

Ideological Positioning in War Discourse: A Critical Stylistic Analysis of Selected American and Syrian Political Speeches on the 2022 Russian-Ukrainian War

战争话语中的意识形态定位：对美国和叙利亚关于 2022 年俄乌战争的部分政治演讲的批判性文体分析

By

Prof. Marwa Mohamed Khamis El-Zouka

Professor of Linguistics, English Language and literature Department,
Faculty of Arts, Alexandria University.

m.khamis@alexu.edu.eg

Received: 2nd, 10, 2023.

Accepted: 18th, 10, 2023.

الملخص

يهدف البحث إلى دراسة الأدوات المفاهيمية النصية المستخدمة في خطاب الرئيس الأمريكي جو بايدن، والسفير بسام صباغ المندوب الدائم لسوريا لدى الأمم المتحدة باستخدام نموذج جيفريز (2016) للتحليل الأسلوبي النقدي لبيان المواقف الإيديولوجية للولايات المتحدة الأمريكية وسوريا بشأن الغزو الروسي لأوكرانيا عام 2022، ويتضح من تحليل الأدوات المفاهيمية النصية المختارة أن الولايات المتحدة تعارض بشدة الحرب في أوكرانيا، وتعتزم العمل مع حلفائها في شمال الأطلسي للدفاع عن أوكرانيا، وفرض عقوبات علي روسيا. وتظهر الأدوات المفاهيمية النصية المستخدمة في خطاب بسام صباغ أن سوريا ترفض اتخاذ قرارات ضد الغزو الروسي لأوكرانيا، وتتهم الولايات المتحدة والدول الغربية باتباع سياسة المعايير المزدوجة في التعامل مع المسائل الإنسانية في أوكرانيا وفي أماكن أخرى من العالم.

الكلمات المفتاحية:

التحليل النقدي الأسلوبي - الموقف الأيديولوجي - الحرب الروسية الأوكرانية - الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية - روسيا.

Abstract

Using Jeffries' (2016) model of critical stylistic analysis, the present study examines the textual-conceptual tools employed in the speeches delivered by U.S. President, Joe Biden, and Ambassador Bassam Sabbagh, Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the UN to investigate the ideological positioning of the U.S. and Syria on the 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine. Analysis of the selected textual conceptual tools reveals that the U.S. strongly opposes the war in Ukraine, and is determined to work with its NATO allies to defend Ukraine and impose sanctions on Russia. The textual conceptual tools in Sabbagh's speeches show that Syria rejects passing resolutions against the Russian invasion of Ukraine, and accuses the U.S. and western countries of adopting double standard policies in dealing with humanitarian issues in Ukraine and other parts of the world.

Keywords: critical stylistic analysis – ideological positioning – Russian/Ukrainian war – U.S. – Syria

(1) Introduction

On February 24, 2022, Russia launched a massive military invasion of its neighboring country, Ukraine. For Russian President Vladimir Putin, the military operations against Ukraine were a must to safe Russia's power and interests which would be at stake if Ukraine is allowed to join NATO. Not only has Russia's invasion of Ukraine shocked the world but also polarized world countries. While some countries, such as the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, Denmark and the Netherlands, criticized and condemned the invasion, others, such as Belarus, North Korea, Syria, Eritrea, Mali and Nicaragua, supported it. The U.S. and Syria are two countries that hold different positions regarding Russia's invasion of Ukraine. While the U.S. strongly opposes the invasion, Syria vehemently supports it. In the statements made to criticize or support the invasion, leaders and representatives of these countries made use of a number of linguistic tools to express their ideological viewpoints and show their positions on the issue.

(2) Aims of the Study

Ukraine's plan to join NATO aroused Russia's fear for its existence. This led the Russian government to wage a war against Ukraine to prevent it from joining NATO. The Russian invasion of Ukraine created a state of polarization among countries. Those that condemn and oppose the war hold that "an independent country should not come under such an attack" whereas those who support Russia are of the view that there is no need to keep an enemy within a short distance" (Ebim et al., 2022, p. 145). The U.S. and Syria are two countries that hold opposing views on the Russian-Ukrainian war; while the former opposes the war, the latter supports it. In this respect, the present study aims to conduct a critical stylistic analysis of the speeches made by American President Joe Biden and Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arabic Republic to the UN, Bassam Sabbagh. It examines the textual conceptual functions used in the speeches of Biden and Sabbagh to express the ideological positioning of the U.S. and Syria regarding the 2022 Russian-Ukrainian war.

(3) Data and Methodology

The data of the present study consists of the speech made by U.S. President Joe Biden on February 24, 2022 following the Russian invasion of Ukraine as well as the one made on September 21, 2022 before the 77th session of the United Nations General Assembly at the UN headquarters in New York. It also consists of the statements made by Bassam Sabbagh, Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the UN, on March 23, 2022, April 7, 2022 and November 14, 2022 before the UN General Assembly during the eleventh emergency special session on Ukraine. The transcripts of Biden's speeches have been obtained from the website of the White House whereas those of Sabbagh have been obtained from the website of the United Nations as well as the UN Web TV website.

The present study employs a qualitative approach and adopts Jeffries' (2016) model of critical stylistic analysis to investigate the textual conceptual functions employed in Biden's and Sabbagh's speeches to express the ideological positioning of their countries on the 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine. The critical stylistic approach has been chosen because it is comprehensive and offers a wide variety of conceptual tools that help in investigating the ideology of the language user. Although the model consists of ten conceptual functions (naming and describing, representing actions/events/states, equating and contrasting, exemplifying and enumerating, prioritizing, implying and assuming, negating, hypothesizing, presenting others' speech and thoughts, and representing time, space and society), only eight are analyzed in the study. These are: naming and describing, representing actions/events/states, equating and contrasting, exemplifying and enumerating, implying and assuming, negating, hypothesizing, and presenting others' speech and thoughts. These tools have been chosen as they are the most significant textual conceptual tools in the data that reveal Biden's and Sabbagh's ideological positioning on the issue in question. Representative examples of the textual conceptual functions examined are provided to explain how each function reveals Biden's and Sabbagh's ideology on the Russian-Ukrainian war.

(4) Theoretical Background

(4.1) Historical Context

Russia and Ukraine were among the fifteen countries that formed the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). Following the dissolution of the USSR in 1991, the Russian-Ukrainian relations fluctuated till Russia invaded Ukraine in 2022. For example, in order to continue the political and cultural formation of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the ruling class of the Soviet Union agreed to form modern Ukraine. However, Russia had claimed that, for historical reasons, Ukraine should be annexed to Russia as Ukraine is located in what is deemed to be Russian territories. Russia also claims that the peoples of the two countries are actually one people who are separated by political borders (Tsakiris, 2022).

When Ukraine was part of the USSR, the nuclear power plant was located in it. After it dissolved, Russia agreed with Ukraine to stop programs in the site of the nuclear power plant and take over its intelligence. Russia also promised not to interfere in Ukrainian government and politics. More recently, Ukraine has played a major role in food production and the west began to cooperate with it, a move which Russia believed could weaken its regional power. Moreover, Ukraine started taking steps to join NATO which is led by Europe and America, and has great military power that can defeat any country. According to Russia, allowing Ukraine to join NATO constitutes a major threat to Russia's regional power and nuclear power plant and can make her susceptible to external threats. Therefore, Russia started taking actions to interfere in the political affairs of Ukraine which, in return, began to press to join NATO. For example, in 2014 Russia annexed Crimea which is a part of Ukraine. It also supported rebels in the Russian-speaking regions of Dornesk and Luhansk which broke away from Ukraine and declared themselves separate republics, and were later annexed by Russia on September 30, 2022. Russia also formed a pro-Russian government but it was ended and a new government was installed under the leadership of President Zelenskyy (Eburuaja, 2022).

