

*Stezhko Yu. H.,**Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor,  
Department at Professional Foreign Languages  
State University "Kyiv Aviation Institute"  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0226-8081>*

## DISFEMIZATION OF JOURNALISTIC DISCOURSE AS A LINGUISTIC REALITY OF MATERIAL LAW

**Summary.** Military operations had its influence on all kinds of public mind, have been imprinted in the mentality of the people, and got its expression in the language of mass media. Journalism has become the severe factor of public communication. *Purpose:* highlighting the conditionality of language transformations in Ukrainian publicistics by military events and mental changes society.

The new concept called “a language of war” took its root in information field, which still hasn't got its final definition. However, differences in its interpretation have not prevented linguists from studying war-related lexical innovations and their use. The given paper study the social- and semiotic markers of the mood of Ukrainians caused by the war. It is noted that since the time of getting sovereignty in Ukraine have already occurred the significant shifts in the language, in particular, towards the revival of authenticity. Now any shifts caused by the war, which occur not only on the line of contact of armies, but also on the information field, when an apt word of a publicist becomes a weapon. The war goes through the consciousness and souls of Ukrainian people, and caused the psychology of hostility, what was reflected in the language with dysphemization, the use of taboo vocabulary, and some language creation. A new social reality and its adequate “language of war” were taking shape. The formation of the “language of war” is logically, which had its manifestation at all times of threats to the Ukrainian identity. Journalism forms a picture of war with the relevant characteristic of “a foe” in response to the mental shifts of Ukrainians. The professional competence of a publicist is manifested in the correct defined way of representing information – focalization. Applying dysphemism or euphemism, the publicist shapes the desired, valuable perception of the narrative by a reader. It's being defined out that, by the way, the main task, publicists got, was to form the perception of the Russian vs. Ukrainian war as the act of aggression against Ukraine.. It is noted that modern journalistic narrative constructions have being formed against the background of lexical- and stylistic liberalization caused by postmodernism. Journalism overcomes the rudiments of modernist “normality” of language, forming a new linguistic “normativity” by using dysphemisms, and taboo vocabulary in the interpretation of “a foe”. Postmodernism declares “freedom being oneself” in the expression by the narrator of social attitudes regarding military assessments. The assessment of the writer's idiosyncrasy cannot be objective, it is always conditioned subjectively by the reader. The saturation of journalism with non-literary vocabulary and dysphemisms should be taken as an objective inevitability, as a new “normality” in language. However, the article notes that freedom is always burdened with responsibility, thus the assessment of the journalist's language is determined by its consequences of the impact on the reader. It is underlined that

the words “the language of war” are going to lose its message only with the oblivion of the very war.

Given in the paper provisions indicate the need to modernize the quality assessment of information provision to society in periods of military threats.

**Key words:** journalism, dysphemism, taboo vocabulary, vocabulary, language creativity, freedom, responsibility.

**Problem statement.** New language reality, ethic of the language has been matured up caused by postmodern and cultural transformations and mental changes conditioned by war events. “The point of language and life are inseparable concepts”, said W. von Humboldt. The Ukrainian people has been faced the challenges of war in everyday life. And a new social reality and a “language of war” were formed adequate to the new social being. Gain its sovereignty by Ukraine, the decolonization of all spheres of social existence, and finally the war events were reflected in language as if on a litmus paper.

The Ukrainian language has undergone a number of significant shifts over the last decade towards the affirmation of authenticity. Start of changes was the implementation of the feminitives, then taking a new spelling, and recently such a phenomenon in journalistic discourse as disfemization has become widespread, originated by a reaction to the existential of the foety caused by losses on the war.

Postmodernism as the cultural phenomenon “in the sense that the vocabulary of a language more or less accurately reflects the culture whose goals it serves” (Sapir, 1921) has also had its influence on the nature of social- and political discourse. Values have been reassessed, new intellectualism has appeared, so even the linguistic reality has changed, what, we think, actualizes the specific topic of research.

