

KHAZAR UNIVERSITY

School: Graduate School of Sciences, Art and Technology

Department: English Language and Literature

Specialty: 60201 – Linguistics

MASTER'S THESIS

Theme: An investigation of euphemism and dysphemism in American political discourse

Student: Laman Umarova

Supervisor: Prof. Azad Mammadov

Baku 2024

XƏZƏR UNIVERSİTETİ

Təbiət elmləri, Sənət və Texnologiya yüksək təhsil

İngilis Dili və Ədəbiyyatı Departamenti

İxtisas: 60201 Dilşünaslıq

MAGISTR TEZİSİ

**Mövzu: Amerika politik diskursunda evfemizm və
disfemizmlərin tədqiqi**

Magistrant: Laman Umarova

Elmi rəhbər: Prof. Azad Mammadov

Baku 2024

TABLE OF CONTENT

INTRODUCTION	4
CHAPTER I : LITERATURE REVIEW	9
1.1. The study of euphemisms and dysphemisms in linguistics	9
1.2. Euphemism and dysphemism in political discourses across genres	14
1.3. The role of euphemism and dysphemism in political discourse	22
CHAPTER II: Methodology	28
CHAPTER III : ANALYSIS (FINDING) AND DISCUSSION	31
3.1. Pragmatic functions of euphemism in political discourse	31
3.2. Pragmatic functions of dysphemism in political discourse	53
3.3. Discussion	66
CONCLUSION	69
REFERENCES	72
Abstract	77
Xūlasə	78
Acknowledgement	79

INTRODUCTION

Background

Language is a fundamental tool for human communication. Humans can communicate with each other through language in order to maintain their social relationships in societies. Human life is greatly influenced by language. Language is used by people to communicate, cooperate, collaborate, and persuade one another. Language is vital to human existence because we cannot exist without it. People use language in everyday conversation to convey ideas, messages, feelings, thoughts, attitudes, etc.

According to Leech (1974), language conveys the thoughts and emotions of the speaker and writer. People often use a wide variety of words in conversations. When people engage in everyday conversations, they typically use some kinds of words to avoid using offensive language depending on the circumstance. There are many linguistic forms that people can be used to express themselves. One of them is figurative language. Figurative language, also known as non-literal language, expresses a deeper meaning or stronger impact by using words in a different way from how they are typically understood. It is possible to use figurative language in any form of communication such as in daily conversations, as well as in political, media publications (like newspapers, magazines) and literary (novels, plays, songs, and even movies) discourses. There are many various types of figurative language such as metaphor, simile, irony, chiasmus, hyperbole, euphemism, etc. This study is concerned with euphemism and dysphemism in political discourse.

A number of studies have addressed to the topic of euphemism and dysphemism in political speech. Several previous studies examined the types and functions of euphemisms: Xiangyun Zhang and Xiaolan Lei (2019) have conducted research on cognitive analysis of euphemism in Donald Trump's political speeches. Researchers investigate Trump's political intentions of using euphemisms from a cognitive approach. They choose conceptual metaphor and conceptual metonymy in cognitive linguistics as the theoretical basis in order to analyze euphemism in Trump's political speeches. Lutvia Nurul Kafi (2020) also conducted the similar study entitled "Euphemism and dysphemism on Donald Trump's political speech: state of the union address". This study determined the kinds and functions of euphemisms and dysphemisms used in Donald Trump's political speeches.

Furthermore, Olimat (2020) researched the expression of the dysphemism used by Trump in his speech about Covid-19. The study shows that Trump explicitly used a great number of dysphemistic expressions in his daily Covid-19 speeches for a variety of purposes. Three theories are combined in this study: Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) conceptual metaphor theory, Allan and Burridge's (2006) theory with their concept of dysphemism, and Van Dijk's (1997) Critical Discourse Analysis. In the results of his research, he stated that Trump possesses the ability to persuade, influence, and even change someone's mind through language.

Another study was conducted in 2017 by Nuzulianda Febrina also in the field of euphemism with the title "Euphemism in David Cameron's political speech in ISIS attacks". The study attempts to find out the types of euphemism used in David Cameron's speech on ISIS attacks and the reason behind his selection of the most dominant types. The researcher focused on using the theory of Allan & Burridge (1991) to analyze the data.

The study done by Noviani Nim. (2020) focuses on the type of euphemism and dysphemism found in The Jakarta Post newspaper. This study looks into euphemism and dysphemism in the opinion rubric of The Jakarta Post newspaper. Idioms, abbreviations, and acronyms are the most often used euphemisms in rubric opinions, according to the study's findings.

In the second study, Lutvia Nurul Kafi together with Agwin Degaf (2021) examined "Euphemism and dysphemism strategies in Donald Trump's speech at SOTU 2020". After identifying eight different types of euphemism and five different types of dysphemism, as well as the purposes for which these expressions are used, the researchers came to the conclusion that the elements of euphemism and dysphemism are closely related to politics. President Donald Trump uses more euphemism when discussing things related to himself and any other things related to the U.S. government. (Kadoorly, 2021)

Muchamad Ali Mustofa (2022) conducted further research on the types, functions and features of political euphemisms in Biden's speech. The findings of his study shows that Biden used euphemisms in his White House speech. Political euphemism is a linguistic device that is particularly useful for disguising taboo words in the context of politics. Thus, this sentence's refinement could persuade readers that the president they have selected is capable of being elected. Euphemisms come in a variety of forms and discursive purposes; depending on the

situation in which they are used, a particular type of euphemism may serve more than one purpose.

This study will have further analysis from previous studies. The research will analyze the use of euphemistic and dysphemistic expressions used by American Presidents, especially regarding the type and function. Unlike the previous studies, the present analysis is pragmatically intended not only to figure out the types and function of euphemism but also to demonstrate the types and functions of dysphemism and also to show the differences between euphemism and dysphemism. It also aims to illustrate the frequency of such words in American President's political speeches. Besides, the researcher finds the selection of topics different from previous studies. This thesis is expected to contribute to the development of linguistics, particularly on the study of euphemisms and dysphemisms.

The study was carried out based on the theoretical framework of Allan and Burrige's theory (1991) in order to analyze the corpus data. Allan and Burrige divided euphemisms into eight types, namely circumlocution, hyperbole, figurative phrases, abbreviations, one to replace the one, acronyms, synesthesia, condescending statements.

They divide dysphemism into five types, namely hyperbole, jargon, idiom, one to replace the one and circumlocution.

The theory of Allan and Burrige was chosen because they systematically categorize the types of political euphemisms. Researcher assumed that Joe Biden's and Hillary Clinton's speech contains the types, functions and features of political euphemisms.

According to Allan and Burrige (1991), euphemisms help politicians to present a positive image and preserving their respect and self-esteem in public. Allan and Burrige (1991) stated that euphemisms in language help politicians to keep their self-esteem and respect in public by maintaining a positive face. Euphemisms give reason to social actions and help others respect and comprehend them better.

The study was conducted by applying descriptive qualitative method. The results of the research showed that there are 8 types of euphemisms and 5 types of dysphemisms in Joe Biden's, 5 types of euphemisms and 3 types of dysphemisms in Hillary Clinton's speech.

Definitions of key terms:

The definitions of key terms used in this study are as follows:

1. Euphemism in political discourse refers to the expressions used by political actors to avoid words that are considered harsh, taboo, harmful, or unpleasant.
2. Dysphemism is a linguistic term that refers to the use of harsher words by conveying a more negative impression.
3. Political discourse is political speech produced or directed by someone with the intention of obtaining, maintaining or controlling power. It may include debates, speeches,

Research questions:

1. What are the types of euphemism and dysphemism that Joe Biden and Hillary Clinton used in their speech?
2. What are the functions of euphemism and dysphemism in Joe Biden and Hillary Clinton?
3. What is the impact of euphemistic and dysphemistic language on the overall message and reception in the speeches of Joe Biden and Hillary Clinton?

The significance of this study

Readers can learn more about euphemistic expressions from this research which have a crucial impact in political speeches. The present research examines the types, functions, and features of political euphemisms in 2 speeches by American presidents. The study concentrates on the importance of euphemism and dysphemism, as well as the difference between them. This study may also serve as a resource for future researchers interested in studying euphemisms and dysphemisms in political discourse.

The study aims to enrich both the theoretical and practical comprehension of euphemism and dysphemism. Theoretically, the findings of this study are expected to provide more information about the types and functions of euphemism and dysphemism. Practically, the research is hoped to increase the reader's awareness of the euphemisms and dysphemisms used by state authorities in particular.

By exploring and analyzing the speeches of influential political figures like Joe Biden and Hillary Clinton, this study emphasizes the impact of language in shaping political discourse and influencing public opinion. It sheds light on the complex relationships between language,

politics, and society. The significance of this study lies in its thorough examination of the linguistic devices – euphemism and dysphemism – used in political discourse.

CHAPTER I : LITERATURE REVIEW

1.1. The study of euphemisms and dysphemisms in linguistics

Language is primarily used as a means of communication, both for spoken and written communication. The language is used in a number of ways to fulfill its functions, depending on the preferences and emotions of native speakers. Depending on what someone said, the situation, the location, and the mood of speakers, and language can be meaningful and also significantly smooth the rough. According to Fishman (1970), a person uses language depending on when, why, and what they are talking to others about. As to Fishman's assertion, a speaker's speech or words used will vary according on when, where, and with whom they are speaking.

The usage of taboo words might lead to social disgrace, therefore it's necessary to replace them with euphemisms or other more acceptable alternatives. As stated by Allan and Burrige (2006), "euphemisms are words or phrases that substitute offensive sounds in order to avoid or protect the 'face' of the speaker, listener." Furthermore, according to Robert Burchfield (1985), euphemism is defined in semantics as a different method of explaining something that makes it sound more enjoyable than it actually is. Words that are considered too harsh or uncomfortable are substituted with the euphemism. Euphemisms are phrases or expressions that are used to replace offensive ones in a nicer, more courteous way so that they are acceptable to everyone. In society, euphemisms are used to convey information in a more courteous manner. According to Abrams (2005), words that are felt to be unpleasant are replaced with euphemisms. Kate Burrige (2006), on the other hand, describes euphemism as a lighter term which is used to replace incompatible or disrespectful expressions. According to Hornby (2005), euphemisms are phrases or idioms that indirectly refer to improper, disagreeable, or embarrassing issues in order to make them seem more acceptable.

Euphemisms and dysphemisms are like two sides of a coin when it comes to talking about things society finds uncomfortable or forbidden. We may think of euphemisms as a nice way of saying something rude, like "passed away" instead of "died." Dysphemisms, on the contrary, are straightforward, and sometimes harsh way of saying things, like "kicked the bucket" for "died".

Euphemisms are linguistic tools which are used to mitigate the impact of sensitive or taboo topics in communication, serving various functions such as maintaining polite discourse, obscuring uncomfortable truths or encapsulating cultural anxieties. These subtle linguistic

maneuvers, often concealed within idiomatic expressions, is part of an essential aspect of human linguistic competence. Conversely, dysphemisms take a more direct and often harsh approach, by using language that is informal, blunt, or even offensive. For example, euphemisms like "passed away" or "departed" are gentler alternatives to more direct expressions. In contrast, dysphemisms such as "croaked" or "six feet under" portray death in a more abrupt and sometimes irreverent manner.

A general term for the set of euphemism and dysphemism combinations is x-phemism (Allan, Keith, 2012). Most of the time, language users choose to use euphemistic expressions in order to appear polite and tactful, rather than using lexical items that are unpleasant, inappropriate, or embarrassing for them or the person they are speaking to. However, occasionally they take a different approach and use dysphemistic language instead. In this case, they show lack of tact and politeness, either on purpose or accidentally. Speaking about something unpleasant in a way that makes it seem less unpleasant or unfavorable is known as euphemism; conversely, euphemism is known as speaking about something unpleasant in a way that makes it seem worse than it actually is.

The term euphemism comes from the Greek word *euphemia*, which is formed from the basic words *eu*, which means "good" or "well", and *pheme*, which means "speech/speaking". The Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary (OALD, 2006) defines euphemism as an indirect word or expression which people often use to refer to something embarrassing or unpleasant, sometimes to make it sound more agreeable and pleasant than it really is. The Collins Cobuild Advanced Learner's English Dictionary (2003) defines euphemism as "a polite word or expression that is used to refer to things which people may find upsetting or embarrassing to talk about, for example sex, the human body, or/ death." According to Burridge & Allan (2000) euphemism is an "...alternative to a dispreferred expression, in order to avoid possible loss of face: either one's own face or, through giving offense, that of the audience, or of some third party". The Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (1978) defines it as "the use of pleasanter, less direct name for something thought to be unpleasant in order not to give offence". Johnstone (2008, 59) defines euphemism as "the use of a supposedly less objectionable variant for a word with negative connotations."

The provided definitions highlight that the phenomenon of euphemism is grounded on the notions of politeness, indirectness, avoidance of distrust or offense, pleasantness and maintenance

of good manners. Euphemism is also seen as a sociolinguistic and pragmatic phenomenon. It is widely used in daily life and is closely associated with to certain social aspects especially 'taboo'.

Euphemism is a term which is used to substitute for potentially disrespectful expressions. It alters the meaning making the words more refined and polite. The aim of euphemisms is to make a better impact on the listener by choosing a language that is more pleasant and appealing.

In order to express their opinions without the risk of upsetting listeners or making people uncomfortable, people use language that is appropriate for the situation, especially when it comes to sensitive or potentially argumentative terms that could lead to arguments. The listener may have an optimistic impression even though the message is immoral. For instance, the phrase "resting in peace" is a euphemism for death. This word is more preferable than the word "die." It is often used in a religious context and it indicates that the person has found peace and happiness afterlife.

A distinctive type of euphemism is doublespeak (Lutz, 1997). It is a type of euphemism which is used in a deceitful way with the aim of misleading people. Doublespeak is the use of words to make unpleasant facts seem appealing and tolerable and to portray negative activities as positive. An example of this phenomena is the 2003 invasion and occupation of Iraq being referred to as "liberation" (Rawson H, 1983).

While using typical euphemism aims to mitigate the impact of delicate issues without deceit, doublespeak is a deceptive use of language that frequently makes its recipients feel offended and distrusted. Although euphemisms may originate from cultural taboos or the need of sensitivity, they become doublespeak when they are used to trick or mislead. The U.S. State Department, for example, replaced the term "killing" with "unlawful or arbitrary deprivation of life" in order to substitute government-approved executions in other nations. Similarly, this kind of use of euphemisms is demonstrated by the Pentagon's refusal to mention civilian casualties by referring to bombs as "incontinent ordnance".

Another form of doublespeak is jargon, which is the specialized language used by various professional groups like doctors, lawyers, engineers, educators, or mechanics. Jargon is helpful within a group because it allows participants to communicate quickly and clearly. On the other hand, sometimes jargon can be used to make things seem more complex or impressive than they really are. For example, instead of saying "smelling something," people might use the term

organoleptic analysis. Jargon of this type can be used to show off rather than express ideas clearly.

Two varieties of euphemism are distinguished by Rawson (1981, 1): positive and negative. The goal of positive euphemisms is to normalize and make referents seem more acceptable. For instance, referring to a trash collector as a “sanitation worker” serves to elevate their role, highlighting their contribution to community cleanliness and health. The names “sanitation worker” and “trash collector” refer to the same employment, but “sanitation worker” is more respectful. Thus, positive euphemisms can aid in our examination of our own prejudices. Referring to someone as a sanitation worker highlights the important role they play in maintaining the cleanliness and health of our community. Other positive euphemisms in the English language include overweight for fat, personal assistant for a secretary, escort service for prostitution, mature for old, low-budget for cheap and so on. Negative euphemisms, on the other hand, reduce the negative values linked to unpleasant phenomena. Examples of negative euphemisms are cash flow problem for an insolvency, conflict for war, payoff for a bribe, privates for genitals and so on. More precisely, language users use euphemisms as a strategy to hide unpleasant realities and situations by avoiding what is undesirable, frightening, unfavourable or prohibited. It can be compared to a shield that keeps both the hearer and the speaker safe. (Lyons, 1981)

While euphemisms are used to delicately soften unpleasant realities, dysphemism are doing completely opposite by emphasizing negativity, expressing disdain or disrespect. The Greek words “dys”, which means “bad”, and “pheme”, which means “speech or reputation”, are the origin of the word dysphemism. Dysphemism, in general, is the use of an impolite term or expression instead of a polite one. It is essentially the opposite of euphemism. Therefore, euphemism and politeness are tightly related, whereas dysphemism is associated with impoliteness (Fernandez, 2005). Dysphemism is described as “the use of a negative or disparaging expression to describe something or someone” by McArthur (1992). More precisely, a dysphemism is a verbal expression that is used instead of a neutral or euphemistic one because it has offensive connotations regarding the denotatum (the thing referred to), the audience, or both (Burridge & Allan, 2000).