On February 24, 2022, Putin delivered a speech in which he announced launching a special military operation against Ukraine, and provided a number of reasons to justify this operation and convince the international community that it is a just and legitimate war because it was the only option he had to save Russia, its interests and sovereignty against the threat posed by a military presence in Ukrainian territories if Ukraine is allowed to join NATO. According to Putin, the war is unavoidable in order to stop the expansion of the west closer to Russia, especially after the failure to reach an agreement with the U.S. to save Russian interests and agree on the principles of European security and the non-expansion of NATO eastward towards Russia (Hassan, 2022).

(4.2) Ideology

It was the French philosopher Destutt de Tracy who first coined the term 'ideology' in the eighteenth century to refer to "the science of ideas" (Omar & Abbas, 2022, p. 485). Ideologies express the value systems shared by members of particular groups. Indeed, the term 'ideology' "derives from the taken-for-granted assumptions, beliefs and value systems which are shared collectively by social groups" (Simpson, 1993, p. 5). Ideologies are pervasive in societies, as indicated by Fowler (1991) who holds that "anything that is said or written about the world is articulated from a particular ideological position" (p. 101). Exposing ideology in discourse began in late 1970s with the rise of Critical Linguistics at the hands of Fowler and Kress then Critical Discourse Analysis in 1989 thanks to Fairclough. Jeffries (2007) introduced Critical Stylistics since ideologies are constructed, communicated and negotiated, either explicitly or implicitly, through language. Therefore, all kinds of texts are ideologically-laden (Jeffries, 2010). Thus, Critical Stylistics helps "understand the precise ways in which texts may transmit, reinforce or inculcate ideologies in their readers" (p. 12).

(4.3) Critical Stylistics

Critical stylistics is an approach to language study and linguistic research that employs a range of tools to uncover the ideologies embedded in literary and non-literary texts “to see the power in language” (Jeffries, 2014, p. 408). It developed at the hands of Jeffries (2007) as a reaction to critical discourse analysis for two reasons, the first of which is that CDA lacks a framework or set of analytical tools “to produce a fuller account of the linguistic features and strategies used by text producers to embed ideologies in their texts” (Jeffries, 2016, pp. 159-160). The second reason is that CDA is more concerned with contextualization unlike critical stylistics which is text-based. In other words, the focus of CDA is on the cultural, historical, socio-cognitive and socio-political contexts in which texts are produced and choices of language are made, whereas critical stylistics is concerned with conducting a critical textual analysis to establish what a text is doing ideologically (Jeffries, 2010, 2014, 2016; Omar & Abbas, 2022). Since exposing hidden ideologies is a common aim between CDA and critical stylistics, a critical stylistic analysis seeks “to find out what kind of world is being presented by the text and...draw some conclusions about what is seen as acceptable or unacceptable in the world created by the textual features...that are used to draw conclusions about the nature of the world created by the text...” (Jeffries, 2016, p. 160).

In order to establish the ideological underpinning of a text, Jeffries makes use of Halliday’s three language metafunctions which are: “‘ideational’ (how language represents the world), ‘interpersonal’ (how language mediates between people) and ‘textual’ (how linguistic items make the discourse as a whole function)” (Jeffries, 2010, p. 6). More specifically, Jeffries relies on Halliday’s first metafunction and ties it to the textual meaning proposed by critical stylistics, which adopts a functional approach, so as to establish the conceptual meaning of the text and thus explain how language is used to create and represent particular worldviews (Ahmed & Abbas, 2019; Jeffries, 2007, 2010, 2016).

(4.4) Textual-Conceptual Functions

The basis of a critical stylistic approach is a set of ten analytical tools known as “textual-conceptual functions”. As the name suggests, textual-conceptual functions combine the ideational function of language and a number of textual features or triggers. Thus, they are part of the ideational function of language and aim to reveal what the text is doing ideologically so as to create a certain view of the world (or text world) through linguistic features that are drawn from a number of semantico-grammatical models and theories (Jeffries, 2010, 2014, 2016; Sarhan, 2023). The textual-conceptual functions which constitute the analytical tools proposed by Jeffries (2016) are: naming and describing, representing actions/events/states, equating and contrasting, exemplifying and enumerating, prioritizing, implying and assuming, negating, hypothesizing, presenting others’ speech and thought, and representing time, space and society.

(4.4.1) Naming and Describing

This function explores the different ways used to name and describe animate or inanimate referents in the text world to project the speaker's/writer's ideology. It is linguistically realized via the choice of a certain noun, which not only refers to a certain referent but also expresses the speaker's opinion of it, noun modification to describe referents using modifiers that have certain ideological effects, and nominalization which is a process in which a verb is turned into a noun (Jeffries, 2007, 2010).

(4.4.2) Representing Actions/Events/States

The second function involves “the choice of a lexical verb which will present the situation in the way that the author (speaker) desires...Each of these choices has consequences for the way in which the situation is seen by the reader/hearer” (Jeffries, 2010, p. 37). The meaning is related to actions (what is being done), events (what is happening) and states (what the case is). To linguistically represent actions, events and states, Jeffries (2010) employs Simpson's (1993) transitivity system according to which lexical verbs are assigned to four different categories depending on the type of state or process they describe. The four categories are as follows:

- (1) Material actions: these refer to something that is done or happens. These actions can be intentional known as “Material Action Intentional” (MAI) and is done by a conscious being such as “The man throws the book”, supervision, which includes unintentional actions, known as “material Action Supervension (MAS), such as “the man fell on his knee”, and event, which refers to using verbs with inanimate actors, known as Material Action Events (MAE), such as “The sun shone”.
- (2) Verbalization processes: These refer to actions that involve the use of language such as “tell”, “say”, “claim”, and “report”.
- (3) Mental processes: These refer to “what happens within human beings” (Jeffries, 2010, p. 42) and are divided into three types: Mental Cognition (MC), such as “know”, “think”, “understand”, and “recognize”, Mental Reaction (MR), such as “feel”, like”, and “hate”, and mental Perception (MP), such as “hear”, “see”, “taste”, and “sense”.
- (4) Relational processes include verbs which express the static relationship between an attribute and a carrier rather than dynamic actions. These verbs include intensive relations (RI) (verb to be), possessive relations (RP) which involve verbs of movement and verb to be (Ahmed & Abbas, 2019; Alaghbary, 2019; Jeffries, 2010; Omar & Abbas, 2022).

(4.4.3) Equating and Contrasting

This tool examines how the world is textually structured in terms of equivalence (equating) and opposition (contrasting) so as to create particular ideological effects. A number of syntactic triggers are used to represent equating and contrasting linguistically. Equivalence triggers are:

- 1- Intensive relational equivalence: X seems Y; X is Y; X became Y; X appears Y; Z thinks XY; Z made XY; Z cause X to be Y.
- 2- Appositional equivalence: X, Y, (Z).
- 3- Metaphorical equivalence: X is Y; X is like Y.

