

УДК 811.1/9

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/54-1-22>

Olha HAVRYLIUK,

orcid.org/0000-0002-0365-3248

Candidate of Philological Sciences,

*Associate Professor at the Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication
Educational and Scientific Institute of Philology of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
(Kyiv, Ukraine) oliagavr@gmail.com*

Larysa PAVLICHENKO,

orcid.org/0000-0003-3801-2587

Candidate of Philological Sciences,

*Associate Professor at the Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication
Educational and Scientific Institute of Philology of Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
(Kyiv, Ukraine) la.pavlichenko@gmail.com*

DIPLOMACY: LINGUISTIC TENDENCIES DURING THE WAR IN UKRAINE

Today diplomacy plays an important role in international communication, it is shaped by changes in global geopolitics.

Different approaches to the definition of diplomatic discourse are regarded in the article. Its genre varieties are highlighted. Diplomatic discourse plays an essential role in the settlement of international disputes and aims to inform and motivate the audience to take active action. The leading trends in the functioning of modern English-language diplomatic discourse are studied and defined. The texts of the official statements of European leaders such as the president of Ukraine, the president of Germany, the representatives of European Union and NATO dedicated to Russian-Ukrainian relations are taken to study. The main functions of diplomatic discourse are the transmission of necessary information, formation of value orientations and attitudes, encouragement to necessary action, influence to change motivation, attitudes, behavior, consolidation and maintenance of conventional relations. Linguistic means to achieve above mentioned goals in diplomatic statements are singled out. Analysis of the official statements of world leaders regarding the Russian-Ukrainian war confirms the active use of stylistic devices. They enhance the emotionality of speech, give expressiveness to the business style of diplomatic speeches. Due to metaphors and metonymy, the strategy of influencing the addressee, typical for diplomatic discourse, is realized.

According to the analysis of public speeches on the international arena, the speeches of Volodymyr Zelensky, the president of the country with ongoing war, is significantly different from the diplomatic speeches of world leaders. The emotionality, diversity and richness of the speech is significant. All the linguistic means call on focusing attention to the ongoing tragedy, war, military invasion, violence and sufferings in Ukraine. Nowadays various meaningful nominations for Ukraine are used by diplomatic actors in their speeches.

Key words: *discourse, diplomacy, diplomatic discourse, communication, international communication, stylistic means.*

Ольга ГАВРИЛЮК,

orcid.org/0000-0002-0365-3248

кандидат філологічних наук,

доцент кафедри англійської філології та міжкультурної комунікації

Навчально-наукового інституту філології

Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка

(Київ, Україна) oliagavr@gmail.com

Лариса ПАВЛІЧЕНКО,

orcid.org/0000-0003-3801-2587

кандидат філологічних наук,

доцент кафедри англійської філології та міжкультурної комунікації

Навчально-наукового інституту філології

Київського національного університету імені Тараса Шевченка

(Київ, Україна) la.pavlichenko@gmail.com

ДИПЛОМАТІЯ: МОВНІ ТЕНДЕНЦІЇ ПІД ЧАС ВІЙНИ В УКРАЇНІ

Сьогодні дипломатія, що формується під впливом змін у геополітиці, відіграє неабияку роль у міжнародній комунікації.

У статті зазначені різні підходи до визначення дипломатичного дискурсу, його жанрові різновиди. Дипломатичний дискурс відіграє важливу роль у вирішенні міжнародних суперечок, має на меті інформувати та спонукати аудиторію до активних дій. У роботі розглянуто та визначено провідні тенденції функціонування сучасного

англомовного дипломатичного дискурсу. Основними функціями дипломатичного дискурсу є передача необхідної інформації, формування ціннісних орієнтацій і установок, спонування до необхідних дій, вплив на зміну мотивації, установок, поведінки, закріплення та підтримання конвенційних відносин. На прикладі текстів офіційних заяв європейських лідерів, зокрема президента України, президента Німеччини, представників Євросоюзу та НАТО, присвячених російсько-українським відносинам виокремлено мовні засоби досягнення вищезазначених цілей у дипломатичних висловлюваннях. Аналіз офіційних заяв світових лідерів стосовно російсько-української війни засвідчує активне використання стилістичних засобів, що посилюють емоційність висловлювання, надають експресивності діловому стилю дипломатичних промов. За допомогою метафор та метонімії реалізується стратегія впливу на адресата, характерна для дипломатичного дискурсу.

Згідно з аналізом публічних виступів на міжнародній арені, промови Володимира Зеленського, президента країни, в якій триває війна, суттєво відрізняються емоційністю, різноманітністю та насиченістю мовлення від дипломатичних промов світових лідерів. Усі використані мовні засоби покликані зосередити увагу на трагедії, війні, військовому вторгненні, насиллі та стражданнях, що тривають в Україні. На цьому етапі, згадуючи Україну, світові лідери використовують різні змістовні номінації.

