



## RESEARCH ARTICLE

# A Linguistic Study of Euphemism and Dysphemism in Lois Lowry's *The Giver* and George Orwell's *Animal Farm*

**Fajar Duriat<sup>1</sup>,**  
*Indraprasta PGRI University Jakarta*  
**Mashadi Said<sup>2</sup>,**  
*Indraprasta PGRI University Jakarta*  
**Supadi<sup>3</sup>,**  
*Indraprasta PGRI University Jakarta*

*e-mail:* [fduriat@gmail.com](mailto:fduriat@gmail.com)

*e-mail:* [mashadi.said@unindra.ac.id](mailto:mashadi.said@unindra.ac.id)

*e-mail:* [supadi@unindra.ac.id](mailto:supadi@unindra.ac.id)

**Abstract:** This study investigates the use of euphemisms and dysphemisms in Lois Lowry's *The Giver* and George Orwell's *Animal Farm* within the framework of Politeness Theory, focusing on how these linguistic strategies influence societal norms and individual roles. This research employs a descriptive qualitative method, which focuses on the detailed analysis and interpretation of textual data. The results demonstrate that euphemisms align with negative politeness and off record strategies to obscure unpleasant truths, while dysphemisms correspond with bald on record strategies to directly attack and discredit. Both novels strategically employ euphemisms to soften harsh realities and maintain societal control, while dysphemisms are used to stigmatize opposition and reinforce authority. The implication of this study is that it highlights how language shapes reality, enabling students to critically analyze linguistic manipulation. Moreover, by examining euphemisms and dysphemisms in *The Giver* and *Animal Farm*, students gain insights into control, power, and oppression, while exploring the connection between language and societal critique in dystopian literature.

**Keywords:** *dystopian literature; societal control; language manipulation; authoritarian systems.*

## Studi Linguistik tentang Eufemisme dan Disfemisme dalam Novel *The Giver* Karya Lois Lowry dan *Animal Farm* Karya George Orwell

**Abstrak:** Penelitian ini mengkaji penggunaan eufemisme dan disfemisme dalam novel *The Giver* karya Lois Lowry dan *Animal Farm* karya George Orwell menggunakan kerangka Teori Kesantunan, dengan fokus pada bagaimana strategi linguistik ini mempengaruhi norma masyarakat dan peran individu. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif deskriptif, yang berfokus pada analisis dan interpretasi data tekstual secara mendetail. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa eufemisme sejalan dengan strategi kesantunan negatif dan strategi tidak langsung untuk menyamarkan kebenaran yang tidak menyenangkan, sedangkan disfemisme sesuai dengan strategi langsung tanpa tedeng aling-alang untuk menyerang dan

mendiskreditkan secara terbuka. Kedua novel ini secara strategis menggunakan eufemisme untuk melembutkan realitas yang keras dan mempertahankan kontrol masyarakat, sementara disfemisme digunakan untuk menstigmatisasi oposisi dan memperkuat otoritas. Implikasi dari penelitian ini adalah bahwa studi ini menyoroti bagaimana bahasa membentuk realitas, memungkinkan siswa untuk menganalisis manipulasi linguistik secara kritis. Selain itu, dengan meneliti eufemisme dan disfemisme dalam *The Giver* dan *Animal Farm*, siswa memperoleh wawasan tentang kontrol, kekuasaan, dan penindasan, sambil mengeksplorasi hubungan antara bahasa dan kritik masyarakat dalam sastra dystopia.

**Kata kunci:** *sastra distopia; kontrol masyarakat; manipulasi bahasa; sistem otoriter.*

---

## Introduction

Language plays a foundational role in literature, not merely as a tool for communication but as the medium through which authors craft narratives, evoke emotions, and express complex ideas. Literature encompasses a variety of forms, including fiction, poetry, drama, and essays, and serves as a reflection of cultural, social, and historical realities. It also fulfils important purposes such as providing entertainment, education, and a means of examining human nature. As Smith and Jacobsen (2022) highlight, literature is a powerful medium for understanding the intricacies of human society, while Alfarhan (2024) adds that it reflects an author's perspectives and interpretations of the world, often through the use of creative and symbolic language.

