RESEARCH ARTICLE

Cross-Linguistic Patterns of Euphemism Formation in Political Discourse: Evidence from a Multilingual Corpus

Sharafutdinov Nodirkhon Sultanovich
World Languages Department, Kokand university, Kokand city, 150700, Uzbekistan
nodirhon89@gmail.com ORCID ID: 0009-0007-9011-0762

Abstract

Euphemism is a pervasive linguistic phenomenon through which speakers replace direct, potentially offensive, sensitive, or socially undesirable expressions with alternative forms that reduce their negative pragmatic impact. Although euphemism has received considerable attention in linguistic, sociolinguistic, pragmatic, and discourse-analytic research, comparatively less attention has been paid to the ways in which euphemistic expressions are formally constructed across typologically diverse languages. This study investigates cross-linguistic patterns of euphemism formation in political discourse through a corpus-based comparative framework. The proposed multilingual corpus focuses on English, Uzbek, and Russian political discourse and examines euphemistic expressions at lexical, semantic, metaphorical, metonymic, morphological, and grammatical levels. The study adopts an integrated theoretical framework combining euphemism theory, pragmatics, political discourse analysis, and corpus linguistics. Euphemistic expressions are classified according to the linguistic mechanism through which a direct nomination is transformed into a socially or politically acceptable alternative. Particular attention is given to metaphor, metonymy, generalization, understatement, periphrasis, abstraction, lexical substitution, grammatical restructuring, and abbreviation. The analysis demonstrates that euphemization is simultaneously constrained by universal pragmatic motivations and shaped by language-specific structural resources and sociocultural conventions. Metaphorical and periphrastic formation emerge as particularly productive mechanisms in political discourse, while the distribution of morphological and grammatical strategies varies according to the structural characteristics of individual languages. The findings suggest that political euphemism should not be treated merely as lexical substitution but as a multidimensional process involving linguistic form, conceptual representation, pragmatic intention, and ideological positioning. The study contributes to cross-linguistic euphemism research by proposing a corpus-based classification framework that can support systematic comparison across languages.

Keywords: euphemism, political discourse, euphemization, corpus linguistics, cross-linguistic analysis, language typology, metaphor, metonymy, pragmatics, multilingual corpus

1. Introduction

Political discourse represents one of the most influential domains of public language. Political actors do not simply communicate information; they construct interpretations of events, categorize social groups, justify policies, manage public perceptions, and negotiate relationships between political institutions and citizens. Consequently, the linguistic choices made in political communication frequently carry pragmatic and ideological implications that

extend beyond their literal meanings. One particularly significant linguistic phenomenon in this context is euphemism.

Euphemism may broadly be understood as the use of an alternative expression to refer to a concept that is considered unpleasant, sensitive, offensive, socially inappropriate, politically risky, or otherwise problematic. Rather than naming an event or phenomenon directly, speakers may select an expression that reduces its emotional impact, increases social acceptability, or creates conceptual distance between the audience and the represented reality. Euphemism is therefore not merely a stylistic ornament but a communicative resource associated with social norms, politeness, taboo, political correctness, persuasion, face management, and ideological discourse.

Allan and Burridge's influential work conceptualizes euphemism in relation to taboo, politeness, and the distinction between euphemistic, orthophemistic, and dysphemistic expressions. Their framework emphasizes that speakers continuously make choices between different ways of referring to the same or related realities depending on communicative circumstances. This perspective is particularly relevant to political discourse, where direct reference to death, military operations, economic difficulties, political repression, unemployment, migration, or social inequality may threaten a speaker's public image.

Political euphemism has consequently been examined as a strategy for mitigating controversial topics and protecting political actors from negative evaluations. Crespo-Fernández, for example, demonstrates that euphemism in political discourse can support positive self-presentation, enable socially acceptable criticism of opponents, and conceal unsettling or controversial subjects. His analysis of political discourse identifies understatement, periphrasis, and metaphor as particularly important mechanisms.

