

*Moiseyenko O. Yu.,
Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Professor of the English Department
National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6262-9678>*

GRAMMATICAL COHESION IN THE DISCOURSE OF INTERVENTION IN THE CASE OF GENOCIDE IN THE LAWSUIT OF UKRAINE AGAINST THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AT THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

Summary. The unprovoked military aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine, which started in 2022, and has resulted in military and civilian casualties, forced displacement, and the destruction of Ukrainian cities, has actualized the discourse of international law and of the International Court of Justice to bring the Russian Federation to justice for committing aggression against Ukraine. Linguists face the issue of researching the integrative nature of the relationship between language and international law in bringing a state to justice for committing international crimes. This article aims to examine the means of grammatical cohesion in the oral observations of thirty-two intervening States in the Case of Genocide in the lawsuit of Ukraine against the Russian Federation at the International Court of Justice. The data for this research includes the verbatim records in English of public sittings in the case held in September 2023 at the Peace Palace in The Hague. The verbatim records are available to the public on the official website of the International Court of Justice. The Court met on that day to hear the oral observations of thirty-two intervening States. The theoretical framework of this research is the theory of textual cohesion introduced by M. Halliday and R. Hasan, which distinguishes four categories of grammatical cohesion: reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. In the analysed texts of oral observations, all the instances of those four categories of grammatical cohesion have been identified, and a general tendency towards the use of certain features has been determined. The results of the research show that the experts in international law, who represent the governments of their countries, utilize a wide range of language resources of cohesion to create coherent, logical arguments in support of Ukraine's position against Russia at the International Court of Justice.

Key words: grammatical cohesion, courtroom discourse, reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction cohesive relations, International Court of Justice.

Statement of the problem. The concept of cohesion explains the relations in discourse. Grammatical cohesion refers to the grammatical connections that link different parts of a text and hold a text together, ensuring that sentences and paragraphs flow logically and smoothly, creating a unified meaning rather than a collection of unrelated sentences. M. Halliday and R. Hasan stressed that cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another [1, p. 4]. The creation of logical texts is especially important for courtroom discourse. Cohesion plays a vital role in ensuring clarity, coherence, and the effective

communication of legal arguments and evidence in courtroom proceedings. From a textual perspective, legal texts have proved to be a highly cohesive type [2].

The unprovoked military aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine, which started in eastern regions of Ukraine and Crimea in 2014 and continued as a full-scale invasion on February 24, 2022, has resulted in military and civilian casualties, forced displacement and the destruction of Ukrainian cities, actualizing the discourse of the international law and of the International Court of Justice to bring the Russian Federation to justice for committing aggression against Ukraine. The International Court of Justice (ICJ) is the principal judicial organ of the United Nations. It was established by the United Nations Charter in June 1945 and began its activities in April 1946. The seat of the Court is at the Peace Palace in The Hague (Netherlands). The Court has a role to settle, in accordance with international law, legal disputes submitted to it by States [3].

On 26 February 2022, Ukraine filed an application instituting proceedings against the Russian Federation. The case is named “Allegations of Genocide under the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Ukraine v. Russian Federation)”, and it is still pending.

In the press release of the Court, in the section “History of the proceedings,” it is stated that “Ukraine contends, *inter alia*, that the Russian Federation has falsely claimed that acts of genocide have occurred in the Luhansk and Donetsk oblasts of Ukraine, and on that basis recognized the so-called ‘Donetsk People’s Republic’ and ‘Luhansk People’s Republic’, and then declared and implemented a ‘special military operation’ against Ukraine”. Ukraine “emphatically denies” that such acts of genocide have occurred and states that it submitted the Application “to establish that Russia has no lawful basis to take action in and against Ukraine for the purpose of preventing and punishing any purported genocide”. In support of Ukraine’s application, thirty-three States filed declarations of intervention in the case, pursuant to the Statute of the Court [4].

