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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Study

Euphemism known as a form of language that uses an acceptable and inoffensive word to substitute the one that may have unpleasant meaning. It is an attempt to refine the language by using a better or polite vocabulary (Deng 542-543). By using euphemism, people can replace words or phrases to maintain the stability of social relation in community. It can also keep a speaker or listener from the possibility of effrontery or aggression. Moreover, Allan and Burridge as quoted in Ren and Yu (46) added that euphemism is used to avoid something bad, especially about taboo subject such as sex area, bodily effluvia, bodily function, death, religious matter, unpleasant issue, etc.

Many euphemisms are experience semantic change. In semantic change, people are confronted by a constant word or form, but it has different concept of meaning (Chaer 143). Such changes affect the value of sense that has appeared, and the meaning of lexeme that is being replaced might be changed through the widening, narrowing, amelioration, or deterioration of meaning. Besides that, the other meaning may shift because of the exchange of perception or the similarity aspects (Allan and Burridge 97). However, the meaning relation is still binding each lexeme up, so they still have
relationship to each other. This relation can be identified by componential analysis that has numerous features to distinguish the member of the set from the other.

Nowadays, euphemism also presents in political discussion used for political purposes. In general, the use of euphemism in political discourse is intended to cover up scandals for someone such as corruption act, and to direct the public opinion about certain political, social, and cultural issues (Condren 88). For newspapers, journalists or editors generally avoid the offensive words to give a good effect to the reader (Hojati 553), especially on news or articles that have highly sensitive topic like politics. The editors tend to choose euphemism as the explicit words that are considered polite. In this regard, the meaning of the euphemism changes or shifts so the reader might find it difficult to understand the message.

The discussion of euphemism term itself has been done in many cases before. One of them is a journal entitled “An Analysis of Phonetic Formation in English Euphemism” written by Fei Deng in 2016. Another study on euphemism are in “A Study of Euphemism in the Context of English-speaking Media” by AlirezaHojati in 2012 and “Politically Correct Euphemism in Mass Media (Based on American and Turkish Online Periodicals of The Beginning of The 21st Century)” by Shemshurenko and Shafigullina in 2015. However, unlike the three previous studies that are concerned in the phonetic formation of euphemism; frequencies of euphemism; and political correct
euphemism, this research is related to discussing semantic change in euphemism found in political articles of newspapers.

To clarify the objectives of the study, the writer gives a limitation on the topic of research on the euphemism which includes the types and functions, along with the semantic change found in The New York Times online political articles on December 2017. The aims of this study is to classify and explain the types and functions of the euphemism based on Allan and Burridge’s theory, as well as to analyze the semantic change that occur by focusing on the theory of Dirk Geeraerts. The writer hopes this research can give benefits to the development of scientific theories about meaning and semantic change of euphemism in political issues, so it can expand the use of euphemism in spoken or written communications in public.

B. Focus of the Study

In conducting this research, the writer focuses on the types and functions, along with the changes of the meaning of euphemism found in The New York Times online political articles on December 2017. The writer use euphemism classification theory proposed by Allan and Burridge, and Dirk Geeraerts’ theory about semantic change. In addition, componential analysis is used in order to get the real meaning relation and semantic change of the euphemism.

The writer applies both theories above to get the overall data analysis appropriately. The writer chose The New York Times online political articles because at this time the use of euphemism is not only limited to oral language,
but also to written language where there are ideas and opinions that are trying to deliver to the wide variety of reader. The euphemism is used to avoid of using bad words to give a good effect to the society, especially in talking about politics.

C. Research Questions

Based on the focus of the study above, the writer arranges this research through the following questions:

1. What are the types of euphemism found in The New York Times political articles on December 2017?

2. How does semantic change of euphemism in The New York Times political articles on December 2017?

D. Significance of the Study

Theoretically, this research will give contribution to the development of linguistics field especially in the study of semantics or euphemism. It will also help the next researchers to find ideas to develop some researches about euphemisms and their semantic change.

Practically, this research will give contribution to society in giving a better understanding about euphemism, so that people can apply the use of it in their written or spoken communication.
E. Research Methodology

1. The Objectives of Research

This research has the following objectives:

a. To classify the types of euphemism found in The New York Times political articles on December 2017.

b. To analyze semantic change of euphemism in The New York Times political articles on December 2017.

2. The Method of Research

The data found in this research which are words, phrases, and sentence will be analyzed through qualitative method. Qualitative method describes research data descriptively and based on the theory that relevant to the topic of the research. In addition, qualitative method uses non-numeric data in giving explanation or description, interpretation, and classification from the data (Subroto 7).

3. The Instrument of the Research

The instrument in this research is the writer herself by collectig and noting the word or phrase related to euphemism. In addition, data card is also used to give a code for the source of the euphemism. The euphemism which have semantic change will analyzed carefully by giving the classification and explanation through the application of main meaning and componential analysis.
4. **The Unit of Analysis**

Unit of analysis is the object of research that is explained and classified based on the focus of the study. Therefore, the unit of analysis of this research is online political articles that are published in The New York Times website, www.nytimes.com, on December 2017 with focusing on euphemism.

5. **The Technique of Data Analysis**

In this research, the writer uses descriptive method to make an explanation, illustration, interpretation, and classification systematically and appropriately about facts, characteristics, and relation between languages phenomena that are occur in society (Subroto 4-5). In applying this method, the writer uses some steps to analyze the research data. The steps are:

a. Choosing The New York Times online political articles on December 2017 randomly.

b. Reading all the news or articles that had been chosen and taking notes of words, phrases, or sentences that possibly contain euphemism.

c. Classifying the euphemisms that are found into types of euphemism according to Allan and Burridge’s theory.

d. Taking the samples of the data and then determining the function of euphemisms that are found.

e. Identifying the research data using main meaning analysis.
f. Analyzing the research data using componential analysis to compare and identify the meaning relation and semantic change that occurred, supported by the theory of semantic change by Dirk Geeraerts.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Previous Research

There are some researches related to this topic which closely explained about the euphemism. The first research related to the study of euphemism is journal entitled “An Analysis of Phonetic Formation in English Euphemism” written by Fei Deng in 2016. The research has aim to explain the forming process of euphemism from its phonetic aspects. It explained that the formation of euphemism expression can occur according to lexical formation, grammatical formation, semantic innovation, slang word, rhetorical formation, and phonetic formation. This research found that the term of euphemism phonetically can be formed through the tone changes, phonetic deviations, acronyms and clipping, spelling and repetition. In addition, phonetic euphemism as a communicative tool to replace those unpleasant, rude, and offensive things or taboo subjects is applied in all human societies and interaction. The study also describes the characteristics of phonetic formation of English euphemism, they are conforming to the speaker himself, to the society, and to interactive communication.

The second related study is a journal with the title “A Study of Euphemism in the Context of English-speaking Media” by AlirezaHojati in 2012. The purpose of the research is to identify and examine the frequently used euphemisms featuring in English-speaking media. The paper focused on the news bulletin of a limited number of high profile English speaking
television channels, they are *BBC World News, AlJazeera English*; and *France 24 English*. Those news bulletin were selected on a random basis at different times of the day, such as early-morning, mid-morning, mid-day, early afternoon, evening, and mid-night. The writer found that the total frequency use of euphemism in English speaking media is military 239, economy 165, disability 67, sex 88, poverty 182, and death 59. It can be said that the category which has highest frequency of euphemism is military, while death become the lowest category. For this reason, the writer concluded that euphemism can be used for legitimate and justifiable, and for say deplorable purpose of deception. It has a special place and widely used by different political and military figures for rather suspicious reasons.

Another study of euphemism is a journal entitled “*Politically Correct Euphemism in Mass Media (Based on American and Turkish Online Periodicals of The Beginning of The 21st Century)*” written by Shemshurenko and Shafigullina in 2015. This research investigated the definition of euphemism and political correct by Russian and Western linguists, and to analyze the classification and functional peculiarities of euphemism based on the theory of political correctness. Furthermore, this study focuses on the comparative analysis, which based on the theoretical data about euphemism in modern American and Turkish online media and compare the types of politically correct euphemisms in the two language. As a result, euphemisms in Turkish and American media are widely employed while describing, mitigating, and masking the negative associations related to the mentioned
issues. Furthermore, the study found that compared to Turkish, the American mass media is more characterized by the widespread use of politically correct lexemes. It contains a great number of politically correct lexemes.

All of the three previous studies have the same main topic, which is analyzing euphemism. Meanwhile, they use different kind of approaches and theories; such as phonetic formation and political correctness. In this paper, the writer also analyzes the euphemism, but focuses on its types, functions, and semantic changes. Like the second and third previous research, this study uses mass media, especially newspaper as the object of the study; while the first study use direct samples in society. However, the second related research applied calculation frequencies of euphemism and the third previous study used comparative method by explaining the data definition, while the purpose of this study is not to compare and calculate the use of euphemism in media. On the contrary, this paper conducted to describe the meaning and its semantic change in a simpler way.

In addition, an online version of The New York Times political articles chosen as the corpus and componential analysis are used to represent the semantic change on euphemism. The writer also applies a qualitative method study by collecting and identifying the data.

B. Euphemism

1. Definitions of Euphemism

Euphemism is the option for an offensive expression that speakers or writers prefer not to use in delivering their message on a given
occasion. Euphemism is derived from Greek *eu* means good or well and *pheme* means speaking (Deng 542; Ren and Yu 46). Literally, euphemism has a meaning to say well or with a pleasant attitude.

Based on *The New Oxford Dictionary of English* quoted by Ren and Yu (46), euphemism is a refinement or replacement of words or expressions that are considered to be too harsh when referring to something unpleasant or embarrassing. The word *eupheme* was previously used to replace some religious words that should not be spoken aloud. But nowadays, euphemism tends to be used to reveal disrespectful or embarrassing topics so they have more polite or subtle meaning.

According to Allan and Burridge (11), euphemism is a collection of words or phrases used as an alternative expression in expressing an uncomfortable thing. This dispreferred term may be taboo, fearsome, distasteful, or for other reason have too many negative meaning to felicitously execute speaker’s communicative intention on a certain occasion. Euphemisms are used to avoid the possibility of loss of face by the speaker, as well as the listener and or third person. With applying euphemism, one can avoid taboo frightening, disliked, or other language that has negative connotation or expressions.

In the use of euphemism, a listener or reader has possibility to determine that there is a word or phrase which is used to show a sensitive matter in more polite and wise manner. To explain more deeply about euphemism, Warren (135) divided the definition into three parts. First, the
referent of euphemism is considered as a sensitive phenomenon. This explains why it is possible to reveal some unpleasant topics like death, crime, unwelcome political and military facts, drug abuse, physical and mental hurt, and sensitive body parts and sex. Second, the referring expression has the meaning of not being too rough or not pointing directly. It is used as an alternative word or phrase. In other words, euphemism tends to name phenomena that are already named. Third, euphemism is a form of someone’s response in view of the choice of expression used by the speaker. In this case, the listener can determine whether the language style of a speaker is counted as euphemism or not. It depends entirely on the understanding of the listener or reader.

Wardaugh (238) interpreted euphemism as a word and expression that forbids people to speak about the unfavorable things by neutralizing its unpleasant meaning. Euphemism is used to avoid mentioning certain matters directly. In addition, euphemism can also give a name for a particular job or activity to make them sound more interesting, such as counsel for lawyer and help for servant. In simply word, Wardaugh (240) describes euphemism as an alternative to the choice of unpleasant expressions and used to avoid possible assault.

Nowadays, euphemism is not only applied in the relation of taboo or religious expressions, but also to political interest. Euphemisms have the function to reduce or decrease the meaning of unpleasant expressions, so that sensitive and sometime not preferred political facts may be covered
indirectly (Shemshurenko and Shafigullina 129). In addition, euphemism is a kind of camouflage and a means of avoiding embarrassment (Condren 89). It plays a role in covering up the political story and building the public attention about prominent figure or certain issue. Based on Orwell quoted in Burridge (68), euphemism is constructed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind.

According to Hojati (553), political euphemism focuses on controversial aspects or topics that are being debated. For this reason, euphemism is not only the matters of lexical choices but also the choice of expression within a given context. The following sentences show the meaning of euphemisms in a certain topic:

(1) “America is in the game, and America is going to win,” he said, to an audience that included cabinet members and military officers. (A2. Pg4. P4)

The word *game* in the sentence (1) refers to the competition in which America was trying to fight other countries and become a superpower country. It is used to distinguish the reader about America’s attempt in becoming a great power. Based on the text, the word *game* substituted the word *competition* which negative connotations. Without knowing the context of the article, the meaning of euphemisms in the sentence below cannot be determined clearly.

Generally, euphemism can be defined as a term to replace other terms that is dislike expression or to avoid a certain meaning of some
expression or language. It is an avoidance language and evasive expression that speaker or writer used as a protective shield against the unpleasant language. Not only in taboos word, but euphemism is also created in political subject to build public belief about certain information that has inappropriate facts.

2. Types of Euphemism

Allan and Burridge in *Euphemism & Dysphemism: Language Use as Shield & Weapon* (1991) divided euphemism into some types which described in the following paragraphs.

**Metaphor** is kind of figurative expression used to replace the real meaning from one word with other explicit meaning that has more soft meaning (Allan and Burridge 15). The examples of metaphor are:

(2) *cavalry's come* (Allan and Burridge 15)
(3) *go to the happy hunting* (Allan and Burridge 15)
(4) “...recalling unresolved *maelstroms* like Mr. Trump’s feud with a Gold Star widow…” (A4. Pg11. P7)

The example (2) used for replacing the words *I've got my period*. It implicitly represents the onset of catamenia as the arrival of the redcoat cavalry. In this example, the meaning of the word *cavalry* has a new meaning of the word *period*. Next, example (3) refers to *die* in which the meaning has taboo connotation; while in the (4) the word *maelstroms* mean *problems* that have negative meaning. All the examples above are the form of euphemism which cover taboos or negative connotations with figurative language that has more polite meaning explicitly.
Remodeling is used to substitute one word with another one that has the same onset or rhyme with the dispreferred expression (Allan and Burridge 15). In this case, those two words are not related semantically. That is the reason why this kind of euphemism will undergo semantic change. The examples of remodeling based on Allan and Burridge (15-16) are:

(5) sugar, shoot, or shucks to replace the taboo word shit
(6) darn, dang, or drat for substitute the word damn
(7) tarnation to replace damnation

The three examples above are used to make the words that have taboos and negative meaning is more polite and acceptable than their meaning before. The euphemism in (5) and (6) have similar onset; and (7) has the same rhyme.

Circumlocution is a way to replace the dislike words with the softer expression that have relation in their meaning component (Allan and Burridge 16). The examples of circumlocution euphemism are:

(8) Categorical in accuracy or terminological inexactitude (Allan and Burridge 16).
(9) “They have also insisted that Mr. Papadopoulos was a low-level figure.” (A.5. Pg15. P11)

The example (8) is the form of circumlocution euphemism for lie. Whereas, the word low-level figure in (9) refers to an incompetent person. Both examples below show that circumlocution is used by replacing the unpleasant words with the other positive one that have relation in the semantic component.
**Clipping** is one type of euphemism which is created by simplifying the dysphemism expression in order to make the negative form little bit clearer (Allan and Burridge 16-17), such as:

(10) *jeezeto replace Jesus* (Allan and Burridge 16).
(11) *bra* refers to *brassiere* (Allan and Burridge 16).

From the example (10) and (11), it can be seen that clipping is a type of euphemism which only used the simply form of the dispreferred expression. Since they are used the short version of word, there is no semantic change in this kind of euphemism.

