

## PLAIN LANGUAGE IN WAR NARRATIVES: DISCURSIVE SIMPLIFICATION AND THE SHAPING OF PUBLIC OPINION

**Mudrynych Svitlana Yuriiivna,**

Candidate of Philological Sciences,  
Associate Professor at the Department  
of the English Language and Translation  
Kyiv National Linguistic University  
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-4524-0935

**Lysenko Olena Anatoliivna,**

Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences,  
Associate Professor at the Department  
of the English Language and Translation  
Kyiv National Linguistic University  
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2919-9343

**Maslova Larysa Oleksandrivna,**

Senior lecturer at the Department  
of the English Language and Translation  
Kyiv National Linguistic University  
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-8279-2077

*The article explores the phenomenon of plain language as a dominant communicative strategy in contemporary military discourse, focusing on Russia's full-scale war against Ukraine. Drawing on cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, rhetoric, and critical discourse analysis, the study examines how linguistic simplification functions not only as a means of facilitating comprehension, but also as a powerful mechanism of ideological influence and emotional regulation. The research analyses rhetorical and lexical strategies of simplification, including binarisation, sloganeering, repetition, metaphorisation, emotional appeal, and the use of abstract categories presented as self-evident values.*

*The empirical material is drawn from political speeches, media reports, and public communication related to the ongoing war, which allows for the identification of recurring discursive patterns shaping public perception. The analysis demonstrates that simplified language constructs morally unambiguous cognitive models of war by reducing complex political and military processes to binary oppositions such as "us versus them" and "good versus evil". These patterns foster emotional mobilisation, collective identification, and social consolidation, while simultaneously limiting critical reflection and alternative interpretations of events.*

*The findings confirm that plain language in military narratives performs a regulatory function at textual, discursive, and social levels. At the textual level, it relies on short sentences, evaluative vocabulary, and emotionally charged formulas; at the discursive level, it operates through repetition and normalisation of dominant narratives; at the social level, it legitimises political decisions and structures public opinion. The article highlights the high manipulative potential of simplified language in wartime communication and emphasises the importance of critical awareness of linguistic strategies used in political and media discourse during periods of armed conflict.*

**Keywords:** *simple language, military discourse, critical discourse analysis, public opinion, rhetorical strategies, Russia's war against Ukraine.*

**Мудринич Світлана, Лисенко Олена, Маслова Лариса. Проста мова у воєнних наративах: дискурсивне спрощення та формування громадської думки**

*У статті досліджується феномен простої мови як визначальної комунікативної стратегії в сучасному військовому дискурсі, зосереджуючи увагу на повномасштабній війні Росії проти Укра-*

їни. Спираючись на когнітивну лінгвістику, соціолінгвістику, риторичну та критичний аналіз дискурсу, в роботі досліджено, як лінгвістичне спрощення функціонує не лише як засіб полегшення розуміння, але й як потужний механізм ідеологічного впливу та емоційної регуляції. У дослідженні аналізуються риторичні та лексичні стратегії спрощення, включаючи бінаризацію, гасла, повторення, метафори-зацію, емоційну привабливість і використання абстрактних категорій, представлених як самоочевидні цінності.

Емпіричний матеріал взято з політичних промов, повідомлень ЗМІ та публічної комунікації, пов'язаної з поточною війною, що дозволяє виявити повторювані дискурсивні моделі, що формують суспільне сприйняття. Аналіз демонструє, що спрощена мова конструює морально однозначні когнітивні моделі війни, зводячи складні політичні та воєнні процеси до бінарних опозицій, як-от «ми проти них» та «добро проти зла». Ці патерни сприяють емоційній мобілізації, колективній ідентифікації та соціальній консолідації, при цьому обмежуючи критичну рефлексію та альтернативні інтерпретації подій.

Результати дослідження підтверджують, що проста мова у військових наративах виконує регуляторну функцію на текстовому, дискурсивному та соціальному рівнях. На текстовому рівні вона спирається на короткі речення, оціночну лексику та емоційно заряджені формули; на дискурсивному рівні вона функціонує через повторення та нормалізацію домінуючих наративів; на соціальному рівні вона легітимізує політичні рішення та формує громадську думку. У статті висвітлено високий маніпулятивний потенціал простої мови в комунікації під час війни та наголошено на важливості критичного усвідомлення лінгвістичних стратегій, що використовуються в політичному та медійному дискурсі в періоди збройних конфліктів.

