LINGUO-AXIOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS
OF POLITICO-DIPLOMATIC SPEECHES

Medvid Olena,
Sumy State University, Ukraine
ORCID ID 0000-0003-0723-5753
Corresponding author: o.medvid@gf.sumdu.edu.ua

Podolkova Svitlana,
Sumy State University, Ukraine
ORCID ID 0000-0003-2853-5579

Vashyst Kateryna,
Sumy State University, Ukraine
ORCID ID 0000-0002-2381-1143

Abstract. *The article is devoted to studying the political speeches of Ukrainian presidents (the last decade) at the United Nations (UN), particularly the theoretical and methodological foundations of studying the specifics of political discourse in international communication, namely, in the politico-diplomatic aspect. This study aims to deepen the theoretical understanding of political discourse and reveal the linguistic aspects that determine the communicative nature of political speeches at the UN. In particular, the authors pay attention to the linguistic aspect of politicians' speeches in English at the UN, and conduct a detailed analysis of the axiological language tools used by the Ukrainian presidents to express their assessments and views. The use of specific lexical units that help structure and formulate political ideas, considering the international nature of diplomatic relations, is considered. Understanding the linguistic axiological features of political and diplomatic speech helps to improve communication between representatives of different countries. The study of effective ways of linguistic influence through lexical units with an evocative load can also help to reduce misunderstandings in international relations.*

This research has used a wide range of scientific methods, including content analysis of the English-language speeches of politicians on the background of political and diplomatic discourse using structural and semantic identification and categorization of lexical features, functional and pragmatic analysis of linguistic means of axiological nature, as well as the method of generalization and systematization to summarize and arrange the information obtained in the course of the study.

Keywords*: political and diplomatic discourse, speech, linguistic and axiological units, functional and pragmatic analysis.*

_____

ЛІНГВАЛЬНО-АКСІОЛОГІЧНІ ХАРАКТЕРИСТИКИ ПОЛІТИКО-ДИПЛОМАТИЧНОГО МОВЛЕННЯ

Медвідь Олена,
Сумський державний університет, Україна
ORCID ID 0000-0003-0723-5753
Автор, відповідальний за листування: o.medvid@gf.sumdu.edu.ua

Подолкова Світлана,
Сумський державний університет, Україна
ORCID ID 0000-0003-2853-5579

Вашист Катерина,
Сумський державний університет, Україна
ORCID ID 0000-0002-2381-1143

Анотація. *Статтю присвячено дослідженню політичних промов українських Президентів (останнього десятиріччя) в Організації Об'єднаних Націй (ООН), зокрема теоретико-методологічним засадам вивчення специфіки політичного дискурсу в міжнародній комунікації, зокрема в політично – дипломатичному аспекті. Вивчення спрямоване на поглиблення теоретичного розуміння політичного дискурсу та розкриття мовленнєвих аспектів, які визначають комунікативність політичних промов в ООН. Зокрема автори звертають увагу на лінгвістичний аспект англомовних промов політиків в ООН, проводиться детальний аналіз аксіологічних мовленнєвих засобів, вживаних українськими Президентами для висловлення своїх оцінок та поглядів. Розглядається використання специфічних лексичних одиниць, що допомагають структурувати та формулювати політичні ідеї, враховуючи міжнародний характер дипломатичних відносин. Розуміння лінгвальних аксіологічних особливостей політико-дипломатичного мовлення сприяє вдосконаленню спілкування між представниками різних країн. Вивчення ефективних способів мовленнєвого впливу через лексичні одиниці, що мають евокативне навантаження може сприяти також зменшенню непорозумінь у міжнародних відносинах.*

Для проведення даного дослідження використовувався широкий спектр наукових методів, зокрема контент-аналіз текстів англомовних промов політиків на тлі політико-дипломатичного дискурсу з використанням структурно-семантичної ідентифікації та категоризації лексичних особливостей, функціонально-прагматичний аналіз лінгвальних засобів аксіологічного характеру, а також метод узагальнення та систематизації для підсумування та упорядкування отриманої у ході дослідження інформації.

Ключові слова: *політико-дипломатичний дискурс, промова, лінгво-аксіологічні одиниці, функціонально-прагматичний аналіз.*

Introduction

The modern world is facing many political, economic and social challenges that require effective international cooperation and discussion at the highest levels. In this context, the United Nations Organisation(UNO) is a key forum where world leaders present their views and consider topical issues. The English-language speeches of politicians at the

UN are an integral part of this process and are important in international political communication.

The relevance of the article is determined by the need to understand and study the language aspect in relation to international diplomacy. Particular emphasis is placed on the identification of specific axiological lexical means used in political and diplomatic discourse, especially in the English-language speeches of Ukrainian presidents at the UN, which allows us to identify their influence on global political discourse.