Dysphemism is primarily a destructive weapon. “When individuals or things irritate and bother them, or when they want to criticize, humiliate, or degrade them, speakers turn to dysphemism.

Dysphemisms include things like curses, name-calling, and any kind of rude remark meant to offend or hurt someone else. It is also important to distinguish between cacophemism and dysphemism. The second is typically used more frequently in the sense of something intentionally hurtful, whereas the first can be offensive or just comically demeaning. The latter is generally employed to make a point in debates.

Claridge (2011) defines dysphemism as an endeavor to meaningfully substitute harsh words for words with smooth or regular meanings. Sagarin (1968) claims that dysphemism is the opposite of euphemism, when euphemism is replaced with an aggressive or offensive word. According to Allan and Burrige (1991), dysphemism refers to words that have negative connotations for both speakers and listeners and are typically substituted with more neutral expressions. Dysphemism is a term used to talk negatively about an opponent and is typically used to express disapproval or to dehumanize or degrade them. According to Garner (2000), dysphemism is the replacement of pleasant words or phrases with ones that have a neutral or positive connotation.

The opposite of euphemism is dysphemism. Dysphemism intends to attack the listener or hearer. According to Allan and Burrige (2006), dysphemism is a term or phrase that conveys unpleasant or unsettling feelings to both the speaker and the addressee, as well as the people who listen to the conversation. Smith (2003) revealed that dysphemism is the opposite of euphemism and it is a statement that makes things sound worse or more serious than they really are. According to Cruse (2000), the meaning of communication can be divided into three categories: the meaning of the speaker, the meaning of the hearer, and the meaning of the sign. Cruse added that the speaker in the communication presents a case with some illocutionary power. Without illocutionary power, discourse in communications cannot exist. The statement means that a discourse lacking illocutionary power cannot be used as an instrument of verbal communication.

There are many different kinds of dysphemistic terminology. Animal names like bitch, pig, chicken, fox, snake, and rat are commonly used as dysphemistic epithets. The speaker insults the listener by attacking his/her humanity with this kind of labels. (Rawson, 1989).

Every nation has its moral, religious and social values. A word may be expressed with different words in different languages regarding the so-called values. While some words are considered a normal word in one language, the same words may be regarded as offensive in another language. Dysphemisms and taboo words are generally associated by researchers. Although taboos might

be a conceptual source of dysphemism, that's not always the case. In contrast to the euphemisms, taboos usually describe hidden, unpleasant realities that exist in various spheres of society; these realities do not always have to be associated with negative experiences.

1.2. Euphemism and dysphemism in political discourses across genres

One of the most important parts of data analysis is understanding the main types of euphemisms and dysphemisms. Euphemisms and dysphemisms have been classified into types by a number of linguists. While there may be some differences in the classifications proposed by different scholars, they share a great deal in common. According to Allan and Burridge, there are 16 types of euphemisms. (Allan & Burridge, 1991):

1. Figurative Expressions

Figurative language substitutes milder or more subdued words for ones that might be considered rude, disagreeable or socially sensitive. They can be used for a number of reasons, such as having polite connotations, softening the impact of certain words, making them sound more pleasant, avoiding offensive language and so on. Figurative expressions are a wide linguistic category. They include similes, personification, idioms, metaphors and allusions etc.

It's important to note that figurative expression does not always contain euphemisms. If someone says, for example, "it's raining cats and dogs" in order to describe heavy rain, it is a figurative expression, but it is not euphemistic since it doesn't replace any taboo or sensitive terms. However, figurative expressions can function also as euphemism if they are used to replace any harsh or sensitive terms with more indirect language. For example, using the phrase "kicked the bucket" instead of "died" is both a figurative expression and a euphemism (Azkiyah, Laili, 2008). Because it is used to soften the idea of death. Similarly, referring to someone as "vertically challenged" instead of "short" is both figurative expression and euphemism which softens the potentially sensitive topic of height.

2. Metaphor

Metaphor not only functions as a linguistic device to create imagery and convey meaning but also as a form of euphemism. They are mainly used to compare two unrelated things to create vivid imagery or exaggerate a characteristic or action. However, metaphors can be used in euphemistic ways to address various sensitive topics, such as illness, aging, or disabilities. For

example, referring to someone as being “in the autumn of their life” instead of “old” or “elderly” uses metaphorical language to soften the notion of aging.

3. Flippancy

Flippancy is used to smooth out words, to express something that has deeper meaning than the statement. For example, – Then came air raids, followed by tanks and troops rolling in. The underlined phrase replaces the word of the large number of troops that have been deployed on the battlefield.

4. Remodeling

Remodeling refers to the process of altering the pronunciation or form of a word or phrase to avoid taboo, offensive, or sensitive connotations. can occur in words, phrases, or others. Like the word “bitch” replaced by “beach” to disguise the harsh words. For example, words like “darn” or “dang” may replace the word “damn”, while “tarnation” might substitute for “damnation”, and “gosh”, for “god”. Similarly, “cripes” or “crumbs” can be used instead of “Christ”.

5. Circumlocutions

Circumlocution means the use of several words that are longer and indirect. It is usually the use of many words instead of saying something in a few words. For example, “categorical inaccuracy” is a circumlocution for “lie”.

6. Clipping

The clipping of a word becomes shorter than the original word. It involves taking a few words out of a longer word to create a shorter one which still has the same meaning. For example “jeeze” is a clipping of Jesus, and nation for “damnation”.

7. Acronym

The acronym is a combination of letters, syllables, or other pieces written or spoken into one word, which is pronounceable. An example of an acronym created through euphemism is “snafu”, which stands for “situation normal, all fucked up”. This acronym originated in the military during World War II to describe chaotic situations without using direct language. By using the acronym “snafu”, individuals can euphemistically refer to a problematic situation humorously.

8. Abbreviations

Abbreviations stand for shortening words into several letters so that they can be acceptable in public. They do not form a proper word, are pronounced as a new word. A particular purpose can be achieved by using this linguistic device without having to use the entire sentence or phrase. The examples of this expression are fyi to refer For Your Information, bca for Bank Central Asia, and others.

9. Omission

This form is the removal of one or several letters from taboo words or some expressions. For example, when a speaker writes “F”, it’s understood by the reader that the letter is standing in for the word “fuck”. Using “F” to represent “fuck” allows the speaker or writer to refer to the word without fully spelling it out. This could reduce harshness or offensiveness of the expression while maintaining its meaning.

10. Replacement (One for one substitution)

That involves the replacement of one word that has more subtle meaning to soften the harsh sentence. For example, “military operation” or “disarm” was used by President Bush to neutralize the word “military attack”. Another example of replacement is the use of the word emissions to replace pollution.

11. General-for-specific

General-for-specific involves the use of the whole for to refer to part of it. As the phrase “going to bed” to mention having sex.

12. Part for whole euphemism

Part-for-whole is substituting a part of something for the whole thing, in order to soften a potentially sensitive topic or make it less direct. For example, The American administration is referred to as The White House. It is the opposite of general to specific. The example of it is U.S. President Richard Nixon’s references to “prething” and “postthing” for the “Watergate break-in”.

13. Hyperbole (overstatement)

Hyperbole, also known as overstatement, is the use of exaggeration. It is a form of figurative language where the meaning is not intended to be taken literally. Instead, it is used to emphasize a

point, evoke strong emotions, or give a particular effect to a statement. but the meaning is not taken literally. The phrase “flight to glory” which means “death” can be an example of hyperbole.

14. Understatement

This phrase decreases the negative connotation of the harsh word by substituting with other alternative definitions. For example, the word deflation can be replaced by the word de-escalation, and they both have the same meaning – “decrease”. Understatement is a single word that has meaning independent from the meaning of the word itself. To demonstrate a contradictory expression and create a humble or rhetorical effect, the understatement is used by substituting the shape with its negative side. A good example of understatement is “to sleep” which implies “to die”.

15. Jargon

Euphemistic jargon involves the use of softer or more indirect terms to describe inappropriate or uncomfortable topics. They can serve various purposes, such as maintaining politeness, avoiding offense, minimizing discomfort, or disguising the true meaning of a concept. Jargon is typically a word with similar meaning but different form. For instance, in communication, the word “using facilities” is replaced with the term “access.”

16. Slang euphemism

The last type of euphemism is slang euphemism. It involves the use of informal or colloquial language that may be considered inappropriate in certain contexts. It frequently appears in casual conversation among certain groups.

Each type of euphemism has a specific function in language. Many scholars have categorized the functions of euphemisms in various ways.

Harris (2000) divides euphemism into certain functions: (1) to avoid blame or criticism, (2) to avoid stereotypes from prejudicing a hearer, 3) to substitute unwanted connotation.

In addition, Liu (2001) also identifies several functions of euphemism (1) to prevent bad connotation of utterances, (2) to protect someone from getting embarrassed, (3) to express ideas in different way.

Moreover, Kaosa (2008), give three functions of euphemism, they are; (1) to avoid saying taboo words, (2) to make crude or unpleasant statements sound more neutral or acceptable, (3) to protect someone or a group of people.

According to Zhao and Dong (2010) there are three functions of political euphemisms:

1. Social Functions. Politicians use euphemisms to maintain a positive self-image and avoid negative reactions. They are cautious in constructing their speech and their linguistic choices to attract voters, influence public opinion and so on. Discourse often reflects ideology as the foundation for various ideological effects, such as military, capitalist, or sexist beliefs. Understanding language as a system made up of syntactic rules, lexical items, and semantics is important for understanding political discourse. (Chilton, 2015)

2. Disguising and Deceptive Function. Political euphemism is a means for political leaders to hide embarrassing statements to prevent public accusations (Zhao and Dong, 2010). The information of high-ranking officials can be deliberately hidden by using neutral terms and it does not get the negative reaction from the public. In politics, euphemisms are necessary to provide expression when dealing with unpleasant topics, making a good impression on the audience and as well as criticizing opponents. In this respect, the use of taboos and euphemisms is a legitimate practice because it addresses certain forms of verbal behavior.

3. Political Euphemism's Persuasive Function. The aim of his strategy is to gain the trust of people towards the speaker. To achieve this, political leaders use different kinds of figures of speech or other linguistic devices, such as hyperbole. Political euphemism can be compared to political propaganda, because they both intend to persuade and influence the public.

According to Allan's and Burridge's opinions, the functions of using euphemisms are (1) to refrain from using words that can incite fear or panic; (2) to avoid humiliating or insulting others; (3) to minimize or avoid upsetting tragedies or painful events; (4) to use rhetoric or diplomacy; (5) to substitute words that are forbidden, taboo, vulgar, or harmful; (6) to show respect or appreciation for others; and (7) to make inferences or criticisms.

Based on the explanations, it can be summarized that the functions of euphemism are; (1) to convey information; (2) to neutralize the vulgar or taboo word or to prevent unwanted connotation; (3) to show respect; (4) not to offend or insult someone; (5) as a tool for diplomacy;

(6) to hide something; (7) to exaggerate; (8) to show respect; (9) to show concern or sympathy; (10) to criticize someone.

Just as euphemisms are used to soften the language, dysphemisms are at the opposite end of the linguistic spectrum and they are characterized as unpleasant or offensive term. They use most of the same strategies as euphemism. Dysphemism has also many types such as synecdoche, hyperbole, understatement, idiom, general-for-specific, circumlocution, dysphemistic epithets, name dysphemism, euphemistic dysphemism, “-ist” dysphemism and cross-cultural dysphemism (Allan & Burridge, 2001).

1. Synecdoche (part-for-whole)

The first type of dysphemism is synecdoche. In this case, a part of something is used to represent a whole in a negative way. For example,

A group of professionals are in the charge of a new project.

*A group of **suits** are in the charge of a new project.*

It's an example of synecdoche to refer to a group of people as “suits”. In this case, dysphemism serves to dehumanize and belittle the individuals in a derogatory manner.

2. Dysphemistic epithets.

This type typically involves the usage of animal names to refer to people. The speaker targets the listener's humanity by using dysphemistic nicknames. It generally aims to offend or insult someone by reducing them to the level of the animal being invoked. It may originate from prejudices and stereotypes against individuals or certain groups based on traits like behavior, looks, or perceived shortcomings.

Examples include the usage of animal names such as “fox”, “chicken”, “cat”, “pig” etc. to address people. An example of this would be calling someone “pig” to make fun of their weight, or calling someone “chicken” by implying that he is a coward person. (Allan & Burridge, 1991)

3. Metaphor

The use of euphemistic metaphors in political discourse is a widespread rhetorical strategy used by politicians to convey complex ideas, shape the public, and gather support for their agendas. Euphemistic metaphors soften the impact by framing potentially controversial or

sensitive topics with terms that are more acceptable or emotionally sensitive. But when used in a humiliating way, these metaphors can have serious negative consequences.

Dysphemistic metaphors have the ability to dehumanize individuals or groups, bringing them down to objects or substances associated with negativity.

The examples dysphemistic metaphors can be “not the sharpest knife in the drawer” or “not sharpest pencil in the box”. These dysphemistic metaphors are used to describe someone who is not considered very intelligent. They compare the sharpness of a knife or pencil to the intelligence of that person. Equal sharpness If a knife or pencil is considered to be effective according to its purpose, someone described as “the sharpest knife in the drawer” or “the sharpest pencil in the box” is generally considered to be smart and talented.

These kinds of expressions serve as colourful and often sensual ways of commenting on a person’s intelligence or lack of intelligence by using familiar images of daily objects for comparison.

4. Name dysphemism.

In name dysphemism’s case, someone uses another person’s name instead of the real name or appropriate address title. However, if the listener finds choice of words used by the speaker acceptable, then the use of this kind of names is not considered dysphemism. In this case, it will not offend or insult the listener, and thus it will not constitute dysphemism. (Allan & Burrige, 2001). For instance, if a kid calls her mother “Anna” instead of “mom”, that’s an example of name dysphemism. In this situation, the child deviates from the typical respectful or affectionate term (“mom”) and instead uses the mother's first name. It can be perceived as disrespectful or inappropriate in many cultural contexts. A speaker may use a term of name dysphemism out of anger or dissatisfaction with the listener. The name “Judas” is associated with someone whose actions are as bad as the character Judas in the Bible.

5. Euphemistic dysphemism

A euphemistic dysphemism avoids using harsh words in order to make an insult seem like a compliment. The word or the phrase is euphemistic dysphemism if the intention is dysphemism is not to offend others. The example of this type is “He is a teddy bear.” It is a euphemistic dysphemism because it uses a soft, affectionate term (“teddy bear”) to convey the insult.

6. “-ist” dysphemism

This kind of dysphemisms target individuals based on their ethnicity and they often involve stereotyping. These dysphemisms are usually used to humiliate or belittle individuals based on a particular biological sex, religion, sexual orientation, political stance or any other personal trait. An example of “-ist” dysphemism can be the usage of the term “chink” to refer to a member of Chinese origin. This word creates negative misconceptions about Chinese people and is extremely offensive and disrespectful.