**Ключові слова:** проста мова, військовий дискурс, критичний аналіз дискурсу, громадська думка, риторичні стратегії, війна Росії проти України.

**Introduction.** Simple language as a communication strategy is increasingly used in political and media narratives of modern wars, especially in the context of mass communication and digital media. Its main stated goal is to facilitate the perception of complex events by a wide audience. At the same time, in practice, the simplification of linguistic means is often accompanied by a reduction in content and emotional manipulation, which creates a powerful tool for shaping public opinion.

The manipulative nature of simple language in war narratives is manifested primarily through the simplification of complex socio-political processes into **binary oppositions**: “*us versus them*”, “*good versus evil*”, “*truth versus lies*”. Such rhetorical devices eliminate the need for in-depth analysis of the causes and consequences of war, replacing them with emotionally charged slogans and images. As a result, the audience does not receive a complete picture of events, but rather an interpretation that has been adapted to the desired political narrative.

**Lexical selection** plays an important role in shaping such a narrative. The use of commonly used, everyday, or emotionally charged words creates the illusion of closeness to the “*ordinary person*”, reduces the critical distance between the speaker and the audience, and promotes emotional solidarity. This allows political actors

to influence the perception of events by manipulating fear, outrage, hope, or nostalgia.

Another mechanism of manipulation is **the semantic simplification of abstract concepts**. Complex categories – security, strategic goals, responsibility – are presented through short slogans or metaphors that lack clear definitions. This strategy allows the same words to be filled with different meanings depending on the political situation, avoiding specific commitments.

The topic of simplified language in military narratives is extremely relevant in light of Russia’s full-scale war against Ukraine. This war clearly demonstrates how political and media actors systematically use simple, emotionally charged rhetoric to shape public perception of events. Simplified language allows key messages to be quickly conveyed to a mass audience, creating the effect of a “*clear enemy*” and mobilizing emotional reactions – fear, outrage, solidarity, or hope.

Thus, in military narratives, simple language performs not only an informative but also a regulatory function, shaping a certain model of worldview. Although it can increase the accessibility of public communication, in the context of war, simple rhetoric often takes on a manipulative character, simplifying thinking and directing public opinion in the desired direction.

**Literature analysis.** The study of plain language and its manipulative potential in political and military discourse has attracted considerable attention from scholars in recent decades. Researchers have approached this topic from several theoretical perspectives, emphasising the interrelationship between language, cognition, ideology, and audience perception.

**Cognitive approach and the concept of frames.** Cognitive linguistics and frame theory [1; 2] emphasise that language structures thinking and perception of reality. In military narratives, simple language often serves a framing function: complex phenomena are reduced to binary or emotionally charged categories such as “us versus them” or “good versus evil”. Such simplification activates ready-made cognitive schemas in the audience’s mind, reducing the need for critical analysis of the causes and consequences of war. Researchers note that framing simplifies decision-making and focuses attention on a particular interpretation of events.

**Critical discourse analysis (CDA).** Critical discourse analysis [3; 4] emphasises the role of language as an instrument of power and ideology. According to CDA, the simplification of discourse in war narratives is not accidental; it is deliberately used to construct the desired narrative, manipulate emotions, and legitimise political decisions. Short slogans, metaphors, and simplified categories serve as tools of persuasion, facilitating the spread of propaganda and control over the audience’s perception of war.

**Sociolinguistic approach.** Sociolinguists study the relationship between language and social processes, in particular power, social stratification, and mass mobilisation. Simple language in military narratives creates the impression of direct communication with the population. William Labov [5] emphasised that social variations in language determine how messages are perceived by different social groups, while Dell Hymes [6] stressed that social context and audience expectations determine the form of speech. Basil Bernstein [7] showed that simplified language enhances solidarity but limits the complexity of the message, which is consistent with the logic of military slogans. Finally, Judith T. Irvine [8] noted that the choice of vocabulary and style determines the social perception of a message and can be used to manipulate the audience. In the context of Russia’s war against Ukraine, these studies demonstrate that the use

of simple, emotionally charged words increases the effectiveness of mobilisation and control over the perception of information.

