

ІСТОРИЯ ТА МЕТОДОЛОГІЯ ЖУРНАЛІСТИКИ

УДК 070.23:81'27(477.64)"1920/1940"

«TOTALITARIAN LANGUAGE» AS A COMMUNICATION TECHNIQUE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PSEUDO REALITY (BASED ON THE REGIONAL PRESS OF THE 20-40^S OF 20TH CENTURY)

Iryna Bondarenko

*Zaporizhzhya National University
Zhukovsky Str. 66, 69600, Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine
e-mail: Lystopad.iryana@gmail.com*

The study is to show how cognitive components were represented in the ideology influenced Soviet linguistic worldview. It also looks at the patterns in the development of newspaper discourse in the period of totalitarian rule. For the first time ever, the press of Zaporizhzhya region becomes the object of linguistic analysis.

Key words: discourse, totalitarian language, stereotype, technique, manipulation.

In the historical paradigm of social and cultural models of Ukrainian journalism the system of totalitarian press can be described in terms of ideological monopoly, political dictatorship, unified forms and methods of activities of all communication channels, manipulative nature of its techniques. Being the main tool of Communist propaganda, Party Soviet journalism throughout a long time of its functioning created specific lingual system, i.e. «newspeak» (M. Glowinski), «sociolect» (E. Khan-Pira), «totalitarian language» (N. Kupina). The effect of its verbal manipulation mechanisms (especially political euphemism, periphrasis, language stereotypes, ideologeme, lexical desemantization) provided structuration of «mass» consciousness of the society/ individual and thus reconstruction of the inner world of a person. According to many researchers, the mass-man as a product of mosaic culture was in a large measure created by the press due to the fact that social value orientations verbalized in the mass communication texts acquired mass character of expression and thus constructed an appropriate axiological and world view dominance of a «Soviet» personality.

At the period of totalitarianism mass media discourse borders with political discourse. Conceptual lexis of political language becomes lexical, semantic and expressive nucleus of the lingual sphere of press. It is the conceptual lexis that creates general linguistic worldview from the one hand and specific publicistic discourse of the epoch from the other thanks to its main sphere of functioning and production. This sphere comprises texts of informative and analytical genres that not only reflect ideological, political and social slant of the newspaper, but also acquire particular stylistic colouring (social evaluation) in the given historical context.

The process of publicistic discourse formation at the totalitarian age was rather rapid. The analysis of the press materials shows that at the beginning of the 30-s of the 20th century the language of Ukrainian newspaper had already turned into conventional, heartless, clichéd, ritualized medium, «sociolect».

The aim of the article is to identify common development trends of lexical and stylistic features of the Party-Soviet press in general on the basis of the lingual material of the press of Zaporizhzhya region and to analyze the representation techniques of cognitive components of Soviet ideological linguistic worldview.

The works of such Ukrainian and foreign media linguists as M. Krongaus, B. Norman, B. Potiatnyk, O. Serbenska, G. Solganik, I. Stetsula, O. Vasilieva are significant contributions to the research on how language functions in totalitarian societies.

The subject matter of the research is that segment of publicistic discourse in the press of Zaporizhzhya region which determined linguistic and genre characteristics of the newspaper language of the following decades. In the modern linguistics this language is usually defined as *totalitarian* along with some other definitions, e.g. «ritual language», «quasi-language», «the language of power», «the language of deception», «wooden language» (from French *langue de bois*), «newspeak».

In the aggregate, all these terms define the enormous lingual massif that was mutilated by the continual processes of clichéing and desemantization during the time of Soviet Power.

However, the problem of the linguistic status of «totalitarian language» is still under discussion. Thus, M. Krongaus thinks that the «Soviet language» is a «totalitarian language», but emphasizes that it is «a separate and independent language».

Yet, most researchers are reluctant to qualify this phenomenon as a language. From the prospective of E. Han-Pira «without having its own phonological and grammatical system, this phenomenon cannot be called a language. It is a lexical and grammatical system, a sociolect, a class jargon. Unlike other sociolects, this one is 1) formal and imposed; 2) integrated into formal and scientific (publicistic – I.B.) styles of the literary language [10, p. 16-17]. In view of this, the use of term «totalitarian» in the article is conventional.

