

# Shadows of Language: Revealing the Multifaceted Nature of Euphemistic Expressions in Biden's Speeches

Ali S. Humood\*

Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Babylon, Babylon, Iraq

Wafaa M. Faisal

Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Babylon, Babylon, Iraq

**Abstract**—In the field of political discourse, euphemistic expressions arise as a linguistic strategy. They are utilized by politicians to cleverly navigate the challenges of achieving their intended goals, such as promoting themselves or criticizing others. The present study delves into the neglected dimensions of euphemisms used by President Biden when he speaks about the local and global affairs. To do so, six carefully selected extracts from Biden's speeches are examined drawing upon Burridge's classification of linguistic features and functions of euphemistic expressions, van Dijk's ideological square, Brown and Levinson's negative politeness strategies, Grice's conversational maxims, and French and Raven's bases of power. The study unfolds significant emphasis on the positive ideological shifts under the current American leadership, contrasting them with the negative underpinnings of others. Accordingly, the function to talk up and inflate serves euphemistic expressions to function as a vehicle for projecting positive representations. Moreover, it is found that to reveal and inspire function is utilized for revealing truths and inspiring profound shifts in perception. Power bases lend legitimacy and authorize Biden to employ such linguistic choices, further amplifying the impact of his intended message.

**Index Terms**—critical pragmatics, euphemism, ideology, power, political euphemism

## I. INTRODUCTION

To conduct a study with such a tendency of analysis, is to arrive at a clear vision of power dynamics and masked ideologies that are beyond a particular type of discourse. Accordingly, discourses that are produced by those who have social authority and/ or higher positions must be inspired by power and ideology. As a field of study, Sociopragmatics focuses on shared goals found in critical linguistics. This area of study is referred to as Critical Pragmatics. Having the same interest of critical discourse analysis, critical pragmatics devotes its effort to identifying the link between language, ideology, and social power (Huang, 2017).

These two essential treats authorize politicians to make the best use of language to accomplish their intended goals. To be more indirect and bring to the scene substitutions for particular concepts and/ or topics is referred to as euphemisms. Etymologically, euphemism is taken from the Greek word *eupheme* whereby *eu* and *pheme* mean *good* and *speak* respectively. Traditionally, euphemistic expressions are scenarios whereby taboo expressions appear in a communication. However, the range of euphemistic expressions is widened to include more scenarios such as offensive, embarrassing, vulgar, and so forth (Pan, 2013).

The present study commits itself to bridging the gap in the literature of euphemism studies which were mainly limited to linguistic analysis in general contexts. It uncovers the neglected dimensions embodied in social power and ideology that motivate particular types of euphemisms and how their employments within a political genre sculpt social identities and shape perception.

Accordingly, the following questions are to be addressed in the present study:

1. What are the types of euphemistic expressions, their functions, and the devices used by Biden when speaking about the local and global affairs; and which ones are frequently used?
2. Which negative politeness strategies are realized via these uses in local and global affairs speeches; and which one is frequently adopted?
3. Why does Biden flout the conversational maxims when using the euphemistic expressions; and which maxim is flouted frequently?
4. To what extent do ideology and power influence the euphemistic expressions used by Biden when speaking about the local and global affairs; and which type of ideology and motive of power is frequently seen?

---

\* Corresponding Author. Email: [hum704.ali.shwekt@student.uobabylon.edu.iq](mailto:hum704.ali.shwekt@student.uobabylon.edu.iq)

## II. CRITICAL PRAGMATICS, POLITENESS, IDEOLOGY, AND POWER

The differences in scope and applications of pragmatics and critical studies of discourses lead to the production of complementary methodologies. In this vein, Chilton's (2004) study of indirectness and its various strategic uses in discourse that is operated via using presupposition and implicature in political discourses represents the fruitful relationship between the two disciplines. Huang (2017, p. 9) asserts that Critical Pragmatics "refers to the work done in sociopragmatics that follows the tradition of critical linguistics, in particular critical discourse analysis. As in critical discourse analysis, in critical pragmatics, great emphasis is put on the relationship between language and social power and between language and ideology".

Hence critical pragmatics and critical discourse analysis have one target, which is, highlighting the questions of how language and social power are related as well as how language and ideology are related.

Mey (2001) regards critical pragmatics as an 'umbrella' concept under which various social inequalities and ideologies are scrutinized by utilizing pragmatic strategies. In this vein, Chen (2020) sees critical pragmatics as a method through which all the positive and negative communicative actions are examined via shedding light on the hidden ideologies.

Politeness theory emphasizes the importance of language use and expressions in showing a friendly attitude. Brown and Levinson's (1987) theory, based on Goffman's concept of 'face', categorizes faces into negative and positive. When people act against face needs, Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) are formed. Strategies to minimize FTAs include claiming common ground, asserting reciprocity, and fulfilling the recipient's wants. Their definition of negative politeness suggests that speakers prioritize the hearer's wants and desires, considering formality, self-determination, and respectful aspects. They propose strategies to avoid threatening the hearer's negative face: indirectness, questioning, pessimism, deference, apologies, impersonation, inclusive perspective, nominalization, and record-keeping.

Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975), outlines four maxims: Quantity, Quality, Relation, and Manner. To achieve these maxims, speakers must provide informative speeches, adequate information, be relevant, and avoid ambiguity. Non-observance of these maxims can occur in various situations, such as flouting a maxim, violating a maxim, infringing a maxim, opting-out a maxim, and suspending a maxim. Flouting the maxims can result in implicature, quantity, quality, relation, and manner issues. Speakers can exploit these maxims to launch non-observance, such as excessive speech or irrelevant information.

Van Dijk (1998) categorizes ideology into three crucial ones. Cognitive: studied by cognitive psychologists to highlight values and ideas in people's minds; Social: studied by sociologists to judge values among societal groups; and Linguistic: learned and/or acquired by the written or spoken discourse.

His ideological square stands for the 'twin strategies' whereby the positives and negatives of in-groups and out-groups are emphasized and de-emphasized respectively. As such, 'Us and Them' are used to refer to the polarized relationship between the in-groups and out-groups positives and negatives.

Daghigh et al. (2018) remark that:

(1) Positive-Self Representation: representing the members of the in-groups 'Us' in a positive way, through discourse, by de-emphasizing their negative and emphasizing their positive characteristics; and

(2) Negative-Other Representation: representing the members of the out-groups 'Them' in a negative way, through discourse, by de-emphasizing their positive and emphasizing their negative characteristics. Thus, the inequality in discourse is represented through these linguistic behaviors.

Power refers to the asymmetrical relationships among people practiced in different contexts. It is also defined as "unequal capacity to control how texts are produced, distributed, and consumed" (Fairclough, 1995, p. 1). In addition, the ability of certain individuals (usually powerful people) to exert control over and display the interests, behaviors, and performances of others (usually inferior people) indicates the meaning of the notion of power (Paltridge, 2006).

French and Raven (1959) present five bases of power which are categorized into positional and personal ones. The positional category includes legitimate, reward, and coercive bases while the personal category includes the referent and expert bases. Legitimate power is mostly determined by one's title or position within the state or government. As a result, the influence of one's position may allow someone with this sort of authority to dictate the actions of individuals. Reward power refers to anticipating approval, receiving favorable assignments, giving praise, accepting, and anticipating positive results are all important motivators for people or organizations to carry out the wishes of others. Coercive power depends on various forms of force, such as punishment, threats, or being assigned undesirable chores, it might be the opposite of reward power. Being forced to accomplish something for which a person is not prepared or does not want to represents the main principle of this type. Undoubtedly, the conduct of a significant portion of a person's followers or devotees will be influenced, directly or indirectly, by their popularity or attraction. As a result, commercials featuring a celebrity or other significant person are far more trustworthy and have a genuine impact than those using unknown individuals. Expert power is individual-based rather than position-based. If someone possesses the skills, expertise, and aptitude to solve problems, come up with logical solutions, and be aware of changing circumstances, this will unquestionably increase their chances of being heard and obeyed.

### *Euphemism and Political Euphemism*

For Allan and Burrige (1991), "[E]uphemism and dysphemism are principally determined by the choice of expression within a given context: both world spoken of and the world spoken in" (p. 4). The various studies of

euphemism such as their (1991, 2007) studies consider euphemism as a universal and comprehensive phenomenon used in everyday communication to achieve different aims rather than being a mere linguistic device (Crespo Fernández, 2005).

Using euphemisms involves using indirect language that is customarily inaccurate or socially acceptable (Hughes, 2006). In addition, Allan and Burridge (1991) assert that euphemism is regarded as a face-saving mechanism initiated on occasions when unwanted or offensive expressions are used.

Further, Xiao (2018) mentions that euphemism can be described as a typical linguistic technique in communicative acts. Whether consciously, or not, speakers employ euphemistic expressions to avoid awkward or inappropriate topics.

Political euphemism involves more than just replacing the verbal equivalents. It differs from euphemisms used in other professions in many distinctive ways. The politicians' motivation for creating it is evident in their desire to hide the truth and deflect public attention. They use such language to alter how individuals acquire knowledge and communicate it (Zhao & Dong, 2010).

#### **Functions of Euphemism**

According to Burridge (2012), euphemistic expressions perform six functions: (1) To shield or avoid offense: Language avoidance and evasiveness are traits of euphemisms. When presented with the challenging task of how to speak about topics in various circumstances. (2) To mystify and misrepresent: Politicians usually employ the kind of euphemistic expressions to intentionally mask an idea and to mislead. Thus, the public are being mystified. For example, the euphemistic expressions *soft skin target*, *surgical strikes*, and *friendly fire* are used to deceive or mystify the public when talking about war, military operations, and medical procedures. (3) To talk up and inflate: Euphemistic expressions achieve to talk up and inflate function when speakers believe that it is preferable to alter words with others since the latter has favorable connotations. *Potholes* to pavement deficiencies and *bottlenecks* to localized capacity deficiencies are examples of this function. (4) To reveal and inspire: It is achieved when the speakers employ them intending to explain taboo topics to motivate the addressees to look behind the obvious level of the message being expressed. *Journey* and *beginning of new life* are substitutions for death. (5) To show solidarity and help define the gang: Taboos are one of the shared beliefs that bind particular community members together; they serve as a symbol of social cohesiveness. Shared taboos in a society, the customs and habits that go along with our euphemistic conduct enhance the social framework and create cohesiveness by fostering a sense of uniqueness. (6) To have fun and entertain: The sixth function of euphemistic expressions is to achieve fun and entertainment. It is the speakers' manipulative way of using linguistic expressions in situations whereby accomplishing amusement and fun becomes its main function.