**Abbreviation** is kind of euphemism that is written and spoken as the string of letters. The words are created from the initial letter or two of the words in a phrase, but do not perform proper words (Allan and Burridge 17). It is all pronounced as strings of letter, not as a form of word. For this reason, abbreviation does not experience semantic change. The examples of abbreviation are

(12) *S.O.B* (Allan and Burridge 17)
(13) *W.A.R* (Allan 241)

In the example above, *S.O.B* (12) stands for *son-of-a-bitch*; meanwhile *W.A.R* (13) is the abbreviation for Woman Against Rape. It can be seen that between the euphemism and its meaning there are no semantic change because it stands for what it refers to.

**Omission** is one of euphemism that steps further. There are two types of omission in euphemisms; they are *quasi-omission* and *full-omission* (Allan and Burridge 17). *Quasi-omission* uses some kinds of non-lexical expression to replace the unpleasant term. This includes the
spoken counterparts to dashes and asterisk things, like *mhm*, and *er-mm*. Like clipping and abbreviation, quasi-omission does not undergo semantic change because this type used a non-lexical expression which usually has no meaning. *Full-omission* seem less common that the *quasi-omission*. The examples of this type are *I need to go* which refers to *go to lavatory* and *there’s the pot calling the kettle black* that omits *arse* in the end.

**Acronym** euphemism constructs from the first or the second initial letters that can be utter or read like the other common words (Allan and Burridge 17). It is used to say in indirect way about unpleasant or impolite word. Therefore, there is no change of meaning in this kind of euphemism. The examples of acronym in euphemism are:

(14) *snafu* stands for *situation normal, all fucked up* (Allan and Burridge 17)
(15) *commfu* stands for *complete monumental military fuck up* (Allan and Burridge 17)

**One-for-one substitution** uses monosyllabic word to replace the unpleasant expression which tends to have more than one syllable (Allan and Burridge 17). There are two group of one-for-one substitution, they are *metonymy* and *synecdoche*. Metonymy (general for specific) is one word that has general meaning exchange with other terms which have more specific meaning (Allan and Burridge 18). In metonymy, the object is referred to something that closely associated with it. Meanwhile, synecdoche (a part for whole) is used to take certain other things that have wider characteristic (Allan and Burridge 18). The examples of one-for-one substitution show as follows:
(16) *Nether regions* (Allan and Burridge 18).
(17) *I’ve got a cough* (Allan and Burridge 18).

The example (16) shows metonymy euphemism which refers to *genitals*, invokes general area for a specific area within it. On the contrary, the example (17) is the form of synecdoche euphemism that means *stuffed up nose, post nasal drip, and running eyes*.

**Hyperbole** is an excessive language that count as figurative expression to pile certain topic on (Allan and Burridge 18). It is used for instances of such exaggerations for emphasis or effect. For examples:

(18) *personal assistant* (Allan and Burridge 18).
(19) *flight to the glory* (Allan and Burridge 18).
(20) “...severely reprimanded Mr. Papadopoulos for failing to clear his *explosive* comments with the campaign in advance.” (A5. Pg18. P25)

The example (18) is a hyperbole euphemism which replaces the word *secretary*, while the example (19) refers to *death*. The word *explosive* in the example (20) means *rude*, where the word is made to exaggerate the issue. In this type, the word has a new meaning that usually more specific that the old one.

**Understatement**, also called litotes, is a figurative expression that used to express euphemism term by explaining the simple part (Allan and Burridge 18). In other words, it is the opposite of hyperbole. Understatement is used to express euphemism by mentioning only part of the true, for instance:

(21) *sleep* (Allan and Burridge 18)
(22) *deed* (Allan and Burridge 18)
“…that the Russians had “dirt” on Mrs. Clinton in the form of “thousands of emails,”…” (A5. Pg18. P28)

The use of *sleep* in (21) is used as the understatement for *die* or *companion*, while *deed* in (22) replaces the *act of murder*. The word *dirt* in (23) is also a kind of understatement euphemism for fraudulence. For this reason, the new meaning of the word usually undergoes semantic broadening because the earlier meaning is more specific than the new one.

**Borrowing** euphemism formed from other languages like Latin and French. The use of Latin homonyms provides Standard English with euphemism for bodily effluvia, sex, and the associated acts and bodily organs (Allan and Burridge 19). Since it comes from other languages, there must be semantic change between the previous and new meaning of the words. Some English euphemisms that derive from other languages are shown in the following examples:

(24) *perspire* (Allan and Burridge 19)
(25) *genitals* or *genitalia* (Allan and Burridge 19)
(26) *expectorate* (Allan and Burridge 19)

The euphemism (24) came from French *perspire* which in English means *sweat*. For example (25), it is derived from Latin *genitalis* that refers to *sex organs*. Then, the word (26) is formed from Latin *expectorat* which means *spit*.

**Jargon or common terms** euphemism come from everyday language and can be applied to replace the taboo or unpleasant expression (Allan and Burridge 20), such as *period* for *menstruate*. Because it used common languages, some people might be not recognizes that it is one
kind of euphemism. Sometimes the antithetical strategy is to use colloquial rather than more formal terms.

3. Functions of Euphemism

The mainly function of euphemism is absolutely as an alternative expression that speakers or writers prefer not to use in delivering their message on a given occasion. In fact, euphemism has other functions depending on how it used in a given context.

Euphemism can be used to avoid the offense in language (the protective euphemism) (Burridge 67). People used these words to talk in different way about subject or topic which for a certain moment would be not accepted. It is originally functioned as verbal as well as nonverbal replacement in response to taboos, such as private parts, sex, anger, dishonesty, drunkenness, madness, disease, etc.

The sense of euphemism is sometimes dishonest when it is functioned to mystify and to misrepresent (the underhand euphemism). Some say that a meaning of euphemism is dishonest since the taboo and dislike words are express in indirect way (Burridge 68). The words are used to distinguish a certain issue in any areas of language like in politics, military, and medical term. In this case, euphemism is used to distinguish a certain topic to deceive (Allan and Burridge 205). This will lead people to mystify and misrepresent the real meaning of those expressions, because the speaker or writers manipulate the information.
Euphemism is applied to talk up and to inflate (the uplifting euphemism) (Burridge 69). It is simply used to make a language has more favorable connotation than the dispreferred one. This kind of function leads people to collide with the jargon, the language peculiar to trade, profession or some other group (Allan and Burridge 31). For example, the hamburger industry’s use of the term *autocondimentation* as opposed to *precondimentation* is an economical way of distinguishing a client’s right to salt his/her hamburger. It is applied to confer the hamburger industry’s dignity.

Furthermore, the purpose of euphemism is also to reveal and to inspire (the provocative euphemism) which is usually found in political satirist (Burridge 69-70). There is more involved than straightforward politeness and the maintenance of face. The main reason of using euphemism in case is to help remove the stigma of negative social stereotypes through the language.

There is another function of euphemism in which the meaning can work as in-group identity (Burridge 70). It is used to show solidarity and to help define the gang (the cohesive euphemism), because taboos link the people of a society together. This explains why euphemism can work as in-group trademarks.

It is also clear that euphemism can be created widely to amuse. It is functioned to have fun and to entertain (the ludic euphemism) since some of them are created to amuse (Burridge 71). Not only used in taboo or
military and medical term, but euphemism also applied in humor for comics and comedies.

C. Meanings

The words meaning is quite vague. It is generally used to represents the quality or sense of purpose in communication. Meaning is insubstantial and elusive that sometimes impossible to make any clear, concrete, or tangible about it.

In linguistics, the branch of study which focuses on the meaning is called semantics. Riemer (2) mentioned that semantics plays a role in distinguishing between different types of meaning and making it clears in the theoretical principles of language. It is any attempt to explain and describe the nature of language meaning. The investigation in meaning has purpose to know a language semantically, like to know the relations of meaning between sentences and which sentences that are meaningful and which are not (Leech 8).

A distinction is made related to the meaning of a word between its denotation and connotation. Both of them focus on the relation of a word to the world (Jackson 58). Denotation is the knowledge to which an expression correctly refers; while connotation names some aspects of meaning which related to secondary factors such as its emotional force, its level of formality, its character as euphemism, etc. (Riemer 18-19). The further explanation about denotation and connotation in meaning will be described below.
1. **Denotative or conceptual meaning** is the central factor in language. It is the primary meaning that the meaning suggested by the word when it used alone (Leech 9). In this case, the meaning is stylistically neutral and objective as opposed to other kinds of associative meaning. The meaning of a word, such as *table* or *chair*, can be successfully determined in a large situation when a person has the ability that makes it possible (Kreidler 43).

2. **Connotative meaning** is the expression that has a communicative value by virtue what it refers to, over and above its purely conceptual content. It is the sense that in fact talking about the real world experience one associates with an expression when one uses or hears it. For example, the word *woman* has conceptual content of human, female, and adult, but the psychosocial connotations could be gregarious, having maternal instinct, etc. In addition, the meaning in connotative are relatively unstable, according to how it is seen in culture, historical period, and the experience of the individual (Leech 12).

   Some words may have different connotations but similar in its denotations, (Riemer 19), such as *police officer* and *cop*, *rest room* and *toilet*, *brat* and *child*, etc. For this reason, euphemism can be counted to have this kind of meaning since it used to make a more positive connotations but it has similar reference in the context. For example, *incident* and *accident* denote to unpleasant and unexpectedly event, but the word *incident* can be used as euphemism which connotatively sounds more positive and polite than *accident* which usually related to causes injury or damage.
To summarize, the meaning of language can be determined by focusing on the word, phrases, sentences, and all the parts and aspects that include inside of it. The analysis of meaning has the goal to understand a language semantically and to decide whether the sentence is meaningful or not. The meaning of words can be seen through different aspects in the world, which are denotation and connotation.

D. Semantic Change

Semantic change might occur along with the development of the language users. This change is a common phenomenon that happens in all languages. According to Yu and Ren (61), semantic change not only adds a new meaning to certain words, but also creates the whole meaning changed. In other words, semantic change occurs when a word loses its original meaning and has a new meaning. However, the meaning relation between the words is still binding each lexeme up, so they still have relationships to each other.

Blank (61-62) believed that changes in meaning can occur due to several factors, including linguistics, psycholinguistics, as well as social and culture. Based on Ullmann quoted in Blank (67), semantic change can occur due to the need of naming newly developed objects or ideas in technic, scientific, politic, or sociocultural which affect human conception. It is a consequence of human mind characteristics and their social interaction.

Allan and Burridge (14) said that euphemism can have semantic change since there is a change or addition of a new meaning to the previous word or expression, and it cause some existing vocabulary to have a more
subtle meaning. This change may include the extension of meaning, the spread of meaning, or a shift in meaning.

In *Theories of Lexical Semantics*, Geeraerts classified four major types based on the result of semantic change. They are:

a. *Specialization* or *narrowing* is the semantic change in which the new meaning of a word develops less general or restricted than the old meaning (Geeraerts 26-27). In specialization, the range of the new meaning is a subset of the old meaning. For example, the word *corn* is originally enveloped all kinds of grain, but now it specialized to *wheat* in England, *oats* in Scotland, and *maize* in the United States. The word undergoes semantic narrowing because its definition is used more frequently compared to other definitions, so the definition eventually evolves to a more specific one. It is also affected by the sociocultural factors where the meaning of *corn* is change in every region.

b. *Generalization* or *broadening* is a kind of semantic change where the new meaning of a word becomes more general or expanded than the old one (Geeraerts 26-27). In this type, the range of the new meaning includes the old meaning. For instance, the word *moon* in the beginning only means the earth’s satellite, but then extended to any planet’s satellite. In this example, the original meaning of the word *moon* remains present because the meaning of previous one includes in the meaning of the new one.
c. **Metonymy** is a semantic change that based on the relationship between the referents of the lexical items (Geeraerts 27). The example of this kind is the words *she drinks a whole bottle*. In this case, the word *bottle* is not only means the bottle itself, but also cover the content of the bottle that is consumed or certain types of receptacle. The concept of metonymy covers a broadly general sense of various associations in the spatial, temporal, or causal domain.

d. **Metaphor** is a type of semantic change which based on similarity between the meanings of the lexical items (Geeraerts 27). This change involves figurative similarity which expanded with the concept of changes based on literal similarity. For example the word *root* primarily means *the root of plant*, but now it can also refers to *the root of word* or *the root of algebra*. In this example, the meaning is transferred on the basis of the fact that the two referents resemble one another, which is the similarity of position or location (root means the origin basis of something).

Semantic change is a part of changes in the meaning between lexicon items which caused by the constantly changing environment. Although the meaning is change from the earlier to the new one, the sense relation still tied the words up so they still have relation between them. In addition, most of the changes are affected by the extension and narrowing of lexeme’s denotation. Furthermore, this semantic change leads to the used of euphemism as a means of avoiding unfavorable topics or ideas. For example, the word *undertaker*
means a person who undertook to do things or contractor, and then later has been used as a euphemism for the word *funeral director* (Allan 208). It can be said that *undertaker* is the consequence of narrowed meaning and the meaning change is a consequence of euphemism. The meaning change of the word *undertaker* can be seen in the following table:

Table 2.1 Example of Semantic Change in Euphemism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undertaker</th>
<th>Previous meaning</th>
<th>New meaning</th>
<th>Semantic change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A person who undertook things or a contractor</td>
<td>Funeral director; a person who prepare the bodies of dead people to be buried; to arrange funerals</td>
<td>Semantic narrowing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To sum up, semantic change is the evolution of language meaning where the point of the modern sense radically different from the original usage. Every word has a variety of sense and meaning which can change through widening, narrowing, adding, removing, amelioration, or pejoration across the space and time.

E. Componential Analysis

Componential analysis cannot be separated from semantic field, since a meaning of a word can be explained by telling what set it belongs to and how it differs from other members of the same set. Sematic field can give a clear distinction between words meaning in a field where the lexemes belong to. After construct the semantic field, the relation between the lexical items
within the set will have to be explained more detail by componential analysis. Both of them are required in assessing the meaning change of word.

Componential analysis is a group of numerous features that distinguish the members of the set from one another. Based on Geeraerts (52), it is a method for explaining such opposition that inspired by structuralist phonology where phonemes are described structurally by their position on a group of contrastive dimension. Geeraerst added that words may be characterized on the basis dimensions that construct a lexical field.

According to Jackson (79), componential analysis is an approach to analyze the meaning of lexemes using some number of components, which are compared between lexemes or group of lexemes. Through the componential analysis, the content or the composition of the word meaning can be found. The component of meaning or semantic component explains that every word or lexical element consists of one or several elements that come together to form the word or lexical element meaning.

Parera (161) explained that there are several procedures to find the content of a word meaning. Firstly, choose a set of words that intuitively relevance connected. After that, look for the analogies of that set of words. Then, gives a special characteristic to the semantic component or composition based on the previous analogies.

The entire description of the components of words for an item can be seen based on the presence or absence of a finite number of features (Riemer 155). Jackson (86) mentioned that the semantic components represent the
binary choices, which have three possibilities: either it is present [+], or it is absent [-], or it may be present or absent [+/-]. Those features of semantic components are conventionally written in capital letters and used a square bracket.

In addition, Katz and Fodor quoted in Finch (149) mentioned that there are a distinction between semantic markers and distinguisher. Semantic markers are the components which reflect the systematic relation between the words. Meanwhile, distinguisher defines special characters of an item that can differentiate it from others.

Component analysis can be used to analyze the term of euphemism. The process involved in euphemism is a kind of componential analysis (Allan and Burridge 16), where the senses of taboo or unpleasant words are unpacked and each of the meaning components is listed. Using this analysis, a new language of euphemism can be made.