Literature, therefore, is not limited to storytelling or imagination but emerges as the product of an author's profound engagement with their reality. Through its fictional dimensions, literature provides a deeper understanding of life and human behavior by exploring the layers of meaning that go beyond surface-level depictions of reality. Literary works are a creative manifestation of ideas, crafted to explore feelings, ideologies, and moral dilemmas that may otherwise be difficult to articulate. As a result, every work of literature is unique, demonstrating the author's distinctive creativity and vision.

An essential aspect of literary creation is the complex use of language. Language in literature goes beyond communication as it serves as a canvas for authors to construct fictional worlds, develop multidimensional characters, and express deep emotions and themes. According to Noletto (2024), language in literary works is not only a means of narration but also a tool to evoke aesthetic effects, move readers emotionally, and build complex fictional worlds. Authors skillfully manipulate language, selecting words, employing rhetorical devices, and crafting distinctive styles to create immersive and impactful narratives.

Euphemisms and dysphemisms are two linguistic devices often employed in literature to achieve specific effects. Euphemisms soften harsh realities or taboo subjects, creating a more pleasant or acceptable tone. For instance, phrases like "passed away" instead of "died" can evoke empathy and mitigate discomfort. In contrast, dysphemisms use harsher, more provocative language to amplify tension, highlight conflict, or evoke strong emotional reactions from readers. These kinds of linguistic strategies not only shape the narrative tone but also influence how readers perceive and respond to the text.

The use of euphemisms and dysphemisms is particularly significant in dystopian literature, where language often serves as a tool of social control and commentary. In Lois Lowry's *The Giver* and George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, euphemisms mask brutal or oppressive societal practices, while dysphemisms reveal underlying tensions and conflicts. For example, in *The Giver*, the term "release" is a euphemism for euthanasia, a term used to maintain societal decorum and avoid confronting the harsh reality of the act (Green, 2021). Similarly, in *Animal Farm*, dysphemisms are utilized to convey dissatisfaction and resistance against oppressive systems, exposing the cruelty of social hierarchies

(Iswara, 2020). These linguistic choices are not incidental; they are deliberately employed to manipulate social attitudes, control perceptions, and convey deeper thematic messages.

As Miller (2022) states, the study of euphemisms and dysphemisms offers valuable insights into how language shapes societal norms and power dynamics. In *The Giver* and *Animal Farm*, these devices play a key role in constructing dystopian worlds and exploring the psychological and social impacts of language on individuals and communities. Euphemisms often conceal the harsh realities of totalitarian control, fostering a false harmony, while dysphemisms intensify opposition and highlight societal flaws. Together, they contribute to a richer, more complex narrative that challenges readers to critically examine the world within and beyond the text.

This research seeks to analyze the use of euphemisms and dysphemisms in *The Giver* and *Animal Farm*, focusing on their narrative, thematic, and sociolinguistic implications. By exploring how these linguistic strategies are used to shape character dynamics, social settings, and reader perceptions, this research aims to uncover the complex relationship between language, power, and social control in dystopian literature. As Thompson (2019) emphasizes, the language choices made by authors not only define the aesthetic and emotional impact of a literary work but also guide readers' moral and intellectual engagement with the underlying themes.

The findings of this analysis are expected to contribute to the broader fields of linguistics and literary studies, particularly in the areas of stylistics and pragmatics. By focusing on the relationship between language and social structures in *The Giver* and *Animal Farm*, this research aims to deepen our understanding of how authors use language to navigate complex themes such as conformity, resistance, and the human condition. Furthermore, it highlights the importance of linguistic analysis in revealing the layered meanings and messages embedded in literary texts, offering new perspectives on the role of language in shaping both narrative and societal discourse.

The study is guided by the following research questions:

1. How are euphemisms and dysphemisms used in *The Giver* and *Animal Farm* to influence the perception of societal norms and individual roles?
2. How is the use of euphemism and dysphemism in *The Giver* and *Animal Farm* examined from the framework of Politeness Theory?
3. How are euphemism and dysphemism in *The Giver* compared to *Animal Farm*?

This research provides useful insights into the complex relationship between language and power in literature, with a particular emphasis on dystopian fiction. It aims to improve our understanding of how authors utilize euphemism and dysphemism to affect the reader's perception of narrative, characters, and overall themes.

