

**MODERN TRENDS IN CHANGING THE COMMUNICATIVE NORMS OF
DIPLOMATIC DISCOURSE**

***TENDÊNCIAS MODERNAS NA MUDANÇA DAS NORMAS COMUNICATIVAS DO
DISCURSO DIPLOMÁTICO***

***TENDENCIAS MODERNAS PARA CAMBIAR LAS NORMAS COMUNICATIVAS DEL
DISCURSO DIPLOMÁTICO***

Oksana Nikolaevna BUTSKAYA¹
Inna Nikolaevna PAKHOMOVA²
Elena Sergeevna BRICHENKOVA³

ABSTRACT: This study is devoted to the trend of changes in the communicative norms of diplomatic discourse. Currently, due to the influence of several extralinguistic factors on diplomatic communication, there is a mixing of the institutional discursive type, which includes diplomatic discourse, with the personal discursive type characteristic of everyday communication. In modern diplomatic discourse, there is an obvious tendency to deviate from the conventional norms of diplomatic communication and deregulate it. With all the social significance and linguistic value of such a process, diplomatic discourse remains poorly understood. The novelty of the study is associated with the relevance of the topic as it examines examples of diplomatic communication that have become typical in the last 6-7 years, which allows analyzing the trend that has formed today.

KEYWORDS: Extralinguistic factors. Institutional type. Personal type. Conventionality. Deregulation.

RESUMO: *Este estudo é dedicado à tendência de mudanças nas normas comunicativas do discurso diplomático. Atualmente, devido à influência de diversos fatores extralinguísticos na comunicação diplomática, há uma mistura do tipo discursivo institucional, que inclui o discurso diplomático, com o tipo discursivo pessoal característico da comunicação cotidiana. No discurso diplomático moderno, há uma tendência óbvia de se desviar das normas convencionais da comunicação diplomática e desregulamentá-la. Com todo o significado social e valor linguístico de tal processo, o discurso diplomático continua mal compreendido. A novidade do estudo está associada à relevância do tema, pois examina exemplos de comunicação diplomática que se tornaram típicos nos últimos 6 a 7 anos, o que permite analisar a tendência que se tem formado hoje.*

¹ Moscow State Linguistic University, Moscow - Russia. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0811-5262>. E-mail: obutskaya@list.ru

² Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (RUDN University), Moscow - Russia. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3838-5888>. E-mail: i.pakhomoffa@mail.ru

³ Kyung Hee University, Giheung-gu, Yongin-si, Gyeonggi-do - Republic of Korea. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3252-332X>. E-mail: elena102000@mail.ru

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Fatores extralinguísticos. Tipo institucional. Tipo pessoal. Convencionalidade. Desregulamentação.*

RESUMEN: *Este estudio está dedicado a la tendencia de cambios en las normas comunicativas del discurso diplomático. Actualmente, debido a la influencia de varios factores extralingüísticos en la comunicación diplomática, existe una mezcla del tipo discursivo institucional, que incluye el discurso diplomático, con el tipo discursivo personal característico de la comunicación cotidiana. En el discurso diplomático moderno, existe una tendencia obvia a desviarse de las normas convencionales de comunicación diplomática y desregularla. Con todo el significado social y el valor lingüístico de tal proceso, el discurso diplomático sigue siendo poco conocido. La novedad del estudio está asociada a la relevancia del tema ya que examina ejemplos de comunicación diplomática que se han vuelto típicos en los últimos 6-7 años, lo que permite analizar la tendencia que se ha formado en la actualidad.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Factores extralingüísticos. Tipo institucional. Tipo personal. Convencionalismo. Desregulación.*