Overall, componential analysis is method that is used to describe the meaning of lexeme or word by explaining their sense relation based on their semantic field. It has purposes to give details of the lexical items meanings and to give rules how the meaning of words build up into the meaning of phrases and sentences.

F. Meaning Relation

Another aspect of meaning is the meaning relations that hold within the vocabulary of language between words themselves which is called meaning relations or meaning relations. They reveal the aspects of meaning of
a word. Meaning relation is the most important aspect in the field and componential analysis of meaning. When a word has various meaning relations with other words, then they are semantically related (Riemer 136). The meaning of each lexeme is explained either in the terms of its reference or denotation and its meaning relations. Both of them play a role to characterizing a meaning of lexeme.

Kreidler (85) stated that there is a close relationship between semantic field, componential analysis, and meaning relation. Componential analysis is the broadening of semantic field theory, and all the lexemes may create and connect by meaning relation of one element to others.

There are four kinds of sense relations as follows:

a. Synonymy

The term synonymy is derived from Greek syn- and -nymy which mean same and name (Jackson 64). Therefore, it is the relationship between two words that have the same meaning. It is also termed as meaning identity or meaning similarity. Two or more words are called synonymy if they used the same referring expression and have the same truth value (Geeraerts 84). For examples, the word seaman and sailor are synonymy in the sentence (27) and large and big are synonym in the sentence (28).

(27) He is a seaman = He is a sailor.

(28) The rock is large = The rock is big.
Synonym is related to the context of use, where two words are called synonyms if they can be replaced interchangeably in all sentence contexts. In this case, two items are synonymous if they may be substituted for each other in a given context, while the semantic value of the expression as a whole are remain the same (Geeraerts 84).

b. Antonym

The notion of oppositeness in language is known as antonym. There is a number of relations between words that related in meaning at the same time yet different or contrasting (Saeed 66). Antonym comes from Greek ant- and –nymy which mean opposite and name (Jackson 64), so antonym is the relation between two words that are contradictory. If one is true, the other must be false (Kreidler 100). Lexemes like on and off, old and new, and small and big are pairs of antonyms.

Geeraerts (86) listed that there are three basic types of antonym; they are binary gradable, binary non-gradable, and multiple antonyms. Gradable antonym is the opposite meaning between words which have various intermediate positions like the words wide and narrow or young and old, or may be expressed by modifiers such as somewhat or very.

Non-gradable antonym is the relation of two words which do not define endpoint on gradable scale. In this type, there is no middle
ground between words like a couples of on and off in an electric devices and a pairs of dead and live.

Multiple antonyms are determined by the number of semantic dimension that involved. The examples of this type can be directional, where most of them are combined into a complex system of coordinates (north/southeast/west) or taking the human body part as a point of reference like left/right/in front of/behind/up/down/.

c. Hyponym

Hyponym is based on the notion of group inclusion. It is derived from Greek hypo which means under (Riemer 142). It is the lexical relation described by the phrase kind, type, or sort of. Hyponym is a sense relation between words that the meaning of one of word is included in the meaning of the other (Hurfordet all 109). Vocabularies are connected to a system of inclusion and it caused semantic network form the hierarchy of elements (Saeed 68), such as collie is a kind of dog, dog then turn into hyponym of animal, after that animal become a kind of living things. The subordination or hyponymy could be determined as the relationship of the hyponym with regard to the hyperonym, while the superordination or hyperonymy would be the relationship between the hyperonym with regard to the hyponym (Geeraerts 82).
d. Meronomy

Meronomy is related to the term of the whole part. It comes from Greek of *meros* that means *part* (Riemer 140). Meronomy is used to describe a part-whole relationship. This relationship can be identified by using sentence frame like *X is part of Y, or Y has X*, as like *a page is part of a book, or a book has pages* (Saeed 70; Geeraerts 88). Other examples of meronymy are, the word *hand* is a meronymy of *arm*, *seed* is a meronymy of *fruit*, and *blade* is a meronymy of *knife*. 
CHAPTER III
RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A. The Data Description

In this chapter, the whole data are taken and collected from five political article of The New York Times online newspaper edition December 2017; they are How the Republicans Broke Congress (Article 1), Trump Delivers a Mixed Message on His National Security Approach (Article 2), Dispute Over Political Strategy Erupts Inside the White House (Article 3), The Year the News Accelerated to Trump Speed (Article 4), How Russia Inquiry Began: A Campaign Aide, Drinks and Talk of Political Dirt (Article 5). Then, the writer notes the euphemism based on three characteristics. First, the referent of euphemism is considered as a sensitive phenomenon. Second, the referring expression is thought of as less harsh or not pointing directly. Third, euphemism is the form of interpreter’s perception in view of tact or embarrassment with the referent that determine it.

The writer identifies semantic change that occur in the euphemism based on the indicator of semantic change and notes the selected data into data card. The indicators of semantic change of euphemism are as follows:

1. Semantic change in which the new meaning of a word develops less general than the old one is called specialization or semantic narrowing.
2. Semantic change that the new meaning of a word becomes more general or expanded than the previous meaning is categorized as generalization or semantic broadening.

3. Semantic change which based on the relationship between the referents of the lexical items is regarded as semantic metonymy.

4. Semantic change that based on the similarity between the meaning of lexical items is noted as semantic metaphor.

Although the meaning of euphemism changes, the sense relation between the lexemes are still binding each other. That sense relation can be identified by componential analysis. In componential analysis, the content of the word meaning can be found. There are several procedures to find the content of a word meaning. Firstly, choose a set of words that intuitively relevance connected. Secondly, look for the analogies of that set of words through the main meaning. Thirdly, gives a special characteristics to the semantic component or composition based on the previous analogies.

From all the data which have been collected and analyzed, there are 26 euphemisms found and 15 are considered as the representative data since they have similarity in character. In addition, all the data findings will be laid on the attachment. The writer also uses some dictionaries to support the analysis of the data, such as Oxford Advanced Learner’s
B. The Data Analysis

The writer analyzed the data thoroughly as being described in the following analysis. In these analyses, the writer uses Allan and Burridge’s concept about euphemism and Geeraerts’ theory of semantic change, and they will answer the two proposed research questions.

Datum 1. On the Right than On the Left

“Third, we have seen the impact of significant changes in the news media, which had a far greater importance on the right than on the left.” (A.1. Pg.3. P.9)

In the article, the sentence on the right than on the left is regarded as euphemism. For this case, the sentence means to the different effects that received from news media which tend to the right side rather than to the left one. It can be said that on the right than on the left replace the word unequally which has negative meaning. It is a type of metaphor euphemism which replaces the real meaning from an unpleasant word with other word that figuratively has more polite explicit meaning. The writer of the article applied on the right than on the left instead of unequally to cover the dispreferred facts about the development of news media which only brought up one side of political party, the Republicans, who were considered to cause political instability that day.

The purpose of euphemism on the right than on the left in this article is to talk in a simple way for expressions that writer preferred not to
use on a certain occasion. The author of the article used euphemism to have better connotations than the dispreferred one. On the other words, the euphemism *on the right than on the left* functioned as the uplifting euphemism to talk up the word *unequally*. The article applied *on the right than on the left* to distinguishing the readers that Republicans Party took all the benefits from news media and built its own facts in politics.

The main meaning of words *right* according to Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary is the right side or direction; the good moral; in a normal or good enough condition. Then, the word *left* means the left side or direction. Then, Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary also explained that in politics, the phrase *on the right than on the left* represents a political positions, ideologies, and parties. The word *right* is a political group that most strongly support capitalist system, and *left* is other group who support ideas and beliefs of socialism. For this article, the right side symbolizes the Republican Party and the left side refers to Democratic Party. Instead of saying unbalance impact of news media between Republicans and Democrats, the writer used the euphemism *on the right than on the left* which indirectly means *unequally*. The word *unequally* has main meaning of the way someone or something treated in different ways or have different advantages; unfair; different size or amount; and not capable doing something. From the definition, it can be seen that there is a change of meaning from *on the right than on the left* to *unequally*. Supporting the explanation above, the writer would break down the
semantic components of \textit{on the right than on the left} and \textit{unequally} in below:

\textit{On the right than on the left}: [DIRECTION] [POSITION] [DIFFERENT] [UNFAIR] [ONE SIDE]

\textit{Unequally}: [POSITION] [DIFFERENT] [UNFAIR] [ONE SIDE]

For the future information, the writer will identify the meaning relation by using semantic components as the following table.

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
On the right than on the left & Unequally \\
\hline
+ & Direction & - \\
+ & Position & - \\
+ & Different & + \\
+ & Unfair & + \\
+ & One side & + \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Componential Analysis of On the Right than on the Left and Unequally}
\end{table}

In the table 3.1, the writer finds out three components in common, they are [DIFFERENT] [UNFAIR] and [ONE SIDE]. These similar components surely allow the author of the article to replace the word \textit{unequally} with \textit{on the right than on the left}. Besides, the writer applies synonymy relation between \textit{on the right than on the left} and \textit{unequally}, although \textit{on the right than on the left} has additional characters [POSITION] and [DIRECTION]. Synonym is the relation of two or more words that have the same meaning. In this case, the additional components only play a role to differentiate both of them because \textit{on the right than on}
the left literally refers to the different direction or position but unequally means to the different way of treated or size or amount.

The new meaning of on the right than on the left in the article meets semantic metaphor which is a type of meaning change based on similarity between the meanings of lexical items. The semantic change can be seen in the following table:

Table 3.2 Semantic Change of On the Right than on the Left

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earlier Meaning</th>
<th>New Meaning</th>
<th>Semantic Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Unequally</td>
<td>Metaphor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The new meaning of on the right than on the left in the article is not broader or narrower, but the change is called metaphor. For this reason, the meaning of on the right than on the left is shifted on the basis of the fact that the referent resemble to unequally, which is the similarity of treated differently or unfair.

Datum 2. Protégé

“Matt Drudge, his protégé Andrew Breitbart and Breitbart’s successor Steve Bannon leveraged the power of the internet to espouse their far-right views.” (A1. Pg3. P9)

In sentence above, the word protégé refers to a young person who is guided in their career by a more power and experienced person. In this case, the word protégé has a role as euphemism for the word subordinate which means a person who has lower position in work and needs help from the superior one. The word protégé is a type of borrowing euphemism which replaces the unpleasant expression, subordinate, with
the French language. The writer of the article used *protégé* as the euphemism because the meaning of *subordinate* has a sensitive meaning about position in job. By using it, the meaning of *subordinate* is not pointing directly, so it will decrease the lose face possibility of Andrew Breitbart who has a lower position than Matt Drudge in Republican Party.

The goal of the euphemism *protégé* in the article is to have more favorable connotation than the dispreferred *subordinate*. It is used as an alternative expression to save the face of Andrew Breitbart who was has important role in the advance of news media for the right political party. Therefore, *protégé* is applied instead of *subordinate* as the uplifting euphemism which related to talk up and inflate about profession. The article used the term *protégé* as a replacement for the *subordinate* which the writer preferred not to use because it has sensitive connotation about position in organization.

According to Online Etymology Dictionary, the word *protégé* came from French *protégé* which means a person who is protected. As an English language, the meaning of *protégé* is a person under the patronage, protection, or care of someone interested in his or her career. Whereas, according to Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, the meaning of *subordinate* is a person who has a position with less authority and power than somebody else in organization. Compared to the meaning of *subordinate*, there is a change of meaning from the words *protégé*. Moreover, the euphemism *protégé* is borrowed from French language so
there must be a semantic change between the previous meaning of original French word and the new meaning of borrowed word. To support the explanation, the writer would arrange the semantic components of protégé and subordinate as follows:

*Protégé*: [PERSON] [PROTECTED] [HELPED]

*Subordinate*: [PERSON] [HELPED] [LOWER POSITION] [LESS AUTHORITY]

To have the meaning relation between *protégé* and *subordinate*, the writer will identify the semantic component into the table below:

**Table 3.3 Componential Analysis of Protégé and Subordinate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protégé</th>
<th>Subordinate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Person</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Protected</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Helped</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lower position</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Less authority</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the description above, the writer discovers that *protégé* and *subordinate* has two components in common, they are [PERSON] and [HELPED]. Therefore, *protégé* is able to replace the sensitive word *subordinate*. If *protégé* is a person who is protected and helped in career, the *subordinate* is a person who is helped in work since s/he has the lower position and less authority.

According to the semantic components, the writer finds out that the relation between *protégé* and *subordinate* is synonym. It is the relation between words that share the same referring expression. In this case, the
additional components of [LOWER POSITION] and [LESS AUTHORITY] in subordinate are used as the distinguishers which reflect the special characteristic about the word. Both of them mean a person who is helped in his or her career, but the word subordinate specifies into the position or status in profession which related to the lower level.

Based on the explanation above, the new meaning of protégé encounters semantic narrowing or specialization where the new meaning of the word becomes less general. The meaning change of protégé will be shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protégé</th>
<th>Earlier Meaning</th>
<th>New Meaning</th>
<th>Semantic Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helped and protected</td>
<td>Subordinate</td>
<td>Specialization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table 3.4, it can be seen that the latest meaning of protégé is restricted into the meaning of subordinate. The earlier meaning of protégé is not described about the position in organization or work, but then it has additional meaning of lower status and less authority or called subordinate.

**Datum 3. Bull Market**

“...he delivered a campaign like address, with familiar calls to build a wall along the southern border with Mexico and a heavy dose of self-congratulation for the bull market, the low jobless rate...” (A2. Pg4. P3)

In the article, the word bull market refers to financial market of a group in which the prices are rising or expected to rise. In this case, the word bull market is used as the euphemism for rising market which...
contains taboo connotation of finance. The word *rising market* has negative connotation because a person only invest the money or share to earn a large profit and the investors will compete each other due to the rising price. The word *bull market* is a kind of metaphor euphemism used to replace the real meaning from one word with other explicit meaning that has softer connotation. The terms *bull* and *bear* (the opposite of *bull market, bear market*) come from the way in which the animals attack each other. This action then related metaphorically to the movement of a market. The writer of the article used *bull market* instead of *rising market* as the alternative expression in talking different way about Mr. Trump’s plan on his national security approach.

The purpose of the euphemism *bull market* in this article is to avoid offense in language. It is functioned as nonverbal replacement in response to taboos of economy or money. In addition, it is used to save the face of Mr. Trump who announced the strategies on national security approach differently from the previous plan. Indirectly, the author of the article covered a reality of Mr. Trump who did not serve his promise by created some strategies that only give benefits to his own self.

The word euphemism *bull market* consists of two word, they are *bull* and *market*. The meaning of *bull* according to Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary is the male of any animal in the cow family or some other large animal, while *market* refers to a place or occasion where people buy and sell goods; business or trade. From both definitions, it can be said
that bull market generally means a place for people buy and sell the male animal. In financial term, the meaning of bull market refers to rising market where the share prices are rising and people are buying share in a period of time. Based on these definitions, the writer concludes that there is a change of meaning from the word bull market to rising market. To support the statement, the writer will break down the semantic components of both words in bellow.

*Bull Market:* [RELATED TO ANIMAL] [BUSINESS] [BUY AND SELL]

*Rising Market:* [BUSINESS] [BUY AND SELL] [COMPETE] [RISING Share]

The table of componential analysis below will explain the further information about the semantic components’ of bull market and rising market.

Table 3.5 Componential Analysis of Bull Market and Rising Market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bull Market</th>
<th>Rising Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Related to animal</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Business</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Buy and Sell</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Compete</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rising Share</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table, the writer discovers that bull market and rising market have two components in common. For this reason, the word bull market surely allows the article to replace rising market with bull market. 