Ключові слова: дискурс, дипломатія, дипломатичний дискурс, комунікація, міжнародна комунікація, стилістичні засоби.

Problem statement. Diplomacy is one of the perfect forms of human communication. Globalization and the close trade ties in the world have also led to an increase in the role of diplomacy, which is carried out at the highest levels. Today “diplomacy is called upon to help political and economic leaders to channel the global changes in an evolutionary, non-violent, democratic rule-based manner. One of its top priorities is facilitation of good governance, both on national and international levels” (Kurbalija, 1998: 86). Diplomatic flexibility is a ‘trademark’ nowadays, which helps actors of diplomacy adapt to new challenges (Kurbalija, 1998: 90). Nowadays it undergoes considerable changes under the influence of digital technologies.

That’s a high time for diplomacy in Ukraine when it is more important than ever on the international stage. Mirroring broad social norms diplomatic discourse is changing and developing. It is often considered to be formal but lately a hint of informality becomes more common.

Analysis of recent studies and publications. As Stanko Nick, Croatian scientist, claims “the use of language in diplomacy is of major importance, since language is not a simple tool, vehicle for transmission of thoughts, or instrument of communication, but very often the very essence of the diplomatic vocation” (Nick: 17). The interest in the study of diplomatic communication led to the fact that in the mid-nineties of the last century, a number of works appeared in the field of diplomatic discourse research, which created the basis for the emergence of a new branch of the anthropological linguistic paradigm – diplomatic linguistics. Among the foreign researchers who studied diplomatic discourse are the following: D’Acquisto G., McClellan M., Donahue R., Shuster J., Andrew F. Cooper, Jorge Heine, Ramesh Thakur. The progress of information technologies and the development of diplomatic relations led to the emer-

gence of electronic diplomacy. Today, scientists are concentrated upon virtual diplomatic communication, the speeches of political leaders, emotivity, multimodality of diplomatic discourse, verbal and non-verbal communication in the international system (N. Kashchyshyn, 2019, O. Ponomarenko, 2018, Ya. Fedoriv, 2010, J. Heine, 2013, Yu. Sudus, 2017).

In Ukraine, Ya. Fedoriv studies charismatic discourse of diplomatic leadership, various genres of discourses of public political speeches in the globalized linguistic and cultural space (Fedoriv, 2010). O. Ponomarenko is focused on diplomatic discourse in the information content, its digital format in well-known social media due to the rapid development of technologies and media resources (Ponomarenko, 2018: 1). Twitter diplomacy or so called ‘Twiplomacy’ in its linguistic aspects (emotivity, multimodality, tactics and strategies, the system of terminology) is under study of O. Ponomarenko (2021), N. Kashchyshyn (2019), L. Dorosh Yu. Kopey (2018), T. Poliakova (2014).

Setting the task. The purpose of the work is to study the regularities of the organization of the modern diplomatic discourse of the English language.

The set goal makes it necessary to solve the following research tasks:

- study the concept of diplomatic discourse;
- to determine the functional and genre-stylistic features of modern diplomatic discourse.

Presenting main material. It is said that diplomacy is “the art of negotiating agreements between states” (Heine, 2013: 9). To be successful at it, one requires set of professional skills, the art of utterance influencing and persuading others to help you in meeting your own ends (Axworthy, 2013: 108). It involves representation, communication and receipt of messages, information gathering and analysis, negotiation, and the exercising of influence on external decisions and developments (Greenstock,

2013: 118). Communication, primarily language is a key tool to achieve goals in diplomacy.

Modern diplomatic linguistics is fully characterized by all the leading features of modern linguistics:

- “anthropocentrism (linguistic personality becomes a point of reference in the study of language and speech phenomena);

- expansionism (inclusion in the field of linguistics research of a number of related problems, expansion of the field of scientific interests);

- functionalism (the study of language in action, in the functioning and managing communication);

- explanatory nature (the effort not only to describe linguistic facts, but also to give them an explanation from the standpoint of various theories)” (Sudus, 2014: 124].

According to Ya. Fedoriv, the object of diplomatic linguistics research is “diplomatic discourse of a certain language community, which serves as a tool for achieving certain results in relations between countries” (Fedoriv, 2010: 16). In linguistics, there are two interpretations of the concept of ‘diplomatic discourse’ – broad and narrow.

Diplomatic discourse in a broad sense “includes all forms of communication in which at least one of the components of the communication process belongs to the field of diplomacy: the sender, the recipient or the content of the message”. This point of view regarding the concept of diplomatic discourse is held by I. Shevchenko (Shevchenko, 2007: 31).

In a narrow sense, diplomatic discourse is a type of discursive behavior, the purpose of which is to implement agreements and reach compromises between states and organizations. Thus, Yu. Sudus defines diplomatic discourse as “a set of discursive practices that identify the participants of diplomatic discourse and form a specific topic of diplomatic communication” (Sudus, 2017: 124].