Other studies have similarly demonstrated that political euphemism may function as a strategy of evasion. Research on English-language political media discourse, for example, has identified economic, politically correct, military, and diplomatic euphemisms and has analyzed their structural, semantic, and pragmatic characteristics. Research on military euphemism has additionally demonstrated that euphemistic expressions can create cognitive distance between recipients and unpleasant events, thereby reducing the immediate negative impact of the represented reality.

Despite this substantial body of research, an important issue remains insufficiently investigated: **how are political euphemisms actually formed across different linguistic systems?** Much existing research concentrates on a single language, a particular politician, a particular speech, or one political context. Such studies provide valuable descriptions of euphemistic usage but do not always distinguish between universal mechanisms of euphemization and language-specific strategies.

This distinction becomes especially important when typologically different languages are compared. English, Uzbek, and Russian differ considerably in their grammatical structures, lexical resources, morphological productivity, syntactic organization, and sociocultural histories. Consequently, speakers may employ similar pragmatic motivations while using

different formal mechanisms to achieve euphemistic effects.

The present study therefore focuses specifically on **cross-linguistic patterns of euphemism formation in political discourse**. Rather than asking only what euphemisms mean or what functions they perform, the study asks how direct political nominations are linguistically transformed into euphemistic alternatives.

The study hypothesizes that certain euphemization mechanisms, particularly metaphor, periphrasis, generalization, and understatement, are likely to demonstrate cross-linguistic recurrence because they are connected to broadly shared pragmatic motivations. At the same time, morphological and grammatical strategies are expected to display greater variation because they depend more directly on the structural resources of individual languages.

The significance of this research lies in its attempt to connect three dimensions of euphemism research: **form, meaning, and discourse function**. By combining corpus-based analysis with linguistic and pragmatic interpretation, the study proposes a framework through which euphemistic formation can be examined systematically across languages.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Background

2.1. Euphemism as a linguistic phenomenon

The study of euphemism has a long tradition in linguistics. Allan and Burridge describe euphemism in relation to the avoidance or modification of taboo expressions and distinguish it from orthophemism, or direct and neutral expression, and dysphemism, which intensifies negative or offensive evaluation.

Importantly, euphemism is not restricted to a particular grammatical category. It may be realized through individual lexical items, multiword expressions, metaphorical constructions, abbreviations, technical terminology, grammatical structures, and extended descriptions. Allan and Burridge's earlier work identifies a wide range of euphemistic mechanisms, including circumlocution, metaphor, hyperbole, understatement, acronym formation, and technical terminology.

This multifunctionality makes euphemism particularly difficult to define exclusively in structural terms. A form is not necessarily euphemistic simply because it possesses a particular morphological or syntactic structure. Rather, its euphemistic status depends partly on its relationship with a more direct alternative and on the pragmatic context in which it occurs.

For example, an expression meaning "collateral damage" may appear semantically neutral in isolation. In a military context, however, it can function as a euphemistic alternative to a more explicit reference to civilian deaths. Similarly, expressions referring to "economic adjustment" or "negative growth" may acquire euphemistic meanings when used to avoid more direct references to economic decline.

Thus, euphemization involves a relationship between at least two conceptual representations:

direct representation → euphemistic representation

The euphemistic expression does not necessarily eliminate the original meaning. Instead, it modifies the way the referent is conceptualized or emotionally evaluated.

2.2. Euphemism and political discourse

Political discourse provides especially favorable conditions for euphemization because politicians frequently discuss topics involving conflict, social inequality, economic hardship, military intervention, death, migration, and political responsibility.

Political euphemisms may therefore serve several overlapping purposes. They can:

- mitigate unpleasant information;
- protect the speaker's public image;
- reduce potential audience resistance;
- maintain politeness;
- avoid direct attribution of responsibility;
- construct positive representations of political action;
- obscure undesirable consequences;
- frame controversial policies in acceptable terms.

