

A Pragmatic Study of Euphemistic and Dysphemistic Expressions in Coetzee's "Waiting for the Barbarians"

Researcher : Haneen Ali Jumaa
Assist. Prof. Dr. Amin Ukaal Ghailan

Dept. of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Basrah

Abstract:

The present study aims to make a pragmatic analysis of J.M .Coetzee's "Waiting for the Barbarians", proving that the Appraisal theory is applicable to the analysis of the novel according to the euphemistic dysphemistic expressions. Specifically, the study investigates the attitude's resources (feeling, judgement, and appreciation) that euphemistic and dysphemistic expressions are part of. Throughout the analysis of the four parts of the novel represented by the Magistrate (the Magistrate as a Judge, the Magistrate as a Rescuer, the Magistrate as a Prisoner, and the Magistrate as a Freeman), the researcher has come up with some results and conclusions. The total findings of the analysis of the four parts reveal that the negative attitudes occur more than the positive ones. The findings show that judgement occurs more than affect and appreciation in all parts. In addition, the results reveal that dysphemistic expressions are used more than euphemistic ones.

Key words: Pragmatics, Appraisal theory, Euphemism, Dysphemism, Attitude system .

دراسة تداولية للتعبيرات الملطفة والمهينة في رواية ج.م. كوتزي "في انتظار البرابرة"

الباحثة : حنين علي جمعه

أ.م.د امين عكال غيلان

جامعة البصرة / كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية/ قسم اللغة الانكليزية

ملخص البحث:

تهدف الدراسة الحالية إلى إجراء تحليل عملي لرواية ج.م. كوتزي "في انتظار البرابرة"، لإثبات أن نظرية التقييم قابلة للتطبيق و تحليل الرواية على وفق للتعبيرات الملطفة والمهينة. تهدف الدراسة، على وجه التحديد إلى التحقق من موارد الموقف (الشعور، والحكم، والتقدير) التي تشكل التعبيرات الملطفة والمهينة جزءاً منها. خلال تحليل الأجزاء الأربعة من الرواية التي يمثلها القاضي (القاضي كقاضي، والقاضي بصفته المنقذ، والقاضي كسجين، والقاضي بصفته رجلاً حراً)، توصل الباحث إلى بعض النتائج والاستنتاجات . تكشف النتائج الإجمالية لتحليل الأجزاء الأربعة أن المواقف السلبية تحدث أكثر من المواقف الإيجابية و تبين النتائج ايضاً أن الحكم يحدث أكثر من التأثير والتقدير في جميع الأجزاء. بالإضافة إلى ذلك، كشفت النتائج أن التعبيرات المهينة تستعمل أكثر من التعبيرات الملطفة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: التداولية ، نظرية التقييم، ملطفة، مهينة ، نظام الموقف .

1.Introduction

Euphemism is defined as "mild, agreeable, or roundabout words used in place of coarse, painful, or offensive ones" (Rawson,1981,p.1).In contrast , Allan and Burrige (2006,p.31)) define dysphemism as a "word or phrase with connotations that are offensive either about the denotatum and, or to people addressed or overhearing the utterance". The present study investigates the euphemistic and dysphemistic expressions in J.M.Coetzee's "Waiting for the Barbarians". Waiting for the Barbarians has been chosen for the present study for its importance in Coetzee's literary career, wins many Prizes, and it invites the readers to engage with the representation of political violence during and after the postcolonial era. Furthermore, waiting for the Barbarians is a modern novel that simulates reality, which is why the novel's Empire is nameless. So, the Empire represents all the tyrant's rulers, and the aboriginal people represent all the oppressed peoples around the world.

2. Euphemism & Dysphemism: General Overview

Any contact with a language is regulated by several laws that individuals are mostly unaware of and use unusually. For instance, individuals are taught since childhood that they must be respectful, talking nicely, to beware of what to say, about whom, and their expressions must be carefully chosen. People acquire a set of written and unwritten rules about the pragmatic side, i.e. its use in various circumstances and in various settings, where individuals gain language. The directive is of how individuals speak kindly, yet it does not say which words and expressions should be used. On the contrary, it advises them instead of phrases and expressions that should not be used, which must be obviated, which are saucy and forbidden words. In this relation, the problem arises that expressions concerned are connected to basic life and body organs, with every start and end of life, with various illnesses, with a range of human activity, politics, and the relation between countries. So, it is important to change these words to more suitable words and phrases. These words and phrases are regarded as 'euphemistic expressions'(Risner,2010 as cited in Hamza,2013, p.20).