In this article, we take the interpretation of discourse in a broad sense as the basis, since it covers all the components of diplomatic discourse area and gives the opportunity to refine each of them, based on the specific tasks of linguistic research.

In terms of the semiotic concept of diplomatic discourse by I. Shevchenko, a communicatively relevant definition of diplomatic discourse becomes possible only through “the interrelationship of verbal and non-verbal communicative actions in a certain socio-psychological context, in which the sender and recipient are endowed with certain social roles in accordance with their participation in diplomatic life, which is the subject of the act of communication” (Shevchenko, 2007: 34). Based on above-mentioned statement, we use diplomatic discourse as a

complex of verbal and non-verbal signs that make up the semiotic system of the specific situation of diplomatic communication and are a product of the purposeful behavior of the semiotic personality ‘diplomat’ (Shevchenko, 2007: 34).

Based on the specifics of the context of the situation, these symbolic verbal and non-verbal systems reveal the modification of pragmatic meanings and functions under the influence of various lingual and extra lingual factors.

In linguistics, the following genres of diplomatic discourse are distinguished:

- “institutional (diplomatic transcripts, documents, public speeches, interviews);

- mass media (created by journalists, formed through the press);

- official business (for hardware communication);

- discourses created by non-diplomats;

- “diplomatic detectives”;

- scientific texts devoted to diplomacy” (Fedoriv, 2010: 38).

Thus, the main fields of discursive research application in diplomacy and discourse studies are related to the identification of the diplomatic thinking peculiarities of communicators based on their linguistic and non-verbal data in diplomatic discourse.

These fundamental questions give us the opportunity to distinguish the main functions of diplomatic discourse:

- instrumental function;

- informative function (Shevchenko, 2007: 33).

The instrumental function of diplomatic discourse is understood as “its use as a tool of diplomatic relations” (Fedoriv, 2010: 16). Diplomatic communication is characterized by the presence of various directions, including, in particular, confrontation on the one hand, and cooperation on the other.

Diplomatic discourse can fulfill its instrumental function only due to another no less important function, namely the informative one, since most members of the mentioned group do not come into direct contact with the world of diplomacy, delegating these powers to their representatives. Thus, average members of society’s ideas about the diplomatic world are formed on the basis of the information presented to them, verbal and non-verbal ‘pictures’, and not on the basis of their personal participation experience in relations between countries.

Diplomatic discourse functions in the conditions of certain socio-political institutions, therefore it is characterized by institutionality. Diplomatic discourse is almost completely “mediated by mass media and represents institutional communication” as it is aimed at the citizens of the country (Shevchenko, 2007).

Nowadays it is highly obvious in case of worldwide virus and Russian-Ukrainian war. The analyzed discourse reveals a sign of distancing, which is manifested in the following aspects:

- “physical/spatial distance (presence of guards, special protective structures, etc.);
- communicative/contact distance (unavailability of diplomats for direct language contact, media-mediated communication);
- symbolic distance (the right to defend the interests of the state by individual people);
- psychological distance (halo of mystery, recognition of special wisdom and perceptiveness of diplomatic actors);
- informational distance (monopoly on information and restricted access to it by subordinates)” (Shevchenko, 2007).

In our work, we adhere to a narrow approach to the selection of texts, choosing only institutional, official texts of government and diplomacy representatives from 2019 to 2022 to analyze.

The purpose of English-language diplomatic discourse is to inform society and encourage the audience to take active action, that is why during negotiations, debates, conferences, etc. diplomats make calls for cooperation, peace and security, negotiations, stabilization of actions, ceasefire, peaceful regulation, reconciliation and many others (Sudus, 2017: 27-28). The language of diplomatic discourse mostly belongs to an official business style, which is characterized by clarity, logic, objectivity, stereotyping, emphasized politeness, and which is not deprived of emotionality (Kashchyshyn, 2019).

The statement of V. Zelenskyi at the general debate of the 75th session of the UN General Assembly is interesting stylistically. The speech begins with a multi-component common appeal that determines the attitude of the speaker to the addressee. The addresses used express respect, gratitude, become emotional centers of the sentence, create shades of solemnity, lyricism: “*Distinguished Mr. President!*” (20).

The speech is very figurative, rich in metaphors:

«*Mankind has conquered space and can even hold UN meetings remotely, using modern technology / At the same time, we must recognize that the system is increasingly failing. It is attacked by new "bugs" and "viruses" / We managed to unblock the dialogue, we resumed meetings of the leaders of the Normandy format countries, we made significant progress in the mutual release of detainees* (20).

In this example, Volodymyr Zelensky compares attacks on the world order and democracy in general with those attacks that computer viruses inflict on the operating system. The metaphorical nature

of the Ukrainian leader's statement has a double meaning, since the fight against the coronavirus infection has become as relevant and painful topic today as military conflicts. Moreover he keeps on the same tendency to use metaphors relating medical issues in his further speech: *And on July 27, a comprehensive ceasefire began, which, despite attempts to disrupt it, still gives hope for a stable "silence" / On the contrary, as long as the wound in central Europe is bleeding, the whole world will feel the pain. And the only recipe for effective treatment is the de-occupation of Crimea and Donbas*» (20).

