

Emotiveness and Political Euphemisms in “1984” by George Orwell and “Qutlug‘ Qon” by Aybek: A Stylistic, Pragmatic and Semantic Analysis

Usmonova Zarina Habibovna

Senior teacher of Bukhara State University

z.h.usmonova@buxdu.uz

Mustafoyeva Umida Komiljon qizi

1st year master students of Bukhara State University

mustafoyeva041020@gmail.com

Qudratova Kamola Jamol qizi

1st year master students of Bukhara State University

qudratovakamola2@gmail.com

Abstract: This research conducts a comparative study of political language in “1984” by George Orwell and “Qutlug‘ qon” (Sacred Blood) by Aybek. The focus is on how political euphemisms and emotive language are used to manipulate public perception and maintain social control. By examining these two distinct literary works, the study identifies how language serves as a tool for ideological influence in different cultural and political settings. The analysis is held through a combination of stylistic, pragmatic, and semantic methods. Stylistic analysis is used to identify specific figures of speech that soften harsh realities. Pragmatic analysis examines the intended effect of these words on the listener, while semantic analysis looks at how the original meanings of words are changed or hidden. This triple approach allows for a deep investigation into the mechanics of political speech across different languages. The results show that both authors use euphemisms to mask violence and oppression, though their specific methods vary based on their cultural backgrounds. The study achieves recognizable results in demonstrating that emotive language is a universal instrument for political power.

Keywords: Political euphemisms, Newspeak, linguistic manipulation, Orwellian, emotive language, stylistic analysis, pragmatic function, semantic shift, social control, ideological influence.

Introduction

Language is the most powerful tool people have for sharing ideas, but it can also be used to hide the truth. In politics, words are often chosen very carefully to make bad things sound good or to change how people feel about a situation. This is done through euphemisms, which are mild words used instead of harsh ones, and through emotiveness, which is the use of words that trigger strong feelings. This article looks at how these language tricks are used in two famous books: George Orwell’s “1984” and Aybek’s “Qutlug‘ qon”. [1]

Even though these books come from different cultures and different times, they both show how leaders try to control the minds of the public by changing the way they speak. In “1984”, a scary future is described where the government creates a new language to stop people from thinking for themselves. In “Qutlug‘ qon”, the story of a changing society is told, showing how political words are used to influence



people's loyalties and beliefs. By comparing these two stories, we can see that the manipulation of language is a problem that happens everywhere.[2]

Literature Review

The study of political language and how it affects the mind is a well-established field. Many scholars have looked at how authors use fiction to warn people about the dangers of linguistic manipulation. This section discusses how researchers have analyzed George Orwell's techniques and how similar studies apply to historical novels like Aybek's "Qutlug' qon".[3]

A major focus in literary linguistics is the concept of "Newspeak". John Geise conducted research into how the government in "1984" uses language to limit human thought. He analyzed the way the state removes specific words from the dictionary to make "thoughtcrime" impossible. His results show that euphemisms like the "Ministry of Truth" (which actually handles lies) are used to create a "doublethink" mentality. [4]

Other researchers have focused on the emotional power of words. H. A. Saporova has studied the pragmatic functions of euphemisms in social and political life. Her research explains that euphemisms are not just polite; they are strategic tools used to influence the listener's emotions. By studying how speakers choose certain words to sound more patriotic or noble, she proved that language can be used to hide violence. [5]

In the field of Uzbek literature, G. Halliyeva and other specialists have explored the historical and social themes in the work of Aybek. Their analysis of "Qutlug' qon" shows how the language of the characters changes based on their political loyalty. They achieved results demonstrating that Aybek uses traditional and emotive Uzbek words to show the struggle between different social classes. [6]

Scholars like Dmitry Zhatkin have examined how political terms are translated and interpreted across different cultures. Their findings suggest that words like freedom or sacred can be reshaped to serve the needs of a specific regime. [7]

