



خطاب الكراهية في خطاب الصراع الروسي الأوكراني: تحليل تداولي- اسلوبي لحسابات فعالة مختارة على منصة اكس

احمد سلطان حسين<sup>(١)</sup> (\*)، فلاح حسن اسود<sup>(٢)</sup>

(١) جامعة المستنصرية، بغداد، العراق

(٢) جامعة المستنصرية، بغداد، العراق

Ahmed\_sultani\_phd@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq: (\*الكاتب المسؤول)

#### الملخص

خطاب الكراهية هو ذلك الخطاب الذي يحرض الناس على الكراهية والعنف ضد اطراف اخرى على اساس صفات عرقية ودينية وعنصرية.. الخ. خطاب الكراهية محرم دوليا وتشريعيا لانه يهدد السلم الاجتماعي ويؤدي الى التمزق الاجتماعي ويؤجج الصراعات الدولية. لتحليل البيانات المتعلقة بخطاب الكراهية للصراع الروسي الأوكراني تبنى الباحث النظرية الاسلوبية ل ليج وشورت لسنة ٢٠٠٧ واربع قواعد المحادثة ل كرايس لسنة ١٩٨٩ ومقياس مستوى الاسلوب اللغوي ل جوز لسنة ١٩٦٢. البيانات التي اختيرت وحلت اسلوبيا وتداوليا هي منشورات حسابيين فعالين على منصة اكس. تهدف هذه الدراسة الى تفحص خطاب الكراهية المتعلق بالحرب لروسية – الأوكرانية. المنشورات التي حلت اسلوبيا وتداوليا هي لحسابيين فعالين مختارين على منصة اكس. تهدف هذه الدراسة الى تفحص وظائف خطاب الكراهية الموجود في المنشورات. مشكلة البحث هي في عدم وجود دراسات سابقة تتعلق في دراسة وظائف خطاب الكراهية الموجود بالمنشورات. للحصول على نتائج شاملة فقد تم الاعتماد على طريقة التحليل الكمي ثم النوعي للبيانات. اظهرت نتائج التحليل انه كاتبي المنشورات يركزوا كثيرا على بعض وظائف خطاب الكراهية مثل التحريض على العنف، سلب الصفة الانسانية من بض الناس وشيبتهم ايضا. وهؤلاء المؤثرين يركزوا ايضا على استخدام اسلوب لغوي حميم وعرضي في لغة منشوراتهم لتناسب ذهنيات قرائهم

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** خطاب الكراهية، المنهج الاسلوبي التحليلي، منشورات منصة اكس، المستوى الاسلوبي

تأريخ النشر: ١٢-١-٢٠٢٥

تأريخ القبول: ٢٥-٦-٢٠٢٥

تأريخ الاستلام: ١٣-٤-٢٠٢٥

### Hate Speech in the Discourse of Russian-Ukrainian Conflict: A Pragma-Stylistic Analysis of Selected Effective Accounts on X.com

Ahmed Sultan Hussein<sup>(1)\*</sup>, Falah Hasan Aswad<sup>(2)</sup>

(1) Department of English language and Literature/ College of Arts/ Mustansiriyah University, Baghdad, Iraq

(2) Department of English language and Literature/ College of Arts/ Mustansiriyah University, Baghdad, Iraq

(\* Corresponding author: Ahmed\_sultani\_phd@uomustansiriyah.edu.iq

#### Abstract

Hate speech is that speech which incorporates expressions that instigate people to hate targeted parties and incite them to act violently against them based on some inherent attributes such as ethnicity, religion, race, etc. Hate speech is internationally and legislatively prohibited because it intimidates social peace, leads to social segregation, and fuels international conflicts. Drawing on Leech and Short's checklist of linguistic and stylistic categories (2007), Grice's four conversational maxims (1989), and Joos' scale of formality (1962), this paper is an attempt to examine hate speech about the Russian-Ukrainian conflict. The dataset that is wholeheartedly pragmatically analyzed is the posts of selected influential accounts on X.com. The ultimate aim of this study is to examine the hate speech functions such influencers aim at in their posts. The hate speech that influencers target in their posts is found to have uncharted inconsistency in hate speech research. For obtaining comprehensive results, a sequential explanatory mixed method is used. The results reveal that X.com influencers put much focus on some hate speech functions such as inciting people to violence, dehumanizing and demonizing people, and reinforcing in-group identity. These influencers zoom in on using an intimate and casual style of formality in their posts to suit their readers' mentalities.

