The use of euphemisms in modern political discourse

Summary. The article presents the results of research aimed at defining the concept of "euphemism" and its role in modern political discourse. The study of euphemism is an urgent linguistic issue today, however, particular attention is devoted to the study of the phenomenon of euphemization in political discourse. Political euphemisms strongly influence public opinion by highlighting events and actions in a specific light. Official political speeches, as a means of communication between politicians and people, are especially important now during the period of Russian aggression against Ukraine. That is why the study was based on the speeches of three world leaders: U.S. President Joe Biden, Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, and Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelensky. It is revealed that in the context of the Russo-Ukrainian war, political leaders used euphemisms to downplay or mitigate the seriousness of certain actions or events. The peculiarities of euphemism functioning in contemporary political discourse remain relatively unexplored and require further study and detailed analysis.
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The use of euphemisms in modern political discourse

Statement of the problem. Today, the art of euphemization exerts great influence on the English language and speech, serving as an active force in shaping our communication. The active use of euphemisms is driven by their mitigating and neutralizing properties of a particular aspect of human life that is considered inappropriate or indecent for open discussion in society. Social life is inextricably intertwined with political activity since it reflects the phenomena of social life that require a veiled, hidden meaning in order to prevent conflicts, avoid rude and impolite statements, etc. Particularly in politics, language becomes a powerful tool for influencing public opinion, and euphemisms serve as tools for presenting information in a manner that is acceptable to society. By allowing individuals to communicate without causing offense or escalating conflicts, euphemisms contribute to a certain level of rhetorical delicacy. The war in Ukraine has become a part of the political discourse, and the use of euphemisms has become an important means of managing the perception of this conflict both domestically and internationally.

Analysis of recent research and publications. A thorough examination of scientific sources shows that the problem of reproducing the euphemistic potential of the lexicon has been and continues to be the subject of research by a considerable number of researchers. A thorough examination of scientific sources shows that the problem of reproducing the euphemistic potential of the lexicon has been and continues to be the subject of research by a considerable number of researchers.
able cohort of scholars. The study of euphemisms, their characteristics and principles of their formation and functioning was carried out by such foreign scholars as K. Allan, K. Burrige, D. Crystal, R. Holder, T. van Dijk and such Ukrainian scholars as V. Velykoroda, O. Selivanova, I. Milieva, Z. Dubynets, O. Pokhlyuk. Their works serve as a significant theoretical foundation for our research, as the proposed conceptual approaches allow us to comprehensively cover the issue. However, despite the elaboration of the problem of euphemism in the lexical aspect, it is essential to acknowledge the insufficient examination of the phenomenon of political euphemisms within a discursive framework.

The purpose of the article. The main purpose of the work is to conceptualize the notion of euphemism in modern political discourse and to identify the peculiarities of its use by the leaders of the United States, Canada and Ukraine amidst the Russo-Ukrainian war.

Presentation of the main research material. Etymologically, the word euphemism is derived from the Greek word eu-úphēmos which signifies "uttering sounds of good omen," "fair-sounding," or "auspicious." Breaking down this term, the prefix eu- conveys the sense of "good, well" and the stem phēmos means "speech." Thus, the words are combined together to signify the meaning of "speaking well" [15, p. 387].

Euphemisms emerged in England during the 16th century in relation to the growth of Puritanism and the aim to cleanse language of blasphemous terms. They gained popularity in the 18th century, particularly among the English nobility, who deemed it inappropriate to directly refer to certain subjects by their names.

Initially, euphemism was primarily employed as a gentler alternative to taboo language. However, over time, its usage expanded to encompass any crude, offensive, severe, embarrassing, direct, or otherwise impolite term. In terms of its historical roots, euphemism can be traced back to the earliest stages of language development, serving as a manifestation of the mythological beliefs and thought processes prevalent among individuals during that era.

The eloquent term "euphemism" was initially introduced to the literary world in the early 1660s by the esteemed British writer Thomas Blount, gracing its pages within his renowned work "Glossographia" (1656). In this opus, he astutely characterized euphemism as "a good or favorable interpretation of a bad word" [13].

Austrian linguists K. Allan and K. Burrige provide a definition of euphemism that is closely tied to one’s reputation. According to them "[a] euphemism is used as an alternative to a dispreferred expression, in order to avoid possible loss of face: either one’s own face or, through giving offence, that of the audience, or some third party." They view the use of euphemisms as a way to be polite in speech [11].

David Crystal describes it as "the use of a vague or indirect expression in place of one which is thought to be unpleasant, embarrassing, or offensive" [12, p. 128].