**The review of the scientific literature** on the indicated by us topic has shown the attention of scientists to different aspects of linguistic and cultural shifts in journalism that have ran last time. Inter alia, achievements of Ukrainian scientists as Bagan M., Danylyenko O., Istomina A., Klochko S., Kovalenko A., Kutsa V., Levchenko T., Navalna M., Radu A., Serbenska O., Slyusarevsky M., Stezhko Y., Taranenko K., Tsarova, I. [1; 2; 3; 4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9] are of interest, a reflection of the stages of the Ukrainian language evolution were found in their works, and it is outlined factors forming its on the path to authenticity, and the lexical and stylistic features of its functioning in journalistic texts.

The prominent place in the research is occupied by the theme of the reflection of mental changes in linguistic innovations of the people, caused by the threats of war, in the works of Daniileiko O., Kovalenko A., Slyusarevsky M. [2; 3; 5].

The topic of linguistic transformations globally as a problem of the ecological linguistics is reflected in a number of works by

foreign authors and the founder of the scientific field of "ecological linguistics" Biase L., Haugen E. [10; 11].

Among foreign publications are noteworthy the studies of Allan K., Battistella E., Brousse S., Burrige K., Liepa D., Liparte E., Mazid B., Ruiz R., Stone A., Thorne S.

However, it is not about now to recognize the research on the topic of linguistic reality in Ukraine during military events as sufficient, at least due to the rapidity of social transformations and their coverage by publicists. Particularly, it is worth noting the topic, which has insufficient attention from researchers, about dysfemization of the language of social- and political discourse, as a reflection of public sentiments caused by military events. This remark did determine the conception of the topic we study there.

**Purpose:** highlighting the conditionality of language transformations in Ukrainian publicistics by military events and mental changes in society.

For the research **methods** are taken: methods of linguistic- and semantic analysis of any journalistic texts, the descriptive method, the method of the lexical- and stylistic analysis, the method of the descent from abstract to concrete.

**Subject** of the study is the "language of war" in the Ukrainian journalism.

For the **methodological basis** for the research of the modern tendency in the narrative practices of journalism is taken the philosophy of language by O. Potebny, the postulate by W. von Humboldt "it is in no way considerable a vocabulary of a language as a ready-made, frozen mass... a language vocabulary, until the language exists in speech of people, and it is a developing and reproducing product..." [12]. and the philosophical markers of postmodernism in linguistics.

The analysis of journalistic materials was a basis for the study.

**Results and discussion.** The theme of war is seen in all spheres of the nation's spirituality and, firstly, in language as a way of expressing thoughts and feelings. Military actions are conducted not only on the front line of armed conflict, the war runs also on the information front, where a word, a message of the publicist is the very weapon. War goes thru the consciousness and souls of the Ukrainians. Public sentiments, caused by threats to national sovereignty, were reflected in the new lexicon of publicism – dysphemization, the use of the taboo vocabulary, the language creativity in reflections of the attitude towards the enemy (rashka, rusnya, zadvukhsotili, etc.). The formation of war language is naturally, which is getting seen in all times of threats to all Ukrainism, cause "there is no spiritual power that would not be included in this work (language creation – Yu. S.); "there is no such depth, such subtlety, such breadth in the human heart that they cannot pass into language and appear in it" [12]. Currently, a linguistic picture of war, a linguistic fixation of military threats, and a connotative filling of messages with dysphemistic characteristics of the aggressor are being formed under the influence of deep mental shifts. A local military linguistics with a corresponding thesaurus takes shape.

Already in the time of modern history, the dreams of the Ukrainian people about national identity building has been such an inspiring force for linguistic transformations, which were reflected in linguistics by the feminativization of the language, new spelling, and by the way the dysphemization of journalism – a reflection of social attitudes to win the war.

The topic of the feminativization and new spelling of the Ukrainian language has already gained its highlighting in scientific literature, and the phenomenon of dysfemization in the context of mental transformations requires its own analysis. Traditionally, philologists consider dysfemisms in comparison with euphemisms, but the com-

parison does not give a full explanation of its independent role in publicists discourse. Moreover, dysfemisms do not always constitute a dichotomy with euphemisms. Therefore, the interest in studying the phenomenon of dysfemization of the Ukrainian language in the local slice of the military journalism seems to be fully justified.

