

Stylistic Forms and Pragmatic Functions of Hate Speech in Russian-Ukrainian Conflict-Related Quotes

Asst. Prof. Ahmed Sultan Hussein (Ph.D.)

Ahmed_sultani_phd@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq

Department of English language and Literature/ College of Arts/ Mustansiriyah University/ Baghdad/ Iraq/

Falah Hasan Aswad

falahalobaidy@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq

Department of English language and Literature/ College of Arts/ Mustansiriyah University/ Baghdad/ Iraq/

Asst. Prof. Ahmed Sultan Hussein (Ph.D.)/ Department of English language and Literature/ College of Arts/ Mustansiriyah University/ Baghdad/ Iraq/

Falah Hasan Aswad/ Department of English language and Literature/ College of Arts/ Mustansiriyah University/ Baghdad/ Iraq/

Abstract

Hate speech is any speech that contains statements encouraging hatred against specific parties and calls for violent acts against them because of some innate characteristics, such as race, ethnicity, sex, etc... Because it threatens societal harmony, instills hatred in individuals, and escalates international crises, hate speech is banned both globally and legally. This research aims to analyze hate speech related to the Russian-Ukrainian conflict by drawing on Leech and Short's checklist of linguistic and stylistic categories of (2007), and Jacob Mey's pragmatic act theory of (2001). The quotes of some prominent figures concerning the Russian-Ukrainian conflict are the dataset that are pragmastylistically analyzed. This paper's ultimate and overarching goals are to scrutinize the stylistic forms and their micro-functions of hate speech in quotes concerning the above-mentioned conflict, to delineate the pragmatic functions and their strategies of this conflict, and to unpack the intended results of integrating the above-mentioned stylistic forms and pragmatic functions. The uncharted inconsistencies are the stylistic forms and their micro-functions of hate speech in quotes, the pragmatic

functions and their strategies, and the results of triangulating these forms and functions. A sequential explanatory mixed method design (quantitative and qualitative) is going to be used to obtain the results required. The results indicated that the quote authors tended to abundantly use complex sentences, various tenses, adverbs of place, and metaphor and hyperbole. They also employ strategies of contextually implying meanings, and co-acting with recipients to help them inference meaning to dehumanize the targeted party and instigate recipients to violently act against this party. In addition, combining stylistic forms and pragmatic functions resulted in controlling the audience's minds and galvanizing them to act violently against the targeted individual(s).

Keywords: Hate speech, quote, the Russian-Ukrainian conflict, pragmastylistic approach.

The questions that are going to be answered by this study are as follows:

1. What are the stylistic forms and their micro-functions of hate speech in quotes concerning the Russian-Ukrainian conflict?
2. What are the pragmatic act strategies of hate speech of these quotes?
3. How do integrating these stylistic forms and pragmatic acts lead to the planned results of utilizing hate speech in quotes?

1. Introduction

Hate speech is that kind of speech which involves expressions of hatred, violence, and hostility against an individual or a group of individuals on the basis of some inherent attributes such as race, ethnicity, disability, sex, religion, etc..... Hate speech oftentimes generates and fuels animosity, exclusion, and grudge and incites people to act violently against targeted parties. It is socially and politically widely used and it leads to defame others and reveal the negative sides of their attitudes and opinions. A versatility of forms, types, and strategies of hate speech are being employed nowadays to convey messages of hatred, atrocity, and violence against an absent party through a present party. Hate speakers utilize their linguistic abilities, cultural information, social status, and psychological affect to control their audience's minds and drive them the way they have already planned. Hate speech is defined by the Council of Europe, Committee of Ministers (1997) as, " All forms of expression which spread, incite, promote or justify racial hatred, xenophobia, anti-Semitism or other forms of hatred based on intolerance, including: intolerance expressed by aggressive nationalism and ethnocentrism, discrimination and hostility against minorities, migrants and people of immigrant origin".

Hate speech is defined as openly and rigorously endangering social peace and cohesion, intimidating people's safety, inspiring people to take harmful actions against others, and justifying violence and exclusion. The United Nations Secretary defined hate speech as "Any kind of communication in speech, writing or behavior that iteratively attacks or uses pejorative or discriminatory language with reference to a person or a group on the basis of who they are, in other words, based on their religion, ethnicity, nationality, race, color, descent, gender or other identity factor". This implies that using derogatory or discriminating words in any way willfully turns it into hate speech. Waldron (2014) described hate speech as, "Speech that vilifies, humiliates, or incites hatred against individuals or groups based on specific attributes such as race, religion, gender identity, or sexual orientation."