The scientific basis of the research on the analysis of political speeches at the UN is critical for the construction and justification of the study results. This type of research requires the use of various scientific sources, methodological approaches, and theoretical concepts. First, the work is based on current scientific research, monographs, theses, and scientific articles covering the topics of political communication, diplomacy, and international relations. Such sources allow us to define the discourse in which political speeches at the UN take place, and also provide a theoretical basis for analysis (the problems of discourse research, in particular political discourse, have been studied by such Ukrainian scholars as Butova I. S, Goltseva M. I., Didenko M. O., Dolynskyi E. V., Zhybak D. M., Lukina L. V., Nagorna L. B., Padalka L. B. and others; the study of linguistic aspects of the diplomatic communication process was conducted by Bondarenko O. M., Kalischuk D. M., Sudus Y. V., Trusov S. S., and others).

In addition, the paper uses information from official UN sources, such as textual records of speeches, reports, etc., which can serve as empirical **material** for analysis. These various sources interact to create a scientific basis that supports the arguments and justifies the conclusions drawn in the study.

A wide range of scientific **methods** was used to conduct the study, including content analysis of the English-language speeches of Ukrainian politicians on the background of political and diplomatic discourse using structural and semantic identification and categorization of lexical features, functional and pragmatic analysis of linguistic means of axiological nature, as well as the method of generalization and systematization to summarize and arrange the information obtained during the study.

The article also offers an in-depth consideration of the methodology of studying political speeches, revealing the role of linguistic means in the development of information and communication technologies. In general, the work offers conceptual and methodological foundations for further research in the field of political communication, contributing to the development of a scientific approach to analyzing political and diplomatic speeches at international forums, particularly in the UN.

Theoretical issues
Features of international communication: political and diplomatic aspects

Language and politics interact with each other, playing an important role in the political life of society. Consideration of the role of language in politics attracts the attention of scholars from various fields, such as philosophers, political scientists, psychologists, sociologists, linguists, as well as politicians and public figures from around the world. The ability of language to activate political processes has become apparent recently. Social constructivism, developed in the 60s of the XX century by P. Berger and T. Luckmann, clearly justifies the role of terms, concepts, and speech patterns as a tool for political mobilization and a significant information resource for political structures [Akinchyts, 2007: 72].

Padalka O. V. reminds us that the formation of public broadcasting dates back to the ancient culture of Ancient Greece and Rome when the abilities of a talented speaker influenced the social and political situation and the development of events [Padalka, 2012: 66]. Nahorna L. notes that the specificity of language is in the fact that it is an active factor in the self-organization of society [Nahorna, 2005: 4]. Emphasizing the communicative and functional aspects and the social nature of discourse, I. Klymenko claims that political

discourse arises in the context of social interactions and, at the same time, influences changes in the social environment through its functioning [Klymenko, 2009: 183].

One of the key tasks of political discourse is to influence the consciousness of both individuals and the mass society through various linguistic means. Political communication is realized through the unique linguistic and stylistic features of political rhetoric, as well as the means of representing the personal mental world in language, the characteristics of categorization and conceptualization of reality [Fil&Tsyokh, 2021: 247].

In general, D. Zhybak sees the concept of discourse as a complex communicative phenomenon, which, in addition to the textual form, also includes extralinguistic factors, such as knowledge about the world, experience, thoughts, views and goals of the addressee, necessary for a full understanding of the text [Zhybak, 2016: 124].

Kushneryk V. I. and Dzera T. Yu. found that, namely, political discourse can be considered as verbal communication in a certain social and psychological context, where the sender and the receiver have certain social roles, depending on their participation in political life, which is the subject of communication [Dzera&Kushneryk, 2022: 23]. Lukina L.V. defines political discourse as a system that represents a specific type of reflexive linguistic communication that takes place in the political sphere. It is characterized by a set of texts related to the issues of gaining, maintaining, and using state power [Lukina, 2021: 76].

The political discourse of the XXI century, according to Butova I. S., is a carefully planned communicative statement that, having passed the stages of formulation and perception, is aimed at achieving a positive result of influence on the recipient [Butova, 2010: 69]. Dolynskyi Ye. V. considers political discourse as a reflection of the culture of a particular era, and it requires a deep study of this phenomenon [Dolynskyi, 2021: 46]. Knowledge of the peculiarities of political discourse is key to successfully creating high-quality diplomatic discourse. Thus, the diplomatic component plays an important role, in particular, in making the political agenda within the United Nations.

According to M. I. Goltseva, diplomatic discourse functions in the sphere of political interactions; it is a complex linguistic construction with social and cultural connotations, which is focused not only on communication between diplomats but is also determined by a number of cultural, psychological, and other influential factor [Goltseva, 2023: 33].