The researchers who consider the specific arguments made in individual declarations, but also the mass nature of the declarations, point out that “The Allegations of Genocide under the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Ukraine v. Russia)” case involves an unprecedented number of Article 63 interventions, and point out that they find evidence that states have cooperated in the preparation of their intervention declarations, using Article 63 as an opportunity to collectively

condemn Russia and support Ukraine, as well as offer their joint interpretation of the Genocide Convention [5]. Today, linguists face the issue of researching the integrative nature of the relationship between language and international law in bringing a state to justice for committing international crimes.

Previous research. The theoretical framework of this research is the theory of textual cohesion, which was developed through a process of research and analysis by M. Halliday and R. Hasan, and which considers intersentence cohesive ties. The main principles of Halliday and Hasan's theory of textual cohesion are presented in their book *Cohesion in English*, published in 1976 [1]. M. Halliday and R. Hasan stress that "the concept of cohesion accounts for the essential semantic relations whereby any passage of speech or writing is enabled to function as text" [1, p. 13]. They systematize the concept by classifying it into distinct categories – reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion [1, p. 13]. In M. Halliday and R. Hasan's theory, the notion of cohesion is closely tied to the notion of coherence of a text, since cohesion contributes to the coherence of a text [1, p. 23]. The researchers emphasize that M. Halliday and R. Hasan's model of cohesive devices has been considered a critical guideline for discourse and text analysis [6]. M. Halliday and R. Hasan stress that "a particular text, or a genre, may exhibit a general tendency towards the use of certain features or modes rather than others" [1, p. 332].

The issues of cohesion have been under consideration by linguists who are researching legal discourse in general and courtroom discourse in particular. Ponomariova L., for example, using different types of legal texts in Ukrainian, and courtroom texts as well, has analysed categories of cohesion and coherence in institutional legal discourse [7]. Researchers have also investigated the lexical cohesion in the texts of the US Supreme Court decisions [2]. Nadova Z. has analysed grammatical means of textual cohesion in English in a specific genre of legal register, i.e., in appellate court decisions [8]. The linguistic aspects of the oral observations of intervening States at the International Court of Justice have not been considered yet.

The purpose of the article. This article aims to examine the means of grammatical cohesion in the oral observations of thirty-two intervening States in the Ukraine v. Russia Genocide Case at the International Court of Justice to determine a general tendency towards the use of specific features of cohesion.

The data for this research includes the verbatim records of public sittings in the case concerning "Allegations of Genocide under the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Ukraine v. Russian Federation: 32 States intervening)" held on 20 September 2023, from 10 a.m. till 12 p.m. and from 3 p.m. till 4 p.m., at the Peace Palace in The Hague. The Court met on that day to hear the oral observations of the 32 intervening States. The verbatim records are available to the public on the official website of the International Court of Justice.

The countries presented their observations individually and in groups. The representative of France presented the observations in French. The individual observations of the following countries were analysed: the Federal Republic of Germany, Australia, the Republic of Cyprus, Spain, the Hellenic Republic, the Italian Republic, the Republic of Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Norway, New Zealand, the Republic of Poland, the Portuguese Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, oral observations of the Republic of Slovenia, the Republic of Bulgaria. And the following joint observations were analysed: joint oral observations

of the Republic of Austria, the Czech Republic, the Principality of Liechtenstein and the Slovak Republic, joint oral observations of Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Romania and Sweden, and oral observations of Canada and the Netherlands

The main results of the research. The research has shown that all four categories of cohesion, such as reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunctions, are used in the texts of oral observations.

REFERENCE

M. Halliday and R. Hasan define reference as "the relation between an element of the text and something else by reference to which it is interpreted in the given instance" [1, p. 308]. They use term *reference* to denote textual reference, which M. Halliday and R. Hasan define as *endophoric reference*. Endophoric reference may be either *anaphoric*, i.e., referring to preceding text, or *cataphoric*, i.e., referring to the following text. The term *exophoric reference* is used by M. Halliday and R. Hasan for reference to the context of a situation, so only endophoric reference is cohesive [1, p. 31-36].

According to M. Halliday and R. Hasan, the category of reference includes the following cohesive devices: pronominals, demonstratives and the definite article, and comparatives. Our research has shown that all types of cohesive devices are used.