Van Dijk (1993) spotlighted, "Hate speech can be understood as discourse that expresses and reproduces hatred, discrimination, and negative stereotypes about a group or its members. This discourse often has ideological functions, supporting social inequality and exclusion". Butler (1997), on his own part, underscored that "Hate speech is a performative act that enacts harm or violence against individuals or groups based on attributes such as race, gender, sexuality, or religion. It not only reflects but also perpetuates social hierarchies and power imbalances". The idea behind the title of Austin's 1962 book, "How to Do Things with Words," is thus well-aligned with the idea that hate speech is an act speech in that it creates and then feeds feelings of hatred that drive people to kill other people. Cameron (2001) argued that "Hate speech is a form of speech that performs harm through its utterance, particularly by reinforcing social hierarchies and power dynamics". Santa Ana (2002) reported, "Hate speech often uses metaphor and other figurative language to perpetuate negative stereotypes and reinforce prejudice". Acknowledging that language influences society and society influences language—a concept that is always linked to Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis, Whorfian Theory, or Linguistic Relativity Theory (1940)—hate speakers often sociolinguistically guide their audience to adopt their vocabularies as well as to follow their themes, ideas, opinions, viewpoints, and attitudes.

Being a cause of threatening social harmony, intimidating people safety, and galvanizing people to thuggishly act against targeted parties, hate speech is internationally and legally prohibited by The United Nations, The European Council, and most international organizations. Guterres (2019) declared, "Addressing hate speech does not mean limiting or prohibiting freedom of speech.

It means keeping hate speech from escalating into something more dangerous, particularly incitement to discrimination, hostility and violence, which is prohibited under international law”.

3. Data and Methodology

The data of this study involve twenty quotes branched into two sets. The first set involves ten anti-Ukraine quotes chosen as top-10 Russian genocidal quotes about Ukraine according to Euromaidan Press. The second set includes ten anti-Russia quotes of an elite group of Ukrainian professional peoples. The full-length twenty quotes are found in macro pragmatic function section and in the appendices.

4. Data Analysis

4.1 Leech and Short's Checklist of Linguistic and Stylistic Categories of (2007)

The first analysis of the raw data of the twenty quotes is a quantitative stylistic one based on Leech and Short's checklist of linguistic and stylistic categories of (2007). This model includes four categories, namely, lexical categories, grammatical categories, figures of speech, etc., cohesion and context.

As shown in table (1), as stylistic forms, both the Russian and Ukrainian authors utilize figures of speech the most in their quotes of hate speech. In the Russian quotes, out of (28) stylistic forms found, there are (7) figures of speech with a percentages of (28%), while in the Ukrainian quotes, out of (26) stylistic forms found, there are (4) figures of speech with a percentages of (16%), The nth rationale of the frequent using of figures of speech in quotes of hate speech is due to that they **1. Dehumanize targeted groups. 2. Dramatize enemy image 3. Evoke emotion, 4. Distort reality. 5. Bypass rational analysis and tap directly into emotional and intuitive processing, making hate messages more impactful. 6. Veil hate-laden messages, making them more insidious and harder to detect, challenge, and censor, and providing plausible deniability.**

Table 1*Statistical Results of Stylistic Forms Used in Russian and Ukrainian Quotes*

Stylistic Form	Russian Quotes		Ukrainian Quotes		Percentage to All
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
figures of speech	7	25%	4	16%	20%
repetition	6	20%	1	4%	13%
formal diction	2	7%	3	11%	9%
imperatives	2	7%	2	8%	7%
enumeration / triadic list	2	7%	1	4%	6%
direct address (2nd person)	0	0%	3	11%	6%
contrastive structure	0	0%	3	11%	6%
nominalization	0	0%	3	11%	6%
existential negation	2	7%	0	0%	3%
elliptical / fragmented syntax	2	7%	0	0%	3%
colloquial phrasing	0	0%	2	8%	3%
pejoratives	1	4%	0	0%	2%
appeal to authority	1	4%	0	0%	2%
nationalist rhetoric	1	4%	0	0%	2%
conversational framing	1	4%	0	0%	2%
anaphora	1	4%	0	0%	2%
generalization	0	0%	1	4%	2%
quotative/reported speech	0	0%	1	4%	2%
religious/moral imagery	0	0%	1	4%	2%
profanity/taboo language	0	0%	1	4%	2%
number of stylistic forms	28		26		%

4.2 Jacob Mey's Pragmatic Act Theory of (2001)

The second model of dataset analysis is Jacob Mey's pragmatic act theory of (2001). This model incorporates six analytical strategies, namely, saying (locutionary function), doing (illocutionary function), referring (denotational function), inferencing (implication function), adapting (contextual function), co-acting (collaborative function).

a. Anti-Ukraine Quotes

1. "These are simply animals. They don't need to be agitated to lose their human form. They have no human form anymore. There is no pity for any of them, not

one of them. This is whom the Russian Army is fighting – ghouls. Fighting against the undead who rose from the grave, just like in the TV series.”

