

традиции обеспечивают глубинные основания, языковые структуры предоставляют технические ресурсы, стереотипы закрепляют устойчивые схемы восприятия, медийные технологии открывают новые каналы распространения, а образовательные практики обеспечивают

трансляцию культурных моделей. В результате формируются уникальные национально-культурные профили юмора: английский дискурс тяготеет к институциональности и индивидуализму, а русский – к экзистенциальности, коллективизму и рефлексивности.

References:

1. Карасик, В. И. (2002). *Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс*. Перемена.
2. Вежбицкая, А. (1999). *Семантические универсалии и описание языков*. Языки русской культуры.
3. Crystal, D. (2004). *The stories of English*. Penguin Books.
4. Архипова, А. С., & Мельниченко, М. А. (2010). *Анекдоты о Сталине: тексты, комментарии, исследования*. ОГИ; РГГУ.
5. Телия, В. Н. (1996). *Русская фразеология: Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологический аспекты*. Школа «Языки русской культуры».

Linguopragmatic functions of the icon, index, and symbol system in euphemistic discourse

Matyakubov Zohid Muminbaevich

z.m.matyakubov@gmail.com

Teacher,

Urgench State University named after Abu Rayhan Biruni

Annotation *This article examines the linguopragmatic functions of icon, index, and symbol in euphemistic discourse based on Charles Sanders Peirce's semiotic theory. The study explores how euphemistic expressions perform semantic mitigation, concealment of reality, and ideological transformation within totalitarian discourse. An interdisciplinary approach combining semiotics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, and critical linguistic theory is employed. George Orwell's novel "1984" serves as the primary source for analysis because of its representation of manipulative political language and ideological communication. Euphemistic units such as "Big Brother," "Ministry of Love," "Ministry of Peace," "Joycamp," "vaporized," and "unperson" are analyzed through the categories of icon, index, and symbol. The findings reveal that euphemisms function not only as stylistic devices but also as ideological tools shaping public consciousness and controlling perception. The study demonstrates that the interaction of semiotic signs creates a linguopragmatic mechanism reinforcing ideological domination and cognitive control in political discourse and contemporary authoritarian communication practices within modern state propaganda systems.*

Keywords *Icon, index, symbol, euphemism, linguopragmatics, semiotics, ideological discourse, totalitarian language, 1984*

Ikona, indeks va ramz tizimining evfemistik diskursdagi lingvopragmatik funksiyalari

Matyakubov Zohid Mo'minbayevich

z.m.matyakubov@gmail.com

O'qituvchi,

Abu Rayhon Beruniy nomidagi Urganch davlat universiteti

Annotatsiya *Ushbu maqola Charlz Sanders Pirsning semiotik nazariyasi asosida evfemistik diskursda ikon, indeks va simvolning lingvopragmatik funksiyalarini tahlil qiladi. Tadqiqot totalitar diskursda evfemistik birliklarning semantik yumshatish, voqelikni yashirish va mafkuraviy qayta kodlash vazifalarini yoritadi. Ishda semiotika, pragmatika, diskurs tahlili hamda tanqidiy lingvistika yondashuvlari uyg'unlashtirilgan. Jorj Oruellning "1984" romani manipulyativ siyosiy til va mafkuraviy kommunikatsiyaning asosiy namunasi sifatida tanlangan. "Big Brother", "Ministry of Love", "Ministry of Peace", "Joycamp", "vaporized" va "unperson" birliklari ikon, indeks va simvol nuqtai nazaridan tahlil qilinadi. Natijalar evfemizmlar nafaqat uslubiy vosita, balki ijtimoiy ongni shakllantiruvchi hamda idrokni boshqaruvchi mafkuraviy mexanizm ekanini ko'rsatadi. Tadqiqot semiotik belgilar o'zaro uyg'unlashib, siyosiy diskursda mafkuraviy hukmronlikni kuchaytirishini asoslaydi. Maqola lingvopragmatika, semiotika va diskurs tahliliga oid zamonaviy tadqiqotlarni boyitib, evfemistik til totalitar tizimlarda*

manipulyatsiya, kognitiv nazorat hamda siyosiy ta'sirning strategik vositasi sifatida qo'llanishini ilmiy jihatdan izohlaydi. Shuningdek, maqolada evfemistik birliklarning kommunikativ ta'siri, ideologik manipulyatsiyadagi o'rni hamda jamiyat ongini boshqarishdagi pragmatik imkoniyatlari batafsil yoritiladi va ularning siyosiy diskursdagi funksional ahamiyati ham.