Pronominals

An important role in oral observations is played by the singular neuter *it*; in total, there are 179 instances of using *it*. For example, an excerpt from the New Zealand presentation shows the use of the pronoun *it* four times with a single referent *refusal to comply*:

A party's refusal to comply with provisional measures is a breach of Article IX, one with significant and far-reaching consequences. It undermines the high ideals of the Convention; it challenges the authority of this Court; it aggravates the underlying dispute; and it threatens the maintenance of international peace and security [9, p. 48].

The pronoun *they* is also used, although the number of instances is much lower, 14 instances. Referents of the pronoun *they* are, for example, *states parties to the Genocide Convention*, since the International Court of Justice resolves disputes between states, and not between individuals:

States parties to the Genocide Convention assume some specific duties to prevent and prosecute the crime of genocide at the national level. They are obliged not only not to commit genocide, but also to take measures to prevent and punish the crime of genocide ... [10, p. 63].

Among the possessive pronouns, the most frequent is the possessive form of *it*, used before the noun, *its*, which is used 159 times. For example: *State party – its claims, its allegations*:

In such cases, a State party cannot hide behind the vagueness of its claims relating to the invocation of the Convention, or the reliance upon the Convention, in order to avoid having its allegations tested before the Court [10, p. 61].

The possessive form of the pronoun *they* *their* is used 24 times. For example, *submissions – their correctness*:

Both of those submissions go directly to the interpretation of Article I. Their correctness is an issue properly within the jurisdiction of the Court ... [10, p. 40].

The use of personal pronouns is not typical for this type of discourse. There are no examples of using the personal pronouns *he* and *she*. The possessive form of *he* – *his* is used 2 times. The referents of the possessive pronoun *his* are judges. For example,

Ad hoc Judge Kress in his declaration related to jurisdiction in The Gambia v. Myanmar states [9, p. 40].

Thus, as *Judge Robinson stated in his separate opinion* “Article I of the Convention imposes an obligation on Russia not only to act to prevent genocide [9, p. 50].

Demonstratives and the definite article

Demonstratives and the definite article take part in creating the textual cohesion of the intervention discourse. In terms of quantity, the use of the definite article prevails. For example, the definite article and the demonstrative pronoun *this* are used as a means of cohesion, that is, endophorically, in an excerpt from a speech by a German representative:

Ukraine initiated these proceedings on 26 February 2022, just two days after the Russian Federation invaded Ukraine on 24 February. In an attempt to justify its armed aggression, Russia had alleged that Ukraine was committing genocide on its territory, the alleged victims of this purported “genocide” being ethnic Russians living in the eastern part of Ukraine [10, p. 34].

However, it should be noted that in the texts there are also examples of exophoric reference that connect with the context of the situation. The examples of exophoric reference are the use of the definite article with the lexemes *court* and *case*, which do not have referents in the text, but the meaning is clear from the context of the situation:

Firstly, the Court must ask whether a dispute exists in the case before it [9, p. 42]. The examples of exophoric reference also include the use of the demonstrative pronoun *this* in the singular with such lexical items as *case* and *court*, and in the plural with the lexical item *proceedings*:

Latvia’s intervention in this case reflects the importance that Latvia attributes to the integrity of the Convention ... [10, p.76].

Poland intervenes in these proceedings in its capacity as a party to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide [9, p. 49].

On all three issues, the Russian Federation seeks to artificially restrict the jurisdiction of this Court [9, p. 45].

It should be noted that the use of *this case* accounts for 24 instances, and *this Court* accounts for 26 instances, outnumbering the use of *the Court* and *the case* in the observations, since the demonstrative pronouns are more emphatic.

It is also important to note the endophoric use of the demonstrative pronouns *these* and *those*. M. Halliday and R. Hasan refer to *these* as near demonstratives and *those* as far demonstratives, that is, the use of that pronoun emphasizes the remoteness in the speaker's perception of the referent [1, p. 334]. For example, the first example considers one's own views, and *these* is used; the second example considers non-own submissions, and *those* is used:

Allow me to address four elements that in our view are essential for the interpretation of that Article with regard to the case at hand. These elements individually – and even more so when considered together... [10, p. 35].

