DOI: https://doi.org/10.31392/UDU-nc.series9.2026.31.05
UDC: 81’1:341.72

Borys V. Mezheritsky
PhD Student, Department of Germanic Languages
and Intercultural Communication,
Dragomanov Ukrainian State University,
Kyiv, Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0009-0008-3247-9008
e-mail: b.v.mezheritskyi@udu.edu.ua

Olena Yu. Tytarenko
PhD in Philology, Professor,
Department of Germanic Languages
and Intercultural Communication,
Dragomanov Ukrainian State University,
Kyiv, Ukraine
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8606-3253
e-mail: o.yu.tytarenko@udu.edu.ua

CHALLENGES IN DIPLOMATIC DISCOURSE IN THE CONTEXT OF MODERN LINGUISTICS

Bibliographic Description:

Mezheritsky, B., & Tytarenko, O. (2026). Challenges in Diplomatic Discourse in the Context of Modern Linguistics. *Scientific Journal of Dragomanov Ukrainian State University. Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development*, 31, 69–81. https://doi.org/10.31392/UDU-nc.series9.2026.31.05

Abstract

This paper examines diplomatic discourse as a complex and multidimensional communicative phenomenon within the framework of contemporary linguistics. The study addresses the problem of defining and interpreting diplomatic discourse in terms of its linguistic, pragmatic, cognitive, and socio-cultural characteristics. The aim of the research is to provide a comprehensive analysis of diplomatic discourse and to identify the key strategies that shape its functioning in international communication. The theoretical and methodological framework integrates critical discourse analysis, speech act theory, and cognitive linguistics. The empirical data consist of authentic English-language diplomatic texts, including official statements, speeches, and institutional communications.

The findings demonstrate that diplomatic discourse is characterized by a systematic use of implicitness, strategic politeness, and discursive ambiguity. These features are realized through indirect speech acts, mitigation strategies, and metaphorical framing, which together enable flexibility of interpretation and contribute to the maintenance of cooperative interaction in potentially conflictual contexts. The study also reveals the importance of intercultural factors in shaping diplomatic communication, as well as the ongoing transformation of diplomatic discourse in the digital environment.

The results contribute to the development of an integrative approach to discourse analysis and provide insights into the linguistic mechanisms underlying diplomatic communication. The study has both theoretical significance for contemporary linguistics and practical relevance for international communication, diplomacy, and translation studies.

***Keywords**: diplomatic discourse, pragmatics, implicitness, politeness strategies, discourse analysis, intercultural communication.*

1. Introduction.

At this stage of linguistic development, researching discourse practices in international communication has become particularly relevant. One of the most challenging and least clearly defined types of institutional speech is diplomatic discourse, which is formed at the intersection of language, politics, culture, and cognitive processes. Its unique nature is shaped by the need to balance precise wording with deliberate ambiguity. It also requires a mix of open communication and strategic restraint, aiming to reach a compromise in situations where interests may conflict.

Because of globalization and more international relations, diplomatic discourse has become a key tool for managing political and economic connections between countries. However, we still do not fully understand how language, culture, and thinking work together in this field. This means we need to study diplomatic speech more closely as a complex system of meanings, rather than treating it as a simple text.

The main problem in modern linguistics is that it is hard to define or classify diplomatic discourse. Some people see it as part of political speech, while others view it as its own system with its own rules and strategies. We still need to understand the balance between direct and hidden meanings, which are very important in international communication. Also, new research needs to look more at how the internet and digital media are changing traditional diplomacy.

The practical significance of researching diplomatic discourse lies in the potential to enhance the efficacy of interstate communication, preempt communicative conflicts, and refine translation practices within international relations. A profound understanding of the linguistic strategies and tactics inherent in diplomatic speech facilitates more precise decoding of communicative intent and the formulation of appropriate responses. This becomes particularly vital amid contemporary geopolitical challenges, where language can exert as much influence as political action itself.

