The Ideological Role of Vocabulary in Ukrainian President Zelensky's Speeches to European and National Parliaments

Ann Abidali Abdulmejeed An-Nassrawi[1], & Assit. Prof. Nidaa Hussain Fahmi Al Khazraji (Ph.D.)[2]

[1] M.A Student, Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Kerbala, Iraq

[2] Assit. Prof. Nidaa Hussain Fahmi Al Khazraji (Ph.D.), Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Kerbala, Iraq

Correspondence: Ann Abidali Abdulmejeed An-Nassrawi, M.A Student, Department of English, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Kerbala, Iraq.

Abstract

The present paper is a critical discourse analysis (CDA), which is basically based on Fairclough's (2001) Three-dimensional model, the descriptive stage. It specifically focuses on the ideological function of vocabulary in the political text. The analyzed data includes six speeches of Ukraine President Zelensky that were delivered virtually to the European and National parliaments from 1-20 March 2022. Moreover, a qualitative approach is employed as the research methodology for data analysis. However, the primary objective of this research is to address the following question: To what extent can vocabulary, specifically in terms of overwording, meaning relations, and wording at the microstructure level, reflect aspects of President Zelensky's ideological stance as reflected in his speeches? The analysis results indicate that vocabulary reflects a significant part of President Zelensky's ideology and he highly depends on them to send ideological messages.

Keywords: CDA, three-dimensional model, Zelensky, European and National parliaments

1. Introduction

The ongoing dispute between Russia and Ukraine is a relatively fresh event; it has gained a lot of attention since it indicates the outbreak of a third world war, and it is the second major international crisis since the COVID-19 pandemic spread, which has taken the lives of millions of people worldwide. In fact, it symbolizes the world's most severe military operation since the 2003 American invasion of Iraq, which has consumed people for years. The Russia-Ukraine war broke out on 24 February 2022 led by Russian President Vladimir Putin and his allies on the Russian side and President Volodymir Zelensky and his Western allies on the Ukrainian side. It was under the pretext of Ukraine's continuous attempts to be a member of the National Atlantic Treaty Organization (henceforth NATO) and the European Union (EU), in addition to its statement about its intention to acquire nuclear weapons. These three obvious causes of the war are what is known to public opinion, however, there could be other motives, some of them are latent, while others are stated, which change according to the different readings and political scenes. Hence, the political speeches on this crisis have increased since the beginning of the war, especially those of the Presidents of the two states who are the main poles in this case. Similarly, the studies about this conflict have also intensified. On that account, some researchers have studied the Ukraine crisis geopolitically, for instance (Shahi,2022); others have made some linguistic studies to reveal the ideology of the war or investigate issues such as identity, conflict, or power such (Mankoff,2022) and (Seals,2022). However, this study is intended to investigate the ideological role of vocabulary in Ukrainian President Zelensky's speeches, which seem to rally more international support for Ukraine and more sanctions against Russia. Thus, from a CDA perspective, the researcher justifies the need to undertake such a study to look at the gap that prior studies have not addressed.

2. Review of Literature

Some studies have investigated vocabulary analysis in CDA, for example, (Al-Musawi,2021); (Jabbar,2021); and (Al-Husseini,2022). Surely, all these studies have added something useful to understanding the ideological role of vocabulary in the discourse.

First, Al-Musawi's (2021) thesis under the title of "The Representation of Qassem Suleimani and Abu Mahdi Al-Muhandis' Murder in American and Iranian News Reports: A Critical Discourse Analysis", a study in which the researcher adopts Fairclough's (1989) model of vocabulary analysis, the result of the study is that overwording is one of the tools, which overweighs the other tools at the microstructure level. Moreover, in Jabbar's (2021) thesis work, which is titled "The Representation of the Iraq War in Chomsky's Articles: A Critical Discourse Analysis", in this work the researcher adopts Fairclough's (1992) model for vocabulary analysis (overwording). The study reveals that hostile language has been prevalent in all publications, and the writer's repeated use of these phrases reveals a strong obsession with the bloodshed and social turmoil brought on by the conflict.

Furthermore, Al-Husseini (2022) examines vocabulary in his thesis work "The Representation of Homosexuality in Netflix Shows: A Critical Discourse Analysis", using Fairclough's (2001) model for vocabulary analysis, overwording, and categorization tools. The results indicate that Netflix uses the elements of microstructure including overwording, and categorization to create the Self and the Other representation.

2.1 Ideology

Ideology is defined as "particular ways of representing and constructing society which reproduce unequal relations of power, relations of domination and exploitation" (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p. 275). Hodge and Kress (1993, p.6) point out that ideology is seen as "a systematic body of ideas, organized from a particular point of view". Since language both reflects and creates ideology, it is sets and systems of views that social groups share and may be studied through particular linguistic practices in texts. Van Dijk (2012) mentions the sources of ideology, indicating that by reading and listening to other group members, beginning with parents and classmates, people learn the majority of their ideological beliefs. Later, among many other spoken and textual mediums, they learn ideologies via watching television, reading school textbooks, advertisements, the news, and novels, or engaging in regular talks with friends and coworkers.