According to Didenko M. O., the crucial element in political and diplomatic communication is the focus of this process on the addressee in order to achieve a perlocutionary effect (influence on the audience) to cause social and political reaction. The researcher notes that participants in this type of communication express specific social and political positions, and the exchange of information takes place with expressed pragmatic goals. Hence, the communication process in political diplomacy always intends to influence the audience. In order to achieve this perlocutionary goal, a detailed selection and organization of linguistic means of different levels is the most important to form a specific type of text – a political speech [Didenko, 2001].

From the scientific point of view inherent in the twenty-first century, we can describe the term *political and diplomatic discourse* as a polyfractal phenomenon that reflects the multidimensionality of global political life and can be expressed in various scales and forms, one of which is political speech. A *political speech* is a prepared text to cover the current political situation. It is a communication process in which the speaker influences the political beliefs of the listener [Kalynyuk, 2022: 24].

Zinchenko A. V. and Yehorova O. I. believe that a politician's public speech emphasizes the pragmatics of political discourse, expressing the speaker's intention to fight for power and influence the political consciousness of the audience. To implement these strategies, various verbal and non-verbal means of political communication are used [Zinchenko&Yehorova, 2013: 33].

Speech communication is a necessary part of diplomatic processes, as Sudus Yu noted. V. Diplomatic speech is one of the most widely used types of diplomacy in different world countries [Sudus, 2018: 71]. The complexity of international relations determines the modern world, inhabited by diverse cultures, where communication becomes an important tool for

achieving common goals and solving global problems. A special aspect of this international interaction is reflected in political speeches at the United Nations Organization (UNO), where representatives of different countries use language to express their views and beliefs.

The main means of realizing diplomatic communication is language. In the political and diplomatic field, it is very important what *language means* the speaker uses. S. Trusov believes that language is a tool for monitoring the fulfillment of obligations by governments. This implies the definition of specific communicative goals, such as normative, recommendatory, proclamatory, implementation, solidarity, identification, world-forming, etc. Each approach requires appropriate linguistic means, characterized by constructiveness, diplomacy, politeness, and mutual respect [Trusov, 2012: 273].

Kalischuk D. M. notes that the linguistic feature of discursive strategies lies in the complexity of the use of language means to achieve communicative goals; the use of language means in discourse is flexible and can have various strategic vectors [Kalischuk, 2018: 20].

Bondarenko O. M. [Bondarenko&Lytvynenko, 2014: 171-173] points out that an indispensable component of political discourse is the use of evaluative vocabulary in particular. *Evaluative* (*axiological*) vocabulary is an important element of speech tactics, particularly in political and diplomatic discourse. The use of axiological lexical constructions determines the tone and emotional connotation of politico-diplomatic speech, directing the listeners' attention to specific aspects of the topic under discussion. This allows the speaker to express his/her opinions, attitudes, and position, which is important for influencing the audience.

Every politician tries to develop his or her unique style of speech, which helps not only to popularize them but also to influence the audience effectively. A speaker whose speech is easy to identify is more likely to attract listeners' attention and successfully influence them.

Kozub L. emphasizes the importance of considering the social and psychological models of both the addresser and the addressee, and this contributes to the effective perception of the information and the successful fulfillment of communicative tasks of the discourse. However, the principal goal of politico-diplomatic discourse is to convince the audience of the correctness of a certain position, to impose his/her opinion, and to cause certain actions on the speaker's part. Thus, political discourse in all its manifestations is audience-oriented and aimed at interaction with the recipients [Kozub, 2011: 51].

So, politicians try to create a discourse that favors their program [Medvid et all, 2022], which determines the choice of linguistic means. This statement underlines the manipulative nature of political discourse and gives an understanding that political discourse as a system is biased and prejudiced.

Thus, the diplomatic aspect of political communication, in particular, fits into the general context of international political relations and interaction between countries. Politico-diplomatic speech in this context becomes a tool for creating, expressing and influencing states' positions (through politicians as their representatives) on the world stage.

Discussion and results
Evaluative Vocabulary in Speeches of the Presidents of Ukraine at United Nations Organization

Analyzing the linguistic aspect of contemporary political figures' diplomatic speeches, we can identify the basic principles of creating their axiological component. Namely, the speech of Volodymyr Zelenskyi at the UN in 2022 at the beginning of the Russian-Ukrainian war attracted special attention: (Volodymyr Zelenskyi) *"Greetings to all people of the world who value peace and unity between different and equal nations!"* [*Zelenskyi, 2022*]. Even in the greeting, which is a prominent part of a diplomatic text, the President uses an evaluative linguistic construction. This sentence expresses a positive and inclusive message that promotes peace and unity among diverse and equal nations. The use

of evaluative vocabulary is realized through the choice of words that express a positive attitude toward people who care about these principles:

1. *"Greetings to all people of the world":* the word *"Greetings"* itself conveys a positive and friendly tone, expressing goodwill and respect;

2. *"Who value peace and unity":* the speaker introduces an evaluative aspect, respecting those who preach these specific values. "*Peace*" and "*unity*" are positive concepts related to harmony and unity;

3. *"Between different and equal nations*": the use of the antithesis "different and equal" is worth noting. It emphasizes diversity *("different")* while stressing on equality *("equal")*, which indicates a positive attitude towards diverse nations united on an equal footing.