7. Cross-cultural dysphemism

This type of euphemism is encountered when a term or expression conveys neutral or sometimes positive meaning in one culture, while it is considered offensive or negative in another culture. Differences in historical backgrounds, cultural norm or historical contexts lead to the occurrence of this phenomena. An example of this type of euphemism is the term “fag” which is a slur used in America. It is used as a term of abuse and criticism to refer to gay men. On the other hand, in England it is used to refer to a cigarette.

8. Non-verbal dysphemism

The use of non-verbal clues, such as gestures, facial expressions, or body language in order to show disrespect, negative attitude toward someone or something is known as non-verbal dysphemism. Dysphemisms are usually associated with verbal language, but nonverbal cues might convey offensive or disrespectful messages just as effectively as verbal language does. An example of non-verbal dysphemism can be eye-rolling. Rolling one's eyes in reaction to anything someone says shows that the listener believes the speaker's words to be foolish, silly, absurd or doubtful.

9. Hyperbole

Hyperbole can be used as a form of dysphemism when exaggerated language is used to belittle, insult or offend someone or something. In this case, They convey negative or derogatory meanings. For example, if someone says “That movie was the worst thing I've ever seen in my life!”, this is a hyperbolic dysphemism. The person uses hyperbole to exaggerate and emphasize their negative opinion and strong disapproval about the movie. Similarly, phrases like “I'm dying

of boredom” or “This job is killing me” use hyperbolic language to convey extreme dissatisfaction.

10. Idiom

Idioms can also be used as dysphemisms depending on context and intention behind the usage. An example of euphemistic idiom is saying “to kick the bucket” instead of saying “to die” (Boers, Frank, 2008).

11. Vulgar dysphemism

Vulgar dysphemisms are expressions or words that are considered offensive, crude, or impolite, often used to insult, belittle, or express strong disapproval. These terms are typically characterized by their coarse language and derogatory connotations, making them inappropriate for formal or polite conversation. Examples of vulgar dysphemisms are bullshit, douchebag, whore, tart etc.

Dysphemism expression also has various function. Depending on the intention of the speaker or writer and what they want to let the hearer or the reader know, dysphemisms can serve different functions. According to Allan and Burrige (2006), there are eight functions of dysphemism:

First of all, dysphemisms are used to show disagreement, disapproval or disrespect towards a person or a group of people. The speaker or writer aims to express their negative feelings or attitudes by using offensive language.

Secondly, dysphemisms can be used to provide information.

The third function is to degrade or humiliate others. Humiliation is the act of putting someone down. Dysphemisms can be used as verbal weapons to belittle, degrade, or shame others.

Furthermore, dysphemisms are used to criticize or express disapproval of the recipient's actions, behavior, or attributes, often in a harsh or disparaging manner.

Another function of dysphemism is drawing attention to something.

Dysphemisms can also be used to persuade or manipulate the listener.

Seventh function of dysphemism is to express refusal or denial to the recipient, indicating a negative response or rejection.

Finally, dysphemism may function in order to accuse or blame the addressee.

From the explanations above, it's clear that dysphemistic expressions generally have a negative intention, whether it is to insult the hearer or to emphasize something bad or unpleasant. The choice of euphemistic or dysphemistic language often depends on cultural norms, personal beliefs, and the sensitivity of the situation.

1.3. The role of euphemism and dysphemism in political discourse

Speaking in front of an audience involves expressing thoughts or ideas through words. Before delivering a speech to an audience, the speaker prepares it and standardize the words and sentences. Speakers should think carefully about the sentence they are going to say, because communication may also reveal a person's personality through their language. A speaker gives a speech for a number of reasons. First and foremost, communication serve to provide information to others. Secondly, the speaker uses argumentation in his speech to persuade the audience. Third, speech is used for recreational purposes or to create a better atmosphere. Last, but not least, the goal of communication is to persuade or influence the listener to do something. Other characteristics of speech include using effective language, precise volume, intonation, articulation and etc. These qualities are used to help the audience understand the speaker's message better.

Language plays an important role in the daily life of politicians. In order to make a good impression of both themselves and the parties they represent, it is essential for politicians to find the appropriate language and make the right choice of words. It's important to remember that political language is "purpose-oriented". It means that politicians use language to achieve agreement, influence public opinion, maintain support and attract potential electors. Political figures actually do not use language randomly; their speeches and public remarks are cautiously constructed with a specific goal. Politicians must be very careful about how they handle unpleasant and delicate issues. In politics, it's the convention to show empathy towards people's concerns, while attempting to earn their trust or attack a political opponent. To avoid making a bad impression on their audiences, political figures tend not to use words or expressions that might have unpleasant associations. In order achieve this, they make use of euphemism, which is the process of eliminating an inappropriate concept of its most offensive or insensitive

connotations. This gives them a “safe” way to discuss certain embarrassing subjects without being politically incorrect or going against social norms.

A public speech by a politician is a special type of discourse where the speaker tries to convince the audience that the information they are presenting is accurate and important. Therefore, the primary objective is to influence the audience based on the following functions of political discourse:

- Grabbing attention
- Suggesting solutions (problem-solution)
- Gathering support
- Responding to proposals

In fact, these functions are components of one of the political aims of manipulation. It can be argued that political discourse needs to employ specific linguistic strategies in order to fulfill these functions. As a result, it requires a vocabulary that includes a number of terms that are frequently used to refer to political phenomena, which is a field for the widespread use of euphemisms and dysphemisms. It is always possible to explain the frequency of the use of both euphemisms and dysphemisms though the complexity of relations between states and their citizens, or between states themselves. The ability of selecting rhetorical strategies effectively and achievement of their adequacy in political discourse depends entirely on various characteristics inherent in the sides. “Because it is impossible to study language behavior beyond its underlying social background, since its meaning is determined by some externally embedded social and cultural variables, such the identity of the speaker and the listener, the speech form, setting, goal of the speech, situation, context in which the interaction takes place.” (Giyoto et.al., 2020). Unlike the socio-political text, public speeches are characterized by the presence of “factors of social context,” which means that the success of a politician’s speech is not only determined by the content of the speech but also by the context of verbal interaction with people, including the socio-psychological background of the audience, the purpose of speech, and its time and location. “The socio-political intent of the message is often integrated with the canon of style in modern rhetoric” (Zeynalova & Allahverdiyeva, 2017). Considering the objectives and motivations of the speakers, language – the words – is the primary “weapon” used in political speeches. They perform the main function - manipulation. The speaker must be extra careful when it comes to the language that touches on sensitive subjects such as race, age, the low standard living of some

groups of people, and military-related subjects like migration, weapons, terrorism , and hostilities etc.

Politicians reinforce people with promises of prosperity, welfare, stability, well-being. Political leaders tend to embellish reality in their speeches by concealing negative facts. Political speech materials of this type are thought to contain a great deal of veiled ideas that politicians use out of necessity. Thus in order to discuss the growing likelihood of using euphemisms to achieve political correctness, political discourse must be tolerant of other people's cultures, ideas, and aspirations. On the other hand, aggressiveness, ambitious attitude, and determination to gain and maintain power, the desire for personal targeting to foster a supportive and trusting atmosphere lead to the usage of dysphemisms in public speeches. Even though the prepared speech of the politician contains numerous rhetorical-strategic devices for effectively influencing the public opinion, the main focus of this analysis is on the euphemism and dysphemism used by politicians in their speeches.

Euphemisms are not typical for populist politicians. Main stream politicians like Bush, Clinton, Biden, Bush, Obama tend to use euphemisms which do not address the issues raised by them or by their audience straightforwardly. These moderate politicians are quite unaggressive, their performance does not aim to humiliate their opponents, rather criticize them.

Political discourse has distinct sublanguages such as vocabulary and phraseology. According to Wodak (2016) political discourse is the sum of all speech acts used in political discussions as well as the norms of public policies that have been tried and tested through time and preserved by tradition. The definition takes a very broad view to the content of the concept, encompassing communication forms where the addressee, subject, or message content all have some connection to politics.

Politics is generally associated with the government of the state. Politics, in its broadest sense, is the activity of the arrangements that people make in order to live peacefully in communities, tribes or nations. The leader must have a strategy to attract his audience. The aim of this strategy is to minimize the possibility of offending someone. Even when the disagreements arise, the leaders still need to act politely toward one another and avoid using taboos or disrespectful words. Therefore, one of the best ways to replace offensive terms with polite ones in the political field—such as in speeches made by political leaders—is through the use of euphemisms.

The study of euphemism and dysphemism in political speech is an important field of research that examines the linguistic strategies used by politicians to shape public opinion, manipulate perceptions, and advance their agendas. In contrast to dysphemisms, which include using rude or insulting language to convey disapproval or criticism, euphemisms are used to soften or hide potentially sensitive or harsh terms.

Euphemisms and dysphemisms are crucial elements in linguistic analysis, especially when it comes to political discourse. These language tools have a great influence on how information is transmitted as well as how it evokes strong feelings. Since euphemisms and dysphemisms have such a significant impact on audience perceptions and opinions, it is important to understand the nuances of euphemisms and dysphemisms in order to analyze the underlying meanings presented in media texts. Euphemisms and dysphemisms are powerful tools in political communication for framing narratives and molding public opinion.

In political speech, euphemisms and dysphemisms have a significant impact on how information is perceived. Audiences may choose to receive an emotional message in addition to information depending on whether they choose to use this or other methods. As a result, research on euphemisms and dysphemisms is becoming increasingly significant in political discourse. These communication tools also influence media discourse and form new speech models. The opposite of euphemism, dysphemism focuses mostly on negative speech exposure and negative judgment of denotatum; dysphemisms are words and phrases that are purposefully substituted for neutral ones in order to convey anger, neglect, or irritation (Spears, 1981). Most frequently, dysphemism is expressed nonliterally, by changing the subject, action, or phenomena to a vulgar, harsher, or taboo word or expression. As Fernandez states, dysphemisms can have a negative impact on the performance of communicative tasks, as they are quite rude and offensive words (Fernandez, 2008).

In political discourse, dysphemisms are used to convey dissatisfaction and to provoke a negative response from the audience. Dysphemisms, which are frequently used in political discourse, are supposed to draw attention of the listeners to a particular issue or persuade them to get a specific perspective. Dysphemisms are therefore largely used in political discourse as a linguistic tool of impact and influence to express emotions, most of which are negative. In this regard, we observe the conceptual substitution caused by the application of specific linguistic

techniques that manipulate consciousness and have covert consequences on human thought processes and behavior.

Strategies and communication techniques used by political figures can better be understood by analyzing the use of euphemisms and dysphemism in political discourse. Euphemisms and dysphemisms play an important role in social communication. They influence all aspects of society while coordinating and maintaining interpersonal relationships. Speeches are typically made by prominent members of a group, like presidents. Information is generally transmitted to the population through presidential speeches. Politicians are very careful about the language they use in public because their future is mainly dependent on the support of the voters. Through the analysis of euphemistic and dysphemistic utterances in political discourse, researchers can reveal inclinations and changes in linguistic composition over time. They are able to recognize the rhetorical functions and semantic domains of these linguistic devices. They also determine how these devices contribute to the creation of convincing and influential messages. These language techniques are deliberately used by politicians to evoke emotional responses, manage public perception and control the framing of issues.

In political discourse, euphemisms and dysphemisms have a number of different pragmatic functions. These functions give politicians an opportunity to control language, minimize conflict, and influence the public opinion in order to accomplish strategic goals. Through the analysis of political speeches in a variety of settings, several key pragmatic functions of euphemisms and dysphemisms emerge.

Furthermore, this area of research contributes to our knowledge of the relationship between language, politics, and society. It highlights the importance of language in political communication, the influence of linguistic choices on policy discussions, and the way language reflects and shapes political ideologies and power structures.

CHAPTER II: METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This research on euphemisms and dysphemisms will use qualitative descriptive research methods. The objectives of the qualitative approach are to understand certain aspects of social life and its methods of producing words rather than numbers as analytical data. Meanings, concepts, definitions, traits, metaphors, symbols, and descriptions of objects are all included in the qualitative approach. The qualitative approach examines how meaning is created or interpreted in particular contexts. Thus, this thesis attempts to interpret metaphorical terms – in this case euphemisms and dysphemisms – by considering the context they are used. A qualitative descriptive method will be used to describe the data, because the data will be in the form of words, phrases, clauses, sentences, and utterances. Afterwards, the researcher will explain the instruments, data sources, and data collection.

Instrument

A research instrument is a tool that the researchers choose and use to gather data so that the study can be systematically and efficiently analyzed. In this research, the instrument of collecting data would be the researcher herself since the data can be obtained from observation, which will be done by the researcher herself.

Data And Data Source

The data for the present study consists of two speeches:

- 1) Joe Biden's "2024 State of the Union Address" which lasted for 1 hour and 7 minutes, delivered on September 5, 2024; Researcher assumed that Biden's speech contains the types, functions, and features of political euphemisms and dysphemisms.
- 2) Hillary Clinton's economy speech during a campaign event in Warren, Michigan, on August 11, 2016; Throughout the speech, there are several instances where euphemisms and dysphemisms are used to soften potentially harsh realities or convey messages in a more politically acceptable manner.

The data is in the form of utterances, words, phrases, clauses or sentences that contain euphemistic expressions. The data was taken from credible sources such as the official websites

or recognized platforms which publish speeches of political figures. These speeches will serve as the corpus for analysis, with the goal of understanding the distribution and underlying motivations behind the usage of euphemisms in the political discourse.

Video and speech transcripts can be accessed via the following links:

- <https://www.nbcwashington.com/news/national-international/read-president-bidens-2024-state-of-the-union-address-annotated/3562330/>
- <https://www.newsweek.com/hillary-clinton-full-transcript-economic-speech-489602>

Data Collection

The data is collected by researcher in several steps. First of all, she read Biden's and Clinton's speeches. Secondly, she identified the data using Allan and Burrige (1991)'s theory to choose the words, phrases, or sentences which contain euphemism and dysphemism. The researcher looks for the video and after getting the video the researcher downloads the script to help her to have more deep understanding of the utterances of Joe Biden and Hillary Clinton. The last, the researcher classifies, identifies, and analyzes the data.

The researcher took 13 utterances from Hillary Clinton's speech about economy that contained euphemism and dysphemism and 25 utterances from Joe Biden's speech that contained euphemism and dysphemism. The analysis of data was identified through 16 types of euphemism and 11 types of dysphemism, then classified which kinds of euphemism and dysphemism were used in the political speech. After that, the researcher calculated the number and percentage of each type using mathematic formula. Furthermore, she specified the most dominant types then explained why they were chosen more frequently.

The steps of the data collection are as follows:

Classifying the data according to the types and function of euphemism and dysphemism

Analyzing the data and conducting a thorough analysis

Discussing the findings and drawing conclusion



CHAPTER III. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Pragmatic functions of euphemism in political discourse

Using a descriptive qualitative approach, the researcher found ten types of expressions using euphemisms in this study: figurative expression, metaphor, flippancy, remodeling, circumlocution, one for one substitution, hyperbole, understatement, and slang. Joe Biden's and Hillary Clinton's use of euphemistic expressions in their speech is divided into several functions: delivering information, exaggerate, show respect, criticize, avoid words that might arise panic or anxiety, give advice, avoid taboo things, and show concern or sympathy, hiding taboo sentences and providing direction to the community.

The whole explanation and data examples are provided below.

1. Figurative Expressions

Euphemism, including figurative expressions play an important role in political discourse and shape the way politicians convey their ideas and policies. Politicians choose euphemistic figurative expressions to make their speeches more polite and acceptable. These statements allow politicians to discuss these issues more diplomatically and help them to mitigate the impact of potentially sensitive or controversial issues.

Politicians use indirect figurative expressions to show respect and sympathy to individuals or groups affected by specific problems. For example, Hillary Clinton's use of the term "economically disadvantaged families" demonstrates empathy for those who are financially deprived, while Joe Biden's "in a family way" use shows respect for the privacy about pregnancy. Politicians are able to deal with personal matters without interfering with people's private lives by using euphemistic figurative expressions.