Methodology

The first method used is stylistic analysis. This involves looking for specific tools in the writing, like metaphors and euphemisms. In both "1984" and "Qutlug' qon", the research tracks how harsh realities like war or social injustice are given softer names. [8]

The second method is semantic analysis, which focuses on the meaning of words. The study examines how the definitions of certain terms, like freedom, peace, or blood, are changed or turned upside down by the political systems in the books. By looking at these semantic shifts, the research can show how language is used to confuse the public. It tracks how a word can be emptied of its original meaning and filled with a new, political message.[9]

The research uses pragmatic analysis to look at the action of the language. This method is used to understand the goal of the speaker and the effect the words have on the listener in a specific situation. [10]

Analysis and Discussion

This section explores how language is used to manipulate and influence in "1984" and "Qutlug' qon". By looking at specific extracts, we can see how euphemisms and emotive words work to change the way people see reality.

"The Ministry of Peace concerns itself with war, the Ministry of Truth with lies, the Ministry of Love with torture, and the Ministry of Plenty with starvation. These contradictions are not accidental, nor do they result from ordinary hypocrisy: they are deliberate exercises in doublethink". [11]

Orwell shows how the government (The Party) uses names that mean the exact opposite of what the department actually does. Instead of calling a place a "Torture Center", they call it the Ministry of Love. This is a perfect example of a political euphemism. The semantic analysis reveals that the goal is to make



it impossible for people to criticize the government. If the word “war” is replaced by “peace”, people lose the ability to even talk about the horrors of fighting. [12]

The next extract is taken from the novel “Qutlug‘ qon”: “Йўлчи ўғлимнинг қони қутлуг, уни юзга, кўзга суриши керак... Йўлчининг қони беҳуда кетмайди, сира беҳуда кетмайди. Бу ҳикматли қон, қутлуг қон”. In this scene, the character Shokir-ota speaks about the blood of the protagonist, Yo‘lchi. He describes it as “sacred” (*qutlug‘*) and “wise” (*hikmatli*). Instead of seeing the death as a simple tragedy or a violent act, the language transforms it into something holy and meaningful. This is a stylistic and semantic transformation. The word “blood”, which usually represents pain or death, is given a new, emotive meaning. By calling it “sacred blood”, Aybek shows how political and social movements use emotive language to turn a victim into a symbol of a larger struggle. [13]

“It’s a beautiful thing, the destruction of words. Of course the great wastage is in the verbs and adjectives... after all, what justification is there for a word which is simply the opposite of some other word?”. A character named Syme explains why the government is deleting words. He argues that if you have the word “good”, you don’t need “bad” you can just use “ungood”. This simplifies the language so that people cannot express complex or negative emotions. From a pragmatic point of view, this method is used to control human behavior. By narrowing the vocabulary, the government narrows the range of human feeling. If there are no words for “rebellion” or “misery”, people will find it harder to feel those things. This shows that the goal of political language is not just to communicate, but to act as a filter that only lets “approved” thoughts pass through.[14]

“Ҳаммамиз санга меҳрибонмиз. Дуруст, Йўлчибой эр ўғли — эр эди, у бошқа оламдан эди. Лекин ўлими ҳам улуг бўлди. Бунни яхши тушун, қизим!”. Here, the language focuses on the “greatness” (*ulug‘*) of Yo‘lchi’s death and his status as a “true man” (*er o‘g‘li*). The speaker uses strong, traditional emotive words to comfort a grieving character and to give the death a higher purpose. This highlights the pragmatic side of political speech in Aybek’s work. The words are used to build a sense of unity and shared identity. By describing the hero as being from “another world” and his death as “great”, the author shows how language is used to create legends. This emotive language is meant to inspire others to follow the same path, turning a personal loss into a tool for social and political change.

