



Linguistic Means of Russian-Speaking Extremists' Speech (Based on Expert Practice)

Article Record

Dziadzinkin Aleksandr L.^{§§*}

PhD (History), Associate Professor, Head of the Department
ORCID 0000-0002-9102-4440
*Corresponding Author



Lavitski Anton A.^{§§}

PhD (Philology), Associate Professor, Senior researcher
ORCID 0000-0003-1029-0788



§ Department of Law and Social and Humanitarian Disciplines, Vitebsk branch of the International University MITSO, Minsk, By (OA)

RECEIVED

2026-03-10

ACCEPTED

2026-03-27

ONLINE PUBLISHED

2026-06-05

PUBLISHED

2026-06-17

PEER REVIEW

Double Blind

Abstract

The implementation of communication strategies and tactics within the Russian-language extremist discourse utilizes a range of specific linguistic means. These primarily include lexical and semantic units that substantiate extremist doctrines and shape the images of "victim" and "enemy." In addition to lexical and semantic units, other linguistic means are also used: word-formation (e.g., suffixes and prefixes of nouns with connotations of disapproval or disdain); morphological (various instances of violation of grammatical usage); syntactic (exclamatory sentences, ellipsis, inversion, etc.); stylistic (metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, allegory, hyperbole, litotes, etc.). In this work, we will characterize the lexical (lexical-semantic), syntactic, and stylistic devices that most influence the formation of the speech profile of a Russian-speaking extremist.

extremist discourse

linguistic means

speech profile

lexical-semantic groups

syntactic compression

imperative constructions

stylistic devices

AI USE STATEMENT

No generative AI was used for analysis or results.

FUNDING

No external funding was declared for this work.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

DATA AVAILABILITY

Not applicable for this article.

ETHICS

No ethics committee approval was required for this article type.

CONSENT

Not applicable for this article.

TRIAL REG.

Not applicable.

Crossref DOI: 10.34257/GJHSSG254131

How to Cite: Dziadzinkin et al. (2026). Linguistic Means of Russian-Speaking Extremists' Speech (Based on Expert Practice). Global Journal of Human-Social Science, 26(2), 35-43. DOI: 10.34257/GJHSSG254131

LICENSE

© 2026 Global Journals. Open-access article under CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 International License.



Print ISSN 0975-587X



9 770975 587004

Online ISSN 2249-460X



9 772249 460013

Under the strict compliance and defined process of



METADATA CONTINUATION

AUTHOR CONTACT QR LEDGER

Dziadzinkin Aleksandr L. §0*



Lavitski Anton A. §Ξ



ARCHIVAL RECORD

GJHSS · Vol 26 · Issue 2 · 2026

Article ID GJHSS-254131 · DOI 10.34257/GJHSSG254131

Print ISSN 0975-587X · Online ISSN 2249-460X

Linguistic Means of Russian-Speaking Extremists' Speech (Based on Expert Practice)

Dziadzinkin Aleksandr L^{§§*} and Lavitski Anton A.^{§§ξ}

Affiliations

§ Department of Law and Social and Humanitarian Disciplines, Vitebsk branch of the International University MITSO, Minsk, By (OA)

Qualifications / Designations

§ PhD (History), Associate Professor, Head of the Department
ξ PhD (Philology), Associate Professor, Senior researcher

Abstract

The implementation of communication strategies and tactics within the Russian-language extremist discourse utilizes a range of specific linguistic means. These primarily include lexical and semantic units that substantiate extremist doctrines and shape the images of "victim" and "enemy." In addition to lexical and semantic units, other linguistic means are also used: word-formation (e.g., suffixes and prefixes of nouns with connotations of disapproval or disdain); morphological (various instances of violation of grammatical usage); syntactic (exclamatory sentences, ellipsis, inversion, etc.); stylistic (metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, allegory, hyperbole, litotes, etc.). In this work, we will characterize the lexical (lexical-semantic), syntactic, and stylistic devices that most influence the formation of the speech profile of a Russian-speaking extremist.

Keywords: *extremist discourse, linguistic means, speech profile, lexical-semantic groups, syntactic compression, imperative constructions, stylistic devices, expert practice*

* Corresponding Author

Dziadzinkin Aleksandr L

DOI

10.34257/GJHSSG254131

1. Lexical Features of the Speech Profile of a Russian-Speaking Extremist

Lexical units possess certain independence, but each interacts with others at different levels of linguistic structure. One manifestation of systemic connections in vocabulary is the formation of thematic (lexical-thematic) groups.

We support the position of F. P. Filin, who defines a thematic group as "...a group of words united on the basis of the classification of realities themselves" [1, p. 526]. A. A. Ufimtseva [2, 88–97] notes the almost complete absence of semantic links between units in the thematic group; A. P. Klimenko and A. E. Suprun [3, 9–10] identified the determinacy of the inclusion of lexemes in a particular thematic group based on the intrinsic properties of language. While agreeing with the researchers' conclusions, we note that within a thematic group, the unification of units occurs based on the common functions of the objects and phenomena designated by the words. In terms of the cognitive organization of discursive interaction, similar understandings are found in the works of J. Lakoff [4], R. Langacker [5], and others.

The speech profile of a Russian-speaking extremist is marked by various nominations, which can be divided into six subgroups within the general thematic group.

1.1. Nominations expressing forms and methods of violent actions against representatives of the recessive group (From here on, real expert material obtained as part of the work of the Laboratory of Linguistic and Legal Research of the Vitebsk branch of the International University "MITSO" is used.).

Example

Example 1 (the nomination "to shed blood").

