

Euphemism

Sweet Talking or Deception?

Omar Abu Hammad
(h06omaah@du.se)
D-Essay in Linguistics
Högskolan Dalarna
Spring Term, 2007
Supervisor: J. White

Table of Contents	2
1. Introduction	
1.1 Background	3-5
1.2 Aim	5-6
1.3 Method	6
2. Sweet Talking	
2.1 Politeness and Face	7-8
2.2 Bodily effluvia and sex	8-9
2.3 Profanity	10-12
3. Deception	13-18
3. Conclusion	19-20
4. References	21-22

1. Introduction:

1.1 Background

There is a strong relationship between *euphemism* and taboo. Taboo "refers to a proscription of behaviour for a specifiable community of one or more persons, at a specifiable time, in specifiable contexts" (Allan and Burridge 2006: 11). Taboo mainly depends on the people, place and time involved, i.e. what someone may find offensive or impolite at a certain time and place may not be considered such by others;

"In Seventeenth-century Europe, women from all social classes, among them King Charles I's wife Henrietta Maria, commonly exposed one or both breasts in public as a display of youth and beauty." (Allan and Burridge 2006: 10).

Nowadays, such an act is considered to be a taboo, at least for royalty.

The term euphemism comes from the Greek word "euphēmē (*eu*: 'good, well' and *phēmē*: 'speech')" (Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary 1991: 428). Is euphemism an example of *sweet talking* (Allan and Burridge 2006:1) or *deception*? According to Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, euphemism is "the substitution of an agreeable or inoffensive expression for one that may offend or suggest something unpleasant." On the other hand, "(t)here is a particular kind of euphemism that involves using language in a perverse way to conceal thought. This is called DOUBLESPEAK" (Katamba 2005:192). Even the term *doublespeak* itself is a euphemism for the orthophemistic¹ term deception that I shall discuss in section 2.2. Which definition suits euphemism; sweet talking or deception? Euphemism, in the sense of sweet talking substituting for taboos, impoliteness, profanity or maintaining

¹ This term was first coined by *Allan and Burridge* to refer to direct expressions; neither euphemistic nor dysphemistic.

one's face, goes back to "primitive people and their interpretation of tabooed objects as having demonic power that shouldn't be mentioned or touched" (Allan and Burridge 2006: 11).

The idea of sweet talking was coined to replace taboos which are demonic, offensive, forbidden or impolite depending on the taboo and culture of the people who interpret them. It is a taboo for many Jordanians to say someone died of *cancer*; instead, they may say (s)he died of *that disease*; however, it is acceptable for others in the same society to refer to *cancer* as *cancer*. Using *that* (not *this*) in the sense that they want to be far away, even, from mentioning the name of the disease. The idea, as set out earlier, depends on our cultural interpretation of taboos. In Jordan, too, the typical Moroccan dish *Couscous* is substituted by another name, *maftool*, to refer to the same dish. The word *couscous*, that is divided into two syllables; *cous cous*, means in Jordanian Arabic *pussy pussy* which is obscene hence the name of the dish is changed. By the same token, it is applicable to the word *cock*, in American English, that is replaced by *rooster*.

In certain cultures, taboos are believed to have demonic power on people who touch or mention them. In certain cases, euphemism has a damaging impact on language; for example, in "all" native Australian languages, when a member of a community dies, the members of his community are forced not to mention his / her name or, even, any word that is similar in pronunciation to his / her name since these words are taboos and must be replaced. Consequently, they, the members of the community, are forced to search for sweet words (loanwords from other languages) to replace the lost words caused by the death of a community member (Trask 1996:41). In Arabic culture, some people usually fear mentioning *genies* since they believe that *genies* have demonic effects on the people who mention their names. It is rare,

especially for old people, to talk about genies in a funny way. Most old people believe that genies can avenge themselves on the people who make fun of them. It is because of the myth that speaking taboo words invites them and people do not want to invite these malevolent forces. They think that these taboos should not be invited by speaking their names and they should be kept away from them. By the same token, we fear mentioning *death* which explains the euphemistic expression *pass away* instead of *died* which implies that the person referred to is moving into another phase which is clear by *pass*. It is a taboo replaced by sweet talking since we do not want to invite malevolent forces such as death and genies by mentioning their names. As you have noticed that most of the background is dedicated to taboos and euphemism in the sense of sweet talking because we use euphemism to avoid taboos; however, when it comes to euphemism in the sense of deception, which will be discussed in section 2.2, there is no taboo to hide or substitute; however, it is a matter of deceiving others to hide a painful truth.