**Keywords:** Hate speech, pragma-stylistic approach, X.com posts, stylistic level.

Received: 13-4-2025

Accepted: 25-6-2025

Published: 1-12-2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.23851/mjs.v36i3.1670>

1



## 1. Introduction

All platforms of social media have recently witnessed a tangible increase in their use, goals, and influence to the extent that they have become a part of a parcel of our lives. One of the most important uses of social media, especially X.com, is to galvanize certain public opinions against an individual or a group of individuals by using hate speech plainly or manipulatively. Hate speech is that speech which generates hatred inside people, and incites them to behave badly against another party. Hate speech must be akin to the mentalities of the addressees. Hate speakers on X.com used to utilize certain linguistic tools that assisted them greatly in controlling people's minds and then pushing them into having a negative attitude against the targeted party. The Secretary-General of the United Nations, António (Guterres, 2022) declared, "Hate speech incites violence, undermines diversity and social cohesion, and threatens the common values and principles that bind us together."

Hate speech which as an all-pervasive phenomenon is widely studied and analyzed in research; however, there are some untrodden inconsistencies (uncharted waters) on top of which are the manner X.com influencers use to index the implicatures in their posts, the hate speech functions such influencers target at in their posts, and the formality level of the posts. This study aims to scrutinize how X.com influencers communicate with their readers to indicate that there are implicatures in the post, examine the hate speech functions such influencers aim at in their posts, and explore the level of formality of the posts. This study is of benefit for readers to know more about hate speech and its functions. Also, it benefits researchers who are interested in pragmatyistics and intend to deploy this approach in their studies.

Sifting through all the collected posts relatable to the Russian-Ukrainian conflict with respect to their relevance, analyzability and accountability, the researcher chose twenty posts from two influential accounts on X.com. They are ten posts from Vladimir Putin (parody) and ten ones from Volodymyr Zelenskyy (joke).

### 1.1 Study Questions

The present study poses the following questions:

1. How do X, com influencers communicate with their readers to indicate that there are implicatures in their posts?
2. What are the hate speech functions X.com influencers aim at in their posts?
3. What is the level of language formality style X.com influencers use in their posts to commensurate the mentalities of the readers they address?

## 2. Hate Speech

Giving a definition of hate speech is a challenging task because it necessitates a lot of information on what hate speech constitutes. Furthermore, there are no widely accepted definitions on which one may rely.



However, a number of academics have provided some definitions to hate speech in a reasonable, credible, and appropriate manner. According to roughly all scholars, hate speech is any written or spoken stretch of language that encompasses expressions of hatred and violence directed against a specific party because of their inherent characteristics including race, sect, religion, ethnicity, colour, etc...

Hate speech is essentially a planned and purposeful linguistic act that primarily targets the audience in order to instigate them and afflict an absent party. (Cameron, 2001) contended that "Hate speech is a form of speech that executes harm through its utterance, particularly by reinforcing social hierarchies and power dynamics". It is almost always delivered by someone who possesses the requisite skills, like extraordinary linguistic skills, a remarkable penning style, an ability to shape the audience's mental interpretations, and manipulative tools. The Council of Europe (2017) considers hate speech as "Any type of language that spreads, encourages, supports, or excuses racial hatred, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, as well as other types of discrimination based on intolerance, which include: aggressive nationalism and racialism, discrimination and hatred towards minorities, migrants, and individuals of immigrant background". Along the same line of thought, (Waldron, 2014) defined hate speech as, "Speech that vilifies, humiliates, or incites hatred against individuals or groups based on specific attributes such as race, religion, gender identity, or sexual orientation."

Hate speech frequently serves ideological purposes by endorsing social exclusion and injustice. In his turn, (Van Dijk, 1993) defines hate speech as any discourse that expresses and reproduces hatred, discrimination, and negative stereotypes about a group or its members. Hate speech is defined as statements that are meant to denigrate and disparage specific traits that characterize an individual. Brown (2017) stated that hate speech is, "insulting, degrading, defaming, negatively stereotyping or inciting hatred, discrimination or violence against people in virtue of their race, ethnicity, nationality, religion, sexual orientation, disability, gender identity" (Brown, 2017, pp. 419-420).