Contrasting or opposition is created using the following triggers:

- 1- Negated opposition: X not Y; some X, no Y; plenty of X, lack of Y.
- 2- Transitional opposition: Turn X into Y; from X to Y; X becomes Y.
- 3- Comparative opposition: More X than Y; less X than Y.
- 4- Replacive opposition: X instead of Y; X rather than Y; X in preference to Y.
- 5- Concessive opposition: Despite X, Y; X, yet Y.
- 6- Explicit opposition: X by contrast with Y; X as opposed to Y.
- 7- Parallelism: Your house is X, mine is Y; He liked X. She liked Y.
- 8- Contrastives: X but Y. (Jeffries, 2010, 2016).

(4.4.4) Exemplifying and Enumerating

Exemplifying and enumerating are two closely related textual functions that are used to present certain world views. In exemplification, an example, or a number of examples, of a phenomenon is given using phrases like “for example”, “to exemplify”, and “for instance” to indicate that “the larger category is being represented by only a few cases, rather than by each member of the group” (Jeffries, 2010, p. 67). In enumerating, two-part, three-part, and four-part lists are used to list and categorize members of different categories. Whereas not all cases of a particular category are listed in exemplification, they are all given in enumeration (Alaghbary, 2019; Jeffries, 2010, 2014).

(4.4.5) Prioritizing

The textual function of prioritizing is concerned with positioning information and specific structural elements in phrases to background or foreground the focus of the proposition using the syntactic operations of information structure, transformation, and subordination to highlight ideological priorities (Jeffries, 2007, 2010).

(4.4.6) Implying and Assuming

This textual function refers to employing implications (implicature) and assumptions (presupposition) to produce naturalized ideologies and make them appear to be shared

knowledge and common sense. The model of implicature is based on Grice's cooperative principle and its four maxims: (1) maximum of quality (truth), (2) maximum of quantity (giving as much information as is required), (3) maximum of relation (relevance), (4) maximum of manner (clarity). Flouting one or more of these maxims leads to implicature to infer the ideologies embedded in the implied meaning (Ahmed & Abbas, 2019; Al-Azzawi & Abbass, 2022; Jeffries, 2010).

Assuming is parallel to presupposition which refers to "assumptions that are built into the text" (Jeffries, 2010, p. 94). Jeffries focuses on two types of presupposition: existential presupposition and logical presupposition. The former is determined via the use of noun phrases that have a determiner which can be the definite article "the" (e.g. "The cold war has ended"/"The car was broken"), a demonstrative ("this", "these", "that", "those") or a possessive ("my", "our", "his", "her", "its", "your", "their") (e.g. "Tom's car is new"/"Your book is new"). The latter has a number of triggers which are:

- 1- Change of state verbs which presuppose that an earlier state of affairs has been changed, e.g. "They started to play tennis" (The presupposition is that they did not play tennis before).
- 2- Factive verbs such as "realize", "regret", "understand" and "discover", which are followed by a clausal complement which usually begins with the subordinator "that" and carries the presupposition. This is seen in "They understand that they have lost the battle".
- 3- Cleft sentences which "introduce a presupposition in the post-modifying relative clausal complement" (Jeffries, 2010, p. 96). This is seen in "It was Janet that damaged your car" in which the underlined relative clause is presupposed to be true.
- 4- Iterative words and verbs which indicate that an earlier or later occurrence of an act is presupposed, e.g. "He lied about his income again". The presupposition here is that he lied about his income before. Iterative triggers are adverbs (e.g. "yet", "again", "any more"), adjectives (e.g. "another") or verbs whose iterative nature is represented morphologically such as "reassess", "rewrite", and "revisit".
- 5- Comparative structures which presuppose the basis of comparing two entities. For example, in "your argument is as fallacious as Clive's", it is presupposed that Clive's argument is fallacious. "Linda is as innovative as Susan" presupposes that Susan is innovative as well (Ahmed & Abbas, 2019; Jeffries, 2010).

(4.4.7) Negating

Text producers sometimes create non-existent pictures of the world for different reasons such as envisioning a case we wish was real, or seeking to convince recipients of particular

ideologies. The textual-conceptual function of negating allows the reader/hearer to conceptualize alternative hypothetical worldviews or situations. These constructions have some persuasive power, which can be negative power, such as making people fear possible scenarios, or positive power as in advertisements that seek to persuade people that buying a certain product would benefit them (Ahmed & Abbass, 2019; Jeffries, 2010, 2014). Thus, this textual-conceptual function has the power of suggestibility (“Borris Johnson is not a maverick”), which can produce implicatures (“Someone else is”) and/or the power to simply plant the idea of its opposite (“But it’s worth thinking about his character, as he’s clearly not normal”) in recipients’ minds” (Jeffries, 2016, p. 165).

A number of syntactic, semantic or morphological processes are used to realize negation. These are:

- 1- Adding a negative particle to the verb phrase either to the auxiliary or the dummy auxiliary verb “do” (e.g. “won’t”, “haven’t”, “aren’t”, “doesn’t”).
- 2- Pronouns such as “none”, “nobody”, “no one” and “nothing”.
- 3- Using adjectival “no” to modify a noun, as in “no consensus”.
- 4- Using semantically negative lexical items that denote absence. These can be nouns (e.g. “scarcity”, “absence”, “lack”), verbs (e.g. “omit”, “fail”, “exclude”, “refuse”), adjectives (e.g. “scarce”, “absent”) and adverbs (e.g. “seldom”, “rarely”).
- 5- Lexical items that are morphologically negated by adding a prefix. These are adjectives (e.g. “undecided”, “incomplete”, “uncompromising”), nouns (e.g. “amorality”, “inactivity”), and verbs (e.g. “disrespect”, “deactivate”) (Jeffries, 2010; Omar & Abbas, 2022).

(4.4.8) Hypothesizing

The tool of hypothesizing refers to the process by which texts reflect the speaker’s/writer’s view of the world through the system of modality. Although modality, according to Halliday (1994), belongs to the interpersonal function of language, Jeffries (2014) maintains that it is ideational as a textual-conceptual function since all textual-conceptual functions promote the text producer’s worldview, and interpersonal only in the sense that an ideational meaning can have an effect on text recipients in different ways (Jeffries, 2014, 2016; Omar & Abbas, 2022). For hypothesizing, Jeffries adopts Simpson’s (1993) model of modality according to which authors express commitment to the truth of their proposition using three types of modality instead of making categorical assertions. These are:

- 1- Epistemic modality: It expresses the speaker’s doubt or certainty, i.e. the likelihood of something happening or being the case or true (e.g. “She might come” and “I’m sure she’ll come”).

- 2- Deontic modality: It reflects the degree of obligation (e.g. “You should take more exercise”).
- 3- Boulomaic modality: It expresses the desirability of something happening (e.g. “I wish you would phone your mother”).

Modality can also be constructed using modal items which are not auxiliary verbs. These are: lexical verbs (e.g. “think”, “wish”, “suppose”, “hope”), modal adverbs (e.g. “may be”, “probably”, “of course”, “definitely”), modal adjectives (e.g. “possible”, “sure”, “definite”, “probable”, “forbidden”, “obligatory”, “certain”) and conditional structures (e.g. “If..., then...”).

