

UDC 811.161.2'42

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2522-4077-2024-209-11>

UKRAINIAN WAR DISCOURSE BEFORE AND AFTER THE FULL-SCALE INVASION OF RUSSIA

УКРАЇНСЬКИЙ ВОЄННИЙ ДИСКУРС ДО ТА ПІСЛЯ ПОВНОМАСШТАБНОГО ВТОРГНЕННЯ РОСІЇ

Halasa I.,*orcid.org/0000-0002-9186-6357**PhD, Associate Professor,**Department of International Economic Relations,**B. Havrylyshyn Education and Research Institute of International Relations,**West Ukrainian National University;**Visiting researcher,**King's College London, UK*

The notion of discourse is rather controversial. However, under *discourse* term we mean any oral or written text on a definite topic. It can also be treated as verbal or non-verbal interchange of ideas or emotions aimed at achieving successful outcome. The concept of *discourse* is ambiguous; however, in the broadest sense of the word, this notion is a complex unity of linguistic approaches and extralinguistic factors necessary for understanding the text. It is claimed that discourse study occurred at the intersection of such fields as linguistics, logics, philosophy, psychology, and sociology. The communicative act is the main factor in discourse analysis. Discourse is the product of verbalization that should inform the recipients about the emotions, ideas, and beliefs of the speakers, approaches and extralinguistic factors necessary for understanding the text.

It is clear that war texts and speeches are a very specific type of discourse filled with non-controversial expressions, loud slogans, allusion, and even obscene vocabulary. War has never been about peace and calmness, especially on its first stages. War has always been about pain, death, crying, loosing, misunderstanding, miscommunicating, damaging, ruining, and killing. The global process can and usually does influence the way people think, behave, and even talk. Linguistic means usage reflect our state of mind, feelings, and even the type of people we are.

This study is a socio-linguistic analysis of the Ukrainian war discourse, produced by the Ukrainians and some Ukrainian politicians, in order to support, inspire, encourage and build resilience before and during the full-scale invasion of russia. Comparison of the data before and after the year of 2022 enrich the research with valuable information on the way Ukrainian identity has been reshaped under the influence of collective trauma.

Key words: war discourse, communicative act, critical discourse analysis, Russo-Ukrainian war, identity communication process.

Поняття дискурсу є досить суперечливим. Однак під терміном дискурс ми маємо на увазі будь-який усний або письмовий текст на певну тему. Його також можна розглядати як вербальний або невербальний обмін ідеями чи емоціями, спрямований на досягнення певного результату. Термін *дискурс* є неоднозначним; однак у широкому розумінні це поняття є складною єдністю лінгвістичних підходів і екстралінгвістичних чинників, необхідних для розуміння тексту. Відомо, що дослідження дискурсу відбувалося на стику таких галузей, як лінгвістика, логіка, філософія, психологія та соціологія. Комунікативний акт є основним фактором аналізу дискурсу. Дискурс – це продукт вербалізації, який має інформувати реципієнтів про емоції, ідеї та переконання мовців, підходи та екстралінгвістичні фактори, необхідні для розуміння тексту.

Зрозуміло, що тексти та промови воєнного характеру – це дуже специфічний тип дискурсу, наповнений гучними гаслами, алюзією і навіть нецензурною лексикою. Війна ніколи не стосувалась миру та спокою, особливо на її перших етапах. Війна завжди була пов'язана з болем, смертю, плачем, втратою, нерозумінням, некоректним спілкуванням, руйнуваннями та вбивствами. Глобальний процес може і зазвичай впливає на те, як люди думають, поведуться і навіть розмовляють. Обрані лінгвістичні засоби відображають наш душевний стан, почуття і навіть те, якими ми зараз є.

Дане дослідження є соціолінгвістичним аналізом українського воєнного дискурсу, створеного українцями та окремими українськими політиками, щоб підтримати, надихнути та розвинути стійкість до та під час повномасштабного вторгнення росії. Порівняння даних до та після 2022 року збагачує дослідження

цінною інформацією стосовно того, як реформується українська ідентичність під впливом колективної травми.

Ключові слова: дискурс війни, комунікативний акт, критичний дискурс-аналіз, російсько-українська війна, комунікативна природа ідентичності.