Introduction

Modern diplomatic communication is undergoing significant changes caused by the intensive transformation of the nature of international relations. Such markers of a new era as globalization, multipolarity, and interdependence of the world, and the World Wide Web have led to an increase in the importance of diplomacy, to an expansion of the range of issues regulated by diplomatic means. The subject of discussion was not only foreign policy issues but also such areas as disarmament, ecology, terrorism, social issues, and many others. The rapidly changing nature of international relations forces diplomatic communication to respond correctly and quickly to what is happening. The composition of the typical participants in diplomatic discourse, agents and clients, has changed, and diplomatic communication has become more open. These factors naturally led to a change in the communicative norms of diplomatic discourse. Being an institutional discursive type, the type of discourse we are considering in the last 6-7 years reveals characteristic features of another type – personal, relevant for personality-oriented communication. There is a tendency towards deviation from the conventional norms of diplomatic communication, deregulation of diplomatic discourse in connection with the use of language techniques and means that are not characteristic of this type of communication. The study of diplomatic discourse is devoted to the work of such scholars as M.V. Belyakov (2015), L.G. Vikulova (2016), L.M. Terentii (2010), V.N. Yapparova (2016), and others. However, the nature of changes in the communicative norms of diplomatic discourse, in our opinion, is not fully studied. This paper presents a study of modern

processes in diplomatic discourse from the standpoint of sociolinguistics (diplomatic discourse as an institutional type of communication) and linguistic stylistics (diplomatic discourse in its relation to the official business style of speech).

Methods

From the standpoint of sociolinguistics personal (personality-oriented) and institutional types of discourse are distinguished. Diplomatic discourse belongs to the group of institutional discourses, that is, it is part of a stable system of status-role relations that exist in the communicative space of a diplomatic institution (KRAVETS, 2017).

An in-depth analysis of institutional discourse was made in the works of V.I. Karasik *On Types of discourse* (2000) and *On Categories of Discourse* (1998). The author notes that in the personal type of discourse, the speaker acts as a person in all the wealth of their inner world, and in the institutional type – as a representative of a certain social institution. The scientist identifies the following types of institutional discourse: political, diplomatic, administrative, legal, military, pedagogical, religious, mystical, medical, business, advertising, sports, scientific, scenic, and mass information. Institutional discourse is distinguished based on two system-forming characteristics: goals and participants in communication. The main participants in the institutional discourse are representatives of the institution (agents) and people who address them (clients). There are varying degrees of discourse openness, for example, clients within the framework of scientific, business, and diplomatic discourse do not differ from agents, while clients of political, legal, medical, and religious discourse show a sharp difference from the agents of the corresponding discourse (KARASIK, 2000). The features of institutionality capture the role characteristics of agents and clients of institutions, typical chronotopes, symbolic actions, stencil genres, and speech clichés. Institutional communication is communication in peculiar masks. It is the stereotyped communication that fundamentally distinguishes the institutional discourse from the personal. According to M.Iu. Oleshkov (2006), institutional discourse is a socialized clichéd type of communication between people who may not know each other but must communicate in accordance with the norms of this social institution.

A.S. Kozheteva (2009), who quite deeply researched the issue of the norm as a sign of the institutionality of diplomatic discourse, draws attention to the fact that communication within the framework of diplomatic discourse as status-oriented is subject to certain norms and traditions that have developed over the long history of international diplomatic relations.

Following L.E. Tumina (2005), A.S. Kozheteva (2012) defines the norm as a set of the most stable traditional implementations of the language system, selected and fixed in the process of public communication. An example of institutional discourse is an excerpt from the introductory speech of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Russia S.V. Lavrov at the ceremony of presenting the Order of Friendship to the Chairman of the Board of the German-Russian Forum M. Platzeck (Berlin, September 14, 2018):

Dear friends, we can begin our short, but very important ceremony. Dear Mr. Platzeck, dear Matthias, it is an honor and pleasure for me to fulfill the honorary order of the President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin and present you with the Order of Friendship. You are our partner who sincerely believes in the future of Russian-German relations, who stood at the origins of many civil society initiatives and who has never deviated from this strategic course. Just now, thanks to your kind invitation, I spoke to the members of the German-Russian Forum and was able to see how popular this structure is and how many famous, influential politicians it attracts. I wish you every success.

Thus, diplomatic discourse is traditionally attributed to the institutional type, which is characterized by normalization, cliché, codification.