**Media-psychological approach.** According to the media-psychological approach, simple language in mass media activates rapid emotional responses, bypassing rational analysis [4; 9]. In war narratives, fear, outrage, hope, or nostalgia become powerful tools for mobilising and shaping collective consciousness. The simplicity of messages allows the same narrative to be adapted for different audience segments, increasing its persuasiveness.

**Rhetorical approach.** Rhetoric explores linguistic strategies of persuasion. In military narratives, simple, emotionally charged language, vivid metaphors and repetitions maintain the audience’s attention, form moral oppositions between “heroes and enemies” and reinforce key narratives in the mind. Aristotle’s [10] classical ideas about logos, ethos, and pathos show how the combination of logical arguments, the authority of the speaker, and emotions influences the perception of messages. Kenneth Burke [11] emphasises in his concept of dramatism that rhetoric shapes social narratives and creates the opposition between “heroes and enemies”, mobilising the audience. Chaim Perelman [12], within the framework of “new rhetoric,” demonstrates that persuasion is achieved not only through logic, but also through the choice of simple words and concrete examples, which increases the effectiveness of military slogans. George Kennedy’s [13] research shows how repetition, slogans, and symbolic language reinforce the impact of messages. Finally, Richard E. Vatz [14] emphasises that the choice of words and phrases determines the perception of reality, which is especially important for the formation of military narratives, where simple, repetitive phrases reinforce the desired perception of events.

The integration of cognitive, critical, sociolinguistic, media-psychological, and rhetorical approaches demonstrates that simple language in political and military discourse performs not only an informative but also a regulatory function. It combines cognitive, social, emotional and rhetorical mechanisms, shaping public opinion, mobilising support and influencing the collective perception of war. Empirical studies confirm that this dual function makes plain language an extremely effective tool for communication and

manipulation in modern warfare. Which make it of high importance for the research potential to thoroughly analyse the use of such tool on the basis of a specific and topical war case, revealing the true impact of plain language in media and real life.

**The aim of the study. Object of study:** The manipulative potential of simple language in contemporary political and military narratives.

**Subject of study:** Linguistic and rhetorical strategies for simplifying military narratives that shape public opinion and the emotional reactions of the audience.

**Purpose of the study:** To identify and analyse the mechanisms of using plain language in military narratives, particularly during the war between Ukraine and Russia, and to assess its impact on the perception of war and the formation of collective models of worldview.

**Research tasks:**

1) To analyse theoretical approaches to the study of plain language and its manipulative potential in political and military discourse;

2) Identify the main rhetorical techniques and simplification strategies used in military narratives;

3) Investigate the peculiarities of the use of simple language in media and political messages during the war between Ukraine and Russia;

4) Assess the impact of simplified language on the formation of public opinion and emotional reactions of the audience in a military context.

**Research methods.** The following methods are used to achieve the research objectives and solve the tasks set. **The theoretical analysis method** allows systematising and comparing existing scientific approaches to the study of plain language, its cognitive and rhetorical impact. It is used to analyse works in the fields of cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, critical discourse analysis, rhetoric and media psychology.

**Content analysis** is used to study specific examples of military and political narratives, slogans, and media messages. The method allows us to identify key rhetorical and lexical strategies, determine the frequency of use of simple words, metaphors, repetitions, and emotionally charged phrases.

**Critical discourse analysis (CDA)** is used to identify manipulative and ideologically charged strategies in political and military discourse. CDA allows us to trace how language shapes

perceptions of the enemy, “us” and “them”, as well as how simplified rhetoric mobilises the audience.

**Comparative analysis** allows us to compare the war narratives of different countries or media sources in order to identify common features of simple rhetorical strategies and the specifics of their use in different contexts.

**The interpretative method** is used to analyse the semantic and emotional connotations of simple language in war narratives, as well as to assess its potential impact on audience perception and the formation of collective ideas.

Research results. Identifying rhetorical devices and simplification strategies in war narratives.

War narratives in the contemporary political and media space systematically employ simplified rhetorical strategies aimed at reducing the cognitive complexity of war perception and forming an emotionally unambiguous interpretation of events. In this context, simple language performs not only a communicative but also a regulatory function, setting the framework for the acceptable understanding of war.