1.2 Aim

As stated in the background that we use euphemism to avoid taboo, we can set out the relationship between euphemism and taboo. Replacing taboos by sweet talking is used to save one's face and be polite in impolite situations. It is a way of concealing vulgar, obscene, offensive, profane or impolite expressions for polite and inoffensive ones. The aim of this paper is to shed light on euphemism in two different senses: sweet talking and deception. I shall treat euphemism from two different perspectives: the usual use of euphemism, sweet talking, and the orthophemistic sense, deception. I shall analyze examples, taken from military, religious, cultural and political backgrounds. Moreover, I have introduced taboo because it is usually associated with euphemism, which is crucial in determining the difference between sweet talking and

deception. In this essay, I shall show that euphemism can be used in two different senses: sweet talking and deception.

1.3 Method

I have introduced taboo and its relationship with euphemism in the first part of this study; the background. The second section is dedicated to discuss sweet talking. The first part deals euphemism as sweet talking used to maintain one's face (politeness) and replace taboo and profanity (bodily effluvia, sex and swearing). In this section, too, I shall analyse the non-linguistic (audio and visual) and linguistic techniques used in euphemism: metaphors, loanwords, figurative speech, circumlocutions, etc. Moreover, I shall discuss in brief the referential (semantic) and expletive (pragmatic) aspects of swearing expressions; namely *fuck* and *shit*. The rest of the analysis is dedicated to euphemism; as used to conceal thought (doublespeak) or deception. I shall analyse different examples from different categories of discourse: law and enforcement and military, political and nuclear in which euphemism is generally used as a means of deception. Finally, I shall talk about the relationship between the 'deceiver' and 'deceived' that govern the use of euphemism in the sense of deception.

2. Sweet Talking

Each culture has its own values, habits, customs and taboos. As mentioned earlier, euphemism, henceforward referred to as sweet talking, is used to be polite in impolite situations or to maintain one's face. Face "means the public self-image of a person. It refers to the emotional and social sense of self that everyone has and expects everyone else to recognize" (Yule 1996: 60). Maintaining one's face is common between the speaker and, at the same time, the hearer. While we are in an interaction, we are expected not to be offensive or be offended by others. This mainly depends on the level of formality and social status between individuals. I am addressing formal situations where there should not be any face threatening act to the individuals whom we are talking to or even those who are within earshot. This is why we usually 'whisper' when we want to be excused to go the toilet.

2.1 Politeness and Face

When someone uses sweet talking, (s)he tries to maintain her / his face and the others', as well. For example, most people usually refer to toilet as *rest room*, *powder room*, *loo* or *bathroom*. It is important for the speaker to be polite and not to offend the hearer. However, referring to the toilet as the *loo* between close friends may be interpreted as a joke or, even more seriously, as being childish because of using children's terminology. Imagine if someone at a formal meeting with his / her employer saying, 'Excuse me! I have to go to the shithouse'. (S)he will be regarded as impolite and, at the same time, offensive to the hearer since (s)he did not maintain both faces. So sweet talking maintains not only the speaker's face but the others', as well.

Sweet talking is used to refer to disabled people in a suitable way in order not to hurt their feelings. In this case sweet talking is not motivated by taboo, but rather

not offending others (face saving). The disabled are referred to as *handicapped*, *differently-abled*, *mentally challenged* or *people with special needs*. Every time we try to address them in an inoffensive way; we fail. For example, the sweet talking expression *differently-abled* still refers to them as being 'different' from us which is still offensive to them. In Jordanian Arabic, a *cross-eyed person* is referred to as a person having a *benevolent eye*; a way of replacing an offensive word with a sweet one. "Unfortunately, when we use euphemisms, the unpleasant associations eventually catch up with the new word" (Katamba 2005:190). This makes it difficult for us to use 'standard' sweet talking to refer to people with special needs since the association of the word is always present.