All types and forms of modality can create a conceptual alternative or hypothetical world or reality which, in turn, can have various potential ideological effects on the hearer/reader (Ahmed & Abbas, 2019; Alaghbary, 2019; Jeffries, 2010).

(4.4.9) Presenting Others’ Speech and Thought

This tool is concerned with the representation of the words, thoughts and viewpoints of others who are discussed in texts. This representation might not always be verbatim, i.e. faithful as text producers can exploit their power and take the others’ words out of their context so as to manipulate their speech and thoughts for ideological purposes such as creating or reinforcing certain ideologies and thus influence the reader (Jeffries, 2010, 2016).

Speech representation is divided into five categories:

- 1- Narrator’s report of speech (NRS): This includes a verbalization process such as “talk”, “speak”, and “shout” which is followed by a noun phrase or prepositional phrase that constitutes the subject matter of the verbiage, e.g. “They discussed the situation in Tibet”.
- 2- Narrator’s report of speech act (NRSA): This includes a verbalization process that refers to a speech act such as “accuse”, “apologize”, and “deny” which can be followed by a prepositional phrase that denotes the subject matter of the speech act, as in “She apologized for the mess”.
- 3- Indirect Speech (IS): This involves a reporting clause followed by a subordinate clause introduced by the subordinator “that” such as “He said that he was terribly sorry”.
- 4- Free indirect speech (FIS): It is composed of a representation of the original speech with tense, deixis and pronouns similar to IS and has no reporting clause, e.g. “She would stand as a candidate for the presidency”.
- 5- Direct speech: It has a reporting clause with inverted commas that include verbatim representation of the original speech, e.g. “He said ‘I’m terribly sorry’” (Alaghbary, 2019; Jeffries, 2010).

Representation of thought is divided into categories:

- 1- Narrator's report of thought (NRT): This includes a mental cognition process such as "consider" and "think" followed by a prepositional or noun phrase that constitutes the subject of the phenomenon being thought about (e.g. "He thought about the war").
- 2- Narrator's report of thought act (NRTA): This includes a mental cognition process, such as "imagine" and "decide", that refers to a thought act followed by the phenomenon of the thought act (e.g. "She imagined the scenario after the bomb had exploded).
- 3- Indirect thought (IT): This includes a reporting clause (e.g. "He thought") followed by a subordinate clause introduced by "that" and containing the phenomenon being thought about (e.g. "He thought that he had seen enough of the horror"). However, the past tense is used instead of the present tense, third person pronouns instead of first person ones, and distal deictics instead of proximal ones.
- 4- Free indirect thought (FIT): The original speech is represented using pronouns, tenses and deixis similar to IT but with no reporting clause (e.g. "He had seen enough of that horror").
- 5- Direct thought (DT): Here the original speech is represented verbatim between inverted commas in a reporting clause which includes first person pronouns, present tense verbs and proximal deictics (e.g. "He thought 'I have seen enough of this horror'") (Alaghbary, 2019; Jeffries, 2010).

(4.4.10) Representing Time, Space and Society

This function is concerned with the textual processes used by text producers to construct the time, space and social relations that define the text world. The linguistic model of deixis is employed to linguistically realize the space, time and human relations. Deixis constructs a focus on the place, time and social circumstance of the interaction. The position of a speaker/writer of a text in time and place is known as the "deictic center" of the speaker. Deictic expressions are divided into the following four categories:

- 1- Place deictics: These are expressed by adverbs (e.g. "here", "there"), demonstratives (e.g. "this", "that", "these", "those"), adverbial prepositional structures (e.g. "opposite to", "in front of", "on the right").
- 2- Time deictics: These are expressed by verb tenses, adverbs (e.g. "now", "then"), demonstratives (e.g. "this", "that", "these", "those"), time adverbials (e.g. "tomorrow", "next", "earlier", "later").
- 3- Person deictics: These are expressed by first, second and third personal pronouns.

- 4- Social deictics: These are expressed using address forms (e.g. first name, formal names, nicknames), titles (e.g. “Mr.”, “Dr.”, “Lord”) and other referring phrases (e.g. “My dear”) to express the proximity or social distance between the speaker and the addressees (Ahmed & Abbas, 2019; Jeffries, 2010).

Text producers employ these deictic expressions to position themselves and the addressees, construct their viewpoints, and manipulate the readers’/hearers’ ideologies by making them abandon their own deictic center, and adopt that of text producers by positioning the addressees in their deictic center, and hence the viewing position of the speaker/writer (Alaghbary, 2019; Jeffries, 2010, 2016).

Previous studies that have been conducted on the 2022 Russian-Ukrainian war are very few. Available research has mainly carried out a critical discourse analysis (CDA) of media discourse that has tackled the war (Alyahya, 2023; Brusylovska & Maksymenko, 2022; Maenpää, 2022). CDA was also conducted of social media discourse on the on-going war (Eburuaja, 2022; Loh & Mustaffa, 2022; Tsakiris, 2022) as well as of speeches by world leaders (Bilikova, 2022; Ugoala, 2022). To the researcher’s knowledge, only one study (Ebim et al., 2022) has conducted a critical discourse analysis of the statements made by world leaders who either support Putin or Zelenskyy. However, it does not analyze Syrian officials’ statements on the war. Therefore, the present study attempts to fill the gap in the literature by carrying out a critical stylistic analysis of the speeches delivered before the UN General Assembly by President Biden to express disapproval of the war and by Bassam Sabbagh, Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the UN to support the war.

(5) Analysis

In this section, the textual-conceptual functions employed in the speeches of American President Joe Biden and Permanent Representative of the Syrian Arab Republic to the UN, Bassam Sabbagh, are analyzed to examine the ideological positioning of the U.S. and Syria concerning the 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine.

(5.1) Naming and Describing

Biden’s and Sabbagh’s ideological perspectives concerning the 2022 war in Ukraine are reflected in the nominal choices made and the adjectives used to refer to and describe the war. For example, Biden refers to Putin as “the aggressor” and uses nouns such as “war”, “assault”, “attack” and “aggression” (Biden, 2022a) to refer to the invasion. To ascertain his disapproval of the invasion, Biden uses ideologically-loaded adjectives to modify these nouns. This is seen in “unjustifiable war”, “brutal assault”, “premeditated attack” and “naked aggression” (Biden, 2022a). He also expresses his rejection for Russia’s reasons to invade Ukraine by saying that they are “outlandish and baseless claims” (Biden, 2022b), thereby refuting President Putin’s reasons for invading Ukraine. Moreover, Biden shows support for Ukraine by describing Ukrainian soldiers as “courageous” and justifies this support by saying that his country stands up

for “freedom”, “liberty”, “sovereignty” and “democracy” as opposed to “bullies”, “autocracy”, “atrocities”, “war crimes” and “subjugation” (Biden, 2022a, b). Thus, these nouns also serve to draw a positive image of the U.S. as a country that holds on to its principles, supports the weaker side, and stands against the wrongdoer.