Results and discussion

Currently, as V.I. Karasik notices, there is a rapid change in the genres of discourse, due, first of all, to the active expansion of mass information communication in the daily life of people. Television and computer communication environments are rapidly blurring the line between everyday (personality-oriented) and institutional communication (KARASIK, 2000). D.S. Khramchenko (2014), examining the modern English-language business discourse, points to a new tendency towards deregulation of this type of discourse, deviation from conventional norms, rules, and regulations as a result of the use of language techniques and means atypical for this discursive type. D.S. Khramchenko writes:

Today, few people are surprised or misunderstood the inclusion by many entrepreneurs, economists and other business people in their speech of such atypical language techniques and means as the use of rude or colloquial vocabulary, irony and humor, excessive imagery when presenting factual information, examples which can be found not only in the media on the relevant subject but also in the official materials of reputable international organizations, such as the IMF or the UN, which, in theory, should have a dry official tone.

This trend extends not only to the English-language business discourse but also to modern diplomatic discourse, which we can confidently assert by analyzing examples of

diplomatic communication in recent years. Despite the obvious changes in the communicative norms of diplomatic discourse this type of discourse, in our opinion, as well as the tendency towards deregulation of modern diplomatic discourse have not been sufficiently studied. L.M. Terentii (2010) believes that the diplomatic discourse remains practically unexplored, although this type cannot but be of interest for linguistics. We classify two categories as an agent of diplomatic discourse: first, senior government officials, that is, professional politicians; secondly, representatives of the diplomatic corps – professional diplomats.

Let us analyze the current trend in diplomatic communication. A striking example of the deregulation of diplomatic discourse is the speech of the Russian diplomat, Russian Deputy Envoy to the UN, Vladimir Safronkov at a meeting of the UN Security Council in 2017. In his speech, he addressed the British Permanent Representative, Matthew Rycroft, making remarks to him about the unjustified insult of several countries, including Russia. The speech of a British diplomat is traditionally distinguished by a neutral tone, restraint, and strict compliance with the rules of the regulations. As for Safronkov's speech, one cannot fail to note the violent emotionality and expressiveness of speech using colloquial and even rude expressions, which is a deviation from conventional norms, rules, and regulations. For example, such expressions as

“you were scared, you lost your sleep that we will cooperate with the United States” (here V. Safronkov is addressing the representatives of Great Britain), “[you] are completely entangled in your anti-regime ideas! What are you doing? It turns out that regime change is more important to you than the positions of most UN members. You spoke today, Mr. Rycroft, not on the agenda of the meeting; insulted Syria, Turkey, Iran and other states. Mr. Chairman, please follow the order of the meeting, if some are irresponsible, insulting, straying in slang, refer to their place in the UN Security Council”.

Addressing as informal “you” does not correspond to the norms of diplomatic communication. Providing the maximum emotional impact on the opponent, “YOU – communication” demonstrates a negative and dismissive attitude towards them. The phrase “*Look at me! Do not look away, why are you looking away?*” said by V. Safronkov, is more appropriate in everyday communication than in institutional one. Such speech, which is a clear deviation from the usual norms of diplomatic speech behavior, makes a powerful impression on the listeners. It is no coincidence that the famous philologist Marina Koroleva called this speech “the brightest in the UN Security Council since Khrushchev days”.

Let us consider the statement of the President of Turkey, Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, to the German authorities at a rally in Istanbul:

“You are Nazis, you have no democracy. Hey Germany, you have no democracy anywhere... Your actions are no different from the actions of the Nazis in the past, the German authorities must respect Turkey, otherwise the result will be against you”.

Such a violent reaction from the President was caused by the fact that on the eve of the referendum, the German authorities refused to allow Turkish ministers to hold a rally in three German cities where the Turkish diaspora lives. Both examples clearly demonstrate the current tendency to deviate from conventional norms due to the use of linguistic techniques and means atypical for institutional discourse.