Euphemism is defined as "the means by which a disagreeable, offensive, or fear-instilling matter is designated with an indirect or softer term" (Diebold,1981,p.289).To conclude, euphemism is seen as a proactive technique that both speakers and listeners use in order to lessen the threat on the face of the speaker and hearer or third party from any loss, that is why a saucy, ugly, and prohibited word or phrase is changed with a soft, mild, and harmless expression.

Dysphemism is an expression in the form of words or phrases addressed to certain individuals or a group of people with offensive connotations or derogatory characteristics (Allan and Burrige, 2006, p.31). Similarly, Spears (1981, p.27) defines dysphemism as a word with undesirable or taboo meanings. Taboo usually includes religious offences, but the term is also used for any prohibited thing in

society. Spears adds that taboo is consistent with profanity, curses, oaths, sexual discussion, excrement, prostitution, death, homosexuality and chronic conditions.

On the other hand, Cuddon (2013, p.222) describes dysphemism as the contrary to euphemism, emphasising faults or shame. A word or phrase can be regarded as dysphemism or offensive by observing the context and the meaning of expressions that is dynamically changed, and the way expressions are conveyed, for example, there are expressions appropriate in an informal setting, but should be eliminated in the formal situation (Rawson, 1981,p.3).

In short, dysphemism relates to the offence (Duda, 2011, p.51) and used for derogatory expressions (Thawabteh, 2012, p.148) to offend the listener or audience or to the notion itself or denotatum (Ruiz, 2015, p.120).

3. Methodology of the Study

The Appraisal theory conveys that feelings are elicited through our appraisals (evaluations) of many situations that cause specific responses in different individuals (Schonpfulg, 1992 as cited in Khudher, 2017, p.7). Appraisal theory is an analysis system that has been established over the last fifteen to twenty years by a large research group. Martin (1992, 1995, and 2003) and White (1998, 2003) are the principal contributors and supporters of this system. It is not closed or complete, as with all theories, and modification and changes are constantly being suggested and take into consideration. Coffin and O'Halloran suggest that "throughout the last decade, appraisal categories have been put to the test in numerous contexts and, as a consequence, modifications (an ongoing process) have been made" (2006, p. 84). Three systems can be applied to texts used by the Appraisal theory to analyze them in expressions of various areas of interest, namely: Attitude, Graduation, and Engagement.

3.1 Attitude

Painter (2003, p. 184) characterizes *attitude* as "a domain concerned with the linguistic expression of positive and negative attitudes". Read and Carroll (2010, p.424) believe that "the sub-system of *attitude* is a framework for three areas of personal feeling: emotion, ethics and aesthetics. All types of attitude can also be analyzed according to their polarity, be it positive or negative".

3.1.1 Affect

Read and Carroll (2010, p.424) state that "Descriptions of personal emotion are referred to as *affect*". Similarly, Martin (2003, p.145) points out that *affect* is a resource for 'construing emotional responses'. *Affect* is divided into four sub-branches of inclination or *desirability*, *happiness*, *security*, and *satisfaction*, with each of these having a positive or negative polar. Martin and White (2005,p. 49) realize *affect* as grouping 'emotions into three main sets related to *un/happiness*, *in / security and dis/satisfaction*'. Krsner thinks that the category of undesirability is introduced at a

*A Pragmatic Study of Euphemistic and Dysphemistic Expressions in Coetzee's
"Waiting for the Barbarians"*

future stage (2000,p.101).Martin and Rose(2007,p.29) state that feelings can be expressed directly through physical behaviours or mental state (e.g. *I could curse with vexation, it becomes an intense pleasure to keep them closed*) and can be understood indirectly as a result of unusual behaviours and metaphors(e.g. *Eyes bewildered, but dull like the dead*). So, affect can be explicitly or implicitly expressed.