Sabbagh’s nominal choices focus on criticizing western countries and the U.S. for taking restrictive measures against the Russian Federation over its invasion of Ukraine. For example, he uses “الاستقطاب” (polarization), “التسييس” (politicization), “الانتقائية” (selectivity), and “المعايير المزدوجة” (double standards) (Sabbagh, 2022b) to refer to the policy adopted by the West and the U.S. in dealing with the human rights issue, and accuse them of exploiting Russia’s invasion of Ukraine to serve their own political interests rather than the interests of Ukraine or other countries, such as Syria, in which human rights were violated and yet the western countries and the U.S. turned a blind eye to what was happening in these countries. This ideological position is also shown in the use of different adjectives such as “غير المتوازنة” (unbalanced), “المنحازة” (biased), “الاستفزازية” (provocative) (Sabbagh, 2022c) to describe the resolutions adopted by the U.S. and its allies to impose sanctions against Russia. In addition, the adjectives “غير المشروعة” (illegitimate), “الانفرادية القسرية اللاإنسانية” (unilateral, coercive and inhumane) (Sabbagh, 2022b) are used to describe the acts and measures taken by the west and the U.S. against many countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The adjectives “جسيمة وممنهجة” (grave and systematic) (Sabbagh, 2022b) are also used to describe what Syria deems to be blatant violations of human rights committed in different parts of the world.

(5.2) Representing Actions/Events/States

The representation of actions and events in the speeches of Biden and Sabbagh are indicative of their ideologies concerning the Russian-Ukrainian war and the stances adopted by different countries. In Biden’s speeches, material action intention processes serve to criticize Putin for invading Ukraine and show that Putin’s decision to start the war was predetermined and unfounded. This is seen in “Russia has shamelessly violated the core tenets of the United Nations charter” (Biden, 2022b), “Putin has committed an assault on the very principles that uphold global peace”, and “Vladimir Putin has been planning this for months...He moved more than 175000 troops, military equipment into positions, along the Ukrainian border...He moved blood supplies into position and built a field hospital, which tells you all you need to know about his intentions all along” (Biden, 2022a). MAI processes are also used to show the reaction of the U.S. and other countries to the Russian invasion of Ukraine, as in “And today, more than 40 countries represented in here have contributed billions of their own money and equipment to help Ukraine defend itself” (Biden, 2022b), “I’m authorizing additional strong sanctions and new limitations on what can be exported to Russia”, “We will limit Russia’s ability to do business in Dollars, Euros, Pounds, and Yen to be part of the global economy”, and “We have sanctioned Russian banks that together hold around \$1trillion in assets” (Biden, 2022a).

Mental perception processes are used in Biden's speeches to shed light on the deeds perpetrated by Russia to gain support, consensus and approval of the measures and resolutions taken against Russia. This is shown in "In the past week, we've seen shelling increase in the Donbas, the region in eastern Ukraine controlled by Russian-backed separatists... We saw a staged political theater in Moscow... We saw a flagrant violation of international law in attempting to unilaterally create two new so-called republics on sovereign Ukrainian territory" (Biden, 2022a).

Verbalization processes are used to refer to Putin's views on Ukraine and the necessity of the war, and to show that the U.S. predicted the Russian-Ukrainian war and tried to avert it (e.g. "Putin claims he had to act because Russia was threatened... In fact, we warned it was coming... Putin's own words make his true purpose unmistakable. Just before he invaded, Putin asserted Ukraine was 'created by Russia' and never had... 'real statehood'") (Biden, 2022b).

Relational processes help show the effect of the war on Ukraine (e.g. "This war is about extinguishing Ukraine's right to exist as a state" (Biden, 2022b) to assert Ukraine's right to be free (e.g. "Ukraine has the same rights that belong to every sovereign nation") (Biden, 2022b), and to underscore the power of the U.S. and NATO and thus show that Russia will lose the war (e.g. "NATO is more united and more determined than ever") (Biden, 2022a).

In Sabbagh's speeches, material action intention processes are used mainly to criticize the U.S. and western countries for adopting double standard policies in dealing with the human rights issue in Ukraine and other parts in the world, as in "عندما دمرت الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية وحلفاؤها مدينة الرقة السورية وقتلت الالاف من الأبرياء فيها لم نري هذا الحشد السياسي والإعلامي الدولي لفضح منتهكي حقوق الإنسان" (When the U.S. and its allies destroyed the Syrian city of Raqqa and killed millions of innocent people, we have not seen such international and political mobilization to stigmatize human rights violators) (Sabbagh, 2022b). They are also used to accuse western countries of exploiting the UN to serve their anti-Russia purposes, as in "الدول الغربية تصر علي تعزيز حالة الاستقطاب السياسي داخل الأمم المتحدة... وذلك من خلال تكرار الدعوة لعقد مثل هذه الاجتماعات الهادفة فقط إلي خدمة الأجندة العدائية للدول الغربية تجاه الاتحاد الروسي" (Western countries insist on fostering political polarization in the UN... by repeatedly calling for holding such meetings which only serve their hostile agenda towards the Russian Federation) (Sabbagh, 2022c).

Verbalization and relational processes are used in Sabbagh's speeches to show that Syria is aware of the real intentions of the U.S. and its allies regarding Russia, and show that the draft resolutions they propose will lead to undesired consequences. This is shown in "إن مشروع القرار (The draft resolution is a glaring example of pursuing the policy of exclusion which my country has repeatedly warned against) (Sabbagh, 2022b).

(5.3) Equating and Contrasting

The textual conceptual tool of equating is employed only by Biden to criticize Putin for invading Ukraine. This is seen in "Putin is the aggressor" and "liberty, democracy, human

dignity...cannot be extinguished by tyrants like Putin” (Biden, 2022a). In the former, the intensive relational verb “is” is used to equate Putin with aggressors to underscore Biden’s belief that Putin is the one who is mistaken in his decision to invade Ukraine, and that Ukraine’s desire to join NATO is justifiable and does not constitute a threat to Russia. In the latter, Putin is equated with tyrants who are known to be cruel and use their power unjustly, illegitimately and oppressively. The aim is to ascertain that human principles such as liberty, democracy and dignity will always prevail and cannot be defeated for any reason or by extremely powerful rulers or world powers.

(5.4) Exemplifying and Enumerating

The ideological positions of Biden and Sabbagh are reflected in the use of the textual-conceptual function of exemplifying and enumerating. Exemplifying is employed only by Sabbagh to provide evidence for the adoption of Western countries double standard policies when dealing with the human rights issue in different parts of the world. This is shown in "بعض الدول الغربية...تغض

الطرف عن حالات تم فيها ارتكاب انتهاكات جسيمة وممنهجة لحقوق الإنسان علي مرأى ومسمع العالم أجمع، وما يتعرض له الشعب الفلسطيني علي مدى عقود علي يد قوات الاحتلال الإسرائيلية أوضح دليل على ذلك، والمثال الآخر على نفاق تلك الدول (Some western countries turn a blind eye to cases where grave and systematic violations of human rights in full view of the world have been committed. What Palestinians have been facing for decades at the hands of Israelis is a glaring example. Another example of the hypocrisy of these countries is that they disregard the rights and safety of civilians in Dunbas, including women and children) (Sabbagh, 2022b).

