



**VARIATION AS INHERENT FEATURE OF
DIPLOMATIC DISCOURSE: A CASE STUDY of ITS
INVARIANT, VARIANTS AND THE PROCESS OF
VARYING**

doi: 10.34142/astreaa.2020.1.2.04



PONOMARENKO Olga

Assoc.prof., PhD in Linguistics,
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv,
Kyiv, Ukraine
e-mail: olga0508009510@gmail.com
orcid

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the phenomenon of variation as inherent characteristic of the diplomatic discourse at any stage of its evolution as well as in all its modern manifestations. The author made a review of existing scientific papers on linguistic variation; elaborated and suggested her own definition of variation, contrasting it to the notion of invariant adjusted to the needs of the diplomatic discourse research. The latter is applicable, in particular, to the linguistic analysis of the discourse under investigation. *Thus, variation of the diplomatic discourse is understood as entire spectrum of all its possible manifestations unless the set of its key features, characteristics and components is recognizable, being, actually, its constant or invariant. The variation appears and exists due to a range of both, linguistic and extra-linguistic factors that nourish the process of proliferation of the diplomatic discourse types.* The author's interpretation of variation, contrasted to the definition of the invariant of the diplomatic discourse, according to the term provided, in combination with the most generic understanding of the phenomenon retrievable in explanatory sources as well as in scientific papers on philology, allowed singling out and listing the criteria of linguistic variation. Therefore, some examples of the most frequently occurring variants (types) of the diplomatic discourse are listed. The mentioned provision is stated as potentially unlimited one. This feature guides

the author to the assumption of impossibility to fulfil an overall research in order to remain scientifically faithful. It is argued that a narrower field of investigation is more likely to be analysed deeply and correctly. At the same time such important variation opens an endless prospective for further linguistic research and/or modification of the contemporary diplomatic discourse canon.

Keywords: variation; invariant; variant (type); change; constant; diplomatic discourse.

АНОТАЦІЯ

У статті розглядається явище варіантності (варіативності) як невід’ємно-притаманна та характерна риса дипломатичного дискурсу на будь-якій стадії його еволюційного варіювання, а також у всіх його сучасних проявах (варіантах). Авторка зробила огляд існуючих наукових праць, присвячених мовній варіантності, варіативності, варіабельності, варіюванню, варіації; розробила та запропонувала власне визначення явища, порівнявши його з поняттям інваріанта, адаптованого до потреб дослідження дипломатичного дискурсу. Останнє стосується, зокрема, мовного аналізу досліджуваного дискурсу. Таким чином, під *варіантом дипломатичного дискурсу* розуміють *увесь спектр усіх можливих його проявів, якщо сукупність його ключових ознак, характеристик і компонентів залишається впізнаваною, що, власне, і є його константою чи інваріантом*. У статті стверджується, що варіанти з’являються та існують завдяки цілому ряду як лінгвальних, так і позалінгвальних факторів, які живлять процес розповсюдження різних типів дипломатичного дискурсу. *Авторське тлумачення варіантності (варіативності)*, протиставлене визначенню інваріанта дипломатичного дискурсу, відповідно до наданого терміну, в поєднанні з найбільш загальним розумінням явища, яке міститься у довідкових джерелах, а також у наукових працях з філології, *дозволило виділити та перерахування критеріїв мовної варіативності (варіантності)*. Відтак, наведено приклади найчастотніших варіантів (типів, проявів) дипломатичного дискурсу. По суті, досліджуване явище та відповідний процес – варіювання – є потенційно необмеженими та безкінечними. Ця особливість наштовхує авторку на припущення про неможливість виконати узагальнене дослідження та залишатися, при цьому, академічно чесними. Стверджується, що тільки певна вузька сфера дослідження може бути проаналізована глибоко, достеменно та

правильно. Водночас така значущість варіантності (варіативності) відкриває нескінченну перспективу для подальшого мовного дослідження та/чи модифікації сучасного канону дипломатичного дискурсу.

Ключові слова: варіантність; варіативність; ін/варіант (тип); зміна; константа; дипломатичний дискурс.

INTRODUCTION

“*Variation is an inherent characteristic of all languages at all times*” (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015). It is the main source, cause, consequence and reason that gives grounds and supplies material worldwide to scientists, politicians, philosophers sociologists, historicists and, of course, philologists and linguists for new or further researches regardless the field of their narrow scientific interest, as all aspects of any language are subject to variations. “Linguistic variation is the spice of every language and there is no living natural language which does not show variation. How dull language would be without it!” (Lipka, 1988 : 319).

It should be borne in mind that *variation* is not to be terminologically substituted for and, thus, unintentionally confused with *variability* (less frequently *variance*). This comment is relevant mostly for non-native English-speaking researchers. The *variability* is the *mere fact* of something being likely to vary (Oxford Learner’s Dictionary : Variability), This is the notion belonging mostly to the sphere of artificial intelligence, statistics, finance, geometry, climatology, genetics, renewable energy research, but not philology. Although one can still come across cases of terminological inaccuracy or equate and, thus, confuse it with the “inherent variability” (Labov 1969), i.e., the coexistence of alternative “ways of saying the same thing” within the speech of a single speaker who alternates between them in a statistically regular way (Huspek, 1989).

On the contrary, *variation* denotes *the very change*, especially in the amount or level of something, as well as a thing that is different from other things in the same general group (Oxford Learner’s Dictionary : Variation). In philology, language variation is one of the biggest discoveries of the previous century and the core concept for sociolinguistics and historical linguistics (Britain, 2016). Actually, sociolinguistic variation studies how the language varies and changes in communities of speakers and concentrates on the interaction of social factors and linguistic structures.

In other world, *variability* is the phenomenon occurring *within a language* or dialect (Milroy, 2017), while *variation* can be traced *outside and across languages*, too.

In cognitive linguistics variation is also one of the most important and widely researched issues. Throughout the relatively short history of variation studies the very notion of variation and the attempt to find an invariant were the matter of concern for phoneticians, lexicologists and those who were paying attention only to grammar (morphology, syntax). Contemporary philologists and linguists do not stay aside, either.

