Professional diplomatic language in the Ukrainian-British and Ukrainian-German international agreements at the turn of the XX – XXI centuries

Фахова дипломатична мова в українсько-британських та українсько-німецьких міжнародних угодах на рубежі XX – XXI століття

Written by:
Olena Kaminska[1]
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2614-3571
Kateryna Tulyulyuk[2]
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8197-8454
Zoya Kudelko[3]
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3331-6154
Alla Tkach[4]
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1108-0256

Abstract

The paper analyzes the peculiarities of the use of the professional language of diplomacy in the Ukrainian-German and Ukrainian-British agreements at the turn of the XX - XXI centuries. International relations is a sphere of social activity in which language is formed in the diplomatic professional field. Diplomatic protocol requires compliance with certain rules and regulations.

The objective of the study is to highlight the main components of the professional language of diplomacy based on the analysis of diplomatic texts of interstate agreements. An important element is the interpretation of diplomatic ideas through the prism of the linguistic dimension. The paper is not just a linguistic analysis of the text, but a comparative analysis of the key elements of the diplomatic style of speech, typical for the Ukrainian-German and Ukrainian-British agreements. A combination of dialectical and synergetic scientific and philosophical methodology was successfully used to achieve the set tasks. Due to the structural and typological

Анотація

У статті аналізуються особливості використання фахової мови дипломатії в українсько-німецьких та українсько-британських договорах на рубежі XX – XXI століття. Міжнародні відносини є сферою суспільної активності, в якій формується мова за дипломатичним професійним спрямуванням. Дипломатичний протокол вимагає дотримання певних норм і правил. У статті здійснено порівняльний аналіз ключових складників дипломатичного офіційно-ділового стилю в українській, англійській та німецькій мовах. Міждержавні угоди періоду здобуття незалежності України з основними європейськими геополітичними гравцями потребують ґрунтовного й різностороннього вивчення. Йдеться не лише про політичний зміст документів, а й про їхню форму та стильове оформлення.

Метою роботи є висвітлення основних складників фахової мови дипломатії на основі аналізу дипломатичних текстів міждержавних угод. Важливим елементом є тлумачення дипломатичних ідей крізь призму лінгвістичного виміру. Завдання полягають у дослідженні

[1] PhD in Philology, assistant, Department of Modern Foreign Languages and Translation, Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Chernivtsi, Ukraine.
[2] PhD in Philology, assistant, Department of Modern Foreign Languages and Translation, Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Chernivtsi, Ukraine.
[3] PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, Department of Modern Foreign Languages and Translation, Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Chernivtsi, Ukraine.
[4] PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, Department of Social Sciences and Ukrainian Studies, Bukovinian State Medical University, Chernivtsi, Ukraine.

methods of linguistic research, the tasks set for the classification of diplomatic texts have been achieved.

Thus, the study of the components of professional diplomatic language is relevant in modern scientific and linguistic discourse, as it enables studying philological aspects and at the same time is useful for understanding the essence of international politics.

Keywords: diplomatic document, interstate agreement, Ukrainian-British relations, Ukrainian-German agreement, professional language of diplomacy.

лексико-граматичних аспектів офіційно-ділового стилю дипломатичного тексту договору. У статті робиться не просто лінгвістичний аналіз тексту, а здійснюється порівняльний аналіз основних елементів дипломатичного стилю мовлення, характерного для українсько-німецьких та українсько-британських угод. Задля досягнення поставлених завдань успішно використовувалося поєднання діалектичної та синергетичної науково-філософської методології. Завдяки структурному та типологічному методам лінгвістичних досліджень досягнуто поставлених завдань щодо класифікації дипломатичних текстів.

Отже, дослідження складників фахової дипломатичної мови актуальне в сучасному науково-лінгвістичному дискурсі, оскільки дозволяє вивчати як філологічні аспекти, так і є корисним для розуміння сутності міжнародної політики.

Ключові слова: дипломатичний документ, міждержавна угода, українсько-британські відносини, українсько-німецький договір, фахова мова дипломатії.