Sergey Mardan, a Russian State TV host

1. Stylistic Forms

No.	Stylistic Form	Examples	Hate Speech-Related Macro-Pragmatic Function
1	Metaphor	“animals”, “ghouls”, “undead”	It allows the author to imply complex evaluations, emotions, or ideologies, dehumanizing Ukraine.
2	Anaphora	Repetition of “they” and “them”	It boosts salience, coherence, and emphasis and shows the relevance of an anti-Ukraine repeated idea to the author’s communicative intent.
3	Simple declarative sentences	Short, direct sentences	It projects certainty, straightforwardness and authority and conveying anti-Ukraine facts or beliefs. It echoes the Ukrainian loss of humanity
4	Repetition	“They have no human form”	It improves memorability and guides recipients to what the speaker deems most relevant concerning objectification of Ukraine.
5	Allusion	to “TV series” as a cultural frame	It triggers shared cultural knowledge or intertextual references, normalizing attacking Ukraine.
6	Nominal sentence	“Fighting against the undead...”	It founds an impression of timelessness, formality, and emotional intensity against Ukraine, omitting the subject to increase effects and deny liability.
7	Lexical field	“ghouls”, “undead”, “grave”.	It tailors thematic patterns and prompts recipients to activate an anti-Ukrainian specific conceptual schema.

2. Pragmatic Act Strategies

No.	Pragmatic Act Strategy	Explanation
1	saying (locutionary function)	The author conspicuously alleges that the Ukrainians are "animals," "ghouls," and "undead". He dehumanizes the Ukrainians, rendering anti-Ukrainian violence more admissible.
2	doing (illocutionary function)	The author abolishes moral constraints by declaring "There is no pity for any of them." He promotes brutality and endorses aggression.
3	referring (denotational function)	"These" and "they" universalize that all the Ukrainians are inhuman beings. The author obliterates person identity, dealing with all Ukrainians as foes.
4	inferencing (implication function)	Comparing the situation to "TV series" insinuates that the Ukrainians are imaginary beasts not actual humans. The author shapes the Ukrainians as adversaries beyond ethical issues, recommending disregard to their hardships.
5	adapting (contextual function)	The author deploys popular ethos, mentioning "zombies, undead" to resonate with recipient's' moods. He simplifies and heightens hostility via common visuals.
6	co-acting (collaborative function)	The author presupposes that the recipients share this outlook, backing the idea that the Ukrainians merit devastation. He generates a communal consensus on hatred, making animosity look like a mutual task.

2. "[Ukrainian children] should have been drowned in the Tysyna [river], right there, where the duckling swims. Just drown those children, drown them right in Tysyna [river]... Whoever says that Russia occupied them, you throw them in the river with a strong undercurrent... Shove them right into those huts and burn them up... [Ukraine] is not supposed to exist at all."

Anton Krasovskyi, a former Director of Broadcasting of Russia's state-funded RT.

1. Stylistic Forms

No.	Stylistic Form	Examples	Hate Speech-Related Macro-Pragmatic Function
1	Imperatives	"Drown... throw... shove... burn"	It directs recipients to violently think and act against Ukraine. It conveys urgency, authority, or solidarity.
2	Repetition	"Drown them"	It intensifies anti-Ukrainian emotional or rhetorical impact, enhancing salience and recall. It signals what the author wants to be most relevant.
3	Parataxis	Clauses placed side by side without subordination	It adds to a stream of aggression against Ukraine, creating urgency, emotional rawness, or simplicity
4	Graphic imagery	"Burn them up... drown them"	It is a visceral and sensory tool, appealing to the senses to create vivid mental representations and escalating emotional impact and memorability against Ukraine.
5	Deictic specificity	"Right there, where the duckling swims"	It is false tenderness adding an annoying paradox. It grounds discourse in immediate context, building identification, urgency, or proximity.
6	Ellipsis	Omitted subject in "Just drown those children"	It gives a disconnected and universalizing tone, forcing recipients to fill in the gaps using context. It heightens tension against the combatant and civilian Ukrainians
7	Existential negation	"Ukraine is not supposed to exist at all"	It totally denies the Ukrainian presence, hope, or legitimacy, dramatizing absence and boosting ideological exclusion.