*Bull market* is used due to the sensitive component of rising market, which
is [COMPETE]. The words *bull market* has additional character of [RELATED TO ANIMAL] while the words *rising market* has more components of [COMPETE] and [RISING SHARE].

As can be seen from the componential analysis, the writer supposes that between *bull market* and *rising market* has hyponym relation. In this case, the relation between both words is horizontal in the hierarchy. The word *bull market* and *rising market* included in the meaning of market in which a business or trade is occurred. So, it can be said that *bull market* and *rising market* is a hyponym market.

As explained before that *bull market* literally means a place to buy or sell animal, whereas in the context *bull market* defined as the *rising market*. Therefore, there is a change of meaning of the word *bull market*. The change of the euphemism *bull market* is showed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bull Market</th>
<th>Earlier Meaning</th>
<th>New Meaning</th>
<th>Semantic Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Animal Market</td>
<td>Rising Market</td>
<td>Specialization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the description above, the writer concludes that the euphemism *bull market* undergoes specialization or semantic narrowing. It clearly seen that the new meaning of the word *bull market* shifted to more restrict than the earlier meaning. In this case, the meaning of *bull market* is not related to animal, but to the place where the share are rising in a certain occasion.
Datum 4. Game

“America is in the game, and America is going to win,” he said, to an audience that included cabinet members and military officers. (A2. Pg4. P4)

In the sentence of New York Times political article above, there is a word *game* which considers as euphemism for a situation where people or group against each other. Therefore, this euphemism is used to replace the word *competition* which has sensitive connotation. The word *game* in this case is regarded as understatement euphemism which representing the euphemism as being smaller than it actually is. It can be seen that the word *game* is the simple part of *competition*. Moreover, the word *game* is applied by Mr. Trump in his speech to distinguish the readers that America was trying to compete other countries and had strong desire to win the battle. The euphemism is used to cover the unpleasant facts that happened between America and other nations.

The aims of the euphemism *game* are to have more favorable expression than the word *competition* which has some negative characters in its meaning. It is used as the alternative in saying different way about *competition*. Since the word *game* is mentioned by Mr. Trump, it also functions to mystify the readers about an issue in which himself was making an attempt to take over the world and make America as the great power by arranged a blueprint on his national security approach.

For Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, the word *game* has meaning of an activity or sport with rules; an activity that people do to
have fun; and a type of activity or business. On the other hand, the word *competition* means a situation in which people compete with each other for something that not everyone can have; to find out who is the best. From the definition, it is shows that the meaning of *game* has semantic change. The writer then breaks down the semantic components to support the explanation above.

**Game:** [ACTIVITY] [SPORT] [TO HAVE FUN] [AGAINST OTHERS] [WITH RULES]

**Competition:** [ACTIVITY] [TO FIND THE BEST] [AGAINST OTHERS]

To analyze more details about the sense relation, the writer draws the semantic components in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Game</th>
<th>Competition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>To have fun</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>To find the best</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Against others</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>With rules</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the componential analysis above, the word *game* and *competition* share two features in common; they are [ACTIVITY] and [AGAINST OTHERS]. Hence, the word *game* can be used as the substitution for the word *competition* caused by the similar semantic components between them. Both *game* and *competition* have negative
connotations in their components, but the word *game* is more specified into an activity to have fun which has more positive connotation.

Based on the components, the writer indicates that the sense relation between *game* and *competition* is synonymy because both of them have some similar identity. In fact, the additional features of the euphemism *game* in this case represent the special information about the word and play a role as the distinguisher rather than semantic marker. If *game* is an activity or a sport against other people or groups to have fun and set by rules, while *competition* is an activity against other people to find out who is the best.

The new meaning of the euphemism *game* in the text encounters semantic broadening or generalization. For more details, the semantic change of the euphemism *game* can be seen in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Game</th>
<th>Earlier Meaning</th>
<th>New Meaning</th>
<th>Semantic Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fun Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Competition</td>
<td>Generalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The original meaning of *game* is a fun activity which played by a set of rules, but then in this case the meaning become broader to the *competition*. It can be said that the new meaning become more general than the earlier one, so the new meaning of euphemism *game* experience semantic broadening.
Datum 5. Rivalry

“But it is animated by a single idea: that the world has been on a three-decade holiday from superpower rivalry; and it suggests that that holiday is now over.”  (A2. Pg5. P10)

The word rivalry in the sentence above is counted as euphemism which means to people, organizations, groups, etc. fight for the same thing. In other words, rivalry in this context refers to the word war that has a taboo connotations of abuse and dangerous. Furthermore, the word rivalry included in the type of metonymy euphemism in which the general meaning of the word rivalry exchange with the more specific meaning of the word war. The word rivalry is used rather than war to say in different context about the competition between great powers which had been stop for more than one decade.

As stated before, the function of euphemism rivalry is as an alternative way in referring the dispreferred expression. It is used as a response to taboos of abuse and dangerous in the word war. It can be said that the word rivalry played a role as a protective euphemism to avoid offense from the readers and third person in talking about taboos.

Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary describes rivalry as a state in which two people, companies, etc. are competing for the same thing. Whereas, the word war means a situation in which two or more countries or groups of people fight against each other over a period of time; a situation in which there is aggressive competition; a fight or an effort over a long period. In other words, rivalry can be defines as a situation where
the people against each other and war refers to a situation where the people fight against each other aggressively over a period of time. Compared to the meaning of war, there is a change of meaning from the word rivalry. To support the explanation, the writer would arrange the semantic components between rivalry and war.

Rivalry: [ACTIVITY] [PROBLEM] [AGAINST OTHERS] [UNFRIENDLY]

War: [ACTIVITY] [PROBLEM] [AGAINST OTHERS] [UNFRIENDLY] [WEAPON] [VIOLENCE]

To examine the meaning relation of both rivalry and war, the writer will put semantic components as follows:

Table 3.9 Componential Analysis of Rivalry and War

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rivalry</th>
<th></th>
<th>War</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Against others</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Unfriendly</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Weapon</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the above explanation, the writer finds out that rivalry and war has four similar features, they are [ACTIVITY] [PROBLEM] [AGAINST OTHERS] and [UNFRIENDLY]. Thus, the word rivalry is able to replace the sensitive word war. In the table, war has extra components, [WEAPON] and [VIOLENCE], since it is intended to stop something unpleasant or kill somebody. Besides, the writer then applies meronymy relation between the word rivalry and war, where the meaning
of rivalry is a part-whole with the word war. This relationship can be stated by using sentence rivalry is a part of war and war has rivalry.

The new meaning of the euphemism rivalry based on the explanation above undergoes semantic narrowing. To make it understandable, the table below will show the semantic change of the word rivalry:

Table 3.10 Semantic Change of Rivalry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rivalry</th>
<th>Earlier Meaning</th>
<th>New Meaning</th>
<th>Semantic Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compete others</td>
<td>War</td>
<td>Specialization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table 3.10, it can be seen that the meaning of rivalry change to the meaning of war according to the context of the newspaper. The initial meaning of rivalry is a situation to compete each other, then later it is restricted into war. For this reason, the new meaning of rivalry becomes more specified than the previous one.

Datum 6. Economic Pressure

“Mr. Trump has tried working with China to curb North Korea’s nuclear and missile programs, even setting aside his America First trade agenda in an effort to persuade President Xi Jinping to put more economic pressure on the government of Kim Jong-un. “ (A2. Pg6. P.20)

The word economic pressure in the text above refers to an economic problem which reaches its worst stage and possibly dangerous. Hence, the word economic pressure takes a part as euphemism for the word crisis which means a time of danger where problems need to be solved. The word economic pressure is a type of circumlocution euphemism. It replaces the negative expression crisis with the softer words
which has circle relation around its meaning component. With the euphemism *economic pressure*, the sensitive meaning of the word *crisis* is not pointing directly, so it will make the sense less offensive and to keep the sensibility of the readers and the third person. In this context, the third person of the article includes Mr. Trump, President XI Jinping and North Korea who are treated in this article.

The euphemism *economic pressure* has intention to have more positive connotation than the word *crisis*. It is used as an alternative expression to cover unpleasant fact about Mr. Trump who had tried to make North Korea in financial crisis by cooperating with China. The words *economic pressure* is simply used as an option to say *crisis* in which the author preferred not to take on this occasion.

On the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, the word *economic* connected with trade, industry, and development of wealth of a country or area; a business producing enough profit to continue. Meanwhile, the word *pressure* means the force or weights with which something presses; the act of trying to persuade or to force somebody; difficulties and feeling of anxiety. Thus, the main meaning of the word *economic pressure* is a time where the business is forced and not in a good condition. On the other hand, the word *crisis* means a time of danger, difficulty, or confusion when problems must be solved; a bad situation in government, political, or economic; a time when problem at its worst point. From the definitions, it can be seen that there is a change of meaning in the word of *economic*
*pressure* in which based on the context has a new meaning of *crisis.* Supporting the explanation above, the writer will list the semantic components of *economic pressure* and *crisis:

**Economic Pressure:** [FORCED] [DIFFICULTY] [FINANCIAL]

**Crisis:** [DIFFICULTY] [FINANCIAL] [UNEXPECTED] [WORST] [DANGEROUS]

For further explanation, the writer then identifies the meaning relation by using componential analysis.

Table 3.11 Componential Analysis of Economic Pressure and Crisis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Pressure</th>
<th>Crisis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Forced</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Difficulty</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Financial</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unexpected</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Worst</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Dangerous</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table above, the writer finds our two components in common, which are [DIFFICULTY] and [FINANCIAL]. These two similar characters proved that the word *economic pressure* can be used as a euphemism for the word *crisis.* Both of them have sensitive feature of [DIFFICULTY], but the word *crisis* has more negative features like [WORST] and [DANGEROUS]. That is why the article applied *economic pressure* instead of *crisis* to make the sense more acceptable.

Based on the table above, the writer supposes that the words *economic pressure* and *crisis* apply synonymy relation which also known as meaning similarity. The two additional components of the word *crisis*
function as distinguisher which drawn a distinction between crisis and economic pressure. Both of them refer to a difficult financial situation, but crisis tends to mean a worst stage of problem which can cause a dangerous.

The new meaning of the euphemism economic pressure in this article experiences specialization or semantic narrowing. The semantic change of the euphemism economic pressure will arrange in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Pressure</th>
<th>Earlier Meaning</th>
<th>New Meaning</th>
<th>Semantic Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bad Condition</td>
<td>Crisis</td>
<td>Specialization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table, the new meaning of economic pressure becomes more specifies into crisis. The earlier meaning of economic pressure is only define as a bad financial condition, but in this context describe as a worst point of economic problem or can be called crisis.

Datum 7. Heated Exchange

“An Oval Office meeting involving President Trump and his top advisers on Wednesday devolved into a heated exchange between his former campaign manager and the White House political director…” (A3. Pg8. P1)

In the paragraph, the words heated exchange refers to a discussion between the participants of Oval Office meeting in which they were agree and disagree about the midterm election in the following year. The words heated exchange is a type of circumlocution euphemism which replaces unpleasant word with other one that has relation in their semantic
components. It is a cover to genuine aim that may have possibilities of other expression such as argument. The writer of the text used heated exchange to cover disagreeable activity which happened during an Oval Office meeting.

The goal of the euphemism heated exchange is to protect the truth meaning of argument which sounds more sensitive. These words are used as a choice to avoid the dispreferred connotation. Thus, the word heated exchange in this article take a part as the uplifting euphemism. The euphemism heated exchange contains language that probably has more pleasing connotation than the word argument.

The euphemism heated exchange consists of two words, heated and exchange. According to Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, the main meaning of heated is full of anger and excitement, while exchange defines as an act of giving or doing something to somebody; a conversation; the process of changing an amount of money. Therefore, the words heated exchange means as activity of giving and receiving with full of anger. The word argument refers to a conversation in which two or more people disagree; often angrily; a reason used to show something is true; the act of disagreeing in a conversation. To analyze the sense relation and semantic change between those words, the writer will break down the semantic components.

Heated exchange: [ANGER] [CONVERSATION] [GIVING AND RECEIVING] [PROBLEM]
Argument: [ANGER] [CONVERSATION] [PROBLEM] [DISAGREEMENT] [REASON]

Then, the semantic component between the words *heated exchange* and *argument* will be put into the table below:

Table 3.13 Componential Analysis of Heated Exchange and Argument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heated Exchange</th>
<th>Argument</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Giving and Receiving</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Disagreement</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Reason</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above description, the writer discovers that *heated exchange* and *argument* has three similar features, they are [ANGER] [CONVERSATION] and [PROBLEM]. In addition, the sense relation between the word *heated exchange* and *argument* is synonymy in which the additional components of [DISAGREEMENT] and [REASON] function as the characteristics of *argument*. The synonymy relation between those two words surely allows the author of the article to make *heated exchange* as the euphemism for *argument*.

As a result, the semantic narrowing or specialization occurred in the word *heated exchange*. The detail explanation of its semantic change will be shown in the table 3.14.

Table 3.14 Semantic Change of Heated Exchange

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heated Exchange</th>
<th>Earlier Meaning</th>
<th>New Meaning</th>
<th>Semantic Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>Argument</td>
<td>Specialization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the table 3.14, the initial meaning is an activity of giving and receiving in full of anger or conversation, but in this context the meaning is narrowed to *argument* in which an act of disagree about certain topic using a strong reason. It can be said that in *argument*, the conversation tends to pointing out the disagreement rather than giving and receiving suggestion.

**Datum 8. Daunting Landscape**

“The meeting centered on the midterm elections and came as Republicans face a *daunting landscape*, challenge next year, particularly after a bruising loss in the Alabama special election this month.” (A3. Pg8. P2)

In the article, the word *daunting landscape* means a difficult situation. It refers to the word *problem* which sounds more negative than the word *daunting landscape*. Hence, the word *daunting landscape* considered as circumlocution euphemism. It substitutes the dislike expression *problem* with a more positive one which has relation around its meaning component.

The aim of *daunting landscape* as euphemism is to talk up about expression that preferred not to use in this context. The author of the article believed that *daunting landscape* has more favorable connotation than the word *problem*. It is applied to make the sense less negative. The word is chosen in order to say indirectly about the difficulty that the Republicans meet for the next year.

The euphemism *daunting landscape* built from two words, *daunting* and *landscape*. The word *daunting* based on Oxford Advanced
Learner’s Dictionary means to make feeling of nervous and less confident about doing something. Then, *landscape* has a meaning of everything which can be seen across a large area; a painting of view; the way of printing document. From both definition, the writer conclude that the general meaning of *daunting landscape* is a scary view which make someone feeling nervous and bring difficult situation. For the word *problem*, the Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary describes it as a difficult thing to deal with or to understand; a question that can be answered by using logical thought. To analyze more detail about their semantic change, the writer will break down the semantic component to find the sense relation between *daunting landscape* and *problem*.

*Daunting landscape*: [VISIBLE] [VIEW] [DIFFICULTY] [INTIMIDATE]

*Problem*: [DIFFICULTY] [NEED TO BE SOLVED] [INTIMIDATE]

The table of componential analysis below will explain the further information about the sense relation between *daunting landscape* and *problem*.

**Table 3.15 Componential Analysis of Daunting Landscape and Problem**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daunting Landscape</th>
<th>Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>View</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Intimidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Need to be solved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the table, the writer discovers that *daunting landscape* and *problem* have two components in common, that are [DIFFICULTY] and [INTIMIDATE]. For this reason, *daunting landscape* enable to replace the word *problem*. In addition, the sense relation between both of them is meronymy in which *daunting landscape* has *problem* and *problem* is a part of *daunting landscape*.