Introduction. War discourse is characterized by the high level of its information content. Catchy phrases are important for attracting attention of the audience. In order to intensify the content of war speeches, their authors use various verbal means and stylistic tropes. Metaphor and allusion are the most popular stylistic devices in speeches of Ukrainian politicians during the full-scale invasion of russia. Aggressive and intolerant expressions, as well as a negative connotation of some linguistic means are present in the messages of some Ukrainian politicians who naturally want to distance their country from the aggressor, russian federation, who started unprovoked war. It is clear that contemporary war discourse is used as soft weapon for influencing, building resilience, and even manipulating the views of the audience.

Previous Research in the Area. The most apt definition of the *discourse* term belongs to T. van Dijk. The scientist states that *discourse*, in the broadest sense of the word, is a complex unity of language form, meaning and action, which can be characterized using the terms *communicative action* and *communicative act*. Nahorna notes the symbolic nature and importance of structure of this linguistic phenomenon [1, p. 33]. A large explanatory dictionary of the Ukrainian language is limited to the following definition of the term *discourse*: conversation and verbal assault. Bahrii confirms this hypothesis, claiming that it is characterized by a dialogic comparison of the author's point of view and the opinions of his/her opponents [2, p. 7]. The electronic dictionary of the English language *datasegment.com* provides the following definitions of the concept *discourse*: conversation (talk) and consecutive speech (oral or written) regarding a certain thought. *The Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners* offers the following explanation of the term *discourse*: a long and serious speech on a particular subject; written or spoken language, especially when it is studied to understand the way people use language.

Even linguists often fail to distinguish between the concepts of *discourse* and *text*. Serazhym defines the text as an elementary unit of discourse [3, p. 12]. According to Habermas, the ethics of discourse assigns different forms of argumentation to ethical and moral issues, namely: discourses of achieving agreement with oneself, on the one hand, and discourses of substantiation (and application) of norms – on the other [4, p. 53]. Therefore, the terms *text linguistics* and *discourse analysis* were often used synonymously. Otherwise, discourse was seen as a conversational practice and a communicative process. It was treated as the act of creating a text and reflects the dependence of language behavior on the goals of the speaker, his beliefs and knowledge. In general, discourse is a complex process of communicative behavior which includes both writing a text and its verbalization.

Disagreements also arise in the interpretation of the concepts *discourse* and *speech*. Serazhym distinguished these two concepts in the most meaningful way. She claims that the opposition «public – personal» corresponds to this ratio. After all, a normatively established sequence of speech acts is typical for the discourse, and its individuality (lexical content, timbre, volume, articulation, duration) is important for speech [3, p. 13].

Researchers claim that *war discourse* is borrowed from war-related rhetoric developed in other fields (humanitarian aid, diplomacy, or human rights advocacy), sometimes without being aware of it, and not always appreciating the relevance of such appropriation. They also are convinced that it has a strong practical reliance on humanitarian organisations [5, p. 58].

It is interesting that all social actors align themselves to or misalign themselves from other social actors creating the feeling of otherness in the second case. In other words the opposition of «us» and «them» is created. The group «we» is naturally distanced from «them» creating the feeling of «otherness». Consequently, «alignment» and «otherness» are two basic linguistic approaches used in any

war discourse. Personal pronouns, linguistic generalizations, use of provocative questions are specifically chosen by all social actors.

Language of war has always had common features. Let's have a look at some linguistic means used during different war times. An interesting fact is that some expressions are still alive and bear the same or slightly different connotation. The war of 1914–1918 has left a significant legacy in the language that is used by communities throughout Britain. The creation of this war discourse stems from the history of the conflict. Soldiers were required to familiarise themselves with the formal/informal terms of the army through their training and service. At the same time familiarity with the form and function of military equipment would necessitate knowledge of a range of technical terms and phrases. Some researchers confirm that soldiers during the First World War «continued the tradition of the British Army incorporating or bastardising words from indigenous languages as a means of expression» [6, p. 456].

War discourse has always been considered distinctive since it is employed within contemporary society in Britain to describe and define contemporary problems and values. Terms «blighty» and «no man's land» are created to «mobilise ideas and memories of the conflict to pass a critical appraisal on modern concerns» [6, p. 457].

War discourse very often employs military terms derived from the conflict to comprehend and comment upon current concerns. Let's take into account the notion «trench warfare» or the phrase «in the trenches». References to «the trenches» would possess a strong connotation. They used to reveal the associations of danger and security afforded by the trenches. Present-day uses of these terms rely on a particular understanding of their meanings. Former Prime Minister Tony Blair liked those expressions in his speeches [6, p. 458].