At the beginning of the speech, Zelenskyi makes the framework of his message, emphasizing whom he is ready to talk with and, thus, implements the well-known state strategy and concept of relations in a safe world, transmitting this idea through the text of his speech.

In the following statement, the President says: (Volodymyr Zelenskyi) *"Ukraine showed strength on the battlefield, using its right to self-defense in accordance with Article 51 of the UN Charter. And no one will reproach us now or in the future with weakness or inability to fight for ourselves, for our independence* [*Zelenskyi, 2022*]."

In this sentence, Volodymyr Zelenskyi gives certain assessments and attitudes towards events related to the use of the right to self-defense according to Article 51 of the UN Charter:

1. *"Ukraine showed strength on the battlefield":* the use of the word *"strength"* has a positive connotation in this context, indicating the determination and effectiveness of Ukraine's actions in the conflict;

2. Through *"Using its right to self-defense"* the guarantor reinforces the legitimacy of actions and emphasizes compliance with international law;

3. *"And no one will reproach us now or in the future with weakness or inability to fight for ourselves, for our independence":* in this part, the nouns *"weakness"* and *"inability"* are evaluative indicators, showing the denial of any doubts about Ukraine's strength or determination in the context of this message.

The President goes on to mention the aggressor country: (Volodymyr Zelenskyi) *"The further the Russian terror reaches, the less likely it is that anyone in the world will agree to sit at the same table with them* [*Zelenskyi, 2022*]." Here, evaluative vocabulary is used to express a negative attitude towards Russia's actions and influence; Russian terror causes rejection and negatively affects international relations:

1. *"Terror"* is a negatively colored lexeme that indicates violence, fear, and threat;

2. *"Less likely"* is a contextual negation (in this example, it indicates a decrease in the likelihood that someone will sit at the same negotiating table with Russia);

3. "*Anyone in the world"* – generalization is used to emphasize the negative mood and impressions worldwide (no one wants to interact with Russia).

These lexical units emphasize negative aspects and create the impression that Russia's actions are non-acceptable in international relations.

One of the final chords of Zelenskyi's speech is the following: (Volodymyr Zelenskyi) *"And if my words are followed by new Russian missiles and acts of terrorism, it will only prove the weakness. Russia's weakness. Its inability to prevail over us, its inability to prevail over us, over the world.* [*Zelenskyi, 2022*]." This statement uses evaluative vocabulary aimed at expressing a negative attitude towards Russia and emphasizing its weaknesses and failures:

1. *"Followed"* indicates possible consequences and further terrorist actions;

2. *"New Russian missiles and acts of terrorism":* terms which are associated with threat, violence, and terror, creating an impression of danger and aggression;

3. *"It will only prove the weakness*": the use of *"weakness"* indicates a negative connotation and emphasizes that any actions of Russia will only prove its weakness;

4. *"**Inability to prevail over us**"*: the phrase indicates Russia's failure in its interaction with Ukraine;

5. *"**Inability to prevail over the world**"*: the phrase generalizes Russia's failure in a global sense.

As for other lexical means and linguistic constructions that embody the evaluation tactic, let's consider a number of statements in President Zelenskyi's 2023 diplomatic speech at the UN.

(Volodymyr Zelenskyi) "*I welcome everyone who **stands for common efforts**! And I promise - being **really united** we can guarantee fair **peace** for all nations. What's more, **unity** can prevent wars*" [*Zelenskyi, 2023*]. Here, the evaluative lexical units of different language levels *"welcome"*, *"stand for common efforts"*, *"really united"* express a positive attitude towards those who support joint efforts for a just peace for all nations. As in his previous speech, the President uses the keywords *"unity"* and *"peace"* to actualize the importance of these two concepts.

(Volodymyr Zelenskyi) "***Unfortunately**, various **terrorist groups abduct children to put pressure on their families** and societies. But never before has mass **kidnapping and deportation** become part of government policy. Not until now.* [*Zelenskyi, 2023*]" This part of the speech expresses outrage at the terrorist actions of Russians. The adverb with evaluative semantics *"unfortunately"* stresses on the negative nature of this situation.