Metaphorization allows a political leader to create vivid images, give an assessment of events, express an emotional attitude to the subject of speech, it greatly affects the addressee of the speech. Being metaphorized, verbs and phrases strengthen their dynamic properties and are used as an artistic and figurative means.

The examples of metaphors are widely used to enhance the diplomatic expression, making it expressive and figurative: *This crisis is changing Europe. But Russia has also reached a crossroads.* (22); *Putin wanted to wipe Ukraine from the map.* (24); *Our sanc-tions can bite very hard, and the Kremlin knows this well.* (23); *it will pave the way for Ukraine's future inside the European Union* (24); *We reaffirm that NATO remains the cornerstone of our security and collective defence* (21); *Although some efforts had been made to broaden the borders of understanding of the actions taken by the G-20, many delegations felt that consultations should be held before any final policy decisions* (21). ... *to help Ukraine rise from the ashes* (25).

Despite strict official requirements of diplomatic discourse to make the speech more effective and impressive the artists use the other syntactic stylistic device as:

- epithet: ... *in the heart of a European capital.* (22); *In these days, independent Ukraine is facing its darkest hour* (22); ... *since the darkest days of the Cold War* (23).

- antithesis: *This is a clash between the rule of law and the rule of the gun; between democracies and autocracies; between a rules-based order and a world of naked aggression.* (22).

- metonymy in combination with metaphor: *the Kremlin knows this well.* (23); *And this is precisely why the Kremlin is threatening it again.* (23);

- repetition: ... *we here are a strong country, we have strong partners and strong alliances* (26); *Russia has attacked not just us, not just our land, not just our cities.* (27); It went on a brutal offensive against our values, basic human values. It threw tanks and planes against our freedom, against our right to live

freely in our own country, choosing our own future, against our desire for happiness, against our national dreams, just like the same dreams you have, you Americans (27).

In addition to the speeches by Volodymyr Zelensky, the president of the country with ongoing war, among the international leaders the speeches by the president of the European Commission Ursula von der Leyen seem to be emotional and stylistically colored, using epithets, antithesis, metonymy, as in the above mentioned examples.

The speech by Jens Stoltenberg, the 13th secretary general of NATO, is worth attention. The word “support” in its verbal or noun forms is frequently used namely in his forthright statement that NATO will not directly intervene in the war in Ukraine. *First, we agreed to step up the support for Ukraine. As you know, NATO Allies provide unprecedented levels of military support to Ukraine. Actually NATO Allies and NATO have been there since 2014 – trained, equipped and supported the Ukrainian Armed Forces.... The message was that we will provide support for as long as it takes. No one can predict exactly when this war will end. But what we do know is that the more we are able to provide support to Ukraine, of course the more we increase the possibility, the likelihood, of an end to this war which happens on acceptable terms for Ukraine.* This repetition is used to create an image of a ‘friend who stands with’ and that is how the speaker is trying to make the rejection seem to be not so harsh: ... *That was also the clear message from Madrid, at the same time stating that NATO is not part of the war: we support Ukraine, a highly valued partner, but NATO would not be directly involved in the fighting on the ground in Ukraine* (28). Moreover deictic repetition occurs in this statement to stress the agent of the action.

Presidents hold more weight in foreign policy decision-making. Diplomatic discourse is an effective means of influencing the international community and, at the same time, a peaceful weapon to defeat the enemy. A skillfull usage of means of language helps to achieve both local and global goals. In the speech by Volodymyr Zelensky on the 75th session of General Council of UN personal verb forms predominate. The combination of different temporal forms emphasizes interdependence, the connection of the past and the present, the present and the future, which creates the necessary prerequisites for an emotional impact on the reader: «*wish to achieve / I am convinced / happened to steer / we discussed / we would say / united to build / have been made / has conquered / we must recognize*» (20). This method is used by the President of Ukraine to update the main messages of his speech, among them: independent Ukraine, common

cause, unity, war, annexation, common enemy, struggle, violence. These key words create the essential dominant of the speech.

Nowadays Ukraine is mentioned in diplomatic discourse by international leaders as ... *a solid, well-grounded parliamentary presidential democracy* (25); ... *our Ukrainian friends, one of us* (24); ... *our close partner; as a sovereign nation* (32); ... *a sovereign and democratic state in Europe* (21).