According to the esteemed Ukrainian scholar O. Selivanova, euphemism can be characterized as a deliberate substitution of words or phrases, employed with the intention of delicately veiling certain concepts that might otherwise be deemed undesirable or overly harsh. This linguistic phenomenon serves to soften the impact of such expressions or cloak them in a more discreet manner, often in response to societal, political, historical, cultural, religious, ethical, and aesthetic sensitivities [7, p. 135].

In Merriam-Webster’s Advanced English Dictionary, it is also defined as “the substitution of an agreeable or inoffensive expression for one that may offend or suggest something unpleasant” [16].

Summarizing the opinions of various scholars, it can be concluded that a euphemism serves as a linguistic device utilized to indirectly and discreetly refer to specific objects, phenomena, actions, or concepts in a manner that is softened and polite. By employing euphemisms, individuals aim to replace socially or psychologically unacceptable terms with alternatives that possess a more neutral connotation. Consequently, euphemisms are regarded as a suitable and aesthetically pleasing method of conveying information effectively [2, p. 212–215].

A word becomes a euphemism only in a certain context of discourse. By itself, the word is a term or nomen that indicates a linguistic concept.

In modern linguistics, the well-known term "discourse" borrowed from Latin (discursus – running about) has a large paradigm of meanings. This term opens up a wide range of interpretations. One of the most famous approaches to understanding this concept is presented by the Dutch linguist Teun van Dijk, who says that discourse is a complex combination of speech practice and extra-linguistic factors (knowledge about the world, judgments, opinions, etc.) that give us an idea of the participants in communication, their goals, as well as the conditions for creating and perceiving a message [23].

As stated by F. Batsevych, discourse is a type of communicative activity that has various forms of manifestation, such as oral, written, and paralingual. It occurs within a specific communication channel and is regulated by the strategies and tactics of communication participants. Ultimately, it leads to the creation of different speech genres [1, p. 112].

The complexity and versatility of the concept of "discourse" implies its study and analysis in various fields, including the political sphere. Political discourse is a set of meanings, cognitive structures, and value system that form the basis of the political culture of a society. It encompasses all forms of human communicative activity, including its reflection on the political world and its own role in it, as well as cultural artifacts revealed through functional political symbolism [8, p. 104–105].

The specificity of political discourse lies in its ability to shape the political priorities of society, sets the parameters for the interpretation of political events, orients members of society in the world of politics, and stimulates political activity. This can occur directly through persuasion and calls to action or covertly through creation of a certain emotional state, mood, and background. Additionally, political discourse brings together members of a society around a particular political group while alienating other social groups.

According to V. Velykoroda, euphemization in political discourse serves as a separate type of expressively colored vocabulary and has a more intense semantic structure compared to neutral vocabulary [2].
From a linguistic perspective, political euphemisms serve as linguistic manifestations of otherness that reflect the social views and intentions of speakers, as well as their verbal strategies. Political speech and euphemistic phenomenon do indeed have common features. These include the social determinism of their formation in the language, the binary opposition of parallel designations, and the desire to change the semantics of words by silencing or distorting conceptual components. Some linguists believe that the term "political euphemisms" covers the names of concepts that are created with the intention of distorting facts, especially those related to a socio-political nature.

Analyzing the peculiarities of political discourse from the point of view of linguistic pragmatics, it is important to distinguish political speech as a distinct genre in the system of intercultural communication.

Politics has always been an arena where the power of words is crucial, an idea that is especially relevant in the era of information upheavals and political crises. In this context, euphemisms emerge as a linguistic tool that allows expressing sharp, unpleasant information realities in a gentle and non-confrontational manner. Euphemisms in political speeches assume even greater relevance as they shape societal perception, influence the formation of public opinion, and dictate the course of events.

In the 21st century, Ukrainian society is facing a difficult stage of its development with critical tasks to protect democratic freedoms and liberalization. In particular, the events in Ukraine related to the war in the east and south of the country and the annexation of Crimea reveal the depth and importance of the use of euphemisms. The crisis state of political discourse conducted in English and Ukrainian amidst the Russo-Ukrainian war requires special analysis, particularly in terms of ambiguous designations. Official statements and diplomatic speeches adopt softer, less confrontational expressions. These linguistic adjustments create the illusion of softening realities and reflecting events in a less dramatic light.

Social networks, news websites, official sources of states and international organizations serve as platforms for the dissemination of such language constructs. The translation of such terms also becomes an important task for journalists and linguists, as it can affect the perception of events in the international context. In addition, the existence of a real information war is evident, where euphemisms are used as a tool to influence global public opinion. Thus, the study of euphemisms in political speeches becomes necessary to understand crucial aspects of the speech of conscious leaders and its impact on society and international relations.