Hate speech is almost always tailored to incite the audience to thuggishly act against an absent party. Butler (1997) emphasizes that hate speech is a performative act that enacts harm or violence against individuals or groups based on attributes such as race, gender, sexual orientation, or religion. In this way, the title of Austin's book of (Austin, 1962), "How to Do Things with Words", is consistent with the notion that hate speech is a speech act since it incites and subsequently nourishes hatred that leads to violently acting against targeted individuals. As far as language and culture are completely interwoven according to the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis, Whorfian Theory, or Linguistic Relativity Theory (1940), hate speakers frequently use sociolinguistic tools to influence their audience to adopt and adapt with their vocabularies as well as to follow their themes, ideas, opinions, viewpoints, and attitudes.

### 3. Data and Methodology



The dataset of this study encapsulates twenty posts from two effective accounts on X.com. Analyzability, suitability, and accountability are the criterial factors of choosing these posts. Ten posts are from a Russian influencer, Vladimir Putin (parody) and ten posts are from a Ukrainian influencer, Volodymyr Zelenskyy (joke). The data are going to be analyzed using Leech and Short's checklist of linguistic and stylistic categories of (2007), Grice's four conversational maxims of (1989), and Joos' scale of language formality of (1962).

#### 4. Data Analysis

##### 4.1 Leech and Short Model of Analysis of (2007)

The raw data of the twenty posts are going to be stylistically analyzed drawing on Leech and Short's checklist of linguistic and stylistic categories of (2007). This model involves four categories, namely, lexical categories, grammatical categories, figures of speech, etc., cohesion and context. The quantitatively-approached stylistic analysis yields the following:

As displayed in summary table (1), the twenty posts are analyzed with respect to the nouns they include. The researcher finds that both the Russian and Ukrainian influencers use concrete nouns more than abstract ones. In the Russian posts, out of (27) nouns found, (20) concrete nouns and (7) abstract nouns are used with percentages of (74%) and (26%) respectively. In the Ukrainian extracts, out of (34) nouns found, (21) concrete nouns and (13) abstract nouns are used with percentages of (62%) and (38%) respectively. In texts of hate speech, concrete nouns are frequently used because they establish material reality, a sense of vividness, and specificity, making the speech more influential and sentimentally bursting.

**Table 1**

*Frequencies and Percentages of Use of Nouns in Russian and Ukrainian Posts*

Type of Noun	Russian Posts		Ukrainian Posts		Percentage to All
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
Concrete	20	74%	21	62%	67%
Abstract	7	26%	13	38%	33%
number of nouns in posts	27		34		

As shown in summary table (2), the twenty posts are also analyzed regarding the types of adjectives they involve. The researcher finds that the Russian influencer uses evaluative adjectives the most. Out of (7) adjectives, he uses (5) evaluative ones with a percentage of (72%), while the Ukrainian influencer employs the physical adjectives the most. Out of (10) adjectives, he uses (5) physical ones with a percentage of (50%). In texts of hate speech, referential and evaluative adjectives are used much because they play a crucial role in polarization, feeling manipulation, and categorization.

**Table 2**

*Frequencies and Percentages of Use of Adjectives in Russian and Ukrainian Posts*





Type of Adjective	Russian Posts		Ukrainian Posts		Percentage to All
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
Evaluative	5	72%	1	10%	35%
Physical	0	0%	5	50%	29%
Referential	1	14%	3	30%	24%
Auditory	1	14%	0	0%	6%
Psychological	0	0%	1	10%	6%
number of adjectives in posts	7		10		

As displayed in summary table (3), the twenty posts are also analyzed regarding the types of verbs, infinitives, participles, and gerunds they contain. The researcher finds that both the Russian and the Ukrainian influencers employ the dynamic, physical, (in)transitive/linking verbs and others the most. In the Russian extracts, out of (14) verbs and others found, there are (9) dynamic, physical, (in)transitive/linking verbs and others with a percentages of (64%), while in the Ukrainian extracts, out of (22) verbs found, there are (18) dynamic, physical, (in)transitive/linking verbs and others with a percentages of (82%), The frequent using of such verbs, infinitives, participles, and gerunds in texts of hate speech is due to they add power, immediacy, and a sense of action. This renders the speech to be more convincing, emotionally stuffed, and rhetorically potent.