Publicistic discourse of the press of Zaporizhzhya region in the 30s-40s of 20th century represents complex processes of clichéing, ideologization, desemantization and ritualization of newspaper language. It was the time when the journalistic text was saturated with numerous euphemisms (mostly social and political ones) and periphrastic expressions, units of «verbal magic» [1, p.19-39], which were used with the aim of lingual manipulation.

G. Solganik thinks that the 1930s-1940s was the time of «conservation» in the language of newspapers when the language and speech means and rules were set, turning dogmatic and unshakable in all spheres of language life and behavior. These changes resulted in the overabundance of language and speech clichés, domination of literary lexicon to the detriment of the conversations one, prevalence of official narrative» [7, c. 49].

O. Serbenska characterizes this chronological period of lingual uniformity and standardization as «a completely separate, completed in time and space historical stage in the development of Ukrainian periodicals in particular and in the national culture as a whole» [6, p. 16]. According to the researcher, it was the time when «the word, and especially the newspaper and publicistic word, «oppressed people, suppressed their intellectual abilities to cognize and represent reality, accumulated distinctive repressive force and therefore imposed a certain point of view and its interpretation» [6, p. 69].

To these conclusions it must be added, that the role of various slogans, clichés and stereotypes becomes most apparent in the process of forming values, viewpoints and ideological attitudes of those with poor education and low level of culture.

For this very reason these linguistic devices helped to set up the dictatorship of the proletariat so quickly and efficiently on the territory of the new «country of socialist prosperity» (*The Chervone Zaporizhzhya*. – 1935. – 1 September. – P. 1), turning its multinational population into the unified mass.

In the research of linguistic and stylistic aspects of press in the totalitarian period the term **stock phrase** along with its synonymic doublets *template*, *stencil*, which O. Serbenska sees as «universal categories» and «attributes of platitude and mediocrity of the newspaper language when it comes to its analysis» [6, p. 20], are the most common to designate fixed in the language practice reproducible linguistic units. Although these concepts belong to the same terminological paradigm, they define somewhat different language (*cliché*), speech (*stock phrase*), social and psychological (*stereotype*) phenomena; in linguistics **stereotype** is used as a unifying category for these concepts.

Stereotype is usually defined as a schematic standardized image or idea related mostly to social processes and phenomena. A stereotype involves some social or individual experience as well as a system of formed and set up in a social practice viewpoints that evoke standard behavioral responses in most people, ensure stability (normally under sound social and cultural conditions) of a system (political, ideological, economic, lingual, etc.). A stereotype is characterized by its evocative power and persistence in specific chronological boundaries.

Analyzing the press of the totalitarian period and its reflection of the one-way standardization of the way of people's thinking, R. Zobov observes that there are some «quite specific groups of stereotypes represented, whereas those that contradict them are being ignored. This selection was conducted with the help of numerous prohibitions (ranged from warnings and means of ideological influence to execution of people-carriers of undesirable stereotypes). Consequently, the one-sided, unilateral approach to reality was formed, which resulted in considerable changes in all spheres of human social life» [2, p. 69].

For this reason a certain social stereotype, or rather ideological one in the context of totalitarian society, with its mandatory evocative (imperative, aggressive) element gave rise to the language stereotypes/clichés → speech stock phrases (perception stamps) in the form of numerous slogans. I. Stetsula's words are worth quoting here: «This tendency to sacralize political and ideology theses induced the overload of slogans in the political discourse of mass communication (besides being in the texts, slogans were also used as epigraphs, banners and headlines)» [8, p. 48].

Having mandatory, although quite vague, information (political slogans had to impose the new worldview) such stereotypical language units due to the difficulties in expressing of their denotative meaning contained the evocative component: the political stereotype was stylized by means of euphemisms, periphrases, slang words, colloquialisms, vulgarisms (as comparisons and epithets).

Thanks to these information load and expressiveness we can see political slogans as language stereotypes/clichés. O. Serbenska is of the same opinion saying that «a social stereotype determines the use of relevant linguistic devices and evaluations. Being a product of essentially mythological type of thinking, it contains information and thus differs from a stock phrase» [6, p.114].