2.2 Bodily effluvia and sex

Sweet talking arises when referring to "tabooed bodily functions and effluvia from the organs of sex, micturition and defecation (SMD organs)" (Allan and Burridge 2006: 144). The language we use when referring to these tabooed parts and functions is usually figurative. *Lose your lunch* instead of *vomiting*² is a sweet talking idiom used figuratively in British English to avoid mentioning bodily effluvia. Allan and Burridge (2006) argue that there is a strong connection between magic and bodily effluvia, and the connection and practise are not only a primitive ritual but it is also still practised "in the twenty-first century". In hoodoo tradition which refers to the "(m)agic healing and control, especially in African-based folk medicine in the United States and the Caribbean"³, there are many instructions for women on how to use tabooed bodily effluvia such as menstrual blood to capture the sexual attention of a man by adding it to his tea or coffee⁴. Some people may think that it is superstitious to believe in such things; however, there are many people who do so; for example,

² <http://www.usingenglish.com/reference/idioms/lose+your+lunch.html>

³ <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/hoodoo>

⁴ <http://www.luckymojo.com/bodyfluids.html>

how many times have you heard the expression *touch wood* that is used superstitiously when we mention good luck or when we want to avoid bad luck?

According to the Old Testament documents in Leviticus 15: 1, 19

"1 The Lord spake unto Moses and Aaron, saying.....19 And if a woman have an issue, and her issue in flesh be blood, she shall be apart seven days: and whosoever toucheth her shall be unclean until the even."

We can find the sweet talking here (*a woman have an issue*) is used to replace the tabooed phrase *menstruating woman*. It is used figuratively to keep the reference of tabooed bodily effluvia away. Another sweet talking to refer to a *menstruating woman* is "*the cavalry's come*" in which it is used metaphorically in the sense that the cavalry wears red clothes compared to the colour of blood. Another example of figurative expressions is "*beat the bishop*", "*juice the sluice*" or "*pull the pope*" for "*masturbate*"⁵

Beside figurative language, there are other ways that sweet talking is used to refer to bodily effluvia, sex reproductive organs. Loanwords; especially from Latin, are used because they are not familiar to many people, for example, *copulate*, *vulva*, *faeces*, *defecate*, *genitals* and *effluvia*. Being unfamiliar to many people, these loanwords serve the function of sweet talking. Another way is focussing on the location rather than the process; e.g., *going to bed with somebody* instead of *having sex*; in which the focus is drawn on the location (*bed*) rather than the process (*having sex*). By the same token, it is applicable when it comes to *toilet* where we focus on the place where the process takes place rather than the process itself.

⁵ <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/linguistics/LaTrobePapersinLinguistics/Vol%2001/1AllanandBurrige.pdf>

2.3 Profanity

Religion is another area where *sweet talking* is used. We saw in the previous section that sweet talking is used to be polite, not to hurt others and maintain one's face. Religious sweet talking is used as a matter of respect to religion. It is mentioned in the Ten Commandments⁶ that the name of God should not be mentioned in vain:

"KJV - 7 Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.

NRSV - 7 You shall not make wrongful use of the name of the LORD your God, for the LORD will not acquit anyone who misuses his name.

TEV - 7 "Do not use my name for evil purposes, for I, the LORD your God, will punish anyone who misuses my name."

Sweet talking is used to replace profanity, blasphemy and swearing. We find it in the Act of 1606 that had penalized anyone on the stage who "speake(s) or use(s) the holy name of God or of the Christ Jesus, or the Holy Ghoste or of the Trinitie". Consequently, in 1616 some words in Ben Jonson's plays were changed to correspond to the new Act; *By Jesu* was replaced by "*Believe me*". Later, in 1634, Beaumont and Fletcher's *Philaster* went through the same remodelling; "*by the (just) Gods* was changed to *by my sword, (b)y my life, by that's good, (b)y nemesis, And I vow*"⁷ (Allan and Burrige, 2006: 16). The Act of 1606 (censorship) can be regarded as sweet talking to respect religion.