Official political speeches hold particular significance as a means of communication between politicians and the public, especially in the context of Russian aggression against Ukraine. These speeches aim to exert political influence not only on the aggressor and its leaders but also to support the values and freedoms of Ukraine and its people.

That is why the speeches of the world leaders of three countries – US President Joe Biden, Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, and Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy – served as the material for the study.

President Joseph Biden, leading the United States of America, speaks not only as the head of the country but also as a key participant in international events and a significant voice in world politics. His speeches exhibit numerous features and defining aspects, especially in the context of the war in Ukraine.

Among the peculiarities of Joseph Biden’s speeches, it is worth noting the use of euphemism as a driver of politically correct intercultural communication. Meanwhile, President Biden’s speeches express unwavering support for Ukraine in the context of the Russo-Ukrainian war and emphasize the importance of Ukraine’s sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Therefore, for a better understanding of the importance and impact of Joseph Biden’s speeches on the contemporary political arena and, in particular, on the situation in Ukraine, a detailed analysis of key aspects of his speeches is necessary, paying special attention to the use of euphemisms and their impact on public perception and reaction in Ukraine and abroad.

That’s what this is about: helping Ukraine defend and protect Ukrainian land. It is not an offensive threat to Russia. We are – there is no offensive threat to Russia [18].

Суть полягає в наступному: надавати допомогу Україні у питанні її оборони та збереження її території. Це не підтримується ними наступальну загрозу для Росії. Не існує жодної наступальної загрози для Росії.

Within the aforementioned text, the use of the euphemism an offensive threat indicates the justification of events and the reduction of tension in communication regarding relations between Ukraine and Russia. Here, an offensive threat functions as a substitution for a harsher expression such as military threat or aggression. Instead of using terms that could reinforce the threat and increase the level of anxiety, this expression uses a less conflict-prone and softened version to emphasize that assistance to Ukraine in defending its territory is not considered an attack on Russia.

It is worth noting that Joseph Biden avoids using the direct term war, choosing expressions that sound less categorical and more consistent with political correctness. In addition, the use of a euphemism for an undesirable phenomenon and its translation is particularly interesting:

And we’ve been in close and frequent communication throughout this conflict from the very beginning, but particularly – it’s particularly meaningful to talk with one another in person – look each other in the eye, because leadership through this terrible crisis has inspired the Ukrainian people – as you have done, Mr. President – and the American people and the entire world [17].

Ми підтримували тісний та постійний зв’язок протягом цього конфлікту з самого початку, але особливо – особливо важливо говорити один з одним особисто – дивитись один одного в очі, тому що ваше лідерство під час цієї жахливої кризи надихнуло український народ – це зробили Ви, пане Президенте, і американський народ, і весь світ.

This statement uses two euphemisms to soften and more diplomatically describe the Rus-
so-Ukrainian war. The first euphemism this conflict is used instead of the more precise word war to reduce the harshness and acuteness of the description of events. The second euphemism, this terrible crisis is also used as a substitute for the more severe term war to create a less offensive tone and soften the impression. This choice of words may be due to political or diplomatic considerations where the use of these euphemisms is intended to mitigate the severity and sharpness of the description, create a less offensive tone in the statement and not to provoke an outright reaction.

Condemning the unlawful and unacceptable actions of the Russian authorities, Joseph Biden tends to use euphemisms to establish contact with the audience:

The stakes of this conflict are clear to all — and the world has sent a clear message in response: Russia cannot erase a sovereign state from the map. Russia cannot seize another country’s territory as its own [22].

Всім зрозуміло, що на кону в цьому конфлікті – і світ наділає чіткий сигнал у відповідь: Росія не може стерти з мапи суверенну державу. Росія не може змінювати кордони силово. Росія не може захоплювати територію іншої країни як своєю власну.

This statement uses several expressions that emphasize the illegality and inadmissibility of Russia’s aggressive actions against Ukraine. Similarly, we consider the use of a euphemistic substitution of conflict for the concept of war for the sake of achieving a politically correct tone of speech, which was used earlier. Thus, in this text, instead of the more severe and direct expression that would indicate a possible occupation or annexation, the less burdensome expression erase from the map is used. In addition, the expression change borders can also be considered as a euphemism, as it is used to soften or simplify the expression of illegally changing the borders of another state through aggression or military force. The expression seize territory may also be used to soften or simplify the expression of aggressive occupation of the territory of another state and may be used to avoid the harsher expression that would indicate illegal occupation. Such euphemisms can be used to mitigate the severity of language or rhetoric but at the same time emphasize the inadmissibility of such actions.