Introduction

The paper elucidates the structure of diplomatic documents of the Ukrainian-German and Ukrainian-British agreements. The peculiarities of the introductory parts with the intentions of the parties, the core of the document with certain elements of cooperation in these areas, aspects of compliance with diplomatic protocol are revealed. The peculiarity of the analysis of these documents is the interpretation of the parts that do not indicate general diplomatic activity, but the aspects that are inherent only in bilateral relations between the states.

Interstate relations need to be studied in detail, as they determine the priorities for the development of political, economic and cultural cooperation on an international scale. Diplomatic nuances remain for political scientists. Analysis of the professional language of diplomacy requires philological research, as it deals with a cluster of formal business style of speech. Thus, the structure of diplomatic documents is fully correlated with the norms and rules of the languages of both parties. Such studies are conducted taking into account the need to highlight the content and form of the text in two languages. Our research proposes to perform a double comparative analysis in the following formats: Ukrainian-German and Ukrainian-English.

For completeness of the study, different types of diplomatic documents are analyzed.

- fundamental intergovernmental agreements on recognition of countries as subjects of international law and priorities of friendship between the states: "Joint Declaration on the Fundamentals of Relations between Ukraine and the Federal Republic of Germany" (1993), "Joint Declaration between Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" (1992);

- basic agreements on cooperation in the field of socio-cultural activities "Agreement between Ukraine and the Federal Republic of Germany on the Development of Large-Scale Cooperation in the Field of Economy, Industry, Science and Technology" (1993) and "Agreement on the Principles of Relations and Cooperation between Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland"(1994);

- sector-specific agreements on cooperation in certain spheres of public activity "Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministry of Emergencies and Protection of the Population from the Consequences of the Chornobyl Accident and the Ministry of Energy and Climate Change of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on Cooperation in Radiation Safety, Physical Protection and Non-

Proliferation"(2009), "Agreement (in the form of an Exchange of Notes) between the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on Cooperation in Biological and Chemical Safety and Nuclear / Radiological Protection" under the initiative of the G-7 led Global Partnership against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction" (2020).

The study of the elements of the professional language of diplomacy entails understanding of international politics, as the documents are formed in two paradigms: the actual, linguistic and diplomatic. On the one hand, there are norms and rules of state languages in which the agreement or treaty is concluded. On the other hand, it is significant to comply with the requirements of diplomatic protocol. These two categories almost never contradict each other, but there are aspects that require agreement between them.

The objective of this study is to investigate the structural elements of the professional language of diplomacy based on the analysis of the Ukrainian-German and Ukrainian-British interstate agreements. In the study of lexical and grammatical features of diplomatic texts, the task is to identify a synergistic model of scientific and linguistic discourse. The format of harmonization of key components of the diplomatic protocol in the philological dimension is clearly traced in the interstate agreements.

Theoretical Framework or Literature Review

The problems of the professional language of diplomacy are covered in the research of Adamcova (2018), Arifon (2016), Bryson (2016), Melchor (2020), Pokhrel (2020), Stanzel (2018).

The peculiarities of diplomatic texts are discovered by Connelly, Hicks, Jervis, Spirling & Suong (2021) and Ismailov, Rayeva, Koblanova, Yelikbayev, & Yessenova (2020).

The use of the INTERNET environment, social networks and information and computer technologies is important in the study of international relations in general and the texts of interstate agreements in particular. Such studies are conducted by Zanettin (2016), Stepanov (2020), Dorosh & Kopey (2018).

Some elements of the relationship and correlation of state languages in international agreements are found in the works of Maynez (2016), Bayram & Ta (2019).

In the study of interstate relations, we use bilateral agreements between Ukraine and the United Kingdom and Ukraine and Germany.

Methodology

The paper uses general scientific research methods, in particular, the analysis of diplomatic texts. The method of comparative analysis was also updated to identify differences (features) of interstate agreements between Ukraine and other countries. Synergetic and dialectical scientific and philosophical methodology was instrumental for identifying common and different elements in the texts of Ukraine's international agreements with Germany and Great Britain. Structural and typological methods of linguistic research were used to study the peculiarities of the professional language of diplomacy, which provided a thorough analysis of diplomatic texts.

