
USAGE OF EUPHEMISM IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Fayzieva Nilufar Nemat Kizi*

*PhD Student,
National University of Uzbekistan,
Tashkent, UZBEKISTAN
Mail Id: Lily_angel94@mail.ru

DOI: [10.5958/2249-7315.2022.00069.7](https://doi.org/10.5958/2249-7315.2022.00069.7)

ABSTRACT

Language is a unique quality that sets apart the human race from all other species. Language has allowed mankind to communicate and express ideas, which has had a major factor in our development over time. However, language does not merely consist of words and phrases. Nowadays the term discourse is one of the concepts of linguistics that is very widely developed and has been the subject of much discussion. Political discourse is also one of the concepts on the topic today. This article focuses on the analysis of euphemisms that are widely used in political discourse in English and Uzbek languages.

KEYWORDS: *Discourse, Political Discourse, Political Correctness, Euphemism.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of "discourse" is very meaningful term in linguistics. It comes from the Latin word "discursus", which literally means "runaway" and has a large number of values. Also, this term express conversation, explanation, argument and others in the history. In the new European languages, scientists began to call this word reasoning. An even more abstract word is discursiveness and the corresponding the adjective discursive in the language of philosophers and logicians means qualities not only logical orderliness, but also formal mediation, in contrast to informal immediacy, which is indicated by the counter-concept intuitiveness.

In the early stages of discourse analysis, there were two basic meanings the term in question. In one of them, used in the study of linguistic structures outside the scope of the proposal, it was practically identified with the concept text (Kress, 1985:27) [1]. That is why in this period the terms "linguistics of the text" and "Discourse analysis" were practically interchangeable. In another sense, this term identified with speaking practice, speech activity and communicative activities (Kubryakova, 2000:9) [2]. It is quite characteristic that already in the early stages of the formation of analysis discourse, this term was used more often than the term "text" in research content aspects, functioning and social significance of the language. Then, discourse begins to be understood as "a complex communicative phenomenon, not only including the act of creating a certain text, but also reflecting the dependence speech work from a significant number of extra linguistic factors -knowledge about the world, opinions, attitudes and specific goals of the speaker as the creator of the text "(Kubryakova,2000:13-14) [2]

Some modern definitions of discourse are absolutely dominated by its non-linguistic components. For example, according to J. Mey, "Discourse is what remains after all the linguistic embellishments have been stripped from the text. Discourse is formed and shaped by our thinking, our mind." (Mey, 1998: 27) [3]. According this definition we can say that, discourse is connected with our cognition. Besides this, discourse is a poly-semantic term in which a text has linguistic features (e.g., the consistency of the text, the written or oral, the dialogue between the speaker and

the listener).

Political linguistics is one of the fields of interest in various disciplines today. It was formed in the field of ethnography, cultural studies, sociology, linguistics and other social sciences. To successfully understand and describe the mechanism of political communication, political discourse is concerned with cognitive linguistics, rhetoric, stylistics, linguo-pragmatics, and text linguistics. An example of this let's look the definition of political discourse by Y.N Karaulov's description: "Political discourse is a linguistic term that contains extralinguistic information (image of the world) and sign information (symbol, image of the world presented by nomination)." (Karaulov, 1993:261) [4] More representative of various professions and various scientific disciplines are interested in political discourse such as journalists, political scientists, philosophers, sociologists, specialists in the field of the theory of communications, as well as linguists. One of the first journalists to pay attention to communication activity in its function of mediating political reality was, of course, A.F. Bentley, who considered the consideration of linguistic activity the most important condition to research politics and public opinion. He never lost sight of the key link between communication and politics, and between communication and social activities.

Political discourse is a special type of communication characterized by a high degree of influence, and therefore the definition of mechanisms of political communication is important in modern society. By analyzing the speeches of politicians, it is possible to identify the debate strategies and tactics they use to convince the audience. The study of political discourse serves, firstly, to learn about the future actions and intentions of politicians, and, secondly, to explore the most effective ways of influencing the audience.

Political discourse is primarily based on language: a form of social movement that is always defined by linguistic values and social norms, conventions (such as ideologies) and social practices, always limited by power structures and the historical processes under their influence. L. Wood and R. Kroger defined political discourse as follows: "Discourse is not only a method of transmitting information, but also a social science that is directly related to the nature of language and its fundamental problems."

Political discourse is presented in many forms of communication, such as contracts, speeches, elections, public speeches, newspapers, election campaigns, interviews, and political conferences. In their speeches, politicians try to use mainly oral and simple speech to make it easier for the recipients of information to understand. They also use proverbs and sayings in their speeches.