The contribution of this paper to addressing the aforementioned problem consists of an attempt to systematically conceptualize diplomatic discourse as a multidimensional phenomenon within modern linguistics. The study proposes an integrative analytical framework that synthesizes pragmatic, cognitive, and discursive approaches, while emphasizing the role of linguistic strategies in constructing diplomatic reality. Such an approach not only refines the field’s theoretical foundations but also delineates prospects for further interdisciplinary research.

2. Literature Review.

The issue of diplomatic discourse occupies a significant place in contemporary linguistic research, driven by the increasing interest in language as a tool for social interaction and political influence. Within the modern paradigm of linguistics, diplomatic discourse is examined through various theoretical frameworks, among which pragmatic, discourse-analytical, cognitive, and sociolinguistic approaches predominate.

A cornerstone of the theoretical framework for discourse studies is the work of Teun A. van Dijk, who pioneered the socio-cognitive approach to discourse analysis. Within his conceptual framework, discourse is viewed as a multifaceted entity comprising text, context, and the cognitive models that govern the production and interpretation of utterances. Van Dijk's insights are exceptionally useful for analysing diplomatic discourse, as they enable researchers to account for both the linguistic properties and the underlying mental structures that shape diplomatic communication (Teun A. van Dijk, 2014).

A significant contribution to the development of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) was made by Norman Fairclough, who conceptualizes discourse as a form of social practice. His approach entails analysing the intricate relationship between language, power, and ideology. In the context of diplomatic discourse, this framework enables the identification of latent mechanisms of influence, through which linguistic tools are employed to construct political reality and legitimize specific decisions (Fairclough, 2014).

The pragmatic aspects of speech, particularly speech acts, were thoroughly developed in the seminal works of John Searle and J. L. Austin. Their theories are pivotal for understanding the functioning of diplomatic discourse, in which utterances do not merely convey information but also perform concrete actions, such as concluding agreements, lodging protests, or establishing protocols. In diplomatic practice, the indirect realization of speech acts is particularly important, as it preserves politeness and mitigates conflict (Searle, 2015).

The concept of politeness proposed by Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson is also fundamental to the analysis of diplomatic communication. These researchers argue that linguistic behavior is governed by the desire to maintain the "face" of the interlocutor, a phenomenon that is especially pertinent in diplomatic settings. Strategies of negative and positive politeness are actively utilized to hedge utterances, avoid direct accusations, and sustain constructive dialogue (Grainger & Mills, 2024).

The cognitive dimension of diplomatic discourse is reflected in the works of George Lakoff, who pioneered the theory of conceptual metaphor. In his view, political thought is largely structured by metaphorical models that influence how reality is interpreted. Within diplomatic discourse, metaphors serve not only a stylistic function but also an ideological one, shaping a specific vision of international relations (Xu & Taylor, 2024).

A significant contribution to the study of political and diplomatic discourse was made by Ruth Wodak, a prominent figure in the discourse-historical approach.

Her research focuses on analysing linguistic practices within their historical and social contexts. This perspective views diplomatic discourse as a dynamic phenomenon that evolves under the influence of political and cultural factors (Cillia et al., 2020).

In the realm of intercultural communication, the works of Edward T. Hall and Geert Hofstede, who explored cultural differences in communicative behavior, are highly influential. Their concepts of high-context and low-context cultures, as well as cultural dimensions, are essential for understanding the specificities of diplomatic discourse across diverse cultural environments (Hall, 1992).

Recent studies in diplomatic linguistics increasingly emphasize the dynamic and persuasive nature of diplomatic discourse in the context of globalization and digital communication. Contemporary researchers examine diplomatic interaction not only as a political instrument but also as a complex communicative practice shaped by ideology, culture, pragmatics, and technological transformation. In this regard, diplomatic discourse is viewed as a multifunctional phenomenon that combines strategic ambiguity, politeness, persuasion, and intercultural negotiation.