There are many techniques used to substitute profanity, blasphemy and swearwords by sweet talking. Audio censorship is used in television and radio programmes by replacing profane words with a *beep* sound or showing an icon with a

⁶ <http://www.bibletexts.com/terms/10commandments-texts.htm>. KJV, NRSV and TEV refer to different versions of the Bible

⁷ Referring to pagan gods was not profane for a Christian.

beep sound on the mouth of the speaker which is applicable only to audio-visual broadcasting. Remodelling is widely used in sweet talking; for example, *gosh* instead of *God*, *heck* instead of *Hell*, "sugar, shoot, or shucks for *shit*, darn (or) dang for *damn*"⁸. By the same token, religious Jews using the term "God" in written English write it as "G-d" leaving out the vowel in order not to mention the name in plain words since they believe that " the law given by Moses as a prohibition against transcribing the name of God, because they feel that if God is recorded onto a piece of paper, there is the possibility that the name will be disrespected or destroyed in some way".⁹ It is motivated by respect for religion rather than taboo, for many people, to use sweet talking when referring to religious concepts. Moreover, sweet talking is used in orthographic way by printing the first letter of a swearing expressions and omitting the rest of it; e.g., F--- (fuck), or, even, full omission of the word; e.g., What the **** (fuck) are you doing here?

Swearing expressions such as *shit* and *fuck* are discussed in this section (*Profanity*) rather than in section 2.2 *bodily effluvia and sex* because these swearing expressions can be viewed from two different perspectives; semantics and pragmatics. The semantic aspect (referential) is dealt with in section 2.2 in which *shit* is replaced by *faeces* and *fuck* for *copulate*, *make love* or *go to bed with somebody*. The pragmatic (expletive) aspect of these two words can not be related to what these words mean or refer; but it refers to the speech act that these words convey when said to express emotional reaction to different situations ranging from surprise, anger, doing something wrong, receiving unexpected news, etc. I can not think of any situation where one of these two swearing expressions should be used in favour of the other; i.e. they can be used interchangeably; for example,

⁸ <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/linguistics/LaTrobePapersinLinguistics/Vol%2005/04Allan&Buridge.pdf>

⁹ <http://www.wisegeek.com/why-do-jews-write-g-d-instead-of-god.htm>

Shit (Fuck)! I have cut my hand.

It is unacceptable to use sweet talking instead of these two words when used in the pragmatic aspect (expletive) as shown in 1 and 2 below:

1. Faeces! I have cut my hand.*
2. Sexual intercourse! I have cut my hand.*

However, they can be replaced by sweet talking when used in the semantic (referential) aspect as shown in 3 and 4 below to replace *fuck* and *shit*, respectively:

3. He was watching them while they were having *sexual intercourse*.
4. *Faeces* are the solid waste excreted from the body of a human or animal through the bowels¹⁰.

As stated before, these profane words can be replaced by sweet talking by remodelling; e.g. *sugar, shoot, or shucks* for *shit* or printing the first letter and omitting the rest (F---!). Four-letter words; such as, *dick, piss, fuck, cunt, shit, wank* etc. are generally regarded as profane and offensive depending on the level of the formality between the speaker and the hearer. These obscene words are not regarded offensive when used between close friends.

¹⁰ <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/define.asp?key=27570&dict=CALD>

3. Deception:

As mentioned earlier, euphemism is used in an acceptable way to substitute taboos, profanity or for maintaining one's face and not hurting others. It is generally the role of euphemism to function in such a way. Moving to euphemism in the sense of deception, we may find it completely different. *Deceive*, according to the Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary (1991: 329), means,

"to cause to accept as true or valid what is false or invalid" or "to give false impression".