2.2 Political Discourse

Van Dijk (2005, p.732) states that politics is the most ideological field among the societal fields and this is because ideology is one of the requirements for group competition, "if there is one social field that is ideological, it is that of politics. This is not surprising because it is eminently here that different and opposed groups, power, struggles, and interests are at stake". Chilton (2004, p.3) thinks of politics either as "a struggle for power, between those who seek to assert and maintain their power and those who seek to resist it" or as a "cooperation, as the practices and institutions that a society has for resolving clashes of interest over money, influence, liberty, and the like".

3. Methodology

The current paper applies a qualitative approach, which is known as "a means for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem". (Creswell, 2009, p.1). Moreover, the data collection process is internet-based. The researcher searches the most reputable and well-known global institutions for information that addresses President Zelensky's speeches in 2022. Among these agencies are the Washington Post, CNN, euronews, i24 news English, the Times of Israel, the official website of Ukraine's president and government, and the official website of the Russian Kremlin. Further, the data in this study is purposefully curated. According to Paton (1990, p.169), "the logic and power of purposeful sampling lie in selecting information-rich cases for study in depth. Information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research".

3.1 Fairclough's (2001) Vocabulary Analysis Model

Locke (2004) states that Fairclough (1992) created an ascending scale-like structure for text analysis or descriptive stage by grouping it under four primary topics (small units to bigger ones).

1. *Vocabulary*: focuses primarily on single words (word meaning, wording, metaphor, etc.).

2. *Grammar*: focuses on the use of words in clauses and phrases (modality, transitivity, and theme).

3. *Cohesion*: focuses on linking clauses and sentences together.

4. *Text Structure*: focuses on large-scale organizational assets.

In a similar vein, Fairclough (2001) poses four main questions and six subquestions that can analyze the text descriptively (level of vocabulary). He points out that text analysis on the level of vocabulary includes four main questions:

1. What experiential values do words possess?

   - What classification schemes are used?

   - Exist any words that are subject to ideological debate?

   - Is there rewording or overwording?

   - What word relationships (synonymy, hyponymy, and antonymy). have ideologically significant meanings?

2. What relational values do words possess?

   - Exist euphemistic words and phrases?

   - Are there words that are clearly formal or informal?

3. What expressive value do words possess?

4. Which metaphors are employed?

Fairclough (2001) presents a distinction between three types of values that formal features of the text may have: *experiential*, *relational*, and *expressive*. He stresses that any particular formal characteristic could have two or three of these values at once. In addition to the above-mentioned values, there is a *connective value* whose role is to connect the parts of the text together.

3.1.1 Vocabulary

Vocabulary is one of the textual features such as grammar, punctuation, rhetorical devices, etc. Vocabulary in CDA can play a considerable role whether they are used to serve linguistically, ideologically, or culturally (Fairclough,2001).

3.1.1.1 Overwording

It is a "high degree of wording" frequently involving numerous terms that are close synonyms. "Overwording shows a preoccupation with some aspect of reality - which may indicate that it is a focus of ideological struggle". (Fairclough,2001, p.96). For example, the word *war* can approach meanings such as *devastation, catastrophe, ruins, destruction*, and *collapse.*

Overwording is "the extensive use of synonymous or near-synonymous words to reference a particular domain or social practice". It is frequently observed in contexts where there is ideological conflict and may reflect an obsession with a particular issue or domain. For instance, depending on the ideological perspective of the name, those who are referred to as *freedom fighters* can also be called *terrorists, rebels, insurgents*, or *assassins* (Baker & Ellece,2011).

3.1.1.2 Meaning Relations

Fairclough (2001) notes that the benefit of switching between the text and the discourse type also applies to the relationships between words' meanings. Other times, a text may make direct use of the meaning relationships established in a discourse type. In that instance, "these relations of synonymy were ideologically determined". In fact, it is generally believed that word relationships, such as synonymy, are connected to specific ideologies, either the ideology that is ingrained in a discourse type or the ideology that is creatively formed in a text.

The key types of meaning relations are *synonymy, hyponymy*, and *antonymy.* Synonymy "is the case where words have the same meaning". Absolute synonyms are rare, but there is a crude test for them, if words may be substituted for one another without significantly changing their meaning, they are in synonymous relation. Hyponymy "is the case where the meaning of one word is, so to speak, included within the meaning of another word". For example, in one ideologically specific discourse type, the meaning of totalitarianism was combined with the meanings of communism, Marxism, and fascism. Antonymy means "incompatibility - the meaning of one word is incompatible with the meaning of another". For example, the meanings of *war* and *peace.*

3.1.1.3 Wording

According to Fairclough (1992, p.236), the wording "the objective is to contrast the ways meanings are worded with the ways they are worded in other (types of) text, and to identify the interpretative perspective that underlies this wording". The wording is also related to vocabulary. It refers to the different ways meaning can be "worded". In which, the same character or episode is seen or estimated discursively according to different points of view. For example, a strong leader may be described as a hero or tyrant. Regarding CDA, "it is clear that particular wordings are clues to interdiscursive relationships between texts". Possibly, "the more frequently a particular wording is taken up across a range of texts in a range of situations, the more likely it is that a particular discourse is enlarging its subscription base" (Locke 2004, pp.50-51). The researcher has finally determined that it is suitable to choose Fairclough's (2001) vocabulary model to uncover part of President Zelensky's hidden ideology to answer a question that previous studies do not pose.