Kalit so'zlar *Ikona, indeks, ramz, evfemizm, lingvopragmatika, semiotika, ideologik diskurs, totalitar til, "1984"*

Лингвопрагматические функции системы иконы, индекса и символа в эвфемистическом дискурсе

Матякубов Зоҳид Муминбаевич

z.m.matyakubov@gmail.com

Преподаватель,

Ургенчский государственный университет
имени Абу Райхана Беруни

Аннотация *В статье рассматриваются лингвопрагматические функции иконы, индекса и символа в эвфемистическом дискурсе на основе семиотической теории Чарльза Сандерса Пирса. Исследование раскрывает, каким образом эвфемистические выражения обеспечивают семантическое смягчение, сокрытие реальности и идеологическое перекодирование в условиях тоталитарного дискурса. В работе применяется междисциплинарный подход, объединяющий семиотику, прагматику, дискурс-анализ и критическую лингвистику. Основным материалом исследования выступает роман «1984», демонстрирующий манипулятивный политический язык и идеологическую коммуникацию. Лексические единицы «Big Brother», «Ministry of Love», «Ministry of Peace», «Joycamp», «vaporized» и «unperson» анализируются с позиций иконы, индекса и символа. Полученные результаты показывают, что эвфемизмы функционируют не только как стилистические замены, но и как идеологические инструменты формирования общественного сознания и контроля восприятия. Исследование доказывает, что взаимодействие семиотических знаков формирует целостную лингвопрагматическую модель, усиливающую идеологическое доминирование в политическом дискурсе. Полученные выводы вносят вклад в современные исследования лингвопрагматики, семиотики и дискурс-анализа, раскрывая эвфемистический язык как стратегический механизм манипуляции, когнитивного контроля и политического воздействия в условиях современных авторитарных систем, массовой коммуникации, идеологической пропаганды и скрытого социального влияния сегодня.*

Ключевые слова *Икона, индекс, символ, эвфемизм, лингвопрагматика, семиотика, идеологический дискурс, тоталитарный язык, «1984»*

Introduction

Modern linguistics increasingly interprets euphemism not only as a stylistic or lexical phenomenon but also as a pragmatic and ideological instrument embedded in discourse practices. Contemporary studies in pragmatics and discourse analysis demonstrate that euphemistic expressions perform various communicative functions, including mitigation, concealment, manipulation, and ideological framing (Allan & Burridge, 1991). In political and totalitarian discourse especially, euphemisms become mechanisms through which power structures reconstruct social reality and regulate collective consciousness.

Within semiotic theory, Charles Sanders Peirce's triadic classification of signs – icon, index, and symbol – provides an important methodological framework for understanding how meaning is constructed in discourse (Peirce, 1931-1958). Peirce argues that signs establish meaning through resemblance, existential relation, or convention. "This classification becomes particularly productive in analyzing euphemistic discourse because euphemisms frequently operate through indirectness, metaphorical substitution, and semantic transformation (Chandler, 2017)."

George Orwell's "1984" remains one of the most significant literary representations of ideological language manipulation. Orwell demonstrates how political authority reshapes reality through linguistic control, especially through Newspeak and institutional euphemisms. Expressions such as "Ministry of Love" or "Big Brother" exemplify how language may disguise oppression under positive semantic forms.

The present article examines the linguopragmatic functions of icon, index, and symbol in euphemistic discourse using Orwell's "1984" as analytical material. The study seeks to determine how these semiotic categories contribute to ideological manipulation and

pragmatic control in totalitarian communication.

Literature review

The theoretical foundation of euphemism studies was significantly developed by Allan and Burridge (Allan & Burridge, 1991), who describe euphemism as a linguistic shield used to mitigate socially unpleasant realities. Later, Allan and Burridge expanded this perspective by emphasizing the relationship between taboo, censorship, and social power.

From a pragmatic perspective, Levinson (Levinson, 1983) and Yule (Yule, 1996) argue that meaning in discourse is strongly dependent on contextual interpretation and communicative intention. "Euphemisms therefore function not only semantically but also pragmatically by shaping hearers' perception of reality (Morris, 1938)."