To describe the ongoing war in Ukraine diplomatic actors use negative collocations with the following nominations to depict and intensify the horrible situation happening:

- *invasion (the Russian invasion of Ukraine, atrocious invasion by Russia, the atrocious and atrocious invasion by Russia* (29, 30), *totally unjustified and reckless invasion of Ukraine* (32), *his full-scale Russian invasion* (31);
- *aggression (brutal aggression, constant aggression* (25), *unprecedented military aggression against Ukraine* (22, 23);
- *war (cruel war, horrible war, horrible and atrocious war, Putin’s war* (28, 29) *and brutal Russian attack on Ukraine* (26), *violence against Ukraine* (23), *the conflict, Russian force, tragedy, brutal fighting* (25), *very difficult conditions, a brutal offensive* (31), *hostilities, use of force and coercion, unparaleled crisis, Russia’s illegal military actions.*

The nouns with negative connotation gain the different level of expressiveness due to the adjectives coming with: *horrible, atrocious, unjustified, cruel, reckless, full-scale, brutal, unprecedented, unparaleled, unprovoked, unjustified, illegal, military.*

On the first day of the Russian-Ukrainian war on February 27, 2022 President Charles Michel of the European Council and President Ursula von der Leyen of the European Commission explicitly describe the situation as *unprovoked and unjustified military actions, Russia is grossly violating international law and undermining European and global security and stability* (33).

On the contrary, NATO representatives are limited to the nominations ‘war’ and ‘invasion’ without specific descriptive adjectives (21, 28).

Olaf Scholtz, the chancellor of Germany, claimed that Ukrainian war is a ‘*turning point in history*’ implicitly informs that it’s crucial not only for Ukraine but also for international order and stability (26). The president of the European Commission names it as a “watershed moment” to stress the significance of the situation (28).

The main goal of diplomatic discourse is to affect the addressee. Among the linguistic means to reach it some actors choose simple declarative sentences.

Whereas informative function is clearly realized as well. *Aggression does not pay. Intimidation does not work. NATO's door remains open. NATO is not part of the war. This crisis is changing Europe.* (22); *And light will win over darkness* (27).

In the current situation of Ukraine among the world leaders on the international stage Ukrainian president greatly shows up due to his bright statements using:

– detailed, personal and target gratitude: Ladies and gentlemen, friends, Ukraine is grateful to the United States for its overwhelming support, for everything that your government and your people have done for us, for weapons and ammunition, for training, for finances, for leadership in the free world, which helps us to pressure the aggressor economically (31); *I am grateful to President Biden for his personal involvement, for his sincere commitment to the defense of Ukraine and democracy all over the world. I am grateful to you for the resolution* (31).

– imperative constructions with expressive means which realize the function of regulating the activity of the address therefore encourage most actions by creating favorable conditions for the activity; in the example given the president uses emphatic ‘do’ to raise the emotional effect, furthermore repetition of the verb “to prove” intensifies his desire to get through to them: *Do prove that you are with us. Do prove that you will not let us go. Do prove that you are indeed*

Europeans, and then life will win over death. And light will win over darkness. (27).

– requests, bluntly asking for help: I call on you to do more. New packages of sanctions are needed constantly, every week, until the Russian military machine stops (31).

All these examples implement the emotive and phatic functions of international communication. They are the most influential adhering to the norms of diplomatic discourse. Considering geopolitical situation in Ukraine, Zelensky's speeches are linguistically the richest and most expressive.

Conclusions. All in all diplomatic discourse is classically institutional and informative. Nowadays it is characterized by wide range of stylistic devices like metaphor, epithet, metonymy, antithesis, repetition. Due to these means the strategy of affecting the addressee, typical for diplomatic discourse, is realized. The frequency of them in the speeches by diplomatic actors depends on the hot topic discussed and the close relevance of the leader to the issue. The top one is Russian-Ukrainian war which is also named and characterized differently depicting the attitude of the speaker. Therefore, the statements of the Ukrainian president turned to be the most figurative and stylistically diverse. The speeches by the European leaders are not so emotional and eloquent, but their statements about the war in Ukraine appear to be more varied stylistically.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Axworthy Lloyd The Political Actors: President, Prime Minister, and Minister of Foreign Affairs. *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy* / ed. by Andrew F. Cooper, Jorge Heine, Ramesh Thakur. Oxford University Press, 2013. P.107-117. URL: http://82.194.16.162:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/696/andrew_f_cooper_jorge_heine_ramesh_thakur_theb-ok-org.pdf?sequence=1
2. D'Acquisto G. Linguistic Analysis of Diplomatic Discourse: UN Resolutions if the Question of Palestine. UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017. 140 p.
3. Dr. Vladimir Petrovsky Diplomacy as an Instrument of Good Governance. *Modern Diplomacy.* / ed. by Jovan Kurbalija. Diplo Publishing, 1998. P. 84-90. URL: https://www.ati.usacademy.org/Books/Modern_Diplomacy.pdf
4. Donahue R. Diplomatic Discourse: International Conflict at the United Nations. London: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1997. 385 p.
5. Dorosh L., Kopey Yu. Twitter-diplomacy: Ukrainian context. *Humanitarian Vision.* 2018. Vol. 4, No 2. P. 32-38. URL: <https://science.lpnu.ua/shv/all-volumes-and-issues/volume-4-number-2-2018/twitter-diplomacy-ukrainian-context-research>
6. Greenstock Jeremy The Bureaucracy: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Foreign Service, and Other Government Departments. *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy.* / ed. by Andrew F. Cooper, Jorge Heine, Ramesh Thakur. Oxford University Press, 2013. P. 118-128. URL: http://82.194.16.162:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/696/andrew_f_cooper_jorge_heine_ramesh_thakur_theb-ok-org.pdf?sequence=1
7. Heine Jorge From Club to Network Diplomacy. *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy.* / ed. by Andrew F. Cooper, Jorge Heine, Ramesh Thakur. Oxford University Press, 2013. P.82-93. URL: http://82.194.16.162:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/696/andrew_f_cooper_jorge_heine_ramesh_thakur_theb-ok-org.pdf?sequence=1
8. Кащишин Н. С. Мультимодальний аспект дослідження англомовного дипломатичного дискурсу. *Науковий вісник Міжнародного гуманітарного університету. Серія «Філологія».* Одеса: Міжнародний гуманітарний університет. 2019. № 39 (2). С. 30-33.
9. Кащишин Н. С. Емотивність як невід’ємна дискурсивна категорія сучасного англомовного дипломатичного дискурсу. *Актуальні питання іноземної філології.* Луцьк: Східноєвропейський національний університет імені Лесі Українки, 2017. № 7. С. 66-73.
10. McClellan M. Public diplomacy in the context of traditional diplomacy. Dublin, 2004. 120 p.
11. Полякова Т. Л. Лінгвостилістичні характеристики жанру Твіттинг в англомовній політичній Інтернет-комунікації: автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04. Харків, 2014. 20 с.