For example, the phrase «home by Christmas» was associated with the departure of troops to the front lines in August 1914. In modern usage, «home by Christmas» or «over by Christmas» is associated with the war and its unplanned longevity [6, p. 463].

Methods. This study is a sociolinguistic study of Ukrainian war discourse within the critical linguistics framework. Critical Discourse Analysis is used for the data analysis, as well as the descriptive method and methods of component and linguistic stylistic analysis. **The purpose** of this research is to demonstrate: *What peculiarities, if any, does the Ukrainian war discourse have? What specific linguistic means, if any, do the Ukrainians use to stay strong and build resilience during the war time? And finally, in which ways does the Ukrainian war discourse before and after the full-scale invasion of Russia differ?* The study was based on the analysis of current Ukrainian mass media and Internet resources and social networks of Ukrainians.

Results and Discussion. War discourse is usually conveyed through the speeches of modern politicians. Depending on the aim of the talk, they «stuff» it with catchy phrases, emotional and rhetorical questions, neologisms, borrowings, metaphors, and other stylistic devices. Having analyzed a number of political speeches and documents, political science dictionaries, Ukrainian press and Internet resources (*Українська Правда, УНІАН, Урядовий портал, Дзеркало тижня, Сьогодні.ua*, etc), audio and video records of politicians' speeches on political talk shows and their participation in presidential debates, I came to the conclusion that the main sources of enrichment of Ukrainian political glossary are through creating neologisms, using metaphors, and borrowing foreign lexicon.

Neologisms. Modern Ukrainian political and war discourse is characterized by a growing number of neologisms.

Here are some examples of neologisms in Ukrainian political discourse:

Антинатівщина – movement against NATO.

Кучмізм – political policies when L. Kuchma was president of Ukraine.

Кучмономіка – economic policy when L. Kuchma was president of Ukraine (Кучма + економіка).

ЗМішники – representatives of mass media.

Ющенківці – supporters of V. Yushchenko.

Тузлитися – conflict of Ukraine with Russia over the construction of a dam across the Kerch Strait from the Taman peninsula to the island of Tuzla.

Тінізація – hiding income from state authorities.

Українізація – the process of reviving language and reintegrating it into all spheres of social, political and cultural life.

Русифікація, росифікація, зросійщення – actions aimed at strengthening of Russian national and political superiority in Ukraine or other countries.

Some political leaders use in their speeches the terms **донбасизація** and **азаровщина**. Both of them bear negative connotation. The former is derived from the name of Donbas region which is regarded among some of the citizens of Western Ukraine as «a region of crime». The latter term is derived from the name of current Ukrainian prime minister M. Azarov who is known for his strict economic policy and «leaves much to be desired» knowledge of the Ukrainian language. The term **люстрація** is also widely used. It is derived from the pure Ukrainian word «люстро» (mirror) and means, in the politicians' words, purification of state authorities. V. Yushchenko used the word **прихватування** to share his opinion about the privatization of «Kryvorizhstal». The original term is «приватизація», but V. Yushchenko gave it an opposite connotation (from Russian «прихват» – capture).

Metaphors. Metaphors play an important role in speeches of Ukrainian politicians. Ukrainian people remember the ironic phrase «маємо те, що маємо» (we have what we have) by L. Kravchuk and «ці руки нічого не крали» (these hands didn't steal anything) by V. Yushchenko. Leader of «Our Ukraine» party V. Kyrylenko compared current politics with **батрахомиомахія** (from Greek *batrachos* – frog, *mys* – mouse, *mache* – struggle, the fight between frogs and mice). Yu. Tymoshenko compared a meeting of the National Security and Defense Council with actions that took place at **Луса гора**, which according to the legend is a favorite place for a coven. O. Tyahnybok called Ukrainians **титульна нація** (titular nation). Arseniy Yatseniuk said that easily manipulated society is **аморфне, одноклітинне** (amorphous, undeveloped). V. Yushchenko characterized the beginning of radical political actions as: **Медовий місяць закінчився!** (Honeymoon is over!). Among other linguistic innovations of V. Yushchenko is a comparison of a Ukrainian book with **надчериця** (stepdaughter) and dignity with **сталь** (steel).

Ukrainian politicians also use soviet terms but give them new interpretations. «**Револуція**» and «**сталінізм**» are remnants of the soviet system which nowadays bear negative connotation.

Borrowings. An important feature of modern Ukrainian political and war discourse is assimilation of foreign lexicon: **ноу-хау** (know how), **ейфорії** (euphoria), **аутсайдерів** (outsider), **лобістські функції** (lobbying).