Based on the previous description, the writer summarize that the new meaning of *daunting landscape* is change into the general one or called semantic broadening. The change of meaning of euphemism *daunting landscape* will be shown in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daunting Landscape</th>
<th>Earlier Meaning</th>
<th>New Meaning</th>
<th>Semantic Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scary View</td>
<td>Scary View</td>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>Generalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 3.16, it can be seen that the previous meaning of *daunting landscape* is an intimidate view which can bring someone into a difficulty. In this case, the meaning shifted into a difficult thing to understand and has to be solved. Therefore, the new meaning of *daunting landscape* expanded into the meaning of *problem*.

**Datum 9. Magician**

“He is the *magician* who swallows a sword no one thought was part of the act, stuffs a dozen rabbits into a hat before the audience can count them…” (A4. Pg11. P5)

In the sentence of New York Times political article above, the word *magician* is considered as euphemism. It means to a person who says
or writes something untrue. The word *magician* is counted as hyperbole euphemism which used to exaggerate the meaning and the effect. In this context, the reference of pronoun *he* is Mr. Trump who is mentioned in the previous paragraph of the article. Therefore, the author used *magician* instead of *liar* to cover up the unpleasant fact about Mr. Trump’s behaviour.

The function of euphemism *magician* in this text is to have more pleasing connotation than the dispreferred *liar*. It is used as a choice language to save the face of Mr. Trump who filled the room of news with his greatest sensation in order to build his public image. In other word, *magician* is applied instead of *liar* as the uplifting euphemism. Moreover, the word *magician* is the euphemism for *liar* since the author of the article wanted to refine his/her language in response to taboo word related to dishonesty. It is chosen as a protective euphemism to avoid offense from the readers and third person.

The meaning of euphemism *magician* according to Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary is a person who can do magic trick or a person who has magic power. Whereas, the word *liar* has a meaning a person who tell lies. Compared to the meaning of *liar*, there is a change of meaning in the word *magician* which in this context refers to a person who says something untrue. To give further explanation, the writer would arrange the semantic components of *magician* and *liar*. 
Magician: [PERSON] [TRICK] [UNTRUE] [SPECIAL] [ABILITY] [PERFORMANCE]

Liar: [PERSON] [UNTRUE] [CHARACTER]

To analyze the meaning relation, the writer will identify the semantic components as follow:

Table 3.17 Componential Analysis of Magician and Liar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magician</th>
<th>Liar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Person</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Trick</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Untrue</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Special</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Ability</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Performance</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Character</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table of componential analysis shows that *magician* and *liar* share two features together, they are [PERSON] and [UNTRUE]. Hence, *magician* is able to replace the unpleasant word *liar*. Besides, the sense relation between those words is hyponymy that a type of meaning inclusion. In this datum, the meaning of *magician* is included in the meaning of *liar*. It can be said that *magician* is a kind of *liar*.

The new meaning of *magician* in the article goes through semantic broadening or generalization. To give a better understanding, the semantic change of the euphemism *magician* will be shown in the table below:

Table 3.18 Semantic Change of Magician

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Magician</th>
<th>Earlier Meaning</th>
<th>New Meaning</th>
<th>Semantic Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A person who can do magic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liar</td>
<td>Generalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The previous meaning of *magician* is a person who has ability to do magic performance, but in this article the meaning become broader into *liar* which means a person who tells lie. Hence, the new meaning become more general than the earlier one or it can be called as generalization.

**Datum 10. Eclipse**

“But then the *eclipse* happened five days later. Not that Trump created the *eclipse*. But maybe.” (A4. Pg11. P8)

The word *eclipse* in the sentence above is not refers to natural phenomenon, but it means to a sudden decrease in the number and quality of Mr. Trump news in media. It is regarded as metaphor euphemism to substitute the truth meaning of unpleasant language with the others that have more polite explicit meaning. In this case, the word eclipse is metaphorically refers to decline because it is related to the process when part of the sun or moon cannot be seen clearly. For those occasions, the sun or the moon loses their importance because something else likes earth become more important than them. Thus, the word *eclipse* played a role as figurative expression to make the truth meaning of the word *decline* is not pointing directly.

The purpose of euphemism *eclipse* in this article is to say in different context about *decline* that prefers not to use. The reason is because it has negative meaning such as become smaller, fewer, or weaker, so that the language must be not mention directly to avoid offense from the readers or third person. Besides, in order to save the face of Mr.
Trump who is considered as the source of disorientation, the author of the article need to refine his/her language to make the expression sounds more polite and acceptable.

The main meaning of *eclipse* according to Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary is an occasion when the moon passes between earth and the sun; an occasion when the earth passes between the moon and the sun; a loss of importance, power, etc. Meanwhile, the word *decline* means to a continuous decrease in number, value, quantity, etc. of something. It can be seen that there is a change of meaning from the word *eclipse*. Supporting the explanation, the writer will give the semantic components of *eclipse* and *decline*.

*Eclipse*: [NATURAL EVENT] [DECREASE] [PROCESS] [CONCRETE] [SHADOW]

*Decline*: [DECREASE] [PROCESS]

For further information, the writer will identify the sense relation by using semantic components’ of both *eclipse* and *decline*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eclipse</th>
<th>Decline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Natural Event</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Decrease</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Process</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Concrete</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Shadow</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table above, the writer finds out that *eclipse* and *decline* share two components together; they are [DECREASE] and [PROCESS]. Both words have negative features of [DECREASE] but the word *eclipse*
sounds more pleasing due to its additional character of [NATURAL EVENT] [CONCRETE] and [SHADOW]. Thus, the article preferred to choose *eclipse* rather than *decline* to make the sense more acceptable and to keep the sensibility of the readers and the third person.

Based on the semantic components, the writer concludes that the word *eclipse* and *decline* apply hyponymy relation in which a kind of meaning inclusion. The features of *eclipse* are included in the features of *decline* so, the word *eclipse* is the hyponym of *decline*. It also can be described as *eclipse* is a kind of *decline*.

The new meaning of *eclipse* in the article encounters semantic broadening or generalization. The writer will draw the change of the word *eclipse* in the table 3.20 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Earlier Meaning</th>
<th>New Meaning</th>
<th>Semantic Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Event</td>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>Generalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table 3.20, it explains that the previous meaning of *eclipse* is a natural phenomenon where the moon or sun loses their importance because something else is covering them. It clearly seen that the new meaning of *eclipse* become broader to only refers to a decrease in number or amount. That is why the meaning of *eclipse* undergoes semantic broadening.
Datum 11. Drinking

“During a night of heavy drinking at an upscale London bar in May 2016, George Papadopoulos, a young foreign policy adviser to the Trump campaign, made a startling revelation to Australia’s top diplomat…” (A5. Pg14. P1)

In the New York Times article edition of 30th December 2017 which tells about Russia inquiry on Hillary Clinton, there is a word drinking that considers as euphemism word. The term drinking is kind of metonymy in one-for-one substitution euphemism which replace the specific word with the general one. In this article, the word drinking swifts with the word drunk or the act of drink alcohol too much. It is used due to the taboo connotation from the meaning of drunk that related to alcohol.

For Oxford Dictionary of Euphemism, drink means an intoxicants or to drink intoxicants; to have a drinking problem or drink too much; alcoholic. The word drinking that primarily has general meaning of to take liquid then changes to the meaning of word drunk. It is used as the euphemism of the word drunk because drunkenness has taboo connotation. So, the author of the newspaper replaced the taboo word with the other one which has more positive meaning.

The function of drinking as euphemism is to avoid offense related to the taboo expression. In this mainly function, euphemism is a language escape created in response to taboos. Moreover, drinking is also used as the face saving device to George Papadopoulos. The author tried to has more pleasant connotations in covering the face of George Papadopoulos by applying the word drinking instead of drunk. This explanation has
shown that, the word *drinking* in this article plays role as the protective and the uplifting euphemism.

The word *drinking* originally means *to take liquid into your mouth and swallow it*, but then shift to *drink alcohol, especially when it is done regularly; the act of drinking alcohol*. Its new meaning later has the same meaning with the word *drunk*. Both of them related to alcohol that counts as unpleasant or taboo expression. The writer then breaks down the semantic components to analyze more details about the meaning of *drinking* and *drunk*.

**Drinking**: [ACTIVITY] [TAKE LIQUID] [ALCOHOLIC]

**Drunk**: [ACTIVITY] [TAKE LIQUID] [ALCOHOLIC] [UNCONSCIOUS] [REGULARLY]

To determine the meaning relation, the writer will identify the semantic components in the following way:

Table 3.21 Componential Analysis of Drinking and Drunk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Drinking</th>
<th>Drunk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Take liquid</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Alcoholic</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Unconscious</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table above, it can be seen that the word *drinking* and *drunk* share the semantic components [ACTIVITY] [TAKE LIQUID] and [ALCOHOLIC]. Both of them have sensitive connotations, but the word *drunk* has more sensitive component which is [UNCONSCIOUS].
Therefore, the author of the article used *drinking* rather than *drunk*. The similar components allow *drinking* to replace *drunk* as the euphemism to have more favorable connotation.

Based on the semantic components, the sense relation between *drinking* and *drunk* is synonym relation, although the term *drunk* has additional character [UNCONSCIOUS] in which used to refer a person who regularly drink too much alcohol and impossible to think or speak clearly. Synonym is the relationship between words that have similar meaning. In this case, the components [UNCONSCIOUS] and [REGULARLY] differentiate *drinking* from *drunk*. It is because the *drinking* only refers to the act of drinking alcohol, while *drunk* is not only means the act of drinking alcohol but also to the effect from the alcohol itself that sometime make people unconscious. The word *drinking* undergoes looser synonym due to the extra feature of *drunk*.

From all explanations, the new meaning of *drinking* in the article experiences semantic metonymy. Metonymy is the semantic change that based on the relationship between the referents of the words. To make a clearer description, the change of euphemism *drinking* will be showed in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.22 Semantic Change of Drinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlier Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take a liquid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.22 describes the change of meaning from the word *drinking*. In the article, the word *drinking* is not only means the act of take a liquid, but the new meaning also covers the effect from the act of drinking too much alcohol which makes people impossible to speak or think clearly. Thus, the meaning is change due to the referent of the word *drinking* that has relation to the referents of the word *drunk*.

**Datum 12. Dirt**

“Russia had political *dirt* on Hillary Clinton.” (A5. Pg14. P1)

In the sentence above, the word *dirt* is considered as understatement euphemism. It refers to political act which intended to cheat somebody, or it can be said as *fraud*. Understatement expresses the euphemism by explaining the simple part. It represents the euphemism as being smaller than it actually is. For this reason, the word *dirt* is the simple part of *fraud*. Moreover, the euphemism *dirt* is used to substitute the word *fraud* which has negative connotation. It covered the unpleasant fact about Russia who cheated on the US president election, especially to Hillary Clinton.

According to Oxford Dictionary of Euphemism, the word *dirt* means information which may be damaging to another. The word *dirt* that primarily has general meaning to any substance that makes something dirty then shifts to the meaning of word *fraud*. It is applied as the euphemism of *fraud* because dishonesty and politics has sensitive and
taboo connotation. Therefore, the author of the newspaper replaced the taboo word with the other one which has more positive meaning.

The function of *dirt* as euphemism is to avoid offense related to the taboo expressions. It is used to say in different context about political fraud which for this occasion would not be accepted. The author of the article used euphemism *dirt* as the face saving device for Russia, since Russia cheated on Hillary Clinton by overspread bad information about her in public. Besides, it is used to refine the language in response to taboo words related to dishonesty and politics. It is chosen as a protective euphemism to avoid offense from the readers and third person.

For Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, the word *dirt* originally refers to substance that makes something dirty like dust, soil, or mud; loose earth or soil; but then changes to unpleasant or harmful information about somebody that could be used to damage their reputation. Its new meaning later has the same meaning with the word *fraud* which refers to the crime of cheating somebody in order to get money or goods illegally; something that is not as good, useful, etc. as people claim it is. To support the definition, the writer would arrange the semantic components between those words.

*Dirt*: [SUBSTANCE] [NOT CLEAN] [BAD INFORMATION] [UNPLEASANT] [DAMAGING]

*Fraud*: [CHEATING] [ILLEGALLY] [BAD INFORMATION] [UNPLEASANT] [DAMAGING]
To determine the meaning relation and meaning change, the writer will identify the semantic components in the following table:

Table 3.23 Componential Analysis of Dirt and Fraud

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dirt</th>
<th>Fraud</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Substance</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Not clean</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Bad Information</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Unpleasant</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>Damaging</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cheating</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Illegally</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In table 3.23, both dirt and fraud have sensitive connotations, but the word fraud has more sensitive components which are [CHEATING] and [ILLEGALLY]. That is why the writer of the newspaper used dirt instead of fraud to say unpleasant activity done by Russia. The similar components such as [BAD INFORMATION], [UNPLEASANT], and [DAMAGING], allow the word dirt to replace fraud as the euphemism in order to have more acceptable expression.

According to the semantic components, the sense relation between dirt and fraud is synonymy because both of them have some similar characteristics, they are [BAD INFORMATION] [UNPLEASANT] and [DAMAGING]. In fact, the additional features from both dirt and fraud show the special characteristics about the word and have a role as the distinguishers. If dirt is the dirty substance or unpleasant information that may damage someone, meanwhile fraud focuses in cheating somebody to get something illegally.
The new meaning of *dirt* in this article undergoes semantic broadening in which the meaning become more general than the earlier one. For more details, the change of euphemism *dirt* will be shown in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dirt</th>
<th>Earlier Meaning</th>
<th>New Meaning</th>
<th>Semantic Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>dirt</em></td>
<td>Not Clean</td>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>Generalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.24 shows that the previous meaning of *dirt* is the substance that make something not clean or information that can damage someone, but then in this case the meaning broader to the *fraud* which only refers to cheating someone illegally.

**Datum 13. Coffee Boy**

“While some of Mr. Trump’s advisers have derided him as an insignificant campaign volunteer or a “coffee boy,” interviews and new documents show that he stayed influential throughout the campaign.” (A5. Pg15. P6)

The words *coffee boy* in The New York Times article is counted as euphemism term referring to a person who does not have any skill so s/he end up making a coffee for people who have abilities and a real job. It can be said that *coffee boy* substituted the word *loser* or *failure*. *Coffee boy* is kind of metaphor euphemism that replace the dispreferred word with figurative expression. Metaphor euphemism is used to replace the truth meaning of unpleasant expression with the other words that have more polite explicit meaning. In this case, the writer of the article applied the
words *coffee boy* as the figurative expression to cover the truth meaning of the word *loser* which sounds negative.

The paragraph tells that George Papadopoulos was an under qualified and insignificant campaign volunteer according to some of Mr. Trump’s adviser. In fact, he is the one who arranged the meeting between Mr. Trump and President of Egypt, Abdel Fattah el-Sisi. Indirectly, the phrase *coffee boy* in the text is shows that some of Mr. Trump’s people did not like George Papadopoulos, especially when he revealed the information about Russia.

The goals of euphemism *coffee boy* is to talk in different expression about subject which has an impolite meaning for a given occasion. Instead of saying *loser*, the writer used euphemism *coffee boy*. The term is applied as an uplifting euphemism to talk up and inflate about issue that related to profession. In this case, the euphemism has role to save the face of George Papadopoulos who was one of Mr. Trump campaign consultant. In addition, another motivation of this euphemism is to direct the public opinion about George Papadopoulos who is guilty for the revelation of Russia’s secret information related to the US President Election.