Modern corpus-based and discourse-oriented studies demonstrate that diplomatic language possesses distinctive stylistic and pragmatic features. Zhang et al. (2023) analyse Chinese and American diplomatic discourse from a corpus-linguistic perspective and argue that diplomatic communication reflects national communicative traditions, ideological priorities, and culturally specific rhetorical strategies. Their findings confirm that diplomatic discourse is strongly influenced by sociocultural context and political objectives.

The persuasive dimension of diplomatic discourse has also become an important object of linguistic investigation. Tang examines persuasion strategies in diplomatic communication and demonstrates that diplomatic texts frequently employ implicit addressees, evaluative language, and strategic framing to influence international audiences. Such mechanisms are particularly relevant in contemporary media diplomacy, where political actors attempt to shape public opinion through carefully constructed discourse practices (Tang, 2021).

Recent pragmatic research pays considerable attention to evidentiality, stance-taking, and implicit meaning construction in diplomatic interaction. Xu (2022) argues that evidential markers in diplomatic speech perform important pragmatic functions by increasing credibility, mitigating responsibility, and preserving diplomatic neutrality. Similarly, Li and Gumul investigate stance-taking lexical bundles in interpreted diplomatic discourse and conclude that interpreters play an active role in shaping pragmatic nuances and ideological positioning during diplomatic communication (Li & Gumul, 2024).

Another important tendency in recent scholarship concerns the role of euphemization and indirectness in diplomatic language. Knyazyan and Ghukasyan (2023) emphasize that euphemisms function as essential communicative tools in diplomacy because they reduce communicative tension and facilitate conflict avoidance. This perspective supports the idea that diplomatic discourse relies heavily on implicitness, strategic vagueness, and politeness mechanisms.

Contemporary studies also highlight the transformation of diplomatic communication under the influence of digital technologies and globalization. Manor (2021) argues that modern diplomacy increasingly operates within conditions of uncertainty, where rapid information exchange and digital media reshape traditional communicative practices. Furthermore, digital diplomacy contributes to the emergence of new discourse forms characterized by immediacy, multimodality, and broader audience engagement (Manor, 2024).

The discourse-historical approach remains highly influential in analysing political and diplomatic communication. R. Wodak demonstrates that political discourse frequently normalizes ideological narratives through repetitive linguistic patterns and emotionally marked rhetoric. Such observations are relevant for diplomatic discourse analysis because diplomatic communication often combines institutional formality with persuasive and ideological elements (Wodak, 2021).

Recent interdisciplinary approaches also underline the significance of intercultural pragmatics in diplomatic interaction. O. Ponomarenko interprets diplomatic discourse as a variable communicative system shaped by cultural and contextual factors. This perspective corresponds with modern theories of intercultural communication, according to which diplomatic language cannot be fully understood outside its sociocultural environment (Ponomarenko, 2020).

Taken together, these contemporary studies substantially broaden the understanding of diplomatic discourse in modern linguistics. They demonstrate that diplomatic communication should be analysed as a multidimensional phenomenon involving cognitive, pragmatic, ideological, intercultural, and technological dimensions. The integration of these perspectives creates a productive theoretical basis for investigating the challenges and transformations of diplomatic discourse in the 21st century.

Despite a considerable body of research, the issue of diplomatic discourse remains open for further investigation. Specifically, there is a need to clarify the mechanisms of interaction between linguistic and cognitive factors, the role of implicitness in meaning construction, and the impact of emerging communication technologies on the transformation of diplomatic speech. Furthermore, the integration of various theoretical frameworks into a unified analytical model remains insufficiently developed.

The theoretical and methodological foundation of this study comprises the principles of critical discourse analysis, speech act theory, cognitive linguistics, and intercultural communication. Such an interdisciplinary approach facilitates a comprehensive analysis of diplomatic discourse as a multidimensional phenomenon in contemporary linguistics.

3. Aim and Objectives.

The aim of this paper is to outline the challenges in diplomatic discourse as a multidimensional communicative phenomenon within the framework of contemporary linguistics, with a particular focus on its pragmatic, cognitive, and socio-cultural characteristics.