The use of the structural-typological method in the current study is due to the need to study the diplomatic-linguistic cluster. Since diplomatic translation is complex in an organizational and structural sense, there is a need for specific research methods. A standard analytical methodological set is not enough, therefore a synergistic approach is used, in which the interaction of structural and typological components is actualized. This methodological principle makes it possible to investigate the content and format of a diplomatic document and to overcome difficulties associated with its translation or interpretation.

Results

It should be noted that the viability of the state language of a particular subject of international relations, which is expressed in cultural and political values, is of utmost significance. The state language must always be presented at the highest level at the international level. The professional language of diplomacy should fully cover all aspects of the socio-cultural environment: from politics to culture (Ismailov, Rayeva, Koblanova, Yelikbayev & Yessenova, 2020).

Language is an important component of communication. The effectiveness of language depends on the possession of language skills by the vast majority of speakers. As for the concept of "professional language", it is about the use of certain terminology (Bryson, 2016). The professional language of diplomacy is characterized by the concepts inherent in foreign policy.

Language is a key component in international relations, which is characterized by a combination of different socio-cultural characteristics. Language as the most effective means of communication is becoming a tool for communication at the interstate and international level (Adamcova, 2018). It should be emphasized that language is a translator of ideas that lead to both understanding and pointing out differences between the subjects of diplomacy. It should be born in mind that the positions set out in diplomatic texts are officially recorded in the historical dimension. Therefore, the professional language of diplomacy bears the burden of responsibility, as all its elements are under constant political monitoring of stakeholders.

Professional language acts as a language cluster that provides an effective communication between specialists in a particular field. Professional language does not appear as an independent linguistic element. Rather, it is a set of philological components used in a particular area of public life. Diplomatic discourse appears as a separate sphere of socio-cultural activity and forms its own terminological system. In addition, modern synergetic models permeate philological elements, so professional diplomatic language is closely intertwined (and, in some cases, merges) with other professional fields (political, economic, cultural, etc.).

Information on the metadata of the relevant documentation is highly topical for the professional language of diplomacy. This is mostly archival data, which should reflect accurate information about the participants involved in a particular document. For example, in the United States, there was established the Freedom of Information Archive (FOI Archive), where more than 3 million diplomatic documents were processed. Researchers of this resource (Connelly et all, 2021) point out that ordered metadata contain information obtained through special natural language processing tools for a particular region. In the way, the linguistic features of the professional language of diplomacy in terms of different regional languages and cultures are studied.

One of the variations in the interpretation of the professional language of diplomacy is the "dialogue of languages" proposed by Maynez (2016). This guideline is intended to eliminate the contradictions caused by linguistic differences. At least two languages from both parties are used when concluding a diplomatic agreement. Difficulties in translation and different interpretations of certain concepts can create certain problems in the perception and understanding of a diplomatic document. Under such conditions, establishing a dialogue of languages will provide the necessary synergy of the text, which will be unambiguous and unified. Certainly, the lexical and grammatical aspects will fully comply with the norms and rules of the official state language. It is rather about the harmonization of structural and typological components.

As an example, we point to the option of resolving a potential contradiction due to the language factor. The Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministry of Emergencies and Protection of the Population from the Consequences of the Chornobyl Accident and the Ministry of Energy and Climate Change of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on Cooperation in Radiation Safety, Physical Protection and Non-Proliferation that the agreement is in duplicate, each in the Ukrainian and English languages, both texts being equally authentic. In case of any divergence in the interpretation or application of the provisions of this Memorandum, the English text shall prevail. Such remarks are common practice in international relations. Of course, there are some inequalities; however, this guideline is used only to resolve differences. Given that English is the most common language in international relations, this format is quite acceptable and effective.

Another approach is found in the Agreement (in the form of exchange of notes) between the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on amendments to the Agreement (in the form of exchange of notes) between the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on Cooperation in Biological, Chemical Safety and Nuclear / Radiological Protection under the initiative of the G-7 led "Global Partnership against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction" (2020), which states that the agreement is in German and Ukrainian, both texts being identical legal force.

As Pokhrel (2020) emphasizes: "Diplomatic language is a social dialect meant to further the successful pursuit of political interests and is mostly used by individuals employed in a diplomatic capacity. Though often characterized as being subtle, it is a subtlety that is frequently arising out of the complexities of working of a diplomatic agent". Therefore, the effectiveness and expediency of the use of diplomatic language

depends both on the competence of its speakers and in the regulatory field of its operation.