4. Data Analysis

Vocabulary is the construction unit of the text; it is one of the textual features that the speaker/writer can use to send a certain message or construe ideological remarks. So, it is significant to ponder President Zelensky's discourse vocabulary and unmask its hidden agenda. In this section, the vocabulary analysis of President Zelensky's six speeches is done in terms of overwording, meaning relations, and wording.

4.1 Speech One Vocabulary Analysis (the European Parliament)

4.1.1 Overwording

Overwording is observed in a text when the words and phrases show an approach in lexicons. That is, the text has different expressions but they feed the same general meaning.

1. Zelensky uses overwording when he starts his speech by saying that he does not know how "t*o greet, welcome, say good morning, say good afternoon, or good evening".* According to Fairclough (2001, p.96), overwording refers to aspects of reality. The presence of such words in the speech is a reflection of the actual situation, that is, Zelensky does not know how to greet because all greetings start with the word *good*. For him as a leader and for his citizens, from now on, there is no good time because their life is exposed to death at any moment.

2. Another example of overwording is figured out in this speech when Zelensky describes war as *"a tragedy, ultimate price, high price, full-scale invasion, the price of freedom, death, and darkness".*

3. The last example of overwording is observed in Zelensky description of his citizens: *"They are defending each other, defending freedom, incredible, strong, and motivated".*

Zelensky's phrases express that Russia pays Ukraine an expensive price which is their souls, young smart people, and land. Nevertheless, Ukrainians are strong despite all the hard times they pass through.

4.1.2 Meaning Relations

According to Fairclough (2001), meaning relationships like synonymy are frequently seen as being related to specific ideologies, either the ideology that is artistically formed in a text or the ideology that is inherent in a discourse type. In Zelensky's first speech, there are examples of meaning relations:

1. Synonyms such as *"happy" = "glad," "like" = "desire", "lonely" = "lonesome", and "Ukrainians" = "my citizens"*. Zelensky uses synonyms like these to create diversity in discourse expressions and subsequently maintain the audience's attention drawn which raises the chances of their response to his demands.

2. Antonymy such as *"life" vs. "death", "light" vs. "darkness", and "killed" vs. "alive"*. Zelensky uses some antonyms relations, that is, all words with negative connotations ideologically refer to Russia, in contrary, all words with positive connotation refer to Ukraine.

3. Hyponymy examples in this speech are: the meaning of *"paper"* is included in *"the sheet"*, and the meaning of *"we, all of we"* is included in "*all the countries of the European Union"*. In the first example *"paper" and "the sheet"*, Zelensky informs the listeners that he delivers his speech extemporarily because the stage of writing a prepared speech in advance is ended in his country. He gives a hint that the situation is very critical to such an extent that printed or handwritten addresses are actions of free and stable states. However, in the second example of hyponymy *"we, all of we"* and *"all the countries of the European Union",* Zelensky grants himself the privilege of joining Ukraine in the EU and behaves as if his country is a member of the EU.

4.1.3 Wording

The wording is also related to vocabulary. It refers to the different ways meaning can be "worded", in which, the same character or position is seen or estimated discursively according to different points of view.

1. Zelensky first example of wording is *"European choice of Ukraine that we are striving for and that's what we're going to and we went to"*. Zelensky, on the one hand, views Ukraine's integration with the EU as a legal right for developing Ukraine at all levels, Russia, on the other hand, considers it a crucial threat to regional security interests and it represents the open decouple from Russia's orbit towards the West and their values which threat the society values.

2. The second example of wording in this speech is *"Yesterday, 16 children were killed. And again, and again, President Putin is going to say that is some kind of operation and we are hitting a military infrastructure, where children, what kind of military factories do they work at? What tanks are they going with or launching cruise missiles?"*. Putin calls the war some kind of operation that targets the military infrastructure in Ukraine, whereas Zelensky calls it a full-scale invasion that targets civilians and specifically children and universities where youth is there.

4.2 Speech Two Vocabulary Analysis (the British Parliament)

4.2.1 Overwording

Overwording is observed in a text when the words and phrases show an approach in lexicons.

1. Zelensky uses overwording after greeting the British Parliament, addressing British people with phrases such as "*all the people of the United Kingdom, all the people of Great Britain, great people with great history"*. In fact, Zelensky addresses a state that is one of the greatest powers in the world. At its height, it has the largest empire in history, and it dominates the world for more than a century. Its constitutional, legal, linguistic, and cultural legacies are therefore well-known.

2. Another example of overwording is figured out in this speech when Zelensky describes the Ukrainian troops' treatment of the Russian war prisoners saying *"we have not lost our dignity, we didn't abuse them, we treat them like people, we remained human"*. Zelensky shows the public opinion that despite the inhumanity of Russia's forces, Ukraine's leadership and army still have humanity and do not breach the norms of international law of treating war prisoners.