To achieve this aim, the following objectives are formulated:

1) to define the theoretical status of diplomatic discourse within modern linguistic paradigms and to clarify its relationship to political, institutional, and intercultural discourse types;

2) to identify the key linguistic and pragmatic features of diplomatic discourse, including implicitness, strategic politeness, and discursive ambiguity, as well as their functional roles in international communication;

3) to determine the communicative strategies and tactics employed in diplomatic discourse, with particular attention to speech acts, mitigation devices, and mechanisms of indirectness;

4) to examine the cognitive and conceptual structures underlying diplomatic communication, including the role of metaphor and framing in shaping diplomatic narratives.

4. Methodology.

This study adopts a qualitative, interdisciplinary research design to examine diplomatic discourse as a complex, multidimensional communicative phenomenon. The methodological framework integrates approaches from critical discourse analysis, pragmatics, and cognitive linguistics, enabling a comprehensive investigation of the linguistic, functional, and conceptual properties of diplomatic communication.

The empirical basis of the study consists of a purposive corpus of authentic English-language diplomatic texts. The dataset includes official statements, speeches by state representatives, diplomatic correspondence, and public addresses delivered in international forums. The selected materials represent contemporary diplomatic communication and reflect diverse geopolitical contexts. The corpus was compiled to ensure thematic relevance, temporal recency, and representativeness of institutional discourse practices.

The study follows a multi-stage analytical procedure. First, the selected texts are examined to identify recurring linguistic patterns and discourse features. Second, these features are categorized according to their pragmatic and cognitive functions. Third, the interaction among linguistic form, communicative intention, and contextual factors is analysed to reveal underlying discourse strategies. Finally, the findings are synthesized to construct an integrative model of diplomatic discourse.

To enhance the study's validity, multiple analytical approaches are combined, enabling triangulation of results. The use of authentic data contributes to the reliability and ecological validity of the analysis. However, the qualitative nature of the study implies a certain degree of interpretative subjectivity. Additionally, the focus on English-language diplomatic discourse may limit the generalizability of the findings to other linguistic and cultural contexts.

5. Results.

The analysis of the selected corpus of diplomatic texts reveals that diplomatic

discourse is structured as a highly strategic and multifunctional communicative system in which linguistic choices are closely aligned with pragmatic intentions, cognitive frameworks, and socio-political constraints. The results demonstrate that the defining features of diplomatic discourse – implicitness, strategic politeness, and discursive ambiguity – are systematically realized through specific linguistic and communicative patterns.

1. Implicitness as a Core Discursive Strategy.

One of the most salient findings of the study is the pervasive use of implicitness in diplomatic communication. Rather than expressing positions directly, speakers frequently rely on indirect formulations, hedging devices, and semantically underdetermined expressions. Phrases such as *"we remain concerned," "the situation requires further consideration,"* or *"constructive dialogue is essential"* function as pragmatic signals that convey evaluation without explicit judgment.

This implicitness serves several functions. First, it allows speakers to avoid direct confrontation while still communicating a stance. Second, it preserves flexibility in interpretation, enabling diplomatic actors to adapt their positions in response to changing circumstances. Third, it facilitates the maintenance of cooperative interaction, even in contexts of disagreement (Manor, 2024).

2. Strategic Politeness and Face Management.

The findings confirm that politeness in diplomatic discourse is not merely a matter of etiquette but a deliberate communicative strategy. The analysis reveals a consistent use of mitigation devices, including modal verbs (*may, might, could*), conditional constructions, and passive voice structures, all of which contribute to reducing the impositive force of statements.

Face-saving strategies are particularly evident in situations involving criticism or disagreement. Instead of direct accusation, diplomatic speakers employ formulations that shift focus from the agent to the action or context, for example: *"challenges have emerged"* rather than *"the government has failed."* This approach minimizes potential offense and helps sustain a constructive communicative environment (Manor, 2021).