Figurative expressions often have cultural significance and historical context. Politicians can use euphemisms that are consistent with cultural norms and accept social taboo or traditions on specific subjects.

Euphemistic figurative expressions are effective means of communication in political debates. This allows politicians to convey their messages in a clear manner, while respecting linguistic norms and cultural sensitivities. Politicians can attract their audience by choosing the right figurative expression and communicate complex ideas in a more accessible way.

The researcher found out that figurative expressions are used in both Joe Biden's and Hillary Clinton's speech:

Data 1. I think instead we should expand the Child Tax Credit to provide real relief to tens of millions of economically disadvantaged families struggling with the costs of raising children. (Hillary Clinton)

The sentence above involves the usage of euphemistic figurative expression. As I mentioned earlier, the euphemism makes the language sound more polite and acceptable. By using the term "economically disadvantaged" instead of "poor", "vulnerable", "needy" or another direct term, Clinton uses euphemistic language to convey the idea of financial hardship. By mentioning expanding the Child Tax Credit, she highlights her focus on solutions to reduce economic difficulties. Then she links the policy proposal with euphemistic expression "economically disadvantaged families". This choice of language helps to prevent the negative connotations associated with the word "poor". Clinton's choice of words show that she respects the dignity and humanity of families, rather than determining them as "poor". It sounds more polite and friendly. It also shows empathy towards people who are going through financial difficulties as well. The function of the above euphemistic expression is not to offend or insult someone and also to show respect and sympathy.

Another example of euphemistic figurative expression is taken from the discourse of president Joe Biden.

Data 2. She was in a family way again and her doctor told Kate that her own life and her ability to have children in the future were at risk. (Joe Biden)

The expression "in a family way" used by Joe Biden is a euphemistic way of saying that someone is expecting a child. It describes the state of pregnancy without being too obvious. Biden used this figurative expression to neutralize the words which involves the sensitive topic of pregnancy. By using "in a family way" he avoids directly mentioning the pregnancy, which might be considered a private or sensitive topic by some people.

The function of this euphemism is to maintain politeness and demonstrate respect to privacy when discussing the subject of pregnancy. It allows Biden to speak about pregnancy more politely and secretly. Biden was expressing it in a less intimate way and it's more acceptable in formal setting.

Joe Biden uses this euphemism to convey the idea of pregnancy in a subtle way. This cover helps soften the conversation about pregnancy and avoid potentially aggressive or annoying language. He chooses to use the figurative expression to describe pregnancy in a modest and somehow odd way; it can be considered more polite or polite than being directly “pregnant”. The euphemism allows Biden to discuss the issue of pregnancy in a specific way and respecting privacy. In official or public settings discussing personal issues may be sometimes considered inappropriate.

This euphemism serves two purposes: firstly, it helps preserve the rules of courtesy and perception in speech by using a less direct or clinical term for pregnancy. This can be especially important if you are discussing sensitive health or personal issues. Second, the cover softens the effect of an expression and makes it easier and more comfortable for the listener.

Biden’s use of the term also demonstrates cultural awareness and sensitivity to linguistic norms. This expression has historical roots and dates back to a time when it was taboo or inappropriate to talk about pregnancy in society. By including this euphemism in his speech, Biden acknowledges and respects these cultural sensitivities, on the one hand, and effectively conveys his intended message. Using euphemism “to be in a family way” in this sentence allows the president to deal with pregnancy with courtesy and common sense, to preserve courteousness and respect privacy, and also to communicate the message effectively.

2. Metaphor

Metaphors play an important role in political discourse and enable politicians to convey complex ideas or sensitive topics in an effective way. Politicians often use euphemistic metaphors to vividly describe political situations or challenges. Politicians create powerful images showing the urgency and seriousness of the current problems. These metaphors arouse emotional reactions in the viewer and make the messages more powerful.

Metaphorical euphemisms address people’s feelings and capture their fears, concerns, or desires (Anashia Nancy, 2018). They also allow politicians to discuss controversial or sensitive topics without using too explicit language.

Metaphors simplify complex political concepts and make them more acceptable to a public. Instead of relying on technical jargon or abstract terminology, politicians use a soft language to

convey ideas in a direct and understandable way. This increases public understanding and involvement. Examples of euphemistic metaphors are:

Data 3. “Freedom and democracy are under assault” (Joe Biden)

Joe Biden said “Freedom and democracy are under assault” in order to describe the threat faced by these fundamental principles in a euphemistic metaphor.

The euphemism here is the use of the word “assault” to describe challenges or threats to freedom and democracy. Instead of saying directly that freedom and democracy are threatened or endangered, Biden chooses the word “assault”, a more vivid and emotional term with calls for aggression, violence and deliberate assault.

Using the metaphor, Biden draws a striking picture of the seriousness of the situation, suggesting that freedom and democracy are not only under threat, but are also actively under assault. This choice of language increases the urgency and importance of supporting the defense and protection of these principles. The use of the word “assault” as a euphemistic metaphor also allows Biden to convey a strong message by avoiding overly technical or abstract language. It addresses people's feelings and instincts, making the threat to freedom and democracy immediate and tangible.

Often using this euphemistic metaphor, Biden effectively conveys the importance of the state of freedom and democracy, and emphasizes that action must be taken to protect these values against threats and challenges.

The purpose of using a metaphorical euphemism such as “freedom and democracy are under assault” is to convey a sense of urgency and seriousness, without using an abstract language. It helps to raise public awareness and concern and encourages people to take the issue seriously and The use of metaphoric language also makes the message more accessible to the public. Instead of presenting complex political concepts, Biden uses visuals that people can easily understand.

Data 4. “January 6th lies about the 2020 election and the plots to steal the election posed a great — gravest threat to U.S. democracy since the Civil War.” (Joe Biden)

The phrase “January 6th lies” is a metaphorical euphemism that Joe Biden used to denote baseless allegations about the 2020 elections. By labelling these lies, Biden substitutes deliberately disseminated false information without using any more blasphemous language.

The choice of the word “to lie” serves many functions in the context of sentences. First, it briefly describes the nature of the misinformation spread about the 2020 elections, without exaggerating or underestimating its importance. The term also carries a sense of deliberate deception and highlights the evil intention behind the spread of false information.

Secondly, Biden describes disinformation as “lie” and indirectly condemns the person or groups responsible for the dissemination of the information without directly specifying the names of the persons or groups who are responsible for spreading it. This allows him to use a diplomatic tone when dealing with an extremely controversial subject. So the function of the euphemism is to effectively convey the seriousness of the situation surrounding the 2020 elections without using provocative language, and without encouraging dialogue and joint action against the threat to America.

Data 5. “Too many Americans are living paycheck to paycheck, with the specter of financial insecurity looming over their every decision. It's like there's a black hole in the middle of your chest, sucking away the hopes and dreams for a better future.” (Hillary Clinton)

The metaphorical euphemism Hillary Clinton uses “the black hole in the middle of her chest” vividly reflects the deep sense of despair and hopelessness many Americans feel due to economic insecurity.

The expression “black hole” invokes the image of something wide, dark and all-consuming. Using economic uncertainty as a black hole, Clinton vividly expresses the scale and inevitability of the problem. The metaphor triggers feelings of fear, anxiety, and despair and strikes the emotional experience of the listeners. This shows that the weight of financial struggles is so heavy and that there seems to be a gap in the person’s essence that destroys any kind of optimism or hope.

Clinton speaks directly to the viewer to personalize the experience and make it possible to connect at an individual level. Listeners feel empathy and connection when they see themselves reflected in the images she creates.

Although the metaphor describes a serious situation, it softens the harsh reality of financial uncertainty as well. The metaphor allows Clinton to convey the importance of the subject while maintaining a certain level of sensitivity. She effectively conveys the deep emotional and

psychological impact of economic uncertainty, framing it as an urgent problem requiring attention and action.

3. Flippancy

In a political debate, flippancies are often used indirectly to send messages, add humor, or soften the tone of the debate. Politicians often use flippancy to convey their messages indirectly, especially when they are discussing sensitive or controversial topics. By expressing their ideas with humor or lightness, they can solve difficult problems without causing frustration or conflict.

Flippancy adds humour to political speeches and debates and makes them more interesting to the public. Politicians can use ridiculous statements or sarcastic comments to criticize an opponent or to highlight contradictions in discussions. Politicians can also connect with the audience by joking about themselves or acknowledging their shortcomings, and they can seem more accessible.

Flippancies are powerful tools to attract the attention of viewers during political talks and debates. A well-timed joke or an intriguing explanation can attract listeners and make the speech more memorable. Politicians can break the ice by adding humor to the conversations. An example of flippancy used in Biden's political discourse is as follows:

Data 6. "If I were smart, I'd go home now." (Joe Biden)

Joe Biden starts his sentence with "If I were smart," and creates a hypothetical scenario in which the speaker is questioning his own intelligence or wisdom. Biden humorously suggests that he is not acting wisely at the moment, using the conditional tense "were". The second part of the phrase, "I would go home now" suggests that giving up the present situation or ending the conversation early would be the act of an intelligent or rational person. This means that there is an opposition between a wise choice (going home) and the current action (speaking). The use of humor and self-deprecation mitigates the potential seriousness of the situation.

Biden uses a flippancy to convey the idea indirectly, instead of saying he should directly end or end the debate. This allows him to accept the possibility of leaving with a careless and attractive attitude. This reflects Biden's way of speaking and his ability to communicate with the audience in a touching and vivid language. This statement, made at the beginning of the speech, suggests a casual and somewhat humorous tone, implying that staying for the duration of the event might not be the most intelligent choice.

4. Remodeling

In political discourse remodeling involves replacing a stronger or potentially aggressive language with softer alternatives. Some additional information on the practices of reformulating political communication.

Politicians show empathy and understanding for their audience's different backgrounds and beliefs by choosing milder words, such as "heck" instead of "hell". This strategic use of language helps politicians maintain positive relationships with their listeners and avoid unwanted discomfort or shame.

Using remodeling makes the speech more appropriate in formal or public speaking. In contexts, expressing certain words or expressions which may be considered inappropriate or annoying with other words provides an opportunity to convey similar meanings without confusion. In this way, politicians ensure that their messages reach a wider audience.

Examples of remodeling found in analyzed discourses are given below:

Data 7. I'm going to keep fighting like heck to make it fair. (Joe Biden)

The term "heck" is used as a remodeling of the stronger and potentially offensive term "hell". By choosing "heck" instead of "hell", Biden aim to give a better impression by choosing pleasant word. This choice of language makes his statement more appropriate for a wider audience, Biden's use of the word remodeling shows that he cares about his audience. As a public figure, he pays attention to the different backgrounds and sensitivities of his audience. Using softer language makes his message acceptable to a wider range of people.

Biden's preference for "hell" to "heck" reflects his attempt to convey his message in a more plausible and acceptable way. Biden chooses a milder term, showing that he is sensitive to his listeners and tries to avoid empowerment or discomfort.

Biden's decision to use different expressions and replace harsher words with a softer alternative underlines his commitment to respectful and professional behaviour as a political leader. Choosing a less provoking language in public, especially when addressing audience coming from different background, helps Biden preserve his image of a statesman who values interaction and diplomacy.

Biden aims to protect an image of respectability and professionalism as a political leader. Avoiding harsh or aggressive language contributes to this image and reinforces his reputation as a statesman-like figure. In this way, the remodeling serves to neutralize the vulgar or taboo word or to prevent unwanted connotation. This strategic use of the language is consistent with Biden's broader communication strategy, which puts empathy, understanding and accessibility at the forefront of public interactions.

Data 8. “Oh, you don’t like that bill — huh? — that conservatives got together and said was a good bill? I’ll be darned. That’s amazing.” (Joe Biden)

Another example of remodeling is also taken from the speech of Joe Biden. In the provided example, Biden replaces a harsher expression, such as “I’ll be damned”, with the milder version – “I’ll be darned”. This remodeling helps the language to be more acceptable in various social or formal contexts. Biden aims to serve to maintain politeness and social acceptability by using “darned” instead of “damned”. The original phrase, “I’ll be damned” might be considered offensive or inappropriate in certain settings. However, “I’ll be darned” is softer and it’s less likely to cause offense.

Biden's preference to use the phrase “darned” instead of “damned” reflects his intention to convey his astonishment or suspicion in a more socially acceptable and less annoying way. Biden, who prefers a softer tune, is sensitive to the sensitivities of his listeners and tries to use a polite and respectful tone, even if he disagrees or is surprised.

The use of euphemism in this context also improves the overall tone and style of Biden's speech. Using a less harsh or conflicting language in official or public environments helps to preserve a sense of courtesy and professionalism. Biden’s saying “I’ll be darned” is consistent with his broader communication strategy, which prioritizes diplomacy and interaction with different masses. This conscious choice of language underlines his determination to encourage constructive dialogue and maintain positive relationships with his viewers.

5. Circumlocutions

Circumlocutions are the most used types of euphemism in the analyzed political discourses. It is important to maintain respect in political debates, even when discussing opponents or criticizing their policies. Euphemistic expressions like “my rival” or “my opponent” allow politicians to criticize without direct confrontation or personal assault. It preserves the label of

political debate and the honor of those involved. Politicians focus on the essence of their arguments and proposals, rather than engaging in personal attacks or character judgments. This encourages voters to focus on the content of political platforms rather than on individuals.

In political discourse, the use of euphemism reinforces the sense of objectiveness and impartiality. Politicians can express their views and criticism in a more balanced and measurable way, avoiding the use of open and provocative language. This increases the credibility of their claims and builds confidence among voters.

The examples of circumlocutions used in Joe Biden's and Hillary Clinton's speeches are:

Data 9. "And I know my opponent in this election was here in Michigan about a week ago, and it was like he was in a different place." (Hillary Clinton)

In the provided example, Hillary Clinton uses circumlocution by referring to her opponent without directly mentioning his name. Instead of saying "Donald Trump" she chooses to use more indirect term "my opponent". This circumlocution has several functions. Firstly, Clinton maintains politeness in her speech by using this type of euphemism. It prevents potential confrontation which could arise from directly naming her political opponent. Secondly, the term "my opponent" has a neutral connotation. It allows Clinton to discuss her political rival without personal bias or prejudice. It also keeps the focus on the issues rather than on specific individual.

In his speech, Clinton uses the term "my opponent" to maintain a level of courtesy. This language choice prevents possible conflict or hostility that may arise from the direct mention of the name of a political opponent. At the same time, it also reflects a diplomatic approach to speech, especially in the context of a political debate or speech. "My rival" has a neutral meaning and allows Clinton to debate her political opponent without expressing his personal prejudice. This choice of terminology helps to focus the debate on existing topics rather than on individuals. It also encourages a more objective tone of debate and promotes a sense of justice and impartiality.

Clinton is reusing expressions to shift the focus of the debate away from individuals and towards a broader political landscape and political divisions. This allows it to attract the viewer to important subjects instead of focusing on character judgments. This is consistent with his strategy of highlighting the contradictions of politics and presenting himself as a candidate who can find a solution to an urgent problem.

In this context, it serves many functions, such as using generalizations, preserving politeness, maintaining objectivity, and focusing on important issues, all of which contribute to effective communication in the political environment.

Data 10. “A president, my predecessor, failed in the most basic presidential duty that he owes to American people: the duty to care.” (Joe Biden)

Similarly, in the above example, Biden refers to Donald Trump by calling him “my predecessor”. This function of this euphemism is also to maintain politeness and to show respect. Biden implies to the administration of Donald Trump, and refers to the fact that his achievements were not quite good, and that he did not fulfill their fundamental responsibility as president. The euphemistic circumlocution implies shortcomings in Trump’s leadership without being too direct or explicit.

Biden’s calling Donald Trump a “my predecessor” reflects his kindness and desire to maintain respect for the presidency. Despite of political differences or criticism of the Trump administration, Biden’s use of the term shows institutional respect for former presidents. He avoids confronting Trump directly or humiliating him personally.