One of the key mechanisms for simplifying the war narrative is binarisation, in which war is presented through a stark opposition between “*us and them*”. In public statements, this strategy is often implemented in the formula “*we are defending ourselves – they are attacking*”, which is characteristic of both Ukrainian official discourse (e.g., “*Ukraine is fighting for freedom*”, “*We are defending our land*”) and Russian propaganda (“*Russia is defending its own*”, “*We are forced to defend ourselves*”). This pattern eliminates complex historical, political, and legal contexts, reducing the war to a morally unambiguous scenario with clearly defined roles of victim and aggressor.

In public speeches and media reports from the Ukrainian side, binarisation manifests itself in formulaic statements that construct a positive image of “*their own*” and at the same time clearly define the image of the enemy. In addition to the slogans “*Glory to Ukraine!*” and the response “*Glory to the heroes!*”, the formulas “*We are on the side of light*” and “*Ukraine means freedom*”, “*Our soldiers are defending the civilised world*”, “*They came to destroy*”, “*Russia is an aggressor state*”. Such statements not only mobilise the audience, but also establish a clear moral hierarchy in which “*our people*”

are identified with righteousness, justice and humanity.

Similar mechanisms can be seen in Russian propaganda discourse, where binary opposition is constructed through formulas such as “*we are liberators, they are Nazis*”, “*we defend the peaceful, they threaten security*”, “*Russia is fighting the West*” and “*they want to destroy our culture*”. As a result, the complex reality of war is reduced to a simplified confrontation between “*good*” and “*evil*”, which minimises the possibility of alternative interpretations and critical reflection on events.

**Lexical simplicity** is another dominant strategy in shaping the military narrative. Instead of complex military and political terms that require professional knowledge or contextualisation, short, emotionally transparent words and generalised terms such as “*enemy*”, “*defence*”, “*ours*”, “*freedom*”, “*victory*” and “*defence*” are actively used. Such lexemes are easily recognisable, require no explanation, and quickly activate established emotional and value associations. Short phrases such as “*Together to Victory*”, “*Fight to the End*”, “*Stand Firm*”, “*Keep Formation*” and “*We Will Not Be Broken*” regularly circulate in the media space. These phrases contain almost no specific information about military strategies, resources, or time frames, but effectively perform mobilising and motivational functions.

A characteristic feature of such statements is their semantic ambiguity and openness to multiple interpretations. For example, the phrase “*Victory will be ours*” does not specify what this victory should be, under what conditions and at what cost, but it creates emotionally positive expectations and supports belief in a successful outcome. Similarly, statements such as “*We are fighting for freedom*” or “*This is a struggle for the future*” reduce complex political and geopolitical processes to understandable moral categories accessible to a wide audience.

Lexical simplicity also helps to blur the line between institutional and everyday speech. Phrases such as “*Everyone in their place*”, “*Everyone makes their contribution*” and “*We are all working for victory*” integrate military discourse into the daily life of the civilian population, turning participation in the war into a universal norm of behaviour. In this sense, simple vocabulary not only facilitates the perception of messages, but also enhances their manipula-

tive potential, as it appeals to basic emotions and values, while eliminating the need for detailed rational analysis of events.

**Repetition and sloganeering** play an important role in military discourse as key mechanisms for simplifying speech. The same formulas are repeated many times in speeches by political leaders, news reports and posts on social networks, performing primarily emotional, regulatory and identification functions. The repetition of statements such as “*We will stand firm*”, “*We will not give up*”, “*Together to victory*”, “*Victory will be ours*”, “*Everyone on their own front*”, “*Strong together*”, “*Free people of a free country*” creates an effect of stability and confidence even in the absence of new facts or arguments. Similarly, slogans such as “*Glory to Ukraine! Glory to the heroes!*” and “*Ukraine above all*” have become markers of collective identity through constant repetition in the media, social networks and official speeches, functioning as emotional signals of belonging to the community, almost without requiring conscious reflection. Similar mechanisms can be observed in Russian propaganda discourse, where slogans such as “*We don't abandon our own*”, “*For the Motherland*”, “*We are together*”, “*For the truth*”, “*Russia doesn't betray its own*”, “*For peace*”, “*Historical justice*”, “*We defend Donbas*” through systematic repetition normalise the given narrative, reduce the need for critical analysis of messages and contribute to the consolidation of the dominant interpretation of the war, while narrowing the space for alternative readings.