In the dictionary of foreign words among numerous political terms, one can come across the following: **демагогія/demagogy**, (**ідеологічна**) **диверсія/diversion**, **політиканство/politicking**, **постулат/postulat**, **пропагандист/propagandist**, **псевдо/pseudo**. American terms **пресинг** (pressing), **реформінг** (reforming), **лобізм** (lobbyism) have been successfully assimilated into Ukrainian discourse.

Ukrainian language has also borrowed from other languages such lexical neologisms as **брифінг**, **істеблішмент**, **лобі**, **корумпованість**. The term **імпичмент** became very popular in Ukraine during the presidency of Leonid Kuchma. Such words as **ток-шоу**, **електорат**, **елективний** are widely used in contemporary Ukrainian.

Ukrainian politicians often use foreign borrowings in order to demonstrate how modern and progressive they are. **Реал-політик** (real politics), **месіджі** (messages), **бла-бла-бла** (blah-blah-blah), **контребутор** (contributor) are terms that are used for speech «decoration».

Annexation of Crimea. First distinct features of Ukrainian war discourse appeared in the year of 2014. This year the Crimea was annexed by Russia, and war in Donbass region started. As already discussed above, politicians used their favourite approach of distancing Ukraine from the occupiers. The concept of «otherness» is vividly observed in Petro Poroshenko's 2014 inauguration speech:

«Зрозуміло, що не зі «стрелками», «абверами», «бесами» чи іншою нечистою. Йдеться про діалог з мирними громадянами України. Навіть з тими, хто дотримується інших, ніж я, поглядів на майбутнє країни», «Сьогодні окремо хочу звернутися до співвітчизників з Донеччини та Луганщини», «Будь-який агресор на кордоні України має згадати Євангельську мудрість: хто з мечем прийде, той від меча і загине!», «Країна зробилася інакшою. Іншими стали люди» [7]. He proceeds in his other speeches: «Війна взагалі не наша ініціатива. Вона нав'язана нам ззовні. Наш вибір – мир», «Ще раз наголошую, що такі утворення, як так звані ДНР та ЛНР, в документі не згадуються взагалі!», «Ми скинули тиранію. Ствердили європейський вибір. Встояли у суворій боротьбі із зовнішнім ворогом», «Їхня мета – знищити нашу державу, не давши нам впевнено звестися на ноги й стати успішним проектом, гідним наслідування», «Це перша в новітній історії континенту спроба не просто переглянути кордони, а стерти з карти цілу країну. Знищити окрему велику європейську націю. Свідому своєї історії, традицій, спільної долі, славного минулого і величного майбутнього», «Та ворог грубо прорахувався. Він зробив нас ще сильнішими. Українська політична нація остаточно ствердилася на всіх теренах» [7].

Ukrainian vocabulary was enriched by first war related words and phrases of that kind: *terrorists, Anti-Terrorist Operation/ATO, terrorist forces, fall in battle, liquidate, heroes, colorados, unprovoked war, hybrid war, undeclared war, atOshnyky, titushky, porohoboty, vata, vatnyky, rashists, ikhtamnEty, ponaduse, etc.*

Full-scale invasion. It is evident that war discourse can provide a critical context for its users to make direct and indirect allusions between the conflict and modern concerns. Soldiers familiarise themselves with the formal and informal terms of the army through their training and service [6, p. 455]. It is interesting that war discourse is sometimes viewed by the journalists as a type of lexical dependence. That is some linguistic means used by the journalists to describe war are borrowed from war-related rhetoric developed in other fields (humanitarian aid, diplomacy, or human rights advocacy). Moreover, the media representatives in their articles find practical reliance on humanitarian organisations. These are the facts that influence the discourse of war in the articles of the journalists [5, p. 61]. In the current aggressive russia's war discourse, it is important to highlight the attitudinal mental representations shared by russians who support the physical and cultural destruction of Ukraine. Consequently, this analysis could explain allowance of military offensive among the russian audience and discover the discursive ways of its legitimization in russian society [8, p. 140]. Discourse of Russo-Ukrainian war is definitely characterized by strong «masculinity». Metaphor and allusion are the most popular stylistic devices in speeches of social actors of Ukraine and russia. Verbal aggression, intolerant expressions, and negative connotation of most linguistic means are present more often in the messages of russian speakers.