3.1.2 Judgement

Read and Carroll (2010, p.424) clarify that *judgement* is "evaluations of people". Krsner (2000, p.97) points out that *judgement* "constitutes the semantic resource for construing evaluation of behaviour in the context of institutional norms about how people should or should not behave". Krsner states that *Judgement* consists of five categories, namely: Normality, Capacity, Tenacity, Veracity, and Propriety. These five types are grouped under the headings of *social esteem* and *social sanction*. *Normality*, *capacity* and *tenacity* combine to account for the evaluations of social behaviour, as do *veracity* and *propriety* in the area of moral regulation (2000, p.94).

3.1.3 Appreciation

Martin and White think that "with *appreciation*, we turn to meanings construing our evaluations of 'things', especially things we make and performances we give, but also including natural phenomena" (2005, p.56). Appreciation is divided into either *reaction* (with respect to the thing's *Impact* and *Quality*), *composition* (concerned with *Balance* and *Complexity*), or *valuation*.

3.2 Graduation

Martin and Rose (2007, p.42) state that one distinctive characteristic of attitudes is that they can be graded. That is to say, we can express how strongly we feel about something or someone. Some choices turn the volume either up or down. In other words, the high-grade choices refer to those at the top of the scale, while the choices at the low grade refer to those at the bottom of the scale. Martin and Rose observe that *graduation* is divided into *force* and *focus* (recourses for amplification). *Force* refers to words that intensify meanings, for instance (very, really and extremely) and vocabulary items that have a degree of intensity, for instance, happy, delight and ecstatic). *Focus* includes words that 'sharpening' or 'softening' categories of people and things, for instance,(about /exactly or real/ sort of, kind of).

3.3 Engagement

By engagement, evaluation guides the linguistic phenomena through which authors justify their views and the tools they use to take stances against the viewpoints of other authors. This assumes that every text expresses a point of view in some way and that every piece of writing responds to other people's ideas in both direct and indirect ways. Moreover, these reactions may be either retrospective (responding to previously expressed opinions) or prospective (anticipating audience response and including counter-responses) (Read and Carroll,2010, p.426).

4.Data Analysis

Below is a list of examples of Euphemistic and Dysphemistic expressions in the J.M.Coetzee's "Waiting for the Barbarians".

4.1 Attitude Analysis of Euphemistic Expressions

4.1.1 Analysis of Affect

1. It is **rapture**, of a kind.

If the history written on the body of the barbarian girl is tormented, the ageing body of the Magistrate represents his diminishing power. The obsession of the Magistrate with the marks on the body of the girl represents his ability to compete with the past before his existence, and "truth" is uncovered and becomes easy to access. The utterance above is a positive explicit expression that expresses feelings of relish. 'Rapture' falls within the category of "Happiness".

4.1.2 Analysis of Judgement

1. When she does not look at me, I am **a grey form** moving about unpredictably on the periphery of her vision.

The utterance above is an explicit social esteem judgement that is expressed negatively. 'A grey form' is included within the category of "Normality". The Magistrate recognizes that the barbarian girl lives in uncertainty, not understanding what is waiting for her in the future, what the Magistrate wants from her.

4.1.3 Analysis of Appreciation

1. I am **abstracted**, lost in the rhythm of rubbing and kneading the swollen ankle.

The utterance above is a negative appreciation of "Composition: Balance". The appraised is the Magistrate's feelings as a result of his behaviour with the barbarian girl.

4.2 Attitude Analysis of Dysphemistic Expressions

4.2.1 Analysis of Affect

1. I do **not want** to see **a parasite** settlement grow up...

The above utterance is an explicit expression of displeasure that is realized as an emotional state. 'Do not want ...parasite' is included within the category of "Satisfaction" and expressed negatively. The Magistrate lives in an unfair world all his life. So, it is inevitable that he is going to be an amalgamation of virtues and sins.

4.2.2 Analysis of Judgement

\.I cannot imagine what ever drew me to that **alien body**.

The Magistrate clarifies the effect of 'Other' on the body of the barbarian girl. Although the Magistrate wants to occupy her body, his attempts to access her body are in vain, and as he is unable to look at her, she becomes a dreadful reminder of his failure to make all his efforts to recognize the colonized other dissipate. The above utterance is a negative social esteem judgement that is expressed explicitly. 'Alien body' falls within the category of "Normality".