Besides, the phenomenon of glocalization (R. Robertson) has manifested itself clearly in the Ukrainian language culture – the imprint of the global culture of postmodernism on local processes of mental transformations, caused by military events. In general, the revival of the Cossack's wins in the conditions of today's military realities could be taken as a mainstream of shaping the new linguistic reality.

A short while ago dysfemization of the language has been on the niveau of common speaking, nevertheless the sphere of information began to be seen some manifestations of dysfemisms. Mass media has become a center for the formation of the new linguistic- and cultural reality (language of war). It has a logical explaining – passion to display a psycho- and emotional condition of the Ukrainian readers and at the time to form up its behavioral reaction on a narrative. Known is that a reader does imitate subconsciously the narrator using the principle of mimetization. In the explanation of the role of dysphemisms, it's difficult to overlook the inter-conditionality of language ethics and social psychology. It is worth to admit that the very language is extra sensitive to mental changes among all the factors of identity.

As a reaction to public inquiries in the assessments of war realities, with the light hand of journalists, a number of dysphemisms and lexemes came into circulation, not always of a literary sample, but relevant to public sentiment. However, we must admit that such innovations are not always positively assessed by some linguists and certain segments of society. And disagreements are a natural reaction. Some representatives assess the aforementioned linguistic innovations as a deterioration of linguistic ecology, while others – as the awakening of the Cossack heroism, a manifestation of justified contempt for the "alien" (let us recall the lexical findings of the Cossacks in a letter to the Turkish Sultan). Currently, such expressions of public sentiment of Ukrainians, negative attitudes towards hated persons, objects and events have become dysphemisms, writing some toponyms and anthroponyms with lowercase letters, etc.

The inevitability of the negative connotative content of narratives about war events is still the objective factor even with all the subjective disagreements what about the ethical innovations the "language of war". For example, the phraseology about an advice where should the known russian warship go to, so aptly reflects the public mood that it has become a popular meme. And this is not the only linguistic innovation that has got so aptly into the circulation of the common Ukrainian language over the past three years. The use of dysphemisms for the "foe" nomination is of leading importance as well as euphemisms for designating "friend." Thus, applying the dysphemism vocabulary or Euphemia, the publicist forms the desired value perception of the narrative by the reader.

The recent history of the Ukrainian language has revealed that, there is Ukrainian-language dysfemization and language creation in focus of war in addition to foreign-language connotatively neutral borrowings such as "інсайдер," (insider), "фактчекін" (fact-checking) "фоловер," (follower) and "шоуранер," (showrunner). For example, "Moskalyaka," "Rusnya", "svinosobaky", "orky," "trokhsoti," "vpyymatay oblyznaya" instead of the neutral as "Moskal," "Russians," "wounded," "failed," etc. Balli Sh. gives an explanation for such a creativity: "language creativity" is explained by number of circumstances, mostly by specific needs inherent in each individ-

ual form of existence and thought" [13, p. 252]. And way of existence and thoughts of Ukrainians about war events determines the language creativity in which the socially desirable dominates over what was literary normed. In recent linguistic ethics is getting visible clearly the postmodernistic reassessment of values, liberalization, which legalized the tattooed (in the interpretation of "normality" of modernists) vocabulary for characterization of "foe" in war time, "The puritanism rudiments of modernism regarding staying in the literary language do not allow currently to give a full lexical- and stylistic interpretation to the moods and aspirations of Ukrainians in the current conditions of martial law" [6, p. 320]. Society is clearing the rubble of outdated views about language ethics. For example, as a display of existential pain for war affairs in the publication dated 03.01.25 regarding 900 million euros for the training of the 155th brigade of the Military Forces of Ukraine, the author notes: "And the way our people screwed (*нпосрали* – *укр.*) it all up is simply beyond comprehension" (<https://www.komersant.info/skandal-navkolo-155-oi-bryhady-podalshe-formuvannya-novykh-pidrozdliv-pid-zahrozoiu/>).