#### **The linguistic strategies of euphemistic expressions**

Burridge (2012) underscores that various euphemistic expressions are achieved by means of using three linguistic strategies; namely, analogy, distortion, and borrowing. Each of these strategies calls for different linguistic devices. Nevertheless, the present study is limited to the linguistic strategy of *analogy* as follows:

a. *Metaphor*: Euphemisms are associated with figurative language to accomplish the aim of metaphor whereby an expression is used to denote another different thing, as in the word *mellow* that describes those in their ripper years or ripe old years.

b. *Whole for part or part for whole substitutions*: Expressions that are conceptually related in some way to the forbidden meaning are frequently used as substitutes. Particularly when saving face is the primary goal, speakers seek vagueness in euphemisms, and frequently the substitutes contain a high degree of abstraction. As such, the expression *certain* describes people (usually women) when they are pregnant when saying they are in a certain condition.

c. *Hyperbole*: Exaggeration is what this linguistic device means. As far as the euphemistic expressions that are related to age, the phrase *past one's prime* refers to the body condition of a person.

d. *Understatement*: Speakers who use euphemisms that downplay the importance of the topic make use of this tactic. *Not youthful* or *not as young as we used to* instead of old people are common examples.

### III. MATERIALS AND METHOD

The samples of the present study are six extracts taken from Biden's speeches in a transcript format from (www.whitehouse.gov) to investigate Biden's employments of euphemistic expressions. Various topics such as war, politics, economy, healthcare, and environment are discussed in these extracts. The ones related to America are referred to as the local affairs speeches whereas the ones related to the whole world are referred to as the global affairs speeches.

Two methods are conducted in the present study; namely, qualitative and quantitative. The former method is achieved via analyzing the data in question in line with the eclectic model of the study which draws upon Burridge's (2012) classifications, linguistic features, and functions of euphemism, Brown and Levinson's (1987) negative politeness strategies, Grice's (1975) conversational maxims, van Dijk's (1998) ideological square, and French and Raven's (1959) bases of power. The latter method is achieved by using frequencies and percentages to conduct calculations of occurrences of euphemistic expressions and comparing results.

#### **Extract (1)**

*And the United States and our Allies and partners are moving as fast as possible to continue to provide Ukraine **the forces** that they need — **the weapons** they need — excuse me — and **the equipment** they need — their forces need to defend their nation.*

Extract (1) illustrates that Biden calls for the euphemistic expression “equipment” at the word level. The linguistic feature of “analogy” is employed via using “the part for whole substitution” device. In doing so, he uses the word *equipment* to refer to the whole weapons, ammunition, drones, and other war supplies. Thus, Biden uses the type of expressions that make the topic about war stuff more benign for the audience. “To talk up and inflate” and “To reveal and inspire” functions are achieved when using the euphemistic expressions by Biden. Exaggerating the topics that are related to the equipment of war leads to the initiation of the first function whereas revealing the role of the United States of America in this war will inspire the Ukrainians to resist and fight for their country, thus, the second function is achieved. The main reason behind choosing these euphemistic expressions is to emphasize the positive role of America that revolves around helping Ukraine defeat Russia.

As for the negative politeness strategies, extract (1) clarifies that Biden activates three strategies namely, “Minimise the imposition”, “Adopt an inclusive perspective” and “Nominalize” when using the euphemistic expressions in question. The first strategy is seen when the speaker tries to lessen the impact of Ukraine’s war against Russia. The second strategy is activated when the president calls for an inclusive perspective when talking about the weapons and the countries that will provide the Ukrainian army with them. Finally, he gives names to this equipment when speaking about America and their Allies’ support, thus, the third strategy is achieved.

Implicature is initiated due to Biden’s flouting of the quantity maxim. In doing so, the speaker aims to make the target look for the kind of meaning that is not mentioned at the plain level when using the euphemistic expression. Thus, this type of non-observance is caused when Biden avoids mentioning informative details when he uses “the equipment”.

The positive ideology and the social variable of power of the current American leadership are reflected. The emphasis is given to the good things that are manifested through supporting the Ukrainian army with the appropriate equipment to help themselves defend their enemy revealing the positive ideology of the American leadership. Being the president of America legitimizes him to linguistically behave so. This behavior reveals the influence of power as a social variable. The motives behind doing so are “To reveal the legitimate power” since he is the president of the United States, “To reveal the reward power” through which the Ukrainian army is rewarded for fighting the Russian army and also he wants “To reveal the referent power” through which Biden acts in a way to show himself as a model for the American presidency.