Euphemisms are frequently used to cover difficult facts or soften harsh realities, thereby harmonizing with the power structures represented in dystopian civilizations. Dysphemisms, on the other hand, expose harsh, unpleasant facts that force both characters and viewers to confront the story's more troubling parts. This research aims to highlight the impact of these language strategies on the reader's emotional response, moral judgments, and interpretation of key themes, with the main goal of advancing further academic discussions on how language shapes stories and influences ideas in literature.

## **Research Method**

This research employs a descriptive qualitative methodology to analyze euphemisms and dysphemisms in Lois Lowry's *The Giver* and George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, with a specific focus on their role in shaping societal norms, individual roles, and power dynamics within the context of dystopian societies. Descriptive qualitative research emphasizes in-depth understanding and interpretation rather than numerical data. The goal is to uncover the underlying meanings, functions, and implications behind linguistic phenomena, providing a nuanced view of how language influences social structures and individual consciousness (Ardyan, 2023). In this research, the novels were

systematically analyzed by identifying, recording, and categorizing examples of euphemisms and dysphemisms based on their linguistic characteristics and the social functions they serve within the narrative. Using Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis framework, the research identified recurring patterns of language use and refined these findings through a comparative method. This ensured consistency and allowed for a deeper understanding of how euphemisms and dysphemisms contribute to the representation of power, control, and social manipulation in both texts. The findings were then organized into clear tables, providing a visual representation of the data, and synthesized into a comprehensive report that outlines the central themes of the study.

The thematic analysis revealed that euphemisms, such as "release" in *The Giver*, and dysphemisms, like "comrade" in *Animal Farm*, serve not only as linguistic devices but also as strategic tools for controlling societal perceptions, shaping individual roles, and maintaining power structures. In *The Giver*, euphemisms obscure the community's brutal practices and facilitate emotional detachment, thereby enforcing a conformist, morally neutral society. In *Animal Farm*, the use of dysphemisms, particularly in the manipulation of political language, reinforces the power of the ruling elite while oppressing the working class. By drawing parallels between these two novels, the research highlights the different ways in which language can be used to suppress dissent, regulate behavior, and preserve the status quo in dystopian contexts.

## Results and Discussion

This research analyzes the use of euphemisms and dysphemisms in Lois Lowry's *The Giver* and George Orwell's *Animal Farm* to uncover their nuanced impact on societal norms, individual roles, and the power dynamics that shape their respective dystopian worlds. By anchoring the discussion within Brown and Levinson's (1987) Politeness Theory, the research explores how these linguistic devices serve as tools for shaping perception, softening or intensifying face-threatening acts (FTAs), and reinforcing hierarchical structures. Euphemisms are investigated as mechanisms for masking harsh realities or controlling public sentiment, while dysphemisms are analyzed for their role in vilifying dissent or consolidating power. Furthermore, a comparative analysis illuminates the contrasting ways in which these devices are strategically employed in the two novels to maintain societal control, reveal ideological conflicts, and influence characters' relationships with authority. The study ultimately gives insight on the wider implications of euphemistic and dysphemistic language in literature and its reflection of real-world social and political dynamics.

In *The Giver*, euphemisms play a significant role in shaping societal norms and regulating individual behavior, ultimately fostering a sense of conformity and emotional detachment within the community. By disguising the true nature of certain practices, euphemisms help to maintain control over the populace, ensuring that people obey the community's rigid expectations without questioning its morality. One of the most powerful examples of this linguistic manipulation is the term "release," which is used to mask the horrific practice of euthanasia. In the context of the novel, "release" is presented as a serene and acceptable transition, without any emotional confusion. The community encourages its members to view it as a necessary and peaceful act, disconnected from any notion of death or violence.

This euphemism is evident in Jonas's initial wonder: "What happens when they make the actual release? Where exactly did Roberto go?" (Chapter 4, p. 32). Jonas's confusion here illustrates the community's careful construction of language that keeps its community unaware of the truth behind the practice. In the early stages of the novel, Jonas's innocence allows him to accept the euphemism without question, as it aligns with the society's emphasis on emotional detachment and collective harmony.