3. Discursive Ambiguity and Interpretative Flexibility.

Another key result concerns the intentional use of ambiguity as a functional feature of diplomatic discourse. Ambiguity is not treated as a deficiency but as a resource that enables multiple interpretations. This is achieved through lexical generalization, abstract nominalizations, and avoidance of specific references.

Such ambiguity allows diplomatic statements to be acceptable to multiple audiences simultaneously. It also creates space for negotiation, as different interlocutors may interpret the same statement in ways that align with their respective interests. Thus, ambiguity functions as a mechanism for managing conflict and facilitating consensus (Lu & Zhou, 2024).

4. Speech Acts and Indirectness.

The analysis shows that diplomatic discourse relies heavily on indirect speech acts. Declarations, requests, and even warnings are often expressed in forms that

do not correspond directly to their illocutionary force. For instance, a request may be framed as a suggestion, and a warning may appear as a statement of concern.

This indirectness enhances the acceptability of potentially sensitive messages and aligns with the broader communicative goal of maintaining diplomatic decorum. It also reflects the need to balance clarity with caution in high-stakes communication.

5. Cognitive Structuring and Metaphorical Framing.

The results indicate that diplomatic discourse is underpinned by systematic cognitive structures, particularly conceptual metaphors that frame international relations in specific ways. Common metaphorical patterns include diplomacy as *dialogue*, *partnership*, or *pathway*, which emphasize cooperation and progress.

These metaphors are not merely stylistic devices but play a crucial role in shaping how political realities are conceptualized and communicated. By framing issues in terms of shared goals and collective movement, diplomatic discourse promotes a cooperative worldview and mitigates adversarial interpretations (Fairclough, 2014).

6. Intercultural Dimensions of Diplomatic Communication.

The study also reveals that diplomatic discourse is highly sensitive to intercultural variation. Differences in communicative norms, levels of directness, and expectations of politeness influence both the production and interpretation of diplomatic texts. As a result, successful diplomatic communication requires not only linguistic competence but also intercultural awareness.

The data suggest that speakers often adopt neutralized or globally accessible linguistic forms to minimize the risk of misinterpretation across cultures. This contributes to the standardization of diplomatic language at the international level (Qu, 2025).

7. Transformation in the Digital Context.

Finally, the findings highlight the ongoing transformation of diplomatic discourse in the context of digital communication. While traditional features such as formality and indirectness remain dominant, there is evidence of increasing hybridity, including elements of immediacy, personalization, and public engagement.

Digital platforms introduce new constraints and opportunities, requiring diplomatic actors to balance institutional authority with accessibility and responsiveness. This shift results in the emergence of new discursive practices that expand the traditional boundaries of diplomatic communication (Evans, 2019).

6. Discussion.

The findings of this study corroborate and further develop existing theoretical approaches to discourse analysis, particularly within the frameworks of critical discourse analysis, pragmatics, and cognitive linguistics. The observed features of diplomatic discourse – implicitness, strategic politeness, and discursive ambiguity – are consistent with the view of discourse as a socially embedded and functionally motivated form of communication.

From the perspective of critical discourse analysis, the results support the assumption that language in diplomatic contexts operates as a mechanism of power and ideological representation. The prevalence of indirectness and ambiguity aligns with the notion that discourse not only reflects but also constructs social reality by shaping how political situations are framed and interpreted. In this regard, the study confirms that diplomatic discourse plays a crucial role in legitimizing institutional actions and maintaining a balance between competing interests.

The pragmatic dimension of the findings aligns with established theories of speech acts and politeness. The extensive use of indirect speech acts and mitigation strategies demonstrates that diplomatic communication prioritizes relational stability over informational transparency. Compared to previous studies, the present analysis highlights the systematic nature of these strategies, showing that they are not merely situational but constitute a stable pattern of communicative behavior in diplomatic settings.

In terms of cognitive linguistics, the identification of metaphorical framing supports the argument that political discourse is structured by underlying conceptual models. The use of cooperative metaphors, such as dialogue and partnership, confirms that diplomatic language is oriented toward constructing a shared interpretative space. This finding is consistent with earlier research but also extends it by demonstrating how such metaphors function in interaction with pragmatic and contextual factors.