An essential element of simplification in military discourse is the **metaphorisation of war**, which allows complex political, military and ethical processes to be represented through images that are understandable at the level of everyday experience. In Ukrainian public discourse, war is often conceptualised through morally charged metaphors such as “*the struggle between light and darkness*”, “*defence of the homeland*”, “*defence of one's own land*”, “*the path to victory*” and “*a test for the nation*”. Such images shift the war from the realm of geopolitics to that of ethical choice and existential necessity, where “*light*”, “*home*” and “*path*” have clearly positive connotations and require no further explanation.

The metaphor of home is also common, evoking images of family, security, and personal

responsibility. Phrases such as “*We are defending our home*”, “*War has come to our home*” and “*Our home must stand*” personalise the war and make it emotionally relevant even to those who are not directly involved in the fighting. Similarly, the metaphor of the path (“*It’s a long road*”, “*We are on the path to victory*”, “*Every step brings us closer to victory*”) creates an image of gradualness and the inevitability of a positive outcome, reducing the feeling of uncertainty.

In Russian propaganda discourse, metaphorisation takes on a different semantic direction. The war is described through metaphors such as “*purification*”, “*protective shield*”, “*historic mission*”, “*restoration of justice*” and “*fight against the threat*”. For example, phrases such as “*cleansing the territory*”, “*putting up a shield against the West*” and “*fulfilling a historical destiny*” remove individual responsibility for violence, as they represent war as an impersonal, almost natural process or as the fulfilment of a higher historical necessity.

**Appeals to emotions**, primarily fear, pride and a sense of existential threat, are actively used as one of the most effective mechanisms for simplifying military discourse. Messages about “*existential danger*”, “*threats to the very existence of the state*”, “*war for survival*” or, conversely, “*historic chance for victory*” are aimed not at rational understanding of the situation, but at an immediate emotional response from the audience. Such formulas activate basic instincts of self-preservation and collective solidarity, significantly reducing the willingness to critically analyse information.

Instead of an analytical description of the causes, course and consequences of military events, the media often uses personalised or dramatised statements that appeal to empathy and moral choice. Phrases such as “*We are fighting for the lives of our children*”, “*Every day of this war is pain*”, “*This is a war that takes away the future*” and “*This is the price we pay for freedom*” are common. Such statements do not contain specific facts, but they create a powerful emotional backdrop within which any doubts or alternative interpretations may be perceived as morally unacceptable.

Personal testimonies, which take on a generalised character and function as symbols of war, are also indicative. Phrases such as “*I am not a soldier; I am a doctor. But in this war, it is*

*one and the same thing,*” “*I am a teacher, but now I am a volunteer,*” and “*We just wanted to live, but we were forced to fight*” circulate in the media space as markers of collective experience that blur the line between civilian and military. Through such statements, war appears not as a political or strategic process, but as a total personal challenge for everyone.

Appeals to pride and moral superiority also play an important role in shaping the emotional background. Phrases such as “*We are strong because we are together*”, “*We cannot be broken*” and “*We have proven to the whole world*” construct a positive self-identification of the community and reinforce the willingness to accept simplified explanations of complex events. Taken together, these emotional strategies shift the war from the realm of rational analysis to that of moral experience, which significantly increases the regulatory and manipulative potential of simple language in military discourse.

The use of **abstract categories in the form of slogans** occupies a special place in military discourse. The concepts of “*freedom*”, “*security*”, “*victory*”, “*justice*”, “*peace*” and “*responsibility*” often lack clear meaning, allowing political actors to flexibly adapt them to different communicative and strategic situations. In such cases, words function not as analytical categories, but as symbols with positive or mobilising connotations that automatically elicit support from the audience.

For example, the phrase “*the fight for security*” can be used to legitimise both defensive and offensive actions without specifying their nature, scale or consequences. Similarly, the slogan “*we are fighting for freedom*” does not specify whose freedom is at stake, by what means it is to be achieved, or what its price is. The media regularly features generalised statements such as “*This is a war for justice*”, “*We are on the side of truth*” and “*Our goal is peace*”, which appeal to universal values but ignore specific political decisions or actions.