#### **Extract (2)**

*So, the way I see it: The biggest risk is not going too big, if we go — it’s if we go too small. We’ve been here before. When this nation hit **the Great Recession** that Barack and I inherited in 2009, I was asked to lead the effort on **the economic Recovery Act** to get it passed. It was a big recovery package, roughly \$800 billion. I did everything I could to get it passed, including getting three Republicans to change their votes and vote for it.*

Extract (2) shows that Biden utilizes the euphemistic expressions “The economic Recovery Act” at the phrase level. The linguistic feature of “analogy” is activated in this extract by using the devices of “metaphor” and “hyperbole”. Thus, the euphemistic expressions “The economic Recovery Act” is metaphorically used by Biden to depict the economic recession of America as a recovery action in an exaggerated manner. Using these euphemistic expressions leads to the achievements of “To talk up and inflate” and “To reveal and inspire” functions. The first function is activated when the President exaggeratedly speaks about his role in dealing with the economic crisis of America in 2009. The second function is launched due to Biden’s speech about revealing his role to remedy the economy which in turn will inspire the American community to be positive towards such issues.

Biden launches three negative politeness strategies via using euphemistic expressions. Firstly, the strategy of “Minimise the imposition” is realized to notify the addressees about his leadership’s great efforts to remedy the recession. Secondly, the strategy of “Be pessimistic” also takes place since he exposes his disappointment about how the former leadership dealt with such a critical issue.

It is understood that Biden flouts the maxim of quantity when using euphemistic expressions in extract (2). This type of non-observance takes place because the president does not provide enough information when speaking about the recession. Instead, he speaks about his role and his leadership in rescuing the American economy from the previous recession. This flouting, therefore, achieves implicature in extract (2).

It is the positive things of the American leaders that are highlighted in this extract whereas the negative things of the former leaders of America are also highlighted and they were the reason behind the economic recession crisis at that time. Additionally, the influence of the social variable of power is revealed in extract (2) since he exploits the euphemistic expressions to describe the economic recession of America as “the economic recovery act”. This means that Biden is legitimate to employ these euphemistic expressions when talking about the economic crisis since he is the president of the United States. In doing so, the motives of “To reveal the legitimate power”, “To reveal the coercive power”, and “To reveal the referent power” are achieved. Speaking critically about the economic recession that was evident in 2009 achieves the first and second motives while depicting himself as a model to be followed and managed to find the accurate remedy for the economic recession achieves the third motive.

#### **Extract (3)**

*In Illinois, for example, the state has launched a broad effort to invest in converting **old power plants to solar farms**, led by Governor Pritzker.*

Concerning the environmental perspectives of the planet, it is explicated in extract (3) that Biden uses the euphemistic expressions "solar plants" at the phrase level to substitute the one that has negative implications, that is, the power factories that depend on fuel. The linguistic feature of "analogy" is activated due to the device of "part for whole substitution". This means that the speaker uses the euphemistic expression "solar plants" to refer to the power system as a whole. Besides, Biden's use of the euphemistic expressions leads to the accomplishment of the "To reveal and inspire" function when talking about the matters that are related to climate change. Revealing the American plans to alter the old power plants with new technology leads the Americans to be inspired by such developments in power production.

In relation to the negative politeness strategies, it is realized that Biden executes the strategies of "Be conventionally indirect" and "Minimise the imposition" when using the euphemistic expressions in extract (3). While the first one is activated when the speaker indirectly speaks about the old power system which basically depends on fuel and, thus, pollutes the environment, the second one is activated when he tries to lessen the imposition that resulted from the old policies of America.

When talking about the old power system in an obscure manner leads to the flouting of the maxim of quantity. In other words, the insufficient information about the old and new sources of power in America by Biden flouts the maxim of quantity. In doing so, he implies that he is doing his best to make the power system of America on natural resources rather than fuel that have a negative influence on the ecological system and its expensive costs.

What has been emphasized in this extract is the positive ideology of the current leadership of America and the negative ideology of the previous leadership of America through prioritizing positive things such as those of the power system. Most importantly, it is seen that Biden openly declared his speech to the public when speaking about such critical issues. The reason behind that is that he is authorized to employ such euphemistic expressions since he is the President of the United States. Thus, the social variable of power is revealed. In doing so, the motives of "To reveal the legitimate power" and "To reveal the referent power" are activated. The first one is seen when the president aims to show that he is authorized to speak about any matter such as the ecological matter that concerns America, in particular, and the whole world, in general. The second one is understood when Biden intends to describe his leadership as the typical one in comparison to the former ones since he pays attention to the power system production and its cost.

#### **Extract (4)**

*They look at **the mob** that stormed the United States Capitol on January 6th — brutally attacking law enforcement — not as insurrectionists who placed a dagger to the throat of our democracy, but they look at them as **patriots**.*

Extract (4) clarifies that Biden uses the euphemistic expression "mob" at the word level to describe the people who brutally destroyed the capitol of the United States on January 6<sup>th</sup>, as he describes them. The linguistic device of "metaphor" is used to initiate the linguistic feature of "analogy" when using this euphemistic expression. More adequately, Biden metaphorically uses the word "mob" as a substitution of "riot" to describe those people who attacked the capital of the United States. "To talk up and inflate" function is accomplished owing to the employment of the expression "mob". In doing so, he aims to highlight the damage of destructors during the era of Trump, the former president. As such, the negative things of the former policy are highlighted.