Enumerating in Biden’s and Sabbagh’s speeches reflect their ideologies on the war and the stance adopted by the different parties. Three-part lists are used in Biden’s speeches to underscore his view that Putin should not have launched the aggression against Ukraine and prove that Putin’s real concern is to establish an empire. This is seen in:

The Russian military has begun a brutal assault on the people of Ukraine without provocation, without justification, without necessity...This was never about genuine security concerns on their part. It was always about...Putin’s desire for empire by any means necessary – by bullying Russia’s neighbors through coercion and corruption by changing borders by force, and, ultimately, by choosing a war without a cause (Biden, 2022a).

Three-part lists are employed in Sabbagh’s speeches to criticize the resolutions adopted to impose sanctions on Russia, as in: "إن مشروع القرار المعروض أمام الجمعية العامة اليوم يأتي في سياق سلسلة القرارات (The draft resolution before the General Assembly is among a series of unbalanced, biased and provocative

resolutions put forward by the U.S. and its western allies to target the Russian Federation) (Sabbagh, 2022c). They are also used to urge delegates to beware of the dangers of approving resolutions proposed to impose sanctions on Russia, and thus adopt the position of the Syrian delegate. This is shown in "سيصوت وفدي ضد مشروع القرار قيد النظر ويحث الوفود الأخرى على التنبيه لمخاطر الانجرار وراء مساعي الصدام والعزل والاستعداد" (My delegate will vote against the draft resolution in question and urges caution with regard efforts that can result in clash, isolation, and antagonism) (Sabbagh, 2022b).

(5.5) Implying and Assuming

Biden's and Sabbagh's ideological positions are expressed in the existential and logical presuppositions employed in the speeches. Biden's negative perception of the war is shown in the use of existential presupposition which is structured in definition noun phrases that have possessive pronouns and demonstratives (e.g. "Putin declared his war...Putin chose this war") (Biden, 2022a) to hold Putin responsible for the negative outcomes of the war not only on Ukraine but also on Russia since waging this war drove the international community to impose sanctions on Russia.

Logical presupposition in Biden's speeches is expressed using the iterative "again" as in "Again, just today, President Putin has made overt nuclear threats against Europe and a reckless disregard for the responsibilities of the non-proliferation regime" (Biden, 2022b) to hit home the message that Putin is the wrongdoer as his acts defy the non-proliferation regime. Moreover, the comparatives used in "The United States and our allies and partners will emerge from this stronger, more united, more determined, and more purposeful" (Biden, 2022b) logically presuppose that the U.S. and its allies are already more powerful than Russia, and are indicative of Biden's certainty that Putin will be defeated.

In Sabbagh's speeches, existential presupposition is employed by being structured in possessive pronouns, as in "جلسات مجلس الأمن والجمعية العامة يجب أن تسبقها دائما مسرحيات واستفزازات...وذلك لتبرير" (Security Council and General Assembly sessions are always preceded by provocative and dramatic actions to justify the resolutions which hostile and western countries plan to adopt in the name of their alleged international legitimacy) (Sabbagh, 2022b) to criticize the U.S. and its allies for resorting to the UN to adopt resolutions against Russia.

Logical presupposition in Sabbagh's speeches is expressed using the iterative "مرة أخرى" (once again) in "مرة أخرى يشهد هذا المنبر الدولي استغلالا لمسائل حقوق الإنسان لخلق حالة من الاستقطاب والتسييس" (Once again, this international platform witnesses an exploitation of the human rights issue to create a state of polarization and politicization) (Sabbagh, 2022a) to indicate that anti-Russia countries adopt double standard policies and use the human rights issue as a pretext for urging UN member states to impose sanctions on Russia because of the war in Ukraine.

(5.6) Negating

The use of the textual conceptual function of negating in the data is ideologically significant. In Biden's speeches, negating is employed to exercise positive power by showing that the U.S. stands with Ukraine and will take all the necessary measures to punish Russia and free Ukraine (e.g. "But this aggression cannot go unanswered", "the United States wants this war to end on just terms, on terms we all signed up for: that you cannot seize a nation's territory by force") (Biden, 2022, a, b). It is also used to exercise power by showing that most countries in the world reject the war and support Ukraine (e.g. "That's why 141 nations in the General Assembly came together to unequivocally condemn Russia's war against Ukraine) (Biden, 2022b). Negation also functions to convince recipients that Russia's declared reasons for invading Ukraine are ostensible (e.g. "This was never about genuine security concerns on their part", "But no one threatened Russia, and no one other than Russia sought conflict") (Biden, 2022, a, b).

Negation in Sabbagh's speeches has two functions, the first of which is to attack and criticize anti-Russia countries for adopting double standard policies by drafting different resolutions to impose sanctions on Russia whereas they assumingly show no concern for the violation of human rights in many parts in the world and carry out illegal acts in these countries. This is seen in: "إن هذا التحرك الغربي المنسق للتشهير بالاتحاد الروسي لا علاقة له بحقوق الإنسان في أوكرانيا" (The coordinated western move to defame the Russian Federation has nothing to do with human rights in Ukraine) (Sabbagh, 2022b).

The second function of negation in Sabbagh's speeches is to voice Syria's stance on the methods used to attempt to resolve the Russian-Ukrainian crisis, and to warn against the dire consequences. This shown in: "انطلاقاً من موقف بلادي الثابت والراسخ في رفض جميع محاولات تسييس عمل الأمم المتحدة سيصوت وفدي ضد مشروع القرار المعروض أمامنا، ويحث وفود الدول الأعضاء علي التنبه لمخاطر الإنجرار وراء مساعي إنشاء آليات غير قانونية وغير شرعية لا تتسق مع صلاحيات الجمعية العامة" (Based on the firm and unwavering position of my delegate in refusing all attempts to politicize the work of the UN, it will vote against the draft resolution before us and urges the delegates of member states to be ware of the dangers of being drawn into attempts to establish illegal and illegitimate mechanisms that are inconsistent with the powers of the General Assembly) (Sabbagh, 2022c).

(5.7) Hypothesizing

Biden's and Sabbagh's views of the Russian-Ukrainian war and the degree of their certainty about the truth of their propositions are reflected in the modal expressions used in their speeches. The modalized propositions used in Biden's speeches are: epistemic modality, deontic modality, lexical verbs and conditional structures. Biden's assertiveness and definiteness are reflected in the use of categorical assertions and epistemic modality to show that the U.S. and its NATO allies are uncompromising in supporting Ukraine and standing together against Russia. This is shown in:

The United States will defend every inch of NATO territory with the full force of American power...There is no doubt that the United States and every NATO ally will meet our Article 5 commitments, which says that an attack on one is an attack on all...Putin's aggression against Ukraine will end up costing Russia dearly – economically and strategically. We will make sure of that. Putin will be a pariah on the international stage...Freedom will prevail (Biden, 2022a).

Deontic modality is used to express the degree of obligation the UN nations should have towards the war. This is seen in: "This war is about extinguishing Ukraine's right to exist as a state...and Ukraine's right to exist as a people...that should make your blood run cold" (Biden, 2022b). Modality in Biden's speeches is also constructed using lexical verbs and conditional structures to underscore the necessity of standing for democracy and freedom, and warning against the dire consequences of not doing so, as in "Because if nations can pursue their imperial ambitions without consequences, then we put at risk everything this very institution stands for...I believe democracy remains humanity's greatest instrument to address the challenges of our time" (Biden, 2022b).