TO SHED (blood) – to kill or seriously injure someone [6].
The cops are committing arbitrariness. If they can do anything, then we can shed their blood too. What the fuck are we going to tolerate?

Example

Example 2 (the nomination "to knock down").

TO KNOCK DOWN – 1. To bring down, to force to fall. 2. To throw down, to pile up haphazardly (colloquial) [6].
Fuck, come out, group up, grab the pipes, and knock down everyone who attacks you... The cops will shit themselves.
Guys, go knock down the cops.

Example

Example 3 (the nominations "to beat," "to tear").

TO BEAT – 1. To strike with strong, repetitive movements. 2. To produce sounds with blows. 3. To mark something with blows, sounds, or ringing [6].
TO TEAR – to yank out with a sharp movement, forcefully separating something from something [6].
And in general... when we all come out, we must not just beat these security forces, but tear them to pieces...;
Tolerance is the lot of slaves! It's time to beat the Khachi, the semi-Jews, and all other scum...
Shine with flame, war! They must be torn to pieces, so that others will learn a lesson...

In addition to the above-mentioned nominations, this subgroup includes such units as "kill," "carnage," "take revenge," "deal with," "attack," "fight," "assault," "blow up," and others.

As we can see, the extremist's speech assigns a significant role to the nomination of actions, which is understandable given the author's pragmatic approach to fighting the "enemy" with violent methods.

1.2. Nominations that are used to justify the "truth" of extremist ideological doctrines.

Example

Example 1 (nominations "honor," "order").

HONOR – 1. Moral qualities worthy of respect and pride. 2. A good, unblemished reputation, a good name. 3. Chastity, purity. 4. Honor, respect [6].

ORDER – 1. The correct, well-ordered state or arrangement of something. 2. The consistent course of something. 3. The rules by which something is done [6].

Everything used to be different. Here we are, walking from a bar, two or three of us. I can't remember. And there are black people sitting there. You understand, we need to restore order. It's a matter of honor for every Russian. It's the same thing when non-Russians showed up in the stands at football matches. We immediately kicked them out. But now the fans swallow everything. And clubs will happily take any black player. This is just crazy...

Example

Example 2 (nominations "loyalty," "faith").

LOYALTY – 1. Conformity to the truth. 2. Inevitability. 3. Steadfastness and constancy in feelings, relationships, and the fulfillment of one's duties and responsibilities [6].

FAITH – 1. Conviction, deep confidence in someone or something. 2. Belief in the existence of God and higher divine powers [6].

Loyalty to Islam is a deep and conscious desire to follow the teachings and principles laid out in the Holy Quran. Loyalty is manifested not only in the observance of rituals but also in the daily life of a Muslim. The members of our organization are consistent in their goals. Faith inspires us to jihad – the holy struggle against the Jews and the Crusaders...

Example

Example 3 (nominations "freedom," "will").

FREEDOM – 1. The ability to act according to one's own will, without harming others and without breaking the law. 2. The absence of constraints and restrictions that bind the socio-political life and activities of society as a whole, its individual members, or any social group [6].

WILL – 1. The ability to fulfill one's desires and set goals. 2. A conscious desire to accomplish something [6].

Visual component of the creolized text: a video sequence of protesting citizens attacking riot police. Verbal component (commentary): *"The people's main value is freedom. We can do anything. We don't want to live under the rule of cops who, on the orders of a psychopath, shot people. We are not cowards! For our freedom!"*

1

In addition to the above-mentioned nominations, this subgroup includes such units as "truth," "nobility," "sacred," "duty," "justice," "dignity," etc.

¹There are three types of interaction between verbal and non-verbal components in the implementation of the semantic-semantic unity of a creolized text: 1) the dominance of the verbal text (the non-verbal material in this case performs the function of "supporting" the semantics of the speech act); 2) the dominance of the non-verbal component (the verbal component complements the semantics of the material and/or contains other significant information about it); 3) the semantic parity of both components (the extraction of one type of textual data disrupts the entire semantics of the text). In the material presented for study, the interaction according to the first type is realized.

As we can see, the units discussed are used in their direct lexical meaning. The author thereby is deliberately substituting concepts, realizing the intention to justify the ideological tenets of extremism. The fight against "enemies" in the corresponding texts becomes a matter of "honor," justified by the need to restore "order" and achieve "freedom."

1.3. Nominations through which the image of the "victim" is formed.

Example

Example 1 (nomination "suffering").

SUFFERING is physical or mental pain, torment [6].

Sheer suffering... Why are rights and truth trampled into the ground? And what's the end result... A Belarusian with brains and ideas... packs his bags... and leaves the country... Forever. To a place where he can live, work, and breathe freely.

Example

Example 2 (nomination "injustice").

INJUSTICE is the lack of a sense of justice [6].

The visual component of the creolized text: a caricature of representatives of the Negroid race, "Eastern" peoples, and Jews, being shown the way to the train station by a Russian hero. Verbal component (commentary): "When will this injustice end and will the Russian people have a place on their own land?"

Example

Example 3 (nominations "oppression," "harassment").

OPPRESSION is a difficult, suppressed state [6].

OPPRESSION is an unfair restriction, a curtailment of freedom [6].

How much longer can we mock the people? Usurper, stop! Give us a sip of freedom, stop clinging to power with your blue fingers. We are against oppression, we will fight to the end! The hour of freedom will inevitably come! Khachi! They're everywhere... And not only are they taking our jobs, but now they're taking our women too. How long will this oppression of the Russian people continue?