2. Pragmatic Act Strategies

No.	Pragmatic Act Strategy	Explanation
1	saying (locutionary function)	The author plainly demands for the drowning of the Ukrainian kids and drowning and burning of the anti-Russia Ukrainians. He straightforwardly instigates violent acts, rendering mass murder seem plausible.
2	doing (illocutionary function)	The author orders the recipients to kill ("drown them," "burn them up"). He motivates for tangible and savage acts against the Ukrainians.

3	referring (denotational function)	Te author calls for degrading “[Ukrainian children]” and subjecting them to destruction. He dismantles the casualties of purity and validates their eradication.
4	inferencing (implication function)	“Ukraine is not supposed to exist at all” hints at that the Ukrainian identity and independence are illicit. The author recommends for mass-murderous belief system, picturing Ukraine as an enemy nation.
5	adapting (contextual function)	The lifelike depiction “(river, huts, burning” turns the intimidation more visceral and relatable to the recipients. The author applies visual imagery to stimulate powerful sentimental responses, maximizing the probability of approval.
6	co-acting (collaborative function)	The author supposes that the recipients will advocate or engage in these fierce actions. He gives incentive to group involvement in hate, mainstreaming brutality.

3. “This [Ukrainian] language should not exist... Neither this [Ukrainian] nation nor this language should exist! Cleanse it all out, cleanse out all of its sources.”

Aleksei Didenko, a Russian State Duma member.

1. Stylistic Forms

No.	Stylistic Form	Examples	Hate Speech-Related Macro-Pragmatic Function
1	Repetition	“This language... this language”	It amplifies anti-Ukrainian sentimental or rhetorical impact, enhancing salience and recall, and creating threat and rhythm elevation.
2	Ellipsis/ Substitution	“[Ukrainian]” substituted rather than repeated	It adds anonymity and objectification. It depends on shared knowledge, reinforcing anti-Ukraine in-group understanding and generating suspense.
3	Imperative mood	“Cleanse it all out”	With a directive voice, it steers an action, asserts authority, and involve recipients eliminating both Ukraine and its language.
4	Anaphora	“This... this...”	It rhythmically fashions discourse, increasing emotional resonance and categorical rejection to the existence of Ukraine and its language.
5	Existential negation	“Should not exist”	It denies presence of Ukraine, delegitimizing and dehumanizing it. It signals exclusion and metaphysically rejects the Ukrainian identity.

6	Metaphor of purification	"Cleanse"	It conveys ideological cleansing of Ukraine and its language, euphemizing thuggishness and genocide by drawing it as a moral necessity.
7	Triadic structure	"Language, nation, sources"	It wells anti-Ukrainian persuasion and memorability. It implies completeness and rhetorical balance, widening the target.

2. Pragmatic Act Strategies

No.	Pragmatic Act Strategy	Explanation
1	saying (locutionary function)	The author conspicuously alleges that the Ukrainian language and nation should no longer exist. He straight appeals for eradicating the Ukrainian language and culture via proclaiming that their nation and language must be erased.
2	doing (illocutionary function)	The author orders to annihilate the Ukrainian nation and language. He furthers brutal and exterminatory acts, depicting the cultural elimination as a virtuous need.
3	referring (denotational function)	"This [Ukrainian] language" and "this nation" are lowered to non-existence, which removes their worth and mankind from them. It vilifies the Ukrainians via disavowing their heritage-based and sense of nationhood.
4	inferencing (implication function)	"Cleanse it all out" implies that the Ukrainians and their language are defiled and in need to be cleansed. The author structures the Ukrainians and their language as an intimidation that ought to be exterminated for the grander righteousness.
5	adapting (contextual function)	The author deploys " <i>cleanse</i> " to conjure past stories relatable to decontamination and displacement, affiliated with genocidal language. He empowers the narrative of refinement, stimulating the recipients to observe the elimination of Ukraine as an accounted for act.
6	co-acting (collaborative function)	The author supposes that the recipients apportion the aim of purging, involving them in the thought of communal action. He rallies advocacy for the cultural devastation of Ukraine, making the recipients complicit in the annihilation of the Ukrainian's character.

b. Anti-Russia Quotes

1. *“You won’t leave from here, we promise you this. Welcome to hell. We can say; you will die here. Die like lousy dogs if you enter our country. And your generals throwing you to this meat grinder will run away first. So drop your (weapons) and go back home to your wives and kids. You have nothing to do here. It’s not your land. And it won’t ever be.”*