However, as the narrative unfolds, Jonas's exposure to the true nature of release forces him to confront the brutal reality concealed beneath the euphemism. This shift is clearly demonstrated when Jonas witnesses the euthanasia of an infant: "He killed it! My father killed it!" (Chapter 19, p. 150). This moment of intense revelation marks a profound turning point for Jonas, shattering his prior understanding

of the world and exposing the deep moral failures embedded in the community's use of language. The euphemism "release" now stands in sharp contrast to the act of killing that it conceals, and Jonas's horror signifies the collapse of the illusion that the community has carefully built around this term.

In this context, the euphemism serves not only as a tool of psychological manipulation but also as a mechanism for maintaining control over individuals' emotions and ethical judgment. The community's avoidance of moral and emotional conflict through language enables it to continue its practice of euthanasia without provoking resistance or guilt. Ultimately, this highlights the chilling power of language in *The Giver*, where euphemisms function as a means to suppress individual values, sanitize morally shameful actions, and preserve the emotional numbness that the society strives to foster. Through Jonas's journey, Lowry critiques the dehumanizing effects of language that seeks to distort reality and silence ethical questioning.

Similarly, the term "nurturer" shows a duality, simultaneously evoking the comforting image of caregivers devoted to the well-being of infants while hiding their darker responsibility of deciding the fates of those under their care. In *The Giver*, nurturers are portrayed as compassionate individuals who feed, bathe, and tend to the needs of the youngest members of society, fostering an image of kindness and dedication. However, beneath this disguise, lies a grim reality where nurturers are also charged with the task of deciding which infants will live and which will be subjected to "release." This obvious contrast between the term's connotations and the reality of the role underscores the community's use of euphemistic language to obscure the ethical implications of its practices.

Jonas's father demonstrates this duality when he explains the process of deciding an infant's fate and says: "I'll have to select the one to be nurtured and the one to be released. It's usually not hard, though" (Chapter 14, p. 114). The firm tone in this statement reveals how the community has normalized such decisions. By framing the act of euthanizing an infant as a routine duty, the euphemism "nurturer" protects individuals from confronting the moral weight of their actions. Instead, it reinforces the community's domination on uniformity and collective efficiency, where individual worth is minor to societal goals.

The euphemism "nurturer" also reflects the community's prioritization of emotional detachment. By assigning a seemingly kind role that involves life-and-death decisions, the society ensures that its members keep away from the emotional and moral consequences of their actions. The linguistic framing not only suppresses ethical questioning but also maintains the illusion of a harmonious society where even the most severe actions are rationalized as necessary for the greater good.

This duality becomes particularly impactful as Jonas begins to uncover the truth about his community. His realization that nurturers, including his own father, are involved in the act of release shatters his perception of the society's values and the integrity of its language. Through this disclosure, Lowry critiques the manipulative power of euphemistic language, illustrating how terms like "nurturer" can obscure the inhumane aspects of societal systems and perpetuate practices that prioritize uniformity and control over compassion and individual humanity. In this way, the term "nurturer" serves as an affecting example of how language can comfort and deceive, enabling dystopian societies to maintain their oppressive structures while suppressing dissent.

"Elsewhere," another critical euphemism in *The Giver*, plays a varied role in shaping the community's perceptions of death and life beyond its boundaries. As an unclear and ambiguous term, "elsewhere" serves to obscure the harsh realities of death while maintaining the illusion of a peaceful and harmonious society. For example, it is stated: "Those who were released, even as new children, were sent Elsewhere and never returned to the community" (Chapter 6, p. 43). This description, devoid of any emotional or graphic detail, ensures that citizens, particularly children, remain detached from the true nature of "release," perceiving it as a kind transition rather than the act of euthanasia it truly represents.

The euphemism's ambiguity is instrumental in sustaining the community's emotional detachment and compliance. By framing death as a journey to an undefined yet seemingly positive destination, "elsewhere" shields citizens from confronting the moral implications of their actions and

those sanctioned by the society. This sanitized portrayal of death supports the community's broader effort to suppress individuality and ethical reflection, reinforcing the collective acceptance of its rigid and controlled way of life.

For Jonas, the meaning of "elsewhere" evolves as he begins to uncover the truth about the community's practices. Initially, like others, he views "elsewhere" as a mysterious but innocuous place. However, as he learns more about the true nature of "release" and the community's oppressive control, "elsewhere" takes on a new significance. It becomes a symbol of hope, freedom, and the possibility of a life unbound by the constraints of his society. This shift is evident when Jonas states, "If you get beyond, if you get to Elsewhere, it will mean that the community has to bear the burden themselves" (Chapter 20, p. 155). Here, "elsewhere" represents not just a physical escape but a broader metaphor for self-determination and the rejection of an oppressive system.