At the same time, the study reveals certain nuances that contribute to the ongoing scholarly debate. In particular, the analysis of digital diplomatic communication suggests a gradual shift toward more hybrid forms of discourse, combining traditional features of formality with elements of immediacy and public engagement. This observation partially diverges from earlier models that conceptualize diplomatic discourse as strictly formal and institutionally constrained, indicating the need to reconsider its boundaries in the context of technological change.

The results also emphasize the importance of intercultural factors, confirming that diplomatic discourse cannot be fully understood without considering variations in communicative norms and cultural expectations. This finding reinforces the interdisciplinary nature of discourse studies and underscores the need to integrate linguistic analysis with insights from cultural and communication studies.

Overall, the findings of this research occupy an intermediate position within the existing body of knowledge: they confirm key theoretical assumptions while also extending them by incorporating the dynamics of contemporary communication environments. This contributes to a more nuanced understanding of diplomatic discourse as a flexible and adaptive communicative system.

7. Conclusions.

This study has demonstrated that diplomatic discourse constitutes a complex

and multidimensional form of communication shaped by linguistic, pragmatic, cognitive, and socio-cultural factors. The analysis confirms that implicitness, strategic politeness, and discursive ambiguity function as core features that enable diplomatic actors to manage sensitive interactions and maintain communicative balance.

The findings show that diplomatic discourse relies on systematic use of indirect speech acts, mitigation strategies, and metaphorical framing, which together contribute to the construction of meaning beyond the literal level. These mechanisms allow for flexibility in interpretation and facilitate cooperation in contexts of potential conflict.

The study also highlights the role of intercultural variation in shaping diplomatic communication, emphasizing the need for cultural awareness in both the production and interpretation of diplomatic texts. In addition, the analysis reveals ongoing transformations in diplomatic discourse driven by digital communication, which introduces new forms of interaction while preserving core institutional norms.

The results have both theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, they contribute to the development of an integrative approach to discourse analysis by combining insights from multiple linguistic frameworks. Practically, they may inform diplomatic practice, translation, and international communication by enhancing understanding of linguistic strategies in high-stakes contexts.

Despite its contributions, the study has certain limitations, including its qualitative nature and focus on English-language data. Future research may expand the scope of analysis by incorporating multilingual corpora and quantitative methods, and by examining the impact of emerging communication technologies in greater detail.

In conclusion, diplomatic discourse should be understood as a dynamic and adaptive system that reflects the evolving nature of global communication while maintaining its core strategic functions.

References

Cillia, D., Rudolf, Wodak, R., Rheindorf, M., & Lehner, S. (2020). Österreichische Identitäten im Wandel: Empirische Untersuchungen zu ihrer diskursiven Konstruktion 1995–2015. Springer.

Chilton, P. (2004). Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice. Routledge. doi: https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203561216

Evans, V. (2019). Cognitive Linguistics: A Complete Guide.

Fairclough, N. (2013). Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language (2nd ed.). Routledge. doi: https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315834366

Fairclough, N. (2014). Language and Power (3rd ed.). Longman.

Grainger, K., & Mills, S. (2024). The Palgrave Handbook of Politeness and Face (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

Hall, E. T. (1992). An Anthropology of Everyday Life: An Autobiography. Doubleday.

Knyazyan, A., & Ghukasyan, V. (2023). Euphemisms in modern diplomatic discourse. *Foreign Languages in Higher Education*, 27(2), 55–66. doi: https://doi.org/10.46991/FLHE/2023.27.2.055

Kranert, M. (2018). Discourse and political culture: The language of the Third Way in Germany and the UK. John Benjamins. doi: https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.77

Li, Y., & Gumul, E. (2024). Stance-taking lexical bundles in interpreted diplomatic discourse: A corpus-informed approach. *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*. doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2024.2406868

Lu, Y., & Zhou, T. (2024). A critical discourse analysis of Chinese diplomatic speeches on China-US relations. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 11, Article 1674. doi: https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-04193-w

Manor, I. (2021). Public Diplomacy and the Politics of Uncertainty. Palgrave Macmillan.