In the press of Zaporizhzhya region in the 1930s-1940s political clichés were able to transform themselves into metaphors: socio-political conceptual lexis of a political = publicistic discourse of totalitarian times was a kind of a figurative and evocative center of gravity of the new lexical semantic components which led to such new political metaphors as *хребет пролетарської диктатури* / *the spine of proletarian dictatorship* (The Chervone Zaporizhzhya. – 1930. – 8 October. – P. 1); *залізо пролетарської диктатури* / *the iron of proletarian dictatorship* (The Stepova Komuna. – 1930. – 26 April. – P. 1); *лабета економічної кризи* / *the trap of economic crisis* (The Stepova Komuna. – 1930. – 23 July. – P. 2); *лещата світової кризи* / *the hammerlock of global crisis* (The Chervone Zaporizhzhya. – 1930. – 10 April. – P. 1); *сонце Сталінської конституції* / *the sun of Stalin's Constitution* (The Chervone Zaporizhzhya. – 1949. – 18 December. – P. 2); *прапор марксо-ленінської теорії* / *the banner of the Marxist-Leninist Theory* (The Proletariat Dniprobudu. – 1932. – 21 January. – P. 1); *весна колективізації* / *the spring of collectivization* (The Chervone Zaporizhzhya. – 1930. – 26 June. – P. 1); *струмінь соціалістичного наступу* / *the current of socialist advancement* (The Chervone Zaporizhzhya. – 1930. – 26 June. – P. 1); political metaphors were also often used in the names of newspapers, which not once repeated themselves even in Zaporizhzhya region: «*Прапор соціалізму*» / *The Banner of Socialism*, «*Прапор комунізму*» / *The Banner of Communism*, «*Зоря комуні*» / *The Dawn of Commune*, «*Колгоспна зоря*» / *The Dawn of Collective Farm*, «*Ленінська зірка*» / *The Lenin's Star*.

In the 1930s-1940s the political standard became a ritual and took the form of a euphemism or periphrasis (both quite similar devices), which often distorted (veiled, disguised) the meaning of certain concepts of sociopolitical processes by expressing and duplicating their semantics, becoming a powerful tool for manipulation of social consciousness and behavior.

Euphemism is traditionally understood as «a word or expression used for indirect, hidden, often softened, polite denotation of certain things, phenomena and actions instead of their direct names» [9, p.154]. We think that in this regard the process of euphemisation is to some extent related to the one of nomination since the object, which is not named directly for ethical, cultural, psychological or, finally, political reasons, requires a euphemistic designation under these circumstances. Renewal of naming units is caused by the necessity to veil or soften again and again the essence of something that is considered to be obscene, embarrassing or improper in a cultural society.

Along with magic and superstitious, cryptic and masking, modifying and ameliorative, farcical and ironic use of these linguo-sylyctic units, they also have a political and ideological function in some social contexts. Moreover, the stricter the social control of different language situations is, the more favourable are the conditions for thriving of the new and numerous, mostly political and ideological euphemistic expressions, as the language policy of local press in the totalitarian period shows.

If we look at the ways how euphemisms for stylistically neutral lexeme *національну* / *national* can be formed, we will be able to single out the following methods: 1) by means of substituting one word with another semantically related: «*Націоналістичний напрямок в проповіді, захоплення національними темами, національними мотивами, національними почуттями, намаганнями, національний тон – все це було виявами націоналістичного напрямку*» / «*Nationalistic direction of the sermon, fascination with national subjects, national motives, national feelings, aspirations, national tune –*