**Table 3**

*Frequencies and Percentages of Use of verb, infinitive, participle, and gerund in Russian and Ukrainian Posts*

Type of Verb, Infinitive, Participle, and Gerund	Russian Posts		Ukrainian Posts		Percentage to All
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
dynamic, physical, (in)transitive/linking	9	64%	18	82%	75%
stative, psychological, (in)transitive/linking	5	36%	3	14%	22%
dynamic, movement, (in)transitive/linking	0	0%	1	4%	3%
number of verb, infinitives, participles, and gerunds	14		22		

As illustrated in summary table (4), the twenty posts are also analyzed regarding the types of adverbs they contain. The researcher finds that both the Russian and Ukrainian influencers utilize adverbs of place and time the most. In the Russian extracts, out of (10) adverbs found, (5) adverbs of place and (3) adverbs of time are used with percentages of (50%) and (30%) respectively. In the Ukrainian extracts, out of (10) adverbs found, (5) adverbs of time and (3) adverbs of place are used with percentages of (50%) and (30%) respectively. In texts of hate speech, place adverbs are frequently used because they foreground proximity to amplify feelings, mark "insider" vs. "outsider" spaces, and legitimize ownership and exclusion.



Time adverbs are also frequently used in texts of hate speech because they formulate a narrative of crisis or decline, manipulate memory and perception, and anchor hate in a timeline.

**Table 4**

*Frequencies and Percentages of Use of Adverbs in Russian and Ukrainian Posts*

Type of Adverb	Russian Posts		Ukrainian Posts		Percentage to All
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
Place	5	50%	3	30%	40%
Time	3	30%	5	50%	40%
Manner	2	20%	1	10%	15%
Frequency	0	0%	1	10%	5%
number of adverbs in posts	10		10		

As expounded in summary table (5), the twenty posts are also analyzed in relation to the figures of speech they contain. The researcher finds that the Russian influencer deploys irony the most. Out of (17) figures of speech found, he applies (6) ironies with a percentage of (45%). The Ukrainian influencer deploys hyperbole the most. Out of (14) figures of speech found, he applies (4) hyperboles with a percentage of (29%). In texts of hate speech, irony is used much because it helps influencers bypass platform rules and mask his hateful intent behind a layer of ambiguity. Hyperbole is also used much in texts of hate speech because it intensifies emotions and panic, shocks and goes viral

**Table 5**

Figure of Speech	Russian Posts		Ukrainian Posts		Percentage to All
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
Irony	6	34%	3	22%	30%
Hyperbole	2	12%	4	29%	20%
Metaphor	2	12%	2	14%	14%
Personification	1	6%	1	7%	6%
Paradox	1	6%	1	7%	6%
Understatement	1	6%	1	7%	6%
Metonymy	0	0%	2	14%	6%
Simile	1	6%	0	0%	3%
Rhetorical question	1	6%	0	0%	3%
Euphemism	1	6%	0	0%	3%
Antithesis	1	6%	0	0%	3%
number of figures of speech in posts	17		14		

## 4.2 Macro Pragmatic Analysis

### 4.2.1 Grice's Cooperative Principle

Grice (1989) divides conversational implicature into two types: "Generalized conversational implicature and particularized conversational implicature". Insofar as the researcher needs both implicature



and context to pragmatically analyze the posts, particularized conversational implicature is going to be depended on. (Huang, 2017) (Levinson, 1983) emphasized that “Particularized conversational implicatures require particular contextual conditions” (p. 38) and (p. 126). Helping readers in their implicational efforts, Grice (1975) proposed the cooperative principle which, in (1989), was further elaborated through the four conversational maxims, namely, maxim of quantity, maxim of quality, maxim of relevance, and maxim of manner. Once these maxims are strictly observed or flouted, conversational implicature can arise. The pragmatic analysis of the posts fruits the following:

#### a. Anti-Ukraine Posts

##### 1. *Good morning to everyone, except the people of Ukraine. (quantity flouting)*

The post author utilizes exclusion, division and polarization in a provoking way to implicitly show his hostility to the Ukrainians. Seeking simplicity in expressing animosity conceals his polarizing message. He stimulates Ukrainians to react by leveraging context and implicature. The pragmatic fruits he seeks hinges on the Ukrainians’ understanding of and stance to the political context. By dehumanizing the Ukrainians, the post author indirectly steers people to think that the Ukrainians deserve to be hated

##### 2. *Nowhere in the world is there as much corruption as it is in Ukraine. In Ukraine, there is a tariff for everything. (quantity flouting)*

The post author wittingly implies that there is a uniquely corrupted government in Ukraine by positioning them the first in corruption in the world. Exaggerating in showing that everything in Ukraine is with a tariff insinuates that the Ukrainians are economically oppressed. Using a trope (hyperbole) in critiquing assists in drawing the Ukrainians’ attention. Divisiveness, denigration, hatred, and perhaps violence are skillfully promoted in this post.

##### 3. *What do you think about wars being solved with missiles. (relevance flouting)*

The post author using a rhetorical question implicitly expresses his might, preparedness, and control over the situation bragging by his ability to end the war at any time and projecting his country’s dominance and unilateralism. Legitimizing and normalizing militaristic responses has a treacherous influence because it rallies hostile narratives and adds to hate speech ecosystem. Mocking at the Ukrainian masks grave intimidation and indirectly refers to the Ukrainian weakness

##### 4. *I am not taking that kid seriously since the beginning. (quality flouting)*

The influencer attempting to marginalize the targeted party uses metaphor comparing the Ukrainian President to a kid implying that this president has a childish thinking and behavior. Condescension, dismissiveness, and disrespect are all implied as an attempt to fuel hatred and conventionalize violence against such a president who, as Russia claims, has supposedly destroyed his country and as such he deserves being hated and violently acted upon.

##### ٥. *In Ukraine, they have been celebrating Halloween for more than 500 days. (flouting manner)*



The influencer cunningly stylizes this seemingly harmless post which actually implicitly undermines the dignity of the Ukrainians. That this post falls under the category of hate speech is crystal clear because the author gloats and desires that all people gloat at the suffering of the Ukrainians because of the war. Using irony to showcase his gloat adds insult to injury and unquestionably propounds his hatred to them.

#### **b. Anti-Russia Posts**

1. *F-16s are in Ukraine. No limits. No mercy. Remember Donbass kindergartens in 2014? Expect a sequel.*

##### **(quality flouting)**

Intending to leave his readers mesmerized, the post author manipulatively leaning towards a historical event explicitly advocates attacking Russia with F-16s; however, this implicitly illustrates that victory is no longer a far-reaching aim. Exploiting a communal memory and fostering animosity, the author instills hating the Russians inside the Ukrainians and promotes a limitless and merciless militaristic move. He rationalizes and institutionalizes aggressiveness and dehumanization promising a continuous and continual bombing.

٢. *No I don't have sympathy for dead ruSSian soldiers. Simply put, they shouldn't have been in Ukraine. Did people cry over dead Nazis? (quantity flouting)*

With emotionally brimming language and historical parallels, the influencer vindicates killing the Russian soldiers, bragging that he has no sympathy for them. Using metaphor by cunningly comparing the Russian soldiers to Nazis is a clever move towards disseminating hatred and inciting violence against them risking further escalating tension and polarizing people. By his rhetorical question, he implicitly states that the Russians are the new Nazis.

٣. *You become sick. You die. Your soul wakes up to this in hell. (manner flouting)*

Profound pessimism, entire hopelessness, and moral caution are what the post author intends to inculcate inside the targeted party. This post resonates with the hate speech agenda of psychologically threatening the opponents. It indirectly depicts to others that such opponents deserve the Hell for what they are doing to the Ukrainians inciting people to abhor them. Using stark imagery and narrative, the influencer institutionalizes and legalizes killing them.

٤. *Terrorist Putin claims NATO won't have enough time to blink let alone invoke article 5. (quantity flouting)*

Ridiculously and sarcastically, this post casts doubt on the gravity of Putin's threats by discrediting and parodying Putin's assertions. Accusing Putin of being a terrorist is an obvious hate speech. The influencer latently both conventionalizes and authorizes violence against the Russian soldiers. He tries to convince his audience to have a negatively valenced attitude against Russia and, in a scheming manner, he revolves around proliferating accusations of punishing them.