Through the euphemism "elsewhere," The Giver critiques the power of language to both obscure truth and inspire liberation. For the community, it is a tool of manipulation that masks the realities of death and maintains emotional detachment. For Jonas, however, it transforms into a beacon of possibility, symbolizing his growing awareness and desire to challenge the societal norms that constrain him. This duality reflects the profound impact of language on perception and underscores its central role in both maintaining control and inspiring resistance within dystopian settings.

In *Animal Farm*, the use of both euphemisms and dysphemisms reveals how language is weaponized to manipulate perceptions, enforce societal norms, and consolidate the pigs' authoritarian rule. Euphemisms like "readjustment of rations" and "re-education committee" are particularly effective in obscuring the pigs' exploitative practices, framing them instead as necessary and kind actions to maintain the farm's stability.

For example, Squealer's declaration, "For the time being, certainly, it had been found necessary to make a readjustment of rations" (Chapter 9, p. 112), reframes food shortages caused by the pigs' greed and mismanagement as sacrifices essential for the collective good. By using the term "readjustment" instead of "reduction" or "deprivation," the pigs minimize the severity of the issue by blaming others and fostering a perception of fairness. This euphemism not only masks the growing inequality on the farm but also discourages dissent by creating an illusion of shared sacrifice.

Similarly, the "re-education committee," introduced under the guise of integrating wild animals and fostering unity, masks its true purpose of indoctrinating dissenters and enforcing loyalty. The committee is presented as one of many initiatives apparently aimed at improving the lives of all animals: "He formed the Egg Production Committee for the hens, Re-education Committee and various others" (Chapter 3, p. 32). These committees, while seemingly progressive and inclusive, are tools of propaganda that serve to normalize the pigs' control over every aspect of life on the farm. By framing indoctrination as education and loyalty-building, the pigs further establish their authority while suppressing opposition under the illusion of community improvement.

These euphemisms reflect the pigs' reliance on manipulation to maintain their dominance. They sanitize exploitative and oppressive actions, ensuring that the other animals view them as necessary, even beneficial, rather than as signs of deepening inequality. This linguistic strategy, combined with the aggressive use of dysphemisms to discredit dissenters, highlights the dual approach used in *Animal Farm* to consolidate power. Through euphemistic masking, the pigs control perception and minimize resistance, reinforcing their position as leaders while maintaining systemic exploitation.

Dysphemisms in *Animal Farm* serve as powerful instruments of fear and control, reflecting the pigs' overtly aggressive tactics to maintain authority and suppress dissent. These terms are deliberately chosen to discredit opponents, discredit potential threats, and instill a sense of fear among the animals, ensuring their compliance and loyalty.

The term "traitor" is one of the most frequently weaponized dysphemisms in the pigs' arsenal. It is strategically used to tarnish Snowball's reputation and delegitimize his influence. For instance, Napoleon declares, "Snowball has sold himself to Frederick of Pinchfield farm" (Chapter

7, p. 78), framing him as a collaborator with the enemy. This accusation serves multiple purposes, where it discredits Snowball, shifts blame for any misfortunes onto him, and diverts attention from the pigs' own failings. The term "traitor" also acts as a psychological deterrent, warning other animals of the severe consequences of disloyalty and rebellion. By labeling Snowball a traitor, the pigs justify their authoritarian actions and silence any dissent under the guise of protecting the collective good.

Similarly, the term "knacker" becomes a frightening symbol of betrayal and exploitation, illustrated by Boxer's tragic fate. Boxer, who represents unwavering loyalty and hard work, is eventually sold to the knacker when he can no longer contribute to the farm's labor. This betrayal is unveiled in the desperate cry, "Do you not understand what that means? They are taking Boxer to the 'knackers'!" (Chapter 9, p. 122). The use of "knacker" here underscores the brutal reality of the regime's utilitarian approach: individuals are valued solely for their productivity, and their loyalty is met with exploitation and disposal once they are no longer useful. Boxer's fate serves as a clear reminder to the other animals of their own risky positions, reinforcing fear and obedience.