This tendency is also a consequence of changes in the target attitudes of this type of discourse. If traditionally the goal of diplomatic communication was to inform the public about the government’s point of view on a particular international problem, now it also seeks to maximize the impact on the client, which brings diplomatic discourse closer to political and mass media. Hence, the use of particular linguistic structures in the investigated discursive type. Let us take as an example the recent negotiations between China and the United States. The Internet portal Korrespondent.net described them as unprecedentedly tough negotiations between the heads of the United States and Chinese Foreign Ministries, which have every reason to be included in diplomacy textbooks. US Secretary of State Antony Blinken and the United States National Security Advisor Jake Sullivan came from the American side to the two-day talks in the capital of Alaska. From the Chinese side, the Minister of Foreign Affairs and Member of the State Council of China Wang Yi and member of the CCP Politburo, head of the office of the Central Committee’s Foreign Affairs Commission attended. Blinken began the negotiations in Alaska with a very harsh statement. Usually, during a protocol shoot, the parties simply greet each other and exchange pleasantries, but instead, the US Secretary of State said: *“We will ... discuss our deep concerns with actions by China, including in Xinjiang, Hong Kong, Taiwan, cyber-attacks on the United States, economic coercion of our allies”.* Yang Jiechi said *“The United States uses its military force and financial hegemony to carry out long-arm jurisdiction and suppress other countries. It abuses so-called notions of national security to obstruct normal trade exchanges, and incite some countries to attack China”.* Also added: *“Let me say here that in front of the Chinese side, the United States does not have the qualification to say that it wants to speak to China from a position of strength”, “the American side had no right to say such things even 20 or 30 years ago, because this is not the way to deal with the Chinese people”* (2021). The media summed up: *“They say that such a public squabble has never happened in the history of diplomacy”.* The word “squabble” was successfully used

in relation to these negotiations, the purpose of which was, apparently, not the solution of important problems, but the establishment of their political influence.

For the most complete coverage of the current trend of changing the communicative norms of diplomatic discourse, it is necessary, in our opinion, to consider this phenomenon also from the standpoint of linguistic stylistics. In this aspect, the analysis of diplomatic discourse is focused on identifying communication registers, differentiating oral and written speech in their genre varieties, determining the functional parameters of communication based on its units (characteristic of functional styles) (KARASIK, 2000). An in-depth study of functional styles is presented in the works of I.R. Galperin (2016), D.E. Rosental (2007), I.V. Arnold (1999), T.A. Znamenskaia (2004), and other scientists. Diplomatic communication is carried out within the framework of the official business style, namely the diplomatic sub-style. Let us consider examples of deviations from the conventional norms inherent in the official business style of communication used in diplomatic communication using the works of A.N. Kozhin (1982), N.V. Priadilnikova (2016), E.P. Rashchevskaia (2012), and several other scientists. Researchers identify the following linguistic features of the official business style of speech:

1. Formality, emphasized objectivity, restraint.
2. Completeness of information with accuracy and compactness of presentation.
3. Impassivity, formality of tone, contraindication of emotionality, subjectivity. A neutral tone is the norm of business etiquette. Personal, subjective moments should be minimized. Therefore, outside of business speech, some forms have an emotionally expressive coloring.
4. Standardization of language means. Business communication takes place in typical situations where terms and speech clichés are not only appropriate but also necessary to ensure one hundred percent understanding between the parties: people who make important decisions should not be distracted by looking for certain formulations. Hence, the use of ready-made language stencils and stamps (RASHCHEVSKAIA, 2012).

Let us consider examples of modern business communication in standard speech situations.

On 20 February 2019, Russian President Vladimir Putin, in a message to the Federal Assembly, stated that the United States itself violates the INF Treaty (the treaty on the elimination of intermediate and shorter-range missiles between Russia and the United States).