3. The last example of overwording is observed in the series of words that describe Ukrainians' insistence to fight the enemy *"We shall fight them in the seas, air, wood, in the fields, on the beaches, in the cities, villages, streets hills, spoil tips, on the banks of Kalmius and Dnieper"*. Using such overwording emphasizes that the fight will last everywhere and in every spot of Ukraine's land until the Russian forces will be defeated.

4.2.2 Meaning Relations

In Zelensky's second speech, there are examples of meaning relations:

1. Synonyms such as "*unarmed" = "with bare hands", "close" = "block", "start" = "begin", "help" = "support", "strive" = "fight", "rockets" = "missiles", "give up" = "surrender"*. Zelensky's colorful discourse is a successful strategy for attracting listeners. His discourse is abounded with meaning relations and synonyms are part of them. Zelensky delivers his speech with different synonyms to raise the morale of the audience and keep them attentive and eager to listen till the end of the speech.

2. Antonymy such as *"ladies" vs. "gentlemen", "start" vs. "end", "slept" vs. "woke up", "killed" vs. "people alive", "savages" vs. "human" "children" vs. "adults", and "sea" vs. "land"*. Zelensky uses antonyms relations to color his discourse and refer to the

opposing principles in war, for example, the opposite words *"savages"* vs*. "human"* serve ideologically to compare Russia with Ukraine.

3. Hyponymy examples in this speech are: the meaning of *"battle"* is included in the meaning of *"war"*, the meaning of *"genocide"* is included in *"crime"*, the meaning of *"Nazis"* is included in *"invaders"*, and the meaning of *"war prisoners"* is included in the meaning of *"troop"*. The hyponymy relation in these examples is obvious, for example, *"war prisoners"* are the troops themselves before capture but they become part of them after capture.

4.2.3 Wording

 The wording is also related to vocabulary; it refers to the different ways meaning can be "worded".

1. Zelensky's first example of wording is found when describing the Russian troops as *"savages"*, *"invaders"*, and *terrorists* who do not know the *"holy and great"*, whereas President Putin considers the Russian troops as defenders who sacrifice for the sake of Russia security interests and for the protection of Russian citizens in some Ukraine eastern districts who appeal Russia for help.

2. The second example of wording is when Zelensky calls the war a *"genocide"* whose criminals should be presented before the international court. However, President Putin says that the war is a *"special military operation"* to help Donbas citizens. Donbas is a district in the east of Ukraine with most Russian citizens. President Putin accuses Ukraine forces of persecuting the Russian citizens there and committing genocide, promising criminals to be brought to justice.

4.3 Speech Three Vocabulary Analysis (Canadian Parliament)

4.3.1 Overwording

1. Zelensky's first use of overwording is at the beginning of his speech when he asks the Canadian Prime Minister to feel what he feels as an official and what Ukrainians feel saying *"I want you to understand my feeling"*, *"the feelings of Ukrainians"*, and *"Feelings during these 20 days"*.

2. Zelensky's second use of overwording occurs when he overuses the word *"imagine"* to make the Canadian Prime Minister live the atmospheres of war and its scourges saying *"Imagine that at four in the morning, each of you hears explosions"*, *"imagine you are looking for words to explain this to children"*, *"imagine - and fire artillery. Fire at residential areas, at people"*, *"They approach Edmonton - imagine - and fire artillery"*, and *"Imagine hearing the report on the dead every day"*

3. Zelensky's third use of overwording appears when he describes the war saying that this war is against *"our people"*, *"our future"*, *"character"*, *"will"*, and *"to destroy everything that makes Ukrainians Ukrainians"*.

4.3.2 Meaning Relations

In Zelensky's third speech, there are examples of meaning relations:

1. Synonyms such as *"begun"* = *"started"*, *"at four in the morning"* = *"dawn"*, *"destroy"* = *"destruction"*, *"conquest"* = *"invasion"*, *"block"* = *"blockade"*, *"hit"* = *"fire"*, *"stay"* = *"remain"*, and "*thankful"* = *"grateful"*. Zelensky uses synonymous relations to remain speech listenable, not monotonous, varied, and thus more effective.

2. Antonymy such as *"life"* vs. *"death"*, *"stop"* vs. *"start"*, *"war"* vs. *"peace"*, *"strong"* vs. *"weak"*, *"honest"* vs. *"hypocrite"*, and *"enemies"* vs. *"friends"*. Zelensky uses antonymy relations to reflect the different contradictions that the war makes. For example, the opposite words *"honest"* and *"hypocrite"* serve ideologically, in that, nations in their misfortune can realize and recognize obviously others' real or fake positions. Actually, war is the fastest way to filter the list of allies around any entity, group, or state.

3. Hyponymy examples in this speech are: the meaning of *"small cities"* and "*larger ones"* is included in the meaning of Ukraine's *"land"*, the meaning of *"dead children"* is included in *"the dead every day"*, the meaning of *"Canada"* is included in *"NATO"*, and the meaning of *"Ukrainian diaspora"* is included in the meaning of *"Ukrainians"*. The hyponymy relations in political discourse is prevalent, for example, most populations have a diaspora that makes a part of the indigenous.

4.3.3 Wording

In wording, the same character or position is seen or estimated discursively according to different points of view.