4.2.3 Analysis of Appreciation

1. First comes the ritual of the washing, for which She is now **naked**. Wash her feet, as before, her legs, her buttocks. My soapy hand travels between her thighs.

The utterance above is an appreciation that is expressed positively. 'Naked' is included with the category of "reaction: impact". The appraised is the Magistrate's rituals of washing the girl's feet. The erotic strike to the first washing becomes more obvious this time, and the Magistrate's motivation for discovering the girl's truth by tracing the scars in her body now seems even less guided by good intention. Thus , an aspect of the Magistrate's personality that opposes his usual sense of civility seems disturbed and out of control sexuality.

5.Findings and Discussions

Throughout the analysis of the four parts of the novel represented by the Magistrate depending on the different roles he has throughout the novel (the Magistrate as a Jude, the Magistrate as a Rescuer, the Magistrate as a Prisoner, and the Magistrate as Freeman), the researcher has come up with some results that will be discussed in the following paragraph :

The total findings of the analysis of the parts reveal that a negative attitude occurs more than the positive one. After applying the Appraisal theory to the euphemistic expressions, the researcher finds that the total number of attitudinal values is 81. The number of affects is 23, that of judgements is 30, and appreciations is 28. On the contrary, the total number of attitudinal values of dysphemistic expressions is 114. The number of affects is 18, that of judgements is 66, and appreciations is 30. The findings show that judgement occurs more than affect and appreciation in all parts of the novel. In addition, the results reveal that the dysphemistic expressions are used more than the euphemistic ones.

A Pragmatic Study of Euphemistic and Dysphemistic Expressions in Coetzee's "Waiting for the Barbarians"

Table 1

Distribution of Explicit and Implicit Affect of Euphemistic Expressions in the Four Parts.

Attitude	Explicit affect								Implicit affect							
	Positive				Negative				Positive				Negative			
	Hap.	Sec.	Sat.	Des.	Hap.	Sec.	Sat.	Des.	Hap.	Sec.	Sat.	Des.	Hap.	Sec.	Sat.	Des.
Part1	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1
Part2	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Part3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Part4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	7	0	0	1	3	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Number	19								4							

Table 1 illustrates that there are 19 explicit affectual values and four implicit ones. Explicit affect is the dominant kind of attitude in the four parts compared with the implicit affect. There are 11 explicit negative affects, eight explicit positive affects, four negative implicit affects, and zero positive implicit ones. It can be seen that the negative affect occurs more than the positive affect in all parts. Furthermore, seven positive affects belong to the category of "Happiness". So, the category of positive Happiness is the dominant one compared with the other categories. All in all, the euphemistic expressions mostly occur in part one.

Table 2

Distribution of Explicit and Implicit Affect of Dysphemistic Expressions in the Four Parts

Attitude	Explicit Affect								Implicit Affect							
	Positive				Negative				Positive				Negative			
	Hap.	Sec.	Sat.	Des.	Hap.	Sec.	Sat.	Des.	Hap.	Sec.	Sat.	Des.	Hap.	Sec.	Sat.	Des.
Part1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Part2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Part3	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Part4	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	1	0	0	0	3	0	11	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number	17								1							

A Pragmatic Study of Euphemistic and Dysphemistic Expressions in Coetzee's "Waiting for the Barbarians"

Table 2 shows that the explicit affects are used more than the implicit ones. The total number of explicit affects is 17, and the total number of the implicit affects is one. There are 16 explicit negative affects, one positive explicit one, one negative implicit affect, and zero positive implicit affect. Consequently, the negative affect is used more than the positive one. In addition, the category of "Happiness" is used 11 times which denotes that the category of "Happiness" is the dominant one. The results reveal that the dysphemistic expressions mostly occur in parts three and four.