The phrase *coffee boy* means a person that will never be good enough for a real job so they are stuck making coffee for people with real jobs; cannot do anything. Meanwhile the meaning of *loser* is a person who is defeated in a competition; regularly unsuccessful; suffers because a
particular action or decision, etc. It can be said that *coffee boy* refers to a person who is incompetent and does not has any skill, while *loser* defines as a failed person. After analyzed the main meaning, the writer would break down the semantic components of *coffee boy* and *loser* as follows.

*Coffee boy*: [PERSON] [INCOMPETENT] [UNQUALIFIED]

*Loser*: [PERSON] [INCOMPETENT] [UNQUALIFIED] [UNSUCCESSFUL] [SUFFER] [FAILED]

To have the meaning relation between *coffee boy* and *loser*, the writer will identify the semantic components in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coffee Boy</th>
<th>Loser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Person</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Incompetent</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Unqualified</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unsuccessful</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Suffer</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Failed</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, the writer concludes that *coffee boy* and *loser* share three components together, they are [PERSON] [INCOMPETENT] and [UNQUALIFIED]. Hence, *coffee boy* can be used to substitute *loser*. Both of them have negative meaning, but the word *loser* has more sensitive features which are [UNSUCCESSFUL] and [FAILED]. Thus the author of the article used *coffee boy* instead of *loser* to make the negative sense not pointing directly and to keep the sensibility of the readers and the third person.
Based on the semantic component, the writer finds out that the relation between coffee boy and loser is hyponymy. It is a sense relation that used to describe one word is included in the meaning of the other. In this case, coffee boy and loser are kinds of unqualified. Thus, unqualified is mentioned as the hyperonym, while coffee boy and loser as the hyponym.

From all the meaning component and sense relation, it can be conclude that the meaning of coffee boy in this article goes through semantic narrowing or specialization, which can be described in the table 3.26 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coffee Boy</th>
<th>Earlier Meaning</th>
<th>New Meaning</th>
<th>Semantic Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td>Incompetent</td>
<td>Loser</td>
<td>Specialization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table 3.26, the new meaning of coffee boy is becomes less general than the previous one. The primary meaning of the euphemism coffee boy is a person who never be good in doing a real job and only has ability to make a coffee, but then its meaning is specified into loser which refers to a person who does not only have skill, but also failed and unsuccessful.
Datum 14. Explosive

“...severely reprimanded Mr. Papadopoulos for failing to clear his explosive comments with the campaign in advance.” (A5. Pg18. P25)

The word explosive in sentence above is counted as euphemism which refers to showing sudden or unpleasant respect for another. In other words, explosive used to replace the word rude. The word explosive is included in the type of hyperbole euphemism, where a figurative language used to exaggerate the effect. By using the word explosive, the writer of the newspaper tried to minimize the sensitive word and wanted to express the strong and rapid effects from the comments that are expressed by George Papadopoulos regarding the campaign.

The function of euphemism explosive in this text is to have more pleasing expression than the dipreferred rude. It is used to cover the face of Mr. Papadopoulos who delivered the negative comments about the campaign. He revealed that Russia had political dirt on Hillary Clinton and Mr. Trump played a role in this fraud.

The main meaning of euphemism explosive in Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary is easily able or likely to explode; likely to cause violence or strong feelings of anger or hatred; increasing suddenly and rapidly; sudden and loud of a sound. Whereas, the word rude has a meaning of having or showing a lack of respect for other people and their feelings; impolite; offensive or embarrassing; sudden, unpleasant, and unexpected. Compared to the meaning of rude, there is a change of meaning in the word explosive which in this context refers to showing a
sudden and unpleasant thing. To give a further explanation, the writer breaks down the semantic components of explosive and rude.

*Explosive*: [TO EXPLODE] [IMPOLITE] [UNPLEASANT] [GREAT EFFECT] [SUDDENLY] [RAPIDLY]

*Rude*: [LACK OF RESPECT] [IMPOLITE] [SUDDENLY] [UNPLEASANT]

The writer then analyses the meaning relation based on the componential analysis below:

**Table 3.27 Componential Analysis of Explosive and Rude**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explosive</th>
<th>Rude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ To explode</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Impolite</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Unpleasant</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Great effect</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Suddenly</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Rapidly</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Lack of respect</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table of componential analysis above shows that explosive and rude share three components together, they are [IMPOLITE] [UNPLEASANT] and [SUDDENLY]. Thus, explosive is able to substitute the unpleasant word rude. Based on the table, the sense relation between explosive and rude is metonymy that related to the whole part meaning relationship. The relationship can be identified by using sentence frame that rude is a part of explosive and explosive has rude.

The latest meaning of explosive in the article encounters semantic broadening or generalization that can be seen through the following table:
Table 3.28 Semantic Change of Explosive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explosive</th>
<th>Earlier Meaning</th>
<th>New Meaning</th>
<th>Semantic Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To explode</td>
<td>Rude</td>
<td>Generalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table 3.28, the earlier meaning of *explosive* is something unpleasant and impolite to explode that brings a great effect, but it changes to only an unpleasant and impolite respect. The meaning of *explosive* becomes more general than the earlier one.

**Datum 15. Conspiracy**

“That included questioning Christopher Steele, the former British spy who was compiling the dossier alleging a far-ranging Russian *conspiracy* to elect Mr. Trump.” (A5. Pg20. P38)

In the text above, the word *conspiracy* is considered as euphemism which refers to *illegality*. It means an activity or plan to do something illegal. The word *conspiracy* belongs to synecdoche euphemism that used to take a certain other things that have wider meaning. It is used *conspiracy* as a part of *illegality* to portray its entire entity. By using *conspiracy*, the author of the newspaper didn’t only mean the secret plan, but it also implies the *illegality* of the plan that is done by Russian.

The purpose of euphemism *conspiracy* is to talk different way about sensitive subject which in this text would not be accepted. With the euphemism *conspiracy*, the sensitive meaning of *illegality* is not pointing directly so it will decrease the offensive sense and to keep the sensibility of the readers and the third person.
According to Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, the euphemism *conspiracy* means a secret plan by a group of people to do something illegal. Meanwhile, the meaning of *illegality* is the state of being illegal or an illegal act. From the definitions, it can be seen that there is a change of meaning from the word *conspiracy* in this article. Supporting the above explanation, the writer would arrange the semantic components of *conspiracy* and *illegality* like below:

*Conspiracy*: [SECRET] [UNLAWFUL] [ALLIANCE] [PLAN]

*Illegality*: [ACT] [SECRET] [UNLAWFUL]

For further information, the writer identifies the meaning relation by using semantic components’ of both words.

Table 3.29 Componential Analysis of Conspiracy and Illegality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conspiracy</th>
<th>Illegality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ Secret</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Unlawful</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Alliance</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Plan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Act</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table, the writer discovers that *conspiracy* and *illegality* share two components in common, they are [SECRET] and [UNLAWFUL]. Hence, the word *conspiracy* can be used as the euphemism for *illegality* because the negative meaning components not pointing directly. Besides, the meaning relation of *conspiracy* and *illegality* is meronymy which is used to describe a part-whole relationship.
It can be said that *conspiracy* is a part of *illegality* and *illegality* has conspiracy.

From all the explanation above, the writer conclude that the word *conspiracy* experiences semantic broadening. The change of meaning of the word *conspiracy* will be shown in the table below:

Table 3.30 Semantic Change of Conspiracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conspiracy</th>
<th>Earlier Meaning</th>
<th>New Meaning</th>
<th>Semantic Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secret plan</td>
<td>Illegality</td>
<td>Generalization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.30 shows that the meaning of the word *conspiracy* shifts to less general than the previous one. In this case, the meaning of *conspiracy* broader becomes the meaning of *illegality*. The initial meaning of *conspiracy* is a secret plan by a group of people then broader becomes an illegal act only.
CHAPTER IV
CONCLUSIONS AND SUGESTIONS

A. Conclusions

Based on the analysis about euphemism and semantic change in the New York Times political article period December 2017, some conclusions are drawn in the following:

Based on the theory of Allan and Burridge, the writer found 7 types of euphemism, they are metaphor, circumlocution, metonymy, synecdoche, hyperbole, understatement, and borrowing euphemism. From the total number of euphemisms in all data findings, there are 8 metaphors, 6 circumlocutions, 3 metonymies, 1 synecdoche, 3 hyperboles, 4 understatements, and 1 borrowing euphemisms.

In general, the euphemisms in the political article are used as the alternatives for expression that the writer preferred not to be used on a certain occasion. They are used to have more favorable language than the dispreferred one. Euphemism is also applied in order to avoid offense in language from the reader. It is functioned as nonverbal replacement in response to negative or taboos expression, such as dishonesty, finance, profession, drunkenness, abuse, and dangerous. In addition, the euphemisms also have purpose to distinguish the readers about a certain issue tried to cover due to the unpleasant fact behind it. For this reason, the authors of the newspaper have to save the face of some important people from some embarrassing events or issues.
The writer found that the types of euphemism metaphor, circumlocution, metonymy, synecdoche, hyperbole, understatement, and borrowing can undergo semantic change. Although there is a change of meaning, the sense relation still binding the lexeme up, such as synonymy, hyponymy, and meronymy which can be determined through componential analysis.

Mostly, the euphemisms experience semantic broadening or generalization. From the 15 representative data, there are 7 euphemisms experience semantic broadening or generalization, 6 euphemisms encounter semantic narrowing or specialization, 1 euphemism meets semantic metaphor and semantic metonymy. Therefore, there is a change of meaning in the euphemism that is generally affected by the changed of lexeme’s denotation. On the other words, it can be conclude that euphemisms are being the cause of semantic change.

B. Suggestions

The writer would like to suggest for the readers to comprehend the meaning of euphemisms, especially its semantic change. Change of meaning in euphemism need to be understood in order to get the message or information of the source text.

The writer also proposes for the future researchers to more concerned in analyzing euphemism from different approaches like pragmatics, sociolinguistics, or political correctness. It can also be examined on other media and topics such as economics issue in speech or
euphemism in medical terms. The writer expects this research can fulfill the reference needed for people who want to conduct information related to euphemism and semantic change.
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## APPENDICES

### A. Data Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Types of Euphemism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A.1. Pg2. P8</td>
<td>Forced to his knees</td>
<td>Metaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A.1. Pg3. P9</td>
<td>On the right than on the left</td>
<td>Metaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A.1. Pg3. P9</td>
<td>Protégé</td>
<td>Borrowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A.2. Pg4. P3</td>
<td>Bull market</td>
<td>Metaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A.2. Pg4. P4</td>
<td>Game</td>
<td>Understatement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A.2. Pg5. P10</td>
<td>Rivalry</td>
<td>Metonymy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A.2. Pg6. P20</td>
<td>Economic pressure</td>
<td>Circumlocution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A.3. Pg8. P1</td>
<td>Heated exchange</td>
<td>Circumlocution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A.3. Pg8. P2</td>
<td>Daunting Landscape</td>
<td>Circumlocution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A.3. Pg9. P7</td>
<td>Lashed out</td>
<td>Circumlocution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A.4. Pg11. P4</td>
<td>Seismic</td>
<td>Metaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A.4. Pg11. P5</td>
<td>Magician</td>
<td>Hyperbole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A.4. Pg11. P7</td>
<td>Maelstrom</td>
<td>Metaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A.4. Pg11. P8</td>
<td>Eclipse</td>
<td>Metaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A.5. Pg14. P1</td>
<td>Drinking</td>
<td>Metonymy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A.5. Pg14. P1</td>
<td>Dirt</td>
<td>Understatement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>A.5. Pg15. P6</td>
<td>Coffee boy</td>
<td>Metaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>A.5. Pg15. P9</td>
<td>Drama</td>
<td>Understatement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>A.5. Pg15. P11</td>
<td>Low-level figure</td>
<td>Circumlocution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>A.5. Pg17. P23</td>
<td>Stand down</td>
<td>Circumlocution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>A.5. Pg18. P25</td>
<td>Explosive</td>
<td>Hyperbole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>A.5. Pg18. P28</td>
<td>Dirt</td>
<td>Understatement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>A.5. Pg20. P36</td>
<td>Tip-off</td>
<td>Metaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>A.5. Pg20. P38</td>
<td>Conspiracy</td>
<td>Synecdoche</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the past three days, Republican leaders in the Senate scrambled to corral votes for a tax bill that the Joint Committee on Taxation said would add $1 trillion to the deficit — without holding any meaningful committee hearings. Worse, Republican leaders have been blunt about their motivation: to deliver on their promises to wealthy donors, and down the road, to use the leverage of huge deficits to cut and privatize Medicare and Social Security.

Congress no longer works the way it’s supposed to. But we’ve said that before. Eleven years ago, we published a book called “The Broken Branch,” which we subtitled “How Congress Is Failing America and How to Get It Back on Track.” Embedded in that subtitle were two assumptions: first, that Congress as an institution — which is to say, both parties, equally — is at fault; and second, that the solution is readily at hand. In 2017, the Republicans’ scandalous tax bill is only the latest proof that both assumptions are wrong.

Which is not to say that we were totally off base in 2006. We stand by our assessment of the political scene at the time. What is astounding, and still largely unappreciated, is the unexpected and rapid nature of the decline in American national politics, and how one-sided its cause. If in 2006 one could cast aspersions on both parties, over the past decade it has become clear that it is the
Republican Party — as an institution, as a movement, as a collection of politicians — that has done unique, extensive and possibly irreparable damage to the American political system.

Even today, many people like to imagine that the damage has all been President Trump’s doing — that he took the Republican Party hostage. But the problem goes much deeper.

We do not come at this issue as political partisans; though we are registered Democrats, we have supported Republicans, consider ourselves moderates and have worked with key figures in both parties to improve political processes. Still, we can’t help seeing the Republican Party as the root cause of today’s political instability. Three major developments in the party required us to change our view.

First, beginning in the 1990s, the Republicans strategically demonized Congress and government more broadly and flouted the norms of lawmaking, fueling a significant decline of trust in government that began well before the financial collapse in 2008, though it has sped up since. House Republicans showed their colors when they first blocked passage of the Troubled Asset Relief Plan, despite the urgent pleas of their own president, George W. Bush, and the speaker of the House, John Boehner. The seeds of a (largely phony) populist reaction were planted.

Second, there was the “Obama effect.” When Mr. Bush became president, Democrats worked with him to enact sweeping education reform early on and provided the key votes to pass his top priority, tax cuts. With President Barack Obama, it was different. While many argued that the problem was that Mr. Obama failed to schmooze enough with Republicans in Congress, we saw a deliberate Republican strategy to oppose all of his initiatives and frame his attempts to compromise as weak or inauthentic. The Senate under the majority leader Mitch McConnell weaponized the filibuster to obstruct legislation, block judges and upend the policy process. The Obama effect had an ominous twist, an undercurrent of racism that was itself embodied in the “birther” movement led by Donald Trump.

House leaders continued to inflame the populist anger of their base to win enormous midterm victories in 2010 and 2014. They repeatedly promised the impossible under divided party government: that if they won, Mr. Obama would be forced to his knees, his policies obliterated and government as we knew it demolished. Their subsequent failures to do so spurred even more rage, this time directed at establishment Republican leaders. But most pundits still clung to the belief that pragmatism would win out and Republicans would nominate an establishment insider in 2016.
Third, we have seen the impact of significant changes in the news media, which had a far greater importance on the right than on the left. The development of the modern conservative media echo chamber began with the rise of Rush Limbaugh and talk radio in the late 1980s and ramped up with the birth of Fox News. Matt Drudge, his protégé Andrew Breitbart and Breitbart’s successor Steve Bannon leveraged the power of the internet to espouse their far-right views. And with the advent of social media, we saw the emergence of a radical “alt-right” media ecosystem able to create its own “facts” and build an audience around hostility to the establishment, anti-immigration sentiment and racial resentment. Nothing even close to comparable exists on the left.