The mentality of the nation, it's known, is not the historical constant, it is dynamic, under social-cultural influences, and therefore stable ethical "normality" of language cannot be. An independent, truly objective assessment of the linguistic construction of a narrative cannot exist naturally; it is always subjectively conditioned by an author and a reader. Everything what tough seems in relation to the characterization of "friend" is not so in relation to "foe", – such is the concreteness of truth, because there is no absolute truth. Social – and cultural changes run, and therefore dysphemisms getting lose their status as a breaker of linguistic ethics. In postmodern imperatives, freedom of expression of idiom gives the publicist "freedom to be oneself". J.-P. Sartre states from the standpoint of existentialism: "We are doomed to be free, and our freedom is perhaps the only thing we are unable to refuse" [14, p. 647], but this freedom also makes a publicist responsible before society. So, the concreteness of truth means – wrong is everything that does not correspond to national unity and Ukrainian Europeanness, namely, dysphemization of messages about "friend". The expression of the author's intentions in language should be aimed at promoting national cohesion against the external "foe".

Journalism, it is such a genre that is designed to shape public consciousness responding demands of contemporary national interests in a language that is generally understandable to a wide audience of readers. "Publicists want to diversify the presentation of their material, to make influence on the emotions of recipients of the information, to call his interest, to convince him of something, to call up compassion or, conversely, anger and contempt with the help of colloquial words, in particular vulgarisms" [4, p. 223]. So, the emotional narrative coloring is almost the most decisive in solving this task.

An everyday use of colloquialism, forbidden vocabulary, the journalists create an emotional- and associative ground to the reader's sensemaking – through giving the desired meaning to the narrative by a reader. After all, known is that a reader builds a sense as postmodernism declares it. Let's take it that postmodernism is right declaring that what matters is not what the author said, but what he did not say – hidden intentions. It can be allusions, metaphors or other latent references. Challenges of martial law predicts the social communication with a language corresponding to the mental state. However, the fact is still undoubtable that the professional competence of a journalist is assessed not by the sharpness of the text, but by the consequences of the impact on

readers. The professional competence of a publicist is manifested in the correctly defined presentation of information ("focalization" according to J. Jeanette). Focalization is a certain technology for influence on a reader. Particularly, the widely use has "focalisation zero" by publicists, often together with "focalisation externe", with its use perceives a reader the message unalternatively as a manifestation of the author's undeniable awareness and objectivity. Conversely, as features of unprofessionalism, which is sometimes found in the mass media, lies in the manifestation of the uncertainty, conscious or unconscious, direct or indirect instillation of moods of disbelief in successes, pessimism on internal troubles, and even the spread of fakes. So, let's agree that "some kind of restraining force is needed, some kind of regulator. Too fast change of language as a way of communication, what it mostly is, constitutes a social danger for a given language community" [13, p. 82]. Such a restraining force in each specific case is internal factors – the journalist's worldview guidelines and external – social demands.

What about the professionalism making the choice of lexical and stylistic construction of the narrative by a publicist – our vision is based on the fact that "language is not localized in the subject of speaking, as his innate or gained abilities, but is forming continuously in the multilevel dynamics of social communication" [8, p. 69]. And to have a clear analysis of such dynamics means see a wide range of linguistic levers of influence. In the formation of the "language of war", language of information confrontation, important is to identify relevantly marked lexemes and to anticipate their possible interpretations by the reader. Currently, to the dominant issues of publicism "rightly belong to the need to rebuild the perceptual shape of the Russian-Ukrainian war that has developed previously" [5, p. 86]. Such is the reality of martial law.

In our study, we are forced to talk about the "language of war" as a controversy with the "language of peace," since as long as hostilities continue, it remains a relevant given. "Peace linguistics," which, as A. Kovalenko. tractates it – "can be used for constructive conflict resolution, which promotes peace rather than hostility, allows us to focus on agreement rather than discord" [3, p. 79], is postponed indefinitely. O. Dynileiko is right saying that "the language of war should be considered as the solid construct that appears in time of the war, and then is preserved in the memory of the people and relayed in various texts as long as the memory of the war remains" [2, p. 105]. And, as history shows, Ukrainians have long lasting memory.