The question of functioning of the professional language within the state language and in comparison with foreign languages is significant. This aspect is especially relevant for professional diplomatic language. Professional languages can be regulated with generally accepted literary language, as there is only one fundamental difference between them: in literary language there are lexical units of a certain national language; and in the professional one specialized terminology system is added to them.

The path to a synergetic model of unification of the norms and rules for the linguistic guidelines for a text of a diplomatic nature is quite challenging. One of the options for forming such guidelines is scientific diplomacy as a transnational and cross-border field, leveling borders, national and cultural aspects, stakeholders and professional components (Melchor, 2020). The only goal is to create an accessible and understandable system of linguistic support for the drafting of texts for diplomatic protocol in all its forms. This format should be accessible and acceptable to all players in international politics. The tacit components that have existed in diplomacy for a long time must be taken into account in the new rules for the use of the professional language in this area.

At the same time, it is worth noting that the subjunctive mood and ambiguity of statements are relevant to diplomatic texts and are actively used. This format provides a manifestation of nonlinearity of thinking and allows demonstrating flexibility and determines the prospects for further negotiation. Discussion, the search for a common position, compromise - all of these are possible only when using elements of conventionality in the professional language of diplomacy.

Translation is an important component of international politics. This domain of diplomatic activity is virtually invisible, but the information and communication functions it performs are fundamental (Zanettin, 2016). Two key aspects of intensifying the use of professional language of diplomacy as a tool for translation are singled out:

- simultaneous translation during negotiations or speeches;
- retransmission and interpretation of the provisions of diplomatic statements and documents in other countries in other languages.

The importance of accurate and unambiguous translation directly during the negotiations is undeniable. As for the interpretation, there may be some distortion of the essence of the diplomatic document. However, in terms of form (namely the linguistic aspect), the document must be submitted in accordance with the requirements and with strict adherence to the basics of professional diplomatic language.

Inaccuracies in translation, blurred content, and ambiguity of wording - all these flaws lead to the rejection of the content. Consequently, the diplomatic community states the inefficiency of this type of work organization. The COVID-19 pandemic has made some changes in the organization of the work of diplomatic missions, reorienting it more to the online format. Virtualization in some way reduces the share of direct communication between diplomats, which represents the need for new algorithms for constructing texts.

Particular attention is paid to elements that can be interpreted ambiguously when organizing a diplomatic document, which can lead to a potentially conflicting situation. Any language form that may demean or disrespect the traditions or laws of another state in diplomatic protocol is not allowed. This applies to the national, ethnic, religious, socio-cultural spheres, which emphasize the uniqueness of the state.

In the studied interstate agreements the examples of respect and tolerance for the state elements of the signatory countries are found. In particular, the historical parallels of the socio-cultural development of Ukraine and Germany are indicated: "Overcoming the contradiction between East and West enabled the German people to regain their unity in free self-determination. The Ukrainian people became independent in free self-determination." (Joint Declaration on the Fundamentals of Relations between Ukraine and the Federal Republic of Germany, 1993).

A similar linguistic appeal to historical and cultural aspects is traced in the Agreement on the Principles of Relations and Cooperation between Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (1994), which states: "Emphasizing the fundamental importance of the historical changes brought about by the end of the era of ideological and military confrontation in Europe… … convinced

of the need to promote an atmosphere of friendship, mutual trust, understanding and cooperation in international relations and determined to play an active role in this process.

Diplomacy in the modern socio-cultural environment is not limited to interstate relations. Politics, economics, culture - this is not a complete list of areas of social activity that are in the orbit of the diplomatic activity interests. Such activity evokes new principles of text construction, including new terminology and the latest formats of information transfer. This necessitates the expansion of existing communication formats (Stanzel, 2018). The linguistic environment, which requires new methodological guidelines, is no exception to this trend. It is worth adding a trend to digitalization, which must be taken into account in new ways of language communication.