all of this was the manifestation of nationalistic direction» (The Stepova Komuna. – 1930. – 2 March. – P. 3); 2) by means of forming the words with different motivation, different inner form and the new meaning based on numerous associations: a) by means of antiphrasis (worse instead of better) *антирадянський, контрреволюційний*: «Тому в перші роки радвлади ВУАН правила за центр залучення і організатора активних елементів української *контрреволюційної* інтелігенції» / «For this reason during the first years of Soviet power NASU was a center of enlistment and an organizer of active elements of Ukrainian *counter-revolutionary* intellectuals» (The Stepova Komuna. 1930. – 2 March. – P. 3); «Інарак проводив шкідництво в складанні українських словників, відкидаючи інтернаціональні слова і перетворюючи українські словники на зброю *шовіністичного* виховання мас» / «*Inarak committed acts of sabotage while compiling dictionaries by rejecting international words and turning the Ukrainian language into the weapon of chauvinistic education of the populace*» (The Chervone Zaporizhzhya. – 1930. – 12 March. – P. 2); b) метонімічного методу *жовтоблакитиний, петлюрівський, petlyurivskyy / Petluraist* («З одного боку класовий ворог (мається на увазі СВУ – І.Б.) намагається сіяти настрої великодержавного російського шовінізму, з другого – *жовтоблакитного* (написання згідно документу – І.Б.), *петлюрівського*...») / «*On the one hand the class enemy is trying to create the mood of great-power Russian chauvinism, on the other hand of yellow-blue, Petluraist one*» (The Chervone Zaporizhzhya. – 1930. – 17 June. – P. 2).

The metaphorical euphemism *чистка / purge* was quite common in the local press in the 1930s-1940s to designate repressive, punitive actions towards party members and nonpartisans: «Парторганізація *відчистившись* від ворожого та негідного елементу ...» / «The party organization having *purged* itself from enemies end rascals...» (The Student-Udarnyk. – 1930. – 30 June. – P. 1); alongside this nomination its semantically identical euphemistic form (which is also metaphor-based) *зривати маішку / strip away the mask*: ... «Спокійно, не підозрюючи, що тут *маішка* з його обличчя буде зірвано, подав він партквиток...» / «Calm and unaware that *the mask would be stripped away from his face*, he delivered the party membership card...» (The Chervone Zaporizhzhya. – 1935. – 26 September. – P. 3).

The concept of a person who suffered political oppression had a wide range of euphemistic designations – *ворог народу / enemy of the people, класовий ворог / class enemy, ворожий елемент / enemy element, троцькіст / Trotskyist, опортуніст / opportunist, зрадник народу / traitor of the people, двурушник / double dealer* (anti-phrasal euphemisms based on the substitution of an undesired name with its negative equivalent).

In the times of «cultivating of denunciation» the newspapers front pages were riddled with such euphemisms as *самокритика / self-criticism, сигнал / signal, висування / promotion (vysuvanets' / promotee, vysuvaty / promote), класова пильність / class vigilance*: «Це примушує нас ще раз *сигналізувати* нашим парторганізаціям потребу максимальної *класової пильності, нашірошеності*, вміння своєчасно і *принципово-політично реагувати*...» / «Once again it makes us *signal* to our party organizations the need of class *vigilance, alertness*, ability to *respond* timely and *in accordance with political principles*» (The Chervone Zaporizhzhya. – 1930. – 24 November. – P. 1).

Periphrases were also common in the press of Zaporizhzhya region. Being grossly overused, they turned into stock phrases, e.g., «Тут будується *серце індустрії, електричне серце України – Дніпрельстан*» / «Here *the heart of industry, the electrical*

*heart of Ukraine is being built which is Dniprelstan»; «Dniprelstan – dytyna revolyutsiyi» / «Dniprelstan is the child of revolution» (The Stepova Komuna. – 1930. – 11 April. – P. 3); «Преса – могутня зброя в руках пролетаріату» / «Press is a powerful weapon in the hands of proletariat» (The Chervone Zaporizhzhya. – 1930. – 12 January. – P. 1). The greatest percentage of figurative and descriptive nominations referred to *Stalin's personality*, e.g., «провідир партії та робітничого класу» / «the leader of the party and the working class» (The Proletar Dinprobudu. – 1932. – 21 January. – P. 1); «Світоч життя» / «Lantern of life» (The Chervone Zaporizhzhya. – 1947. – 21 January. – P. 1); «досвідчений керманіч» / «experienced steersman» (The Chervone Zaporizhzhya. – 1949. – 26 April. – P. 1); «кращий лєнінець, мудріший із мудрих, перший вчитель і кращий друг народу» / «the best Leninist, the wisest of the wise» (The Chervone Zaporizhzhya. – 1947. – 21 December. – P. 1); «творець найдемократичнішої в світі Конституції, мудрий вождь і вчитель» / «the founder of the most democratic constitution in the world, the wise chief and the teacher» (The Chervone Zaporizhzhya. – 1949. – 21 December. – P. 1).*