Ukraine contends that State parties to the Convention must act in good faith and with due diligence both in determining whether genocide is occurring, and that they must also act in good faith in determining what measures of prevention or punishment are appropriate in response. Both of those submissions go directly to the interpretation of Article I [10, p. 40].

Comparatives

Among comparatives, the pronoun *same* with the meaning exactly like (20 instances) and the pronoun *such* with the mea-

ning similar type (24 instances) are used to express similarity. For example,

Thus, we submit that when a State is accused by another State of being responsible for committing genocide, it has the same right to initiate proceedings before the Court, just as the State making such an accusation [10, p. 43].

Thus, the adoption of preventive measures that exceed the limits permitted by international law can also constitute a violation of the obligation to prevent stated by the Convention, especially if such measures involve an abuse of law or have been taken contrary to the principle of good faith [10, p. 64].

The comparative *other* is used exophorically as well as endophorically. In the first example, *other* refers to the observations of other states, thus it is used as exophoric, and in the second example *other* is anaphoric to Article IX:

This construction converges with that put forward by other intervening European Union Member States [10, p. 69].

My remarks will present views on the construction of Article IX and other provisions of the Convention relevant to a determination... [9, p. 48].

SUBSTITUTION

According to M. Halliday and R. Hasan “reference implies that there is identity of meaning between the presupposing item and that which it presupposes, while substitution implies non-identity of meaning” [1, p. 315]. They distinguish three types of substitution: nominal, verbal, and clausal. The list of items that occur as substitutes includes nominal: one, ones, same; verbal: do, be, have, do so, be so; and clausal: so, not [1, p. 334].

The examination of the texts allowed for the identification of the cases of nominal substitution (*one* – 10 instances, *ones* – 1 instance) and the cases of verbal substitution (*do so* – 10 instances, *be so* – 1 instance). In the first example, *ones* is used to substitute the lexeme *states*, in the second example, *one* is used to substitute the lexeme *dispute*, and in the third example *do so* is used to substitute to prevent genocide:

However, and as confirmed by the Court’s decision on admissibility of Norway’s intervention, this is not relevant for Norway’s right to opine on the construction of the Genocide Convention under Article 63 of the Statute as a means for other States than the ones at bar to provide their views to the Court. Respectfully, the two are not mutually exclusive [9, p. 44].

Article IX provides it exactly with that opportunity: the relevant dispute is thus clearly one that “relates to” the responsibility of a State for genocide [10, p. 61].

It is unthinkable that a State fulfilling its undertaking to prevent genocide in good faith could do so through aggression or other international crimes [9, p. 58].

ELLIPSIS

M. Halliday and R. Hasan stress that “the difference between substitution and ellipsis is that in the former a substitution counter occurs in the slot, and this must therefore be deleted if the presupposed item is replaced, whereas in the latter the slot is empty – there has been substitution by zero” [1, p.145]. On the level of abstraction, reference is semantic, while substitution and ellipsis are lexicogrammatical. M. Halliday and R. Hasan distinguish three types of substitution: nominal, verbal, and clausal [1, p. 334].

The examination of the texts allowed for the identification of the usage of nominal ellipsis. Nominal ellipsis is defined as ellipsis within the nominal group [1, p.147]. In the first example

of the nominal ellipsis *two*, which is a numerative and therefore normally acts as a modifier, is upgraded to function as a head. In the second example of the nominal ellipsis, the whole nominal group, the subject, is omitted since the meaning is understood:

However, and as confirmed by the Court's decision on admissibility of Norway's intervention, this is not relevant for Norway's right to opine on the construction of the Genocide Convention under Article 63 of the Statute as a means for other States than the ones at bar to provide their views to the Court. Respectfully, the two are not mutually exclusive [9, p. 44].

The Russian Federation has now not only accepted that statement, but has gone further, stating that "its position is that the Convention does not provide such a legal basis [10, p. 41].

CONJUNCTION

M. Halliday and R. Hasan define conjunction cohesion relations in the following way: "conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meanings; they are not primarily devices for reaching out into the preceding (or following) text, but they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse" [1, p. 226]. M. Halliday and R. Hasan distinguish the following types of conjunction cohesion relations: additive, adversative, causal, and temporal. Conjunction cohesion relations are realized not only with conjunctions but also with adverbs and phrases [1, p. 334-335].

