship, denotes social control mainly by replacing inappropriate, harsh expressions with soft and convoluted ones. In this sense, individual and social events such as fear, sadness, respect, pressure, belief, and illness that cause the controlled use of the language are areas that require in-depth studies specific to each language.

It was determined that the items/usages such as ‘semantic shift’, ‘simile’, ‘hyperbole’, ‘using common nouns’, and ‘domestication’ in the table of meaning-based euphemisms in Turkish are not found in the table of lexical meaning-based euphemisms in Russian. Similarly, the study revealed that the items such as ‘the method of using paronyms’, ‘ellipsis method’, ‘meiosis method’, and ‘interjection method’, which exist in the Russian vocabulary, do not have equivalents in the table created in Turkish.

The ‘metaphorization method’ (in Russian) and ‘idiom transfer and metaphor’ (in Turkish), which are similar in the context of general usage, were discussed in depth semantically, and it was determined that meaning-based transfers in Russian were formed through commonalities of colour, shape, and function, while Turkish transfers formed through the nature–human cycle. Despite the structural and semantic differences between the languages, items such as ‘the method of using synonyms’, ‘allegory method and connotation’, ‘semantic restriction’, and ‘semantic extension’—which occur in Turkish and Russian and exist under the same

title in the euphemism table—were mentioned, and the common aspects of these uses were supported through examples.

It was determined that there were similarities between the item titled ‘the method of using antonyms’ in Russian, the title ‘irony, humour’ in Turkish, and the title of ‘attributing proper nouns’ in Russian with ‘generalization of proper nouns’ in Turkish. These similarities were presented with examples and explanations.

Like the title of ‘meaning-based euphemisms’, ‘structure-based euphemisms’ in Russian and Turkish vocabulary were examined based on similar and divergent items in the two languages. In this context, the study associated Turkish and English titles with one another and presented their common aspects through examples. These associations are—the Turkish title of ‘affixation’ with ‘morphological euphemism methods’ in Russian—euphemisms formed from derived nouns under the Turkish title of ‘sound derivation’ with the title of ‘nominalized adjectives’ in Russian, the title of ‘syntactic ellipsis’ in Russian with ‘ellipsis’ in Turkish, ‘sound similarity’ in Russian with ‘sound duplication’ in Turkish, usages under the title of ‘spelling errors’ in Russian with ‘euphemisms created by changing a letter of a word’ in Turkish, and the usage expressed with the title of ‘borrowing’ in Russian with the main title of ‘borrowing, loanword’ in Turkish.

It has been determined that usages such as ‘composition/compound word’, ‘abbreviation’, and ‘onomatopoeia’ were represented with the same titles in the structure-based euphemism table created in Turkish and Russian, and these usages were explained with relevant examples. The study revealed that Turkish usages such as acronyms, word groups (curse, prayer, idiom, and hendiadys), child language, and haplogy are not found in Russian. Linguistic phenomena in the formation of structure-based euphemisms in Russian are grouped into six main headings. Among these, the titles of ‘lexical-syntactic method’ (except for the sub-heading ‘syntactic ellipsis’), ‘episodes generated based on letters’ (except for the sub-heading ‘spelling errors’), and ‘phonetic methods’ (except for the sub-heading ‘onomatopoeia’) were not included in the table created in Turkish.

Euphemisms, which are utilized in every language for psychological, pragmatic, or sociological reasons, constitute a different dimension of the language phenomenon. This study compared the two languages technically through euphemisms and revealed the differences and similarities between these languages through various examples. Although the usages have different names, it can be stated that the concept of *language* reflects the common aspects observed in the different cultures of different geographies. The usages that differ from each other and are unique to each language can be seen as a manifestation of the cultural diversity in the world. In both ways, this indicates the reflection of cultural differences or commonalities in societies on language through euphemisms.

Peer-review: Externally peer-reviewed.

Author Contributions: Conception/Design of Study- H.S., E.H.T.M.; Data Acquisition- H.S.; Data Analysis/ Interpretation- E.H.T.M., H.S.; Drafting Manuscript- H.S., E.H.T.M.; Critical Revision of Manuscript- E.H.T.M.; Final Approval and Accountability- H.S., E.H.T.M.

Conflict of Interest: The authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

Grant Support: The authors declared that this study has received no financial support.

Hakem Değerlendirmesi: Dış bağımsız.