Putin said:

Many countries have developed and continue to develop this type of weapon, but Russia and the United States have not, we voluntarily limit ourselves in this matter. This state of affairs, of course, can raise questions. So, our American partners needed to say so and be honest, and not use far-fetched accusations against Russia to justify their unilateral withdrawal from the Treaty. They also mobilize their satellites. *They are neatly (akkuratnenko), but still grunt (podkhriukivaiut) at the Americans on this issue*

In Russian, the use here of the vernacular verb “podkhriukivaiut” (grunt) in combination with the adverb “akkuratnenko” (neatly) with the diminutive-endearing suffix -enk-, inherent in everyday communication and contradicts the conventional norms of diplomatic discourse.

Another example:

“*Petr Alekseevich has gone mad (osatanel), apparently, in the right mind one can't even lie like that*”, the official representative of the Russian Foreign Ministry, diplomat Maria Zakharova speaks on the official Facebook page to the address of the former President of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko (Petr Alekseevich – in the text). Here Zakharova used the colloquial word “osatanel” (has gone mad) with a negative connotation, characteristic of everyday communication; “in the right mind one can't even lie like that” is a colloquial phrase that has a contemptuous-ironic expressive-stylistic coloring, which clearly demonstrates the modern tendency towards deregulation of diplomatic discourse.

Let us also cite as an example the statements of the President of the Philippines Rodrigo Duterte to the United States (2016), made after the refusal to supply small arms from the United States:

“*Look at these monkeys, the 26,000 firearms we wanted to buy, they don't want to sell. Son of a b****, we have many homemade guns here. These American fools*”. The unilateral termination of the treaty turned into not only a conflict but also a public insult and humiliation of the country's honor.

Here is another quote from Rodrigo Duterte, who responded to the criticism of UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon regarding human rights violations in the country: “*I said, (Ban Ki-moon), you are more fool. I will continue the campaign against the criminals. I do not have any pity for them. I do not give a sh*t. I am the president of the Philippines, not the republic of the international community*”. The President of the Philippines regularly uses invective vocabulary in his statements, which until recently was unacceptable in the circulation of representatives/heads of state. Abusive speech violates not only the rules of diplomatic communication but also the norms of public morality.

Here are some more examples. During a meeting of the UN Security Council, US Permanent Representative Samantha Power said:

“It seems that Russia has decided to change its borders, but it cannot change the facts. A referendum took place. But it doesn’t change the status of Crimea. *When a thief steals something, he doesn’t get ownership rights*”, quoted by the Voice of America, 2014.

In the following example, the newly elected Prime Minister of Italy, Mario Draghi, described the Turkish leader as “... *a dictator. However, we have to collaborate*” (2021).

M.V. Belyakov, studying emotiveness in diplomatic discourse, concluded that with an external protocol ban on emotions in diplomatic texts and interviews, the expression of emotions and assessments of a particular event is nevertheless present. Emotive statements are those that include emotive vocabulary. M.V. Belyakov, following V.I. Shakhovskii (2008) distinguishes the following groups of the emotive vocabulary of the language: vocabulary that names, designates emotions (that is, giving them a name), for example, joy; vocabulary describing emotions, such as trembling with fear, desperate, with contempt; and vocabulary expressing emotions, such as sycophants. The vocabulary denoting emotions is acceptable in diplomatic discourse, and the vocabulary describing and expressing emotions, as a rule, is unacceptable (BELYAKOV, 2015).

Here are some examples.

In 2017, speaking at the UN General Assembly, Donald Trump called North Korea an autocratic “*gang of criminals*” regime. He said that President Kim Jong-un is a “*rocket man*” on a “*suicide mission*”.

Minister of Foreign Affairs of North Korea Ri Yong-ho, who also arrived in New York for the General Assembly session, compared the President’s speech “*the sound of a dog barking*”. Kim Jong-un answered: “Now that Trump has denied the existence of and insulted me and my country in front of the eyes of the world, we will consider with seriousness exercising a corresponding, highest level of hard-line countermeasure in history”. He also stated that “action is the best option in treating the *dotard who, hard of hearing, is uttering only what he wants to say*”. “I will surely and definitely tame the mentally deranged U.S. dotard with fire,” he said. We observe in these examples the active use of vocabulary describing emotions and vocabulary expressing emotions, which is unacceptable, according to M.V. Belyakov.