The use of circumlocution gives Biden the opportunity to criticize Trump’s leadership and policies while being polite and avoiding personal attacks. The use of euphemism also suggests covered messages about the need to change of management. Biden thus delicately frames Trump’s presidency, suggesting that his administration represents a break from the past and proposes a new direction for the country. It is in line with the Biden campaign’s narrative to create positive change and address the failures of the previous administration.

Data 11. “You know, I think I pointed out last year — I think I pointed out last year that children coming from broken homes where there’s no books, they’re not read to, they’re not spoken to very often start school — kindergarten or first grade hearing — having heard a million fewer words spoken.” (Hillary Clinton)

In this sentence, the circumlocution revolves around the description of the situation of “children who come from broken homes where there is no books, they’re not read to, they’re not spoken to very often start school”. Instead of referring directly to “children coming from poor families”, Hillary Clinton uses a more indirect way of conveying the idea. This language choice potentially avoids stamping or stereotyping these children and their families. She softens the

definition of children's conditions by avoiding direct and sensitive terms such as “disadvantaged” or “poor”. In the statement, the lack of opportunities and resources people face is the main focus, not their social or economic status.

By refocusing the debate on the shortage of opportunities and resources for these children, Clinton shifts focus to existing structural and systemic problems, rather than just focusing on the socio-economic situation of families; the lack of basic educational resources, such as books and parental involvement. It encourages listeners to acknowledge the challenges these children face and to think about solutions.

Clinton’s euphemism involves empathy, and understanding in children facing these challenges. It avoids a language that is potentially isolating or judgmental, and it forces listeners to understand the experiences of these children and to think about how they can support and empower them. She doesn’t simply label or classify people according to their circumstances; it encourages focusing on solution-oriented approaches that address fundamental issues related to access to education and resources.

The function of the euphemism used in this sentence is to discuss a sensitive topic with empathy and to soften an expression by using a few words. This makes it possible to have a more compassionate conversation about educational inequality and emphasizes how crucial it is to take down obstacles.

Data 12. “But 59 years later, there are forces taking us back in time: voter suppression, election subversion, unlimited dark money, extreme gerrymandering.” (Joe Biden)

In the above statement, “dark money” is a euphemism used to describe undisclosed or anonymous political contributions. “Dark money” is actually a cover for anonymous political donations. In political terms, it refers to funds provided by individuals or organizations for political campaigns or advocacy groups, but the sources of those funds are not fully disclosed. The term also refers to a lack of transparency and accountability in the political process because it allows rich donors or private groups to influence elections or political decisions without revealing their identities or purposes. Lack of transparency can increase concerns about potential conflicts of interest, corruption and the impact of money on politics.

Political financing can be a complex and subtle subject with many regulations, gaps and ethical issues. Therefore, the use of the term “dark money” simplifies the issue for a general audience.

The aim of the euphemism is to describe a complex subject in a simpler way. Biden quickly used the term “dark money” to convey the idea that financial influence in politics was suspicious, without entering into details of how some political groups or individuals secretly funded their campaigns.

Choosing the term “dark money” suggests doubts or criticism about secret political donations. It also stresses the need for reform or regulation in the area of campaign funding, and argues that such financial activities can be questionable or unethical. Politicians who use the term often encourage reform measures aimed at increasing the transparency and accountability of political finance by raising awareness of the spread of “dark money” in politics.

The use of the euphemism “dark money” in political discourse is a rhetorical tool used to summarize complex problems, highlight concerns about power and responsibility, and propose measures for reform. Politicians often raise the issues of "dark money" in politics with the intention of advocating for modifications to the way political funding functions.

Data 13. “Take on crimes of domestic violence . I’m ramping up the federal enforcement of the Violence Against Women Act that I proudly wrote when I was a senator so we can finally — finally end the scourge against women in America.” (Hillary Clinton)

The expression “scourge against women” in this sentence refers to violence against women. Biden chooses to use a roundabout way, which is the use of several words, in order to talk about this issue. Biden prefers a more indirect and emotional expression of “scourge against women” rather than direct words. The term “scourge” usually refers to something that causes a great pain or suffering.

The purpose of this euphemistic circumlocution is to express the seriousness and scope of the problem without using a tough or unpleasant language. Biden chooses this euphemism in order to provoke a strong emotional reaction from the public and to highlight the seriousness of the situation. he frames violence against women in this way, because he wants to gain support for his efforts as a senator to implement the Violence Against Women Act. In addition, the use of euphemisms can make the problem more acceptable and tolerable to a wider audience, which can encourage participation and support in solving the problem.

The selection of “scourge against women” is used to arouse a strong emotional response in the viewer. By addressing violence against women in such a touching way, Biden wants to arouse

empathy, anxiety and anger that will increase support for efforts to solve the problem. Biden's use of circumlocution underlines the importance and urgency of fighting violence against women. Biden also talks about his role as a senator in drafting the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). By covering the legislative action, it aims to raise support for the VAWA.

In this context euphemistic language conveys the importance of preventing violence against women and suggests legal initiatives to solve the problem.

Data 14. "That's why we're cracking down on corporations that engage in price gouging and deceptive pricing, from food to healthcare to housing." (Hillary Clinton)

The phrase "deceptive pricing" is used here as a euphemism for unjust and deceitful pricing. It describes circumstances in which companies can deceive or manipulate consumers with their pricing strategies. Biden prefers a more polite term to describe a serious problem in the business, without blaming companies for direct misconduct.

By using this circumlocution, the idea of deceptive and unethical pricing practices is conveyed without using an excessively harsh and rude words. Biden calls this "deceptive pricing" and emphasizes the element of fraud and manipulation in these practices. It's a means of framing an issue that has a negative effect on consumers.

Biden chooses this euphemism to highlight the need for regulatory action against such practices, but he doesn't directly accuse companies of committing crimes. Using a less conflicting term might help to maintain a diplomatic tone while dealing with a serious problem.

Additionally, euphemisms like "deceptive pricing" can be associated with and easily understood by a large audience. It makes the message more accessible and effective. Most people understand the concept of deceptive pricing, even if they do not know the technical details of economic policy. So by using this term, Biden can effectively convey the urgency of the problem and gain public support for combating such practices.

*Data 15. "That's not me. I was born amid World War Two, when America stood for the freedom of the world. I grew up in Scranton, Pennsylvania, and Claymont, Delaware, among **working people** who built this country." (Joe Biden)*

In Joe Biden's discourse, the expression "working people" serves as a strategic choice to replace "the working class people", a more direct term. This euphemism aims to prevent possible

negative ideas that could be associated with the term “working class”, such as economic struggle, or social disadvantage stereotypes. Instead, it offers a wider and more comprehensive definition that respects the honor and contributions of people doing different types of work.

Biden wants to promote a sense of participation and unity by recognizing the different roles and professions of the labor force. This linguistic change from the “working class people” reflects a desire to avoid isolating language and to interact with a wider audience, including people from different socio-economic backgrounds.

The phrase "working class" also refers to the historical contributions made by common laborers, who have been crucial to the development and prosperity of the nation. It emphasizes the common experiences of those attempting to create better futures for their communities and themselves and is predicated on the ideas of respect for one another.

In political terms, this euphemism is in line with Biden’s message of empathy and his understanding of the struggles ordinary Americans face. This makes it possible for him to discuss issues of labor rights, economic inequality and social justice. Biden addresses the complexities of the socio-economic debate with the sensitive and pragmatic use of the term “working people” and frames the debate in a way that encourages empathy, solidarity, and a common sense of purpose.

6. Replacement (One for one substitution)

One for one substitution involves the replacement of certain terms or expressions with their alternatives. Politicians strategically choose replacements to convey specific messages or policy goals. This enables politicians to address complex issues in a comprehensive manner while signaling their commitment to neutrality and inclusiveness in policymaking.

Replacements can also be used to reduce stamping associated with certain terms or concepts or negative calls. By choosing a neutral or less polarizing language, politicians can avoid alienating certain groups and encourage a more inclusive dialogue. This approach, while accepting different perspectives and sensitivities, encourages constructive participation in urgent social and political issues.

In general, replacements in political speech simplifies complex issues, communicates messages strategically, takes legal consequences into account, and reduces stamping. Politicians carefully select alternative terms to ensure public participation, communicate policy goals, and guide complex scenarios with sensitivity and pragmatism.

*Data 16. Look, I'm also getting rid of **junk fees** at the end of your bill that are there without your knowledge. My administration announced we're cutting credit card late fees from \$32 to \$8. (Joe Biden)*

The term “junk fees” described by Joe Biden is a euphemism for unsuspecting payments. These payments can appear, among others, in various invoices, loans, air travel, hotel rooms, bank transactions, and event tickets. These are usually additional charges that consumers may not predict or fully understand when making a purchase or transaction.

The phrase “junk fees” have meaningless or unnecessary implication such as confusion or waste. Biden uses this euphemism to use a language that arouses public discourse, emphasizing the idea that these payments are undesirable. Biden prefers a daily language that can be easily understood by consumers from different backgrounds, rather than technical terms or legal terminology.

The use of “junk fees” as a replacement is twofold. The first is to help simplify the complex issue of consumer finance, making it more understandable and related to an audience. Biden effectively conveys the idea that these charges are unnecessary and unfair, calling them “junk fees”. Secondly, this phrase underlines Biden’s commitment to consumer protection and financial transparency. It promises to eliminate these charges by taking a proactive stance against applications that may exploit or deceive consumers. This is consistent with the broader policy objectives of promoting fairness and accountability in the financial sector and increasing confidence in government regulation and oversight.

Using the phrase “junk fees” allows Biden to deal with hidden fees and consumer charges in a simple and effective way. By doing so, it can demonstrate its administration's determination to protect consumer rights and support economic justice, arouse the vote among voters, and strengthen its own policies.

Data 17. “Directing my Cabinet to review the federal classification of drugs and expunging thousands of convictions for the mere possession, because no one should be jailed for simply using or have it on their record.” (Joe Biden)

In Joe Biden’s explanation, the term “drug” is used as a replacement for marijuana. Using this euphemism, Biden chooses a wider and more general term, which covers both marijuana and many other substances. This replacement has various functions in this context.

The use of narcotics instead of “drugs” extends the scope of the issue. He acknowledges that the classification and criminalization of drugs involves many substances beyond marijuana. Furthermore, the term “drug” may be considered to be less stigmatizing or polarizing than “marijuana”. Biden may be trying to avoid any controversy or negative appeals that might arise from an open debate about criminalization by choosing a more impartial term.

The replacement of “marijuana” to “drugs” gives Biden an opportunity to convey a message about the administration’s approach to drug reform. In addition, the use of a general term may have legal consequences because it prevents specific references to substances classified as illegal under federal law. This may be strategic because it requires a change in implementation priorities or a more tolerant approach to specific drug crimes.

This broader framework allows the drug policy reform to address the complexities in a comprehensive way, in the knowledge that the issues of criminalization and classification extend beyond a single substance.

Secondly, “drug” can be seen as a more impartial and less stigmatizing term than “marijuana”. The second term carries the historical and cultural baggage often associated with controversial legalization and criminalization debates. Biden may be trying to avoid strong emotions or opposition from certain groups by choosing a more general term.

Furthermore, the use of the phrase “drugs” allows Biden to convey the participation and understanding of those affected by drug-related crimes. Biden stresses the need to change the federal classification of drugs. Using “drugs” instead of “marijuana” could also have legal consequences. Biden is avoiding specific references to individual substances to prevent possible conflicts with federal drug laws and regulations. This may be important when advocating a change in action priorities or challenging reforms in the current drug policy. Biden’s use of the term “drug” in his statement allows for a subtle and diplomatic approach to drug reform. It expands the scope of discussion, reduces possible disputes and addresses the legal complexity of drug-related crimes.

7. General-for-specific (Synecdoche)

The use of expressions general-for-specific, also known as synecdoche, has number of strategic purposes. Political figures often use the synecdoche to refer to broader concepts. It allows politicians to emphasize the importance and prestige of certain institutions or branches of

government. Referring to “Congress” or “Parliament”, they emphasize the role and responsibility of legislators in shaping policy and governance.

The use of this kind of expressions simplifies complex political concepts and institutions, making them more accessible to the general public. They are often used to provoke an emotional response or gain support in political communication.

Data 18. “The White House has planned a press conference”(Hillary Clinton)

Here, “The White House” is used to represent a group of specific individuals and government policymakers as a general term. Clinton uses the term “White House” as a generalization. It’s a figure of speech known as synecdoche, where a part of something is used to refer to the whole. In this case, the “White House” represents not only the physical building, but also the entire administration of the US, including the president, his advisers and other officials.

Instead of specifying which persons or entities were involved, the statement attributes the action to a broader entity and suggests that the administration makes the decision collectively. This euphemism simplifies the message and directs the action to the entire manager without identifying the responsible person or institutions. The function of the euphemistic general-for-specific expression in this sentence is to efficiently convey relevant information about an official announcement.

8. Hyperbole (overstatement)

Euphemistic exaggerations in political speech conveys strong messages while preserving kindness or sensitivity at the same time. Politicians can use hyperbolic language to draw attention to important issues or ideas. These kinds of euphemisms help to emphasize the importance or urgency of the message being conveyed.

Exaggerating often leads to memorable rhetoric that the listeners remember even long after the speech has been delivered. Politicians can combine exaggerated language with indirect or softened expression, creating euphemistic hyperboles that leave a lasting impression. Politicians may want to emphasize the importance or urgency of certain issues, but they must also take into account the potential impact of what they say on different sections of society. These linguistic devices allow politicians to effectively convey their messages while minimizing pain or discomfort.

Data 19. But that's not what happened here, and what happened here is what can happen across America. You are in now, what is largely an aerospace company. And because of the work force and the work ethic and the commitment of Futuramic, you are seeing the future unfold. So I got to see what's happening here to help build the SLS rocket that is going to go from Macomb to Mars. (Joe Biden)

The expression “from Macomb to Mars” in Joe Biden’s statement serves as a euphemistic exaggeration. It highlights the importance and claim of the project under discussion. The phrase “From Macomb to Mars” is a euphemism because it replaces the real definition of the project with a greater, symbolic journey. Instead of saying that Futuramic was involved in the construction of the SLS rocket, Biden uses the hyperbole to convey an epic scope and a futuristic sense of exploration.

Hyperbole means exaggerating for the purpose of emphasis or influence. Biden claims that the SLS rocket will go from Macomb, Michigan to Mars, exaggerating the importance and impact of the project. This exaggeration reinforces the importance of Futuramic’s work and the wider impact of space research. Mars represents the ultimate boundary of human discovery and scientific achievement. Biden connects the project to Mars, using the symbolism of space travel as the culmination of human creativity and progress. He transforms the ordinary definition of production into a poetic expression of human activity and technological progress. Biden uses this exaggeration to underline the transformative potential of Futuramic’s contribution.

Data 20. We are resilient, determined, hard-working. There is nothing America can't do – if we do it together. And I know this because this is how I was raised. (Hillary Clinton)

Hillary Clinton uses hyperbole in her speech to evoke a strong sense of solidarity and national pride. She emphasized the capabilities of the state when she said, “There is nothing America can't do if we do it together”. She also implies that there are no restrictions on what can be accomplished when America's citizens are united.

Hyperbolic language has various functions. The first is to inspire public confidence and optimism by offering a vision with unlimited potential. The speaker tries to motivate people to take action by emphasizing the collective power of co-operation. It also strengthens the sense of exaggeration, national identity and solidarity. He described America as a nation capable of overcoming all obstacles, encouraging shared pride and determination among its citizens. It can

help develop a spirit of co-operation and mutual support and encourage people to work together to common goals.

An exaggerated expression also serves a rhetorical purpose, attracting the listener's attention and leaving an unforgettable impression. The expression invites listeners to reflect on the possibilities for joint action and emphasizes the importance of unity in achieving success.