In addition to the aforementioned nominations, this subgroup includes such units as "exploitation," "oppression," "discrimination," "disenfranchisement," "lawlessness," "torment," "sorrow," "agony," "torture," and others.

As we can see, the units discussed, as in the previous case, are used in their direct lexical meaning. Here, too, a deliberate substitution of concepts occurs, when the author essentially reframes the situation: supporters of destructive ideology in extremist texts appear not as aggressors, but as "victims" who "suffer disenfranchisement," "suffer from injustice," and "experience suffering."

1.4. Nominations that have a positive connotation in relation to "their own."

Example

Example 1 (the nomination "hero").

HERO – a person who performs heroic deeds, extraordinary in their bravery, valor, and dedication [6]. SS soldiers are true heroes, deserving universal recognition.

They spared no effort, laying their lives on the altar of victory. We will not allow the Jews to take revenge! The National Socialist Movement will live on!

Example**Example 2 (nomination "real guys").**

A REAL (guy) – truly what one should be; representing the best example, the ideal of something [6].

The cops are running amok. These monsters are ruining the lives of real guys.

Example**Example 3 (nomination "glorious Russians").**

GLORIOUS (Rusich) – enjoying glory, worthy of glory [6].

Yegor Sviridov was killed by Caucasians. Glorious Russians, it's time to fight them back. One for all and all for one.

As we can see, the units discussed, as in the previous cases, are used in their direct lexical meaning. These nominations allow us not only to identify the subject of speech but also to express a subjective (complimentary) attitude toward it. The subject of speech is "our own" ("Rusichi," "lads," etc.). The predicate is expressed by evaluative nouns ("hero," "symbol," "genius," etc.) or adjectives (free, glorious, real, etc.).

1.5. Nominations that have a negative connotation in relation to the "enemy."

Example

Example 1. Nominations with a negative evaluative component, clearly related to the characterization of groups based on national, racial, religious, and other social characteristics (for example, khachi – people of Caucasian "nationality" [7]).

The visual component of the creolized text is represented by an image of two people beating a third. Verbal component (commentary): Khachi should be greeted like this!

Example

Example 2. Euphemistic nominations with a negative evaluation of a group based on national, racial, religious, or other characteristics (e.g., Acabs – police officers or other law enforcement officers (an abbreviation for "All cops are bastards").

The visual component of the creolized text is represented by an image of a skull and crossbones. The verbal component (commentary): Acabs are not allowed!

Example

Example 3. Nominations that identify members of a recessive group with animals, plants, or inanimate objects. For example, "monkeys," "creatures," "hyenas," "jackals" (meaning "worthless people"), "rams" (meaning "stupid people"), "logs" (meaning "insensitive people"), "monkeys" (meaning "ugly people"), weeds (meaning "harmful people"), "rags" (meaning "weak-willed") "people". In this case, the natural oppositions "man – animal", "man – plant" are realized [8].

The almighty Jewry has declared war on us. Rise up, white people! Unite against Jewish tyranny! This rootless clique of hyenas is turning people against each other; it is a diabolical force from which there is no salvation.

Chechens are jackals, from whom only a traumatic weapon can protect. Churkas are everywhere, and we Russians will soon be listed in the Red Book.

Example

Example 4. Nominations of obscene vocabulary (vulgar expressions, taboo words related to the lower body and physiological functions). For example, "cocksuckers", "faggots" (meaning "people with non-traditional sexual preferences"), "assholes", "fucked up" (meaning "mentally handicapped people").

No to Moskvobad! No to dickheads, no to khachas-cocksuckers! We Russians are the masters here, and the kolovrat is ours and lights the way.

Visual component of the creolized text: image of a police (garbage) car near the "Musorgsky Street" bus stop. Verbal component (commentary): A den for assholes.

As we can see, extremist speech is characterized by the use of invectives, that is, units expressing a negative assessment of a social group or its members. Invective, being a manifestation of pragmatics, is realized primarily at the lexical level. Dictionaries use the following labels to denote these units: abusive, disapproving, contemptuous, dismissive, reproachful words.

1.6. Nominations used to create a sense of belonging to the addressee.

Example**Example 1 (nomination "brothers")**

BROTHER – 1. A person close to another (others) in spirit, activity, interests, position, and also generally close. 2. A comrade, like-minded person (high-flown) [6].

Zig Hail, brothers. Victory will be ours!

Brothers, forward! Down with the foreign scum!

Example**Example 2 (nomination "comrades").**

A COMRADE is a comrade in struggle, activity, and generally a tried and true comrade-in-arms [6].

Comrades, we must fight Antifa. This is a movement created by the anti-Russian government. Among them are the Judeo-Massons and the half-Khachi. Death to Antifa!

Example**Example 3 (nomination "compatriots").**

COUNTRYMAN – a native of the same area [6].

The Right Sector is a force! Glory to Bandera! Countrymen, put the Muscovites on the sword!

Rus' to the Russians! Remember this, fellow countryman!

The Motherland is ours! Countryman for countryman!

Countryman, defend Rus' from Caucasian lawlessness!

Example**Example 4 (nomination "Slavs").**

SLAVS – peoples related in language and culture and comprising three branches: East Slavic, West Slavic, and South Slavic; People belonging to this group of peoples [6].

Visual component of the creolized text: a video sequence showing a Caucasian girl and a Black boy holding hands. The boy is struck with a hand bearing a Nazi "Celtic cross" tattoo. Verbal component (commentary): Slavs, we won't let them spoil our blood!

The Caucasus has declared jihad on us. The Slavs will show who's boss!