Following this trend, the author of this article sets out *THE OBJECTIVE TO VERIFY* her *HYPOTHESES* that *diplomatic discourse* expressed by means of any natural language follows its general laws. Thus, it is *subject to varying*; consequently, *has many different types (variants)*, and *variation is one of its inherent features*.

LITERATURE REVIEW

At earlier stages of language variation investigation O.S. Ahmanova (Ahmanova, 1957; 1969), L.A. Verbitska differentiated three notions (Verbitskaya, 1976), D.A. Shahbagova (Shahbagova, 1992), and even some contemporary peer scientists (Bagana Zh., Bondarenko E.V., Chernova O.O., 2012 : 48) adhere to another terminology, differentiating:

- *variability* (“вариабельность”), understood as the quality and the ability of a language or its levels in the whole to vary the means of what is agreed as language norm;

- *variation* (“вариативность¹”), understood as mutual substitutability of the variants, observed within the synchronic approach, literary language and the norm; functioning of the standard variants in speech;

- *variance*, a range of options, plurality of variants (“вариантность²”), understood as juxtaposing the variants (both, in synchrony and diachrony), the usage of which is registered in speech.

1 Here and farther, the terms, given in brackets, are quoted exactly as their authors used them, without translating them.

2 Here and farther, the terms, given in brackets, are quoted exactly as their authors used them, without translating them.

The three terms are still accepted and used at same time, often interchanged or substituted one for another.

Scientists interested in linguistic variation research, i.e. *variationists*, try to find out *why and how languages change* in different situations and contexts. For example, variation is studied by observing linguistic and social environments, and then the data is analyzed as the change occurs (Preston, 1993).

The new branch of linguistics, whose matter of scientific interest and concern is the phenomenon of variation, is referred to as *variology* (Gak, 2002, 2010; Sandalova, 2015), mostly in post-soviet countries, or, more frequently, as *varientology* (Domashnev, 2005; Zielinski, 2008; Bagana, Bondarenko, Chernova, 2012 : 48; Nevehina, 2016, 2017).

One of the “fathers” of the concept of linguistic variation is F. de Saussure. Studying phonology, he was the first to mention that a linguistic sign aims at varying (F. de Saussure, 1916; 1993). Then four characteristics of a linguistic sign were distinguished, among which the diachronic mutability is mentioned, as well as such notions as “modification”, “alterations” and “changes” (Saussure, 1916 : 109, 117). F. de Saussure also sustained that a language lives, carries on and changes over time (Saussure, 1993).

Later the idea was developed by the Czech linguist V. Mathesius, his peer, R. Jakobson, and their follower, S.O Karcevskij: “Une signe linguistique, de quelque plan qu’il relève est toujours une unité à double face. Les rapports entre les deux aspects de la langue variant d’un plan à l’autre, chaque plan, de même qu’il possède sa propre “idéologie” ... (Karcevskij, 1931 : 188–189). Then it was further analyzed, within phonology, by B. Trnka (Trnka, 1935). B. Trnka combined the ideas of V. Mathesius with those of N.S. Trubezkoy (Trubezkoy, 1929; 1960), while N. Trubezkoy absorbed the main trends proposed by B. de Courtenay and F. de Saussure. B. Trnka’s theory about phonological structures was proposed to be applied further to language in the whole as a general modelling principle (Hajicova, 1999 : 6).

In the following decades many other linguists were elaborating theories starting from the studies of linguistic sign and phoneme, originated within structuralistic approach of the Prague Linguistic Circle at the beginning of the XX century. Actually, all these theories were seeking a valid opposition of what nowadays is commonly referred to as “invariant vs variant”. For example, N.S. Trubezkoy, expressed the idea that in speech several various realizations correspond to one phoneme. So, a language was considered to be invariant, while speech varied (Lukina, 2014 : 7; Musayeva, 2016

: 410. It is evident, that early linguistic investigations of the phenomena of invariant and variability were regarded as belonging to different levels and were analyzed separately for each level of a language.

In 1960s, is W. Labov made another significant contribution to the investigation of the issue in question. The linguist described several aspects of variation, notably, its sociolinguistic peculiarities, and variations depending on and occurring according to the race of language users (Labov, 1963).

In post-modern linguistics the Russian scientist L.V. Shcherba investigated variation in the context of sociolect and idiolect research (Shcherba, 1974). The linguists' provision about any social change being reflected in speech is especially valuable for this paper as I argue that the diplomatic discourse varying depends also on the interlocutors, their purposes and target audience (e.g.: diplomats talking to or about medicine, economy and so on).

J.L. Dillard (Dillard, 1965; 1992), R. Fasold (Fasold and A. Wolfram, 1974), W.A. Stewart (Stewart, 1968), and W.A. Wolfram (Wolfram, 1973) were interested in racial peculiarities and in the American English peculiarities.

Some years later the idea of L.V. Shcherba was further developed by another Russian theoretician, L.P. Yakubinskyi. He broaden the thesis of social variation, suggesting to take into consideration the whole range of communicative situations (Yakubinskij, 1986 : 33) in which variations were registered, too. Introducing the notion of "national language", the linguist remarked peculiarities of nationally specific variations. Both ideas fit perfect into my vision of diplomatic discourse variation (here are some examples: Italian diplomatic discourse, Western diplomatic discourse, etc.). it should be remarked that similar reflexions had been anticipated even in M.V. Zhirmunskij works in the middle of the XX century (Zhirmunskij, 1936 : 6; 1964 : 107-110).