The abstract nature of such categories creates an effect of semantic openness, whereby the audience independently fills the slogans with the meaning they desire, based on emotions, previous experience or the dominant narrative. At the same time, this relieves the speaker of the responsibility to clearly formulate their position and complicates the possibility of critical dis-

cussion. Criticism of slogans such as “*victory will be ours*” or “*we are for peace*” in such discourse is easily interpreted as a denial of basic values rather than an attempt at rational analysis.

Thus, the use of abstract categories in the form of slogans is an effective tool for simplifying the reality of war: it masks the complexity of political and military processes, shifts the discussion to the realm of symbols and values, and enhances the manipulative potential of simple language in shaping public opinion.

In general, these techniques demonstrate that war in public discourse is constructed as **a narrative of simplicity**, in which complex reality is replaced by understandable, emotionally charged patterns that facilitate mass perception and contribute to the manipulation of public opinion. Through binary oppositions, sloganeering, repetition and emotional appeal, it simplifies the complex reality of war, while reinforcing its narrative controllability.

***The impact of simplified language on shaping public opinion and emotional reactions of the audience in a military context.***

In a military context, simplified language serves as a cognitive and emotional guide that helps the audience quickly interpret events in conditions of information instability. During Russia’s full-scale war against Ukraine, this function is realised through linguistic formulas that appeal to basic notions of security, justice and collective responsibility.

One manifestation of the influence of simplified language is **the construction of an image of inevitability and historical determinism of events**. In media discourse, statements such as “*We had no other choice*” or “*This is a war for the very existence of the state*” are often heard. Such formulas remove the need to discuss alternative scenarios and shape public opinion about war as the only possible response to external threats.

Simplified language is also actively used **to create a sense of moral certainty**. Political statements and news headlines feature phrases such as “*The world must know the truth,*” “*This is clearly a crime,*” and “*There can be no two opinions here*”. Such statements appeal not to reasoning, but to the moral intuition of the audience, forming a clear distinction between “*right*” and “*wrong*” without the need for rational justification.

An important element is **the appeal to everyday experience**, which reduces the distance

between war and civilian life. Phrases such as “*Everyone is fighting on their own front*” or “*This is a war that has affected every family*” are widespread in the media. Such statements integrate the war narrative into everyday reality and contribute to the emotional involvement of even those who have no direct military experience.

Separate attention should be paid to **the simplified understanding of time in military discourse**. Phrases such as “*We will always remember this*”, “*This day will go down in history*” and “*This is the moment that defines us*” are often used. Such statements create a sense of historical exceptionalism of the current moment and heighten emotional tension, shaping public opinion about the special significance of each event.

Simplified language also influences **emotional reactions by generalising losses and suffering**. In news reports, one can find phrases such as “*The price of freedom is too high*” or “*We are paying a terrible price*”. They do not specify the scale or nature of the losses, but they create a powerful emotional effect that promotes collective experience and solidarity.

In addition, simplified language is often used **to calm and stabilise the emotional state of the audience**. Official statements include phrases such as “*The situation is difficult but under control*” or “*We are holding our ground.*” Such phrases minimise anxiety, even if they are not accompanied by detailed explanations, and create a sense of control over the situation in public opinion.

Thus, the examples show that simplified language in a military context has a complex effect: it simultaneously explains, mobilises, calms and morally guides the audience. It is through these simple, often aphoristic formulas that the emotional reaction of society is formed and the dominant interpretation of war is reinforced, confirming the high regulatory and manipulative potential of simple language in contemporary military discourse.

**Conclusions.** Simple language in military discourse is not only a tool for informing, but also a powerful mechanism for regulating public perception. It ensures the accessibility of messages, shapes moral and emotional frameworks, and promotes rapid assimilation of information, which is especially important in the crisis conditions of full-scale war.

The manipulative potential of simple formulas is manifested through the use of binary

oppositions (“*us vs. them*”, “*heroes vs. enemies*”), lexical simplicity, slogans, repetition, and emotional coloring. An analysis of real media and political messages during Russia’s war against Ukraine shows that such strategies are aimed at forming a clear moral and cognitive model of events in the minds of the audience.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) reveals the multi-level effect of simple language at the textual level – the use of short sentences, aphoristic formulas, and evaluative vocabulary; at the discursive level – repetition and normalisation of certain narratives; at the social level – the legitimisation of actions and decisions, the consolidation of society and the formation of dominant public opinion.