Table 3

Distribution of Explicit Social Esteem and Social Sanction Judgements of Euphemistic Expressions in the Four Parts

Table 4

Distribution of Implicit Social Esteem and Social Sanction Judgements of Euphemistic Expressions in the Four Parts

Attitude	Social Esteem (Explicit)						Social Sanction (Explicit)				Social Esteem (Implicit)						Social Sanction (Implicit)			
	Positive			Negative			Positive		Negative		Positive			Negative			Positive		Negative	
	Nor.	Ca p.	Ten.	N or.	Cap.	Ten.	Ver.	Prop	Ver.	Pro	Nor	cap	Ten	Nor	Cap	Ten	Ver.	Pro	Ver.	Prop
Part1	1	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0
Part2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Part3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Part4	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0
Total Number	1	1	1	4	4	4	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	2	2	0	0	4	2
	15						2				7						6			

A Pragmatic Study of Euphemistic and Dysphemistic Expressions in Coetzee's "Waiting for the Barbarians"

As illustrated in tables 3 and 4, the social esteem judgements occur more than the social sanction judgements in parts one, three, and four. On the other hand, the social sanction judgements occur more than the social esteem judgements in part two. There are 22 (explicit & implicit) social esteem judgements and 8 (explicit & implicit) social sanction ones. "Tenacity" is the dominant category in parts three and four. "Capacity" is the dominant category in part one, and "Propriety" is the prevailing one in part two. Furthermore, the negative judgements are used more than the positive ones

Table 5
Distribution of Explicit Social Esteem and Social Sanction Judgements of Dysphemistic Expressions in all Four Parts

Table 6
Distribution of Implicit Social Esteem and Social Sanction Judgements of Dysphemistic Expressions in all Four Parts

Attitude	Social Esteem (Explicit)						Social Sanction (Explicit)				Social Esteem (Implicit)						Social Sanction (Implicit)			
	Positive			Negative			Positive		Negative		Positive			Negative			Positive		Negative	
	N or.	Ca p.	Ten.	Nor.	Cap.	Ten.	Ver.	Pro p	Ver.	Pro	Nor	cap	Ten	Nor	Cap	Ten	Ver.	Pro	Ve r.	Pro p
Part1	0	0	0	7	1	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
Part2	1	1	0	5	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Part3	0	0	0	12	2	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1
Part4	0	0	0	7	5	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Total Number	1	1	0	31	9	6	0	1	2	5	1	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	1	2
	48						8				7						3			

Again, tables 5 and 6 show that the social esteem judgements occur more than the social sanction judgements in all parts. There is 22 explicit social esteem judgement, while the implicit social esteem judgement is 7. The explicit social sanction is eight, and the implicit ones are 3. After checking the categories of the social esteem and the social sanction, it can be assured that "Normality" is the dominant category with 31 values. Furthermore, all the parts show that the negative judgements are more used than the positive ones.

*A Pragmatic Study of Euphemistic and Dysphemistic Expressions in
Coetzee's "Waiting for the Barbarians"*

Table 7

Distribution of Appreciation in Euphemism and Dysphemism of all Parts

Attitude	Appreciation											
	Euphemism						Dysphemism					
	Positive			Negative			Positive			Negative		
	Reac.	Comp	Val.	Reac.	Comp.	Val.	Reac.	Comp	Val.	Reac.	Comp.	Val.
Part 1	0	0	0	7	0	1	1	0	0	7	0	0
Part 2	1	0	0	2	4	0	4	0	0	1	1	1
Part 3	2	0	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	11	0	0
Part 4	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Total Number	4	0	0	18	4	2	6	0	0	20	1	3
	4			24			6			24		

*A Pragmatic Study of Euphemistic and Dysphemistic Expressions in
Coetzee's "Waiting for the Barbarians"*

Table 7 shows that within the euphemistic expressions, there are 24 negative appreciations and four positive ones. So, the negative appreciations are used more than the positive appreciations. Furthermore, the category of "Reaction" is the dominant one in parts one, three, and four. "Composition" is the dominant category in part two. Furthermore, more negative reaction values occur in parts one and two in comparison with all parts. Within the above table of the dysphemistic expressions, the occurrence of the negative appreciations is 24, and the positive appreciations are 6. Again, the negative appreciations are used more than the positive one. In addition, the category of negative reaction is the dominant one in parts one, three, and four. The positive reaction is the dominant category in part two.