At the current state of research, the most prominent linguists, who dedicated at least part of their scientific papers to the field and the issue in question, and the respectful aspect they contributed to, are the following (mentioned here in alphabetic order): J.K. Chambers, who analyzed sociolinguistic peculiarities, paying more attention to variations according to the age of language users (Chambers, 2003); J. Fisher (2015) and J. Gumperz (1954) who worked within the trend of dialectology studies; R. Keller (1994; 2009) who researched different manifestations of variation; R.T. Lakoff who wrote papers concerning gender differences (Lakoff, 1975) as well as about the influence

of contexts (Lakoff, 1972); G. Schlee (2001) who mentioned individual ethnical variations in speakers' ways of expressing themselves; P. Trudgill (1974), H. Volker (2009), M. Weinreich (1972), and others who made their contribution to variation research and analysis, as well.

In contemporary linguistic paradigm, the phenomenon of linguistic variation is being still studied in many aspects. It drew attention of peer linguistics from different countries and belonging to different schools. Some scientists retained there were enough grounds to go beyond the traditional margins of variation research. They suggested the following provisions, ideas and trends:

O.O. Selivanova and T.S. Musayeva suggested their own definitions for the phenomenon under research (Selivanova, 2006). Besides, T.S. Musayeva expressed her critical thoughts regarding the accuracy of the main terms used in the theory of variation (Musayeva, 2016). A.E. Lukina analysed the notion of variation and the respectful terminology, as well. She made a thorough in-depth investigation and traced the evolution of variation studies in the world (Lukina, 2014).

N.D. Golev and L.G. Kim considered the established tradition of analyzing variation pays attention mostly to its manifestations on the levels of phonology, lexis, morphology and grammar in general, which turns to be too narrow for the contemporary linguistics. Thus, they argued the necessity to consider the level of text, and study the cases of its varying (Golev, Kim, 2009).

K.S. Serazhym (Serazhym, 2002) argued variation being peculiar to a discourse as an element of higher level in a language system, while N.S. Berseneva was analysing some cases of grammatical variation in the scientific discourse (Berseneva, 2017). I.M. Basovets was interested in variation of some grammar constructions in media-discourse (Basovets, 2019 : 23–25). E.V. Glinka contributed to the research of media-discourse, too (Glinkina, 2012 : 53–54). S.P. Halaur looked for cases of variability manifestations in communicative strategies in different contexts (Halaur, 2019 : 10–12).

The above mentioned findings are important for my present research as they direct and lead the current trend in variation studies onto the level of super-phrasal units and – more extensively – pragmatics. Namely, these papers prove that variation exist not only on the phonetic, lexico-grammatical and stylistic levels. It is obvious that discourse as phenomenon of any natural language varies, too.

T.N. Homutova elaborated her theory of variation, considering the sociolinguistic

aspect of the phenomenon (Homutova, 2005). In the context of my investigation the conclusions of the peer serve to pay a particular attention to a number of sociolinguistic components of communication process as main discourse variation factors and the endless source of its variants.

The beginning of the second decade of the XXI century was also marked with a new wave of attempts to find and explain theoretical basis (Bagana, Bondarenko, Chernova, 2012) and methodology for variation studies (Tagliamonte, 2012).

S.N. Dubrovina sustained and reiterated the thesis of variation being a universal feature of any language (Dubrovina, 2015). N.V. Sandalova (2015) formulated and made an attempt to solve the problem of unification and standardization of metalanguage used in theory of variology (Sandalova, 2015).

The list of active contemporary researchers is far from being complete. This fact testifies the importance of variability as well as shows the directions in which the contemporary linguistics evolves.

Among the latest works of peer linguists, I particularly appreciate the contribution of M. Borodinà as she applies the notion of “area/range” (“apeaλ”³) while analyzing the Romanic languages, their dialects and linguo-geography, to be more precise. She made a valuable conclusion for the sphere of my narrow professional interest, arguing that a linguistic space depends on the extra-linguistic conditions, in particular, on the geographical, political and economic ones (Borodinà, 2002 : 137). I share this belief, and one of my goals is to contribute to the general research by investigating some peculiarities of the diplomatic discourse of four countries belonging to the Romanic languages area (Ponomarenko, 2012), variability being one of its inherent features.

It is obvious that variation is still being studied, and the number of researches interested in the phenomenon is constantly growing. Scientists publish their results in individual articles and collection of papers, dedicated exceptionally to the phenomenon under investigation, for instance, “Linguistic Variation Yearbook” and “Linguistic Variation” journals published by John Benjamins Publishing (2001-2019); Belorus journal of conference proceedings (“Variation in language and speech/Variativnost v yazyke i rechi”) All linguistic theories account for some particular manifestation of variation underline that it is the primary and key feature of languages and each of their units or elements. According to T.N. Homutova (Homutova, 2005), it is typical for

³ Here and farther, the terms, given in brackets, are quoted exactly as their authors used them, without translating them.

languages to be realized in different and multiple variants, when actualized in speech. It is reiterated that variation is considered to be one of the most important factors of language evolution, is manifested on all its levels and in all forms of its existence, which “allows to argue the universal character” (Solntsev, 1982; Homutova, 2005 : 28) of both, the phenomenon of variation and the process of varying.

Generalizing the approaches suggested by the scientists mentioned above, it seems me possible to conclude that in linguistics, *variation* – still referred to in some linguistic papers as *variability* – is generally understood as regional, social, contextual or other differences manifested in the ways a particular language is used (Musayeva, 2016; Selivanova, 2006; Serazhym, 2002; Lehmann, 2019; Nordquist, 2019; Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015; Reppen et al., 2002) and is recognized to be “a fundamental property of a language” (Lukina, 2014 : 7), as well as “the vehicle of language change” (Trask, 1999/2005).

Limits of previous investigations and lacunae in linguistic analysis.

Regardless the endless chain of scientific papers and researches, continuing one another, there still exist a great variety (Bagana, Bondarenko, Chernova, 2012 : 47), instead of unanimous convergence, of views, theories and definitions concerning variation in language and speech. The contemporary linguistic paradigm lacks a systemic view regarding the phenomenon under investigation (Slozhenikina, 2006 : 123). T.S. Musayeva joins to this thesis. She retains that nowadays there is *an urgent need to generalize and systematize* the already accumulated experience [in linguistic research] as well to *elaborate some norms in variation investigations* throughout their history. The linguist thinks that the *study of language variants’ competing* is the indispensable link for determination of the *main tendencies of a language evolution* as well as for the *elaboration of the dynamic theory of the language norm/standard* (Musayeva, 2016 : 44).