**Conclusion and research prospects.** Thus, the concept of the proposed study lies in: recognition that the language expression of reality in the mass media is conditioned by the public consciousness status; acceptance of the situational kind of the national mentality of Ukrainism; its conditionality by military threats and the culture of postmodernism. Currently, the saturation of journalism with non-literary vocabulary, and dysphemisms is to be taken as an objective inevitability, as the new linguistic "normality". "Without breaking the puritanical norms of vocabulary, it is impossible to color reports of military events with public sentiment adequately" [6, p. 320].

Spreading up dysphemisms in journalistic articles become an effective way to influence on the comprehension of readers, solving practical problems about formation of public sentiments, and making the wishful behavioral reaction on the narrative. The prevailing opinion in some circles of linguists about using dysphemisms and forbidden vocabulary harms Ukrainian culture does not stand any verification. The ambivalence of the dysfeminization in journalistic practice should become an incentive for push-



ing forward information about military events all around. In today's conditions against existential threats background caused by military events, dysphemisms become not as much the linguistic category, as a social-and psychological one.

The highlighted provisions in the paper say about the need to make the criteria for assessing the quality of information provision to society during periods of military threats current.

And finally. The potential for researches of linguistic realities is inexhaustible, since social being in its various spheres is dynamically developing, and therefore requires constant renewal.

#### Bibliography:

1. Bagan M., Navalna M., Istomina A., (2022). Individual Verbal Codes of Spontaneous Emotional Psychoregulation of Modern Ukrainian Youth. *Psycholinguistics*, 31 (2), pp. 6-32. <https://doi.org/10.31470/2309-1797-2022-31-2-6-32>
2. Danyleiko O.V. (2023). The Language of War: Definition and Research in the Era of Hybrid Warfare. *Transcarpathian Philological Studies*. 32 (1), pp. 101-107. <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2023.32.1.18>
3. Kovalenko A.Yu. (2023). Peace Linguistics as a Way to Spiritualization of the Personality during War. *Spirituality of a personality: methodology, theory and practice*. 2(106), pp. 77-85. <https://doi.org/10.33216/2220-6310/2023-106-2-77-85>
4. Levchenko T.M. (2020). Actualization of Vulgarisms in Texts of Social and Political Topics. *Scientific Bulletin of Kherson State University. Series «Germanic Studies and Intercultural Communication»*. 1, pp. 222-228.
5. Sliusarevsky M.M. (2022). The social- and psychological situation of Ukrainian society in the conditions of a full-scale Russian invasion: urgent challenges and responses. *Scientific report at the meeting of the Presidium of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine April 21, 2022. Bulletin of the National Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine*, 4 (1), pp. 85-92. <https://doi.org/10.37472/v.naes.2022.4124>
6. Stezhko Yu.H. (2025). Linguistic Ecology of Structures of Publicistic Texts (analysis of narrative practices). *Scientific notes of V.I. Vernadsky Taurida National University, Series: Philology. Journalism*. 36 (75). 1, pp. 318-324. <https://doi.org/10.32782/2710-4656/2025.1.2/51>
7. Stezhko Yu.H. (2023). Philosophy of Postmodernism as a Marker of Modern Linguistic Methodology of Research on Interlinguistic Communication. *Philosophy. Sociology*. 34. 3, pp. 261-268. <https://doi.org/10.6001/fil-soc.2023.34.3.6>
8. Taranenko K.V. (2020). Trends in the Development of World and Domestic Ecolinguistics. *Scientific notes of V. I. Vernadsky Taurida National University, Series: Philology*, 31 (70), 2, part 1, pp. 67-72. <https://doi.org/10.32838/2663-6069/2020.2-1/12>
9. Tsarova, I. (2023). Modern Military Discourse: Process of Neologization. *Linguistics*. 2 (48), pp. 107-114. <https://doi.org/10.12958/2227-2631-2023-2-48-107-114>
10. Biase L.De. (2022). Diversity not division: language in the media ecology. URL: <https://www.oecd-forum.org/posts/diversity-not-division-language-in-the-media-ecology> (date of access: 28.05.2025).
11. Haugen E. (1972). *The Ecology of Language*. Stanford University Press. 366 p.
12. Humboldt W.von. (1876). *Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts. Innere Sprachform*. Berlin. Verlag von S. Calvary & Co. 428p. URL: [https://platon.net/load/knigi\\_po\\_filosofii/antropologija/gumboldt\\_v\\_fon\\_izbrannye\\_trudy\\_po\\_po\\_jazykoznaniju/5-1-0-196](https://platon.net/load/knigi_po_filosofii/antropologija/gumboldt_v_fon_izbrannye_trudy_po_po_jazykoznaniju/5-1-0-196) (date of access: 28.05.2025).
13. Bally Ch. (1951). *Traite de stylistique francaise*. Paris-Geneve. 392 p. URL: <https://f.eruditor.link/file/1573385/> (date of access: 28.05.2025).
14. Sartre J-P. (2021). *Being and Nothingness An Essay in Phenomenological Ontology*. K.: Publishing house Solomii Pavlychko «Osnovy». 854 p.