Euphemistic antiphrasis *вороги народу / the enemies of the people* was accompanied with such standard periphrastic characteristics as «підлі подонки людства», «підлі виродки троцькістсько-зінов'євської банди» / «villainous monsters of the Trotsky-Zinoviev gang», «троцькістсько-зінов'євські терористи» / «the Trotsky-Zinoviev terrorists» (The Chervone Zaporizhzhya. – 1935. – 26 September. – P. 1); «мерзенна шайка троцькістсько-бухарінських шпигунів» / «the blackguardly mob of Trotsky-Bukharin spies», «антирадянська наволоч» / «anti-Soviet rascals» (The Chervone Zaporizhzhya. – 1937. – 3 July. – P. 1); «презренні камі» / «scurvy butchers» (The Chervone Zaporizhzhya. – 1936. – 21 March. – P. 1).

Naturally, various political and ideological slogans as well as clichés sooner or later lose their information and expressive value (quite often under the influence of extralingual factors or the excessive repetition of some set expressions) and move into the realm of stock phrases. Performing definite informative and expressive function in the text, numerous language clichés of the 1930s structured and cultivated the ideological stereotypes (mostly the false ones) in the social consciousness thus facilitating the acceptance of personal dictatorship with its command and bureaucratic management methods. In the 1940s they were perceived as stock phrases devoid of any connotative and denotative meanings. It resulted in the extremely minimal communicativeness of journalistic texts.

Noteworthy in this regard is B. Potiatnyk's point of view: «The ritual function reflected loyalty to the governing regime, came to the fore. As for communicative and informative text features, they became secondary, even symbolic. Thus, we can say we deal with quasi-communicative texts» [5, p. 27].

One more specific feature of the language of Zaporizhzhian press in the 1930s-1940s was desemantization of its lexis. It showed itself as an ability of some key lexemes of the political discourse with indefinite meaning to become synonyms in certain contexts which led to semantic shift and to consequent semantic change. M. Krongaus notes that «words of the ritual language often lose just a part of their meaning, but not all of it, saving or even gaining evaluative connotation (positive or negative). Hence we have a long chain of synonyms or «quasi-synonyms» that do not usually function this way in everyday language» [3].

G. Solganik is in agreement with P. Sériot that this process can be called «compound-ing» and explains that «in the process of compounding two or more concepts, which in everyday discourse (outside of political one) are not synonyms, are combined either with

the help of the linking word «and» or without it, e.g., *party, people – party and people...* As a result of this procedure we have a semantic paradox, i.e., a lot of concepts became synonymic which gives the impression of their real correlation, of their identity, for example, party – people – CC – government – state – communists – Soviet people» [7, p. 48].

This example shows the way how to create «ideological phantoms» (M. Krongaus), i.e., words-mythogenes that cultivated and supported certain social illusions by designating either factitious or non-existent referent. Thus, the language creator who speaks about the Ukrainian holiday and, in essence, about the Ukrainian national identity, peremptorily associates the Ukrainian people with *the Russian people* and *all the peoples of the Soviet Union* as well as synonymic concepts of *our Motherland* and the *Soviet state* took place of the concept *Ukraine*.

The period of the 1930s-1940s in the newspaper language of Zaporizhzhya region (and the Soviet state in general) had a ritualized character when numerous set words and expressions, phrases and even whole lexical blocks of micro texts in the newspaper discourse were devoid of the informative element and thus did not contribute to revealing the truth and became dysfunctional. These processes were accelerated by desemantization (when words meanings were broadened and lexemes became universal categories), clichéing (when a word lost its denotative and connotative meanings), euphemization (when the meaning of the concept was disguised by a desirable verbal formula).