Yazar Katkıları: Çalışma Konsepti/Tasarım- H.S., E.H.T.M.; Veri Toplama- H.S.; Veri Analizi/Yorumlama- E.H.T.M., H.S.; Yazı Taslağı- H.S., E.H.T.M.; İçeriğin Eleştirel İncelemesi- E.H.T.M. ; Son Onay ve Sorumluluk- H.S., E.H.T.M.

Çıkar Çatışması: Yazarlar çıkar çatışması bildirmemiştir.

Finansal Destek: Yazarlar bu çalışma için finansal destek almadığını beyan etmiştir.

REFERENCES

- Ahmanova, O. (1969). *Slovar' lingvističeskikh terminov* (İzd.4-oje). Moskva: Sovetskaja entsiklopedija.
- Aksan, D. (1990). *Her yönüyle dil*. Ankara: TDK.
- Aktunç, H. (1998). *Türkçenin büyük argo sözlüğü (tanuklarıyla)*. İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Avrupa'nın Gündemi | Fransa'da sosyal güvencesizlik yangını [Editorial]. (2019, November 17). *Evrensel*. Retrieved from: <https://www.evrensel.net/haber/391084/avrupanin-gundemi-fransada-sosyal-guvenesizlik-yangini>
- Aymoldina, A. (24-26 nojabrja 2009). *K voprosu ob issledovaniyah javlenija evfemizma i ego klassifikatsij. Materialy mezhdunarodnoj naučno-praktičeskoj konferentsii "İnnovatsionnye tehnologi v teorii i praktike prepodavanja yazyka i literatury: problemy i puti rešenija"*, Yevraziyskiy Natsional'nıy Universitet im. L. N. Gumileva, Astana, Sektıja IV, p. 11-16.
- Baskova, Ju. (2006). *Evfemizmy kak sredstvo manipulirovanija v jazyke SMİ na materiale russkogo i anglijskogo jazykov* (Doctoral dissertation). Krasnodar.
- Bilginer, H. (2011). Batı dillerinde ve Türkçede güzel adlandırmalar. *Türk Dili*, 598, pp. 441- 445.
- Boldyrev, N. N. & Aleksikova, Ju. V. (2012). Kognitivnyj aspekt evfemizatsii (na materiale anglijskogo yazıka), *Voprosy kognitivnoj lingvistiki*, № 2 (023), pp. 5-11.
- Condon, J. C. (1998). *Kelimelerin büyüküdü dünyası* (M. Çiftkaya, Trans.). İstanbul: İnsan Yayınları.
- Çabuk Çiftođlu, A. (2015). Türkçede örtmece sözlerin oluşum yolları. *MANAS Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 4 / 5, pp. 136-160.
- Çelik, C. (2011). *Türkiye Türkçesinde örtmece ve tabu kelimeler* [Unpublished master's thesis]. Dođu Akdeniz University, Northern Cyprus.
- Davutođlu gücünü kaybediyor [Editorial]. (2016, May 2). *BBC News*. Retrieved from: https://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler/2016/05/160502_reuters_davutoglu
- Demirci, K. (2008). Örtmece (euphemism) kavramı üzerine. *Milli Folklor*, 77, pp. 21-35.
- Freud, S. (2002). *Totem ve tabu*. (K. Sahir Sel, Trans.). İstanbul: Sosyal Yayınları.
- Güngör, A. (2006). Tabu-örtmece (euphemism) sözler üzerine. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Türkiyat Araştırmaları Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 29, pp. 69-93.