٥. *We will win the fight against the terrorist empire that calls itself Russia and finally establish a democratic Ukraine. (quantity flouting)*



To exploitatively shape the Russian-Ukrainian conflict, emotively bursting language and morally enriched expressions are aptly applied by the post author. Targeting at garnering worldwide support and unifying supporters, the post delegitimizes the Russian attack. The influencer implicitly cultivates an atmosphere of polarization and normalization of taking an action against Russia. He plans to make people conceptualize that he has a solid plan for Ukraine's future.

Closely navigating the twenty posts under investigation, the researcher found that the X.com influencers intending to leave their audience entranced had resorted to manipulation, implication, and explication to convey their hate speech message well, to convince their audience of their viewpoints, and to stimulate them into violently act against the targeted party. Thus, the authors built their posts according to people's different mentalities. Thus, they used a very simple post like, "Good morning to everyone, except the people of Ukraine", a moderate post like, "Peace was never an option", and a complex post like, "Terrorist Putin claims NATO won't have enough time to blink let alone invoke article 5".

#### 4.3 Formality Scale

Measuring the formality degree of a stretch of language is very important just because it delineates the level of style the author has already chosen to address his audience. Such measuring banks on different factors the most important of which are the audience's linguistic and social competences. It necessitates a model of formality that can take into consideration the factors that determine formality, namely vocabularies, expressions and structures. Joos' scale of formality of (1962) is the most reliable and valid scale and widely used one. It helps much in explaining how the way we communicate is influenced by context. Joos (1962) classifies the levels of formality in spoken and written language into five distinct styles. These five styles, oftentimes referred to as registers, are tabulated as follows:

**Table 2**  
*Joos' Scale of Formality of (1962)*

No.	Level of Formality	Characteristics	Use	Example
1	Frozen (static)	very well-organized, unchangeable, and widely accepted	legal language, religious texts national anthems, pledges	<i>We hold these truths to be self-evident...</i>
2	formal	complex grammar, whole phrases, and the absence of contractions and slang	business meetings, speeches, academic papers	<i>It is with great honor that I accept this award.</i>
3	consultative	being courteous, using formal language sparingly, and allowing for clarification	workplace communication, doctor's appointments, classroom discussions	<i>Could you clarify that for me?</i>
4	casual	friends and peers use casual, relaxed language	social media, conversations with friends, text messages	<i>Let's grab lunch later.</i>
5	intimate	inside jokes, incomplete sentences, nonverbal clues, and private jargon	conversations with close friends or partners, family interactions	<i>Hey babe, how was your day?</i>



Holistically scrutinizing the twenty posts, the researcher finds that The Russian and Ukrainian X. com influencers use the intimate and casual style of formality the most respectively. As explained in summary table (6), the Russian influencer applies intimate level of formality. Out of (10) frequencies of level of formality, he applies intimate level (6) times with a percentage of (60%). The Ukrainian influencer applies casual level of formality the most. Out of (10) frequencies of level of formality, he applies (3) casual level (3) times with a percentage of (30%). In texts of hate speech, the intimate level is used much because it fosters a sense of closeness and community and makes hateful ideas seem commonplace and socially acceptable. The casual level is also used much in texts of hate speech because it makes the influencer sound like a regular person, not an extremist, and it allows hate to be disguised as banter, jokes, or sarcasm.

**Table 6**

*Frequencies and Percentages of Use of levels of formality in Russian and Ukrainian Posts*

Level of Formality	Russian Posts		Ukrainian Posts		Percentage to All
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	
Intimate	6	60%	2	20%	40%
Casual	2	20%	3	30%	25%
Formal	1	10%	3	30%	20%
Consultative	1	10%	2	20%	15%
frozen (static)	0	0%	0	0%	0%
frequency of all levels	10		10		

## 5. Conclusions

Hate speech is the speech which encapsulates expressions that incite to violence against a targeted party. It galvanizes people to thuggishly act against other individuals, threatens the social peace, results in social segregation, and enflames the international conflicts. The chosen post authors on X.com do their best and utmost to convince their addressees to take a negatively valenced attitude against Ukraine or Russia by endorsing, rationalizing and institutionalizing polarization, dehumanization, demonization, aggressiveness, divisiveness, exclusion, and prejudice.