A.E. Lukina underlines that while the discussed issue has been thoroughly analyzed on the material of the Germanic languages, but it still requires a closer and more attentive look when it comes to the *Romanic languages*. In particular, she argues that the French language was singled out as the one lacking its variation description in diachronic aspect (Lukina, 2014 : 9).

T.N. Homutova urges peer colleagues to conduct *sociolinguistic* investigations of variation, especially of *text and discourse* (Homutova, 2005 : 32). N.Ye. Kashchyshyn appeals to scientist inviting to research all aspects of the diplomatic discourse (Kashchyshyn, 2016).

The above quoted pool of research directions and aspects of variation not exhaustively analyzed **shows the gaps** in the recently established branch of linguistics, i.e. variology. Therefore, in our opinion, the contemporary philologists should lock their investigations onto completing the missing links and provide all the necessary provisions in order to present the general theory (Gak, Domashnev, 2005; Firsova, 2000), which is being created at present. In particular, *linguistic studies in the field should aim at:*

- elaborating the unique (Slozhenikina, 2006 : 123) and comprehensive terminological nomenclature (Bagana, Bondarenko, Chernova, 2012 : 47), appropriate for the linguistic research;
- state the notion of invariant (constant) as the indispensable point of reference and king of a “margin” or “limit” for variation analysis;
- list all the factors, reasons and causes of variation and/or those triggering it;
- describe the dimensions of variation, taking in account the latest change in linguistic paradigm, in particular, the emerge and further diversification of digital communication;
- determine the levels of variation, paying special attention to different discourses, as they seem to have not been considered by variationists before;
- establish the criteria for singling out (sub)types of variation;
- start research on the material of those languages that, up to now, did not constitute the interest of linguists.

Judging by the collected and overviewed corpora of linguistic works dedicated to the phenomenon of variation, they are impressively numerous. It is obvious that the list of goals goes far beyond the limits of a scientific article restrictions.

While setting priorities for the present research, I noticed that **neither of** existing papers on variation is dedicated to the **investigation of the diplomatic discourse variation**. So, the **identified gap** led to the current research and **constituted the original contribution** of this article.

The **need for such research** in the universe of the existing scientific literature is explained by the general tendency in linguistics **to elaborate comprehensive theories** explaining different phenomena. As far as the so vastly studied phenomenon of variation is inherent to any language, and – at the same time – diplomatic discourse is generated exactly by means of natural languages, the **conjunction point** between all previously made researches and the current paper becomes obvious. Thus, the

complete and comprehensive survey on the diplomatic discourse must include also include its extensive variation analysis.

AIM OF THE ARTICLE is to analyze the peers' papers dedicated to the phenomena of variation and variability, decide on the correct terminology to be used, draw attention of the scientists and researchers to the issue of diplomatic discourse variation, which has not been studied so far; suggest the possible ways of its typologization (i.e., its types or variants' singling out and definition), their classification within the generalized investigation of the modern canon of the contemporary diplomatic discourse.

METHODOLOGY

1. Design

For the purposes of this article the necessary and relevant data were collected in several stages. Namely, at the very first stage, I found, sorted out and catalogued the existing linguistic works on the subject of variation, variability, variance, the process of varying, variants and invariant. The following research was carried out to analyze the existing terminological nomenclature and decide on the appropriate and relevant terminology to be used in this paper. The next step was to prove that diplomatic discourse is subject to variation, too. For this scope, the notion of variation in the diplomatic discourse was defined, with the previous determination of the concept of the invariant.

2. Materials


Further on, to create the sample database of the discourse under investigation, I collected and analyzed 218 papers on diplomacy in general and 189 ones dedicated to different aspects of the linguistic analysis of the diplomatic discourse, as well as 560 diplomatic documents (speeches, open letters, tweets, Facebook posts and similar) in free access.

3. Procedure

The singled out variants were subject to quantitative analysis and generalization. Finally, they were logically and thematically grouped into classes. Thus, the collected corpora proved to be sufficient to elaborate the multi-component and largely diverse classification of the diplomatic discourse variants.

RESULTS

The investigation carried out enabled me to present schematically the range of diplomatic discourse variations in the following way:



Pic. 1. Variation of the diplomatic discourse.

The diagram visualizes that the *diplomatic discourse is apt to vary*:

- in time (prehistorical, ancient, Medieval, current, contemporary);
- in space/geolocation (European, Oriental);
- in form of its existence (real/material, digital/virtual, Twiplomacy);
- in quantity of the participants (bilateral, multilateral);
- in gender (masculine, feminine);
- in individual psycho-linguistic peculiarities and idiolects (of Trump, of the Pope);
- according to the sphere of a particular diplomat/s' concern (military, economic)
- according to the institution it is being used (parliamentary, clerical);
- according to the place where it is being carried out ("Russian banya"/bathe, Turkish Hammam);
- according to the chosen form of state policy (feudal, presidential, monarchical,

totalitarian, democratic);

- according to the level of publicity (public, secret);
- according to the organization involved (OSCE, UNESCO, UN);
- according to the nation generating it (Italian, Chinese);
- according to the tonality and physiological effect it creates (coercive, evasive);
- according to the context or purpose of utterance (for youth, for immigrants, for journalists/briefing; consular);
- according to the form (dialogue, conference);
- according to its material realization (written, oral, electronic);
- according to the means facilitating communication (telephone, Internet/digital);
- according to national symbols (panda, “vyshyvankovyi” = of embroidered shirts);
- in comparison to/with the standard existing in particular period (traditional, modern);
- according to “auxiliary”, additional or similar external means, tools or similar applied (caviar, sport, gunboat; transport).