The research has shown that all four conjunction cohesion relations distinguished by M. Halliday and R. Hasan are realized in the discourse of oral observations.

Additive

The examination of the texts of oral observations made it possible to establish that additive conjunction cohesion relations are widely used in this type of discourse. The use of the conjunction *and* prevails. For example,

Accordingly, Italy believes that when the interpretation of this kind of obligations is at stake and the Court is seised of the matter, the Court should exercise its jurisdiction to the fullest extent [10, p. 73].

Conjunction *nor* is used to express negative additive intersentance relations, although the number of uses is not high, only 3 instances. For example,

Madam President, I do not intend to repeat every point put forward in New Zealand's written observations. Nor will I rehearse the arguments made by Ukraine and the other intervening States in their written and oral submissions [9, p. 44].

The phrase *in addition* is also used to express additive intersentance relations:

In addition, the use of the expression of the Convention confirms the broad scope of the compromissory clause [9, p. 53].

The conjunction *or* is used to express alternative relations. For example,

It may, for example, ignore the Court's proceedings entirely. Or it may reject the Court's authority and refuse to comply with the provisional measures it has indicated.

The adverb *furthermore* is also used to create additive relations, but *furthermore* is considered more emphatic [1, p. 334]. Seven instances of the use of *furthermore* were identified. For example,

Furthermore, the failure to fulfil the Convention in good faith constitutes a violation of the Convention [10, p. 52].

The expository relations are expressed with the help of *that is* (5 instances) and *in other words* (3 instances). For example,

That is: how a party's outright refusal to comply with provisional measures may be relevant to the Court's determination of jurisdiction under the Convention [9, p. 45].

In other words, a judicial organ cannot disentangle the character of a norm from the construction of that same norm because the norm was not conceived, and does not subsist, in abstracto [9, p. 40].

The exemplificatory relations are expressed by the adverb *thus* (23 instances). For example,

Thus, this provision concerns a situation in which one State raises the commission of genocide by another State and the latter opposes such an assertion [9, p. 50].

The relations of comparison, in particular, the relations of dissimilarity, are expressed with the idiom *on the other hand* (2 instances). For example,

Ukraine, of course, denies that it has done anything that might constitute genocide. The Russian Federation, on the other hand, now denies that it has relied on the Convention to take action in and against Ukraine [10, p. 39].

Adversative proper relations are expressed with the emphatic adverb *however* (11 instances). For example,

However, it follows from the case law of the Court that certain facts or omissions may give rise to a dispute that falls within the ambit of more than one treaty [10, p. 46].

Contrastive relations are expressed with the conjunction *but*, and contrastive emphatic relations are expressed with the expression *on the other hand* (2 instances). For example,

In my presentation, I will not address the existence of a dispute between the Parties in this case, but will highlight the following three points relating to the scope of Article IX [10, p. 56].

The Russian Federation, on the other hand, now denies that it has relied on the Convention to take action in and against Ukraine [10, p. 39].

The relations of correction of meaning are expressed with the adverb *rather* (5 instances). For example,

These constraints are not extrinsic to the Convention. Rather, they are embedded within it, consistently with the object and purpose of the Convention. Britain [9, p. 59]. Causal

The adverb *therefore* is the most used to express general causal relations; 21 examples of the use of *therefore* have been identified. For example,

Therefore, we have a legal interest in and attach fundamental importance to its correct interpretation [9, p. 42].

General causal relations are also expressed with the adverb *accordingly* (5 instances). For example,

And secondly, Article IX explicitly states that the seisin of the Court can be the initiative of "any of the parties to the dispute". Accordingly, such a dispute can be submitted to the Court by either of the disputing States [10, p. 36].

The conjunction *because* is used to express reversed causal relations; 14 examples of the use of *because* were identified:

New Zealand has chosen to intervene in these proceedings because we consider that the issues in this case go to the very heart of the international rule of law and the protection of this Court's role in the peaceful settlement of disputes [9, p. 44].