In political propaganda and "doublespeak", there is nothing unpleasant, taboo, forbidden or offensive to hide. As stated by Hugh Rawson in the *Dictionary of Euphemisms and Other Doubletalk*,

". . .when speakers and writers seek not so much to avoid offense as to deceive, . . .we pass into the universe of **dishonest euphemisms**, where the conscious elements of circumlocution and **doubletalk** loom large."¹¹

Moreover, William Lutz, the former editor of the *Doublespeak Quarterly Review*, provides different definitions of doublespeak (deception) that:

"misleads, distorts reality, pretends to communicate, makes the bad seem good, avoids or shifts responsibility, makes the negative appear positive, creates a false verbal map of the world, limits, conceals, corrupts, prevents thought, makes the unpleasant appear attractive or tolerable and creates incongruity between reality and what is said or not said"¹²

¹¹ <http://www.damronplanet.com/doublespeak/Harmlessorharmful.htm>

¹² <http://www.damronplanet.com/doublespeak/whatisdoublespeak.htm>

It is merely a way of deceiving others; the recipients. It is a relationship between two parties; one who has direct access to information and the other who receives it through the first one's version¹³. The latter is usually the public because they have no access or, sometimes, knowledge about the topic that the former party is trying to hide. Euphemism, henceforward referred to as deception, is generally referred to as doublespeak¹⁴, which can be found in three main categories of discourse: law enforcement and military, political and nuclear. The main techniques used in deception are circumlocutions and jargon. *Circumlocution*, according to Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, means: "evasion in speech". It is a deliberate dishonest roundabout way of using words, phrases or expressions to make the bad seem good or, at least, tolerable.

In 1974, the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE) "ironically" established the NCTE Doublespeak Award to be awarded to "public speakers" who have maintained language that is "grossly deceptive, evasive, euphemistic, confusing or self-centered". From 1974, the date the NCTE Doublespeak Award was introduced, till 2005, the award was given to the Nuclear Power Industry: 1979, the Central Intelligence Agency (C.I.A): 1985, President George W. Bush: 2003, his Administration: 2004. The Award was given two times to the U.S. State Department: 1976 and 1984, Presidents Ronald Reagan: 1980 and 1983 and George Bush: 1990 and 1992 and three times to the U.S. Defense Department: 1991, 1993 and 2001¹⁵. The irony is that the 'winners' represent the most sensitive and trustworthy institutions or people in the United States of America who have direct access to the information passed to the public.

¹³ <http://listserv.linguistlist.org/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0510b&L=linguist&P=4318>

¹⁴ Even the term *doublespeak* is a *euphemistic* term for *deception*.

¹⁵ <http://www.ncte.org/about/awards/council/jrnl/106868.htm>

Politics is one of the most 'nourishing' fields of deception. Saddam Hussein, when he was forced to withdraw the rest of his soldiers from Kuwait after most of them had been wounded, captured or killed in the bombing of the coalition forces, addressed the public "we just lost a battle; however, we did not lose the war". In this example, the first party, the leader, has direct access to the whole situation and he does know that he lost most of his troops in Kuwait and he actually lost the war not a battle. He did not use euphemism, but rather deceived his people, who received it through the regime's version. Another example is that when Afghanistan was under the Russian occupation in the 1980s, the Afghani fighters, from the American perspective, were referred to as "freedom fighters". Later in the late 1990s, the *freedom fighters* became "terrorists" depending on the political interpretations that make the same term change, within less than twenty years, from sounding good (freedom fighters) to sounding bad (terrorists). Moving to Africa, during the apartheid regime in the Republic of South Africa, the agency which was responsible for the assassination of political opponents was called the "Civil Cooperation Bureau" (Katamba 2005:192). It is an obfuscatory way that politicians use language to serve their needs, propaganda and goals.

Police jargon is full of deception, too. When someone is imprisoned without legal justification, it is described as *preventive detention*. Examining the circumlocutory expression; *preventive detention*, we can find two contradictory images that refer to the same situation. The first image, which is the plain truth, is that there is someone who is imprisoned without legal justification. The second deceiving image is that this person is imprisoned because he / she can be a threat to the law and order of the society which is clear from the premodifier *preventive*. It is a two-contradictory-image phrase, in which the fact is manipulated by circumlocutions to

deceive others by hiding the truth. As the term doublespeak implies, there are two contradictory images (double) referring to the same situation. It is an obfuscatory way of changing facts; showing the victim as a dangerous person who should be prevented from harming others for the benefit of society.