There is an explicit way of realizing emotiveness in the given examples. Diplomatic communication in recent years has been distinguished by pronounced emotionality, expressiveness of communication, subjectivity, and evaluative judgments. At the vocabulary level, we note the active use of figurative linguistic means, as well as colloquial, rough, and even invective vocabulary. The frequency of such examples in modern diplomatic

communication indicates a tendency towards mixing institutional communication with the ordinary, deregulation of diplomatic discourse.

Conclusion

In modern society, extralinguistic factors such as globalization, the proliferation of Internet resources, the increase in the level of interdependence of states, the expansion of the problems of international negotiations have largely influenced the nature of diplomatic communication. The influence of these extralinguistic factors on diplomatic communication led to a change in the communicative norms of diplomatic discourse. Currently, in diplomatic discourse (primarily in its oral form), there is the use of linguistic means and techniques atypical for this discursive type. The use of colloquial vocabulary, coarse, vernacular linguistic elements, figurative means of expressiveness, which have a pronounced emotional and expressive connotation, testifies to a qualitatively new level of diplomatic communication. On the one hand, such processes indicate a greater openness of diplomatic communication, “democratization” of this discursive type, which has always been considered the elite and most closed type of communication. On the other hand, changes in the communicative norms of diplomatic discourse indicate a change in the target attitudes of this type of communication: not only informing the client but also influencing him, which brings this discursive type closer to political discourse and mass media. This tendency, in our opinion, will increase, and, therefore, require deeper study.

REFERENCES

ARNOLD, I. V. **Semantika. Stilistika. Intertekstualnost: Sb. st.** [Semantics. Stylistics. Intertextuality: Collection of articles]. Saint-Petersburg: Izd-vo S.- Peterburgskogo un-ta, 1999. 443 p. (in Russian).

BELYAKOV, M. V. Kharakter emotivnosti diplomaticheskogo diskursa [Emotive character of a diplomatic discourse]. **Vestnik Rossiiskogo universiteta druzhby narodov. Seriya: Lingvistika**, 2, p. 124-132, 2015 (in Russian).

GALPERIN, I. R. **Ocherki po stilistike angliiskogo iazyka: opyt sistematizatsii vyrazitelnykh sredstv** [Essays on the stylistics of the English language: an experience of systematizing expressive means]. Moscow: Librokom (Lingvisticheskoe Nasledie XX veka), 2016. 376 p. (in Russian).

KARASIK, V. I. O kategoriakh diskursa [On categories of discourse]. In: Slyshkin, G.G. (Ed.). **Iazykovaia lichnost: institutsionalnyi i personalnyi diskurs: Sb. nauch. tr.**

[Language personality: institutional and personal discourse: Collection of scientific papers]. Volgograd: Peremena, 1998. p. 185-197 (in Russian).

KARASIK, V. I. O tipakh diskursa [On types of discourse]. In: Karasik, V.I.; Slyshkin, G.G. (Ed.). **Iazykovaia lichnost: institutsionalnyi i personalnyi diskurs: Sb. nauch. tr.** [Language personality: institutional and personal discourse: Collection of scientific papers]. Volgograd: Peremena, 2000. p. 5-20 (in Russian).

KHRAMCHENKO, D. S. Konventsionalnost i dereglamentatsiia sovremennoogo angliiskogo delovogo diskursa [Conventionality and deregulation of modern business English discourse]. **Philology. Theory & Practice**, no. 1-1(31), p. 194-197, 2014 (in Russian).

KOZHETEVA, A. S. Norma kak priznak institutsionalnosti diplomaticheskogo diskursa [Norm as an Indication of Intitutionality of Diplomatic Discourse]. **Vestnik IGLU**, no. 3, p. 158-162, 2009 (in Russian).