Oleksiy Goncharenko, A Ukrainian MP

No.	Stylistic Form	Examples	Hate Speech-Related Macro-Pragmatic Function
1	Direct address	Second-person pronouns (“you”, “your”)	It involves recipients to personalize the Russian threat, creating solidarity and confrontation and building rapport to target blame
2	Imperative mood	“Drop your weapons”, “go back home”	With a directive tone, it asserts authority, and commanding the Russian soldiers to surrender; otherwise, they are killed.
3	Metaphor	“Welcome to hell”, “meat grinder”	It allows indirect communication through cross-domain mapping, satirically menacing the Russian soldiers of being killed.
4	Simile	“Die like lousy dogs”	It overtly compares two concepts to build perception and judgment and to dehumanize the Russian soldiers through animal comparison.
5	Anaphora	Repeated structure: “You...”, “It’s not your...”	It rhythmically builds rhetorical intensity, increasing emotional resonance and categorical rejection to the Russian invasion.
6	Short declarative sentences		It conveys authority and certainty, making them ideal for improving directness and indexing the Russian aggression.
7	Colloquial phrasing	“lousy dogs”, “your wives and kids”	It structures informality, relatability, and populism. It lessening the social distance and implying authenticity regarding the Russian threat
8	Juxtaposition	Peaceful domestic life (“wives and kids”) vs. violent death.	It underscores paradoxes, founding irony and revealing hypocrisy. It prompts recipients to evaluate anti-Ukraine ideas and identities.

2. Pragmatic Act Strategies

No.	Pragmatic Act Strategy	Explanation
1	saying (locutionary function)	The author straightforwardly intimidates the Russian fighters with their end and hardships, naming them “ <i>lousy dogs</i> ”. He denigrates the Russian fighters, causing their death to look normal or warranted.
2	doing (illocutionary function)	The author uses a fear strategy, forewarning the Russian forces of their end if they storm Ukraine. He agitates panic and feeling –related anguish, possibly dispiriting the Russian fighters.
3	referring (denotational function)	“ <i>You won’t leave from here</i> ” and “ <i>you will die here</i> ” outright refer to the Russian forces, situating them in a combative stance. The author pictures the Russian forces as destined-for-failure invaders, promoting animosity.
4	inferencing (implication function)	“ <i>die like lousy dogs</i> ” insinuates that the Russian fighters are subhuman and their death is unimportant. The author legitimizes acting violently against the Russian forces, stating that they are worth being mercilessly terminated.
5	adapting (contextual function)	The author adjusts the text to the battle time backdrop, where denigration is a familiar rhetorical tool to empower defiance and urge fighters. He applies conflict indoctrination tactics, bolstering patriotic zeal.
6	co-acting (collaborative function)	The author assumes that the Ukrainian soldiers and civilians back the idea of absolute refusal and devastating the Russian forces. He rallies the concerted camaraderie, inspiring the all-encompassing resistance and enmity.

2. “*Regarding hatred: for the offended party, which has been despicably attacked and is experiencing minute-by-minute torment and destruction inflicted by the aggressor, the very feeling of hatred is existentially important.*”

Jurko Prochasko, a literary critic and psychoanalyst.

No.	Stylistic Form	Examples	Hate Speech-Related Macro-Pragmatic Function
1	Noun phrase fronting	“Regarding hatred”	Centring on a specific element, it overrides normal word order to direct attention to the Russian soldiers, pragmatically signaling topic salience.
2	Formal syntax	Complex sentence with subordinate	It mirrors institutional or authoritative voice, generating distance between Ukrainians as defender

		clauses	and Russians as aggressors.
3	Intensifiers:	“despicably”, “minute-by-minute”, “very”	It intensifies accusing Russia of attacking Ukraine, pragmatically strengthening persuasion and sentimental power.
4	Nominalization	“torment”, “destruction”, “feeling of hatred”	It objectifies and depersonalizes events, removing agency but expanding consequences, creating an objective tone in accusing Russia of aggression.
5	Appositive clause	“which has been despicably attacked...”	It adds descriptive or evaluative information about the Russian attack, enabling the author to embed anti-Russian value and background assumptions.
6	Existential phrase	“existentially important”	It introduces vitally important information impersonally, obscuring agency and focusing instead on existence or presence of Ukraine.