Mr. Trump’s election and behavior during his first 10 months in office represent not a break with the past but an extreme acceleration of a process that was long underway in conservative politics. The Republican Party is now rationalizing and enabling Mr. Trump’s autocratic, kleptocratic, dangerous and downright embarrassing behavior in hopes of salvaging key elements of its ideological agenda: cutting taxes for the wealthy (as part of possibly the worst tax bill in American history), hobbling the regulatory regime, gutting core government functions and repealing Obamacare without any reasonable plan to replace it.

This is a far cry from the aspirations of Republican presidential giants like Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt and Dwight Eisenhower, as well as legions of former Republican senators and representatives who identified critical roles for government and worked tirelessly to make them succeed. It’s an agenda bereft of any serious efforts to remedy the problems that trouble vast segments of the American public, including the disaffected voters who flocked to Mr. Trump.

The failure of Republican members of Congress to resist the anti-democratic behavior of President Trump — including holding not a single hearing on his and his team’s kleptocracy — is cringe-worthy. A few Republican senators have spoken up, but occasional words have not been matched by any meaningful deeds. Only conservative intellectuals have acknowledged the bankruptcy of the Republican Party.

We have never suggested that Democrats are angels and Republicans devils. Parties exist to win elections and organize government, and they are shaped by the interests, ideas and donors that constitute their coalitions. Neither party is immune from a pull to the extreme.

But the imbalance today is striking, and frightening. Our democracy requires vigorous competition between two serious and ideologically distinct parties, both of which operate in the realm of truth, see governing as an essential and ennobling responsibility, and believe that the acceptance of republican institutions and democratic values define what it is to be an American. The Republican Party must reclaim its purpose.
WASHINGTON — President Trump presented a blueprint for the country’s national security on Monday that warns of a treacherous world in which the United States faces rising threats from an emboldened Russia and China, as well as from what it calls rogue governments, like North Korea and Iran.

To fend off these multiple challenges, the report says with Cold War urgency, the government must put “America First,” fortifying its borders, ripping up unfair trade agreements and rebuilding its military might.

But in his speech announcing the strategy, Mr. Trump struck a much different tone. Instead of explaining the nature of these threats, he delivered a campaignlike address, with familiar calls to build a wall along the southern border with Mexico and a heavy dose of self-congratulation for the bull market, the low jobless rate and tax cuts, which, he promised, were “days away.”

“Ameria is in the game, and America is going to win,” he said, to an audience that included cabinet members and military officers.

The disconnect between the president’s speech and the analysis in his administration’s document attests to the broader challenge his national security advisers have faced, as they have struggled to develop an intellectual framework that encompasses Mr. Trump’s unpredictable, domestically driven and Twitter-fueled approach to foreign policy. The same confusion has confronted foreign governments trying to understand Mr. Trump’s conflicting signals.

Mr. Trump, for example, spoke of how Russia and China “seek to challenge American influence, values and wealth.” But he made no mention of Russian interference in the 2016 presidential election, even though the document itself makes fleeting reference to “Russia using tools in an attempt to undermine the legitimacy of democracies.”

Indeed, Mr. Trump preferred to focus on a Sunday phone call from President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia, who thanked him for intelligence that the C.I.A. had passed on to Russian authorities, which Mr. Trump said foiled a terrorist attack in St. Petersburg that could have killed thousands of people.
A portion of a draft of the Trump administration’s national security plan.

“That’s a great thing,” he said, “And the way it’s supposed to work.”

Outlining a national security strategy is mandated by Congress, but Mr. Trump broke with his two most recent predecessors, Presidents Barack Obama and George W. Bush, in announcing one himself. His aides said that reflected his enthusiastic approval of the exercise, and that the Trump administration published its strategy months earlier than either the Bush or Obama administrations.

The strategy — which administration officials said was drawn from speeches that Mr. Trump had delivered during the 2016 campaign and as president while at the United Nations and on trips in Europe and Asia — ranges widely and includes jihadi extremism, space exploration, nuclear proliferation and pandemics. But it is animated by a single idea: that the world has been on a three-decade holiday from superpower rivalry; and it suggests that that holiday is now over.

“After being dismissed as a phenomenon of an earlier century, great power competition returned,” the document says. China and Russia, it says, “are determined to make economies less free and less fair, to grow their militaries, and to control information and data to repress their societies and expand their influence.”

The document’s call to push back against China on trade is familiar from the campaign, but its description of the challenge posed by Russia seems at odds with Mr. Trump’s own refusal to criticize Mr. Putin for his seizure of Crimea, his efforts to destabilize Ukraine and his violations of a key nuclear treaty with the United States.

While Mr. Obama’s two national security strategies emphasized cooperation with allies and economic partners, Mr. Trump’s strategy attempts to walk the line between his campaign slogan of “America First” and an insistence that he is not rejecting working with American partners — as long as they do so on terms advantageous to the United States.

Mr. Trump’s strategy contains more than a few hints of a return to a Cold War view of the world. Mr. Obama used his strategies to de-emphasize nuclear weapons as a key to American defense, but Mr. Trump calls those weapons “the foundation of our strategy to preserve peace and stability by deterring aggression against the United States.”

The national security strategies of past administrations were sometimes strong predictors of future action: It was Mr. Bush’s 2002 strategy that revived a national debate about the justifications for pre-emptive military action. And it helped frame the rationale for the invasion of Iraq six months later, arguing that
the risks of inaction in the face of a major threat made “a compelling case for taking anticipatory actions to defend ourselves.”

China’s man-made Subi Reef in the South China Sea, as seen from a Philippine Air Force plane in April. Credit: Bullit Marquez/Associated Press

The new strategy never uses the word “pre-emption,” including in its discussion of North Korea. This omission comes despite the fact that Mr. Trump’s national security adviser, Lt. Gen. H. R. McMaster, has said that if diplomacy and sanctions fail, “preventive war,” or a pre-emptive strike, might be needed to keep the North from attacking the United States.

Mr. Obama viewed China as a potential partner in confronting global threats, from Iran’s and North Korea’s nuclear programs to climate change, although he was critical of it on human rights issues.

Mr. Trump defines China as a “revisionist” power, reflecting the administration’s worry that Beijing is trying to rewrite the rules of the post-World War II order to match its own economic interests and global ambitions. (Russia is also described as revisionist, though it does not have China’s economic reach or influence.)

The Trump administration’s language suggests it will push back hard on China’s state-driven economic practices and expansionist claims in the South China Sea, while not challenging it on rights issues.

Mr. Trump has tried working with China to curb North Korea’s nuclear and missile programs, even setting aside his America First trade agenda in an effort to persuade President Xi Jinping to put more economic pressure on the government.
of Kim Jong-un. But the document suggests a return to his campaign promises, and states explicitly that “the United States will no longer turn a blind eye to violations, cheating or economic aggression.”

Another section refers to preserving the “national security innovation base,” at a moment that the administration is considering steps to keep China from investing in promising American technology.

In another shift from his predecessor, Mr. Trump’s strategy does not recognize the changing climate as a threat to national security. The document instead places climate under a section on embracing “energy dominance,” and says that while “climate policies will continue to shape the global energy system,” American leadership will be “indispensable to countering an anti-growth energy agenda.”

A portion of a draft of the Trump administration’s national security plan.

That puts it at odds with the Pentagon, which has continued to highlight national security threats from a changing climate, including refugee flows as a result of droughts and intensifying storms and the repercussions of rising sea waters.

In describing the use of cyberattacks against the United States, the document described the problems facing the nation rather than prescribing solutions. It refers to cyberweapons as a new threat because they can strike “without ever physically crossing our borders.”

“Deterrence today is significantly more complex to achieve than during the Cold War,” the document reads, saying a mix of inexpensive weapons and “the use of cybertools have allowed state and nonstate competitors to harm the United States across various domains.”

But the document deals with the subject at some remove, not dwelling on how Russia used cybertechniques in an attempt to interfere with the 2016 election. And it does nothing to describe any broad national strategy to guard against meddling in future elections.

Some foreign policy experts praised the report for its vigorous tone.
“It’s a robust statement of U.S. leadership on the world stage,” said Nile Gardiner, the director of the Margaret Thatcher Center for Freedom at the Heritage Foundation. “It’s a rejection of isolationism.”

Others, however, said the disjunction between Mr. Trump and his national security team raised questions about how relevant the strategy would be.

“Who does it represent? What does it represent? How seriously should we take it?” asked Richard N. Haass, who served in the State Department during the George W. Bush administration and is now the president of the Council on Foreign Relations.

“In my experience, national security strategies have a fairly short shelf life,” Mr. Haass added. “This administration will face that reality — and then some.”

**Article 3**

1. **Dispute Over Political Strategy Erupts Inside the White House**

By MAGGIE HABERMAN, DEC. 21, 2017

A heated exchange at the White House came during a discussion about the midterm elections next year, in which Republicans face a daunting landscape. Credit: Tom Brenner/The New York Times

An Oval Office meeting involving President Trump and his top advisers on Wednesday devolved into a **heated exchange** between his former campaign manager and the White House political director, people briefed on the discussion said.
The meeting centered on the midterm elections and came as Republicans face a daunting landscape, challenge next year, particularly after a bruising loss in the Alabama special election this month. It also came as the White House faces an expected string of departures from the West Wing, including that of a deputy chief of staff, Rick Dearborn, on Thursday. Mr. Dearborn, who was close to Jared Kushner and Ivanka Trump during the transition, had been overseeing a broad cross section of departments, including the political department, which was a source of contention during the meeting.

The meeting prompted the political director, Bill Stepien, to call an official at the main political group supporting Mr. Trump, America First Policies, to say its counsel should be involved at future gatherings.

It also underlined the turf battles and strategic disagreements that have long been characteristic of Mr. Trump’s circle, dating to his presidential campaign.

A White House spokeswoman declined to comment. The initial meeting included Mr. Trump; Mr. Stepien; John F. Kelly, the White House chief of staff; Kellyanne Conway, the White House counselor; and Hope Hicks, the communications director. Also in attendance were Corey Lewandowski, Mr. Trump’s former campaign manager, and Brad Parscale, both of whom are advisers to America First Policies.

Mr. Lewandowski aggressively criticized the Republican National Committee, as well as several White House departments, five people briefed on the discussion said. He told the president that his government staff and political advisers at the party committee were doing little to help him, three of the people briefed on the meeting said. He pointed to, among other thinned-out departments, the Office of Public Liaison.

One attendee, speaking on the condition of anonymity because the discussion was intended to be private, said Mr. Lewandowski took pointed aim at the political operation led by Mr. Stepien. Another attendee insisted that Mr. Lewandowski lashed out at nearly every department but the political shop.

Mr. Lewandowski called the White House team too insular, and he said it had done little to tend to fellow Republicans or to conduct outreach with outside groups and supporters. Asked for an example, Mr. Lewandowski said he knew of a senator who had not been invited to the White House Hanukkah party, one attendee said.

Mr. Trump, who often pits advisers against one another, appeared to be receptive to the argument. “A lot of people” have been telling the president that his White House team needs improvement, a person briefed on the meeting said.
After the meeting, Mr. Lewandowski and Mr. Stepien got into an argument outside the Oval Office, continuing the exchange elsewhere on the White House grounds. They eventually reached a cordial place, three people briefed on the exchange said.

But on Thursday morning, Mr. Stepien called a leading official at America First Policies, Brian O. Walsh, and said its counsel needed to be present for future meetings, according to a person briefed on the events.

“America First Policies exists for one reason: to support the president of the United States and his agenda,” Mr. Walsh said. “Everything else is just noise. We commend the president for getting tax reform passed and making America great again.”

Mr. Stepien appears to be the latest front in a rotating cast of advisers surrounding Mr. Trump over the last three years. A series of election defeats, coupled with legislative inertia through much of the year, has made him the target of criticism, primarily from outside the White House.

But Mr. Stepien has his defenders, among them Mr. Kelly, who two attendees at the Oval Office meeting said was put off by Mr. Lewandowski’s criticism. So were other attendees of the meeting, according to two people present, although Mr. Trump did not appear to be one of them.

Mr. Lewandowski declined to comment.

Article 4
The Year the News Accelerated to Trump Speed
By MATT FLEGENHEIMER DEC. 29, 2017
President Trump’s ability to produce a blizzard of news can shorten the life span of even seismic news events. Credit: Tom Brenner/The New York Times

WASHINGTON — Barack Obama was president earlier this year.

Really, eyewitness accounts from the period confirm this. It lasted nearly three weeks, it seems, or roughly the time elapsed since a Democrat won a Senate seat in Alabama, if memory serves, which it generally does not anymore.

That special election came before President Trump helped usher a once-in-a-generation tax overhaul through Congress, but after he recognized Jerusalem as Israel’s capital, which preceded threats to end American aid to any countries that objected — and they did, en masse, in a remarkable United Nations vote that almost certainly took place somewhere in there, right? Possibly around the time the president accused a female senator of doing “anything” for campaign contributions, touching off tremors in the #MeToo movement he helped inspire, and alleged another wide-scale conspiracy against him in the upper reaches of the F.B.I.

Or was that one over the summer? When were those hurricanes again? Oh, and the Pentagon has been tracking possible alien visitation. That definitely came up.

One year out, this may be Mr. Trump’s greatest trick: His tornado of news-making has scrambled Americans’ grasp of time and memory, producing a sort of sensory overload that can make even seismic events — of his creation or otherwise — disappear from the collective consciousness and public view.

He is the magician who swallows a sword no one thought was part of the act, stuffs a dozen rabbits into a hat before the audience can count them — and then merrily tweets about “Fox & Friends” while the crowd strains to remember what show it had paid to attend in the first place.

“We crammed six years in,” said Jason Chaffetz, a former Republican congressman from Utah who left the job at the end of June.

“We get to the point where we’re just done dealing with something,” said Matt Negrin, a digital producer at “The Daily Show,” recalling unresolved maelstroms like Mr. Trump’s feud with a Gold Star widow, his baseless claim that Mr. Obama wiretapped him and his defense of white nationalist supporters amid the deadly violence this summer in Charlottesville, Va.

“That’s something, in my opinion, we should be talking about,” Mr. Negrin said. “But then the eclipse happened five days later. Not that Trump created the eclipse. But maybe.”
The disorientation has had far-reaching effects, shaping not only Mr. Trump’s public image but also the ways in which lawmakers, journalists and others in his ecosystem are compelled to operate.

It is not exactly that “nothing matters,” to borrow social media’s favorite nihilistic buzz-phrase of the Trump age. It is that nothing matters long enough to matter.

“Las Vegas and the church in Texas have fallen off the map — two of the most heinous mass murders in recent American history,” said Tom Brokaw, the special correspondent at NBC News, flagging two episodes that would have, under previous circumstances, most likely remained seared in the national conversation. “It’s astonishing. It should be one of the defining stories not just of the year but of our time.”

There are a lot of those. And the president’s apparent triumph over the space-time continuum has created practical concerns across newsrooms and congressional offices, exacerbated by forces that predate Mr. Trump: the rise of Facebook and Twitter, the partisan instincts of cable news and, in the case of mass shootings, what many describe as a growing public imperviousness to horror.

Senator Christopher S. Murphy, Democrat of Connecticut, who became a prominent gun control advocate after the 2012 massacre in Newtown, Conn., described his task under Mr. Trump as a “triage” mission, “newly overwhelming” every day.

“As someone who works on an issue that is unfortunately driven by news cycles,” he said, “it makes it harder to try to focus attention.”