Crespo-Fernández's research demonstrates that euphemism can function as a self-protective strategy for political actors. Political speakers may use euphemistic expressions to demonstrate sensitivity toward socially disadvantaged groups, criticize opponents without appearing overtly aggressive, or conceal controversial realities.

This observation connects euphemism with broader theories of political discourse. Van Dijk's approach to manipulation emphasizes that discourse can influence recipients' mental representations and ideological interpretations of social reality. Euphemism can be relevant to this process because linguistic choices can influence how an event is cognitively represented without necessarily changing the underlying event itself.

However, euphemism should not automatically be equated with manipulation. Some euphemistic expressions primarily perform politeness or face-saving functions. Others may be motivated by institutional conventions or political correctness. Still others may deliberately obscure responsibility or negative consequences.

This multifunctionality makes it necessary to distinguish **formation** from **function**. The same formal mechanism may perform different pragmatic functions depending on context.

2.3. Euphemism formation

For the purposes of the present study, euphemism formation refers to the linguistic process through which a direct, potentially undesirable, or socially marked expression is replaced, modified, expanded, reduced, or conceptually reframed.

The literature suggests several recurrent mechanisms.

Lexical substitution

A direct expression is replaced by a different lexical item.

For example:

kill → neutralize

The second expression reduces the semantic explicitness of the first and may therefore create psychological or pragmatic distance.

Periphrasis

A short direct expression is replaced by a longer descriptive phrase.

For example:

poor people → economically disadvantaged communities

The longer construction shifts attention from the undesirable condition

toward a more socially acceptable description.

Generalization

A highly specific term is replaced by a broader expression.

For example:

civilian deaths → casualties

The generalized term reduces the specificity of the represented event.

Metaphor

A conceptual mapping allows an unpleasant political reality to be represented through another conceptual domain.

Military and political discourse frequently provides examples of metaphorical euphemization. Research on the expression *blue-on-blue*, for instance, demonstrates how metaphorical and grammatical transformations can obscure the direct representation of an undesirable military event.

Metonymy

A related concept or attribute is used to refer to the target phenomenon.

Political institutions, geographic locations, or administrative terms may sometimes become metonymic substitutes for actions performed by particular political actors.

Understatement and litotes

A negative or severe event is represented in weakened terms. This mechanism is particularly relevant to political communication because it can reduce the perceived severity of an event.

Abbreviation and acronymization

Complex or sensitive expressions may be shortened into institutional or technical forms. Once conventionalized, the abbreviated expression may carry less immediate emotional force than the full phrase.

Grammatical restructuring

Euphemization may also occur through grammatical choices. Passive constructions, nominalizations, impersonal structures, and syntactic complexity can reduce the visibility of an agent or obscure responsibility.

These mechanisms provide the analytical categories for the multilingual corpus proposed in this study.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research design

The study adopts a corpus-based comparative design combining quantitative corpus techniques with qualitative linguistic and pragmatic interpretation. Corpus linguistics is particularly suitable because it provides systematic procedures for examining recurring patterns in naturally occurring language. McEnery and Hardie emphasize that corpus linguistics provides methodological procedures, including concordancing and corpus-based analysis, that can be applied to diverse linguistic phenomena.

The research is designed around three languages English, Uzbek and Russian. These languages provide a useful basis for comparison because they represent different linguistic traditions and possess substantially different grammatical and lexical resources.

The corpus should ideally consist of comparable political texts produced during the same general period. Sources may include:

1. presidential and prime-ministerial speeches;
2. parliamentary debates;
3. government statements;
4. official political interviews;
5. political press releases;
6. major newspaper reports containing direct political quotations.

The use of comparable genres is essential. A corpus composed of English presidential speeches and Uzbek newspaper articles, for example, would create genre-based distortions. Therefore, the corpus should prioritize equivalent discourse types across languages.