A Slavic revolt will be a complete disaster for the Khachams.

Example**Example 5 (the nomination "we").**

WE – is used to refer to oneself and the interlocutor, or to several (or many) people, including the interlocutor, and, when generalized, to all, an indefinite number of people [6].

We will never stop fighting the regime. Truth is on our side...

All we have is the will to fight...

We need to close ranks and resist...

We are the masters of this land! And that says it all!

We are Russian and that says it all!

We must defend the rights of white people!

In addition to the aforementioned terms, this group includes such terms as "friends," "compatriots," "Rusichi," "Russians," and others.

The examples provided show that the terms in question are used in their literal meaning. The author uses these terms to establish a dialogue with readers or listeners, aiming to do so with like-minded individuals.

Thus, the speech portrait of a Russian-speaking extremist, in terms of his lexical organization, is constructed in such a way as to present his actions as just, not contrary to common sense and moral norms. This is most often achieved through linguistic techniques such as the deliberate substitution of concepts and the inclusion of complementary units in the text. At the same time, the extremist presents the opponent's actions as criminal, using vocabulary with a pronounced negative connotation.

2. Syntactic Features of the Speech Profile of a Russian-Speaking Extremist

Syntax most fully reveals the functional aspects of language. Therefore, modeling the speech profile of a Russian-speaking extremist involves examining their syntactic features. Let us name a few.

Russian-language texts with extremist content are characterized by the use of various methods of "compressing syntactic structure" [9, p. 104]. Syntactic laconism is represented by elliptical, incomplete, monosyllabic (nominative and verbal) sentences, as well as the absence of conjunctions.

The author of a Russian-language extremist text uses elliptical constructions for two reasons. First, the intentional omission of a predicate is a means of evading legal risks. Thus, in the absence of a specific unit in the utterance indicating the method of action, the addresser has the opportunity to "mask" their intentions and, if necessary, attempt to prove their "innocence" to law enforcement. Second, the capacious nature of the elliptical sentence lends the text a particularly expressive quality. For this purpose, such constructions are typically placed at the end of the utterance.

Example**Examples of elliptical constructions:**

... Freedom for the boys! Death for the Acabs!

... And we'll throw these Jews in the oven, in the oven!

... We'd like to gather these hot Chechen beards in one place and give them a nuclear missile for 100% certainty!

In the structure of an incomplete utterance, a specific component lacks verbal explication, but this occurs as a result of adaptation to the context or speech situation.

In contextual incomplete sentences, unnamed members are usually mentioned in the immediate clause or in the same sentence (if it's complex):

The boys were already standing closer to the exit. Yorsh was still near the stands. And so they took the centaur... the freaks.

What awaits you here, assholes? A knife or a noose!

In situational incomplete sentences, unnamed members are clear from the prevailing circumstances. The speech situation compensates for the omitted components, and the form of the existing sentence members indicates a grammatical connection with them:

And what about the Jews... Did you know that in Auschwitz they had comfortable rooms, and bathrooms, and a brothel, and even a theater... Don't tell me about the Holocaust now... And the Russians on the straw...

One-part nominative sentences inform the addressee that a certain phenomenon or object exists in the present tense. These sentences are a type of verbless construction used to convey the author's intent in a highly compressed form. Furthermore, they contribute to the creation of subtext, which is formed by omitting individual components. Against a background of neutral syntactic constructions, nominative sentences attract the recipient's attention.

In Russian-language extremist discourse, both common and uncommon nominative constructions are encountered:

“

Lawlessness...

We're in total trouble...

Khachis are everywhere!

Fixers in uniform...

The grammatical base of single-member verb sentences contains only a predicate. These sentences can be definitely personal, vaguely personal, generally personal, or impersonal. In Russian-language extremist discourse, such constructions convey the emotional state of the speaker and encourage illegal actions.

The speech profile of a Russian-language extremist is characterized by the use of both common and uncommon verb constructions:

“

We must fight!

Russian, it's time to fight back!

Let's drive out the chinks together!

Let's say NO to the blacks!

Complex sentences are quite rare in Russian-language extremist discourse. However, non-union connections predominate over conjunctions.

Based on expert practice, the following non-union constructions can be identified:

- with a causal connection between parts

Only one request for you, Russian, don't let foreigners onto your land: you'll sign a death sentence for the entire nation.

- explanatory type

The boys are right: what a joy it will be for everyone when the cops are gone!

As we can see, in the examples given, complex non-union constructions with the meaning of cause and explanation allow the

author to shorten the length of the speech message without losing the informative value. In all the cases examined, the simplicity of the wording allows the speaker to clearly convey the necessary intentions to the addressee and focus their attention on the most important aspects. In turn, this saves the listener or reader time and effort [10, pp. 40–43]. Such constructions also possess significant expressiveness, which evokes the desired response from the audience (for example, fear or anger).

2.1. Use of imperative constructions

Imperativeness presupposes the use of linguistic means with the aim of motivating the addressee to perform some action. E. Fortuyn defines the imperative as a polysemic complex meaning an impulse to perform an action [11, pp. 3–24]. According to A. Vezhbitskaya, "the imperative construction is used to express the meaning 'I want you to do something'" [12, p. 49]. A. V. Bondarko believes that the imperative is characterized not only by an "imperative situation" but also by an "imperative intonation" [13, pp. 188–194]. V. E. Iosifova [14, p. [342–347] proposes a classification of semantic-pragmatic types of imperative utterances: order, prohibition, recommendation, request, demand, advice, threat, warning, suggestion, and appeal. It should be noted that linguistic expertology has yet to develop clear criteria for differentiating these speech acts from each other.