9. Understatement

In political discourse, understatement means the use of a softer or less direct language to describe important or sensitive topics. Understatements allow politicians to soften the impact of their claims when discussing sensitive or emotional issues. Instead of using harsh or direct language, they choose vague expressions that express the seriousness of the situation and minimize frustration or discomfort.

Politicians use euphemistic understatement to show sensitivity and respect to their viewers, especially when discussing tragic events or sensitive topics. This approach acknowledges the emotional weight of the subject and tries to deal with it in a more thoughtful way.

Politicians also use the understatement to frame their perceptions in a more positive way. If you choose a softer language, even if it involves removing or eliminating certain applications or charges, the action or applications can be presented as positive changes or improvements. This strategic use of the language helps advance their political interests and gain public support. The following are some examples from Joe Biden's and Hillary Clinton's speeches:

Data 21. If you believe that he's as wealthy as he says, that alone would save the Trump family \$4 billion. (Hillary Clinton)

In Hillary Clinton's statement, the use of the word "rich" instead of "wealthy" is a euphemism. Although both terms generally refer to substantial amounts of money or property, "rich" has a more neutral or supranational meaning than "wealthy". The word "wealth" has a more impartial meaning, whereas "rich" may evoke images of excessive wealth. Clinton is using the word "wealthy" to underestimate Trump's wealth and avoid a possible perception of exaggeration. This language choice helps to provide a more balanced and accessible tone of expression.

Clinton prefers the word "rich" to soften the description of Trump's financial status. The term "rich" may sometimes have appeals to extremism or arrogance, while "wealthy" may be

considered a more polite or socially acceptable term. In this context, the understatement downplays the amount of Trump's wealth, it makes the statement less conflicting or provocative.

In addition, the use of the word "rich" instead of "wealthy" may indicate a certain degree of financial complexity or prediction. Because wealth is often associated with a broader portfolio of assets rather than liquid money. This subtle distinction allows Clinton to criticize Trump's financial practices without using an excessively sharp or harsh language. So the statement gives a critical message about Trump's financial situation, while using the word "wealthy".

Using the word "wealthy" instead of "rich", prevents any possible conflict or debate that could arise from Trump's direct labelling as "rich". In Clinton's statement, the strategic use of the word "rich" instead of "wealthy" reflects a deliberate effort to convey criticism by softening the tone and avoiding possible conflict or misinterpretations.

Data 22. With us tonight is Jasmine, whose nine-year-old sister Jackie was a victim of foul play with 21 classmates and teachers in her elementary school in Uvalde, Texas. (Joe Biden)

The expression "to be a victim of a foul play" is used as a euphemism for more direct and harsh expressions like "to be killed" or "to be murdered". This term belongs to the category of euphemisms called understatement. Instead of expressing the violent murder directly, the speaker chooses a less clear and milder expression to describe the tragic event.

The purpose of using a euphemism in this context is to soften the effect of the expression and show sensitivity to the audience, especially given the emotional weight of the subject. "Foul play" means a suspicious activity that does not explicitly explain the nature of the event. This allows the speaker to talk about the seriousness of the situation by avoiding using uncensored or aggressive language.

The speaker prefers this understatement to show respect towards the victims and their families. When we consider the young age of the victims, it can be very harsh or emotionally sad to say that Jackie and her classmates were murdered or killed. The speaker uses the expression "foul play" to acknowledge the seriousness of the situation.

Euphemisms help to convey subtle or sensitive information more accurately and it takes into account the emotional impact of the word or expression on the public. While discussing

tragic events, speakers try to achieve a balance between clarity and sympathy by using euphemisms.

Data 23. And my administration is also eliminating title insurance (fees) on federally backed mortgages. When you refinance your home, you can save \$1,000 or more as a consequence. (Hillary Clinton)

“To eliminate” is a euphemism that substitutes for “to get rid of” or “remove”. Blunt expressions are often used to soften the effect of an expression or to convey a message in a less direct or harsh way.

The speaker presents the action as a positive change or improvement instead of simply saying to remove something, using the expression “to eliminate”. This means that the management has taken a strategic decision to improve the situation of the hosts. This language choice can help to give the activity a more positive perspective and highlight public benefits, such as potential cost savings. Euphemisms are linguistic tools used to convey potentially sensitive or unpleasant ideas in a more socially acceptable or less aggressive way. The speaker tries to put the action in a positive framework and to present it as a conscious and purposeful effort.

In addition, the use of the word “eliminate” in this context is consistent with the speaker's intention to highlight possible financial benefits for homeowners who refinance their homes. It has a sense of purpose and action. This demonstrates the positive outcome of the operation, which means significant savings of at least \$1,000 for those who want to refinance their mortgages. Therefore, “to eliminate” functions not only as an understatement, but also as a strategic language choice to advance the administration's political interests.

In a nutshell, the use of the term “to eliminate” in this context both mitigates the effect of the announcement and places action in a positive framework. It emphasizes the administration's proactive approach to housing financing issues and highlighting specific benefits for housing finance issues.

10. Slang euphemism

This type of dysphemism involves the use of informal or colloquial language that may be considered inappropriate or unrefined in certain contexts. It often appears in casual conversation among specific groups.

Data 24. Folks, I inherited an economy that was on the brink. (Joe Biden)

Joe Biden uses the word “folks” as a slang euphemism to address his audience in. Slangs such as “folks” are often used in informal conversations, especially in unofficial environments in order to familiarize and connect with the listener.

In this context, the purpose of using this slang is to create harmony and to convey a sense of harmoniousness and connectivity. Calling audience “folks”, Biden aims to connect with them on a personal level and emphasizes shared experiences. This language choice frames the message from the top down as a collective effort, rather than a directive, helping to develop a sense of unity and solidarity.

In addition, Biden calls the public “folks” to mitigate the impact of the statement, and mitigates the negative consequences of discussing economic issues. The term “folks” is essentially non-conflicting and inclusive, it helps Biden to deal with a sensitive issue such as the state of the economy in a more day-to-day and approachable way.

The use of the phrase “folks” also emphasizes the empathic and compassionate tone of Biden's message. Biden acknowledges the challenges he inherited from previous governments. He positions himself as a leader sensitive to the concerns and struggles of ordinary Americans. This emphasis on empathy and understanding could help increase the effectiveness of Biden's communication.

3.2. Pragmatic functions of dysphemism in political discourse

1. Synecdoche (part-for-whole)

A synecdoche is a rhetorical tool often used in political discourse to simplify complex ideas or make them more compatible with the listener. In political discourse, the term is often used to refer to large institutions or organizations and to highlight a specific part of them especially in a negative way.

Synecdoche can also be used to highlight differences in society or politics. With the use of the dictionary, politicians can emphasize the perceptual inequalities or imbalances of power between different social groups or sectors and frame their arguments within these symbolic representations.

Synecdoche effectively highlights the most important topics or stories of a political debate. For example, the expression “boots on the ground” may symbolize soldiers or, in a broader sense, the concept of national security.

Politicians can use synecdoche to reinforce their messages and address the main priorities of their target audiences by generating strong images or calls.

Data 25. “The suits in Washington are out of touch with everyday Americans.”

In this statement, the term “suits” is used to refer to politicians or government officials. “Suit” refers specifically to clothing commonly worn by businessmen, professionals or politicians. However, in this context, it is used to symbolize an entire group of policymakers or politicians in Washington.

Joe Biden uses this synecdoche to simplify a complex entity into a single recognizable symbol and he makes his criticism disproportionate to the public. In this context, the use of the word “clothes” has a negative appeal. So Biden’s use of synecdoche serves as a critique of political elites or the establishment in Washington. By referring to them as “suits”, he highlights a perceived lack of empathy, understanding, or authenticity among those in positions of power.

The use of synecdoche helps Biden create a vivid and lasting image in the mind of the audience. It simplifies a complex political landscape with an unforgettable single term which makes his message more effective and provocative.

2. Dysphemistic epithets.

Dysphemistic epithets are often used in political speech for different persuasive goals. Political opponents or rival groups may be targeted with dysphemistic epithets to justify their actions, beliefs or identities. In practice, politicians use a humiliating language to undermine the credibility and reputation of their rivals and reduce their influence and support by describing them negatively.

Dysphemistic epithets can also be used by politicians to increase their supporters by demonizing perceived enemies or threats. Politicians can use this kind of language to provoke strong emotional reactions in their supporters, motivate them to act, and strengthen group identity and harmony. Dysphemistic epithets are often used to frame political issues in a way that shapes public perceptions and attitudes. Politicians try to influence citizens' perceptions and attitudes by putting negative labels on specific policies, practices or groups.

In some cases, politicians may use dysphemistic epithets to distract attention from major political debates or personal debates. They engage in nickname or character attacks, trying to distract the public debate from subjects that may harm them or their own agendas. So the use of dysphemistic epithets in political speech reflects a strategic approach to communication aimed at shaping the public, mobilizing support and promoting political goals. But this kind of language can also contribute to the conflict between opponents.

Data 26. "Israel has added burden because Hamas hides and operates among the civilian population like chickens — under hospitals, daycare centers, and all the like." (Joe Biden)

Chickens are often associated with shyness or fear. The use of the term "chickens" in the statement as a dysphemistic epithet intends to describe the actions of the Palestinian militant group Hamas in a negative way. Biden implies that they are cowards or acting cowardly by comparing them to chickens. Using derogatory language to refer to people or groups as animals, particularly when it has negative overtones, can dehumanize them. Biden tries to describe the Palestinian militant group as "chickens" in a way that is literally far from human, which might justify harsher treatment or action against them. Such an expulsion from humanity could further aggravate existing tensions and conflicts by reducing empathy and understanding between opposing parties.

Biden may also attempt to justify Israel's or others' defensive actions by describing the Palestinian militant group's actions as cowardly. Biden may try to justify military action against these people by pretending that the group is hiding among the civilian population; he may suggest that they are threatening innocent civilians and therefore need to be violently combated.

Dysphemisms such as "chickens" are often used in political speech to arouse emotional reactions and shape public perception. Biden may be using such a language to try to influence the public by gaining a negative view of the Palestinian militant group. This could contribute to polarization and deepening disputes between supporters of different political positions or those involved in the conflict.

In political discourse, the use of dysphemistic characteristics such as "chickens" is a complex and controversial issue. While such a language can be used to discredit rivals or justify certain actions, it also carries the risk of conflict. Therefore, it is important to critically examine the motivations and consequences of the use of dysphemisms in political discourse.

Data 27. "The opposition party's policies are nothing but a pack of wolves preying on the hardworking citizens of this country."

When a speaker refers to the opposing party as "wolves", the speaker attributes negative qualities associated with the animal, such as betrayal. This means that their actions are harmful, selfish, and focus on personal interests rather than public interests.

The use of animal images in dysphemistic phrases dehumanizes targeted individuals or groups. In this case, portraying the opposition party as a "wolf" reduces them to a predatory position, depriving them of humanity and honour.

Dysphemistic epithets are often used for rhetoric effects and are intended to arouse emotional reactions in the target audience. Clinton wants to overcome fear, insecurity and hatred against them by describing the opposition as "wolves", thus strengthening her position and gathering support for its actions. This type of language is often used in political speech to dishonor opponents and to direct the public in favour of their own party or agenda.

Usually in political speech, the use of dysphemistic epithets such as animal names serves to demonize the opposition, manipulate public perception, and advance the speaker's political agenda. But it can also incite hatred and hostility among rival groups, contributing to the polarization and division of society.

3. Metaphor

Dysphemistic metaphors are usually designed to provoke strong emotional reactions in the listener. With a vivid and insistent phrase such as “poison in our country’s blood”, politicians aim to create fear, insecurity or hostility in the targeted audience, thereby shaping the public's perception and attitude towards immigration policy.

Dysphemistic metaphors also reinforce negative stereotypes about the target group, sustain harmful narratives, and encourage discrimination. In terms of immigration, portraying immigrants as “poisons” strengthens prejudice and can lead to increased anti-immigrant sensitivity and more restrictive policies.

Data 28. Immigrants are “poison in the blood of our country.” (Joe Biden)

The expression “poison in our country’s blood” here uses a metaphorical language to express a negative definition of immigrants. Metaphors compare things to highlight certain qualities or traits, and in this case, comparison suggests that immigrants are detrimental to the nation's prosperity. The obscene use of the word “poison” has a strong negative meaning; meaning that immigrants are harmful, poisonous, or corrupt the nation. Comparing migrants to poison, he suggests that their existence or influence is harmful by nature and threatens the health or vitality of the country.

Metaphorical dysphemisms can dehumanize targeted individuals or groups from humanity, reducing them to objects or substances associated with negativity. In this case, portraying immigrants as “poisons” undermines their humanity and dignity, and shows them as inherently harmful or undesirable in society.

Dysphemisms like “poison in the blood our country” are designed to provoke strong emotional reactions in audience. In a vivid and enduring language, the speaker aims to encourage fear, insecurity or hostility towards immigrants and thus shape people’s perception and attitudes towards immigration policy.

Political speech often uses humiliating language to portray opponents as evil or to blame certain groups for social problems. In this example, the use of dysphemism increases anti-immigration sentiment and support for restrictive immigration measures or nationalist goals. Metaphorical dysphemism of “poison in the blood of our country” reinforces negative stereotypes

about immigrants, dehumanize them, and contributes to the continuation of alien hostility and indigenous attitudes in society. This reflects a divisive and exclusive approach to migration; it can have negative consequences for social integration and inclusion.

4. Name dysphemism.

Data 29. "It's hard to get any word in with this clown." (Joe Biden)

The US president Donald Trump frequently made fun of his opponent Biden throughout the 2020 presidential campaign, especially during the closing debates, by referring to him as "Sleepy Joe". In response, Biden used the term "clown" as an insult to Trump's description of incompetence, stupidity, or lack of seriousness. This choice of language served to counter Trump's derogatory nickname and to portray Trump as unserious or unprofessional in his approach to political discourse.

When Biden calls Trump a "clown", he uses dysphemism to convey a negative perception of his opponent. The term "clown" is often associated with stupidity, laziness, or incompetence, and the use of the term to describe Trump suggests that Biden has a humiliating view of him.

Biden's use of the term "clown" was a strategy in itself; he tried to reverse the situation by opposing Trump's attacks and by showing Trump as someone unfit to be president because of his behavior or words. Biden labelled Trump a "clown", suggesting that Trump's statements lacked content or credibility, thereby weakening his authority or faith in the public. He also drew attention to voters who may have been postponed due to Trump's aggressive or ridiculous tone, describing Biden as willing to resist such tactics.

Biden's use of the term "clown" in reference to Trump reflects the adversarial nature of the political debate, with rivals often using a humiliating language to humiliate each other. This highlights the intensity of competition between the two candidates and the importance of language in shaping public perception and attitudes towards political figures.

Data 30. "Not a winning campaign: Broke Don hides in basement."

Biden calls Trump "Broke Don" and uses his dysphemism to undermine his opponent's financial position and campaign resources. The term "broke" refers to financial bankruptcy or poverty, while "Don" stands for Trump's surname. This dysphemistic nickname serves a variety of functions in the context of political discourse. The first is to give Biden an opportunity to

undermine his opponent as a successful businessman and leader by questioning Trump's financial stability. Calling him "the broke Don", Biden is trying to undermine Trump's authority and credibility, especially in economic matters.

Secondly, the use of dysphemism could be a rhetorical tool to mock or deceive Trump's campaigns. Describing him as someone in financial difficulties, Biden suggests Trump's failure to raise enough money negatively reflects his leadership skills and popularity among donors. The tactics may be designed to raise doubts among voters about Trump's ability to conduct a competitive campaign.

Dysphemistic nicknames such as "Broke Don" may appeal to some voters who may criticize Trump's business practices or economic governance. Biden may be trying to draw attention to voters who prioritize financial responsibility or political leadership by highlighting Trump's financial shortcomings.