(Volodymyr Zelenskyy) *"We see towns and villages in Ukraine **wiped out** by Russian artillery. **Leveled to the ground completely!** [*Zelenskyi, 2023*]."* This statement conveys concern and condemnation over the destruction of towns and villages in Ukraine by Russian artillery. Emotionally colored vocabulary such as *"wiped out"*, *"leveled to the ground completely"* is used to emphasize the destructive impact of Russian artillery strikes.

(Volodymyr Zelenskyy) *"**The main thing** is that it is not only about Ukraine. More than 140 states and international organizations have **supported** the Ukrainian Peace Formula **fully** or **in part**. The Ukrainian Peace Formula is **becoming global**. Its points offer solutions and steps that will stop all forms of weaponization that Russia has used against Ukraine and other countries and may be used by other aggressors* [*Zelenskyi, 2023*]." Several aspects of the evaluative effect can be identified in this part of the speech:

1. *"The main thing"* indicates the importance and emphasis of the given statement, highlighting the global nature of the problem, which is not limited to Ukraine;

2. *"fully or in part"* provides flexibility and defines different levels of support, and *"supported"* indicates the positive nature of this action, strengthening the success of the initiative;

3. *"is becoming global"* underlines the expansion and recognition of the initiative at the global level, which has a positive semantic connotation;

4. *"Its points offer solutions and steps that will stop all forms of weaponization that Russia has used against Ukraine and other countries and may be used by other aggressors."* This sentence evaluates an initiative that offers solutions and steps to stop forms of armed conflict, pointing to the positive consequences of this action. The structure *"that Russia used against Ukraine and other countries and may be used by other aggressors"* has a negative lexical and semantic load, which assesses Russia's actions as illegal and potentially dangerous for other countries

As we see, the evaluative effect in President Zelenskyi's speeches is achieved not only through the use of certain contextually determined lexical units but also through entire axiological lexical and syntactic structures.

The other politician whose speeches at the UN are of interest from the point of view of the axiological aspect is the fifth President of Ukraine, Petro Poroshenko.

In his speeches, President Poroshenko uses, for example, a large number of adjectives and adverbs, either used separately or within different syntactic constructions, which are particularly evaluative: (Petro Poroshenko) *"The international security environment seemed **rock-solid** less than two decades ago. Now it has descended into a*

volatile and ***increasingly disturbing state*** *where both* ***traditional and hybrid threats*** *are challenging the stability of our societies* [*Poroshenko, 2018*]."

In this statement, lexical units characterize the international environment, which has recently undergone major changes and become less stable. Let's analyze a few key elements:

1. *"Rock-solid"*: indicates solidity, immobility, and stability in the international environment; the use of this adjective makes a contrast between the state of affairs before and now;

2. *"Volatile"*: describes the volatility and unpredictability of the modern international environment; it creates an image of instability and riskiness;

3. *"Increasingly disturbing state"*: means that the international security situation is not only becoming less stable but also causing serious concern;

4. *"Traditional and hybrid threats"*: emphasizes the diversity and complexity of the challenges faced by the modern international environment.

In general, Poroshenko uses evaluative vocabulary in his statement to emphasize that international security has lost its former firmness and stability, turning into an unstable and alarming state caused by various threats.

Then, Petro Poroshenko says: (Petro Poroshenko) *"Over 1.5 million people have become internally displaced persons. They still can't return to their homes. Russia* ***constantly multiplies the human tragedy****, which* ***lately has acquired a new dimension: ecological"***[*Poroshenko, 2018*]. This statement uses evaluative vocabulary to describe the situation from a more negative perspective:

1. *"Constantly multiplies the human tragedy"*: the use of the word *"constantly"* strengthens the impression of the unfavorable and long-lasting nature of the situation, while *"multiplies"* has a negative connotation, pointing that Russia is contributing to the further complication of the human tragedy;

2. *"Lately received a new dimension: ecological"*: the use of *"lately"* shows that this is a recent and possibly aggravated problem, the specification of *"ecological"* emphasizes that the situation now also has the dimension of ecological crisis, which may be caused by Russia's activities.

In general, the statement uses evaluative vocabulary to emphasize the negative impact of Russia on society, especially now when it also has an ecological scale in addition.