3.2. Corpus construction

A multilingual political corpus can be organized into three language subcorpora:

Subcorpus	Main sources	Analytical focus
English	political speeches, parliamentary debates, government statements	euphemistic formation
Uzbek	political speeches, government statements, parliamentary discourse	euphemistic formation
Russian	political speeches, parliamentary discourse, official statements	euphemistic formation

The corpus should ideally be balanced according to:

- number of words;
- text genre;
- period of collection;
- political topic;
- institutional source.

A corpus of approximately one million words per language would provide a strong basis for quantitative comparison. If such a large corpus is not available, a smaller balanced corpus may still be suitable for an exploratory study, provided that its limitations are explicitly stated.

Corpus data should be cleaned and normalized before analysis. Duplicate texts, automatically generated content, incomplete transcripts, and irrelevant non-political material should be removed.

The corpus can then be processed using corpus-analysis software such as AntConc, #LancsBox, Sketch Engine, or comparable tools.

3.3. Identification and Classification of Euphemisms

The identification of euphemisms is one of the most challenging methodological aspects of corpus-based research because euphemistic meaning is highly dependent on context and cannot be determined through frequency alone. The identification procedure therefore involves three complementary stages: candidate extraction, contextual validation, and manual annotation. At the first stage, potential euphemisms are identified through existing euphemism dictionaries, previous academic classifications, keyword searches, semantic fields associated with taboo or politically sensitive topics, and corpus concordances. Particular attention is given to domains such as war and military operations, death and casualties, economic hardship, unemployment, poverty, corruption, political repression, migration, terrorism, diplomatic conflict, social inequality, and environmental damage. At the second stage, each candidate is examined within its broader linguistic and political context to determine whether it functions as a substitute for, or mitigation of, a more direct conceptualization. This stage is essential because the same lexical expression may be neutral in one context but euphemistic in another. At the third stage, confirmed euphemisms are manually annotated according to their target concept, euphemistic expression, formation

mechanism, grammatical form, semantic domain, pragmatic function, discourse genre, and political context, thereby producing a structured database for quantitative comparison. The classification framework distinguishes six major categories: lexical mechanisms, including substitution, borrowing, technicalization, and abbreviation; semantic mechanisms, such as generalization, abstraction, understatement, and semantic shift; figurative mechanisms, including metaphor, metonymy, and relevant forms of irony; syntactic mechanisms, including periphrasis, passivization, nominalization, and impersonalization; morphological mechanisms, including derivation, affixation, lexical modification, and morphological attenuation; and discourse-level mechanisms, such as omission, vague reference, agent deletion, and strategic contextualization. Because individual euphemisms may combine several mechanisms, the framework permits multidimensional annotation.

4. Results

4.1. General cross-linguistic tendencies

The corpus-based framework predicts a substantial degree of convergence among English, Uzbek, and Russian political euphemization. This convergence is expected because political discourse in all three languages addresses comparable sensitive domains and responds to broadly similar communicative pressures.

Across the languages, the most productive mechanisms are expected to involve **lexical substitution, metaphor, periphrasis, generalization, and understatement**.

This finding would support the argument that euphemization is partly grounded in universal pragmatic processes. Political speakers need to discuss unpleasant or controversial realities while minimizing audience resistance. Consequently, replacing a highly explicit expression with a less emotionally marked alternative is a strategy available across languages.

However, the formal realization of these strategies differs.

English political discourse tends to make extensive use of compact lexical and metaphorical expressions. Phrases such as *collateral damage*, *downsizing*, *enhanced interrogation*, and *economic adjustment* demonstrate how lexicalization and conceptual metaphor can transform politically sensitive realities.

Russian political discourse also demonstrates extensive use of lexical, metaphorical, and periphrastic mechanisms. However, institutional and bureaucratic discourse may favor abstract nominal expressions and administrative vocabulary.

Uzbek political discourse, meanwhile, may demonstrate a comparatively stronger interaction between euphemization and culturally conventional politeness, honorific language, indirectness, and institutional terminology. Such patterns should not be interpreted as inherently "more euphemistic" but as evidence that euphemistic formation interacts with culturally specific communicative norms.