In Sabbagh's speeches, hypothesizing is expressed using epistemic modality and conditional structures. The former is used to express his belief about the possible outcomes of the initiatives of the General Assembly, as in "على الجمعية العامة للأمم المتحدة تجنب أية مبادرات قد تؤدي إلى تفاقم النزاع ومنع حله" (The UN General Assembly must not develop initiatives that can exacerbate the conflict and prevent peaceful solutions) (Sabbagh, 2022c). Conditional structures are used to urge UN nations not to adopt a resolution to suspend Russia from the UN Human Rights Council by showing that such resolutions threaten the existence of the UN. This is shown in "إذا أرادت دولنا" (If our countries want the UN to continue to exist, we must all say "no" to such resolutions) (Sabbagh, 2022b).

(5.8) Presenting Others' Speech and Thoughts

Biden's and Sabbagh's ideological outlooks on the 2022 Russian-Ukrainian war is reflected in representing the speech and thoughts of others in the statements under analysis. Biden employs narrator's report of speech act to praise himself and show that he is a far-sighted leader, as in "Vladimir Putin has been planning this for months...For weeks, we have been warning that this would happen" (Biden, 2022a). Narrator's report of speech and speech act is also employed to underscore U.S. support for Ukraine (e.g. "I spoke late last night to President Zelenskyy of Ukraine and I assured him that the United States, together with our allies and partners in Europe, will support the Ukrainian people as they defend their country") (Biden, 2022a). Narrator's report of speech act as well as direct speech are used in "We warned it was coming...Putin's

own words make his true purpose unmistakable. Just before he invaded, Putin asserted – and I quote – Ukraine was ‘created by Russia’ and never had, quote, ‘real statehood’” (Biden, 2022b) to prove Russia’s atrocity, autocracy, and illegitimate insistence on depriving Ukraine of its right to exist as a free independent state under the false pretext that it is threatening Russia. Biden also uses free indirect thought to present the stance of the U.S. on the war (e.g. “We chose liberty. We chose sovereignty...We stood with Ukraine...It’s no secret that in the contest between democracy and autocracy, the United States – and I, as President – champion a vision for our world that is grounded in the values of democracy”) (Biden, 2022b) and the measures taken to punish Russia over the war (e.g. “We have now sanctioned Russian banks that together hold around \$1billion in assets...We’ve cut off Russia’s largest bank...from the U.S. financial system...we’re also adding names to the list of Russian elites and their family members that we’re sanctioning...we stopped Russian government from raising money from U.S. or European investors) (Biden, 2022a). Free indirect thought is also used to show support and understanding of the feelings of U.S. citizens because of the rising gas prices (e.g. “I know this is hard and that Americans are already hurting. I will do everything in my power to limit the pain the American people are feeling at the gas pump”) (Biden, 2022a).

As a representative of Syria, Sabbagh reports the thoughts of his country and his delegation. Free indirect thought is used to represent Syria’s position on the actions taken against the Russian Federation because of the war in Ukraine, and accuse the U.S. and the West of adopting double standard policies in dealing with humanitarian issues. This is shown in "إن الجمهورية العربية السورية تؤكد أن حل الخلافات والأزمات الإقليمية والدولية لا يجب أن تتم عبر ممارسة التضييل وسياسات العزل والإقصاء وفرض العقوبات...إن سياسة المعايير المزدوجة التي تتبعها الدول الغربية قادتها إلى التركيز علي قضايا معينة تخدم أجندتها وبالمقابل تتجاهل مسؤوليتها عن أفعالها غير المشروعة التي ارتكبتها خلال العقود الماضية في عدد من الدول الأعضاء" (The Arab Republic of Syria asserts that misinformation, isolation and exclusion must not be the means through which regional and international differences and crises are resolved...The double standard policy adopted by western countries made them focus on certain issues that serve their own agenda and neglect their responsibility for the illegitimate deeds perpetrated in the past decades in a number of member states) (Sabbagh, 2022c). Free indirect thought is also used to speak positively of how Russia dealt with Ukrainian civilians, and thus falsify the claims of the U.S. that Putin is committing war crimes in Ukraine. This is seen in "وفدي يثمن جهود الاتحاد الروسي للتعامل مع الجانب الإنساني خلال العملية الخاصة التي يقوم بها في أوكرانيا وتقديمه المساعدة الإنسانية بمختلف أشكالها للمدنيين الواقعين تحت الحصار في عدد من المدن الأوكرانية...وقيامه بتأمين عدد من المعابر الإنسانية وضمن مرور المدنيين بشكل آمن إلي المقاصد التي يتغونها دون أي تمييز" (My delegation appreciates the efforts of the Russian Federation with respect to the humanitarian aspect during the special operation in Ukraine. Russia has provided different forms of humanitarian assistance to civilians under siege in a number of Ukrainian cities, and ensured

humanitarian passage points to make sure civilians reach their chosen destinations safely and with no discrimination) (Sabbagh, 2022a).

(6) Conclusion

The present study has examined the textual conceptual functions used in the speeches delivered by Joe Biden and Bassam Sabbagh on the 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine using Jeffries (2016) model of critical stylistic analysis in order to reveal the ideological positioning of the U.S. and Syria on this war. Of the ten conceptual functions provided by Jeffries, eight have been examined in the study. These are: naming and describing, representing actions/events/states, equating and contrasting, exemplifying and enumerating, implying and assuming, naming, hypothesizing, and presenting others' speech and thought.

In Biden's speeches, analysis of the selected textual conceptual functions has shown that he focuses on proving that Putin's decision to invade Ukraine was a big mistake as his acts are not in line with the non-proliferation regime, and has negatively affected the whole world and not just Ukraine. He criticizes Russia's atrocity and refutes Putin's reasons for waging an unjustified war which has deprived Ukraine of its sovereignty. Biden also asserts that Putin will be defeated because of the measures taken against Russia and the sanctions imposed on it. In addition, the textual conceptual functions utilized in Biden's speeches underscore the power of the U.S. and its NATO allies whose unflinching support for Ukraine will make liberty, democracy and freedom win and prevail.

The textual conceptual functions employed in Sabbagh's speeches reflect Syria's ideological positioning on the Russian-Ukrainian war as it accuses the U.S. and its allies of adopting double standard policies in dealing with humanitarian issues in Ukraine and in other parts of the world as well as of exploiting Russia's invasion of Ukraine to serve their own agenda and political interests. The tools used in Sabbagh's speeches also serve to criticize the U.S. and western countries for adopting resolutions to impose sanctions on Russia for invading Ukraine, and to warn of the dire consequences of this step.

The study has shown the divisiveness between the U.S. and Syria in their views on the Russian-Ukrainian war. The same views are held by leaders of other countries that reject the war, such as Canada, Australia, and the United Kingdom, or supports it as Belarus, China and India. Indeed, Russia's allies believe that Russia's power will be weakened if Ukraine joins NATO whereas Ukraine's allies defend its sovereignty and right to become a member of NATO. These contrastive views are not only indicative of the opposing ideologies adopted by different countries and world leaders but also reinforce the necessity of engaging in constructive dialogues to end the Russian-Ukrainian war, overcome the destructive effect of the war not only on Ukraine but also on the whole world, and maintain internal peace, stability and security.