“War is Peace. Freedom is Slavery. Ignorance is Strength”. These are the three slogans of the Party in Orwell's world. Here, opposite words are balanced against each other. “War” is called “Peace”, and “Freedom” is defined as “Slavery”. From a pragmatic view, these slogans are meant to stop the human brain from thinking logically. By making people believe that war is a form of peace, the government can keep the country in a state of constant conflict without the public complaining. [15]

Conclusion

In both novels, it is clear that language is not just used for talking; it is used as a weapon of power. Orwell shows through a futuristic world how dangerous and artificial language can become. Aybek, through a historical story, shows how traditional beliefs and emotional words (like fate, blood, and honor) can be used for political goals. Both authors warn us that when words are manipulated, our reality is manipulated too.

This idea becomes even more significant when we look closely at how differently these authors approach the same issue. Orwell presents a controlled and restrictive system, where language is simplified to the point that people lose the ability to think critically or express complex ideas. In contrast, Aybek uses rich and expressive language to influence emotions and shape collective identity. His use of culturally meaningful words turns individual experiences into symbols of a larger social and political struggle.

Despite these differences in style and context, both works clearly demonstrate that language has the power to influence perception and guide human behavior. It is not limited to communication but extends to shaping beliefs, values, and even reality itself. This comparison shows that linguistic manipulation exists across different cultures and historical periods. Therefore, readers should remain aware and critical of how language is used, as it can quietly shape thoughts and attitudes without being immediately noticed.



References

- [1] J. Geise, “Orwell’s 1984: Language, Thought, and Power,” *Political Studies Journal*, 2018.
- [2] G. Halliyeva, *Comparative Literature and Cultural Contexts*. Tashkent, 2020.
- [3] G. Orwell, *1984*. London: Secker & Warburg, 1949.
- [4] Oybek (M. Toshmuhammad o‘g‘li), *Qutlug‘ qon*. 1940.
- [5] H. A. Saparova, “Pragmatic Functions of Euphemisms in Modern Linguistics,” *Journal of Foreign Philology*, 2022.
- [6] D. N. Zhatkin, “Political Discourse and Translation in Literature,” *Opción*, vol. 34, no. 15, 2018.
- [7] S. M. Askarova, “Euphemisms in English: A Linguistic Analysis of Meaning, Function, and Usage,” *American Journal of Education and Learning*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 41–46, 2026.
- [8] R. N. Zarifovna, “Linguocultural functions of euphemisms in political journalism in English and Uzbek,” in *Zamonaviy ta’lim tizimini rivojlantirish va unga qaratilgan kreativ g‘oyalar, takliflar va yechimlar*, vol. 8, no. 84, pp. 134–136, 2026.
- [9] Z. Usmonova, “The main features of stylistic device in describing places in the story ‘A Rose for Emily’,” *Formation of Psychology and Pedagogy as Interdisciplinary Sciences*, vol. 3, no. 35, pp. 211–215, 2024.
- [10] Z. H. Usmonova, “The main features of analyses on ‘I, Robot’ by Isaac Asimov,” *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 206–210, 2023.
- [11] Z. H. Usmonova, “The main features of analyses on ‘I, Robot’ by Isaac Asimov,” *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 206–210, 2023. *(duplicate retained for original consistency but marked)*
- [12] Z. Usmonova, “Artistic functions of scientific terms in work (on the example of Ray Bradbury and Isaac Asimov),” *Центр научных публикаций (buxdu.uz)*, vol. 5, no. 5, 2021.
- [13] Z. H. Usmonova, “The peculiarity of fantastic works (on the example of Ray Bradbury, Isaac Asimov and Stephen King),” *European Scholar Journal*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 499–503, 2021.
- [14] Z. H. Usmonova, “The peculiarity of literary devices in the work of Khaled Hosseini’s ‘The Kite Runner’,” *American Journal of Multidisciplinary Bulletin*, vol. 3, no. 5, pp. 336–341, 2025.
- [15] T. A. van Dijk, *Discourse and Power*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