The most heinous shootings once dominated TV news for days. “Now,” Mr. Murphy said, “it doesn’t seem that there’s much more than 24 hours’ room for any story.”

Of course, Mr. Trump runs neither the networks nor the newspapers, much as he might prefer it at times, and the news media has come by its share of criticism honestly. Corralling the fire hose of White House doings has become a near-constant exercise in news judgment, with mixed returns.

Not every Twitter tremble requires mass attention. Not all executive skirmishes need a referee on every channel.

“Trump is just so dislocating for everybody that it’s making us all nuts,” said Peter Hamby, the head of news at Snapchat. “There’s so much sexy, salacious, bananas-crazy news happening every single day. But there is a duty, I think, to cover substance.”
No one suggests the mandate is simple. Even Mr. Brokaw, a dean of meat-and-potatoes news delivery, allowed that the daily Trumpian churn is “not unimportant, and it’s got this Shakespearean quality about it.”

And while there have been frenzied, tumultuous years before, present conditions are unique.

The 2016 presidential campaign season delivered rapid-fire insanities without precedent, but still adhered broadly to the rhythms of an election cycle: the primaries, the conventions, the debates, the big day.

In 2017, the chaos tends to be unscheduled.

The most oft-cited parallel is 1968 — a tinderbox of tragedy, protest and political upheaval — though the composition of the news industry then precluded the minute-to-minute ubiquity of 2017.

“It isn’t as though we haven’t seen a year like this,” said Nancy Gibbs, the former editor in chief of Time magazine. “But in the past, we haven’t been mainlining it.”

Mr. Negrin, from “The Daily Show,” has pursued social media performance art to combat the times, hoping to drill down on a single, elusive subject. His Twitter handle includes the number of days since Mr. Trump promised to clarify his position on Hezbollah within 24 hours — a pledge, like many presidential utterances of nontrivial consequence, that went largely ignored in the typical swirl of the moment.

That was July.

Mr. Negrin offered two predictions for the new year: Mr. Trump is unlikely to hold forth on Hezbollah anytime soon.

And: “2018 is going to be 10 times worse.”
George Papadopoulos was working as an energy consultant in London when the Trump campaign named him a foreign policy adviser in early March 2016. Credit via Agence France-Presse — Getty Images

WASHINGTON — During a night of heavy drinking at an upscale London bar in May 2016, George Papadopoulos, a young foreign policy adviser to the Trump campaign, made a startling revelation to Australia’s top diplomat in Britain: Russia had political dirt on Hillary Clinton.

About three weeks earlier, Mr. Papadopoulos had been told that Moscow had thousands of emails that would embarrass Mrs. Clinton, apparently stolen in an effort to try to damage her campaign.

Exactly how much Mr. Papadopoulos said that night at the Kensington Wine Rooms with the Australian, Alexander Downer, is unclear. But two months later, when leaked Democratic emails began appearing online, Australian officials passed the information about Mr. Papadopoulos to their American counterparts, according to four current and former American and foreign officials with direct knowledge of the Australians’ role.

The hacking and the revelation that a member of the Trump campaign may have had inside information about it were driving factors that led the F.B.I. to open an
investigation in July 2016 into Russia’s attempts to disrupt the election and whether any of President Trump’s associates conspired.

If Mr. Papadopoulos, who pleaded guilty to lying to the F.B.I. and is now a cooperating witness, was the improbable match that set off a blaze that has consumed the first year of the Trump administration, his saga is also a tale of the Trump campaign in miniature. He was brash, boastful and underqualified, yet he exceeded expectations. And, like the campaign itself, he proved to be a tantalizing target for a Russian influence operation.

While some of Mr. Trump’s advisers have derided him as an insignificant campaign volunteer or a “coffee boy,” interviews and new documents show that he stayed influential throughout the campaign. Two months before the election, for instance, he helped arrange a New York meeting between Mr. Trump and President Abdel Fattah el-Sisi of Egypt.

The information that Mr. Papadopoulos gave to the Australians answers one of the lingering mysteries of the past year: What so alarmed American officials to provoke the F.B.I. to open a counterintelligence investigation into the Trump campaign months before the presidential election?

It was not, as Mr. Trump and other politicians have alleged, a dossier compiled by a former British spy hired by a rival campaign. Instead, it was firsthand information from one of America’s closest intelligence allies.

Interviews and previously undisclosed documents show that Mr. Papadopoulos played a critical role in this drama and reveal a Russian operation that was more aggressive and widespread than previously known. They add to an emerging portrait, gradually filled in over the past year in revelations by federal investigators, journalists and lawmakers, of Russians with government contacts trying to establish secret channels at various levels of the Trump campaign.

The F.B.I. investigation, which was taken over seven months ago by the special counsel, Robert S. Mueller III, has cast a shadow over Mr. Trump’s first year in office — even as he and his aides repeatedly played down the Russian efforts and falsely denied campaign contacts with Russians.

They have also insisted that Mr. Papadopoulos was a low-level figure. But spies frequently target peripheral players as a way to gain insight and leverage.

F.B.I. officials disagreed in 2016 about how aggressively and publicly to pursue the Russia inquiry before the election. But there was little debate about what seemed to be afoot. John O. Brennan, who retired this year after four years as C.I.A. director, told Congress in May that he had been concerned about multiple contacts between Russian officials and Trump advisers.
Russia, he said, had tried to “suborn” members of the Trump campaign.

_The Signal to Meet_

Mr. Papadopoulos, then an ambitious 28-year-old from Chicago, was working as an energy consultant in London when the Trump campaign, desperate to create a foreign policy team, named him as an adviser in early March 2016. His political experience was limited to two months on Ben Carson’s presidential campaign before it collapsed.

Mr. Papadopoulos had no experience on Russia issues. But during his job interview with Sam Clovis, a top early campaign aide, he saw an opening. He was told that improving relations with Russia was one of Mr. Trump’s top foreign policy goals, according to court papers, an account Mr. Clovis has denied.

Traveling in Italy that March, Mr. Papadopoulos met Joseph Mifsud, a Maltese professor at a now-defunct London academy who had valuable contacts with the Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Mr. Mifsud showed little interest in Mr. Papadopoulos at first.

But when he found out he was a Trump campaign adviser, he latched onto him, according to court records and emails obtained by The New York Times. Their joint goal was to arrange a meeting between Mr. Trump and President Vladimir V. Putin of Russia in Moscow, or between their respective aides.

Sam Clovis, a former co-chairman of Mr. Trump’s presidential campaign, denies that he told Mr. Papadopoulos that improving relations with Russia was one of Mr. Trump’s top foreign policy goals during Mr. Papadopoulos’s interview for a job with the campaign. Credit Win McNamee/Getty Images
In response to questions, Mr. Papadopoulos’s lawyers declined to provide a statement.

Before the end of the month, Mr. Mifsud had arranged a meeting at a London cafe between Mr. Papadopoulos and Olga Polonskaya, a young woman from St. Petersburg whom he falsely described as Mr. Putin’s niece. Although Ms. Polonskaya told The Times in a text message that her English skills are poor, her emails to Mr. Papadopoulos were largely fluent. “We are all very excited by the possibility of a good relationship with Mr. Trump,” Ms. Polonskaya wrote in one message.

More important, Mr. Mifsud connected Mr. Papadopoulos to Ivan Timofeev, a program director for the prestigious Valdai Discussion Club, a gathering of academics that meets annually with Mr. Putin. The two men corresponded for months about how to connect the Russian government and the campaign. Records suggest that Mr. Timofeev, who has been described by Mr. Mueller’s team as an intermediary for the Russian Foreign Ministry, discussed the matter with the ministry’s former leader, Igor S. Ivanov, who is widely viewed in the United States as one of Russia’s elder statesmen.

When Mr. Trump’s foreign policy team gathered for the first time at the end of March in Washington, Mr. Papadopoulos said he had the contacts to set up a meeting between Mr. Trump and Mr. Putin. Mr. Trump listened intently but apparently deferred to Jeff Sessions, then a senator from Alabama and head of the campaign’s foreign policy team, according to participants in the meeting.

Mr. Sessions, now the attorney general, initially did not reveal that discussion to Congress, because, he has said, he did not recall it. More recently, he said he pushed back against Mr. Papadopoulos’s proposal, at least partly because he did not want someone so unqualified to represent the campaign on such a sensitive matter.

If the campaign wanted Mr. Papadopoulos to stand down, previously undisclosed emails obtained by The Times show that he either did not get the message or failed to heed it. He continued for months to try to arrange some kind of meeting with Russian representatives, keeping senior campaign advisers abreast of his efforts. Mr. Clovis ultimately encouraged him and another foreign policy adviser to travel to Moscow, but neither went because the campaign would not cover the cost.

Mr. Papadopoulos was trusted enough to edit the outline of Mr. Trump’s first major foreign policy speech on April 27, an address in which the candidate said it was possible to improve relations with Russia. Mr. Papadopoulos flagged the speech to his newfound Russia contacts, telling Mr. Timofeev that it should be taken as “the signal to meet.”
“That is a statesman speech,” Mr. Mifsud agreed. Ms. Polonskaya wrote that she was pleased that Mr. Trump’s “position toward Russia is much softer” than that of other candidates.

Stephen Miller, then a senior policy adviser to the campaign and now a top White House aide, was eager for Mr. Papadopoulos to serve as a surrogate, someone who could publicize Mr. Trump’s foreign policy views without officially speaking for the campaign. But Mr. Papadopoulos’s first public attempt to do so was a disaster.

In a May 4, 2016, interview with The Times of London, Mr. Papadopoulos called on Prime Minister David Cameron to apologize to Mr. Trump for criticizing his remarks on Muslims as “stupid” and divisive. “Say sorry to Trump or risk special relationship,” Cameron told,” the headline read. Mr. Clovis, the national campaign co-chairman, severely reprimanded Mr. Papadopoulos for failing to clear his explosive comments with the campaign in advance.

From then on, Mr. Papadopoulos was more careful with the press — though he never regained the full trust of Mr. Clovis or several other campaign officials.

Mr. Mifsud proposed to Mr. Papadopoulos that he, too, serve as a campaign surrogate. He could write op-eds under the guise of a “neutral” observer, he wrote in a previously undisclosed email, and follow Mr. Trump to his rallies as an accredited journalist while receiving briefings from the inside the campaign.

In late April, at a London hotel, Mr. Mifsud told Mr. Papadopoulos that he had just learned from high-level Russian officials in Moscow that the Russians had “dirt” on Mrs. Clinton in the form of “thousands of emails,” according to court documents. Although Russian hackers had been mining data from the Democratic National Committee’s computers for months, that information was not yet public. Even the committee itself did not know.

Whether Mr. Papadopoulos shared that information with anyone else in the campaign is one of many unanswered questions. He was mostly in contact with the campaign over emails. The day after Mr. Mifsud’s revelation about the hacked emails, he told Mr. Miller in an email only that he had “interesting messages coming in from Moscow” about a possible trip. The emails obtained by The Times show no evidence that Mr. Papadopoulos discussed the stolen messages with the campaign.

Not long after, however, he opened up to Mr. Downer, the Australian diplomat, about his contacts with the Russians. It is unclear whether Mr. Downer was fishing for that information that night in May 2016. The meeting at the bar came about because of a series of connections, beginning with an Israeli Embassy
official who introduced Mr. Papadopoulos to another Australian diplomat in London.

It is also not clear why, after getting the information in May, the Australian government waited two months to pass it to the F.B.I. In a statement, the Australian Embassy in Washington declined to provide details about the meeting or confirm that it occurred.

“As a matter of principle and practice, the Australian government does not comment on matters relevant to active investigations,” the statement said. The F.B.I. declined to comment.

A Secretive Investigation

Once the information Mr. Papadopoulos had disclosed to the Australian diplomat reached the F.B.I., the bureau opened an investigation that became one of its most closely guarded secrets. Senior agents did not discuss it at the daily morning briefing, a classified setting where officials normally speak freely about highly sensitive operations.

Besides the information from the Australians, the investigation was also propelled by intelligence from other friendly governments, including the British and Dutch. A trip to Moscow by another adviser, Carter Page, also raised concerns at the F.B.I.
With so many strands coming in — about Mr. Papadopoulos, Mr. Page, the hackers and more — F.B.I. agents debated how aggressively to investigate the campaign’s Russia ties, according to current and former officials familiar with the debate. Issuing subpoenas or questioning people, for example, could cause the investigation to burst into public view in the final months of a presidential campaign.

It could also tip off the Russian government, which might try to cover its tracks. Some officials argued against taking such disruptive steps, especially since the F.B.I. would not be able to unravel the case before the election.

Others believed that the possibility of a compromised presidential campaign was so serious that it warranted the most thorough, aggressive tactics. Even if the odds against a Trump presidency were long, these agents argued, it was prudent to take every precaution.

That included questioning Christopher Steele, the former British spy who was compiling the dossier alleging a far-ranging Russian conspiracy to elect Mr. Trump. A team of F.B.I. agents traveled to Europe to interview Mr. Steele in early October 2016. Mr. Steele had shown some of his findings to an F.B.I. agent in Rome three months earlier, but that information was not part of the justification to start an counterintelligence inquiry, American officials said.

Ultimately, the F.B.I. and Justice Department decided to keep the investigation quiet, a decision that Democrats in particular have criticized. And agents did not interview Mr. Papadopoulos until late January.

Opening Doors, to the Top

He was hardly central to the daily running of the Trump campaign, yet Mr. Papadopoulos continuously found ways to make himself useful to senior Trump advisers. In September 2016, with the United Nations General Assembly approaching and stories circulating that Mrs. Clinton was going to meet with Mr. Sisi, the Egyptian president, Mr. Papadopoulos sent a message to Stephen K. Bannon, the campaign’s chief executive, offering to broker a similar meeting for Mr. Trump.

After days of scheduling discussions, the meeting was set and Mr. Papadopoulos sent a list of talking points to Mr. Bannon, according to people familiar with those interactions. Asked about his contacts with Mr. Papadopoulos, Mr. Bannon declined to comment.

Mr. Trump’s improbable victory raised Mr. Papadopoulos’s hopes that he might ascend to a top White House job. The election win also prompted a business proposal from Sergei Millian, a naturalized American citizen born in Belarus.
After he had contacted Mr. Papadopoulos out of the blue over LinkedIn during the summer of 2016, the two met repeatedly in Manhattan.

Mr. Millian has bragged of his ties to Mr. Trump — boasts that the president’s advisers have said are overstated. He headed an obscure organization called the Russian-American Chamber of Commerce, some of whose board members and clients are difficult to confirm. Congress is investigating where he fits into the swirl of contacts with the Trump campaign, although he has said he is unfairly being scrutinized only because of his support for Mr. Trump.

Mr. Millian proposed that he and Mr. Papadopoulos form an energy-related business that would be financed by Russian billionaires “who are not under sanctions” and would “open all doors for us” at “any level all the way to the top.”

One billionaire, he said, wanted to explore the idea of opening a Trump-branded hotel in Moscow. “I know the president will distance himself from business, but his children might be interested,” he wrote.

Nothing came of his proposals, partly because Mr. Papadopoulos was hoping that Michael T. Flynn, then Mr. Trump’s pick to be national security adviser, might give him the energy portfolio at the National Security Council.

The pair exchanged New Year’s greetings in the final hours of 2016. “Happy New Year, sir,” Mr. Papadopoulos wrote.

“Thank you and same to you, George. Happy New Year!” Mr. Flynn responded, ahead of a year that seemed to hold great promise.

But 2017 did not unfold that way. Within months, Mr. Flynn was fired, and both men were charged with lying to the F.B.I. And both became important witnesses in the investigation Mr. Papadopoulos had played a critical role in starting.