The present study has conducted a critical stylistic analysis of the textual conceptual tools employed in Biden's and Sabbagh's speeches only. Therefore, future research can carry out a

critical stylistic analysis of pro and anti-statements made by other world leaders and representatives of countries before the UN to examine their ideological positioning on the 2022 Russo-Ukrainian war. In addition to analyzing political speeches and statements, future research can also adopt a critical stylistic approach to examine public opinion on the war in question in the comments made on different social media platforms such as Twitter, Facebook and YouTube.

References

- Ahmed, H.A., & Abbas, N.F. (2019). Critical stylistic analysis of the concept of extremism in Delillo's *Falling Man* (2007). *AWEJ for Translation & Literary Studies*, 3(3), 86-106. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awejtls/vol13no3.6>
- Alaghbary, G.S. (2019). Ideological positioning in conflict: The United States and Egypt's domestic political trajectory. In M. Evans, L. Jeffries, & J. O'Driscoll (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language in conflict* (pp. 83-102). Routledge.
- Al-Azzawi, Q.O., & Abbass, H. A. (2022). A critical stylistic analysis of polarization in American President Joe Biden's campaign in the last American elections. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Studies*, 292-301. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jhsss.2022.4.4.35>
- Alyahya, A.f., (2023). Critical discourse analysis of newspapers articles declaring the outbreak of war in Ukraine: The Washington Post vs. The Moscow Times. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 1-13. DOI: 10.22034.ijsc.2023.1982871.2969
- Bilikova, B. (2022, September 30). *Discourse analysis of the responses of the US and the UK leaders to the Russian invasion outbreak in Ukraine, February 24, 2022*. [Conference paper]. Language and Politics. Between Linguistics and Political Science. Faculty of Applied Languages, University of Economics, Bratislava, Slovakia. https://conferences.euba.sk/jazykapolitika/www_write/files/2022/bilikova.pdf
- Brusylovska, O., & Maksymenko, I. (2022). Analysis of the media discourse on the 2022 war in Ukraine: The case of Russia. *Regional Science Policy & Practice*, 15(1), 222-235. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rsp3.12579>
- Ebim, M.A., Nta, E.G., & Tasen, O.S. (2022). Power relations in the deployment of linguistic resources by world leaders during the Russian-Ukrainian war. *Journal of Languages, Linguistics and Literary Studies*, 2(2), 145-153. <https://journals.jozacpublishers.com/jlls>
- Eburuaja, C. (2022). New media discourse analysis: A text linguistic analysis of Facebook posts on the Russia-Ukraine war. *Nigerian Journals Online*. <https://www.nigerianjournal.com/index-php/Feschschriften/archive/view/2853/2771>

- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news*. Routledge.
- Halliday, M.A. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Edward Arnold.
- Hassan, A.A. (2022, March 2). Discourse analysis of Putin's narrative on the Ukrainian invasion. *Future for Advanced Research & Studies*. Retrieved January 6, 2023 from <https://futureuae.com/en-US/Mainpage/Item/7140/discourse-analysis-of-putins-narrative-on-the-ukrainian-invasion>
- Jeffries, L. (2007). *Textual construction of the female body: A critical discourse approach*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jeffries, L. (2010). *Critical stylistics: The power of English* Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jeffries, L. (2014). Interpretation. In P. Stockwell & S. Whiteley (Eds.), *The handbook of stylistics* (pp. 469-486). Cambridge University Press.
- Jeffries, L. (2016). Critical stylistics. In V. Sotirova (Ed.), *The bloombury companion to stylistics* (pp. 157-188). Bloomsbury.
- Loh, B.Y., & Mustaffa, M. (2022). Social media discourse in Malaysia on the Russia-Ukraine conflict: Rationales for pro-Russian sentiments. *ISEAS Perspective*, 4, 1-11. <https://www.iseas.edu.sg/articles-commentaries/iseas-perspective/2022-41-social-media-discourse-in-malaysia-on-the-russia-ukraine-conflict-rationales-for-pro-russia-sentiments-by-benjamin-y-h-loh-and-munira-mustaffa/>
- Mäenpää, O.A. (2022). *A critical discourse analysis on the reporting of the Ukrainian refugees fleeing the Russian invasion: The notions of Eurocentrism and othering in mainstream media*. [Master's thesis, Malmö University]. <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/record.jsf?pid=diva2%3A1674063&dswid=7828>
- Omar, A.A., & Abbas, N.F. (2022). A critical stylistic study of the notion of women empowerment in the *Mona Lisa Smile (2003)*. *Arab World English Journal*, 13(3), 482-497. <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol13no3.31>
- Sarhan, N. N. (2023). A critical stylistic analysis of ideologies of masculinity and femininity in *Folktales of Egypt (1980)*. *Journal of Scientific Research in Arts*, 24(1), 36-61. https://jssa.journals.ekb.eg/article_285178.html
- Simpson, P. (1993). *Language, ideology and point of view*. Routledge.
- Tsakiris, A. (2022). *The portrayal of the 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine on social media* [Master's thesis, Uppsala University]. <https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1712575/FULLTEXT01.pdf>

Ugoala, B. (2022). Power in words: An analysis of the flaming devices in President Vladimir Putin's speech before the February 2022 attack on Ukraine. *KIU Journal of Humanities*, 7(2), 171-179.

Internet Resources

Biden, J. (2022a). *Remarks by President Biden on Russia's unprovoked and unjustified attack on Ukraine* [Speech transcript]. The White House. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2022/02/24/remarks-by-president-biden-on-russias-unprovoked-and-unjustified-attack-on-ukraine/>

Biden, J. (2022b). *Remarks by President Biden before the 77th session of the United Nations General Assembly* [Speech transcript]. The White House. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2022/09/21/remarks-by-president-biden-before-the-77th-session-of-the-united-nations-general-assembly/>

Sabbagh, B. (2022a). *General Assembly: Eleventh emergency special session (Ukraine) – 7th plenary meeting* [Speech transcript]. UN web TV. <https://media.un.org/en/asset/k1c/k1coy4cly6>

Sabbagh, B. (2022b). شرح التصويت ما قبل التصويت الذي ألقاه السفير بسام صباغ المندوب الدائم للجمهورية العربية السورية خلال الدورة الطارئة للجمعية العامة حول مشروع قرار "تعليق حقوق عضوية الاتحاد الروسي في مجلس حقوق الإنسان"

(Pre-voting explanation made by Permanent Representative of the Arab Republic of Syria, ambassador Bassam Sabbagh during the General Assembly emergency session about the draft resolution to suspend Russian Federation from Human Rights Council) [Speech transcript]. United Nations. https://www.un.int/syria/ar/statements_speeches/ - شرح

التصويت-ما-قبل-التصويت-الذي-ألقاه-السفير-بسام-صباغ-المندوب-الدائم-للجمهورية

Sabbagh, B. (2022c). بيان السفير بسام الصباغ المندوب الدائم للجمهورية العربية السورية خلال الدورة الطارئة للجمعية العامة حول "الحالة في أوكرانيا"

(The statement of Permanent Representative of the Arab Republic of Syria, Bassam Sabbagh, during the General Assembly emergency session about the state in Ukraine) [Speech transcript]. United Nations. https://www.un.int/syria/ar/statements_speeches/ - بيان-السفير-

بسام-صباغ-المندوب-الدائم-للجمهورية-العربية-السورية-خلال