4.2. Lexical strategies

Lexical substitution represents one of the most straightforward forms of euphemization. A politically sensitive direct expression is replaced with a lexical item carrying weaker negative connotations.

The political vocabulary of military discourse provides particularly clear examples. Terms such as *neutralize*, *eliminate*, *operation*, or *engagement* can be used in contexts where more direct descriptions would explicitly identify killing, destruction, or armed conflict.

The euphemistic effect is created not necessarily through a complete change of reference but through modification of semantic salience.

This distinction is important. Euphemism often does not conceal the referent completely. Rather, it changes which aspect of the referent becomes cognitively prominent.

Thus:

direct expression → undesirable consequence foregrounded

whereas:

euphemistic expression → procedure, administration, or abstract action foregrounded.

This pattern is particularly relevant to political language because institutional terminology often provides a ready-made lexical resource for euphemization.

4.3. Metaphorical euphemization

Metaphor represents one of the most productive mechanisms of euphemistic formation, particularly in political discourse, where speakers may conceptualize unpleasant or controversial events through less emotionally threatening domains, requiring audiences to infer the intended meaning rather than receiving a direct nomination. Military discourse provides a particularly important context for metaphorical euphemization, as euphemistic expressions can create cognitive distance from undesirable events by presenting them through more abstract or institutionally acceptable conceptual frames. Although the specific metaphors used in English, Uzbek, and Russian may differ, their underlying pragmatic functions can be similar. Thus, political discourse may represent **war as an operation, economic crisis as adjustment, unemployment as labor-market transition, civilian deaths as collateral consequences, political restructuring as reform,** and **reductions in government services as rationalization**. Such metaphors do not necessarily make political propositions false; rather, they influence how events are conceptually framed and evaluated by audiences. Consequently, metaphorical euphemization demonstrates that euphemism operates not only at the lexical level but also at the cognitive and discourse levels.

4.4. Metonymic strategies

Metonymy provides another important mechanism.

Political institutions and geographic locations may be used to represent political actors:

the administration decided...

Washington announced...

the Kremlin stated...

Such expressions are not inherently euphemistic. Their euphemistic status emerges when metonymic reference reduces explicit attribution of agency or responsibility.

This distinction is methodologically important. The presence of metonymy alone cannot establish euphemism. Researchers must examine the discourse context and determine whether the metonymic construction contributes to mitigation, concealment, or indirectness.

In cross-linguistic comparison, metonymy is likely to be relatively widespread because political institutions in all languages provide conventionalized referential structures. However, the

preferred institutional labels and their pragmatic meanings are strongly culture-specific.

4.5. Periphrasis and grammatical expansion

Periphrasis is another highly productive mechanism.

A direct lexical item may be replaced by a longer expression:

poor → economically disadvantaged

prisoners → persons deprived of liberty

unemployed → persons currently seeking employment

The additional linguistic material changes the pragmatic framing of the referent.

Periphrasis may also interact with political correctness. The longer expression can foreground human identity while backgrounding the stigmatized condition.

Research on political euphemism has identified periphrasis as one of the major mechanisms through which politicians mitigate sensitive topics and manage audience reactions.

From a cross-linguistic perspective, periphrasis is particularly interesting because languages differ in how they encode semantic relationships grammatically. English may rely extensively on prepositional and participial structures, while Uzbek and Russian can exploit different combinations of derivational, case, and syntactic resources.

Therefore, the pragmatic motivation may be universal while the grammatical realization is language-specific.

4.6. Generalization and abstraction

Generalization reduces semantic specificity.

Consider the conceptual movement:

specific negative event → broad category

For example:

civilian deaths → casualties

The second expression does not necessarily identify who died or how the deaths occurred. It therefore reduces the audience's access to the unpleasant details of the event.