"Be pessimistic" is the negative politeness strategy that is initiated in extract (4). In doing so, Biden expresses his view against the negative attitudes of the former leadership by naming those who attacked the White House as patriots. The maxims of quantity and manner are flouted when using the euphemistic expression. This type of non-observance of maxims is attributed to Biden's use of less information about those who attack the White House and, thus, makes this issue unclear to the addressee.

The positive ideology of the current American policy and negative ideology of the previous American policy are revealed since Biden uses the type of euphemistic expression that denotes so by emphasizing the positive things of his leadership and the negative things of the former leadership. The positive things are embodied by showing the damage that is caused to America by such people whereas the negative things are embodied by making those destroyers as patriots. Notably, the influence of the social variable is evident in his speech due to the employment of the euphemistic expression "the mob" when describing those protesters who brutally attacked the White House, as he described them. This means that Biden is authorized to do so since he is the President. Due to this linguistic behavior, the motives of "To reveal the legitimate power" and "To reveal the coercive power" are launched. By occupying the presidency position Biden wishes to exploit his authorized policy to linguistically punish the former leadership of America and to prioritize the current one.

#### **Extract (5)**

*You know, these past weeks have seen a terrible human cost of Putin's ambition for conquest and control. **Approximately two thirds — two thirds — of all Ukrainian children have been displaced from their homes. More than 5 million Ukrainians have fled their country. It's an absolute outrage. The idea this is happening approaching the second quarter of the 21st century is just — (sighs).***

*Last month, when I was in Europe, I announced that the United States would welcome 100,000 Ukrainians so that we share in the responsibility of supporting Ukrainians fleeing Putin's war machine. **We've already welcomed tens of thousands of Ukrainians to the United States.***

The expressions "We've already welcomed tens of thousands of Ukrainians to the United States" that are used by Biden achieve the type of euphemistic expressions at the sentence level. Extract (5) clarifies that Biden exploits the

sentence type of euphemistic expressions to substitute the expressions "approximately two thirds — two thirds — of all Ukrainian children have been displaced from their homes". Here he wants to alter these expressions with euphemistic ones to nullify the offensive connotations that are attached to the first ones. The linguistic strategy of "analogy" is activated via the employment of the device of "hyperbole". Using this device initiates the functions of "to talk up and inflate" and "to reveal and inspire". Exaggerating the Americans' role in welcoming the Ukrainians accomplishes the purpose of the first function, whereas revealing the positive news to the Ukrainians about being welcomed will inspire them to have optimism during the war.

The negative politeness strategies of "Be conventionally indirect", "Minimise the imposition", and "Adopt an inclusive perspective" are used by Biden when speaking about the Russian-Ukrainian war. Biden indirectly intends that it is Putin's irrational actions that lead to the destruction of Ukraine and the parting of its citizens. Using the euphemistic expressions in extract (5) reduces the amount of imposition that is caused by the war. Biden wants the Ukrainians to feel that they are in their country. Thus, minimizing the imposition strategy is achieved. Besides, Biden's use of an inclusive perspective strategy to include the Americans and the Europeans in this crisis and welcomes those innocent Ukrainians.

In addition, the achievement of implicature is attributed to Biden's flouting of the maxim of quality. This non-observance type resulted from giving insufficient information about how America welcomed the Ukrainians. The reason behind doing so is that Biden aims to implicate that it is America that helps Ukraine to defeat Russia as well as support those who left their homes. Thus, implicature is achieved due to the employment of the euphemistic expressions at the sentence level.

The President of America wants to emphasize the good of his leadership and policy and the negative of Putin's leadership and policy. Thus, the positive ideology and the negative ideology of Biden's leadership and Putin's leadership are emphasized respectively. This emphasis is influenced by the social variable of power because speaking about this critical issue requires authorization such as that of Biden. What motivates Biden to do so is "To reveal the legitimate power" and "To reveal the reward power" as well. This means that Biden aims to show his authority to speak about critical matters and, accordingly, reward the Ukrainians by welcoming them to America.

**Extract (6)**

*Unlike Trump, we don't believe **America is dark and negative, a nation driven by anger fear, and revenge**. When Trump spoke at his inauguration, **he spoke about American carnage**. That's what he spoke about, if you recall. At my inauguration, I spoke about **American possibilities**. We believe we are **hopeful, an optimistic nation** driven by a simple proposition that everyone deserves a fair shot.*

The word *carnage* in the phrase "American carnage" is substituted by the euphemistic expression "nation" in the phrase "an optimistic nation". Thus, the word type of euphemistic expression is achieved in extract (6). The linguistic strategy of "analogy" is initiated by the device of part for the whole substitution. This means that Biden uses this expression to substitute all possibilities that are related to vacancies, climate change, power systems, and many others. As such, the functions of "To talk up and inflate" and "To show solidarity and help define the gang" are executed. These functions indicate that the President aims to emphasize the negative implications of Trump's policy in administering the community and to prioritize his leadership by finding the possibilities that will rescue the American community from darkness to light.