- Jaskevič, A. A. (2007). *Modifikatsija formy slova kak sposob sozdaniya evfemizma i disfemizma*. Trudy Kongressa. III Mejdunarodnyj kongress issledovatelej russkogo yazyka, MGU, Moskva, p. 160.
- Karaağaç, G. (2013). *Anlam: Anlam bilimi ve iletişim*. İstanbul: Kesit Yayınları.
- Karabulut, F. & Ospanova, G. (2013). Örtmece sözlerin mantığı: Kazak Türkçesi ile Türkiye Türkçesinde karşılaştırmalı model analizi. *Teke Dergisi* 2/2, pp. 122-146.
- Karasik, V. (1991). *Yazyk sotsial'nogo statusa*. Moskva: İn-t yazyk-ja AN SSSR.
- Katsev, A. (1988). *Yazykovye tabu i evfemija*. Leningrad: LGPI
- Kovşova, M. (2007). *Semantika i pragmatika evfemizmov. Kratkij tematičeskij slovar' sovremennyh russkih evfemizmov*. Moskva: Gnozis.
- Krysin, L. (1994). Evfemizmy v sovremennoj russkoj reči'. *Rusistika*, № 1-2, 28-49.
- Krysin, L. (2004). *Russkoje slovo, svoje i čujoye: issledovanija po sovremennomu russkomu yazyku i sotsiolingvistike*. Moskva: Yazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.
- Krysin, L. (2007). *Sovremennyj russkij yazyk. Leksičeskaja semantika*. Moskva: Akademija.
- Matveyeva, T. (2010). *Polnyj slovar' lingvističeskikh terminov*. Rostov-na-Donu: Feniks.
- Mironina, A. (2012). *Političeskije evfemizmy kak sredstvo realizatsii strategii ukloenija ot istina v sovremennom političeskom diskurse* (Doctoral dissertation), Novgorod.
- Moskvin, V. (2010). *Evfemizmy v leksičeskoj sisteme sovremennogo russkogo yazyka* (İzd. 4-je). Moskva: Stereotip.
- Nikitina, T. G. (1999). Tak govorit molodoj. *Russkaja reč'*, № 4, pp. 115-117.
- Ojegov, S. (1990). *Slovar' russkogo yazyka* (23-ye izd). Moskva: Russkij yazyk.
- Ospanova, G. (2014). *Türkiye Türkçesinde örtmeceler* (Doctoral dissertation), Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Kayseri.
- Örnek, S. V. (2000). *Etnoloji sözlüğü*. Ankara: A.Ü. DTCF Yayınları.
- Özder M. A. (1981). *Türk halkbiliminde düğün, evlilik, akrabalık terimleri sözlüğü*. Ankara: Ziya Gökalp Derneği.
- Rutkovskaja, P. (2020, November 8). Vorob'jev nazval "očen' neprostoj" situatsiju s COVID-19 v Podmoskov'e. *Gazeta.Ru*.
https://www.gazeta.ru/social/news/2020/11/08/n_15196879.shtml.
- Sağol Yüksekaya, G. (Ed.). (2012). *Türk dili kitabı*. İstanbul: Kesit yayınları.
- Şahovskij, V. İ. & Tahtarova, S.S. (2008). Meyotičeskije formy otkloenija ot istiny. (Ed. N. D. Arutjunova), *Logičeskij analiz yazyka. Meždu lož'ju i fantaziyej* (pp. 334-343). Moskva: İndrik,
- Sammani Mansur, M. H. (2015). *Evfemizmy v sovremennom russkom jazyke i sposoby ih perevoda na arabskij jazyk (v russkih periodičeskikh izdanijah poslednih 15 let)* (Doctoral dissertation), Kair.
- Sannikov, V. (1999). *Russkij yazyk v zerkale yazykovoju igry*. Moskva: Yazyki russkoj kul'tury.
- Seničkina, Je. (2006). *Evfemizmy russkogo yazyka: Spetskurs: Učeb. Posobije*. Moskva: Vısšaja škola.
- Şeygal, Ye. (2000). *Semiotika političeskogo diskursa* (Doctoral dissertation), Volgograd.
- Tišina, N. (2006). *Natsional'no-kul'turnye osobennosti evfemii v sovremennom anglijskom i russkom jazyke* (Doctoral dissertation), Moskva.
- Topaloğlu, A. (1989). *Dilbilgisi terimleri sözlüğü*. İstanbul: Ötüken Yayınları.
- Türkçe sözlük* (2005). Akalın, Ş. H. (Ed.). Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.
- Uvarova, Je. (2012). *Sistemnaja semantika anglijskogo evfemizma* (Doctoral dissertation), Moskva.

- Üstüner, A. (2009). Örtmece sözlerle ilgili terimler. *Turkish Studies, International Periodical For The Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 4/8 Fall, pp. 166-177.
- Varbot, J. (1979). *Tabu*. Russkij jazyk. Entsiklopedija. Moskva: Sovetskaja entsiklopedija.
- Višnjakova, O. (1984). *Slovar 'paronimov russkogo yazyka*. Moskva: Russkij jazyk.
- Warren, B. (1992). What euphemisms tell us about the interpretation of words. *Studia Linguistica*, 46/2, pp. 128-172.