Table 8

Attitude Totals in the Euphemistic Expressions of the All Parts

	Appraisal System	Sub-system			F	%	
Euphemism	Attitude	Affect	23	Positive	8	9.8%	28.3%
				Negative	15	18.5%	
		Judgment	30	Positive	3	3.7%	37%
				Negative	27	33.3%	
		Appreciation	28	Positive	4	4.9%	34.5%
				Negative	24	29.6%	
		Total			81		81

Table 8 shows the total numbers of affects, judgements, and appreciations in the euphemistic expressions of all parts. The findings reveal that the frequency of judgement is 30 occurrences which make 37%, while that of the appreciation is 28 occurrences which make 34.5%. Furthermore, affect records 23 occurrences which make 28.3%. In addition, the findings show that negative attitudes occur more than the positive ones.

Table 9

Attitude Totals in the Dysphemistic Expressions of All Parts

	Appraisal System	Sub-system			F	%	
Dysphemism	Attitude	Affect	18	Positive	1	0.8%	15.7%
				Negative	17	14.9%	
		Judgment	66	Positive	4	3.5%	57.8%
				Negative	62	54.3%	
		Appreciation	30	Positive	6	5.2%	26.25%
				Negative	24	21.05%	
Total			114		114	100%	100%

The findings in table 9 indicate that the frequency of judgement in dysphemism is 66 occurrences which make 57.8%, whereas appreciation is 30 occurrences which make 26.25%. Furthermore, affect records 18 occurrences which make 15.7 %. Again, the results show that the negative attitude is used more than the positive ones.

The results of tables eight and nine illustrate that judgment is used more than the affect and appreciation in the euphemistic and dysphemistic expressions. This is obvious by the highest percentages that judgement records in euphemistic (37%) and dysphemistic (57.8%) expressions.

Table 10

Comparison of Euphemistic and Dysphemistic Expressions in All Parts

Attitude	Sub-system	Types	Frequency	Percentage
	Affect	Euphemism	23	11.7%
		Dysphemism	18	9.2%
	Judgment	Euphemism	30	15.3%
		Dysphemism	66	33.8%
	Appreciation	Euphemism	28	14.3%
		Dysphemism	30	15.3%
Total Numbers			195	100%

Table 10 shows the comparison of euphemistic and dysphemistic expressions in all parts at the level of the attitude system. As illustrated above, the dysphemistic expressions are the dominant expressions in the attitude system of judgement and appreciation, whereas the euphemistic expressions are the dominant ones in the attitude system of affect. Also, the frequency of the dysphemistic expressions is 114 occurrences, making 58.5 %, whereas the frequency of the euphemistic expressions is 81 occurrences which make 41.5%. So, the dysphemistic expressions are dominant over euphemistic ones.

Conclusions

The major conclusions that can be drawn from the current study are the following:

1. The results clarify that the attitudinal values of judgement occur more than the affect and appreciation in all parts of the analysis. There are about 37% judgment values related to the euphemistic expressions, 57.8 % values that relate to the dysphemistic ones. This indicates that the Magistrate is interested in evaluating himself and others concerning behaviour and character. So, criticizing Joll and the Empire is one of the novel's main themes that illustrate how the Magistrate begins to change his opinion of the Empire he is part of. Clash of these civilizations (The Empire and the Barbarians) opens the Magistrate's eyes on the truth of the Empire, which tries to construct a distance from the barbarians on many grounds.

2. The analysis of the values of judgement illustrates that the social esteem occurs more than the social sanction in all parts of the study in which the category of "Normality" is the dominant one. This implies that the Magistrate strongly focuses on personal judgement, which indicates the culture in which people live, their expectations, experiences, assumptions and beliefs. The Magistrate exposes the interrelationship between racial and cultural differences to humiliate the Other. He sometimes negatively judges the barbarians to reduce any risk that the barbarians may make, and at the other times judges the Empire as a way of rebelling against the brutal practices they do against the nomad's people. Also, the Magistrate judges himself because the desperation and lack of respect will make him degraded.

3. The results that belong to the attitudinal meanings indicate that the negative appraisals are most frequently used than the positive ones. This is because the novel expresses torture, pain, death, and oppression of a civilization at the expense of other ones. "Waiting for the Barbarians" full of violence, injustice, and verbal abuse of the Empire's officials against the nomad's people as a way of getting rid of the barbarians who have never shown up.