1. First example of wording is when Zelensky accuses Russia charge of Ukraine's facilities' *"destruction"*. In turn, President Putin in his speech about Ukraine says that the Soviet Union has gifted Ukraine with industries and infrastructures that Ukraine one day has been proud of, asking where are they now, Putin points out that all these advanced factories and technologies, including space industry, has been destroyed by the West, citing this is the result of approaching of the West.

2. The second example of wording is when Zelensky names Russia the *"total evil"* which will destroy everything. Zelensky views Russia as a *"total evil"* that threatens Ukraine and the whole of Europe continental, while President Putin argues that Ukraine's aspiration to join NATO is a *"fundamental threat"* to the entire region because it brings the West to Russia's borders, allowing to NATO's radars to explore even the farthest point in Russia, and this is a stark violation to the security agreements between the two countries.

4.4 Speech Four Vocabulary Analysis (U.S. Congress)

4.4.1 Overwording

1.   Zelensky's first use of overwording is at the beginning of his speech when he describes his country saying that he feels proud to greet the audience from "*Ukraine*", "*our capital city of Kyiv*", "*a city that is under missile*", *and* "*our beautiful country*".

2.   Zelensky's second use of overwording when describing his people saying they are "*brave*", "*freedom-loving people*", "*resisting*", "*sacrificing*", and "*fighting for the values of Europe*".

3.   Zelensky's third use of overwording when he describes the features of U.S. former Presidents saying that they put down a foundation of the "*United States*", "*democracy*", "*independence*", "*freedom*", they "*care for everyone*", "*every person*", "*work diligently*", "*live honestly*", and "*respects the law*".

4.4.2 Meaning Relations

In Zelensky's fourth speech, there are examples of meaning relations:

1. Synonymous relations such as "*brave*" = "*ready to fight*", "*aggression*" = "*attack*", "*reply*" = "*answer*", "*aircraft*" = "*plane*", "*aviation*" = "*flying*", "*save*" = "*protect*", "*exactly*" = "*with precision*", "*weapons*" = "*ammunition*", "*prevent*" = "*stop*", "*alliance*" = "*union*", "*districts*" = "*territories*", and "*conflict*" = "*war*". Zelensky takes advantage of synonymous relations to keep his discourse interesting, diversified, and without monotony.

2. Antonymous relations such as "*life*" vs. "*death*", "*allow*" vs. "*prevent*", "*terror*" vs. "*peace*", "*die*" vs. "*live*", "*aggressor*" vs. "*friend*", "*innocent people*" vs. "*criminals*", and "*brutal*" vs. "*human*". Zelensky uses antonymy relations to illustrate the various contradictions that the war makes. It is clear that all the words with negative connotations are connected with the war, in turn, all words with positive connotations are associated with peace.

3. Hyponymy relations examples in this speech are: the meaning of "*Ukraine*" is included in the meaning of "*whole Europe*", the meaning of "*U.S.*" is included in "*democracy*", and the meaning of "*Ukraine*" is included in the meaning of "*antiwar coalition*". The meaning of Ukraine is part of the meaning of the European countries as well as the European continent.

4.4.3 Wording

In wording, the same character or position is seen or estimated discursively according to different points of view.

1. The first example of wording is when Zelensky describes the war of Russia against Ukraine as a "*full-scale invasion*", whereas President Putin states that he does not want to invade Ukraine but Russia wants to "*demilitarize*" Ukraine and to hold criminals accountable.

2. Second example of wording is Zelensky's belief that the U.S. provides Ukraine with "*overwhelming support*". In contrast, President Putin views the West and especially the U.S. as the main cause of the dispute with Ukraine because they feed Ukraine with hatred of "*Russophobia*", adding that the West deceives Ukraine to be "*an anti-Russia bridgehead*".

3. The third example of wording is when Zelensky asks President Biden to become the "*leader of the peace*" and when he connects the U.S. with democracy "*defense democracy*". However, President Putin considers the U.S. an "*empire of lies*". Because it denies all its promises about NATO expansion and because of its policy of non-compliance with Security Council resolutions in the past when it invaded Iraq and when it fueled the war in Syria and Libya.

4.5 Speech Five Vocabulary Analysis (the German Parliament)

4.5.1 Overwording

1. Zelensky's first use of overwording is when he addresses the German Parliament saying that he appeals to Germany in time Russia "*is <u>bombing</u> our cities*", "*<u>destroying</u> everything*", and "*<u>Using</u> missiles*".

2. Zelensky's second use of overwording is when tells Germany that he resorts to it after many "*meetings*", "*negotiations*", "*statements*", "*requests*", "*steps in support*", and "*sanctions*" that all do not stop Russia's war.

3. Zelensky's third use of overwording is when he describes Ukrainians' feelings towards Germany's position when the former asks to impose more sanctions on Russia and then submits a request to join NATO and EU saying "*we <u>saw</u> delays*", "*we <u>felt</u> resistance*", and "*we <u>understood</u> that you want to continue the economy*".

4. Zelensky's fourth use of overwording is when he appeals to Germany on behalf of "*Ukrainians*", "*Mariupol residents – civilians*"," "*older Ukrainians*", and "*our military*".