Digitalization makes its adjustments in the functioning of the professional language of diplomacy. Unlike traditional means of communication, the virtualization of diplomatic dialogue significantly increases the level of accessibility of diplomatic texts to the general public. If we consider the difference in the ability to quickly get acquainted with the content and form of the intergovernmental agreement in the 90s of the XX century and the agreements that are currently being concluded, it is very striking. The creation of current and analysis of past diplomatic texts using the capabilities of information and computer technology optimizes the process of application and research of their lexical and grammatical nuances. At the same time, digitalization carries certain risks associated with information security issues (Stepanov, 2020). The transition to a virtual format of interstate communication is not yet fully comprehensible; as such a model requires new methodological guidelines.

The Internet, according to (Kurbalija & Slavik, 2001), "has strengthened the importance of texts as a key means of communication for modern man in various forms, such as e-mail, websites and hypertext-based documents". Diplomatic agreements always depend to a large extent on the texts. "IT-assisted analysis methods, such as DiploAnalytica, can detect layers of information and knowledge, both focus and tacit, contained in diplomatic documents" (Kurbalija & Slavik, 2001). Information and computer and technological support are effectively used in the creation of documentation for diplomatic use. In general, technology provides solutions to organizational and technical issues, offering a means to focus exclusively on the language of the diplomatic document.

The study of the linguistic peculiarities of the texts of international agreements was the result of a revival of public interest in foreign policy issues. The development of communication technologies makes it possible to understand not only the content of diplomatic activity, but also to understand the peculiarities of the form of international relations in the texts of agreements, media or social networks (Dorosh & Kopey, 2018).

The concept of "language style" is introduced into scientific discourse, which involves a combination of words for special purposes. International agreements have also become the object of a specialized language style. It is significant to be aware of the dichotomy: the similarities and differences of a diplomatic agreement. Convergence occurs through the individual aspirations of diplomats, which are expressed in their communications and synergies of language styles. At the same time, linguistic differences lead to dialectical contradictions. Researchers (Bayram & Ta, 2019) used text analysis programs Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC). According to the study, the percentage of agreed provisions of the texts is higher in those moments where there was a direct discussion between stakeholders, rather than just reading in the text version. Hence, the conclusion appears that there is an urgent need to change the algorithms for organizing diplomatic texts to increase their accessibility and clarity. Arifon (2016) emphasizes the need to take into account the differences between diplomatic language and the general style of speech.

The introductory part of interstate agreements consists of a declaration of intent of the parties and a statement of mutual respect and interest in the implementation of bilateral relations. In the declarations on the establishment of diplomatic relations between Ukraine, Britain and Germany, the actualization of intentions is provided by the following concepts:

- "seeking"
- "welcoming"
- "noting"
- "guided"
- "being aware".

Declarative intentions are reinforced by concepts that express social activity (see: Table 1).

Table 1.

Linguistic concepts of socio-cultural activity in interstate agreements

Joint Declaration between Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Joint Declaration on the Fundamentals of Relations between Ukraine and the Federal Republic of Germany
"Ukraine and Germany will build their relations in compliance with the norms of international law…"	"The Parties will cooperate in improving the efficiency and implementation of the agreement…"
"Both Parties reaffirm the right of all peoples to determine their destiny freely and without outside interference…"	"The Parties shall render all appropriate assistance to each other in establishing diplomatic missions…"
"Ukraine and Germany reaffirm shared responsibility for strengthening peace…"	"The Parties will not create political obstacles to the rapid development of mutual understanding and cooperation…"
"Both Parties declare that they respect territorial integrity…"	"The Parties respect sovereignty and territorial integrity…"
"Ukraine and Germany confirm that they will recognize commitments…"	"The Parties welcome the transition from confrontation to cooperation…"

Analyzing these two agreements between Ukraine and Germany and Ukraine and Great Britain, we underline the following linguistic features:

1) Each new sub-paragraph emphasizes the interest and involvement of both parties to the agreement on activity in a particular area of social activity. A characteristic feature is the different definitions in both agreements: if the Declaration between Ukraine and Germany indicates such variants as "both parties" and the signatory countries "Ukraine and Germany"; then in the Ukrainian-British version only the term "parties" is used. This peculiarity of the textual construction is most likely due to the fact that the United Kingdom consists of several state entities, which are indicated only in the title of the document, which is caused by the simplification of the presentation of the main provisions.