The list of possible variant is long, but not exhausted. It is open for any relevant change or modification reflecting the real current state of a natural language development.

It is worth mentioning that the important quantity of samples analyzed revealed no data that could contradict my hypotheses.

The collected data – sufficient in quantity, quite diverse but relevant to the object of investigation and logically arranged – led to the fulfillment of the research aim.

At the same time, such multi-component structure and diversity in the classification of types (=variants) of the diplomatic discourse shows the great extent of its variation, which, in its turn, backs up the validity of the initially proposed hypotheses.

DISCUSSIONS

Having fulfilled the diachronic review of previous linguistic findings, I picked out the most logical, well-proved and relevant provisions. Further, I defined variation in diplomatic discourse, providing a couple of examples. This will help to continue the elaboration of the theory of diplomatic discourse variation as part of the general

theory of variation.

I followed the trend of finding correspondents to general linguistic terms, used in variology, for the sphere of the diplomatic discourse research. I think it logical to suggest the following definitions and build my research on these theoretical assumptions:

1. Original elements of the paper of worldwide readers' interest.

Language is one of the most important, powerful and widely used tools of diplomacy. In fact, diplomacy embodies in practice by means of natural languages. Any natural language is a system; and any system possesses the intrinsic and inherent quality and ability to vary. Thus, it is also apt to variation, which is considered to be one of its general and universal characteristics (Homutova, 2005 : 28).

At the same time, any specific discourse is either a part of a language or, at least, makes use of language means in order to exist as a discourse. It automatically implies that any discourse possesses main features of the language it belongs to or that it uses. This provision enabled me to conclude that diplomatic discourse can also vary.

1.1. For diplomatic discourse research, **varying** is *the process of using (=recurring to) one or several variants of the diplomatic discourse* in oral, written, virtual or any other form; it changes depending on pure linguistic and/or external factors and it adjusts itself to each particular communicative situation, context, participants and similar needs in order to achieve effective communication.

At the same time, adapting the thesis as well as definitions, mentioned at the beginning of this article, to diplomatic discourse analysis I suggest the following formulation: **variation of the diplomatic discourse** is *its realization by means of its numerous and diverse variants (=types) occurring within the universal process of language varying.*

At this stage of my research I consider it possible to use sporadically the noun “variability” but only as the descriptive characteristic of the diplomatic discourse, because it is, in fact, is able to vary.

1.2. There are two dominant **factors triggering variation** (Borodinà, 2002 : 137), and both are indispensable for its scientifically faithful research (Volker, 2009; Lukina, 2014 : 10):

- the *inner (linguistic)* one, as any language is in constant evolution, which literally means that it changes or varies;
- the *external (extralinguistic)* one, as language does not exist in a “vacuum”, it

serves human beings to be able to interact in personal, social, highly professional and other communicative situations. In all these interactions, languages are influenced by geographical, political, economic, cultural, age, sex and other peculiarities of the communicative context. At the same time, languages themselves tend to “format” this communicative context adjusting it to the inner laws, regulations and patterns of grammar, word order and so on.

1.3. I agree with T.N. Homutova, who states that the general *process of varying* – the usage of variants – in language and speech comprises three *main types: formal, semantic and functional* (Homutova, 2005 : 28). Analyzing samples of diplomatic discourse, I revealed that all of them are *relevant for the diplomatic discourse*, as well.

1.4. Thus, the notion of a *variant of the diplomatic discourse*, in my opinion, corresponds to the *concrete (single or repeated) realization of one of its types in an equal or very similar (=typical) communicative situation*, context, circumstances, sphere of human activity, etc.

1.5. Another point not to disregard in a meticulous research is the *multi-level manifestation of variation*, which means that it should be traced on different language levels. For example, intonation patterns applied for solemn diplomatic speeches or during press conferences; typical lexical units, peculiar grammar structures and so on are to be studied. This approach enabled me to define such variants as The Pope’s diplomatic discourse, coercive, clerical and other ones.

It should be also borne in mind that, in linguistic analysis, *variation can be traced* in language if it occurs in course of *inter-personal* interaction within a society as contrasted to *inner-personal* peculiarities, called idiolects. The examples are: the royal diplomatic discourse, the diplomatic discourse of Trump and similar (Ponomarenko, 2020).


2. Validity of the research and its limits. Any scholar, starting a new research, should think carefully about *what* particular *aspect of its variations to focus at*, as the latter *are* so *numerous* that it is impossible to embrace all the aspects in one scientific paper. Ch. Lehmann argues that “any empirical generalization is a statement about a principle obtaining in the variation” (Lehmann, 2019). The author theorizes further, stating that linguistic activity is goal-directed and, thus, obeys a teleonomic hierarchy. “Consequently, any generalization abides at a certain level of abstractness. It ascertains something which, at that level, may appear as an invariant,

but which, at a higher level of the hierarchy may be just a variant means for a higher goal” (Lehmann, 2019). From this quotation derives the necessity to determine the *notion of the invariant*, agreed and accepted as a “template” in each sphere, also referred to as a “dimension” (Lukina, 2014 : 9) of variation. This definition is also indispensable in terms of proving the validity of my research and show its limits. Actually, the concept of invariant is the key one as it is the starting point for defining variants within traditional dual paradigm, based on oppositions. Consequently, this investigation will comprise only what can logically be contrasted to the defined notion of invariant of the diplomatic discourse.

There are *several coexisting* similar or different *theories*, called “*models*”, each aimed at describing in/variant, contrasting and/or trying to find out the exact [linguistically relevant] hierarchal correspondence. A closer look at them will help to elaborate the definition of the notion of invariant, applicable for the diplomatic discourse analysis.

2.1. One of the most widely spread theories is the *invariant-variant* one (A. Guillaume, Solntsev, 1971; Homutova, 2005; Skrelina, 2009; Lukina, 2014 et al.).