4.5.2 Meaning Relations

In Zelensky's fifth speech, there are examples of meaning relations:

1. Synonymous relations such as "*preserve*" = "*save*", "*tear down*" = "*destroy*" = "*razed*", "*rocket*" = "*missile*", "*shelling*" = "*bombing*", and, "*rescue*" = "*survive*". Zelensky keens on using synonymous relations to keep his speech active and palatable.

2. Antonymous relations such as *"life" vs. "death", "freedom" vs. "slavery", "war" vs. "peace", "died" vs. "survived", "civilian" vs. "military", and "military facilities" vs. "civilian objects"*. Zelensky uses some antonymy relations that serve ideologically, for example, *"freedom" vs. "slavery"* to state that there are only two options for Ukraine either they accept the slave life or the free life.

3. Hyponymy relations examples in this speech are: the meaning of *"108 children" is* included in the meaning of *"Thousands of Ukrainians died",* the meaning of *"Nord Stream"* is included in *"economy",* the meaning of *"German"* is included in *"NATO" and "European Union"*, and the meaning of *"Berlin Wall"* is included in the meaning of *"anti-fascist", and* the meaning of "*Berlin Wall"* is included in *"Germany"*. Zelensky's speech has examples of hyponym relations that serve ideologically, such as the meaning of *"Germany"* is included in *"NATO and EU"*. In fact, this comes from Germany's longstanding membership in NATO since 1955, from the financial participation of Germany in the EU budget, and because of Germany's distinguished location, which lies in the heart of Europe.

4.5.3 Wording

In wording, the same character or position is seen or estimated discursively according to different points of view.

1. The first example of wording is when Zelensky describes the war of Russia against Ukraine as a *"full-scale invasion"*. However, President Putin states that he is beginning a *"special military operation"* in Ukraine to defend those who are being subjected to *"humiliation and genocide"* by the Kyiv government, in addition to prosecuting individuals responsible for multiple heinous crimes against civilians, including those committed against residents of the Russian Federation. He also promises to *"demilitarize"* and *"denazify"* Ukraine, adding that there is no intention to harm Ukraine's interests or those of the Ukrainian people in the current events. Russian troops are involved in protecting Russia from those attempting to use Ukraine as a weapon against Russia and its people by holding it, hostage.

2. Second example of wording is Zelensky's announcement that Ukraine is defending European values which are *"freedom", "equality", and "opportunity to live freely, not to submit to another state"*. However, President Putin accuses the West of the *"degradation"*, "*domination"* and the pursuit to submit independent states. According to him, the aggressive policy of some Western elites, who are making every effort to maintain their dominance and trying to block and suppress any sovereign and independent development centers in order to continue aggressively imposing their *"will"* and *"pseudo-values"* on other countries and nations.

He Comments that the West seeks to destroy Russian traditional values and impose their *"false values"* to erode Russians from the inside out, adding that the West has been aggressively imposing its values on their countries, the attitudes that are directly contributing to the degradation and degeneration of Russia's values because they are odd to human nature.

4.6 Speech Six Vocabulary Analysis (Israeli Knesset)

4.6.1 Overwording

1. Zelensky's first use of overwording is when he describes the Russian war as an "*invasion", "tragedy", "criminal order", "a large-scale and treacherous", "evil", and "terrible"*.

2. Zelensky's second use of overwording is when he praises Israel's defense as *"the best", "powerful", "strong",* and *"doing great"*.

3. Zelensky's third use of overwording is when he describes the Nazi party saying that it wants to *"destroy everything", "destroy everyone" "conquer the nations*", and *"leave nothing from us"*.

4.6.2 Meaning Relations

In Zelensky's sixth speech, there are examples of meaning relations:

1. Synonymous relations such as *"support" = "help", "powerful" = "strong", "launch" = "beginning", "destroy" = "destruction",* and *"looking for" = "searched"*. As usual, Zelensky makes advantage of synonymous relations to keep his discourse interesting and diverse.

2. Antonymous relations such as *"joy" vs. "pain", "remain alive" vs. "dead", "different" vs. "same", "war" vs. "peace", "remember" vs. "forget", "rescued" vs. "kill", and "good" vs. "evil"*. Zelensky uses some antonymy relations which serve ideologically, for example, *"good" vs. "evil"* to compare Russia with wickedness and Ukraine with benevolence.

3. Hyponymy relations examples in this speech are: the meaning of *"the National Socialist Workers' Party of Germany"* is included in the meaning of *"Nazi",* the meaning of *"Holocaust"* is included in *"Jewish communities",* the meaning of *"Golda Meir"* is included in *"Israel"*, and the meaning of *"Nachman of Breslov"* is included in the meaning of *"city of Uman"* or *"Ukraine", and* the meaning of *"tragedy"* is included in *"War"*. Zelensky's speech has examples of hyponym relations that serve ideologically, such as the meaning of *"Holocaust"* is included in *"Jewish communities*". Actually, the listener cannot hear the word "*Holocaust*" without conjuring up the Jewish community.

4.6.3 Wording

In wording, the same character or position is seen or estimated discursively according to different points of view.