(Petro Poroshenko) *"Ukraine made a* ***sovereign decision*** *to live its own way and promote the Free World based on* ***democratic values and rules****. Russia* ***punishes*** *Ukraine for this decision. It* ***kills****. It* ***ruins*** *homes. It* ***lies*** *on an industrial scale. It* ***pretends*** *that Ukraine as well as Georgia "attacked themselves".* ***Do we know which neighbor of Russia will "attack itself" next?*** *Or will the world be* ***"comfortably numb"*** *in the hope that "the next one won't be me"? As we* ***defend*** *Ukraine's land and our* ***free choice****, as we counter the resurgent neo-imperialist power willing to divide the world anew - we* ***defend*** *the* ***Free World"?***[*Poroshenko, 2018*]. In this part of the speech, evaluative vocabulary and rhetorical devices are used to express certain views and assessments of Russia's actions toward Ukraine:

1. *"Ukraine has made a sovereign decision to live its way and promote the Free World based on democratic values and rules.* [*Poroshenko, 2018*]*":*– this sentence uses positive vocabulary such as *"sovereign decision", "Free World", and "democratic values"* to emphasize Ukraine's position as a sovereign country that chooses the path of democracy;

2. *"Russia punishes Ukraine for this decision. It kills. It ruins homes. It lies on an industrial scale.":* negative vocabulary *("punishes", "kills", "ruins", "lies"* [*Poroshenko, 2018*]*)* is used here to evaluate Russia's actions towards Ukraine; it creates the impression of aggressive and illegal behavior of Russia.

3. *"It pretends that Ukraine, as well as Georgia, 'attacked themselves'* [*Poroshenko, 2018*] – the word *"pretends"* is again used to indicate dishonesty or disinformation on the part of Russia;

4. *"Do we know which neighbor of Russia will 'attack itself' next?"* [*Poroshenko, 2018*] – this rhetorical question makes the reader speculate about the possible purpose of this disinformation and aggression on the part of Russia;

5. *"Or will the world be "comfortably numb" in the hope that 'the next one won't be me?"* [*Poroshenko, 2018*] – the expression *"comfortably numb"* is used here, indicating a safe but detached position of the world in relation to the conflict (the metaphor *"comfortably numb"* is taken from the famous song by Pink Floyd), in the context of this sentence, it indicates that the world can become *"comfortably alienated"* in the face of a threat or conflict, it can mean safety or a sense of security, but it can also mean a lack of active response to danger;

6. *"As we defend Ukraine's land and our free choice, as we counter the resurgent neo-imperialist power willing to divide the world anew – we defend the Free World"* [*Poroshenko, 2018*] – the sentence has a positive connotation, using *"defend"*, *"free choice"*, *"defend the Free World"* to actualize the essence of defending freedom and democracy in the face of the threat from Russia.

Then, the speaker says: (Petro Poroshenko) *"It has proven that staying **comfortably silent** when international norms are violated does not stop but encourages the offender to continue its destructive policies. **Your silence** is exactly what the Kremlin **weaponizes** against Ukraine and, ultimately, against all of us!* [*Poroshenko, 2018*]". This statement uses various lexical and stylistic devices to express a certain assessment of international norms violation. The metaphor *"your silence"* implies the address to the recipients, emphasizing their important influence, and *"weaponizes"* reinforces the context and indicates that silence is seen as a tool or even weapon used by the Kremlin against Ukraine.

(Petro Poroshenko) *"In the absence of a strong and united reaction, such an extremely irresponsible and selfish actor **resorts to the tactic of further escalation**, **creating new crises, raising the stakes, blackmailing other countries** and even entire international organizations"* [*Poroshenko, 2018*]. This sentence uses evaluative lexical and syntactic structures for generalizing a negative attitude towards Russia's actions: *"resorts to the tactic of further escalation"*, *"creating new crises"*, *"raising the stakes"*, *"blackmailing other countries"*.

(Petro Poroshenko) *"By **illegally** building a bridge across the Kerch Strait, Russia launched a **systematic disruption** of the freedom of international navigation through the Kerch Strait for Ukrainian and foreign vessels. Such **brutal actions** must be rejected as illegal, including under the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. They require a strong response, including **strengthening the sanctions policy and other targeted measures*** [*Poroshenko, 2018*]." Here, due to the use of evaluative vocabulary such as *"illegally"*, *"systematic disruption"*, *"brutal actions"*, the condemnation of Russia for the illegal construction of the bridge across the Kerch Strait and the systematic violation of the freedom of international law is expressed. The President also points to the need for a strong reaction and tough measures to respond to such actions: *"strengthening the policy of sanctions and other targeted measures"*.

(Petro Poroshenko) *"I highly appreciate the **remarkable manifestation of support and unity throughout the world** to seek freedom for these **brave people**. Unfortunately, the Kremlin remains **blind and deaf** to these appeals of the international community and many of Russian intellectuals."* [*Poroshenko, 2018*]. In this part of the speech, praise is given for the great support and unity (*the remarkable manifestation of support and unity throughout the world*) shown by the international community in the pursuit of freedom for courageous people (*these brave persons*). We should also note the use of the metaphorical epithet *"blind and deaf"* in relation to the Russian leadership (*"Kremlin"* can be seen as their personification), indicating their inability or unwillingness to respond to the appeals of the international community.