The main feature of political discourse is manipulation, which is the process of using the vocabulary of a language to achieve its goals and objectives. In order to achieve their goals, politicians need to make their speeches as beautiful and relevant as pearls and convey their goals and objectives to the public. We can see that this can be achieved through a variety of linguistic tools.

Political discourse must perform at least four functions:

- Provide accurate and clear political opinion;
- Attract the attention of the audience and encourage them to think seriously about the information they hear;
- Persuade and persuade them to accept the speaker's point of view;
- Encourage the audience to do what the speaker says.

One of the main goals of political discourse can be considered the conquest and retention of power. The specificity of political discourse is manifested in strategies and tactics representations of the concept. Selection of funds for achieving goals in specific conditions communication is seen

as a realization a certain strategy in discourse, since the same communication goal can be achieved in a variety of ways. Tactics are seen as a way to implement discourse strategies.

All of the political speeches can achieve these characteristic features correctly using some stylistic features. First, the political speech must be very clear and concise. The speaker should be able to talk directly to the audience about what he or she wants. Second, we need to pay special attention to the fact that the information used in political discourse is logically structured. Third, political discourse must become a powerful inspiration. Finally, political discourse needs to be more engaging and understandable. If their speech is characterized by the use of different stylistic means, they can achieve their political goals. In short, it can be said that for politics, political language is a goal-oriented tool in their fields. The methodological tools used in political discourse are different in each language. One of the most used stylistic device in political discourse is euphemism.

Euphemisms are diverse in structure and very significant linguistic phenomenon available in the lexical systems of languages. Euphemism - is not only a trope consisting of an implicit expression of a negative assessment, but also an element of the structure of language, which plays an important role in its historical development, as this phenomenon is a continuous process of replacing some names for the other ones, based on a continuous evaluation and re-evaluation of human forms of expression emanating from a desire for successful communication.

There are many works devoted to euphemisms directly or somehow touching upon this problem. The initiative to the study of euphemisms was suggested by such prominent scholars as G. Paul, J. Vandryes, S. Bruno, Kanye C., Sh. Bally, E. Benveniste, L. Bloomfield, S. Vidlak, I.R. Galperin, B.A. Larin. Further development of this issue can be found in the works of such linguists as V.I. Zhelvis, A.M. Katsev, B. Cooper, J. Niemann and K. Silver, lexicographers R.V. Holder and X. Rawson, researchers L.P. Krisin, E.I. Sheigal, G.G. Kuzhim, V.I. Zobotkina, V.P. Moskvin, and others.

A euphemism is a substitution of an agreeable or less offensive expression in place of one that may offend or suggest something unpleasant to the receiver, or to make it less troublesome for the speaker. The deployment of euphemisms is a central aspect within the public application of political correctness. It may also substitute a description of something or someone to avoid revealing secret, holy, or sacred names to the uninitiated, or to obscure the identity of the subject of a conversation from potential eavesdroppers. Some euphemisms are intended to amuse.

Traditionally, according to A.M.Katsev euphemisms are defined as “indirect substitutes for denominations that contribute to mitigation terrible, shameful or odious, brought to life by moral or religious motives”. (Katsev, 1988: 5) [5] The cognitive-discursive approach allows us to consider euphemisms as one of the ways secondary representation of knowledge in language, which allows us to represent euphemisms as mechanism for the formation of new meaning in as a result of the interaction of several concepts, as well as identify conceptual schemes and models that underlie euphemizations (Boldyrev 2009:50) [6]. Besides this, there are three main mechanisms for the formation of euphemisms, depending on the method and the degree of change in conceptual content:

- 1) Neutralization of the negative characteristics of the original concept;
- 2) A decrease in the severity of a negative sign;
- 3) A change in the evaluative characteristic from negative to positive (Boldyrev, 2010:7) [6].

The usage of political euphemism is inextricably linked with the concept of political correctness. English as one of the most dynamically developing languages of the world has undergone recent decades, significant changes, which in many ways determined by changes in the public sphere. It

is no coincidence that it was in the world of the English language that a powerful cultural, behavioral and linguistic trend emerged, which received the name "Political correctness".