Manor, I. (2024). The Oxford Handbook of Digital Diplomacy. Oxford University Press.

Ponomarenko, O. (2020). Variation as inherent feature of diplomatic discourse: A case study of its invariant, variants and the process of varying. Astraea, 1(2). doi: https://doi.org/10.34142/astraea.2020.1.2.04

Qu, J. (2025). A study of narrative structure and cognitive processes in English language and literature. *Applied Mathematics and Nonlinear Sciences*, 10(1), 1–17.

Searle, J. (2015). Seeing Things as They Are: A Theory of Perception.

Tang, L. (2021). The putative addressee in the persuasion of diplomatic discourse: China's communication efforts through South African English-language newspapers. *Discourse & Communication*, 15(4), 458–475. doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/17504813211002034

Teun A. van Dijk. (2014). Discourse and Knowledge: A sociocognitive approach. Cambridge University Press.

Wodak, R. (2021). The politics of fear: The shameless normalization of far-right discourse (2nd ed.). Sage. doi: 10.4135/9781529739664

Xu, W., & Taylor, J. R. (2024). The Routledge Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics (2nd ed.).

Xu, Z. (2022). Pragmatic functions of evidentiality in diplomatic discourse: Toward a new analytical framework. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 1019359. doi: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1019359

Zhang, C., Afzaal, M., Omar, A., & Altohami, W. M. A. (2023). A corpus-based analysis of the stylistic features of Chinese and American diplomatic discourse. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1122675. doi: https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1122675

Бібліографічний опис:

Межеріцький, Б. В., Титаренко, О. Ю. (2026). Виклики дипломатичного дискурсу в контексті сучасної лінгвістики. *Науковий часопис Українського державного університету імені Михайла Драгоманова. Серія 9. Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов*, 31, 66–81. https://doi.org/10.31392/UDU-nc.series9.2026.31.05.

А н о т а ц і я

У статті розглянуто дипломатичний дискурс як складне багатовимірне комунікативне явище в контексті сучасного мовознавства. Вирішено проблему визначення та інтерпретації дипломатичного дискурсу з урахуванням його мовних, прагматичних, когнітивних і соціокультурних характеристик. Метою дослідження є комплексний аналіз дипломатичного дискурсу та виявлення ключових стратегій, що визначають його функціонування у сфері міжнародної комунікації. Теоретико-методологічну основу роботи становлять положення критичного дискурс-аналізу, теорії мовленнєвих актів і когнітивної лінгвістики. Емпіричну базу дослідження сформовано з автентичних англомовних дипломатичних текстів, зокрема офіційних заяв, виступів і документів.

Результати дослідження засвідчують, що дипломатичний дискурс характеризується системним використанням імпліцитності, стратегічної ввічливості та дискурсивної неоднозначності. Ці ознаки реалізуються через непрямі мовленнєві акти, стратегії пом'якшення та метафоричне моделювання, що забезпечують гнучкість інтерпретації та сприяють підтриманню кооперативної взаємодії в умовах потенційного конфлікту. Виявлено також значущість міжкультурних чинників у формуванні дипломатичного мовлення та вплив цифрового середовища на його трансформацію.

Отримані результати сприяють розвитку інтегративного підходу до аналізу дискурсу та поглиблюють розуміння мовних механізмів дипломатичної комунікації. Дослідження має як теоретичне значення для сучасного мовознавства, так і практичну цінність для сфери міжнародних відносин, перекладознавства та міжкультурної комунікації.

Ключові слова: *дипломатичний дискурс, прагматика, імпліцитність, стратегії ввічливості, дискурс-аналіз, міжкультурна комунікація.*

Received: *10 March 2026*
Revised: *11 April 2026*
Accepted for Publication: *23 May 2026*