Emotional and axiologically colored is President Poroshenko's speech at the UN on September 22, 2016, which almost ten years ago focused the world's attention on the

possible spread of the growing threat from Russia, which at that time was localized only in the territory of Donbas. (Petro Poroshenko) *"This is actually the **biggest threat facing humanity nowadays**. Our future, the **future of our children** and our Organization **depend directly on how we manage to overcome this threat** [Poroshenko, 2016].*" Analyzing this statement, the following aspects can be highlighted:

1. *"the biggest threat facing humanity nowadays"* has an evaluative character, indicating the seriousness and significance of the threat (the words *"biggest"* and *"facing"* enhance the impression of the threat);

2. *"Our future, the future of our children, and our Organization depend directly on how we manage to overcome this threat.":* this sentence expresses the assessment of the importance and direct dependence of the future of children on whether the growing threat will be overcome *("depend directly on"* shows the critical nature of this dependence).

(Petro Poroshenko) *"There is **a critical need** to make our Organization capable of addressing effectively acts of aggression and to **bring those responsible to justice** [Poroshenko, 2016].*"

1. *"a critical need"* indicates a high degree of importance and urgency of actions *("critical"* enhances the impression of urgency and seriousness);

2. *"...and to bring those responsible to justice"* has an evaluative connotation, pointing to the need for justice and punishment of those responsible for acts of aggression.

(Petro Poroshenko) *"The **shocking reality** is that there is a roughly 38,000-strong illegal military force in Donbas and its large part is regulars and **mercenaries** from Russia. This force is **armed to the teeth** by Russia. And this is no exaggeration - they have at their disposal about **700 tanks, 1200 armored vehicles, more than 1000 artillery systems and more than 300 multiple launch rocket systems** [Poroshenko, 2016].*" In the course of analyzing the passage of the text, it was determined:

1. *"The shocking reality"* indicates that the information presented is unexpected and shocking, stressing on the seriousness of the situation;

2. *"...its large part is regulars and mercenaries from Russia"*: the use of the word *"mercenaries"* has a negative connotation and may cause condemnation for the participation of foreign fighters;

3. *"armed to the teeth"* indicates that this force has huge weapons, which causes threat and indignation;

4. *"...they have at their disposal about 700 tanks, 1200 armored vehicles, more than 1000 artillery systems, and more than 300 multiple launch rocket systems.":* quantitative evaluation of weapons and equipment makes the impression of significant military power, which can cause anxiety and resentment.

Thus, due to the pragmalinguistic and functional analysis of the famous speeches of Ukrainian Presidents of the last decade, it has been found that the use of axiological linguistic means in the speeches of politicians at the UN is of great functional importance in creating an effective communicative impact, and is a principal element of political and diplomatic discourse in particular, as well as of political and diplomatic relations between countries in general.

Conclusions and prospects

The detailed linguistic analysis of political speeches that have influenced international politics in the last decade provides an important contribution to the expansion and improvement of communication in the context of the political and diplomatic discourse of the United Nations Organization (UNO). Diplomatic speech is characterized by its precision, politeness, and careful selection of linguistic means. It resolves conflicts, establishes partnerships, and expresses positions and agreements between countries. Speech in diplomacy also reflects the cultural and national peculiarities of the speaker's habitat and should be presented in a context understandable to listeners and readers; this requires the balanced use of axiological language in politicians' speeches. A principal element of political

and diplomatic discourse is the ability to express opinions and positions in an acceptable way to all parties.

Understanding the linguistic axiological features of political and diplomatic speech helps to improve communication between representatives of different countries. Studying effective ways of linguistic influence by lexical units with an evocative load can also help reduce misunderstandings in international relations. The data obtained from the study can be used to understand political trends, strategies, and images in international political and diplomatic discourse.

The prospects of this research are aimed at expanding the study of linguistic and communicative specifics of politicians' speech styles in international forums, which can improve the quality and effectiveness of political communication. The findings may be used by political technologists, including diplomats, sociologists, journalists and other professionals and researchers within other paradigms in the social and humanitarian sphere, to adapt their speech influence to an international audience.

REFERENCES

Akinchyts, N. H. (2007). Political discourse as an object of scientific analysis. *Culture of peoples of the Black Sea region*. pp. 72-76. Access mode: http://dspace.nbuv.gov.ua/handle/123456789/54472

Bondarenko, O. M., Lytvynenko O. K. (2014). Evaluative vocabulary in modern political discourse. *Bulletin of Zaporizhzhya National University. Philological Sciences.* Zaporizhzhia, No. 1. pp. 170-175.