In Russian-language extremist texts, the most frequently used imperative speech act is the appeal. The actualization of the call in this case is due to the disposition of legislative acts, in which this speech act is reflected as a form of implementation of extremist activity (for example, the Law of the Republic of Belarus on Combating Extremism states that Extremism (extremist activity) is the activity of citizens of the Republic of Belarus, foreign citizens or stateless persons (hereinafter, unless otherwise specified, citizens) or political parties, trade unions, other public associations, religious and other organizations, including foreign or international organizations or their representative offices (hereinafter, unless otherwise specified, organizations), formations and individual entrepreneurs in planning, organizing, preparing and committing attacks on independence, territorial integrity, sovereignty, the foundations of the constitutional order, public safety through: public calls to organize or hold for these purposes illegal meetings, rallies, street marches, demonstrations ...; Use of state symbols of the Republic of Belarus, images and symbols that are historical and cultural values, as well as official heraldic symbols for the purpose of promoting extremism, or publicly calling for extremist activity, is prohibited and entails liability in accordance with legislation). Unlike other imperative constructions, it does not require the addressee to immediately perform certain actions.

In expert practice, there are examples of both direct and indirect forms of appeal.

A direct call to extremist activity is explicated through the underlying meaning of the words that comprise the utterance and is expressed using the following markers:

- a second-person singular or plural verb in an exclamatory utterance: *Chuchmeks, get out of Russia! Russian, prepare an incendiary mixture! Churki, hang yourself!*
- a first-person plural verb in an exclamatory utterance: *Let's defend the existence of our people and the future of white children! Let's remember our grandfathers who died for us! We will not tolerate foreign scum on our land!*
- a past-tense verb in an exclamatory utterance: *Get up and go! We've tolerated the bastards of the regime for so long!*

- an infinitive verb in an exclamatory utterance: *It's time to exterminate the Khachi!*

- an infinitive verb combined with the particle "давай" (come on) in an exclamatory utterance: *Let's wipe out the Jews! We can't get rid of this scum any other way!*

- the auxiliary verb "to be" in the second person, singular or plural, in an exclamatory utterance: *Rise up and take revenge on these creatures! Your family and your future are yours! You are responsible for your homeland. Be brave and drive this scum out of the country!*

- modal verbs with the semantics of obligation (must, obliged, able to do something, etc.) in an exclamatory utterance: *White, wake up! The countdown is in sight. You must take up arms! Death to the Jews and semi-Jews!*

- non-verbal forms with an imperative meaning as part of an exclamatory utterance: *Death to the Acabs! To arms! Not a step back, Moscow is not Moskvobod!*

The expression of an indirect call, like any hidden meaning, is conveyed through hints. In this case, the imperative is not explicitly stated, and the utterance takes the following forms:

- an assertion about the necessity of implementing something: *We need to go out to the square every day. Otherwise, these creatures will crush us.*

- a statement containing a latent invitation to something: *Today we're going to kill this herd of pigs who serve the collective farm scum... It would be good if you were with us.*

- a statement containing a "choice" for the addressee: *Every self-respecting guy should either have a fight with the cops or break a window in the police station.*

- a statement containing a wish for the addressee: *It would be good if brother would stand up for brother, against the Khachi, with one hut.*

The list of linguistic means of expressing this appeal is quite extensive. Only those instances that were regularly encountered during expert examinations of Russian-language texts with extremist content are considered.

2.2. Use of rhetorical constructions

Rhetorical questions and exclamations are quite frequently used in extremist texts.

Rhetorical questions are statements that lack the communicative element of a request and serve the function of a message. Such questions do not require an answer and, according to E. A. Skorodumova, represent "a structure with an asymmetrical relationship between form and content" [15, p. 137], i.e., formally they are interrogative sentences, but semantically they are assertions.

The primary purpose of a rhetorical question in a Russian-language extremist text is to attract the addressee's attention, indirectly prompting them to draw an "independent" conclusion already contained in the question. Another function of a rhetorical question is to heighten the emotional tone of the statement. This syntactic figure expresses surprise, anger, fear, reproach, irritation, and other expressions.

Expert practice in extremism cases allows us to distinguish the following types of rhetorical questions:

- provocative: *Can we really allow them to humiliate us, spit in our faces?*

- manipulative: *Who, if not us, will protect Rus' from foreign carrion?*

- clarifying: *How much longer will the humiliation of Russians in Russia continue?*

- emotionally charged: *How can one remain indifferent when free Belarusians are subjected to arbitrary treatment?*

- sarcastic: *And how, in your opinion, will this cop scum protect us?*
The rhetorical exclamation serves two functions [16, p. 169]:

1. Expression of the sender's emotions:

- indignation: *We're supporting these ghouls in uniform at the expense of our hard-working people's taxes. These slackers are living in squalor, while the whole country is in poverty!*

- surprise: *Just think about it: migrants in our country have more rights than Russians!*

- regret: *It's with bitterness that we have to admit that a Jewish-Massachusetts clique is in charge in our country!*

2. Appeal to the recipient's feelings, including the opponent's:

- condemnation: *When some live in luxury while others live in squalor, it certainly can't be called a social state!*

- threat: *Whoever wants to continue to serve this scumbag, know that we'll kill you and your wives!*

- warning: *A little more time will pass, and not a single Russian will remain in Russia!*

As we can see, rhetorical questions and exclamations in Russian-language extremist discourse are used to foster destructive sentiments in the addressee and encourage them to commit violent acts against the "enemy." The use of these syntactic devices is not only a means of expressing the expressiveness of discourse but also an indicator of its dialogic nature.