1. An example of wording is when Zelensky describes the war as a *"large-scale and treacherous war"* and when quotes Golda Meir's words *"Our neighbors want to see us dead"*. However, President Putin says that Ukraine is not just Russia's neighbor but

Ukrainians are Russia's friends, lovers, and relatives who have with Russia blood ties. Adding that this operation is not intended to harm Ukraine's interests but rather targeting those who want to infringe on Russia's interests.

5. Results Discussion

The results indicate that President Zelensky uses overwording, meaning relations, and wording in all six speeches with different ideological goals, but with varying degrees. Overwording is utilized to reflect the presence of an "ideological struggle" between President Zelensky and President Putin and visualize the real aspects of President Zelensky's stance, meaning relations serve both linguistic and ideological purposes, and wording effectively represents the diverse perspectives of opposing parties through their ideological discourse. Hence, this verifies Fairclough's (2001) theory (vocabulary is one of the best tools to construe ideological text) is suitable for the current study to uncover part of President Zelensky's ideology. Below is a table showing the repetition of the examples of each vocabulary type in all six speeches.

Table 1. The Repetition of Examples of Each Vocabulary Type in All of President Zelensky's Six Speeches.

No.	Overwording	Meaning Relations	Wording
Speech 1	3	3	2
Speech 2	3	3	2
Speech 3	3	3	2
Speech 4	3	3	3
Speech 5	4	3	2
Speech 6	3	3	1
Total	**19**	**18**	**12**

Depending on the figures of Table 1, overwording is the most used type, it is repeated 19 times in comparison with meaning relations and wording, which are frequented 18 and 12 times respectively. In the same connection, speech 5 has the highest number of overwording examples, whereas all six speeches have an equal number of meaning relations examples, in that, all of them have examples of the three categories of synonyms, antonyms, and hyponyms, however, speech 6 has the lowest number of wording examples.

Concerning overwording President Zelensky uses it with different functions, for example, to describe the war with different tragic words as in example 2 in speech 1 analysis, or to compliment some strong states such as Britain and US, as in example 1 in speech 2 analysis and example 3 in speech 4 analysis, or to declare the readiness of Ukrainians to fight Russia in every spot, as in example 3 in speech 2 analysis. He also uses overwording to describe the goal of Russia behind the war, as in example 3 in speech 3 analysis, or the brutality or cruelty of some regimes such as the Russian or Nasi party, as in example 1 in speech 5 analysis, and example 3 in speech 6 analysis.

Regarding meaning relations analysis, the results show that President Zelensky uses them linguistically and ideologically. For example, he uses different synonymy words to color his discourse and draw the audience's attention such as: *"Ukrainians" = "my citizens", "unarmed" = "with bare hands, etc.* In the same vein, he utilizes antonymy relations that serve ideologically, for example, to compare *"slavery"* and *"freedom", "life"* and *"death", "savages"* and *"human", and "honest"* and *"hypocrite".* He also employs some examples of hyponymy relations, which serve ideologically, for example, *"Canada"* is included in *"NATO",* he links *Canada* to *NATO* because the former joins the alliance at its establishment and has remained a member ever since, and Canadian security and defense strategy is anchored by NATO. Likewise, *"Berlin Wall"* is included in the meaning of *"anti-fascist.* The wall is built by the President of East Germany to protect the latter from Nasi and prevent the citizens of East Germany from fleeing to West Germany because of poor living conditions. Similarly, the meaning of *"Holocaust"* is included in the meaning of *"Jewish communities"*, the massacre, in which Jews remember a great tragedy (*cf.* examples of hyponym relations).

Similarly, the results reveal that President Zelensky's ideology is very obvious through using wording, which contradicts totally with that of President Putin. For example, Russia wages a full-scale invasion that targets civilians, and EU and NATO integration is Ukraine's choice (*cf.* wording examples in speech 1 analysis). Further, Russia is charged with Ukraine's facilities' destruction (*cf.* example 1 in speech 3 analysis), Russia is a *"total evil"* that threatens Ukraine and the whole of Europe Continental (*cf.* example 2 in speech 3 analysis), the U.S. provides Ukraine with *"overwhelming support"*, President Biden should be the *"leader of the peace"* and America should be the sponsor of democracy all over the world (*cf.* examples 2 and 3 in speech 4 analysis); and Russia wants Ukrainians to die (*cf.* example 1 in speech 6 analysis and all wording analysis).

6. Conclusion

Vocabulary reflects a large part of President Zelensky's ideology. For example, he uses overwording to enhance his discourse, describes the war with different tragic words, glorifies Ukrainian citizens with great words, compliments some strong states like Britain and the U.S., declares the readiness of Ukrainians to fight Russia in every spot, and describes the goal of Russia behind the war as well as the brutality or cruelty of some regimes such as the Russian or Nasi party.