Causal specific relations of reason are expressed by *it follows*; 4 examples of the use of *it follows* were identified. For example,

As the Court has consistently found – most recently in the Myanmar Genocide case – the obligations contained in the Convention

are obligations *erga omnes*. *It follows that all States parties to the Convention have an interest in securing compliance with those obligations – including the obligations in Article IX* [9, p. 48].

The examination of the texts also allowed for the identification of the relations of reversed polarity, which are expressed with the conjunction *otherwise* (11 instances). For example,

Otherwise, a State party could freely invent violations of the Convention, allegedly committed by another State party ... part 1, p. 71, Hellenic

Temporal

Among the temporal relations, the correlative relations, in particular, the sequential and conclusive, and the relations of summary, are used in the construction of text cohesion. The most frequent are sequential relations, which are created with the help of the adverbs *first, second*. For example,

First, it derives from the argument that the ostensible breach of Article I by the applicant would preclude the wrongfulness of the Defendant's aggression.

Second, the Defendant's act of aggression brings the interpretation of Article IV into play in relation to the scope of the admissible measures against alleged breaches of the Convention [10, p. 76].

Conclusive relations are expressed with the adverb *finally* (6 instances) and with the phrase *in conclusion* (5 instances). For example,

Finally, Lithuania recalls that when the Court has jurisdiction under Article IX, such jurisdiction also extends to applying "the rules of general international law on treaty interpretation and on responsibility of States for internationally wrongful acts" [9, p. 37].

In conclusion, Madam President, distinguished Members of the Court, the Republic of Bulgaria respectfully submits that the proper construction of Article IX of the Genocide Convention confers jurisdiction on the Court ... [10, p. 52].

The relations of summary are expressed with the phrasal verb *to sum up* (1 instance).

To sum up on this first point: a State party that considers itself falsely accused of genocide by another State party may rebut such accusation and submit the ensuing dispute to the Court pursuant to Article IX [9, p. 36].

Conclusions. Grammatical cohesion plays an integral role in the creation of courtroom discourse. The theoretical framework of this research on grammatical cohesion in the oral observations of intervening States in the Ukraine v. Russia Genocide Case at the International Court of Justice is the theory of textual cohesion introduced by M. Halliday and R. Hasan, which distinguishes four categories of grammatical cohesion: reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. In the analysed texts of oral observations, all the instances of those four categories of grammatical cohesion have been identified, and a general tendency towards the use of certain features has been determined. Among the reference means of cohesion, the neuter pronoun and its possessive form prevail in this type of discourse, which is explained by the nonpersonal character of the discourse, since the International Court of Justice settles, in accordance with international law, legal disputes submitted to it by States, not individuals. Demonstratives and the definite article are used endophorically to create text cohesion as well as exophorically to connect the observations with the context of the situation. Nominal and verbal substitutions, as well as nominal ellipses, are utilized to escape repetition, and thus to make the observations more laconic. The conjunction relations are diverse in this type

of discourse. The conjunctive elements provide specific semantic relations like additive, causal, temporal, and adversative ties, showing the clear semantic and logical relationships between legal arguments. The emphatic means of conjunction relations, such as *moreover, therefore, furthermore, however*, add force in signaling the coherence relationships between propositions. Thus, the results of the analysis of the means of grammatical cohesion in the oral observations of intervening States in the Ukraine v. Russia Genocide Case show that the experts in international law, who represent the governments of their countries, utilize a wide range of language resources of cohesion to present coherent logical arguments in support of Ukraine's position against Russia at the International Court of Justice.

The prospects of the research consist of further studies of the peculiarities of the cohesion of various types of discourse of the UN International Court of Justice for the development of a taxonomy of the means of cohesion of the international legal discourse.