Based on Leech and Short's model of stylistics of (2007), Grice's cooperative principle, and Joos' scale of formality (1962), the present study attempted to examine how X.com influencers communicate with their readers to indicate that there are implicatures in the post, to audit the hate speech functions such influencers aim at in their posts, and to delineate the level of formality of the posts. The results reveal that X.com influencers oftentimes violate conversational maxims of quantity, quality, relevance, and manner to indicate that there are implicatures. Such influencers concentrate on certain hate speech functions such as inciting people to violence, dehumanizing and demonizing people, and reinforcing in-group identity. These influencers put focus on using intimate and casual style of formality in their post language.



Realizing that they address people of different mentalities, the post authors tend to use simple, moderate, and complex posts to help different people understand their posts. The posts are characterized by having plenty of concrete nouns, physical adjectives, adverbs of place and time, and transitive verbs. Such quantity and quality of content words help recipients inference the intended meaning well. Additionally, most sentences, noun phrases, and verb phrases are simple ones and as such interpreting and inferring is not difficult. Moreover, figures of speech are abundantly utilized to near the implied idea to the imagination of the readers and to lessen misunderstanding much. The post authors convey their hate messages both explicitly to facilitate understanding the posts and implicitly to imbue hatred and incite to violence without being accused of being hate speakers.

### Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors

### Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper

### Acknowledgments

The authors would like to extend their heartfelt thanks to institution, for the moral support provided during the course of this research. The encouragement and guidance provided by the institution have helped tremendously in completing this research.

### 6. References

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
- Brown, A. (2017). *What is hate speech? The myth of hate*. .
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. Routledge.
- Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. SAGE Publications.
- Council of Europe, C. o. (1997). *Recommendation No. R (97) . 20 of the Committee of Ministers to members states on "hate speech"* adopted on 30.10.1997.
- Grice, H. (1975). *Logic and conversation*. In Cole, P., & Morgan, J.L. (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics: Volume 3, Speech Acts* .
- Guterres, A. (2022). *Message on the international day for countering hate speech*.  
<https://unis.unvienna.org/unis/en/pressrels/2022/unisgsm1241.html>.
- H.P., G. (1989). *Studies in the way of words*. Harvard University Press.
- Huang, Y. (2017). *Pragmatics. 2nd Edition*. Oxford University Press.
- Joos, M. (1967). *The five clocks: A linguistic excursion into the five styles of English usage*. Harcourt, Brace & World.



Leech, G. &. (2007). *Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose (2nd ed.)*. Longman.

Levinson, S. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. Sage Publications.

Waldron, J. (2014). *The harm in hate speech*. Harvard University Press.

## 7. Appendices

### Anti-Ukraine Posts

1. Good morning to everyone, except the people of Ukraine.
2. Nowhere in the world is there as much corruption as it is in Ukraine. In Ukraine, there is a tariff for everything.
3. What do you think about wars being solved with missiles.
4. I am not taking that kid seriously since the beginning.
5. Good morning to everyone except those who still think I need their permission to annex.
6. In Ukraine, they have been celebrating Halloween for more than 500 days.
7. My speeches hit harder than Hypersonic Missiles.
8. I keep my nukes like my tea: strong and ready.
9. Happy New Year to everyone, the president wishes you. My missiles will be in the air to celebrate it.
10. They say money can't buy happiness, but have you tried a tank?

### Anti-Russia Posts

1. F-16s are in Ukraine. No limits. No mercy. Remember Donbass kindergartens in 2014? Expect a sequel.
2. Yes! We are finally receiving our F-16s. Now we can bomb Moscow and other large cities so this war can finally stop. This is the only way to peace!
3. Peace was never an option.
4. No I don't have sympathy for dead ruSSian soldiers. Simply put, they shouldn't have been in Ukraine. Did people cry over dead Nazis?
5. The invaders can go and fuck themselves, Dead or alive.
6. Putin is bluffing.
7. You become sick. You die. Your soul wakes up to this in hell.
8. Terrorist Putin claims NATO won't have enough time to blink let alone invoke article 5.
9. Russia did 9/11.
10. We will win the fight against the terrorist empire that calls itself Russia and finally establish a democratic Ukraine.