KOZHETEVA, A. S. **Lingvopragmaticheskie kharakteristiki diplomaticheskogo diskursa** [Linguo-pragmatic characteristics of diplomatic discourse]: Abstract of the Thesis of the Candidate of Philological Sciences. Moscow City Pedagogical University, Moscow, 2012. 23 p. (in Russian).

KOZHIN, A. N.; KRYLOVA, O. A.; ODINTSOV, V. V. **Funktsionalnye tipy russkoi rechi: ucheb. posobie dlia filol. spets. un-tov** [Functional types of Russian speech: textbook for specialized philological universities]. Moscow: Vysshiaia shkola, 1982. 223 p. (in Russian).

KRAVETS, T. N. Diskursivnye osobennosti sovremennoi diplomaticheskoi kommunikatsii [Discursive characteristics of modern diplomatic communication]. **Theoretical and Applied Aspects of Studying Speech Activity**, v. 12, no. 5, p. 54-63, 2017 (in Russian).

OLESHKOV, M. Iu. **Modelirovanie kommunikativnogo protsessa: monografiia** [Modeling the communication process: monograph]. Nizhny Tagil: Nizhegorodskaia gos. sots.-ped. akad., 2006 (in Russian).

PRIADILNIKOVA, N. V. **Prakticheskaiia i funktsionalnaia stilistika russkogo iazyka: ucheb. posobie** v 2 ch. Ch. 2 [Practical and functional stylistics of the Russian language: textbook in 2 parts. Part 2]. Samara: Izd-vo Samarskogo un-ta, 2016. 164 p. (in Russian).

RASHCHEVSKAIA, E. P. **Delovoi russkii iazyk, Uchebnoe posobie** [Business Russian, Study Guide]. Kostroma: Izd-vo Kostromskogo gos. tekhnol. un-ta, 2012. 186 p. (in Russian).

ROZENTAL, D. E. **Spravochnik po russkomu iazyku. Prakticheskaiia stilistika** [Russian language guidebook. Practical stylistics]. 2nd ed., revised. Moscow: Oniks, 2007. 414 p. (in Russian).

SHAKHOVSKII, V. I. **Lingvisticheskaiia teoriia emotsii** [Linguistic theory of emotions]. Moscow: Gnozis, 2008 (in Russian).

TERENTII, L. M. Diplomaticeskii diskurs kak osobaia forma politicheskoi kommunikatsii [Diplomatic discourse as a specific form of political communication]. **Issues of Cognitive Linguistics**, no. 1(022), p. 47-56, 2010 (in Russian).

TUMINA, L. E. Iazykovaia norma [Language norm]. In: Panov, M.I. (Ed.). **Effective communication: history, theory, practice: a reference dictionary**. Moscow: Olimp, 2005. p. 524-526 (in Russian).

VIKULOVA, L. G.; MAKAROVA, I. V.; NOVIKOV, N. V. Institutional discourse of digital diplomacy: new communicative practices. **Science Journal of Volgograd State University. Linguistics**, v. 15, no. 3, p. 54-65, 2016 (in Russian). DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15688/jvolsu2.2016.3.6>

YAPPAROVA, V. N. Diplomaticeskii diskurs kak obekt mezhdistsiplinarnogo issledovaniia [Diplomatic discourse as an object of interdisciplinary research]. **Philology and Culture**, no. 2(44), p. 165-170, 2016 (in Russian).

ZNAMENSKAIA, T. A. **Stilistika angliiskogo iazyka: ucheb. posobie** [Stylistics of the English language: textbook]. 2nd ed., revised. Moscow: Editorial URSS, 2004. 205 p. (in Russian).

How to reference this article

BUTSKAYA, O. N.; PAKHOMOVA, I. N.; BRICHENKOVA, E. S. Modern trends in changing the communicative norms of diplomatic discourse. **Rev. EntreLínguas**, Araraquara, v. 7, n. esp. 4, e021097, Nov. 2021. e-ISSN: 2447-3529. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29051/el.v7iesp.4.15654>

Submitted: 09/02/2021

Required revisions: 20/05/2021

Approved: 05/09/2021

Published: 10/11/2021