The influence on public opinion and emotions manifests itself in the rapid construction of collective assessments, mobilisation of the audience, and strengthening of solidarity and

empathy, but at the same time limits the space for critical analysis of events. Simplified language forms stable cognitive and emotional patterns, making society susceptible to dominant narratives.

Empirical data and examples from Ukrainian media and political messages confirm that simple language is used consciously and systematically: short slogans, catchphrases, repetitive formulas, and the personalisation of war integrate the war narrative into the everyday experience of citizens and stimulate emotional reactions.

In general, *the narrative of simplicity in a military context* is an effective means of managing information and public opinion, shaping perceptions of war as a morally understandable and emotionally conscious phenomenon. This highlights the need for critical reflection on linguistic strategies in political discourse and the media, especially during wartime, when their impact on society is extremely significant.

### Bibliography:

1. Goffman E. *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Harvard University Press. 1974. 586 pp.
2. Lakoff G. *Don’t think of an elephant: Know your values and frame the debate*. Chelsea Green Publishing. 2004. 124 pp.
3. Fairclough N. *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Routledge. 2010. DOI: 608 pp. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315834368>.
4. Van Dijk, T.A. *Discourse and power*. Palgrave Macmillan. 2008. 308 pp. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-07299-3>.
5. Labov W. *Sociolinguistic patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press. 1972. 344 pp.
6. Hymes D. *Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life*. In: Gumperz, J.J. and Dell, H., Eds., *Direction in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1972. pp. 35–71.
7. Bernstein B. *Class, codes and control: Vol. 1. Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language (2nd ed.)*. Routledge. 2003. 212 pp.
8. Irvine J.T. “Style” as distinctiveness: The culture and ideology of linguistic differentiation. In P. Eckert, & J. Rickford (Eds.), *Style and sociolinguistic variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2001. pp. 21–43.
9. Pfetsch B., Esser F. *Comparing Political Communication*. In F. Esser & T. Hanitzsch (Eds.), *Handbook of Comparative Communication Research*. London: Routledge. 2012. pp. 25–47. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203149102>.
10. Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. / Transl. by W. Rhys Roberts. Dover Publications. 2004. 171 pp.
11. Burke K. *A Grammar of Motives*. University of California Press. 1966. 530 pp.
12. Perelman C., Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. *The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation*. University of Notre Dame Press. 1969. 565 pp.
13. Kennedy G.A. *Classical rhetoric and its Christian and secular tradition from ancient to modern times*. University of North Carolina Press. 1999. 345 pp.
14. Vatz R.E. The myth of the rhetorical situation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 6(3). 1973. pp. 154–161.

### References:

1. Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Harvard University Press.
2. Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don’t think of an elephant!: Know your values and frame the debate*. Chelsea Green Publishing.

3. Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315834368>
4. Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and power*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-07299-3>
5. Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
6. Hymes, D. (1972) *Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life*. In: Gumperz, J.J. and Dell, H., Eds., *Direction in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication* (pp. 35–71). Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
7. Bernstein, B. (2003). *Class, codes and control: Vol. 1. Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
8. Irvine, J. T. (2001). “Style” as distinctiveness: *The culture and ideology of linguistic differentiation*. In P. Eckert, & J. Rickford (Eds.), *Style and sociolinguistic variation* (pp. 21–43). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
9. Pfetsch, B., & Esser, F. (2012). *Comparing Political Communication*. In F. Esser & T. Hanitzsch (Eds.), *Handbook of Comparative Communication Research* (pp. 25–47). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203149102>
10. Aristotle, (2004). *Rhetoric*. /Transl. by W. Rhys Roberts. Dover Publications, 171 pp.
11. Burke, K. (1966). *A grammar of motives*. University of California Press.
12. Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). *The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation*. University of Notre Dame Press.
13. Kennedy, G. A. (1999). *Classical rhetoric and its Christian and secular tradition from ancient to modern times*. University of North Carolina Press.
14. Vatz, R. E. (1973). *The myth of the rhetorical situation*. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 6(3) (pp. 154–161).

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 01.01.2026

Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 21.01.2026

Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 15.04.2026