2. Pragmatic Act Strategies

No.	Pragmatic Act Strategy	Explanation
1	saying (locutionary function)	The author palpably alleges that abhorrence is “ <i>existentially important</i> ” for those suffering under an assailant. He standardizes and rationalizes hatred, rendering it seem crucial for surviving.
2	doing (illocutionary function)	This statement works not only as a direct call to violence but also an ethical validation of hate. The author stimulates emotional extremism, causing hatred to seem morally legitimate.
3	referring (denotational function)	“The offended party” and “ <i>the aggressor</i> ” structure a victim-antagonist dichotomy. The author bolsters a binary worldview, cementing group separation and exacerbating abhorrence.
4	inferencing (implication function)	By declaring that hatred is vitally crucial, the author implies that with no hate, persistence is in danger. He frames hatred as a survival mechanism, legitimizing continued hostility.
5	adapting (contextual function)	The linguistic building of “ <i>minute-by-minute torment and destruction</i> ” triggers a sense of exigency and hard enduring. He manipulates emotions, intensifying feelings of resentment and moral outrage.
6	co-acting (collaborative function)	The author supposes that the recipients will sympathize with and adopt this viewpoint, turning hatred a shared and agreed upon feeling. He promotes collective acceptance of abhorrence, fostering cohesion via reciprocal hatred.

3. *“This isn’t just ‘Putin’s war.’ It reflects centuries of Russian culture and social attitudes. Russian culture and society is totally invested in this war. So, yes, in that sense, it’s a war of all that is Russian.”*

Peter Pomerantsev, a senior fellow at Johns Hopkins University

1. Stylistic Forms

No.	Stylistic Form	Examples	Hate Speech-Related Macro-Pragmatic Function
1	Contrastive structure	“This isn’t just... It reflects...”	It presents a wider accusation of aggression involving both the Russian culture and society, polarizing and highlighting ideological divides.
2	Temporal scope	“centuries”	It shapes the Russian aggression as long-standing, overdue, and urgent, anchoring the argument in historical and future depth and continuity.
3	Generalization	“all that is Russian”	It frames universal and collective assumptions and sweeps national features to legitimize violence against Russia and bypass nuance.
4	Repetition	“Russian culture and society...”	Via echo, it spotlights key ideas of accusing the Russian culture and society of attacking Ukraine, bolstering emotional and rhetorical weight.
5	Colloquial phrase	“So, yes...”	It builds rapport and populism to diminish the social distance and involve recipients, attempting at showing the Russian danger against Ukraine.
6	Declarative tone	Statements presented as facts, not opinions	It affirms authority, certainty, or truth to present the author’s anti-Russian opinion as a fact.
7	Inclusive metaphor	“a war of all that is Russian”	It fosters solidarity, unity, and shared identity. Pragmatically it promotes the Russian collective cultural and social indictment.

2. Pragmatic Act Strategies

No.	Pragmatic Act Strategy	Explanation
1	saying (locutionary function)	The author affirms that the Russian culture and community, not just Putin, are liable for the conflict. He collectivizes censure, turning all the Russians responsible for the conflict, irrespective of the individual views or actions.

2	doing (illocutionary function)	The author redefines the conflict as an outcome of deep-seated Russian principles rather than just a political resolution. He essentializes the Russian character, implicitly stating that hostility is a fundamental characteristic of the Russian culture.
3	referring (denotational function)	" <i>Russian culture and society is totally invested in this war</i> " envisions all Russia involving in the Russian crimes. The author deletes individual influence, causing every Russian citizen to look morally accountable.
4	inferencing (implication function)	" <i>A war of all that is Russian</i> " hints at that being Russian is innately associated with war and belligerence. The author advances cultural inevitability, cultivating stereotypes that validate hatred against the Russians.
5	adapting (contextual function)	The author acclimatizes upon anti-Russian feelings, enticing those who already perceive the Russian society as inherently hostile. He promotes anti-Russian mindsets, supporting prevailing biases.
6	co-acting (collaborative function)	The author presupposes accord from the recipients, structuring the idea that all the Russians are responsible as a broadly agreed upon fact. He fosters communal denouncement, conceivably legalizing bias against the Russians as a group.

All in all, integrating Leech and Short's stylistic forms of (2007) and Mey's pragmatic act strategies of (2001) yields the following effects:

1. It leads readers to not only process text stylistically but also to align themselves pragmatically with or against its messages.
2. It allows readers to link linguistic form to pragmatic function—i.e., a stylistic choice is not neutral; it acts on the reader/listener.
3. Leech and Short's stylistic forms become a conveying bearer for the pragmatic message. Mey's pragmatic act strategies enable readers to realize how recipients interpret those forms within a social frame. Put it another way, they're not just noticing style, but acting on it, reacting, aligning, and resisting.