Extract (6) authenticates that the negative politeness strategies of "Be pessimistic", "Nominalize", and "Adopt an inclusive perspective" are employed by Biden. Showing the negative perspectives of Trump's administration and its bad outcomes on America and stating his name directly initiate the first two negative strategies in his speech. Besides, it is the American community that is addressed by Biden's speech, thus, the third negative politeness strategy is accomplished. The reason behind that is to criticize the former administration.

In addition, the maxim of quantity is flouted by Biden when speaking about such an important issue as Trump's era since he provides less information about how Trump parted the Americans' unity. Also, the maxim of quality is flouted by Biden when using the euphemistic expression "nation". This type of non-observance is initiated due to Biden's use of insufficient information that is concerned with Trump's role in America.

The positive ideology of the current leadership and the negative ideology of the former one(s) are emphasized due to Biden's employment of the euphemistic expressions. Accordingly, this behavior prioritizes the good things and the negative things of the current and former American leaderships respectively. It is also seen that these expressions are influenced by the social variable of power since they are saliently employed to criticize Trump's leadership of America. Consequently, the motives of "To reveal the legitimate power" and "To reveal the coercive power" are seen on the spectrum of Trump's social power. The first motive is observed when Biden critically discusses Trump's inappropriate leadership whereas the second motive is seen when Biden linguistically punishes Trump's policy in this manner.

## IV. RESULTS

TABLE 1  
TYPES OF EUPHEMISTIC EXPRESSIONS IN LOCAL AND GLOBAL AFFAIRS

Types	Local affairs		Global affairs	
	Freq.	Per.	Freq.	Per.
Word	2	66.6	1	33.3
Phrase	1	33.4	1	33.3
Sentence	0	0	1	33.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 1 illustrates that Biden exploits the euphemistic expressions types differently in local and global affairs speeches. In the local affairs the prominence is given to the word type followed by the phrase type (66.6%) and (33.3%) respectively. However, the sentence type is not used (0%). Besides, the same euphemistic types register an equal percentage that amounts to (33.3%) for each type (word, phrase, sentence) when they are employed by Biden in global affairs.

TABLE 2  
DEVICES TYPES IN LOCAL AND GLOBAL AFFAIRS

Devices	Local affairs		Global affairs	
	Freq.	Per.	Freq.	Per.
Metaphor	2	50	0	0
Hyperbole	1	25	1	33.4
Whole for part and part for whole substitution	1	25	2	66.6
Understatement	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>

As for the devices of the linguistic strategy of analogy, Table 2 authenticates that Biden employs these devices differently in local and global affairs speeches. On the one hand, it is the device of metaphor that occupies the priority of use with (50%) of the employment whereas both the devices of hyperbole and whole for part and part for whole substitution register the other half of the employment (25%) for each in local affairs. On the other hand, the device of whole for part and part for whole substitution records higher employment with (66.6%) while the device of hyperbole gets less employment with a percentage of (33.4%) in global affairs. The device of understatement is not used in local and global affairs speeches with (0%).

TABLE 3  
FUNCTIONS OF EUPHEMISTIC EXPRESSIONS IN LOCAL AND GLOBAL AFFAIRS

Functions	Local affairs		Global affairs	
	Freq.	Per.	Freq.	Per.
To talk up and inflate	3	60	2	40
To reveal and inspire	1	20	3	60
To show solidarity and help define the gang	1	20	0	0
To shield and avoid offense	0	0	0	0
To mystify and misrepresent	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100</b>

In relation to the functions of euphemistic expressions, it is presented in Table 3 that the percentages assigned to each vary in local and global affairs. The function of to talk up and inflate occupies the highest employment in local affairs with (60%), whereas the same function occupies the second rank in global affairs with (40%). In addition the function of to reveal and inspire gets frequent use with (60%) in global affairs whereas the same function receives the least employment with (20%) in local affairs speeches. Further, the function of to show solidarity and help define the gang is only seen in local affairs with (20%) while the same function is not used in global affairs. The functions to shield and avoid offense and to mystify and misrepresent are not used in both local and global affairs speeches.

TABLE 4  
NEGATIVE POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN LOCAL AND GLOBAL AFFAIRS

Strategies	Local affairs		Global affairs	
	Freq.	Per.	Freq.	Per.
Be pessimistic	3	50	0	0
Minimize the imposition	1	16.3	3	37.5
Nominalize	1	16.3	1	12.5
Adopt an inclusive perspective	1	16.3	2	25
Impersonate S and H	0	0	0	0
Be conventionally indirect	0	0	2	25
Go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebted H	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100</b>

What has been emphasized in Table 4 is that the negative politeness strategies that are adopted when using the euphemistic expressions differ in use in local and global affairs. The total frequencies that are assigned to the global affairs (8 times) are higher than that given to the local affairs (6 times). In global affairs, the negative strategy of minimize the imposition is highly used with (37.5%) followed by the negative strategies of be conventionally indirect and adopt an inclusive perspective with an equal percentage of (25%) for each. The negative strategy of nominalize registers the lowest percentage (12.5%). In contrast, the negative politeness strategies of impersonate S and H, be pessimistic and be on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H are not used in global affairs speeches. Conversely, the same negative politeness strategies are used differently. The higher emphasis is given to the negative politeness strategy of be pessimistic with (50%). The negative politeness strategies of minimize the imposition, nominalize, and adopt an inclusive perspective reach an equal percentage of (16.3%) for each. However, impersonate S and H, be conventionally indirect, and go on record as incurring a debt, or as not indebting H, are not used by Biden when talking about the local affairs with a percentage of (0%) for each.