Together, these dysphemisms reflect the pigs' reliance on intimidation and dehumanization to consolidate their power. By labeling dissenters as "traitors" and evoking the unuseful individual as "knacker," the pigs create a culture of fear that suppresses resistance and justifies their oppressive rule. The clear contrast between euphemisms, which obscure exploitation, and dysphemisms, which enforce it through fear and aggression, highlights the manipulation of language in *Animal Farm*. This dual strategy ensures the pigs' unchallenged dominance, portraying opposition as treachery and submission as the only possible path for survival.

Brown and Levinson's Politeness Theory offers a valuable framework for examining how euphemisms and dysphemisms function in *The Giver* and *Animal Farm* to manage face-threatening acts (FTAs) and reinforce social order. According to the theory, individuals use politeness strategies to navigate social interactions and mitigate potential threats to the "face, the public self-image of themselves or others. In the context of these novels, euphemisms serve as positive politeness strategies, softening harsh realities and maintaining harmony, while dysphemisms function as negative politeness or even face-threatening strategies, intensifying discord or reinforcing authority.

In *The Giver*, euphemisms like "release" mitigate the impact of the act of euthanasia, shielding individuals from confronting its moral implications and allowing the society to maintain its facade of peace and order. For example, the term "release" reframes death as a dignified transition, preserving the community's collective face by avoiding the discomfort of addressing the reality of killing. This linguistic choice aligns with the politeness strategy of minimizing FTAs, as it avoids directly threatening the moral or emotional face of community members, including those responsible for carrying out the act. By employing such euphemisms, the society upholds its principles of uniformity and emotional detachment, suppressing dissent and ethical reflection.

Conversely, in *Animal Farm*, dysphemisms are strategically employed to delegitimize enemies and consolidate power. Terms like "traitor" and "enemy of the farm" serve as face-threatening language aimed at discrediting individuals who challenge the ruling authority. These dysphemisms intensify FTAs, framing dissenters as threats to the collective well-being of the animals. For instance, when Snowball is labeled a "traitor" after his expulsion, the term not only erodes his credibility but also reinforces Napoleon's dominance by presenting opposition as harmful. In this way, dysphemisms are used to manage social order by rallying the animals around a shared enemy, diverting attention from the leadership's failures.

Through the lens of Politeness Theory, both novels demonstrate how language can be used as a tool to navigate power dynamics and maintain control. Euphemisms in *The Giver* act as a buffer, minimizing FTAs and sustaining the community's illusion of moral integrity, while dysphemisms in *Animal Farm* function as a weapon to enforce compliance and suppress rebellion. By managing face-threatening acts, these linguistic devices shape interpersonal relationships and societal structures, ultimately revealing the critical role of language in sustaining dystopian power systems.

The use of euphemisms and dysphemisms in *The Giver* and *Animal Farm* differs significantly, reflecting the distinct mechanisms of societal control employed in each narrative. In *The Giver*, euphemisms dominate the linguistic landscape, aligning with a covert strategy of control designed to suppress individuality and ethical questioning through the use of sanitized and emotionally neutral language. Terms such as "release," "nurturer," and "elsewhere" exemplify this approach, creating an illusion of harmony and compliance by obscuring the harsh realities they represent. For instance, "release" reframes the act of euthanasia as a peaceful and dignified process, shielding individuals from the moral implications of the practice. Similarly, "nurturer" suggests a role of compassion and care while concealing the darker responsibility of determining which infants are deemed fit to live. The term "elsewhere" furthers this strategy by offering a vague, idealized destination that masks the absence of freedom or true choice in the society.

This reliance on euphemisms aligns closely with Brown and Levinson's concept of negative politeness strategies, which seek to minimize conflict and avoid overt confrontation. By employing euphemistic language, the society in *The Giver* fosters emotional detachment, suppressing the natural human response to ethical dilemmas and ensuring passive compliance. The sanitization of language serves to maintain order and discourage resistance, as the true nature of societal practices is hidden behind words that imply harmony and benevolence. This strategy reflects the community's emphasis on uniformity and its rejection of individual autonomy, using language as a tool to enforce collective control while suppressing dissent.