5. Conclusions

Drawing on Leech and Short's model of stylistics of (2007) and Mey's pragmatic act theory of (2001), the current study attempted to investigate the stylistic forms and their micro-functions of hate speech in quotes concerning the above-mentioned conflict, to determine the pragmatic functions and their strategies of this conflict, and to shed light on the intended results of integrating the above-mentioned stylistic forms and pragmatic functions. Based on the results

of the data analysis , answering the three research questions has shown that quote authors, to affect their audiences well and to make their statements easily perceived, utilized various stylistic forms such as complex sentences, adverbs of place, different tenses, referential and evaluative adjectives, and simple noun phrases. Tropes especially, metaphor and hyperbole were abundantly used.

A versatility of words and expressions was deployed in the quotes by their authors to instigate and convince the audience about the idea of abhorring and acting violently against the targeted party. They implicitly and explicitly mentioned and justified violence, dehumanization, radicalization, mobilization, and demonization to be their ideology against other individuals by virtue of their inherent characteristics such as religion, sect, sex, disability, race, ethnicity, ..etc The ideologies of tearing the social harmony and cohesion were what the quotationist attempted to normalize, justify, and legitimize.

Integrating the stylistic forms that were well chosen and the ideologies mentioned above result in micro and macro functions that influenced the audiences much. To put it another way, quote sources (quote authors) zoomed in on two senses, namely, deploying appropriate linguistic tools and applying overt and covert hate speech expressions. The targeted audiences were linguistically and pragmatically convinced to behave the way the quote authors want.

All things considered, the integrating of stylistic forms and pragmatic acts wells emotional, convincing, and manipulative power. Leech and Short showcase how the message is encoded; Mey demonstrates what that encoding does in context. Together, they illuminate how recipients are not just decoding forms, but engaging in ideological and social and positioning.

6. References

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford University Press.
- Council of Europe, Committee of Ministers . (1997). Recommendation No. R (97) 20 of the Committee of Ministers to members states on “hate speech” adopted on 30.10.1997.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. Routledge.
- Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. SAGE Publications.
- Guterres, A. (United Nations Secretary-General). (June, 2019).

<https://www.un.org/en/hate-speech/united-nations-and-hate-speech/international-human-rights-law>.

- Leech, G., & Short, M. (2007). *Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose* (2nd ed.). Longman.
- Mey, J. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Santa Ana, O. (1999). Like an animal I was treated: Anti-Immigrant metaphor in US public discourse." *Discourse & Society*, 10(2), 191-224.
- Santa Ana, O. (2002). *Brown tide rising: Metaphors of Latinos in contemporary American public discourse*. University of Texas Press.
- Thomas, J. (2013). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. 2nd Edition. Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. Sage Publications.
- Waldron, J. (2014). *The harm in hate speech*. Harvard University Press.

7. Appendices

Table 2

Quantitatively Analyzed Extracts, Their Authors, and Their links

No.	Quote	Author	Link
	Russian Discourse		
1	<i>We will crush this evil like annoying bugs. We will stand as a wall, defending our great homeland, which honors the traditions of its peoples and safeguards their spiritual values.</i>	Ramzan Kadyrov	https://euromaidanpress.com/2023/10/31/top-10-russian-genocidal-quotes-about-ukraine/
2	<i>These are simply animals. They don't need to be agitated to lose their human form. They have no human form anymore. There is no pity for any of them, not one of them. This is whom the Russian Army is fighting – ghouls. Fighting against the undead who rose from the grave, just like in the TV series.</i>	Sergey Mardan	https://euromaidanpress.com/2023/10/31/top-10-russian-genocidal-quotes-about-ukraine/
3	<i>A pig is a well-known, widespread, popular image that symbolizes Ukraine. To make it more illustrative, we covered it with the Ukrainian flag. We took this photograph as a visual demonstration to show the fate of the Ukrainian nation. Just like this pig."</i>	An unidentified lecturer	https://euromaidanpress.com/2023/10/31/top-10-russian-genocidal-quotes-about-ukraine/
4	<i>When a veterinarian deworms a cat, it is a routine procedure for the vet, a war for the worms, and a cleansing for the cat.</i>	Vladimir Solovyov	https://euromaidanpress.com/2023/10/31/top-10-russian-genocidal-quotes-about-ukraine/
5	<i>"[Ukrainian children] should have been drowned in the Tysyna [river], right there, where the duckling swims. Just drown those children, drown them right in Tysyna [river] ... Whoever says that Russia occupied them, you throw them in the river with a strong undercurrent... Shove them right into those huts</i>	Anton Krasovskiy	https://euromaidanpress.com/2023/10/31/top-10-russian-genocidal-quotes-about-ukraine/