In general paradigmatic theory:



In classic works (Labov, 1972; Preston, 1986). Within this theory the notion of “invariant” is a generalized image, an abstract unit of a language level, possessing all the features and main characteristics of all its variants, while the notion of “variant” is understood as a concrete realization of a linguistic unit (=element) occurring in speech. The two notions are seen as an opposition to each other. In this assumption, the invariant is regarded as an ideal used for analyzing and studying common features (Solntsev, 1971; Homutova, 2005) of all its possible variants and/or each particular single variant, belonging to the same category as the invariant itself. Such approach allows classifying language material, language and speech units and other linguistically relevant issues. In this case, the invariant is neither a representative of a class, nor its “template” or the best/ideal member. It is a shortened name of the class (Vasilev, 1990).


The above described invariant-variant theory was initially elaborated within

phonology and, step by step, applied to other levels of language (Homutova, 2005 : 29). That's why it is also referred to as *paradigmatic* or *radial*.

V. Yartseva indicated that invariant can be traced in diachrony, while variants are typical for synchronic descriptions of a language (Yartseva, 2000 : 80). This approach coexists in nowadays linguistic paradigm with the first one, based on the opposition language-speech (Lukina, 2014 : 8; Skrelina, 1987 : 20).

2.2. As far as not all the linguistic community is unanimous when it comes to the notion of invariant (Belyayevskaya, 1987), considering it to be too narrow to comprise all empirical possibilities, they suggest, instead, the *theory of two zones* (areas): those of *constant and variable characteristics* of language (linguistic) units (Homutova, 2005 : 29; Vinogradov, 1947; Smirnitskij, 1956). It is called otherwise the *syntagmatic* or *horizontal model*.¹¹

In theory of two zones (horizontal/syntagmatic model):



The theory implies that the *constant zone* is a pool of defined characteristics which remain unchangeable in cases of all modifications of the very language unit; while the *variant* is a concrete realization of a language unit possessing all constant and some variable characteristics.

The two approaches do not contradict, though, but, to a certain extent complement each other. They are appropriate for different types of language units and linguistic analysis. T.N. Homutova suggests that the former model suits better the formal variation studies and the latter one satisfies the needs of the semantic variation analysis (Homutova, 2005 : 29).


Both theories are being still elaborated and used nowadays. I retain them applicable for the diplomatic discourse variation research, as well.

2.3. For the sake of completeness of the present review of approaches and model, it is necessary to mention that there exist:

- W. Labov's model of *linguistic variable*, a set or a paradigm of variants actualized in speech and influences by sociolinguistic context; two or more / two alternative ways of saying the same thing (Labov, 1972; Sankoff, 1980 : 55; Tagliamonte, 2006/2012 : 70-98). Here we quote a simple Labov's definition, different from the

original one, formulated in 1966 (Labov, 1972/1982 : 49). The approach using this notion is perfect for analyzing sociolinguistic variation.

W. Labov's model of linguistic variable:



- E. Rosch's *theory of prototype*, a kind of cognitive reference point or "standard" in comparison to similar, not prototypical variants; the proto-image of all representatives of a conceptual category; the most central member of a category. Again, I quote the simpler and re-elaborated definition (E. Rosch et al., 1976: Rosch, 1978), different from the initial one, given in 1973 (Rosche, 1973). The notion is adjacent to "family resemblance" (Rosch, Mervis, 1975).

E. Rosch's theory of prototype:




Comparing these two theories, T.N. Homutova calls the first one "paradygmaic, vertical", indispensable for sociolinguistic investigations (Homutova, 2005 : 29). Thus, the second one should be "syntagmatic, horizontal", appropriate for cognitive linguistics.

This provision is also valuable for the analysis of diplomatic discourse variation.

2.4. The other issue to be mention in regard with variation is the so-called "*free variation*", an accidental choice of a variant (Homutova, 2005 : 31).

Free variation:



2.5. Depending on the particular purpose of its analysis, philologist may focus more on:

- an abstract notion of traditional diplomatic discourse remaining unchanged over evolutionary time (i.e., its invariant),
- a concrete set of characteristics unanimously ascribed to the diplomatic

discourse (i.e., constant);

- number of ways, chosen by professional diplomats depending on their interlocutor, to express and convey the same idea or thought (i.e., linguistic variable),
- the ideal example of a written document, speech or any other message, compelled according to the norms and traditions of diplomacy (i.e., prototype) or
- a sporadic usage of “out-of-the-diplomacy” element for some specific rhetorical, stylistic, psychological or any communicative purpose.

If to choose among these theories, in my vision, the invariant-variant one suits the best for the present research. Though I assume that the *essence of variation in the contemporary diplomatic discourse is the result of hybridization and merging of the above mentioned concepts* into a new linguo-philosophic provision.

I came to this idea after having elaborated my own definition for invariant and variant of diplomatic discourse.

I needed these definitions because the notion of invariant served as a reference point and gave me grounds to determine cases of the diplomatic discourse variations. It also enabled me to provide some examples, necessary for proving each argued thesis.

2.6. Invariant, both as notion and term, is not the “invention” of linguists. It originated in diverse areas of mathematics (algebra, geometry, topology, discrete mathematics) and in the field of physics. It was primarily used to denote:

- a property of a mathematical object (or a class of mathematical objects) which remains unchanged, after operations or transformations of a certain type are applied to the objects (Hunt, 1996; Weisstein, 2019);
- more generally, with respect to an equivalence relation, a property that is constant on each equivalence class (Popov, 2001);
- quantity which remains unchanged (under certain classes of transformations). Invariants are extremely useful for classifying [mathematical] objects because they usually reflect intrinsic properties of the object of study (Hunt, 1996);
- in theoretic physics, a property of a system which remains unchanged under some transformation (Cherepanov, 2019).

In cognitive linguistics, the *invariance principle* was initially developed within attempts to explain similarities and differences for conceptual metaphor. It originated from G. Lakoff and M. Turner invariance hypothesis (Lakoff, Turner, 1989), which was revised and renamed later (Lakoff, 1993 : 215). The key concept of this theory

was that of preserving cognitive topology, i.e. image-scheme (inherent) structure of the source domain.