2.3. Use of inversion constructions

Inversion is a technique of expressive syntax that consists of "a violation of the usual order of sentence members, as a result of which some element is highlighted and acquires special connotations of emotionality or expressiveness" [17, p. 114]. Within this technique, the object may occupy the first position in the sentence, the attribute may follow the word it defines, and the adverbial modifier and predicate may precede the subject.

According to A. N. Morokhovskiy, two types of inversion can be distinguished: grammatical and stylistic. Grammatical inversion is used in interrogative and interrogative-negative sentences, altering the meaning of the syntactic structure. Stylistic inversion is characterized by the intentional distortion of the existing word order for the purpose of emotional or semantic highlighting of a significant segment [18, pp. 122–130].

In Russian-language extremist discourse, inversion is commonly used to create provocative or existential statements.

Example

Examples of inversion:

Why aren't we fighting for the truth? How long will this go on? (An interrogative sentence with inversion emphasizes that fighting for the truth is a necessary condition for survival).

What if we don't speak out? (An interrogative-negative construction with inversion emphasizes the responsibility for inaction on the addressee).

Who can stop us? Who can object to us? (An interrogative form with inversion emphasizes that only "our own" can win).

As we can see, when modeling the speech profile of an extremist, it is important to consider the expressive potential of inversion constructions.

Thus, the speech portrait of a Russian-speaking extremist, in terms of its syntactic organization, is constructed to present the offender's actions as worthy of emulation, based on moral values, and to present the image of the "enemy" in an exclusively negative light. These objectives are most often achieved through the use of imperatives, rhetorical questions and exclamations, laconic constructions, and certain other linguistic devices.

3. Stylistic Features of the Speech Portrait of a Russian-Speaking Extremist

The propaganda focus of a Russian-speaking extremist's speech determines the author's use of certain stylistic devices that allow for the most effective impact on the addressee. Let's name a few of them:

3.1. Metaphor

O. A. Leshchinskaya's work "Metaphor in the Poetry of Yankee Kupaly" presents various perspectives on the phenomenon of metaphor in contemporary humanities, emphasizing the connection and difference between linguistic and individual-author metaphors [19]. We support the position of S. B. Kurash, who proposed analyzing metaphor within its contextual limits – from the contextual minimum to the contextual maximum [20, p. 7].

In Russian-language extremist discourse, metaphor performs the following functions:

- creating vivid images: *Russians are waging a holy war against infidels and foreigners who poison our land. The time has come to cleanse the Motherland of this plague! The crusade has been declared!*

- emotional impact on the recipient: *Caucasians are leaving a bloody trail in our cities: violence, drugs, and murder. How long will this continue? Will we be able to ensure a happy future for our children and grandchildren?*

- the formation of boundaries between "us" and "them": *We will walk over the corpses of enemies and traitors for the future of our homeland, for the smiles of our children, for the health of our mothers...*

- the legitimization of violence: *It's time for a purge! Migrants and other marginalized groups, pay attention! Sanitary treatment has begun!*

Expert practice also included metaphors such as "infection" (used to compare a certain social group or ideology to a disease that threatens the health of the entire society); "ship" (used to describe a society that must find its "right course"); "tree" (used to justify the radicalization of social relations as a "natural" process of "branch growth"); "wall" (used to instill the idea of the need for isolation or protection from the "enemy"), etc.

In the examples given, metaphor within Russian-language extremist discourse is a rather "effective" manipulation technique, forming a destructive "agenda" in the recipient's mind.

3.2. Hyperbole

Scientific literature offers various interpretations of hyperbole as a stylistic device. Existing definitions of hyperbole reflect its nature, lingua-stylistic, and pragmatic characteristics. Thus, N. P. Potockaya asserts that hyperbole is a "stylistic figure of obvious and deliberate exaggeration for enhanced expressiveness" [21, p. 138]. K. Eterstein and A. Lesot note that hyperbole amplifies individual units of utterance in order to highlight a specific subject or an entire idea [22, pp. 76–84]. According to I. Arnold, hyperbole is a "deliberate exaggeration that enhances the expressiveness of a statement and imparts emphatic quality" [17, p. 65].

Expert practice in extremism cases has identified four typical situations in which the author of a Russian-language text deliberately uses hyperbole. First, hyperbole emphasizes the exceptionalism of a particular social group or ideology: *The values of National Socialism are the only shield against the complete annihilation of the Slavic people. Only a Russian can cope with an army of 100,000 or 100 million chinks and orcs.*

Second, hyperbole instills fear of the "enemy" in the recipient: *The Judeomassons are everywhere; soon they will conquer the world and turn us into slaves.*

Third, hyperbole justifies violent actions against the "enemy," shaping their image as a real threat: *Anyone who is against the Russian people must be destroyed, otherwise our nation will perish!*

Fourth, through hyperbole, the author of the extremist text informs the addressee of the "grave" consequences that may arise if the fight against the "enemy" is not fought: *If the Jews gain power, we will return to the Stone Age. We will have nothing left...*

As we can see, hyperbole is used in extremist texts to manipulate public opinion and to generate the desired emotional response in the audience.

3.3. Repetition

Repetition can be either a verbatim reproduction of a lexical unit or a restoration of only its semantic content. Repetition is a technique for creating coherence in a text. In linguistic literature, a distinction is made between semantic and lexical-semantic repetition. The most widely accepted classification to date is that of M. Morin, which includes simple lexical repetition, anaphora, epiphora, epanaphora, and partial repetition [23, p. 37; 24, p. 220].