#### Стежко Ю. Дисфемізація публіцистичного дискурсу як мовна реальність воєнного стану

**Анотація.** Воєнні події відбилися на усіх формах суспільної свідомості, закарбувалися у ментальності та знайшли своєрідне вираження в мові суспільно-політичного дискурсу. Публіцистика стала вагомим чинником суспільної комунікації. Мета: висвітлення обумовленості мовних трансформацій в українській публіцистиці воєнними подіями та ментальними змінами суспільства.

В інформаційному обігу укорінилося поняття «мова війни», яке наразі не набуло свого остаточного дефініювання. Однак розбіжності в тлумаченні не завадили мовознавцям досліджувати пов'язані з війною лексичні інновації та їх ужиток. У запропонованій статті здійснюється дослідження соціально-семіотичних маркерів настроїв українців, обумовлених війною. Зазначається, що за часів суверенітету в Україні уже відбулися істотні зрушення в мові, зокрема, у бік відродження автентичності. Наразі ж зрушення, обумовлені війною, які відбуваються не лише на лінії зіткнення армій, а й на інформаційному фронті, коли зброєю стає влучне слово публіциста. Війна проходить через свідомість та душі українського народу, обумовила екзистенціаль ворожості, що не могло не відбитися на мові дисфемізацією, ужитком табуованої лексики, мовотворчістю. Сформувався нова соціальна реальність та адекватна їй «мова війни». Формування «мови війни» є закономірністю, яка проявлялася в усі часи загроз українству. У відповідь на ментальні зрушення українців публіцистика формує картину війни з релевантною характеристикою «чужого». Професійна компетентність публіциста проявляється у вірно визначеному способі подачі інформації – focalization. Застосовуючи дисфемії або евфемії, публіцист формує бажане ціннісне сприйняття наративу читачем. Визначається, що наразі основне завдання, яке постало перед публіцистами є формування перцепції російсько-української війни як агресії щодо українства. Зазначається, що сучасні публіцистичні конструкції наративів формуються на тлі лексико-стилістичної лібералізації, обумовленої постмодернізмом. Ужитком дисфемізмів, табуованої лексики в інтерпретації «чужого» публіцистика долає рудименти модерністської «нормальності» мови, формуючи нову мовну «нормативність». Постмодернізм декларує «свободу бути собою» у вираженні наратором суспільних установок щодо воєнних оцінок. Оцінка ідіостилу дописувача не може бути об'єктивною, вона завжди суб'єктивно обумовлена читачем. Насичення публіцистики нелітературною лексикою, дисфемізмами маємо сприймати як об'єктивну неминучість, як нову мовну «нормальність». Проте, зазначається у статті, свобода завжди обтяжена відповідальністю, тож оцінка мови публіциста визначається наслідками впливу на читача. Відзначається що вираз «мова війни» втратить своє призначення лише із забуттям самої війни.

Наведені у статті положення свідчать про необхідність осучаснення оцінки якості інформаційного забезпечення суспільства в період воєнних загроз.

**Ключові слова:** публіцистика, дисфемізми, табуована лексика, мовотворчість, свобода, відповідальність.

Дата першого надходження рукопису  
до видання: 11.08.2025

Дата прийнятого до друку рукопису  
після рецензування: 08.09.2025

Дата публікації: 21.10.2025