12. Пономаренко О. В. Дипломатичний дискурс у твіттері: твіттинг і твіт як новітні жанрові форми дипломатичної комунікації. *Стіль і переклад*. Київ: «Київський університет», 2018. Вип. 1. С. 282-297. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/stt_2018
13. Ponomarenko O., Smushchynska I., Popivniak O., Tyshchenko O., Kovalchuk V. Genological stratification of diplomatic discourse on Twitter: Based on the material of the countries of the Romance and Germanic language areas. *Linguistics and Culture Review*. 2021. 5(S4). P. 1176-1186. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS4.1755>
14. Судус Ю. В. Мовленнєві тактики реалізації стратегії дискредитації в англомовному дипломатичному дискурсі: дис. ... канд. філол. наук : 10.02.04. Запоріжжя, 2017. 245 с.
15. Shuster J. *Diplomatic discourse*. London: Lulu, 2015. 668 p.
16. Stanko Nick Use of Language in Diplomacy. *Language and diplomacy*. / ed. by Jovan Kurbalija, Hannah Slavik. Academic Training Institute. 2010. P.17-21. URL: http://site.iugaza.edu.ps/wmodallal/files/2010/02/Language_and_Diplomacy.pdf
17. *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy*. / ed. by Andrew F. Cooper, Jorge Heine, Ramesh Thakur. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. URL: http://82.194.16.162:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/696/andrew_f_cooper_jorge_heine_ramesh_thakur_theb-ok-org.pdf?sequence=1
18. Федорів Я. Р. Лінгвістичні моделі дискурсу публічних виступів: нариси із сучасних культурно-мовленнєвих практик : монографія. Київ : ВПЦ НАУКМА, 2010. 188 с.
19. Шевченко І. С. Мовленнєвий акт у когнітивно-дискурсивній парадигмі. *Вісник Київського національного лінгвістичного університету. Серія: Філологія*. Київ: Київський національний лінгвістичний університет, 2007. Т. 10, № 1. С. 28-36.
20. 75th session of General Council of UN. URL: <https://www.un.org/ru/ga/75/>
21. NATO. URL: <https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions.htm>
22. Speech by President von der Leyen at the European Parliament Plenary on the Russian aggression against Ukraine, 1 March, 2022 URL: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/speech_22_1483
23. Speech by President von der Leyen at the European Parliament Plenary on EU-Russia relations, European security and Russia's military threat against Ukraine, 16 February, 2022 URL: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/SPEECH_22_1101
24. Speech by President von der Leyen at the EP Plenary on the social and economic consequences for the EU of the Russian war in Ukraine – reinforcing the EU's capacity to act, 4 May, 2022 URL: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/speech_22_2785
25. Statement by President von der Leyen with Ukrainian President Zelenskyy on the occasion of the President's visit to Kyiv, 11 June, 2022 URL: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/STATEMENT_22_3622
26. Scholtz addresses parliament on Ukraine: DW's Michaela Kufner in Berlin <https://www.dw.com/en/chancellor-olaf-scholz-tells-german-parliament-russia-must-not-win-this-war/a-61845874>
27. Zelensky addresses European Parliament: “No one is going to break us” 1 Mar, 2022 URL: <https://www.axios.com/2022/03/01/zelensky-video-european-parliament-address-ukraine>
28. Opening remarks by NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg at a joint meeting of the European Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Subcommittee on Security and Defence followed by an exchange of views with Members of the European Parliament, 18 June, 2022 URL: https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_197902.htm
29. Statement by President von der Leyen on further measures to respond to the Russian invasion of Ukraine, 27 February, 2022 URL: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/statement_22_1441
30. Speech by President of Ukraine Volodymyr Zelenskyy at the NATO Summit 24 March, 2022 URL: <https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/vistup-prezidenta-ukrayini-volodimira-zelenskogo-na-samiti-n-73785>
31. Zelensky's speech to Congress of the USA, 16 March, 2022 URL: <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/03/16/us/politics/transcript-zelensky-speech.html>
32. Press conference with NATO Secretary General Jen Stoltenberg, 1 March, 2022 URL: https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_192582.htm?selectedLocale=en
33. Press Statement of President Charles Michel of the European Council and President Ursula von der Leyen of the European Commission on Russia's unprecedented and unprovoked military aggression of Ukraine, 24 February, 2022 URL: https://neighbourhood-enlargement.ec.europa.eu/news/press-statement-president-charles-michel-european-council-and-president-ursula-von-der-leyen-2022-02-24_en