We can find the same deceiving expressions and phrases in military jargon, too. When an army is almost defeated and should withdraw to save the troops, it is described as a *strategic withdrawal*. Hearing this circumlocutory expression, I would be deceived that the army is controlling everything and it is just military tactics that may lead to victory; which is exactly the opposite of the truth. The genocide of the Jewish people (the Holocaust), during the Nazi reign, which was one of the most awful crimes against humanity of the 20th century, was referred to as "*the final solution*"¹⁶. As if the Nazi regime tried all the possible solutions (to a problem) and they did not work; therefore, they were 'forced' to take the "final solution" to solve the problem! Paul de Rooij under the title *Abused Terms* gives many examples concerning "(the Israeli Propagandists') language (that) obfuscates and exculpates Israel's actions against a basically defenceless population (the Palestinians)": *Man of Peace* instead of *War Criminal*, throwing *rocks* (instead of *stones* to show that Palestinians are dangerous) at soldiers in tanks and armored vehicles and soldiers, *bilateral negotiations* instead of *confiscation of land*, *caught in cross fire* instead of *deliberate killing*, *closed military area* instead of "a demarcation for the press and observers to stay out so that they won't witness the depredation of the occupation force" and *disputed territories* instead of occupied territories¹⁷. It is, as George Orwell said, the "defense of the indefensible".¹⁸

¹⁶ <http://www.holocaust-history.org/hitler-final-solution/>

¹⁷ <http://www.counterpunch.org/rooij0912.html>

¹⁸ <http://www.strike-the-root.com/4/long/long7.html>

"Terminological inexactitude" instead of "lie or untruth" is a deceiving phrase that was first introduced in 1906 by Winston Churchill¹⁹. Using the circumlocutory phrase *terminological inexactitude* instead of *lie* is another way of saying, "I did not lie to you; however, I just used inaccurate words!" Another deceiving phrase for *lie* is being "economical with the truth"²⁰. It implies that the speaker being 'economical with the truth' deliberately hides important information and he / she does not want to spend more time on giving all the facts about a serious issue because, as he / she reckons, is not important for others to know. This circumlocutory way of changing, and even manipulating, facts can not be considered under any circumstances euphemism; it is deception.

Sometimes language is used in an evasive way in which horrible incidents are referred to as neutral or not harmful. Nuclear energy is usually associated with being "clean" (Thomas, L et al. 2003: 28). Recalling the 1986 disaster of Chernobyl Nuclear Reactor, we can feel how clean it is. The so-called 'the Three Mile Island Accident', described as "the most serious in U.S. commercial nuclear power plant operating history"²¹, was regarded as "abnormal evolution", a "plant transient" and a "normal aberration"²². The last phrase *normal aberration* shows that there is nothing dangerous or serious to worry about; it is just an *aberration* (a temporary change from the typical or usual way of behaving²³) in the nuclear power plant and this temporary change is "normal"! Therefore, the horrible experience of having a problem in a nuclear power plant is described in a circumlocutory phrase that implies that there is nothing to be worried about; it is just a normal or temporary nuclear problem!

¹⁹ <http://www.answers.com/topic/terminological-inexactitude>

²⁰ <http://www.phrases.org.uk/meanings/127700.html>

²¹ <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/fact-sheets/3mile-isle.html>

²² <http://www.ncte.org/about/awards/council/jrnl/106868.htm>

²³ <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/define.asp?key=110&dict=CALD>

In closing, sometimes euphemism is used to conceal the painful truth. It is deception by all means. There are no taboos to avoid or unpleasant expressions to conceal in politics, military or nuclear categories of discourse. It is the way of the people who have direct access to knowledge that they subdue language to serve their objectives. Euphemism, in the sense of deception, is completely different from sweet talking in which it is used as a way of deception as we have seen from the abovementioned examples and analysis. It is a way of showing horrible things as something normal; for example, in an ABC NEWS report, dated November 18, 2005, in which CIA sources described, in details, a "list of six enhanced interrogation techniques...on a dozen top al Qaeda targets". The "enhanced interrogation techniques", which is a deceiving expression for *torture* in plain language, range from "the (a)ttention (s)lap" to " (t)he (c)old (c)ell" where the detainee "is left to stand naked in a cell kept near 50 degrees (Fahrenheit). Throughout the time in the cell the prisoner is doused with cold water."²⁴ *Enhanced interrogation, attention slap and the cold cell* are not euphemism, but rather deception.