TABLE 5  
FLOUTS OF THE MAXIMS IN LOCAL AND GLOBAL AFFAIRS

Maxim	Local affairs		Global affairs	
	Freq.	Per.	Freq.	Per.
Quantity	2	66.6	3	75
Quality	1	33.4	1	25
Manner	0	0	0	0
Relevance	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100</b>

As far as the non-observance of maxims is concerned, it is found that Biden flouts the maxim of quantity more frequently than the other types in both the local and global affairs. The percentages that are given to this maxim read (66.6%) and (75%) in local and global affairs respectively. Besides, the maxim of quality receives the lowest percentages with (33.3%) and (25%) in local and global affairs respectively. In contrast, Table 5 shows that the maxims of manner and relevance are not flouted in local and global affairs speeches.

TABLE 6  
TYPES OF IDEOLOGIES IN LOCAL AND GLOBAL AFFAIRS

Type	Local affairs		Global affairs	
	Freq.	Per.	Freq.	Per.
Positive ideology	3	60	2	50
Negative ideology	2	40	2	50
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100</b>

In relation to the positive and negative ideologies, Table 6 presents that Biden aims to reveal the positive and negative ideologies when using the euphemistic expressions. In global affairs, the positive ideology and negative ideology are equally utilized with a percentage of (50%) each. By contrast, the emphasis is given to the positive ideology more than the negative ideology in local affairs with percentages that arrive at (60%) and (40%) respectively.

TABLE 7  
MOTIVES OF POWER IN LOCAL AND GLOBAL AFFAIRS

Motive	Local affairs		Global affairs	
	Freq.	Per.	Freq.	Per.
To reveal legitimate power	3	42.8	3	42.8
To reveal coercive power	3	42.8	0	0
To reveal referent power	1	14.4	2	28.6
To reveal reward power	0	0	2	28.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 7 illustrates that the motives of power are differently revealed when Biden exploits the euphemistic expressions in his speeches. In local affairs, the percentages that are assigned to each motive indicate that Biden aims to prioritize the motive of to reveal the legitimate power and to reveal the coercive power that amount to (42.8%) respectively whereas the motive of to reveal referent power gets (14.4%). In global affairs, approximate percentages are presented in Table 7. While the higher percentage (42.8%) is given to the motive of to reveal the legitimate power, the following equal percentage (28.6%) is given to the motives of to reveal reward power and to reveal referent power. In addition, the motive of to reveal the reward power is not used in local affairs and the same for the motive of to reveal the coercive power in global affairs both register (0%).

## V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The euphemistic expressions are exemplified by using words, phrases, and sentences used for the sake of achieving certain purposes. In political contexts, Biden calls for these expressions so as to achieve the functions of *to talk up and inflate*, *to reveal and inspire*, *to show solidarity and help define the gang*, *to shield and avoid offense*, and *to mystify and*



*misrepresent*. Besides, the devices of *metaphor*, *hyperbole*, *understatement*, and *part for whole or whole for part substitutions* are used to initiate the linguistic feature of *analogy*. However, it is found that not all these functions are used in his speech. In local affairs, Biden frequently calls for the euphemistic types of word whereas in global affairs, it is seen that all types of euphemistic expressions are equally used. It can be inferred that the word type is appropriate for tackling the local affairs whereas all types are required to tackle the global affairs. As for the devices, *metaphor* receives higher emphasis in local affairs while *whole for part and part for whole substitutions* register higher emphasis in global affairs. This means that Biden tries to depict and exaggerate things related to local affairs, whereas he substitutes things with others and exaggerates when speaking about global affairs. The function of *to talk up and inflate* is mostly used so as to overstate the achievements of his leadership concerning the local affairs, whereas the function *to reveal and inspire* is mostly executed in global affairs to send a message that America stands to bring remedy to unfortunate matters.