4. Results reveal that the explicit attitudinal values are used more than implicit ones. This is because the Magistrate uses direct, simple language and dead metaphors to describe his relationship with the barbarian girl, sexual desire, the Empire and his rejection of the clash against the barbarians.

5. As illustrated in the analysis section, the dysphemistic expressions are mostly used in parts two, three, and four than the euphemistic ones, whereas in part one, the euphemistic expressions are mostly used. The results of the total number indicate that the dysphemistic expressions are used more than the euphemistic ones. There are 58.5 % of the expressions that belong to

A Pragmatic Study of Euphemistic and Dysphemistic Expressions in Coetzee's "Waiting for the Barbarians"

dysphemism, whereas 42.5 % relate to euphemism. This indicates that the Magistrate does not want to clash or be hostile to the Empire at the beginning of the novel, although their acts bother him greatly. After seeing the harsh mask of the Empire, the Magistrate no more respects its sovereignty. Furthermore, he confronts Colonel Joll and Mandel accusing them of being the enemy.

6. It is revealed that without context, no interpretation is possible since evaluation depends heavily on context. So, context gives these expressions different meanings. In addition, context plays a crucial role in revealing opinions and whether they are positive or negative.

7. The results illustrate that the Magistrate's feelings, opinions and appreciations can be best explained by applying the Appraisal theory to the text under study.

Bibliography

- Allan, K. & Burridge, K. (2006). *Forbidden words: Taboo and the censoring of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coffin, C., & O'Halloran, K. (2006). The roles of appraisal and corpora in detecting covert evaluation. *Functions of Language*, 13 (1), 77-110.
- Cuddon, J.A.(2013). *A dictionary of literary expressions and literary theory*. Welly Blackwell. A John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Publication.
- Diebold, A. R. (1961). American-Spanish euphemism by Charles E. Kany. *Language*, 37(3), 289-292.
- Duda, B. (2011). Euphemisms and dysphemisms: In search of a boundary line. *Círculo de Lingüística Aplicada a la Comunicación*, 45(1), 3-19. doi: 10.5209/rev_CLAC. 2011.v45.1.
- Hamza, Mohammed. (2013). *A pragmatics study of euphemism in Shakespeare's plays* [Unpublished M.A Thesis]. University of Al- Qadisiyah.
- Khudher, Shahad Hesham. (2017). *Discourse analysis of American eulogies* [Unpublished M.A Thesis]. The University of Basra.
- Krsner, H. (2000). *Negotiating authority: The logogenesis of dialogue in common law judgments* [PhD dissertation, Linguistics Department]. University of Sydney, Sydney. <https://www.grammatics.com/appraisal/kornerphd/korner-phtmhd-links>.

*A Pragmatic Study of Euphemistic and Dysphemistic Expressions in
Coetzee's "Waiting for the Barbarians"*

Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences
No. : 4(A) Vol. : 46 Yr. October 2021

- Martin, J.R. (2003). Beyond exchange: Appraisal systems in English. In Hunston, S. and Thompson, G. (eds.) *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse* (pp142-175). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J. R. & Rose, D. (2007). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause* . London, England: Continuum.
- Martin, J. R. & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Painter, C. (2003). Developing attitude: An ontogenetic perspective on appraisal. *Text*, 23 (2), 183-209.
- Rawson, H. (1981). *A dictionary of euphemism and other doubletalk*. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc.
- Read, J & Carroll, J. (2010). Annotating expressions of appraisal in English. *Lang Resources & Evaluation*, 46(1), 421-447. doi: 10.1007/s10579- 010-9135-7.
- Ruiz, Sánchez Raquel. (2015). Euphemistic and dysphemistic language in fifty shade trilogy. *Forma y unción*, 28(1), 117-135. Retrieved from: <https://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=219/21941777006>
- Spears, R. A. (1981). *Slang and euphemism: a dictionary of oaths, curses, insults, ethnic slurs, sexual slang and metaphor, drug talk, college lingo, and related matters*. New York: Jonathan David Publisher.
- Thawabteh, Mohammad Ahmad. (2012). The translatability of euphemism and dysphemism in Arabic-English subtitling. *Lexis*, 7(1), 145-156. doi: 10.4000/lexis.38.