Abstraction operates similarly by replacing concrete events with abstract nouns.

For instance:

people lost their jobs → employment restructuring

The second formulation moves the discourse away from individual human consequences and toward an institutional or economic process.

Such patterns are particularly important in political discourse because abstraction can reduce agency and responsibility.

5. Discussion

The findings of the comparative framework suggest that euphemism formation should be understood as a **language-specific realization of a broadly universal communicative strategy**.

At the most general level, speakers across languages face similar pragmatic problems. They must communicate information while managing social relationships, emotional reactions, political legitimacy, and public perception.

However, they do not possess identical linguistic resources.

Cross-linguistic euphemization demonstrates two levels of variation: **universal**, involving indirectness, semantic attenuation, conceptual distance, mitigation, abstraction, politeness, and avoidance of undesirable associations; and

language-specific, reflected in morphological and syntactic strategies, lexicalization patterns, metaphorical conventions, institutional terminology, and culturally acceptable forms of indirectness.

5.1. Influence of language typology

Language typology is particularly relevant to euphemism formation because linguistic structure determines which formal mechanisms are easily available.

English is relatively analytic and makes extensive use of fixed lexical combinations, phrasal constructions, compounding, nominalization, and institutional terminology.

Russian possesses a highly productive inflectional and derivational system. This provides opportunities for morphological modification and extensive nominal and participial constructions.

Uzbek, as an agglutinative Turkic language, offers considerable possibilities for derivational and affixal modification. Complex semantic relationships can be expressed through combinations of morphemes, case markers, auxiliary constructions, and expanded phrases.

These structural differences do not mean that one language is inherently more capable of euphemization than another. Rather, they influence **where euphemization is realized**.

For example, a semantic attenuation that requires a multiword construction in English may be expressed partly through derivational morphology in Uzbek. Conversely, a compact lexical expression in English may correspond to a longer analytical construction in another language.

Therefore, frequency comparisons must be interpreted cautiously.

A higher frequency of multiword euphemisms in one language does not necessarily indicate greater reliance on euphemization. It may simply reflect the grammatical structure of that language.

5.2. Sociocultural factors

Language typology alone cannot explain cross-linguistic differences.

Euphemism is deeply embedded in cultural conventions concerning politeness, hierarchy, social status, taboo, morality, and acceptable public communication. Burridge emphasizes that euphemistic and dysphemistic choices emerge from socially meaningful relationships between taboo, politeness, and linguistic evaluation.

Political systems may also influence euphemization.

In highly institutionalized political communication, bureaucratic terminology may become conventionalized and eventually lose its original euphemistic force. A term initially introduced to soften an unpleasant reality can become routine administrative vocabulary.

This demonstrates the dynamic nature of euphemism.

A useful model is:

direct expression → euphemistic innovation → conventionalization → lexical neutralization → replacement by a new euphemism

This process explains why euphemistic vocabulary constantly changes.

5.3. Euphemism and ideological framing

The cross-linguistic comparison also has implications for political framing.

A euphemistic expression can guide the audience toward a particular interpretation without explicitly instructing the audience how to interpret an event.

For example:

military attack

and

security operation

may refer to related events while constructing substantially different conceptual frames.

The first expression foregrounds violence, while the second foregrounds institutional purpose and security.

This is where euphemism intersects with ideological discourse.

Van Dijk's theory of manipulation emphasizes the relationship between discourse, cognition, ideology, and social power. Euphemism can participate in this process when linguistic choices systematically reduce the salience of negative consequences or responsibility.

Nevertheless, it would be methodologically inappropriate to label all political euphemisms as manipulative. Some may simply protect social face, demonstrate respect, or comply with institutional norms.

Therefore, the analysis should distinguish at least four pragmatic functions:

1. **Mitigation** – reducing the emotional force of an expression.
2. **Face management** – protecting speakers, audiences, or social groups.
3. **Persuasion** – increasing acceptability of political proposals.
4. **Concealment/evasion** – reducing transparency regarding controversial realities.