2) Common lexical and grammatical construction of the provisions of the Declaration. Both agreements actively use affirmative definitions: "confirm recognition", "welcome the transition", "respect sovereignty", "do not hinder", "build relationships", "provide assistance", etc. The application of such affirmative concepts strengthens the diplomatic weight of the signed agreement, indicating the specificity of the proposed agreements and the inevitability of their implementation.

A separate cluster in the joint declarations of cooperation is the specification of elements of cooperation in certain areas of social activity (see: Table 2).

Table 2.

Common and distinctive features of the texts of interstate agreements

In the economic sphere	
Joint Declaration on the Fundamentals of Relations between Ukraine and the Federal Republic of Germany Agreement between Ukraine and the Federal Republic of Germany on the Development of Large-Scale Cooperation in the Field of Economy, Industry, Science and Technology	Agreement on the Principles of Relations and Cooperation between Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
"The Contracting Parties shall, in accordance with the principles of equality, non-discrimination and mutual benefit, make efforts to steadily intensify and diversify bilateral relations in the fields of economy, industry, science and technology."	"The Parties will seek to promote, in accordance with the principles of market economy and private enterprise, cooperation between the two countries in various fields of economic activity."
In the sphere of international law	
"Ukraine and Germany will build their relations in compliance with international law, adhering to the principles of sovereign equality, territorial integrity, inviolability of borders, peaceful settlement of disputes, prohibition of the use of force or threat of force and	"The Parties will develop their relations on the basis of strict adherence to the principles of international law and good faith. They declare their commitment to the peaceful settlement of disputes, the principles of sovereign equality, territorial integrity and inviolability of borders, the democratic principles and practices of an

respect for human rights, including the rights of national minorities."

In the cultural sphere

"Both Parties declare their desire to further develop cultural cooperation in all areas, including education and science. They reaffirm their readiness to ensure that all interested parties have free access to the language and culture of the other Party and to support relevant state, public and other initiatives. Concern for the cultural values of one Party located in the territory of the other Party, their preservation is a natural manifestation of the new relationship between Ukraine and Germany. They agree that lost or illegally exported cultural property located in their territories will be returned to the owner or his successor."

open society, and respect for human rights and the rule of law. "

"The Parties will promote the development of cultural and educational contacts, cooperation and exchanges between organizations and individuals of both countries. The Parties will welcome each other's efforts to spread the language of the other Party in their country.

The key elements of economic and legal cooperation are linguistically stated in a similar way.

Affirmative definitions are combined with specific clarifications on the components of certain areas of social activity.

The format of diplomatic agreements concluded by Ukraine during the period of independence is marked by benevolent intentions and the manifestation of general prospects for the development of interstate relations. At the same time, further interstate agreements already have a more specific mission, determining the content of cooperation between states. This has led to a certain change in the terminology of diplomatic documents.

Further research into the professional language of diplomacy should be conducted in the context of the analysis of a larger number of diplomatic documents covering a larger number of member states. A comparative analysis of diplomatic agreements between Ukraine and the United Kingdom and Ukraine and Germany enables identifying common and different characteristics of the diplomatic formal business style of language. The structure of documents, their typology and lexical and grammatical content are instrumental for exploring both the linguistic component and the subtleties of diplomatic work.

Conclusions

The diversity of studied documents contributes to a better understanding of the "nature of diplomatic texts". It should be pointed out that the style of organizing Ukrainian-German and Ukrainian-British documents is in fact similar in content. At the same time, certain linguistic differences are indicated, which testify to the uniqueness of individual interstate relations and the peculiarity of each individual diplomatic text.

While analyzing the texts of interstate agreements, it may be concluded that the most optimal methodological approach to the study of the professional language of diplomacy is a synergetic model that allows to find a format for constructing diplomatic texts based not only on linguistic, but also sociocultural components. The combination of diplomatic professionalism with skillful use of the linguistic component will lead to effective international activities. Philological accuracy and diplomatic subtlety of interstate documents are the key to effective international relations.