The use of repetition in Russian-language extremist discourse serves several functions simultaneously: - the information conveyed by the author becomes more memorable; - a dynamic rhythm is created, which helps hold the recipient's attention: *Protect your family! Protect your people! Protect your land!* - the recipient's emotional reactions (e.g., fear or anger) are heightened, which can motivate action: *Enough! Enough tolerating!* - the importance of the message being conveyed is emphasized, which compels the audience to respond appropriately; - the illusion of the truth of the speaker's statements and the persuasiveness of the arguments presented is created; - a sense of community is fostered among the audience: *We are united! We are invincible!*

In expert practice, the most common instances of the author of an extremist text were anaphoric and epiphoric repetitions: *The time will come, and we will be able to live in a free country... The time will come, the dictatorship will fall, and those guilty of murdering defenseless people will be punished. The time will come, justice will prevail, and victory will come...* (anaphora).

These khachi achieved this themselves when they disrespected us... These degenerates angered us... (epiphora).

Thus, the text-forming function of repetition lies in its participation in organizing the formal and semantic structure of the text, expressing its implicit meaning, and fulfilling a cohesive function at the syntagmatic and paradigmatic levels.

3.4. Comparison

In linguistics, there are still disagreements on a number of aspects regarding the study of comparative constructions. The functions of comparison as a stylistic device within Russian-language extremist discourse have not been studied at all. In the Dictionary and Reference Book of Linguistic Terms by D. E. Rosenthal, comparison

is considered a concept of a greater or lesser degree of quality, which finds its expression in the grammatical category of degrees of comparison of an adjective and an adverb [25]. In the Complete Linguistic Dictionary by T. V. Matveeva, comparison is understood as "a grammatically formalized figurative juxtaposition of two phenomena, the purpose of which is to highlight a feature of the object of speech that is important for the speaker" [26]. The most precise definition of comparative constructions was given by Yu. P. Knyazev. According to the researcher, "with the help of comparative constructions, an object, feature, or situation P (object of comparison) is described not in itself, but in relation to an object, feature, or situation Q (standard of comparison). The criterion of comparison is the feature Z (the feature of comparison), which takes on the value V (the value of the feature of comparison)" [27, p. 346].

Within Russian-language extremist discourse, comparative constructions are used to concretize the author's message (comparisons allow information to be presented in a more accessible form), create "emotional intensity" (comparisons can evoke fear, anger, or hatred in the recipient), and shape identity (comparisons help to distinguish a group of "us" by contrasting it with a group of "them").

Our expert practice in extremism cases has allowed us to identify three typical situations in which the author deliberately uses comparative constructions:

1. Comparison to justify violence

If we had not acted in time, the blood of the Russian people would have become as dirty as a pig's tail (violence as an act of defense).

War against a dictatorial regime is like fighting a cancer. We must be decisive, otherwise it will consume us (violence as a means of salvation from the "enemy").

2. Comparison to create a negative image of the "enemy"

The ideology of the Lukupants is like a poison that slowly poisons the minds of the younger generation.

A Jew is like a snake that bites when you least expect it. He must be destroyed before he does any harm. The poison, albeit slowly, penetrates the bloodstream.

3. A contrasting comparison within the "friends vs. enemies" opposition

We, as honest people, wanted fair elections, but they, like Dementors, crushed our will. Be like the master and take the axe. Why do we need these degenerates from the Caucasus Mountains?

As we can see, comparative constructions in extremist texts are an effective tool for manipulating the recipient's consciousness. They help create negative images and shape the recipient's perception of violence as something fair, necessary, and justifiable.

Thus, the speech portrait of a Russian-speaking extremist, in terms of its stylistic organization, is constructed to heighten the recipient's emotional reactions, incite them to commit unlawful acts, and emphasize the key points of the message being conveyed. This is most often achieved through the use of metaphors, repetition, comparisons, hyperbole, and other linguistic devices.

4. Conclusions

The implementation of communication strategies and tactics within Russian-language extremist discourse utilizes a range of specific linguistic markers, among which lexical, syntactic, and stylistic devices have the greatest impact on the speech portrait of an extremist.

The speech portrait of a Russian-language extremist is marked through various nominations, which, within the general thematic group, can be divided into six subgroups: 1) nominations that express forms and methods of violent actions against representatives of the

recessive group (their use is explained by the author's pragmatic approach to fighting the "enemy"); 2) nominations that are used to substantiate the "truth" of extremist ideological doctrines (through the substitution of concepts, the intention to justify destructive attitudes is realized); 3) nominations through which the image of the "victim" is formed (through the substitution of concepts, supporters of a destructive ideology are presented not as aggressors, but as "victims"); 4) nominations that have a positive connotation in relation to "our own" (their use allows one to express a complimentary attitude towards the subject of speech); 5) nominations that have a negative connotation in relation to "the enemy" (their use allows one to express a negative assessment of a social group or its representatives); 6) nominations that are used to form a sense of belonging to a group in the addressee (they are used to establish a dialogue with readers or listeners as with like-minded people).