According to the point of view of S.G. Terminusova, by the word "politically correctness" we usually understand, new ways of language expression instead of those that hurt feelings and the dignity of the individual, infringe on his human rights the usual linguistic tactlessness and / or straightforwardness in relation to race and gender, age, condition health, social status, appearance, etc. (Terminusova, 2000:11) [7]

Political correctness requires the removal from the language of all those linguistic units that hurt a person's feelings, or rather, find for them appropriate neutral or positive euphemisms. Generally, we can say that, political correctness refers to a language that protects people of all genders, races, sexual orientations, cultures, or social backgrounds from being insulted. One of the most common goals of political correction is to eradicate verbal discrimination and negative stereotypes. Demanding political correctness is often controversial and becomes a source of criticism and satire. Politicians argue that it cannot change key sentiments that lead to discrimination and social marginalization. Nowadays political correctness plays important role in political discourse. Because, through it, speakers and politicians can achieve their goals. [8]

It is believed that political euphemisms "Do not just sweeten unpleasant events, but deliberately change the correct perception of reality by the addressee, as a result what language ceases to reflect reality, it becomes distorted, deceitful and treacherous". It is impossible, however, not recognize the fact that compliance with the rules of political correctness gives and positive results, making our society more civilized. [9]

In the process of analyzing euphemisms in the field of pragmatics, we can see that they consist of the following factors in political discourse:

1) The process of origin is associated with taboo. As we all know, the phenomenon of euphemism is associated with taboo. Because taboo applies to things that are forbidden, scary, forbidden to say or do. Euphemisms are also speech activities used to evoke fear and anxiety in people. For example, many euphemisms for death and illness are taboo. [10]

"o'lik" o'rniga "marhuma", "marhum"; "ko'mish" o'rniga "dafn etmoq", "qabrga qo'ymoq", "tuproqqa topshirmoq", "qora yerga qo'ymoq", "joylashtirib qaytmoq", "dafn etmoq"; -Yoshim yigirma yettiga kirdi, hamon o'g'ilga zorman, bir emas, ikki o'g'ilni qabrga qo'ydim. (P.Qodirov "Avlodlar dovoni" 364)

"Pass away", "departed", "negative patient outcome" instead of "death";

"Put to sleep" instead of "being killed";

"Late-term abortion" instead of "murder of unborn babies";

"Capital punishment" instead of "death penalty";

• *"The charter reined in the forests and removed capital punishment or the loss of a limb for stealing the king's venison." (Times, Sunday Times, 2017)*

2) The function of politeness. The most important pragmatic function of euphemisms is to avoid discriminating against the listener without directly speaking about his or her speech, moral, physical, and other shortcomings during the speech process. It is important to replace words and phrases that have a strong effect on the listener in any situation. [11]

"yetimxona" o'rniga "bolalar uyi", "mehrisonlik uyi"; "go'riston" o'rniga "abadiy makon", "joyi roston", "indamaslar olami", "marhumlar diyori", "so'nggi manzil"; "qamoqxona"

o'rniga "jazoni o'tash koloniyasi", "ahloq tuzatish koloniyasi";

- "Mehribonlik uyi tarbiyalanuvchilariga bo'lgan e'tibor haqida gapiradigan bo'lsak, ... ("Oila va jamiyat", 1998, 21 mart).

"Restroom", "lavatory", "WC", instead of "toilet"; "substandard housing", "an economically depressed neighborhood", "culturally deprived environment" instead of "slum correctional facility";

- "He was never out of sight and rarely out of reach, following her everywhere but into the restroom" (E.Lowell, Remember summe)

3) The function of creating convenience for all participants in the process of speech activity. In order to achieve a goal in a speech, the speaker must convey information in a way that is not only convenient for him, but also pleasing to others. Only then will he be able to achieve his goal. [12]

"mansab" o'rniga "yog'lik joy", "amaldorlik", "katta oxir", "ko'tarilmoq", "oppoq mashina", "martaba"; "pora olmoq" o'rniga "kaft qichishmoq", "mansabini su'istemol qilmoq", "olmoq", "sabil", "o'n tuyoqli o'rgimchak"; "ishdan haydalmoq" yoki "ishsiz" o'rniga "amalidan ketmoq", "boshqa ish topmoq", "vazifa bilan hayrlashmoq", "to'rt tomon qibla";

- "U mansabini su'istemol qilgan..."("Tadbirkor", 1998, 21 may)

"lay off" instead of "being fired"; "pursing other opportunities" instead of "quitting" or "being fired"; "embraking on a journey of self-discovery" instead of "jobless".

- "But do you think Blizzard is going to lay off of you because you've left the force?" (C.Jon, Murder song)

4) The function of political governance. In some case, in socio-political processes, some words or phrases are euphemized in order to prevent panic among the population. For example: conflict (in the sense of war), groups that disrupt the peace (in the sense of terrorists).