Bibliography:

- Halliday, M., Hasan, R. Cohesion in English. Longman 1976. 374 p.
- Santaemilia J., Coperias M.-J., Piqué J. Lexical cohesion in legal language: Several US Supreme Court abortion decisions. In: *Integrating theory and practice in LSP and LAP*. Papers from the IRAAL/ALC conference, March 1998: Part 2. Dublin: IRAAL & University College Dublin, 2000, P. 13-21.
- The International Court of Justice. The Court. <https://www.icj-cij.org/court>
- Allegations of Genocide under the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Ukraine v. Russian Federation). Press Release, International Court of Justice, No. 2025/5, 31 January 2025. URL: <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/182> (Date of access 01.06.2025)
- Wigard K., Pomson O., McIntyre J. Keeping score: an empirical analysis of the interventions in Ukraine v Russia. *Journal of International Dispute Settlement*, 2023, P.1–23. URL: <https://academic.oup.com/jids/article/14/3/305/7187451> (Date of access 01.06.2025).
- AlSuwaiyan L. A. Grammatical Cohesion in the Introduction Chapters of Linguistics Ph.D. Theses Written by Anglophone Academic Writers. *International Journal of English Linguistics*; Vol. 14, No. 5, 2024. P. 94-104. URL: <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v14n5p94> (Date of access 01.06.2025)
- Пономарьова Л. Маркери зв'язаності тексту в інституційно-правовому дискурсі. *European Humanities Studies: State and Society Issue 3(I)*, 2019. P. 140-149. URL: DOI: 10.38014/ehs-ss.2019.3-I.11 (Date of access 01.06.2025)
- Nadova Z. Grammatical means of textual cohesion in appellate court decisions. *Revista de Linguas para Fines Especificos* 21.2 (2015), P. 8-47. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.20420/rife.2015.0010>
- Public sitting held on Wednesday 20 September 2023, at 3 p.m., at the Peace Palace. Verbatim Record. The International Court of Justice. URL: <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/182> (Date of access 01.05.2025)
- Public sitting held on Wednesday 20 September 2023, at 10 a.m., at the Peace Palace. Verbatim Record. The International Court of Justice. URL: <https://www.icj-cij.org/case/182> (Date of access 01.05.2025)

Моїсєнко О. Граматична когезія в дискурсі інтервенції у справі про геноцид за позовом України проти російської федерації у Міжнародному суді ООН

Анотація. Неспровокована військова агресія російської федерації проти України, яка почалася у 2022 році та призвела до жертв серед військових і цивільного

населення, вимушеного переміщення та руйнування українських міст, актуалізувала дискурс міжнародного права та Міжнародного суду ООН щодо притягнення російської федерації до відповідальності за вчинення агресії проти України. Перед лінгвістами постає питання дослідження інтегративного характеру взаємозв'язку між мовою та міжнародним правом у притягненні держави до відповідальності за вчинення міжнародних злочинів. Ця стаття має на меті дослідити засоби граматичної когезії в усних заявах тридцяти двох держав, які втрутилися у справу про геноцид у позові України проти російської федерації в Міжнародному суді ООН. Дані для цього дослідження включають стенограми англійською мовою відкритих засідань у справі, яка відбулася у вересні 2023 року в Палаці Миру в Гаазі, стенограми є доступними для громадськості на офіційному веб-сайті Міжнародного суду ООН. Того дня Суд зібрався, щоб заслухати усні заяви 32 держав, які втрутилися в справу. Теоретичною основою цього дослідження є теорія текстової когезії, запропонована М. Холлідієм і Р. Хасан, яка розрізняє чотири категорії

граматичної когезії: референція, субституція, еліпсис і сполучникові смислові зв'язки. У проаналізованих текстах усних заяв виявлено всі випадки чотирьох категорій граматичної когезії та визначено загальну тенденцію до використання окремих рис когезії. Результати дослідження показують, що експерти з міжнародного права, які представляють уряди своїх країн, використовують широкий спектр мовних ресурсів когезії для створення когерентних, логічних аргументів на підтримку позиції України проти росії в Міжнародному суді ООН.

Ключові слова: граматична когезія, судовий дискурс, референція, субституція, еліпсис, сполучникові когезійні відносини, Міжнародний Суд ООН.

Дата першого надходження рукопису
до видання: 20.08.2025

Дата прийнятого до друку рукопису
після рецензування: 16.09.2025
Дата публікації: 21.10.2025