²⁴ <http://abcnews.go.com/WNT/Investigation/story?id=1322866>

4. Conclusion:

Having discussed euphemism from two perspectives, I have come to the conclusion that euphemism can be used in two different senses; sweet talking and deception. Euphemism is sweet talking to replace unpleasant or tabooed objects. It is also used to maintain one's face in order not to be rude and offensive to others. This general sense of euphemism, which is motivated by taboos, politeness and maintaining one's face and substituting bodily effluvia and profanity, is widely used in our everyday language. Taboo generally depends on whom, when and where it is used. Consequently, the use of *sweet talking* changes according to these three factors. We have seen many examples that someone may regard something as a taboo or impolite in certain time and place but it is not according to a different person, time and place. Belonging to different culture makes us behave or talk in certain way that is different from what others do. *Oh God!* is considered profane in Christianity; however, it is not in Islam.

There are many linguistic and non-linguistic techniques used to express sweet talking. These techniques are used to replace unpleasant, offensive, impolite, profane and tabooed words with sweet ones. Unfortunately, when we replace these unpleasant words with sweet ones, the associations of these words catch up, with the passage of time, with the sweet ones which makes it very difficult to have a 'permanent' sweet talking. Another problem of sweet talking is its effect on language in terms of loanwords.

Deception is the way that political, military and nuclear categories of discourse use language to serve their propaganda and needs. They change horrible things to tolerable ones. They conceal plain facts by using evasive words or expressions. The people who use deception (deceivers) have direct access to the

information that they want to conceal from the public (deceived). It is this relationship that governs deception. The public receives this information from the people who control everything. So, it is a deceiver-deceived relationship that exists by concealing a horrible thing and showing it to the others as a tolerable one that can be handled and controlled easily. The techniques used in deception are circumlocutions and jargon. Using these two techniques, *torture* becomes *enhanced interrogation*, *lying*; *terminological inexactitude* and *nuclear problem*; *plant transient* or *normal aberration*. It is deception and nothing but deception.

5. References

1. Allan, K and Burrige, K 2006. *Forbidden Words*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
2. <http://abcnews.go.com/WNT/Investigation/story?id=1322866>
3. <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/define.asp?key=110&dict=CALD>
4. <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/define.asp?key=27570&dict=CALD>
5. <http://listserv.linguistlist.org/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0510b&L=linguist&P=4318>
6. <http://www.answers.com/topic/terminological-inexactitude>
7. <http://www.bibletexts.com/terms/10commandments-texts.htm>
8. <http://www.counterpunch.org/rooij0912.html>
9. <http://www.damronplanet.com/doublespeak/Harmlessorharmful.htm>
10. <http://www.damronplanet.com/doublespeak/whatisdoublespeak.htm>
11. <http://www.holocaust-history.org/hitler-final-solution/>
12. <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/linguistics/LaTrobePapersinLinguistics/Vol%2001/1AllanandBurrige.pdf>
13. <http://www.luckymojo.com/bodyfluids.html>
14. <http://www.ncte.org/about/awards/council/jrnl/106868.htm>
15. <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/fact-sheets/3mile-isle.html>
16. <http://www.phrases.org.uk/meanings/127700.html>
17. <http://www.strike-the-root.com/4/long/long7.html>
18. <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/hoodoo>
19. <http://www.usingenglish.com/reference/idioms/lose+your+lunch.html>
20. <http://www.wisegeek.com/why-do-jews-write-g-d-instead-of-god.htm>
21. Katamba, F 2005. *English Words*. Routledge, London and New York

22. Mish, C. Frederick et al. 1991. *Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary*.
Merriam – Webster Incorporated, Massachusetts.
23. Tomas, L et al. 2003. *Language Society and Power*
24. Trask, R.L. 1996. *Historical Linguistics*. Arnold, London.
25. Yule, George. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.