My observations resulted in forming three categories of newly created and widely spread war vocabulary in Ukraine:

1) **Vocabulary connected with horror and disaster:** *air raid alarm, siren, missiles, invaders, terrorists, occupants, genocide, linguicide, shelling, fighter jet, air defense, nuclear weapon, shelter, explosions, disinformation, displaced, refugees, annihilate, danger, smashed kitchens, remnants of bedrooms, silence, tickets, trash, warehouse, bodies, etc* [9].

2) **Enthusiastic and patriotic vocabulary:** *Glory to Ukraine, Glory to the Heroes, Be brave like Ukraine, Glory to the Armed Forces of Ukraine, Good evening. We are from Ukraine, defenders, victory, peace, independence, Russian warship, anxiety, love, hope, belief, freedom, future, God wears the Armed Forces of Ukraine uniform, beck to Chornobayivka, etc.*

3) **Neologisms:** *macronism, javelin, humanitarian corridor, putler, putin, kaputler, orcs, russists, raschists, gauleiter, collaborator, polizei, Johnsonuk, to play Scholz, russia (not capitalized), Bucha, Irpin, cyborgs, TikTok army, Bayraktar, inthreedays, pixel, arrival, to start the tractor, clear sky, discotheque, kadyryty, kimyty, arestovyty, banderyty, pushkinopad, ghost of Kyiv, Bandera smoothie, Lilliputian, bunker worm, javelinyty, katsapy, etc.*

Ukrainians don't capitalize such words as *putin*, *russia*, *kreml*, *moscow* showing disrespect and disgust for the occupiers. Such words as *kimyty* and *arestovyty* have relation to political figures who were very popular and influenced the audience with their powerful and appealing public messages. *Cyborgs* are associated with the Ukrainian army who are believed to have unique skills to fight with the enemy. *Pushkinopad* is a term connected with derussification of Ukraine which included famous people of russia monuments demolition. *Discoteque* and *clear sky* both stand for massive explosions during russia's attacks and a relief when they are over.

Conclusions and further study. Language has played an important role not only during diplomatic meetings and negotiations; it has always been a tool of manipulation and aggression. War vocabulary reflects the nation's mood, country's existing reality or politicians' vector of communication. The aims can also be different: to unite, to oppose, to cheer up, to support, to sympathize, to demonstrate leadership, to demonize an opponent, etc.

Ukrainian war vocabulary before and after the full-scale invasion of russia possesses the same features of creativity and patriotic vibe. The main ways of its enriching are through lexicalization, assimilation, and metaphorization. It is important to note that because of an ongoing character of the Russo-Ukrainian war, the corpus of this research is hardly to be called full. Tragic reality provokes appearance of new linguistic means and phrases; it also provides already existing words with new connotations and meanings. Further analysis is aimed at enriching corpus of this study with the latest and brightest linguistic means created by the Ukrainians.

REFERENCES:

1. Нагорна Л. П. Політична мова і мовна політика: діапазон можливостей політичної лінгвістики : монографія. Київ : Світогляд, 2005. 316 с.
2. Багрій О. І. Наукова дискусія: дискурсивні та прагматичні характеристики (на матеріалі англійських статей середини XX – початку XXI сторіч) : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04, Київ, 2010. 20 с.
3. Серажим К. С. Дискурс як соціолінгвальний феномен сучасного комунікативного простору (методологічний, прагматико-семантичний і жанрово-лінгвістичний аспекти: на матеріалі політичного різновиду українського масовоінформаційного дискурсу) : автореф. дис. ... д. філол. наук : 10.01.08, Київ, 2003. 32 с.
4. Габермас Ю. Залучення іншого : студії з політичної теорії : монографія. Львів : Астролябія, 2006. 415 с.
5. Brabant J. Producing Journalistic Discourse on War: A Congolese Experience. *Journal of Humanitarian Affairs*. 2020. Vol. 2, № 2. P. 58–65.
6. Wilson R. Still fighting in the trenches: 'War discourse' and the memory of the First World War in Britain. *UK Memory Studies*. 2015. Vol. 8(4). P. 454-469.
7. Офіційний сайт Президента України : веб-сайт. URL: <https://www.president.gov.ua> (дата звернення: 22.11.2019).
8. Ushchyna V. From Conflict of Discourses to Military Conflict: Multimodality of Identity Construction in Russo-Ukrainian War Discourse. *East European Journal of Psycholinguistics*. 2022. Vol. 9, № 2. P. 130–143.
9. Офіційне інтернет-представництво Президента України : веб-сайт. URL: <https://www.president.gov.ua/news/speeches> (дата звернення: 24.08.2023).