On the other hand, the invariant studies emerge from invariant-variant theory elaboration, which was already described here above (*See par. 6.2.1.*).

L. Hjelmslev was the first to suggest a wide and comprehensive definition of the invariant, retaining it to be the multiple repetition of “one and the same” (Hjelmslev, 1960, p. 320) essence, but expressed in different ways in the text.

N.D. Arutyunova recalled the dual nature, the arbitrary of a sign, the signifier and the signified (Arutyunova, 1969 : 380). This idea is developed into the following thesis: the variation of linguistic units in their form is the very identity of these units to themselves, while as far as denotation is concerned, it is confined to emerging of new meanings which are being accumulated (Solntsev, 1977: 228, 235).

V.M. Solntsev contemplated that the notion of invariant stood for something general in the row of similar objects (Solntsev, 1977: 214), he considered that the invariant was an abstract object thought to be a common name for the particular pool of objects, each of them being a variant in relation to the others of the pool (Solntsev, 1977: 215).

I.S. Uluhanov proposed to determine semantic variation by singling out identical (“тождественные”)⁴ components in the non-motivating part of word meaning (Uluhanov, 1977 : 89). Actually, in the middle of the XX century the development of invariant theories was quite popular in semantics and lexicology; and the notable contribution was made by V.A. Zviegintsev and A.I. Smirnitskij (Gryaznova, 2009 : 186).

A thorough analysis of historic and contemporary understanding of the invariant in linguistics was made by V.M. Gryaznova. She analysed crucial theories and approaches to the phenomenon and traced the usage of the appropriate and out-of-terminological context usage of the notion “invariant” in modern philological investigations (Gryaznova, 2009 : 189–190). The scientist states that it is typical to observe in contemporary linguistics the blurring and erosion of usage, research and description of previously existing boundaries. Finally, she concludes that the critical comprehension of variation is the manifestation of contemporary research processes’ further evolution (Gryazniva, 2009 : 190).

So, different linguists provide their own definitions for the “invariant”, and there

⁴ The term, given in brackets, is quoted exactly as the author used it.

is not the unique one. Still, judging from the analysed provisions, I am certain that all of them contain the general philosophic idea of “remaining unchanged, preserved under any modification of coordinates and time” (Rozental, Yudin, 1968 : 129).

Adapting this thesis to my current research and taking in consideration the provisions of the invariant-variant theory (*See par. 6.2.1.*), I suggest calling provisionally *the diplomatic discourse in its traditional assumption the invariant*, while *any particular or more specific (restricted, limited, context bound) usage of the diplomatic discourse will constitute its variants*. For example: *coercive diplomatic discourse, the diplomatic discourse of the Minister*, etc. Thus,

in diplomatic discourse:



2.7. I think, there have been given enough proofs so far that *languages vary* in many aspects and *according to a number of criteria*. They change throughout centuries, sometimes slowly, sometimes in remarkable leaps as, for example, with the advent of digital technologies. In particular, I refer to the development of the Web 2.0. It gave birth to new types and means of communication among which social nets stand out.

Variations are also perceived when one moves from the North to the South and from the East to the West, covering long distances, as well as within one country or its regions.

Languages vary depending on who is using them: people of different age, sex, social and professional groups; those of prominent or weak physical and mental abilities.

All these and many other distinctions are reflected on the level of phonetics, lexis, grammar, syntaxes, stylistic and rhetorical devices, communicative (pragmatic) tactics and strategies applied.

These variations are registered both, in group and individual language practices. Previously, my peers made several attempts to *classify cases of variation*:

- M.A.K. Halliday, A. McIntosh, P. Strevens (1964) distinguished two types: *according to the user* (participants of communications) and *according to the use* (function or register) variations. The latter type was further subdivided into three

types (Halliday, 1978): register *variation of field of discourse* (political, religious, etc.), *variation of the tenor* (tone/tonality: official-familiar, polite-rude/impolite, etc.), and *variation of the mode* (i.e. channel of communication: written-oral, monologue-dialogue, etc.).

- D. Crystal & D. Davy enumerated eight “dimensions of situational constraint” predetermining language variation, but then grouped them into three (Crystal, Davy, 1969): *individuality* (idiolect), *dialect, time* (diachrony), *discourse* (with regard of medium and participation: monologue-dialogue, etc.), *province* (law, advertising, etc.), *status* (formal, polite, intimate), *modality* (genres, mode), *singularity* (individual peculiarities of the author).

- The University Grammar (1973, quoted after Lipka, 1988 : 319) lists six kinds of variation, called there “varieties”: *region* (geographical); *education and social standing*, *subject matter* (register), *medium* (speaking vs written), *attitude* (stylistic), *interference* (of native/foreign language). The six types may be subjected for further subdivision.

- W. Croft applied the notion of “*domains of variant*” (Croft, 2006 : 98–103), singling out their three types: *phonetic, lexical and morpho-syntactic variation*. These domains can be observed after having defined what M. Rydén called a “variant field” (Rydén, 1987), i.e. a pool of linguistic features considered “roughly equivalent”.

- Ch. Lehmann, following ideas of the German-Hungarian linguist E. Coseriu (Coseriu, 1981), singled out and listed four dimensions of language variation, calling this set, after L. Flydal (Flydal, 1951), “the architecture of a language” (Lehmann, 2013). I would like to precise that, according to A. Lukina, the initially suggested model in 1969 did not contained the diachronic dimension (Lukina, 2014 : 9, with reference to Coseriu, 1963 : 165, 167-183), while, according to Lehmann (Lehmann, 2019), K. Bentein, M. Janse, J. Soltic (2017), these dimensions (dia-types, type-setting dimensions) are:

- *diachronic*, i.e. variants and even *historical stages* following each other on the diachronic axis,

- *diatopic*, i.e. different *dialects* spoken in different places and regions of the linguistic area,

- *diastratic*, i.e. different *sociolects* used in different social groups according to sex, age, profession),

- *diaphasic*, i.e. different levels of *style/register* used in different communicative

settings.