In the same context, meaning relations (synonymy, antonymy, and hyponymy) helps to reveal part of his ideology, for example, he uses synonymy to make his discourse colorful, unrepeatable, non-monotonous, varied, and more effective, in order to maintain the audience's attention drawn, as a result, raises the chances of their response to his demands. Further, with antonymy, he highlights the different contradictions that the war creates, recognizes obviously others' real or fake positions, describes Ukraine's enemies and allies, and distinguishes or compares opposite situations. Moreover, hyponymy reflects blatantly his ideologies, for example, Ukraine should be part

of NATO and EU, genocide is part of Russia's crimes against Ukraine, Canada is part of NATO, which makes it capable of helping Ukraine, Ukraine is part of Europe and it is required that the European countries defend and protect this part. Berlin Wall and Soviet occupation are parts of Germany's history and the Holocaust is part of the Israeli community and history, a history which reveals Jews once had been weakened, persecuted, and oppressed.

In the same vein, President Zelensky's ideology is very obvious through using wording, for instance, Russia wages a full-scale invasion that targets Ukraine's civilians, youth, culture, values, etc., EU and NATO integration is Ukraine's choice, Russia is charged with Ukraine's facilities' destruction, Russia is absolutely evil, which threatens Ukraine and the whole of Europe Continental, the U.S. provides Ukraine with tremendous support and President Biden should be a man of peace while America should be the sponsor of democracy all over the world, and Russia wants Ukrainians to die, its war is treacherous and aims at Ukraine's devastation at all levels.

Competing interests

We the authors of this work declare that we do not have known competing financial interests or personal relationships that influence the work reported in this paper.

Informed consent

Obtained.

Ethics approval

The Publication Ethics Committee of the Sciedu Press.

The journal's policies adhere to the Core Practices established by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE).

Provenance and peer review

Not commissioned; externally double-blind peer reviewed.

Data availability statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the corresponding author. The data are not publicly available due to privacy or ethical restrictions.

Data sharing statement

No additional data are available.

References

Al-Husseini, K. M. J. (2022). *The representation of Homosexuality in Netflix shows: A critical discourse analysis.* Kerbala University.

Al-Musawi, M. A. S. M. (2021). *The representation of Qassem Suleimani and Abu Mahdi Al-Muhandis' murder in American and Iranian news reports: A critical discourse analysis.* Kerbala University.

Baker, P., & Ellece, S. (2011). *Key terms in discourse analysis.* Continuum International Publishing Group.

Chilton, P. (2004). *Analyzing political discourse: Theory and practice.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203561218

Creswell, W. J. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods.* Sage.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power.* Routledge.

Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction: Discourse studies 2* (A multidisciplinary introduction) (pp. 258-284). Sage.

Hodge, R., & Kress, G. (1993). *Language as ideology.* Routledge.

Jabbar, S. S. (2021). *The representation of the Iraq war in Chomsky's articles: A critical discourse analysis.* Kerbala University. https://doi.org/10.37648/ijrssh.v11i01.002

Locke, T. (2004). *Critical discourse analysis.* Continuum International Publishing Group.

Mankoff, J. (2022). *Russia's war in Ukraine identity, history, and conflict.* Center for Strategic & International Studies. Retrieved from https://www.csis.org/analysis/russias-war-ukraine-identity-history-and-conflict

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods.* Sage.

Putin, V. (2022, February 24). Address by the President of the Russian Federation [speech audio recording] President of Russia. Retrieved from http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/67843

Putin, V. (2022, February 24). *Full text of Vladimir Putin's speech announcing 'special military operation' in Ukraine* [speech audio recording]. The Print. Retrieved from https://theprint.in/world/full-text-of-vladimir-putins-speech-announcing-special-military-operation-in-ukraine/845714/

Seals, C. (2022). "War against Ukraine", not "conflict in the Ukraine": Why the language we use matters. The Spinoff. (PDF) "War against Ukraine", not "conflict in the Ukraine": Why the language we use matters (researchgate.net)

Shahi, D. K. (2022). War in Ukraine: A geopolitical analysis. *International Journal of Research in Social Science, 12*(6), 89-97. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361098792_War_in_Ukraine_A_Geopolitical_Analysis

Van Dijk, T. (2005). Politics, ideology and discourse. In Ruth Wodak, (Ed.), *Elsevier Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics.* Volume on Politics and Language, 728-740. https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00722-7

Van Dijk, T. (2012). *Ideology and discourse: a multidisciplinary introduction.* Barcelona. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446289068

Appendices

Appendix A: President's Zelensky speech to European Parliament.

https://www.nationalworld.com/news/world/volodymyr-zelensky-speech-today-full-transcript-of-ukraine-presidents-statement-to-european-parliament-3592244

Appendix B: President's Zelensky speech to British Parliament.

https://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/volodymyrzelenskybritishparliament.htm

Appendix C: President's Zelensky speech to Canadian Parliament.

https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/promova-prezidenta-ukrayini-volodimira-zelenskogo-u-parlamen-73581

Appendix D: President's Zelensky speech to U.S. Congress.

https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/03/16/text-zelensky-address-congress/

Appendix E: President's Zelensky speech to Germany Parliament.

https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/promova-prezidenta-ukrayini-volodimira-zelenskogo-u-bundesta-73621

Appendix F: President's Zelensky speech to Israeli Knesset.

Full text: Ukraine President Zelensky's speech to Israeli lawmakers | The Times of Israel