	<i>and burn them up... [Ukraine] is not supposed to exist at all.</i>		
6	<i>The opponents of letter Z must understand that if they are counting on mercy, no. There will be no mercy for them. It all became very serious, in this case, it means concentration camps, re-education, sterilization.</i>	Karen Shakhnazarov	https://euromaidanpress.com/2023/10/31/top-10-russian-genocidal-quotes-about-ukraine/
7	<i>We will kill as many of you as we have to. We will kill 1 million, or 5 million; we can exterminate all of you until you understand that you're possessed and you have to be cured.</i>	Pavel Gubarev	https://euromaidanpress.com/2023/10/31/top-10-russian-genocidal-quotes-about-ukraine/
8	<i>We need to kill, kill, and kill [Ukrainians], 'as I tell you as a professor...</i>	Alexander Dugin	https://euromaidanpress.com/2023/10/31/top-10-russian-genocidal-quotes-about-ukraine/
9	<i>This [Ukrainian] language should not exist... Neither this [Ukrainian] nation nor this language should exist! Cleanse it all out, cleanse out all of its sources."</i>	Aleksei Didenko	https://euromaidanpress.com/2023/10/31/top-10-russian-genocidal-quotes-about-ukraine/
10	<i>People often ask me why my Telegram posts are so harsh. The answer: I hate them [Ukrainians]. They are scum and degenerates. They want death for us, for Russia. And as long as I'm alive, I will do everything to make them disappear.</i>	Dmitry Medvedev	https://euromaidanpress.com/2023/10/31/top-10-russian-genocidal-quotes-about-ukraine/
	Ukrainian Discourse		
11	<i>You won't leave from here, we promise you this. Welcome to hell. We can say, you will die here. Die like lousy dogs if you enter our country. And your generals throwing you to this meat grinder will run away first. So drop your (weapons) and go back home to your wives and kids. You have nothing to do here. It's not your land. And won't ever be.</i>	Oleksiy Goncharenko	https://www.express.co.uk/news/world/1571289/ukraine-russia-war-citizens-protest-putin
12	<i>War criminals don't go to purgatory, they go straight to Hell.</i>	Sergiy Kyslytsya	https://x.com/khodorkovsky_en/status/1496771367223676934
13	<i>I didn't hate before, but now I do. I really hate the Russians.</i>	A professional woman	https://www.newyorker.com/news/daily-comment/how-do-ukrainians-think-about-russians-now
14	<i>When you attack us, you will see our faces, not our backs.</i>	Volodymyr Zelensky	https://united24media.com/war-in-ukraine/president-zelenskys-most-powerful-speeches-20-quotes-that-shaped-ukraines-fight-for-freedom-2555
15	<i>This war is based in no small part on dehumanizing Ukrainians as a group.</i>	Emma Graham-	https://www.newyorker.com/news/daily-comment/how-do

		Harrison	ukrainians-think-about-russians-now
16	<i>Russian warship, go fuck (sic) yourself.</i>	Roman Hrybov	https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Russian_warship,_go_fuck_yourself
17	<i>Regarding hatred: for the offended party, which has been despicably attacked and is experiencing minute-by-minute torment and destruction inflicted by the aggressor, the very feeling of hatred is existentially important.</i>	Jurko Prochasko	https://www.newyorker.com/news/daily-comment/how-do-ukrainians-think-about-russians-now
18	<i>Since the brutal occupation of Bucha, last year, which had seen dozens of civilians raped, tortured, and murdered by Russian troops, he had nothing more to say to them. By their actions, the Russians had "placed themselves outside of humanity.</i>	Ostap Slyvynsk	https://www.newyorker.com/news/daily-comment/how-do-ukrainians-think-about-russians-now
19	<i>You are attacked; you hate the people attacking you.</i>	Peter Pomerantsev	https://www.newyorker.com/news/daily-comment/how-do-ukrainians-think-about-russians-now
20	<i>This isn't just 'Putin's war.' It reflects centuries of Russian culture and social attitudes. Russian culture and society is totally invested in this war. So, yes, in that sense, it's a war of all that is Russian.</i>	Peter Pomerantsev	https://www.newyorker.com/news/daily-comment/how-do-ukrainians-think-about-russians-now