In contrast, *Animal Farm* employs a strategic balance of euphemisms and dysphemisms, with a more significant role to enforce power and control. Euphemisms, such as "re-education committee," serve to obscure harsh realities like indoctrination and manipulation by presenting them in a kind and procedural way. This softens the perception of forcible practices and makes them appear necessary or even morally correct for the collective good. Meanwhile, dysphemisms such as "traitor" and "knacker" are employed to provoke fear and ensure loyalty. These terms are weaponized to dehumanize dissenters and highlight the consequences of disobedience, creating an environment where opposition to the regime is similar to betrayal.

The dysphemisms in *Animal Farm* align with Bald on Record politeness tactics, which prioritize directness, confrontation, and intimidation to maintain authority. While *The Giver* relies on sanitized language to suppress ethical questioning and ensure compliance, *Animal Farm* leverages overt propaganda and fear-mongering to consolidate power and manipulate collective behavior. Together, these linguistic strategies reflect the differing methods of societal control in each dystopian setting, with *The Giver* embodying an understated psychological manipulation and *Animal Farm* emphasizing direct authoritarianism.

**Table 1** Comparison of the use of euphemism and dysphemism in *The Giver* and *Animal Farm* novels

Aspects		The Giver	Animal Farm
Dominant linguistic tools	Euphemism		Dysphemism.
Purpose of euphemism	Mask harsh realities and maintain harmony and suppress individuality.		Conceal systemic exploitation and justify oppression as well as create a facade of fairness.
Examples of euphemism	release, elsewhere, nurturer.		re-education committee, readjustment of rations
Purpose of dysphemism	Stigmatize natural emotions.		Stigmatize opposition and instill fear and reinforce loyalty through hostility.
Examples of dysphemism	stirrings.		traitor, sold himself to, knacker.
Politeness Theory Alignment	Negative Politeness (softens harsh realities, avoids direct confrontation).		Bald on Record (directly attacks opposition, uses confrontational language).
Method of Control	Emotional suppression and maintaining social harmony.		Division, fear, and intimidation to consolidate power.

## Conclusions

Euphemisms and dysphemisms play a pivotal role in shaping societal norms, defining individual roles, and influencing perceptions of power in Lois Lowry's *The Giver* and George Orwell's *Animal Farm*. These linguistic tools are employed differently in each narrative, reflecting their distinct methods of societal control.

In *The Giver*, euphemisms dominate the society's language, sanitizing oppressive acts to maintain a harmonious and orderly facade. Terms such as "release" (a euphemism for euthanasia), "nurturer" (a caregiver tasked with deciding infants' fates), and "elsewhere" (an unclear reference to death or exile) obscure harsh realities, allowing the community to suppress individuality and ethical questioning. These euphemisms align with Negative Politeness strategies, which aim to minimize emotional impact, avoid direct confrontation with uncomfortable truths, and foster compliance. By reframing ethically troubling practices in neutral or positive terms, the society ensures its members remain emotionally detached and involved in the continuation of its rules.

Jonas's gradual realization of the true meanings behind these euphemisms exposes the manipulative power of language in *The Giver*. For instance, his reaction to witnessing an infant's "release" reveals the extent of this manipulation: "He killed it! My father killed it!" (Chapter 19). This moment is a turning point, highlighting how euphemisms like "release" have desensitized individuals, even those carrying out these acts, to the natural brutality in the community's practices. The discovery shatters Jonas's trust in the societal structure, prompting him to question the moral foundations of his world and ultimately reject its values.

Through this reliance on euphemistic language, *The Giver* critiques the ways in which oppressive societies use linguistic manipulation to maintain control. By presenting actions like euthanasia and exile in sanitized terms, the society avoids moral confrontation and ensures that its members remain obedient and compliant, prioritizing uniformity over individual autonomy or ethical reflection. This contrasts sharply with the more aggressive use of language seen in *Animal Farm*, where dysphemisms dominate, emphasizing overt propaganda and fear-mongering to consolidate power. Together, these novels demonstrate the profound impact of linguistic choices on shaping societal perceptions and maintaining authority.

Dysphemisms, though less prominent in *The Giver*, play a subtle yet significant role in shaping societal norms by stigmatizing natural human emotions and reinforcing conformity. For instance, the term "stirrings" is used to pathologize natural sexual desires, framing them as undesirable impulses that must be suppressed through daily medication. This dysphemistic labeling devalues individuality and fosters emotional repression, aligning with the community's broader goal of eliminating personal connections and maintaining collective uniformity. By stigmatizing these natural emotions, the society ensures emotional detachment and suppresses any potential for rebellion or deviation from its rigid structure.