REFERENCES

1. Vasil'ev, O. (2000). A word on the televisional ether: essays on the newest usage in Russian television broadcasting, Sibirskij juridicheskij institut MVD Rossii, Krasnoyarsk, 167 p. (Print).
2. Zobov, R. (1992). The problem of stereotype in the media, Zhurnalist. Pressa. Auditorija, Edition 4, Ed. I. Lysakova, Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo universiteta, Leningrad, pp. 62-73. (Print).
3. Kronhauz, M. (1994). The disability of language in the era of mature socialism, Fol'klor i postfol'klor: struktura, tipologija, semiotika, available at: <http://www.ruthenia.ru/folklore/krongauz1.htm>.
4. Kupina, N. (1995). Totalitarian Language: Dictionary and Speech Reactions, Izdatel'stvo Ural'skoho universiteta, Ekaterinburg, Perm, 144 p. (Print).
5. Potyatynyk, B. (1991). Total journalism: Text of lecture, Redaktsiyno-vydavnychyy viddil, Lviv, 1991, 80 p. (Print).
6. Serbens'ka, O. (1991). The language of the newspaper and the journalist's discourse in the aspect of socio-cultural development of society, D.Sc. diss. (philol. sci.), Institute of Journalism, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, 419 c. (Print).
7. Solganik, G. (2002). On the regularities of the development of the language of the newspaper in the twentieth century, Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta, series Journalism, no. 2, pp. 74-84. (Print).
8. Stetsula, I. (1994). Political discourse of mass communication: transformation of pragmalinguistic parameters of functioning (on the material of the Ukrainian press), PhD diss. (philol. sci.), Institute of Journalism, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, 167 p. (Print).

9. Ukrainian language. Encyclopedia (2000), Ed. V. M. Rusanivs'kyy, NAN Ukrayiny, In-t movoznavstva im. O. O. Potebni, In-t ukr. Movy, Kyiv: Ukrayins'ka entsyklopediya im. M. P. Bazhana, 752 p. (Print).
10. Khan-Pira, E. (1991). Language of authority and language authority, Vestnik Akademii nauk SSSR, Volume 4, pp. 12-25. (Print).
11. Glowinski, M. (1990). Nowomowa po polsku, PEN, Warszawa, 149 p.

«ТОТАЛІТАРНА МОВА» ЯК КОМУНІКАЦІЙНА ТЕХНІКА КОНСТРУЮВАННЯ ПСЕВДОРЕАЛЬНОСТІ (НА МАТЕРІАЛАХ РЕГІОНАЛЬНОЇ ПРЕСИ 20–40-х рр. ХХ ст.)

Ірина Бондаренко

*Запорізький національний університет,
вул. Жуковського, 66, 69600, Запоріжжя, Україна
e-mail: Lystopad.iryna@gmail.com*

У статті проаналізовано засоби репрезентації когнітивних компонентів радянської ідеологічної мовної картини світу, досліджено специфіку процесу формування газетно-публіцистичного дискурсу періоду тоталітаризму. Уперше преса запорізького регіону стає об'єктом лінгвістичного аналізу, причому визначені на його основі характерні ознаки публіцистичного дискурсу місцевої періодики проектується на виявлення динаміки розвитку лексико-стилістичної специфіки партійно-радянської (тоталітарної) журналістики в цілому. У статті проаналізовано газетну мову (ширше – мову ЗМІ) як складний лінгвальний, мовленнєвий (дискурсивний) та соціокультурний феномен, специфіка функціонування якого координується, з одного боку, станом і практикою національної мови в конкретний період, з іншого – певними соціальними, політичними, економічними умовами. Будучи своєрідним суспільним і лінгвальним продуктом, мова ЗМІ є важливим механізмом когнітивних та психологічних процесів індивіда/соціуму. Об'єктом аналізу нашого дослідження стає місцева газетна журналістика 20-х – 40-х рр. ХХ ст. Саме у цей час відбувається кардинальна зміна типологічної структури місцевої преси – це період становлення, формування нового типу однопартійно-радянської періодики, яка репрезентує нові типи газетно-журнальних видань. Тексти інформаційної й аналітичної груп газетних текстів, що склали жанрове ядро газетних видань, найбільш повно відтворювали еволюційні зміни в системі публіцистичного мовлення зазначеного періоду. Концептуальні слова (суспільно-політичні), які становлять лексичну доміанту названих жанрових груп, відтворюють ідеологічну, політичну спрямованість тоталітарної журналістики в цілому. Саме концептуальна лексика формує і визначає загальні стилістичні характеристики публіцистичного дискурсу, зміни ж у її структурі ведуть до еволюційних процесів у системі газетного мовлення.

Ключові слова: дискурс, тоталітарна мова, стереотип, технологія маніпулювання.