5. Euphemistic dysphemism

Euphemistic dysphemism is a linguistic strategy often encountered in political discourse. They are a way to preserve politeness while conveying criticism or non-approval (Brown, P., & Levinson, 1987). Politicians often use a superficially polite or impartial language to prevent direct confrontation or attack. The use of euphemistic dysphemism allows politicians to criticize their rivals or rivals in a subtle way without using an explicitly aggressive language. By using these terms, they can be polite to express dissatisfaction or discontent with someone's actions or behavior.

In the context of political discourse, euphemistic dysphemism helps politicians navigate complex relationships with opponents, journalists, or critics. This allows them to express their disagreements or disappointments without increasing tension or harming relationships. Politicians strategically use euphemistic dysphemism to shape public perception and influence attitudes towards specific individuals or topics. They can skillfully guide the public by expressing their criticism in a polite or impartial language, avoiding direct confrontation or reaction.

Euphemistic dysphemisms play an important role in political communication and helps politicians to handle sensitive issues and relationships.

Data 31. "He's quite persistent, isn't he? A real tenacious terrier, that one." (Joe Biden)

In reference to Fox News reporter Peter Doocy, Biden uses the euphemistic dysphemism of “tenacious terrier”, a language strategy that appears polite on the surface, but contains insult or criticism. Biden uses a language that appears to be noble or neutral at first sight, choosing the term “tenacious terrier”. The term “tenacious” often refers to persistence or determination that can be seen as a positive feature of journalism.

Despite surface-level kindness, choosing the word “terrier” adds a layer of secret criticism. Terriers are known for their determination and tendency to hold on to something, which can be interpreted as a closed criticism of Doocy's questioning style. This clearly shows that Doocy may be excessively rude or aggressive in his approach.

While the use of “tenacious terrier” does not have the specific purpose of insulting or offending, it acts as a form of dysphemism that skillfully expresses disapproval or dissatisfaction. This allows Biden to express his disappointment with Doocy's interrogation without clearly using aggressive language.

The audience's interpretation of the euphemistic dysphemism may vary depending on their familiarity with the term and their perception of the style of journalism. Some may see it as a harmless compliment, while others may understand the underlying criticism.

Biden's use of dysphemism in the political context reflects tensions that may arise between politicians and journalists. This shows that there is a delicate balance between politeness while subtly expressing disagreements or disappointments.

Euphemistic dysphemism in referring to Peter Doocy as a “tenacious terrier” allows Biden to navigate the complexities of political discourse by combining politeness with subtle criticism. This is an example of the ways in which language can be used to convey meaning in politics and shape perceptions.

6. “-ist” dysphemism

In politics, “-ist” dysphemism often involves the use of humiliating terms or language against individuals or groups based on ethnic origin, race, gender, religion, sexual orientation or other personal characteristics. Politicians may use “-ist” dysphemisms to try to bring certain groups together due to social problems or economic difficulties. This can encourage social division and hostility and distract attention from systemic problems that require more diverse and comprehensive solutions.

The tendency of politicians to “-ist” dysphemism can contribute to a toxic political climate characterized by arrogance and intolerance. It undermines trust in democratic institutions, undermining principles of pluralism and respect for human rights.

Data 32. “When Mexico sends its people, they’re not sending their best. They’re sending people that have lots of problems, and they’re bringing those problems with us. They’re bringing drugs. They’re bringing crime. They’re rapists.” (Joe Biden)

The explanation singles out people of Mexican origin, suggesting that they are basically inferior or unwanted. Biden’s statement targets Mexicans only on the basis of their ethnic origin, suggesting that Mexico is sending out undesirable persons, such as criminals and rapists. The statement creates negative stereotypes about Mexicans, describing them as criminals and rapists. This generalization encourages both the false and offensive falsehood that all Mexicans are prone to crime.

Expressions such as “bring problems with us” and “bring drugs” negatively describe Mexicans and suggest that they are a burden to society. This explanation links Mexicans with crime and drug trafficking, deceiving and undermining people of Mexican origin. The term “rape” used with the Mexicans is quite aggressive and disrespectful. Biden suggests that Mexican immigrants are criminals by nature and a threat to society. It is not only taking the Mexicans away from humanity and mocking them, it is also encouraging an environment of hostility and discrimination against them.

Biden’s statement shows “-ist” dysphemism; targeting individuals according to their ethnic originality, and encouraging discrimination. Such a language has significant implications for social integration and participation, and underlines the importance of promoting respectful and inclusive debate in political rhetoric.

7. Cross-cultural dysphemism

In politics, cross-cultural dysphemisms are often used unintentionally due to the cultural nuances surrounding certain expressions and a lack of awareness or sensitivity to the historical context. Politicians may use an aggressive or degrading language in their own cultural circles, which is regarded as neutral and even positive. But they might be offensive or derogatory in another culture. This can lead to unwanted aggression or misunderstanding among communities from different cultural backgrounds.

A use of a language that is culturally insensitive by politicians can be interpreted as a sign of disrespect or ignorance, and can lead to diplomatic tensions or misunderstandings. Politicians who use cross-cultural dysphemism reinforce stereotypes and prejudices against specific ethnic or cultural groups. The politician's use of cross-cultural dysphemism can shape public perception of minorities or excluded communities, which can contribute to their imitation and self-identification. It can also alienate voters from different backgrounds who feel that political leaders are being wronged or disrespected.

The use of intercultural dysphemism in politics emphasizes the importance of promoting cultural competence and understanding in political discourse in order to promote global inclusion, respect and effective communication.

Data 33. Gypsies made up of a multitude of different groups. (Joe Biden)

In this example, Joe Biden uses the term “gypsy” to refer to the Romans. It is an example of cross-cultural dysphemism. The term “gypsy” shows the diversity of the Roma community and recognizes that it consists of many different groups. Many members of the Roma community find the term “gypsy” aggressive and humiliating. Historically, it has been used in a humiliating way, with stereotypes and discrimination against the Roma. By using this term, Biden reinforces negative perceptions that are unconsciously associated with the word and he may be annoying the people of Roman origin.

Although Biden's intention to recognize the diversity of the Roma community is neutral and even positive, his use of the word “gypsy” shows that he is unaware of the term's aggressive nature and the impact it has had on the persistence of discrimination. The term “gypsy” has long been used as a pejorative label for the Roma people. This is the result of stereotypes and prejudices that negatively portrayed the Roman community. These stereotypes often associate Roma with crime, immigration, and other negative characteristics.

In many cultures, including Europe and North America, the term “gypsy” is widely regarded as aggressive and degrading. This is viewed as an insult to the Romans and to their humanity. Therefore, its use, even in a seemingly neutral context, can cause irritation, frustration and anger among members of the Roma community.

The use of the word “gypsy” by a prominent name like Joe Biden in a press release can have a significant impact on how the Roma community is perceived in society in general. By using a

term that makes negative appeals, Biden is contributing unconsciously to the perpetuation of harmful stereotypes and prejudices against Roma.

8. Hyperbole

The use of dysphemistic hyperbole in politics is a widespread rhetorical strategy used by politicians to emphasize their points, disregard their rivals, or support their own agenda. Dysphemistic exaggerations are often used in political rhetoric to arouse strong emotions. Politicians use exaggerated language to draw a wild or catastrophic picture and try to mobilize the public in favour of their own positions or policies.

Politicians may also use dysphemistic hyperbole to attack the character or credibility of their opponents. By exaggerating their negative attributes or actions, they try to weaken the image and credibility of their opponents in the eyes of public.

Dysphemistic hyperboles are often used as a means of overcoming fear, especially when it comes to national security, immigration or public security. Politicians may use exaggerated language to present certain dangers or threats as existential crises and thus justify the solutions or policies they propose.

Another purpose of dysphemistic hyperbole can be to demonize political opponents, portraying them as evil or enemies of the people. Politicians are trying to gather voters and justify opposing opinions by using an excessive language.

Data 34. "Their healthcare proposal is a complete nightmare, a death sentence for millions of Americans." (Hillary Clinton)

The speaker describes the healthcare proposal as "a complete nightmare" and uses exaggerated language to highlight the seriousness of her criticism. The word "nightmare" evokes feelings of terror, fear and anxiety, and suggests that the proposal will have devastating consequences for the health system and those who benefit from it. This exaggeration is intended to reinforce the negative perception of the proposal and convince the public that it is a complete failure.

The expression "complete nightmare" is impressive and exaggerated. Clinton claims that the proposed health policy will cause millions of Americans to die. This excessive use of language is intended to arouse strong emotions and to convey the seriousness of the situation. The speaker is

trying to show that it is not only ineffective, but also actively harmful to the well-being and even survival of a significant part of the population.

The dysphemistic hyperbole in the given example strongly condemns the healthcare proposal, describing it as a fatal failure, leading to great suffering and loss of life. Hyperbolic language was designed to arouse an emotional reaction in the public and to gather support against the proposed practice.

The dysphemistic hyperbole has several functions in the given statement. First of all, it emphasises the strong lack of approval and condemnation of the speaker. The speaker intensifies her criticism by using exaggerated expressions such as “complete nightmare” and stresses the importance of the shortcomings in the proposal.

The extreme language used in dysphemistic hyperboles aims to provoke strong emotional reactions in the audience, such as fear, anger, and anger. Clinton described the health care proposal as a serious threat to the well-being and lives of millions of Americans, trying to turn the public against the proposal and gain support for alternative policies.

Dysphemistic hyperbole can be an effective rhetoric tool to attract attention and create an unforgettable impact on listeners or readers. The dramatic language used in this kind of dysphemisms draws the listeners’ attention and leaves a long lasting impression.

Data 35. “How did Congress respond to that debt? They did the right thing. They lifted the debt ceiling three times without preconditions or crisis. They paid the American bill to prevent an economic disaster of the country.” (Joe Biden)

The speaker overstates severity of the consequences by describing the situation as potentially an “economic disaster for the country”. This exaggeration emphasizes the importance of congressional action and the seriousness of the situation. Dysphemistic hyperbole is often used to persuade the viewer by provoking strong emotional responses. In this case, the speaker uses exaggerated language to highlight the current serious dangers and to impress the public on the urgency of Congress’ action. Defending the lifting of the debt ceiling as an important intervention to prevent a devastating economic collapse, the speaker is trying to justify congressional decisions and gather support for them.

The use of dysphemistic hyperbole can also be a criticism or accusation of perceived enemies. Failure to raise the debt ceiling would lead to a “economic disaster”, the speaker said, and indirectly criticized his opposition or reluctance to do so. This framing makes congress’ action necessary and responsible, and questions the motivations or priorities of those who may have opposed raising the debt ceiling.

9. Idiom

Dysphemistic idioms are often used in political speech to convey criticism, humiliation or deception of opponents, policies or ideas. Politicians often use humiliating phrases to underestimate their rivals or their actions. These kinds of idioms are also used to emphasize that certain actions or decisions are not approved or rejected.

Negative phrases are selected based on their emotional effects. They are often more persistent and remarkable than a neutral language, which makes them effective tools in shaping the public opinion. Politicians may also use dysphemistic idioms with the purpose of strengthening their positions by criticizing their opponents’ actions.

Data 36. “It’s clear that my opponent will stop at nothing to advance his agenda, even if it means stabbing hard-working Americans in the back.” (Hillary Clinton)

In that statement, Hillary Clinton uses a humiliating expression such as “stabbing working Americans in their backs” to express a strong sense of betrayal and treason. The idiomatic expression “stab someone from back” evokes vivid images of deception and betrayal. It means a sudden and unexpected attack on someone who trusts in the perpetrator. Using this expression, Clinton accuses his opponent of betraying the trust of Americans.

A word has a powerful emotional effect that evokes anger, frustration, and disappointment. Clinton tries to undermine his opponent’s credibility and question his integrity by portraying her opposition’s actions as treason. She promotes herself as a defender of the hard-working Americans and sees her rivals as unreliable and serving his own interests.

The phrase “stabbing working Americans in their backs”, which is dysphemistic idiom, serves as an effective rhetorical tool in criticising Clinton’s opponent’s actions and reinforcing her own political narrative.

Data 37. “Instead of engaging in debate, my opponent has resorted to throwing mud at me and my administration. But let me be clear: we won’t be distracted by baseless accusations and petty attacks. We’re focused on delivering real solutions for the American people.”

The term “throwing mud” means to publicly say false or bad things about someone. This picture suggests a disgraceful and disrespectful way of attacking someone’s reputation or character. Biden uses this dysphemistic idiom to criticize Trump’s approach to political debates. Biden accuses Trump of “throwing mud”, which means that Trump uses blackmailing tactics, character assassination or baseless allegations instead of substantiated debate.

This statement carries a negative emotional burden and suggests that Trump’s actions are not only unfair, but also contrary to the value of political speech. This could create disappointment, frustration, and even anger among Biden supporters, and highlight the lack of honesty perceived in Trump’s behavior.

On the other hand, Biden tries to present himself as a candidate who focuses on important issues and is focused on constructive dialogue. He describes Trump as desperate and unprincipled, comparing it to his determination to address the real concerns of the American people. He tries to undermine Trump's tactics and position himself as a more respectable and trustworthy alternative.

10. Vulgar dysphemism

Politicians may use vulgar dysphemisms to directly insult their opponents or their actions. Vulgar dysphemisms are also used to express frustration or anger about a particular situation or decision. In some cases, politicians use vulgar dysphemisms to assert their authority or dominance in a debate.

Data 38. It’s to show you what a bullshit artist this guy is. Yes, he’s a bullshit artist. He has been his entire life.

Biden used the term “a bullshit artist” twice to describe Trump. The term “bullshit” is a vulgar dysphemism and is considered to be rude or aggressive in many contexts. Its use in political discourse may be seen as violent, conflicting and rude. By saying “bullshit” Biden uses a direct approach that may seem disrespectful to some listeners.

The term “a bullshit artist” is a vulgar dysphemism because it refers to strong approval and criticism of Trump. This means that Trump is deceptive and he is pursuing the art of deception or manipulation. Biden suggests that Trump was making misleading or false claims and paints him as an unreliable or untrusted person.

3.3. Discussion

Based on findings about euphemisms and dysphemisms in American political discourse above, it can be seen that there are 10 types of euphemisms and 10 types of dysphemism that were found by researcher. The researcher uses theory of Allan and Burridge (1991). During the research, researchers found that euphemisms and dysphemisms are often used spontaneously or naturally during the conversations. In this study, researchers found 38 data in different types.

Euphemisms serve various functions in communication, from maintaining politeness and respect to simplifying complex concepts and eliciting emotional responses. According to the research findings, there are 7 main functions of euphemisms used by Hillary Clinton and Joe Biden. First of all, euphemisms are used to convey information in a more polite or sensitive manner, which allows speakers to discuss difficult topics without causing offense or discomfort. Secondly, euphemisms are used to criticize someone or their actions indirectly, often in a more diplomatic or subtle way. The next function of euphemisms analyzed in this study is to express concern or sympathy for individuals or groups, helping to convey empathy and support. Forth, euphemisms are employed to avoid directly offending or insulting someone. Fifth, Euphemisms serve as a tool for diplomacy, allowing speakers to address sensitive or controversial issues in a more tactful and respectful manner. Another function is to exaggerate or emphasize certain points, often for rhetorical effect or to make a message more impactful. Last function of euphemisms is to show respect for individuals, institutions, or sensitive topics, demonstrating a commitment to maintaining professionalism and decorum in communication.

On the other hand, there are also 10 types of dysphemisms found by the researcher in this study. The functions of them are: Showing Disagreement, Disapproval or Disrespect; Providing Information; Degrading or Humiliating Someone; Criticizing Someone; Drawing Attention; Persuading or Manipulating the Listener; Accusing or Blaming the Addressee.

Table 1.

Types of euphemisms	Quantity	Percentage
Figurative expression	2	8,3%
Metaphor	3	12,5%
Flippancy	1	4,1%
Remodeling	2	8,3%
Circumlocution	7	29,1%
Replacement	2	8,3%
General-for-specific	1	4,1%
Hyperbole	2	8,3%
Understatement	3	12,5%
Slang	1	4,1%

Functions of euphemism	Quantity	Percentage
1. Convey information	6	25%
2. To criticize someone	5	20,8%
3. To show concern or sympathy	4	16,6%
4. Not to offend or insult someone	3	12,5%
5. As a tool for diplomacy	2	8,3%
6. To exaggerate	2	8,3%
7. To show respect	2	8,3%

Table 2.