Butova I. S. (2010). Creativity and evaluative saturation of the political discourse of the 21st century (based on the material of the English and Ukrainian languages). *Mandrivets: current problems of humanitarian knowledge*. Ternopil. No. 5. pp. 66–69.

Didenko M. O. (2001). Political speech as a type of text (based on the speeches of German political figures of the late 20th century). Odesa. 19 p.

Dzera T. Yu., Kushneryk V. I. (2022). Current Problems of English political speeches Translation. Materials of the 4th All-Ukrainian Scientific and Practical Conference. Kamianets-Podilskyi, May 19, 2022. Pp. 21-25.

Dolynskyi Ye. V. (2021). Rhetorical techniques in the political techniques of political leaders as a means of manipulating the public consciousness of citizens. *Scientific Bulletin of Kherson State University, Series:German Studies and Intercultural Communication.* Kherson. No. 1. pp. 45-51.

Fil Y. T., Tsyokh L. Y. (2021). Lexical means of verbalizing the concept of national identity in the English-language discourse of political public speeches: Lviv Polytechnic National University. pp. 247-251.

Goltseva M. I. (2023). English-language diplomatic discourse of the UN Security Council: structure and pragmatics: diss. Doctor of Philosophy: Kyiv. 300 p.

Kalischuk D. M. (2018). Conceptual styles of English-speaking politicians (based on the political discourse by J. Bush Jr., B. Obama): monograph. Lutsk: Aqua Print. 192 p.

Kalynyuk T. V. (2022). A foreign language in a multicultural space: experience and perspectives: materials of the 4th All-Ukrainian scientific and practical conference, Kamianets - Podilskyi, May 19, 2022, edited by T. V. Kalynyuk and others. Kamianets - Podilsk National University named after Ivan Ohienko. pp. 16-19.

Klymenko I. (2009). Theoretical foundations of linguistic analysis of political discourse. *Linguistic studies: a collection of scientific works of the Ukrainian press.* Vol. 19. pp. 182-186.

Kozub, L. (2011). Linguistic means of influence in modern English-language political discourse. *Studia Methodologica*. Ternopil: TNPU. Issue 32. pp. 50-53.

Lukina L. V. (2021). Political discourse: essence and features of application. *Politicus*. No. 2. pp. 75-80.

Medvid O., Vashyst K., Sushkova O., Sadivnychyi V., Malovana N., Shumenko O. (2022). US Presidents' Political Speeches as a Means of Manipulation in the 21st Century Society. *Wisdom*. Volume 3. No. 2. Special Issue: *Philosophy of Language and Literature*. pp. 144-156. Access mode: https://doi.org/10.24234/wisdom.v3i2.859.

Nahorna L. B. (2005). Political language and language policy: the range of possibilities of political linguistics. NAS of Ukraine: Institute of Political and Ethnonational Studies. Kyiv: Svitoglyad. 316 p.

Padalka O. V. (2012). Political speech and its prosodic characteristics. *Scientific Bulletin of the Volyn National University named after Lesia Ukrainka: Philological sciences. Linguistics*. No. 6. pp. 66-69.

Sudus Yu. V. (2018). Speech tactics of implementing the strategy of discrediting in the discourse of US diplomats. *Prykarpattia National University named after Vasyl Stefanyk*. No. 1. pp. 70-82.

Trusov S. S. (2012). English-language discourse of the UN Human Rights Council as a type of institutional discourse. *Bulletin of the Dnipropetrovsk University named after Alfred Nobel. Series "Philological Sciences"*. pp. 226 - 231.

Zhybak D. M. (2016). To the issue of features and functions of political discourse. *Scientific Bulletin of the International Humanitarian University. Series: Philology*. Vol. 20(1). pp. 124-126.

Zinchenko A. V., Yehorova O. I. (2013). Linguopragmatic actualization of quantity in political discourse texts (based on the material of B. Obama's inaugural speeches). Philological treatises. pp. 32-37.

Illustrative material

Zelenskyi, 2022. — Ukraine – President Addresses United Nations General Debate, 77th Session. Access mode: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3ip7wXSfxx0&t=5s&ab_channel=UnitedNations (accessed: 12.04.2024).

Zelenskyi, 2023. — Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy speaks at U.N. General Assembly. Access mode: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CkM4DCmFoY&t=150s&ab_channel=CBS News (accessed: 26.04.2024).;

Poroshenko, 2016. — UN Speeches: Ukranian President Petro Poroshenko. Access mode: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XNa10V94kJI&t=78s&ab_channel=TeleSUREnglish (accessed: 21.03.2024).

Poroshenko, 2018. — Ukraine – President Addresses General Debate, 73rd Session. Access mode: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dVztO4pey6I&ab_channel=UnitedNations (accessed: 29.02.2024).