On the other hand, *Animal Farm* employs a more overt and aggressive mix of euphemisms and dysphemisms to consolidate power and manipulate perception. Euphemisms such as "re-education committee" (a term for indoctrination) and "readjustment of rations" (a euphemism for resource deprivation) obscure exploitation and present authoritarian practices as rational and beneficial. These linguistic tools minimize the perceived harm of the pigs' actions, framing their exploitation of the other animals as necessary for the greater good. This aligns with the pigs' propaganda efforts to justify their growing dominance while maintaining the illusion of equality.

Dysphemisms in *Animal Farm*, such as "traitor" and "knacker," are more prominently employed as tools of intimidation and control. These terms serve to vilify dissenters and create fear among the animals, ensuring loyalty and suppressing opposition. For instance, Snowball's branding as a "traitor" discredits him and shifts blame for the farm's challenges onto a scapegoat, allowing Napoleon to consolidate his power unchallenged. Similarly, the term "knacker," used in relation to Boxer's fate, underscores the betrayal of loyal individuals under the guise of necessity. Boxer's

eventual betrayal not only highlights the pigs' ruthless exploitation but also serves as a cautionary example to deter dissent from others

These dysphemisms align with Bald on Record strategies, which prioritize directness, confrontation, and fear to enforce authority. By discrediting opponents and justifying oppressive actions, the pigs solidify their control over the farm while suppressing any potential rebellion. Together, the euphemisms and dysphemisms in *Animal Farm* reflect a dual strategy of propaganda and intimidation, showcasing the deliberate manipulation of language to maintain power and oppress the populace.

The comparison underscores the contrasting linguistic strategies employed in *The Giver* and *Animal Farm* to maintain control within their respective dystopian settings. In *The Giver*, euphemisms serve as a subtle yet general mechanism for suppressing individuality and fostering conformity. By masking harsh realities with sanitized terms such as "release," "nurturer," and "elsewhere," the society eliminates ethical questioning and emotional engagement, ensuring compliance and order. This euphemistic masking creates an illusion of harmony, reinforcing the community's hierarchical structure through manipulation.

Conversely, *Animal Farm* leverages dysphemisms as a more direct and confrontational means of enforcing obedience and quashing dissent. Aggressive terms like "traitor" and "knacker" are wielded to vilify opposition, create fear, and justify ruthless actions, ensuring the pigs' unchallenged dominance. Paired with euphemisms such as "re-education committee" and "readjustment of rations," which obscure exploitative practices, the language of *Animal Farm* reflects a dual strategy of propaganda and intimidation. This approach consolidates power by discrediting dissenters and maintaining the illusion of necessity behind authoritarian measures.

Together, these novels reveal how language functions as a potent tool for manipulation in dystopian regimes. Through the euphemistic masking in *The Giver* and dysphemistic aggression in *Animal Farm*, both societies use linguistic strategies to reinforce their hierarchies, suppress rebellion, and maintain control. The clear differences in approach where subtle psychological suppression versus obvious fear-mongering highlight the versatility of language as an instrument of power, exposing the depths to which dystopian authorities will go to secure their dominance and maintain their systems of control.

## References

- Alfarhan, Ins. Eqbal. A. (2024). The Influence of Literature on the Society. Print) *International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Research*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10886693>
- Ardyan, E. (2023). Metode Penelitian Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif : *Pendekatan Metode Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif di Berbagai Bidang*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Green, P. (2021). *Euphemisms in modern literature: A critical analysis of Lois Lowry's The Giver*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Iswara, A. A. (2020). The Form and Use of Dysphemism in Hoax. Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Language, Literature, Culture, and Education (ICOLLITE 2020), 509. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.201215.005>
- Miller, S. (2022). *Language control and societal influence: A linguistic approach*. Penguin Books.
- Noletto, I. (2024). *Fictional Languages in Science Fiction Literature*. Taylor & Francis.
- Smith, G. W. H., & Jacobsen, M. H. (2022). *The Routledge international handbook of Goffman studies*. Routledge.

Thompson, H. (2019). *Reader perception and language manipulation in literary texts*. Bloomsbury Publishing.