Bibliographic references

Adamcova, S. (2018). Communication in Diplomacy. Language and politics between linguistics and political science, 3. 370-377 https://conferences.euba.sk/jazykapolitika/archiv/3-rocnik

Agreement between Ukraine and the Federal Republic of Germany on the development of large-scale cooperation in the field of economy, industry, science and technology. No 276_010. (1993, November 5) [In Ukrainian]. Retrieved from: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/276_010#Text

Agreement on the Principles of Relations and Cooperation between Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. No 826_040. (1994, August 5) [In Ukrainian]. Retrieved from: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/826_040#Text

Agreement (in the form of an exchange of notes) between the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on cooperation in biological and chemical safety and nuclear / radiological protection under the initiative of the Group of Seven. No 276_001-19. (2020, January 4) [In Ukrainian]. Retrieved from:

https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/276_00
1-19#Text

Arifon. O. (2016). Diplomatic language and formal language: a code with a double meaning. An Experts' Guide to International Protocol. Amsterdam University Press, pp. 152-175 https://doi.org/10.1515/9789048530625-013

Bayram, A. B., & Ta, V. P. (2019). Diplomatic Chameleons: Language Style Matching and Agreement in International Diplomatic Negotiations. Negotiation and conflict management research, 12(1), 23-40 https://DOI10.1111/ncmr.12142

Bryson, D. (2016) Professional Language: Understanding and being understood. Journal of Visual Communication in Medicine, 39(3-4). 158-159 https://doi.org/10.1080/17453054.2016.1246 942

Connelly, M.J., Hicks, R., Jervis, R., Spirling, A., & Suong, C.H. (2021). Diplomatic documents data for international relations: the Freedom of Informationт Archive Database. Conflict management and peace science, 38(6), 762-781 https://doi.org/10.1177/0738894220930326

Dorosh, L., & Kopey, Yu. (2018). Twitter-diplomacy: Ukrainian context. Political science, 4(2), 10.23939/shv2018.02.032

Ismailov, F., Rayeva, G., Koblanova, A., Yelikbayev, B., & Yessenova, K. (2020). Analysis of political and diplomatic language in linguistic, cognitive and pragmatic aspects. Opción, 91, 803-819 https://www.produccioncientificaluz.org/ind ex.php/opcion/article/view/31882

Joint Declaration between Ukraine and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. No 826_002. (1992, September 15) [In Ukrainian]. Retrieved from: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/826_00 2#Text

Joint Declaration on the Fundamentals of Relations between Ukraine and the Federal Republic of Germany. No 276_012 (1993, June 9) [In Ukrainian]. Retrieved from: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/main/276_01 2#Text

Kurbalija, J., & Slavik, H. (2001). Language and Diplomacy. Diplomacy, 182 p. https://www.diplomacy.edu/resource/langua ge-and-diplomacy-preface/

Maynez, P. (2016). Dialogue of the language. A diplomatic edition. Nueva revista filologia hispánica, 64(2), 543-547 https://doi.org/10.24201/nrfh.v64i2.2577

Melchor, L. (2020). What Is a Science Diplomat? The Hague Journal of Diplomacy, 15, 409-423. https://DOI:10.1163/1871191X-bja10026

Memorandum of Understanding between the Ministry of Emergencies and Protection of the Population from the Consequences of the Chornobyl Accident and the Ministry of Energy and Climate Change of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on Cooperation in Radiation Safety, Physical Protection and Non-Proliferation. No 826_031. (2009, August 31) [In Ukrainian]. Retrieved from: https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/826_03 1#Text

Pokhrel, S. (2020). Diplomatic Language: An Analysis of Salutations from Speeches used in International Diplomacy. Journal of International Affairs, 3, 180-193 https://doi.org/10.3126/joia.v3i1.29094

Stanzel, V. (2018). New Realities in Foreign Affairs: Diplomacy in the 21st Century. Berlin: SWP Research Paper, 69 p. https://acortar.link/ar4n69

Stepanov, V. (2020). Digital diplomacy in the informational space. Bulletin of the NAPA. Series «Public Administration», 2, 10-13

Zanettin, F. (2016). The deadliest error: translation, international relations and the news media. Translator, 22(3), pp. 303-318 https://doi.org/10.1080/13556509.2016.1149 754