1. *Be pessimistic, minimize the imposition, nominalize, adopt an inclusive perspective, impersonate S and H, be conventionally indirect, and go on record as incurring a debt, or as not incurring S* are the negative politeness strategies used in political contexts. The priority is assigned to the negative politeness strategy of *be pessimistic* in local affairs so as to saliently show the negative attitude of the former leaderships and their inappropriate procedures while the negative politeness strategies of *minimize the imposition* and *be conventionally indirect* are seen in global affairs to indirectly criticize the matters that are related to the globe and send a positive message that America is doing its best to make the world better.
2. Biden flouts the maxims of *quantity* when using the euphemistic expressions in his speeches on local and global affairs so as to initiate an implicature that the current leadership of America is present and follows planned objectives to correct what had been damaged by the former leadership and destructors of the globe.
3. The positive and negative ideologies are revealed in local affairs to show the American society that what his leadership does is the appropriate procedure whereas what other leaderships did is not. In global affairs, the positive ideology is emphasized since he wants to convince the world that America aims to make the world prosperous and safe for living. Thus, ideology influences the euphemistic expressions in his speech. Besides, the social variable of power also influences the employment of the euphemistic expressions. This influence can be explained by pertaining to the motive of *to reveal legitimate power, to reveal coercive power, to reveal referent power, and to reveal reward power*. In local affairs, the motive of *to reveal legitimate power* and *to reveal coercive power* are frequently reflected to show the American society that his leadership is authorized and can punish illegal or inappropriate actions by the former leadership. In global affairs, the motive of *to reveal the legitimate power* and *to reveal reward power* are used frequently to send a message to other countries that America is powerful and can reward countries with adequate procedures, solutions, and assistance as a result for any danger they may encounter.
4. Biden skilfully shapes the narrative on the engagements of America in the international affairs and economic stability by downplaying previous economic policy mistakes and emphasizing America's support for Ukraine. In addition, Biden establishes confidence and trust with both local and foreign audiences by sophisticatedly using euphemistic language to communicate progress and hope while also recognizing previous setbacks and errors. By underlining the influence of language on forming impressions and public opinion, Biden's use of euphemistic expressions reveals a deep awareness of the complexity of political speech and the importance of framing topics to connect with varied people.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Allan, K., & Burrige, K. (1991). *Euphemism & dysphemism: Language used as shield and weapon*. Oxford University Press.
- [2] Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- [3] Burrige, K. (2012). Euphemism and language change: The sixth and seventh ages. *Lexis*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.355>
- [4] Chen, X. (2020). *Critical pragmatic studies on Chinese public discourse*. Routledge.
- [5] Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203561218>
- [6] Crespo Fernández, E. (2005). Euphemistic strategies in politeness and face concerns. *Pragmalinguistica*, 13, 77–86. <https://doi.org/10.25267/Pragmalinguistica.2005.i13.05>
- [7] Daghigh, A. J., Saleh Sanatifar, M., & Awang, R. (2018). Modeling van Dijk's Ideological Square in Translation Studies: Investigating Manipulation in Political Discourse Translation. In *TRAlinea: Online Translation Journal*, 20.
- [8] Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Routledge.
- [9] French, J., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power*. University of Michigan Press.
- [10] Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In *Speech Acts* (pp. 41–58). Brill. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368811\\_003](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004368811_003)
- [11] Huang, Y. (Ed.). (2017). *The Oxford handbook of pragmatics* (First edition). Oxford University Press.
- [12] Hughes, G. (2006). *An encyclopedia of swearing: The social history of oaths, profanity, foul language, and ethnic slurs in the English-speaking world*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315706412>
- [13] Mey, J. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishers.
- [14] Paltridge, B. (2006). *Discourse analysis: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Continuum.
- [15] Pan, Q. (2013). A tentative study on the functions and applications of English euphemism. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3(11), 2107–2111. <https://doi.org/10.4304/tpls.3.11.2107-2111>

- [16] Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage Publications.
- [17] Xiao, T. (2018). The functions and expressions of English euphemism in business negotiation. *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Arts, Design and Contemporary Education (ICADCE 2018)*. 4th International Conference on Arts, Design and Contemporary Education (ICADCE 2018), Zhengzhou, China. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icadce-18.2018.25>
- [18] Zhao, X., & Dong, J. (2010). Study on the features of English political euphemism and its social functions. *English Language Teaching*, 3(1), p118. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v3n1p118>



**Ali Shawket Humood** was born in Babylon/ Iraq (1982); married with two sons; currently lives in Babylon/Hilla city. He got his Bachelor's Degree in English language and linguistics from the University of Babylon/ Iraq (2004).

Currently, he is a Master's degree candidate at the University of Babylon/ Iraq College of Education for Human Sciences. This article is developed to represent a part of his ongoing thesis. Humood has an experience of more than 14 years in teaching English as a foreign language for middle and high school students. As a researcher he is interested in general linguistics, critical language studies, stylistic and pragmatic analysis.



**Wafaa Mokhols Faisal** was born in Mosul/ Iraq (1970); married with three children; currently lives in Babylon/ Hilla city. She got her Bachelor's Degree in English language and linguistics (1992), Master's degree in methods of teaching English as a foreign language (1994) from the University of Baghdad/College of Ibn Rushd/ Iraq, and her Doctoral degree in methods of teaching English as a foreign language (2002) from the same university.

Asst. Prof. Faisal participated in several international as well as local conferences, participated in several workshops and seminars. She published a number of academic papers in local and international journals. Under her supervision, numerous MA theses and Ph.D. dissertations have been authored in both the English Language department and the Department of Educational and Psychological Sciences.