"qullik", "qaramlik illatlari" o'rniga "mustamlakachilik asoratlari" –
-Ayni vaqtda mazkur ong o'zbek zaminida tarixning turli davrlarida ketma-ketsodir bo'lgan urushlar natijasida yuzaga kelgan *mustamlakachilik asoratlaridanozod* bo'lishga erishdi. (Ibrohimov N. va b. *O'zbekiston: davlat va uningyo'lboshchisi. T: O'zbekiston, 1999. –B.7.)* lame duck" instead of "useless politician"

- But critics described the move as undemocratic and warned it could lead to a lame-duckgovernment, hanging on in office after losing a no-confidence vote.

5) The function of hiding negative messages during the speech process. This is to cover up a situation that could adversely affect the recipient by conveying information to the listener by replacing it with another word without conveying an unpleasant message to him. [13] For example

"ishga yaroqsiz, ojiz" o'rniga "nogiron"; "kambag'al, bechora" o'rniga "muhtoj oila";

- "Qashshoqlikni tugatish, muammolarini hal etishda aholoning vujudga kelgan vaziyatlar tufayli kambag'allik darajasiga tushib qolishi mumkin bo'lgan "nochor guruhlari": nogironlar, yolg'iz onalar, yetim bolalar, keksalarga alohida e'tibor berish talab qilinadi. (Karimov I. Xavfsizlik va barqaror taraqqiyot yo'lida. T., 1998.-B.187.)"

"Low-income", "underprivileged", "under-served", "economically disadvantaged" instead of "poor";

“Temporary negative cash flow” instead of “broke”;

- “After housing costs, almost a quarter of town dwellers had **a low income**, compared with 17 per cent in the countryside, with the gap widening” (Times, Sunday Times, 2014)

As mentioned above, euphemisms serve to enrich the pictorial possibilities of language as a more lenient expression of an event. Summarizing the above, it should be noted that the trend towards the use of euphemisms in political discourse at present time is quite stable, which is due to active cooperation between states in the world, a wide range of problems in various fields of activity, different ethnic the composition of these states and the different welfare of citizens. [14]

2. CONCLUSION

Note that in political discourse various discursive strategies are implemented, and productive linguistic the mechanisms of euphemization are generalization and neutralization of meaning, followed by a change in the evaluative sign from negative to positive. The study revealed that discursive strategies are implemented in political discourse of left and right parties by various means, which is associated with the choice of the focus of the event and the applied tactics [15].

Discourse is verbally mediated activity in a special sphere in which concepts are formed and objectified, and the specifics of political discourse manifests itself in the strategies and tactics of representing a military event. Euphemism is a special way of representing a military event in political discourse. In different types of political discourse (right and left parties) presents a different number of euphemisms formed with the help of certain (dominant) mechanisms. Comparative analysis of euphemisms in different types of discourse indicates different strategies for representing a military event in the political discourse. The discourse of left-wing parties presents a strategy of justifying actions governments, and in the discourse of right-wing parties - criticism.

REFERENCES:

1. Kress G. Ideological structures in discourse. Handbook of discourse analysis. Vol. 4. 1985. pp. 27-42.
2. Kubryakova ES. On the concepts of discourse and discursive analysis in modern linguistics. Series "Theory and History of Linguistics" RAS. INION. Moscow; 2000. pp. 5-14.
3. Mey J. The Pragmatics of transition. Political discourse in transition in Europe, 1989-1991. Amsterdam; Philadelphia. 1998. pp.25-34.
4. Караулов ЮН. Русский язык и языковая личность. Moscow: Наука, 1993. 261р.
5. Кацев АМ. Языковое табу и эвфемия. Л : Просвещение;1988. 112р.
6. Болдырев НН, Алексикова ЮВ. Когнитивный аспект эвфемизации. Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. 2010;(2):5-11.
7. Тер-Минасова СГ. Язык и межкультурная коммуникация. Moscow; 2000.
8. Dijk TA. Discourse, Opinion and Ideologies. Discourse and Ideologies. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters LTD, 1996. pp. 7-37.
9. Dallmayr FR. Language and politics: Why does language matter in political philosophy? Notre Dame; London: Univ. of Notre Dame press; 1984. XII, 243 p.
10. Holder RW. A dictionary of euphemisms. London: Oxford University Press; 1995. p.470.
11. Schiffrin D. Approaches to discourse. Cambridge, MA & Oxford: Blackwell; 1994. p.470.

12. Seidel G. Political discourse analysis. Handbook of discourse analysis. 1985. Vol. 4. pp. 43-60.
13. Richard SA. Slang and euphemism: a dictionary of oaths, curses, insults, sexual slang, metaphor, etc. New York: New American Library; 1982. p.11.
14. Wodak R. Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis. Handbook of Pragmatics. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publ. Co.; 1994. pp. 30-42.
15. Kary CE. American-Spanish euphemisms. Berkely, Los Angeles: University of California; 1960. p.5.