Semiotic approaches to language originate mainly from Peirce's theory of signs. "Peirce conceptualizes (Peirce, 1931-1958), iconic signs as meaning-producing structures grounded in perceptual similarity between sign and referent." Eco (Eco, 1976) further explains that symbolic systems become especially powerful in ideological communication because their meanings are socially institutionalized.

Critical discourse theorists such as Fairclough (Fairclough, 2015) and van Dijk (van Dijk, 1998) emphasize that language is deeply connected to structures of power and ideology. Political discourse frequently manipulates lexical choices in order to legitimize domination and suppress resistance. Fowler (Fowler, 1991) similarly notes that institutional language often disguises violence through neutral or positive terminology.

Although numerous studies have examined euphemism and ideology separately, fewer investigations have integrated Peirce's semiotic triad into linguopragmatic analysis of euphemistic discourse. This study addresses that gap by examining how icon, index, and

symbol collectively function in Orwell's totalitarian linguistic model.

Methodology

The study employs qualitative discourse analysis combined with semiotic and linguopragmatic approaches. The primary material consists of selected euphemistic expressions from George Orwell's "1984". The analysis focuses on lexical units that demonstrate ideological manipulation through indirect semantic representation.

- The methodological framework is based on:
- Peirce's semiotic classification of signs;
- Pragmatic theories of meaning and implication;
- Critical discourse analysis of ideological language.

The selected euphemisms were categorized according to their dominant semiotic function:

- Iconic euphemisms;
- Indexical euphemisms;
- Symbolic euphemisms.

Each lexical unit was analyzed according to:

- semantic structure;
- contextual meaning;
- pragmatic effect;
- ideological function.

Comparative interpretation was applied to determine how these categories interact within totalitarian discourse.

Results

The analysis demonstrates that Orwell's euphemistic expressions function through a complex interaction of icon, index, and symbol.

Iconic Functions in Euphemistic Discourse. The expression "Big Brother" operates primarily through iconic association. The lexical unit "brother" evokes positive associations such as protection, intimacy, and care. However, within the novel's context, the phrase symbolizes surveillance and authoritarian domination.

The iconic mechanism performs several pragmatically important functions:

- mitigation of fear;

- emotional normalization of control;
- reduction of psychological resistance.

Thus, the totalitarian state appears as a protective familial structure rather than a repressive institution.

Indexical Functions and Concealment. The euphemism "vaporized" demonstrates indexical functioning. The term does not directly mention execution or murder but indirectly points to disappearance and erasure from existence.

Its pragmatic functions include:

- concealment of violence;
- indirect transmission of fear;
- creation of ambiguity.

Indexical euphemisms are especially effective in authoritarian discourse because they simultaneously hide and imply political terror.

Symbolic Functions and Ideological Recoding. Expressions such as "Ministry of Love," "Ministry of Peace" and "Joycamp" function predominantly as symbolic euphemisms. Their meanings are established through ideological convention rather than resemblance or existential relation. For example: "Ministry of Love" refers to torture and punishment; "Ministry of Peace" manages warfare; "Joycamp" designates forced labor camps. These expressions reconstruct reality through semantic inversion. Positive lexical forms conceal oppressive institutional functions.

Discussion

The findings indicate that euphemistic discourse in "1984" cannot be explained through purely lexical analysis. Instead, euphemisms operate as semiotic-pragmatic mechanisms deeply connected with ideology and power.

Iconic euphemisms create emotional familiarity that legitimizes domination. Indexical euphemisms produce ambiguity and indirect fear, preventing explicit confrontation with violence. "Symbolic euphemisms completely reconstruct social reality through ideological convention (Saussure, 1916)."

Importantly, these categories do not function independently. Orwell's discourse demonstrates their integrative interaction. For instance, "Big Brother is watching you" simultaneously contains:

- Iconic familiarity ("Brother");
- Indexical surveillance ("watching");
- Symbolic authority ("Big Brother" as state ideology).

This interaction creates a highly manipulative linguistic structure capable of influencing cognition and collective perception.

The study confirms Fairclough's assertion (Fairclough, 2015) that language is inseparable from power relations. It also supports van Dijk's argument (van Dijk, 1998) that ideology is reproduced through discourse structures rather than direct coercion alone.