REFERENCES

1. Axworthy Lloyd The Political Actors: President, Prime Minister, and Minister of Foreign Affairs. *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy* / ed. by Andrew F. Cooper, Jorge Heine, Ramesh Thakur. Oxford University Press, 2013. P.107-117. URL: http://82.194.16.162:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/696/andrew_f_cooper_jorge_heine_ramesh_thakur_theb-ok-org.pdf?sequence=1
2. D'Acquisto G. *Linguistic Analysis of Diplomatic Discourse: UN Resolutions if the Question of Palestine*. UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017. 140 p.
3. Dr. Vladimir Petrovsky *Diplomacy as an Instrument of Good Governance*. *Modern Diplomacy*. / ed. by Jovan Kurbalija. Diplo Publishing, 1998. P. 84-90. URL: https://www.ati.usacademy.org/Books/Modern_Diplomacy.pdf
4. Donahue R. *Diplomatic Discourse: International Conflict at the United Nations*. London: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1997. 385 p.

5. Dorosh L., Kopey Yu. Twitter-diplomacy: Ukrainian context. *Humanitarian Vision*. 2018. Vol. 4, No 2. P. 32-38. URL: <https://science.lpnu.ua/shv/all-volumes-and-issues/volume-4-number-2-2018/twitter-diplomacy-ukrainian-context-research>
6. Greenstock Jeremy The Bureaucracy: Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Foreign Service, and Other Government Departments. *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy*. / ed. by Andrew F. Cooper, Jorge Heine, Ramesh Thakur. Oxford University Press, 2013. P. 118-128. URL: http://82.194.16.162:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/696/andrew_f_cooper_jorge_heine_ramesh_thakur_theb-ok-org.pdf?sequence=1
7. Heine Jorge From Club to Network Diplomacy. *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy*. / ed. by Andrew F. Cooper, Jorge Heine, Ramesh Thakur. Oxford University Press, 2013. P.82-93. URL: http://82.194.16.162:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/696/andrew_f_cooper_jorge_heine_ramesh_thakur_theb-ok-org.pdf?sequence=1
8. Kashchyshyn N. Ye. Multymodalnyi aspekt doslidzhennia anhlovnoho dyplomatychnoho dyskursu. [Multimodal aspect of the study of English-language diplomatic discourse]. *Scientific Bulletin of the International Humanitarian University. Series: Philology*. Odesa: International Humanitarian University, 2019. Vol. 2, No. 39, C.30-33 [in Ukrainian].
9. Kashchyshyn N. Ye. Emotyvnist yak nevidiemna dyskursyвна katehoriia suchasnoho anhlovnoho dyplomatychnoho dyskursu. [Emotionality as an integral discursive category of modern English-language diplomatic discourse]. *Current issues of foreign philology*. Lutsk: Eastern European National Lesia Ukrainka University, 2017. No. 7. P.66-73 [in Ukrainian].
10. McClellan M. Public diplomacy in the context of traditional diplomacy. Dublin, 2004. 120 p.
11. Poliakova T.L. Lihvostylistychni kharakterystyky zhanru Tvittinh v anhlovonii politychnii Internet-komunikatsii. [Linguistic and stylistic characteristics of the Tweeting genre in English-language political Internet communication]: abstract of diss. ... PhD in philology: 10.02.04. Kharkiv, 2014. 20 p. [in Ukrainian].
12. Ponomarenko O. V. Dyplomatychnyi dyskurs u twitteri: tvittinh i tvit yak novitni zhanrovi formy dyplomatychnoi komunikatsii. [Diplomatic discourse on Twitter: tweeting and tweeting as the newest genre forms of diplomatic communication]. *Style and translation*. Kyiv: "Kyiv University", 2018. Issue 1. P. 282-297. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/stt_2018 [in Ukrainian].
13. Ponomarenko O., Smushchynska I., Popivniak O., Tyshchenko O., Kovalchuk V. Genological stratification of diplomatic discourse on Twitter: Based on the material of the countries of the Romance and Germanic language areas. *Linguistics and Culture Review*. 2021. 5(S4). P. 1176-1186. <https://doi.org/10.21744/lingcure.v5nS4.1755>
14. Sudus Yu. V. Movlenniivi taktyky realizatsii stratehii dyskredytatsii v anhlovnomu dyplomatychnomu dyskursi. [Speech tactics of implementing the strategy of discrediting in the English-language diplomatic discourse]: diss. ... PhD in philology: 10.02.04. Zaporizhzhia, 2017. 245 p. [in Ukrainian].
15. Shuster J. Diplomatic discourse. London: Lulu, 2015. 668 p.