Modeling the speech portrait of a Russian-speaking extremist includes an analysis of his syntactic features. Firstly, extremist texts are characterized by the use of various methods of syntactic compression. Syntactic "laconicism" is represented by elliptical, incomplete, monosyllabic sentences, as well as asynthetic absence. Simplicity of wording allows the author to clearly convey the necessary intentions to the addressee, and this saves the addressee time and effort. Secondly, Russian-language extremist discourse is characterized by the use of imperative constructions. Such texts most often employ a type of imperative speech act called "call for action." Unlike other imperative constructions, it has a "deferred" effect. Expert practice has encountered cases of both direct and indirect forms of appeal. Third, extremist texts frequently employ rhetorical questions and exclamations to attract the recipient's attention, indirectly prompting them to draw an "independent" conclusion already contained in the question. Fourth, authors of extremist texts employ inversions to create provocative or existential statements.

The speech of Russian-speaking extremists is characterized by the use of certain stylistic devices. For example, metaphor influences the recipient's emotional state, creates boundaries between "us" and "them," and legitimizes violence. Hyperbole emphasizes the exclusivity of a particular social group or ideology, instills fear of the "enemy," and creates an image of the enemy as a real threat. The use of repetition in extremist texts serves several functions simultaneously: the information conveyed by the author becomes more memorable; a dynamic rhythm is created, which helps hold the recipient's attention; the recipient's emotional reactions are heightened; and the importance of the message being conveyed is emphasized. Comparative constructions within extremist discourse are used to concretize the author's message (comparisons allow information to be presented in a more accessible form), create "emotional intensity" (comparisons can evoke fear, anger, or hatred in the recipient), and shape identity (comparisons help distinguish a group of "us" by contrasting it with a group of "them").

■ REFERENCES

- [1] Filin, F. P. (1957). On Lexical-Semantic Groups of Words. In *Lexical Studies in Honor of Academician Stefan Mladenov* (pp. 523-538). Sofia: Khudozhnik.
- [2] Ufimtseva, A. A. (1962). *An Experience of Studying Lexicon as a System (Based on the English Language)*. Moscow: Publishing House of the USSR Academy of Sciences.
- [3] Klimenko, A. P., & Suprun, A. E. (2017). Problems of Studying the Lexical Structure of a Text. In *Text in Language, Speech, Culture: Collection of Scientific Articles* (pp. 7-15). Minsk: RIVSh.
- [4] Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [5] Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Vol. 1: Theoretical Prerequisites. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- [6] Russian Semantic Dictionary. An Explanatory Dictionary, Systematized by Word Classes and Meanings. Edited by N. Yu. Shvedova. URL: <https://slovari.ru/search.aspx?p=3068>. (Accessed: 07.11.2025).
- [7] Dictionary of modern vocabulary, jargon and slang. URL: <http://rus-yaz.niv.ru/doc/jargon-dictionary/index.htm?ysclid=m6nu4u2725506249335>. (Accessed: 07.11.2025).
- [8] Yatsenko, N. E. (2001). *Explanatory Dictionary of Social Science Terms*. Saint Petersburg: Lan.
- [9] Rimikhanova, A. N. (2012). Laconic language constructions based on the compression of syntactic structure. *Bulletin of the Dagestan State Pedagogical University. Social and Humanitarian Sciences*, (3), 104-110.
- [10] Milentey, O. D. (2018). Functional and semantic properties of an incomplete sentence in speech. *Bulletin of the KRAUNC. Humanitarian Sciences*, 2(32), 40-43.
- [11] Fortuyn, E. (2008). Polysemy of the Imperative in Russian. *Voprosy yazykoznaniiya*, (1), 3-24.
- [12] Vezhbitskaya, A. (1999). *Semantic Universals and Description of Languages*. Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture.
- [13] Bondarko, A. V. (1990). *Theory of Functional Grammar: Temporality. Modality*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- [14] Iosifova, V. E. (2012). Imperative utterances with a special form of inciting the "third person". *Teacher of the XXI century*, 2(1), 342-347.
- [15] Skorodumova, E. A. (2009). Rhetorical question-reaction as a means of expressing emotions (based on English-language fiction texts). *Bulletin of Chelyabinsk State University. Philology. Art criticism*, 39(177), 137-139.
- [16] Karamova, A. A., & Silantyeva, V. M. (2016). Rhetorical question and rhetorical exclamation in modern political discourse. *Innovative science*, (3-3), 168-170.
- [17] Arnold, I. V. (2002). *Stylistics of the Modern English Language*. Moscow: Nauka.
- [18] Morokhovskiy, A. N., & Vorobyova, O. P. (1984). *Stylistics of the English Language*. Kyiv: Vishcha shkola.
- [19] Lyashchynskaya, V. A. (2003). *Metafara ũ paezii Yanki Kupaly*. Gomel: State Duma of the Frantsuz University of Skaryny.
- [20] Kurash, S. B. (2001). *Metaphor and its limits: microcontext – text – intertext*. Mozyr: MozGPI im. N. K. Krupskaya.
- [21] Potockaya, N. P. (1974). *Stylistics of the modern French language*. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.

- [22] Eterstein, C., & Lesot, A. (1986). *Pratique du frangais*. Paris: Hatier.
- [23] Morin, M. K., & Terevnikova, N. N. (1970). *Stylistics of the modern French language*. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.
- [24] Tayupova, O. I. (2019). Repetitions and their role in the texts of various discourses. *Bulletin of Bashkir University*, (1), 220-223.
- [25] Rosenthal, D. E., & Telenkova, M. A. (1985). *Dictionary and reference book of linguistic terms. Teacher's manual* (3rd ed.). Moscow: Prosveshchenie.
- [26] Matveeva, T. V. (2010). *Complete dictionary of linguistic terms*. Rostov-on-Don: Phoenix.
- [27] Knyazev, Yu. P. (2007). *Grammatical semantics: Russian language in typological perspective*. Moscow: Language of Slavic cultures.