Conclusion

The present study demonstrates that Charles Sanders Peirce's semiotic triad of icon, index, and symbol offers a highly productive theoretical framework for the linguopragmatic analysis of euphemistic discourse in ideological and political contexts. The analysis of George Orwell's "1984" reveals that euphemisms in totalitarian discourse are not accidental stylistic substitutions, but deliberate communicative strategies designed to manipulate perception, regulate interpretation, and maintain ideological dominance. Through euphemistic language, political power structures are able to reshape social reality and influence collective consciousness in subtle yet highly effective ways.

The findings indicate that iconic euphemisms primarily function through emotional association and semantic mitigation. By employing familiar and psychologically comforting images, such as "Big Brother," totalitarian discourse disguises surveillance and repression under the appearance of protection, unity, and care. This mechanism reduces psychological resistance and normalizes authoritarian control within public consciousness. Indexical euphemisms, on the

other hand, operate through indirect reference and pragmatic ambiguity. Expressions such as "vaporized" conceal political violence while simultaneously implying fear, disappearance, and punishment. Such forms of indirectness create uncertainty and silence, which are essential components of ideological control. Symbolic euphemisms demonstrate the strongest manipulative potential because they reconstruct reality through socially accepted semantic conventions. Institutional expressions such as "Ministry of Love" or "Ministry of Peace" completely invert the relationship between sign and reality, transforming oppression into apparent legitimacy through linguistic recoding.

An important conclusion of this research is that icon, index, and symbol rarely function independently in political discourse. Instead, they interact dynamically and form an integrated semiotic-pragmatic mechanism. Orwell's discourse illustrates how emotional imagery, indirect implication, and ideological symbolism combine to produce persuasive and manipulative communicative effects. This interaction enables totalitarian language not only to hide reality but also to replace it with an ideologically constructed version of truth (Sebeok, 2001). Consequently, language becomes an instrument of cognitive domination capable of shaping how individuals perceive power, morality, and social order.

The study also confirms the close relationship between language, ideology, and social power emphasized in critical discourse analysis. Euphemistic discourse functions as a mechanism of legitimization through which political systems normalize violence, censorship, and surveillance. In this sense, Orwell's "1984" remains highly relevant for contemporary linguistic and sociopolitical studies because many modern political and media discourses continue to employ euphemistic strategies to manipulate public opinion. Terms associated with military intervention, political censorship, economic crisis, or digital surveillance frequently

demonstrate similar semiotic and pragmatic mechanisms in modern communication.

Furthermore, the research highlights the significance of interdisciplinary approaches in contemporary linguistics. The integration of semiotics, pragmatics, discourse analysis, and ideological criticism allows for a deeper understanding of how meaning is strategically constructed in communication. Such an approach broadens the methodological possibilities of linguopragmatic studies and contributes to the development of critical language awareness.

Finally, the study suggests several directions for future research. Similar analyses may be conducted on modern political

speeches, media narratives, advertising discourse, and digital propaganda systems. Comparative studies involving different languages and cultural contexts may also reveal how euphemistic mechanisms vary across sociolinguistic environments. In addition, future research may explore the role of euphemisms in artificial intelligence communication, social media manipulation, and algorithmically controlled information systems. Therefore, the linguopragmatic investigation of euphemistic discourse remains an important and перспективный field for understanding the relationship between language, ideology, and power in contemporary society.

References:

1. Allan, K., & Burridge, K. (1991). *Euphemism and dysphemism: Language used as shield and weapon*. Oxford University Press.
2. Allan, K., & Burridge, K. (2006). *Forbidden words: Taboo and the censoring of language*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Chandler, D. (2017). *Semiotics: The basics* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
4. Eco, U. (1976). *A theory of semiotics*. Indiana University Press.
5. Fairclough, N. (2015). *Language and power* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
6. Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. Routledge.
7. Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
8. Morris, C. (1938). *Foundations of the theory of signs*. University of Chicago Press.
9. Orwell, G. (1949). *Nineteen eighty-four*. Secker & Warburg.
10. Peirce, C. S. (1931–1958). *Collected papers of Charles Sanders Peirce*. Vols. 1-8. Harvard University Press.
11. Saussure, F. de. (1916). *Cours de linguistique générale*. Payot.
12. Sebeok, T. A. (2001). *Signs: An introduction to semiotics* (2nd ed.). University of Toronto Press.
13. van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage Publications.
14. Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.