16. Stanko Nick Use of Language in Diplomacy. *Language and diplomacy*. / ed. by Jovan Kurbalija, Hannah Slavik. Academic Training Institute. 2010. P.17-21. URL: http://site.iugaza.edu.ps/wmodallal/files/2010/02/Language_and_Diplomacy.pdf
17. *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy*. / ed. by Andrew F. Cooper, Jorge Heine, Ramesh Thakur. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. URL: http://82.194.16.162:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/696/andrew_f_cooper_jorge_heine_ramesh_thakur_theb-ok-org.pdf?sequence=1
18. http://82.194.16.162:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/696/andrew_f_cooper_jorge_heine_ramesh_thakur_theb-ok-org.pdf?sequence=1
19. Fedoriv Ya. R. Lihvistychni modeli dyskursu publicnykh vystupiv: narysy iz suchasnykh kulturno-movlenniivykh praktyk. [Linguistic models of the discourse of public speeches: essays from modern cultural and speech practices]: monograph. Kyiv: VOC NaUKMA, 2010. 188 p. [in Ukrainian].
20. Shevchenko I. S. Movlenniivy akt u kohnityvno-dyskursyvni paradyhmi. [Speech act in the cognitive-discursive paradigm]. *Bulletin of the Kyiv National Linguistic University. Series: Philology*. Kyiv: Kyiv National Linguistic University, 2007. Vol. 10, No. 1. P. 28-36. [in Ukrainian].
21. 75th session of General Council of UN. URL: <https://www.un.org/ru/ga/75/>
22. NATO. URL: <https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions.htm>
23. Speech by President von der Leyen at the European Parliament Plenary on the Russian aggression against Ukraine, 1 March, 2022 URL: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/speech_22_1483
24. Speech by President von der Leyen at the European Parliament Plenary on EU-Russia relations, European security and Russia's military threat against Ukraine, 16 February, 2022 URL: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/SPEECH_22_1101
25. Speech by President von der Leyen at the EP Plenary on the social and economic consequences for the EU of the Russian war in Ukraine – reinforcing the EU's capacity to act, 4 May, 2022 URL: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/speech_22_2785
26. Statement by President von der Leyen with Ukrainian President Zelenskyy on the occasion of the President's visit to Kyiv, 11 June, 2022 URL: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/STATEMENT_22_3622
27. Scholtz addresses parliament on Ukraine: DW's Michaela Kufner in Berlin <https://www.dw.com/en/chancellor-olaf-scholz-tells-german-parliament-russia-must-not-win-this-war/a-61845874>
28. Zelensky addresses European Parliament: “No one is going to break us” 1 Mar, 2022 URL: <https://www.axios.com/2022/03/01/zelensky-video-european-parliament-address-ukraine>
29. Opening remarks by NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg at a joint meeting of the European Parliament's Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Subcommittee on Security and Defence followed by an exchange of views with Members of the European Parliament, 18 June, 2022 URL: https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_197902.htm

30. Statement by President von der Leyen on further measures to respond to the Russian invasion of Ukraine, 27 February, 2022 URL: https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/statement_22_1441

31. Speech by President of Ukraine Volodymyr Zelenskyy at the NATO Summit 24 March, 2022 URL: <https://www.president.gov.ua/en/news/vistup-prezidenta-ukrayini-volodimira-zelenskogo-na-samiti-n-73785>

32. Zelensky's speech to Congress of the USA, 16 March, 2022 URL: <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/03/16/us/politics/transcript-zelensky-speech.html>

33. Press conference with NATO Secretary General Jen Stoltenberg, 1 March, 2022 URL: https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_192582.htm?selectedLocale=en

34. Press Statement of President Charles Michel of the European Council and President Ursula von der Leyen of the European Commission on Russia's unprecedented and unprovoked military aggression of Ukraine, 24 February, 2022. URL: https://neighbourhood-enlargement.ec.europa.eu/news/press-statement-president-charles-michel-european-council-and-president-ursula-von-der-leyen-2022-02-24_en