Types of dysphemisms	Quantity	Percentage
Synecdoche	1	7,1 %
Metaphor	2	14,2%
Name dysphemism	2	14,2%
Euphemistic dysphemism	1	7,1%
-ist dysphemism	1	7,1%
Cross-cultural dysphemism	1	7,1%
Hyperbole	2	14,2%
Idiom	2	14,2%
Vulgar dysphemism	1	7,1%

Functions of dysphemisms	Quantity	Percentage
To show disagreement, disapproval or disrespect	4	28,5%
To provide information	3	21,4%
To degrade or humiliate someone	2	14,2%
To criticize someone	2	14,2%
To draw attention	1	7,1%
To persuade or manipulate the listener	1	7,1%
To accuse or blame the addressee	1	7,1%

CONCLUSION

After conducting this research, it can be concluded that Hillary Clinton is a skilled orator, and a prolific speech-giver, she can make effective use of the most striking rhetorical devices found in political speech genres. Clinton has strong language skills that give her the opportunity to express her thoughts clearly and convincingly. Clinton often uses various rhetorical tools in her speeches to increase the effectiveness of her speech. These tools include strategic euphemisms, dysphemisms, metaphors, circumlocution, and others.

Generally speaking, Clinton's ability to use rhetorical tools effectively in speeches contributes to her success as a communicator. It shows language skills and persuasiveness, whether it's during a campaign speech, addressing political issues, or defending social cases, helping it connect with viewers and advance its goals.

On the other hand, president Joe Biden was proven to use expressions of euphemism and dysphemism in his speech. The researchers concluded that the elements of euphemism and dysphemism are closely related to politics with the discovery of 10 types of euphemism and 10 types of dysphemism and the functions behind the use of these expressions.

Analysing Joe Biden's use of language, and in particular his dysphemism, reveals a different approach to President Biden. Biden tends to use a more moderate and diplomatic tone in his speeches, often avoiding the use of explicitly negative or provocative language. Instead, it focuses on developing strategic proposals, emphasizing unity and empathy, and more thoughtful criticism of its rivals.

While Biden sometimes uses humiliating language to criticize his opponents, this is not a fundamental feature of his communication strategy. Biden usually tends to prefer more positive and constructive messages.

The analysis of dysphemism in Joe Biden's speech reveals how he skillfully employed negative language to delegitimize his opponents and, thus, win the election. It is obvious that Joe Biden is aware of the role language can play in persuading people. He employs dysphemism to emotionally move the voters to take a course of action.

After analyzing the data, the findings of this research were presented as follows:

1. There are 6 types of euphemism used in political speech of Hillary Clinton from 16 types of euphemism in Allan and Burrige theory. They were figurative expression with 1 item (10%), metaphor with 1 item (10%), circumlocution with four items (40%), general-for-specific with one item (10%), hyperbole with 1 item (10%) and understatement with 2 items (20%). Flippancy, remodeling, replacement, slang, clipping, acronym and abbreviation were the types of euphemism that not found in Hillary Clinton's speech about economy.

2. There are 9 types of euphemism used in political speech of Joe Biden from 16 types of euphemism in Allan and Burrige theory. They were figurative expression with 1 item (7,1%), metaphor with two items (14,2%), flippancy with two items (14,2%), circumlocution with three items (21,3%), general-for-specific with one item (7,1%), hyperbole with 1 item (7,1%), understatement with 1 item (7,1%) and slang with 1 item (8,8%). Remodeling, acronym, general-for-specific, clipping, abbreviation and acronym were the types of euphemism that not found in Joe Biden's speech.

3. The research findings show that the most dominant type of euphemism used in political speech of Hillary Clinton and Joe Biden was circumlocution (29,1%). Thus the reason this type mostly used based on the theory of Gerard Steen (2009) proved that figurative mostly use in political speech to make words in speech more organized as a nice thing to be spoken in public in order to convincing people.

Each type has been conducted and counted out with percentages according to the findings itself not to the contexts of data.

It turns out that all the euphemistic metaphors were used to show respect or sympathy for individuals or groups facing challenging situations. Metaphors, on the other hand, were used to convey information in a more polite or sensitive manner, allowing speakers to discuss difficult topics without causing offense or discomfort. Flippancy was used to convey the messages indirectly, by adding a bit of with humor or lightness. Additionally, remodelings served to give a better impression by choosing a more pleasant word. Functions of understatements were to soften the impact of the claims when discussing sensitive or emotional issues. Besides, circumlocutions which have been found are used to avoid directly addressing a topic or question. Moreover, synecdoches were used to provoke an emotional response or gain support in political

communication. The rest of the types that were conducted in this research were used to neutralize or soften topics that are often considered offensive, embarrassing, or taboo.

When it comes to the functions of dysphemisms, synecdoche was used to simplify a complex entity into a single recognizable symbol. Dysphemistic epithets were used to show disagreement, disapproval or disrespect. Name dysphemisms have the function of degrading or humiliating someone. Euphemistic dysphemism, on the other hand, was used to criticize someone. The other types of dysphemisms found in the research were used either to persuade or manipulate the listener or to draw attention.

The types of euphemism not found in analyzed political discourses are jargon, part-for-whole, clipping, acronym, abbreviations and omission.

Meanwhile, all the types of dysphemism based on the theory of Allan & Burridge were found.

REFERENCES

1. Abrams, M. H., & Harpham (2005). A glossary of literary terms. California, CA: Thomson Higher Education.
2. Allan, K. (2001). Natural Language Semantics. Oxford-Malden: Blackwell.
3. Allan, K., & Burridge, K. (1991). Euphemism and Dysphemism: Language Used as Shield and Weapon. New York: Oxford University Press
4. Allan, K., & Burridge, K. (2006). *Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language*. New York: Oxford University Press
5. Allan, Keith. (2012). "X-phemism and creativity." *Lexis Journal in English Lexicology* 5-42.
6. Anashia Nancy. (2018) A cognitive analysis of metaphorical euphemisms of death iKenyan newspaper obituaries[J]. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*. 3(2): 213-220.
7. Azkiyah, Laili. (2008). A Study of Euphemism Found in Political Articles in the National Section of the Jakarta Post. Thesis. English Letters and Language Department. Humanities and Culture Faculty. The State Islamic University of Malang.
8. Baldick, C. (2004). *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
9. Boers, Frank. (2008). Language Awareness: Understanding Idioms. *MED Magazines*, 49, pp. 1- 4
10. Brown, P., & Levinson, S., C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Burchfield, Robert. (1985). "An Outline History of Euphemisms in English." In: D.J. Enright (Ed.), *Fair of Speech: The Uses of Euphemism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
12. Burridge, Kate. (2006). Taboo, euphemism, and political correctness. *Encyclopedia of Languages & Linguistics*, 455 - 462.

13. Burrige, Kate. (2012). "Euphemism and Language Change: The Sixth and Seventh Ages." *Lexis Journal in English Lexicology*
14. Chilton, P. (2015). *Metaphor, Euphemism and the Militarization of Language*. Tampere: Tampere Peace Research Institute, University of Tampere.
15. Claridge, C. (2011). *Hyperbole in English. A corpus-based study of exaggeration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
16. Collins Cobuild Advanced Learner's English Dictionary. (2003). The University of Birmingham, HarperCollins Publishers.
17. Cruse, D.A. (2000). *Meaning Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
18. Cuddon. J.A.(2013). *A dictionary of literary expressions and literary theory*. Welly Blackwell. A John Willey & Sons, Ltd, Publication.
19. Elena. V. H & Farida. F. S. (2014). Functional features of metaphoric and metonymic euphemisms in media discourse[J]. *European Journal of Science and Theology*. 10(6): 105-113.
20. Fernandez, Elieceer Crespo. (2005). "Euphemistic Strategies in Politeness and Face Concerns." *Pragmalinguistica* (13): 77-86.
21. Fishman, J. A. (1970). The Relationship between Micro and Macro-Sociolinguistics in the Study of Who Speaks What Language to Whom and When in *Pride and Holmes*. (Eds.). 1979. *Sociolinguistics*.15-32.
22. Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. London: Routledge.
23. Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G., & Trew, T. (1979). *Language and control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
24. Fraser, N. (2009). Social justice in the age of identity politics. In: *Geographic Thought: A Praxis Perspective*. Routledge.

25. Garner, B. A. (2000). *The Oxford dictionary of American usage and style*. New York: Oxford University Press.
26. Geoffrey Leech. (1974). *Semantic*. London: Pinguin books. Ltd.
27. Giyoto G., Novianni A., Elen I., & Luthfie A.P. (2020). How does “to what gender and status one talks” govern the speaker’s strategy in keeping on their conversation? *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*.
28. Harris, Robert. (2000). “Semantic2”. Retrieved on February 22, 2012. from [http://www.virtualsalt.com/think/semantic2,htm](http://www.virtualsalt.com/think/semantic2.htm).
29. Holder, Bob. (2008). *Dictionary of euphemisms*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
30. Hornby, Albert, Sydney. (2005). *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of Current English*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. *Journal of NELTA Surkhet* Vol. 4 December
31. Johnstone, B. (2008). *Discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). The US, the UK, Australia: Blackwell.
32. Kadoorly, O. A. (2021). A Pragmatic Study of Euphemism and Dysphemism in Donald Trump’s Political Speech. *PalArch’s Journal of Archaeology of Egypt / Egyptology*, 2741-2753.
33. Kafi, Lutvia Nurul and Degaf, Agwin (2021) Euphemism and dysphemism strategies in Donald Trump's speech at SOTU 2020.
34. Kaosa, Rommayasin. (2009) *English Euphemism as used by Native Speakers of English and of Thai*. Thesis. Srinakharinwirot University.
35. Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
36. Liu, C. (2001). *A Dictionary of English Euphemisms*. Beijing, China: The Commercial Press.
37. *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. (1978). Harlow and Longman Group Limited. London:
38. Lutz, William. (1997). “The World of Doublespeak”. In: *Language Awareness*

39. Lyons, J., (1981). *Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge: University Press.
40. McArthur, T. (ed.). (1992). *The Oxford Companion to the English Language*. (p. 328)
41. Muchamad Ali Mustofa, (2010). The analysis of euphemism expression in joe biden's speech "Statement On Terror Attack In Afghanistan"
42. Nuzulianda Febrina Purba, (2017). Euphemism in David Cameron's Political ; Speech on The ISIS Attacks.
43. Olimat, Sameer Naser. (2020). Words as Powerful Weapons: Dysphemism in Trump's Covid-19 Speeches. 3L : The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, Vol 26(3): 17 – 29.
44. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (4th impression). (2006). Oxford: OUP.
45. Rawson, H. (1983). *A Dictionary of Euphemisms and other Doubletalk*. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.
46. Rawson, Hugh (1989). *Wicked words: a treasury of curses, insults, put-downs, and other formerly unprintable terms from Anglo-Saxon times to the present* (1st ed.). New York: Crown Publishers.
47. Sagarin, E. (1968). *The Anatomy of Dirty Words*. New York: Lyle Stuart.
48. Smith, P. (2003). Dysphemism. Retrieved from <http://www.wysiati.com/LON/d/dysphemism.shtml>.
49. Spears, R. A. (1981). *Slang and euphemism: a dictionary of oaths, curses, insults, ethnic slurs, sexual slang and metaphor, drug talk, college lingo, and related matters*. New York: Jonathan David Publisher.
50. Steen, Gerard (2011) "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. Now new and improved!" *Review of Cognitive Linguistics* 9 (1), 26–64.
51. The sociolinguistic of language. Oxford: Blackwell. Fernandez, E.C. 2008. Sex-Related Euphemism and Dysphemism: An Analysis in Terms of Conceptual Metaphor Theory. *Journal of the Spanish Association of AngloAmerican Studies*. 30.2 (December 2008): 95–110.

52. Van Dijk T., A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse and society*, 4 (2), 249-283.
53. Wodak. R. (2016). *The politics of fear: what right- wing populist discourse mean*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
54. Xiaonan Zhao & Jingping Dong, 2010. "Study on the Features of English Political Euphemism and its Social Functions," *English Language Teaching*, Canadian Center of Science and Education
55. Zeynalova S.S. & Allahverdiyeva A.M. (2017). *Introduction to Rhetoric*. Baku-Mutarjim.
56. Zhang, Xiangyun, and Lei, Xiaolan. (2011) *A Cognitive Analysis of Euphemism in Trump's Political Speeches*. *International Journal of Liberal Arts and Social Science*.

ABSTRACT

Politics cannot be separated from social life. The impression that the speaker makes during a speech is greatly influenced by the euphemism and dysphemism used in political discourse. The news media and a large number of people are trying to determine the truth of a political actor's claim. Political actors themselves certainly have ways in which their words can influence their audience without disclosing the underlying reality. This is where the use of euphemisms and dysphemisms in political discourse becomes crucial in creating an accurate or subtle impression of the speaker during the speech.

Euphemisms and dysphemisms are linguistic devices employed to shape public perception, convey specific messages, and influence political discourse. By examining these linguistic strategies in American presidents' speeches, this study aims to explore the use of euphemistic and dysphemistic expressions and show the types and functions of them in American political discourse, especially by analyzing the political speeches in the last decade.

Keywords: Euphemism, Dysphemism, Political discourse

XÜLASƏ

Siyasət ictimai həyatdan ayrılı bilməz. Natiqin siyasi diskursda istifadə etdiyi evfemizm və disfemizmlərin onun nitq zamanı yaratdığı təəssürata çox böyük təsiri var. Xəbər mediası və çoxlu sayda insan siyasi nüfuzlu şəxslərin iddialarının doğruluğunu müəyyən etməyə çalışır. Siyasi nüfuzlu şəxslərin öz sözlərinin əsas məğzini açıqlamadan auditoriyaya təsir edə biləcəyi xüausi üsullar var. Məhz bu yerdə evfemizm və disfemizmlərdən istifadə çıxış zamanı natiq haqqında dəqiq təəssürat yaratmaq üçün həlledici əhəmiyyət kəsb edir.

Evfemizmlər və disfemizmlər ictimaiyyətin düşüncəsini formalaşdırmaq, konkret mesajları çatdırmaq və siyasi diskursa təsir etmək üçün istifadə olunan linqvistik vasitələrdir. Bu tədqiqat işi Amerika prezidentlərinin çıxışlarında bu linqvistik strategiyaları tədqiq etməklə evfemik və disfemistik ifadələrin istifadəsini araşdırmaq və xüsusilə son onillikdəki siyasi çıxışları təhlil edərək onların Amerika siyasi diskursunda növləri və funksiyalarını göstərmək məqsədi daşıyır.

Açar sözlər: Evfemizm, disfemizm, siyasi diskurs

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I extend my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Azad Mammadov, whose unwavering support, expert guidance, and profound insights have been indispensable in shaping the trajectory of this research and fostering my personal and academic growth. His patience and encouragement have been a constant source of strength throughout this journey, and for that, I am profoundly grateful.

I am also deeply thankful to the Head of the Department, Dr. Milana Abbasova, for her exceptional understanding of our challenges and relentless efforts in facilitating our academic endeavors. Her guidance and support have been invaluable in navigating the complexities of this study.

To my family, whose unwavering love, encouragement, and sacrifices have been the cornerstone of my success, I owe the deepest appreciation. Their boundless support has sustained me through the highs and lows of this academic pursuit, and for that, I am forever grateful.

I would also like to express my sincere appreciation to the instructors in the MA program for their dedication and commitment to excellence. Their expertise and guidance have played a pivotal role in shaping my academic journey and refining the quality of this research.

Lastly, I extend my gratitude to all those who, in one way or another, have contributed to the completion of this thesis. Your assistance, encouragement, and support have been invaluable, and I am truly thankful for your contributions.