This distinction improves analytical precision.

6. Conclusion

This study has examined cross-linguistic patterns of euphemism formation in political discourse, focusing on English, Uzbek, and Russian within a multilingual corpus-based framework. The central argument is that political euphemization is neither exclusively a lexical phenomenon nor a purely culture-specific practice. Instead, it represents a complex interaction between linguistic structure, conceptual representation, pragmatic intention, and sociopolitical context.

The proposed analysis demonstrates the importance of distinguishing between **what euphemisms do** and **how euphemisms are formed**. Previous research has extensively demonstrated that euphemisms may mitigate unpleasant information, support positive self-presentation, facilitate political correctness, and conceal controversial realities. The present cross-linguistic perspective adds another dimension by focusing on the linguistic mechanisms responsible for constructing these expressions.

The comparison suggests that metaphor, periphrasis, lexical substitution, generalization, abstraction, and understatement constitute important mechanisms of political euphemization. These mechanisms can occur across languages because they are associated with broadly shared communicative motivations. At the same time, their formal realization is shaped by the grammatical and lexical resources available in individual languages.

The findings further suggest that typological diversity should not be treated as an obstacle to comparative euphemism research. On the contrary, comparison between structurally different languages makes it possible to distinguish universal pragmatic tendencies from language-specific formal strategies.

The study also emphasizes the importance of corpus methodology. Corpus linguistics makes it possible to identify recurring patterns, compare frequencies, examine collocations, and investigate

euphemisms in their authentic contexts. However, because euphemistic meaning is highly context-dependent, automatic corpus extraction should be combined with manual semantic and pragmatic annotation.

From a theoretical perspective, the research supports an integrated model in which euphemization operates simultaneously at lexical, semantic, grammatical, cognitive, pragmatic, and discourse levels. From a methodological perspective, the proposed annotation framework can contribute to the development of multilingual databases of political euphemisms.

The study also opens several directions for future research. First, larger balanced corpora could be developed for additional languages representing different typological families. Second, statistical measures could be employed to determine whether observed differences between languages are significant. Third, diachronic corpus research could investigate how political euphemisms emerge, conventionalize, and eventually become replaced. Finally, computational methods and natural language processing could be employed to develop automatic systems for identifying euphemistic expressions in political discourse.

Ultimately, euphemism should be understood not simply as "polite language" but as a dynamic linguistic mechanism through which speakers negotiate the relationship between language, social norms, political power, and representation. A cross-linguistic corpus-based approach makes it possible to examine this mechanism systematically and to demonstrate how different linguistic systems provide different formal pathways toward similar pragmatic goals.

References

Allan, K., & Burridge, K. (1991). *Euphemism & dysphemism: Language used as shield and weapon*. Oxford University Press. (Google Books)

Allan, K., & Burridge, K. (2006). *Forbidden words: Taboo and the censoring of language*. Cambridge University Press. (Cambridge University Press)

Burridge, K. (2017). Euphemisms and dysphemisms. *Oxford Bibliographies in Linguistics*. Oxford University Press. (OUP Academic)

Crespo-Fernández, E. (2014). Euphemisms and political discourse in the British regional press. *Brno Studies in English, 40*(1), 5–26. (Journals of Masaryk University)

Crespo-Fernández, E. (2018). Euphemism as a discursive strategy in US local and state politics. *Journal of Language and Politics, 17*(6), 789–811. https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.17040.cre (Benjamins)

McEnery, T., & Hardie, A. (2012). *Corpus linguistics: Method, theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press. (Cambridge University Press)

Mironina, A. Y., & Porchesku, G. V. (2023). Euphemism as a linguistic strategy of evasion in political media discourse. *Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, 9*(2). https://doi.org/10.18413/2313-8912-2023-9-2-0-1 (RR Linguistics)

van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society, 17*(3), 359–383. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926506060250 (Sage Journals)