Justin Trudeau’s speeches are characterized by a high degree of linguistic mastery and diplomacy, which determines their importance in the global political arena. As the Prime Minister of Canada, Trudeau actively expresses his position on global conflicts, including the war in Ukraine. The politician advocates for the preservation of world peace and support for Ukraine in its struggle for territorial integrity.

A distinctive feature of Justin Trudeau’s speeches is his ability to harmoniously combine less conflicting expressions with expressive images. He strives to create an atmosphere of cooperation and understanding in political communication, avoiding direct or aggressive language that could cause conflict. The use of euphemisms in the speeches of Justin Trudeau is due to the priority desire for conflict-free communication and bringing the level of speech to a more friendly tone while adhering to the basics of diplomacy.

Justin Trudeau, like Joseph Biden, often uses euphemisms in his speeches, especially in the context of geopolitical conflicts. Instead of using harsh words like war, Trudeau may choose less severe expressions like conflict to soften and simplify the language of his speeches. This may be part of his communication strategy to reassure his audience and reflect pro-social values such as peace and diplomacy:

Since 2014, Russia has violated Ukraine’s sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence. Despite calls from the international community to cease its violations of international law, Russia continues to illegally occupy Crimea, destabilize Ukraine through disinformation campaigns and malicious hybrid operations, and support the conflict in eastern Ukraine [21].

З 2014 року Росія порушує суверенітет, територіальну цілісність і незалежність України. Незважаючи на заклики міжнародної спільноти припинити порушення міжнародного права, Росія продовжує незаконно окупаувати Крим, дестабілізувати Україну шляхом впровадження дезінформаційних кампаній та зловмисних гібридних операцій, а також підтримувати конфлікт на сході України.

In this context, the word conflict is used to soften and simplify the real state of affairs. There is a more objective and cruel term – war, which more accurately reflects the real nature of the events in eastern Ukraine. The use of the word conflict can cause a simplistic view of the situation, concealing the aggressive nature of Russian activities and events in Ukraine.

Justin Trudeau wants to condemn the actions of Russia and its President Vladimir Putin in the context of invading another country. At the same time, he uses euphemisms to avoid aggressive vocabulary and maintain a balance between direct condemnation and a diplomatic approach:

We must ensure that the decision to invade a sovereign, independent country is understood to be a strategic failure that carries with it ruinous costs for Putin and Russia [19].

Ми повинні забезпечити, щоб рішення про вторгнення в незалежну суверенну країну розглядалося як стратегічна невдача, яка призводить до руйнівних витрат президенту Путіна та Росії.

This sentence uses euphemisms to mitigate and simplify the negative aspects of invading another country and its consequences. The phrase a strategic failure is a kind of euphemism that can be perceived as a less burdensome and softened version of the word defeat. It is used to condemn Russia’s invasion while avoiding harsh language. Instead of directly asserting the possible loss of power in Russia and its complete defeat, it refers to ruinous costs, which helps to portray events in a less severe light and avoid excessive aggression in political discourse.

In some cases, Justin Trudeau uses words and expressions that may seem to narrow or mitigate the true horror and real situation in Ukraine:

Vladimir Putin’s blatant disregard for human life is completely unacceptable [20].
Conclusions and prospects for further research. The analysis of the definitions of the concept of "euphemism" has shown that the main function of euphemisms is to conceal or disguise
a phenomenon that is negatively assessed in the public consciousness, thereby softening or encrypting somewhat harsh words.

Euphemisms, those clever linguistic disguises, have become ubiquitous in modern political communication. In the realm of politics, where every word can be scrutinized and deeply analyzed, euphemisms serve as a cloak that allows politicians to convey their messages with finesse, while softening the impact of potentially harsh or controversial statements. They are an effective communicative strategy employed by policymakers to ensure their true intentions are not overly exposed and to shape public perception.

By resorting to such vocabulary when discussing events in Ukraine, the leaders of the three states aim to avoid describing the true state of affairs in the military and political sphere. This can be argued as a deliberate tactic to achieve and implement their own goals, to present facts and events in those tones that correspond to their subsequent strategies and interests. Therefore, the use of euphemisms is often justified by the desire to be politically correct since the ideology of political correctness is a major feature of modern English-language political discourse.

In terms of future research, it would be beneficial to conduct a comparative study of euphemisms in British and American versions of the English language, analyzing the functioning of euphemisms in other types of discourse, and implementing translation analysis in this area.
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