Some scientists see little distinction between diastratic and diaphasic dimensions, retaining they overlap (Bentein, Janse, Soltic, 2017 : 3), as both connect language to the social context in which it is being used. The very E. Coseriu (1988) originally classified age, sex and occupation distinctions belonging the same dimension (Lipka, 1988 : 320-321).

In the first part of 1980s P. Koch and W. Oesterreicher suggested to add one more dimension, distinguishing “communicative immediacy” and “communicative distance” (Lukina, 2014 : 9; Koch, Oesterreicher, 1985 : 35). The former one stands for particular spontaneous communication with one or several known interlocutors. The latter one refers to a public prepared beforehand communication, often without a concrete audience of reference. This dimension of variation, in fact, combines all or some variantions, namely, those according the interlocutor, social status, communicative situation/context, spoken vs standard language. Such provision allows to conclude that variation is not bound to a couple of oppositions, but should be regarded as a multi-dimensional phenomenon (Lukina, 2014 : 9), with the communicating individual in the centre. While this idea remains partially accepted, there is, anyway, the clearly distinguished fifth dimension of variation, suggested by the French linguist F. Gadet (Gadet, 1997 : 5). This dimension is called

- *diamesic*, i.e. differentiation between the *oral* and *written communication* (speech, “parole”).

Real-life communication within the modern linguistic paradigm shows the fact that people nowadays interact in different – parallel (independently in each of them or simultaneously in both) or inter-crossing (up-to-the-moment or time-unspecific) – real and virtual worlds. This peculiar feature is also reflected in the contemporary diplomatic discourse, that is why *I suggest broadening the already existing classification of linguistic variation* and add the sixth type, called provisionally

- “*dia-dimentional*”. The proposed type or vector, in terminology of A. Lukina (Lukina, 2014 : 9), or dimension, using the E. Cosiriu’s terminology (Cosiriu, 1981), embraces all the cases of diplomatic discourse *variation in virtual* (electronic, digital, Internet, online) professional *communication* of diplomats *being compared or contrasted to the real one*. While choosing the name for this dimension, I followed the logic previously establish by the inventor of the first model for variation analysis, E. Cosiriu (Cosiriu, 1981). Thus, I opted for using the Greek prefix “*dia-*”, too. It sounds a bit clumsy, though. But as far as Greek prefixes are very productive, and they

are frequently used in terminological derivation, I remained faithful to the already created tradition.

In the Greek language the element “dia-” had the meaning of a “movement through, penetration”, “distribution”, “sub/division, separation, singling out”, “mutuality”, “boosting”, “accomplishing, realization” (Ryzhenkova, 2008) and it helped to create such commonly used lexical units as diagonal, dialogue, diachrony, diagram, dialyses, diapause, diaphragm, diarist, diaspora, diastema, etc. All the quoted meaning of the prefix “dia-” are relevant for the purposes of our research, but we used it in the meaning explained by G. Ryzhenkova (Ryzhenkova, 2008) and as the one prevalently used in the Russian and Ukrainian languages “movement through, penetration”. Thus, we intend to say that the diplomatic discourse of the first quarter of the XXI century has been shifting from the real world communication into the virtual one. It infiltrated into other discourses (purely political, economic, financial, juridical, medical and so on). At the same time the diplomatic discourse acquired some peculiarities and, especially, lexical units. So, the process is mutually beneficial. All its manifestations can be separated and singled as its (sub)types. Such facts justify the chosen name for this type of diplomatic discourse variation. The newly coined term may be rendered into Ukrainian as “*діа(ву)мірний*”.

For each of the above named dimension of linguistic variation I highlighted using italics, both, the linguistic term and the key notion it stands for.

The above mentioned sixth dimension of variation broadens the dia-system (W. Weinreich, 1972), the complex of co-existing systems applicable for researching any phenomenon in different manifestations, each of them accounting for a triad “individual/interlocutor – language – society” (Lukina, 2014 : 9).

Having considered the already exposed ideas, I narrowed the field of my research by concretizing the type of variation I am particularly interested in. Actually, it is the combination of diachronic, diastratic, dia-dimensional and – a bit less – diaphasic uses (assumptionë) of the diplomatic discourse.

This sphere of research enabled me to single out and classify the listed variants of the diplomatic discourse (*See par. 5 in this article*), existed and/or still existing throughout its evolution.

3. It is remarkable that variation understood as inherent feature of linguistic phenomena in general, thoroughly studied on the example of the diplomatic discourse, revealed its peculiarities which – in a mirror pattern – can be **extrapolated to any**

other research on the topic. It means that peer linguists can make use of my terminological nomenclature (namely: in/variant and variation of a discourse), the indicated factors triggering variation of a discourse and the suggested typology of a discourse variants, and **apply the results of this study** to their own investigation of any other discourse on the material of different natural languages.

4. At the same time, the complexity, considerable diversity and multi-levelled realization of the phenomenon under investigation indicated the necessity to analyze it by studying its single constituents, i.e. its particular manifestations. On the one hand, this finding revealed geographical, epistemological, methodological **limitations of the variation research** conducted with the utmost academic integrity and faithfulness. On the other hand, it showed the right way how to develop **the generalized theory of variation**, applicable worldwide.

CONCLUSIONS

Since language is not only the main “tool, vehicle for transmission thoughts, or instrument of communication but very often the very essence of the diplomatic vocation” (Stanko, 2001 : 39), the urge and relevance of studying diplomacy and the diplomatic discourse in all their linguistically relevant applications are also obvious. (Kashchyshyn, 2016).

The conducted investigation of the diplomatic discourse manifestations in Romanic and Germanic languages resulted in typology (architectonical scheme) of the diplomatic discourse variants, enumeration of factors causing variation, elaboration of the appropriate terminological nomenclature. In their turn, the conclusions driven enabled me to argue the following provisions:

1. For the purposes of linguistic investigations, *variability of the diplomatic discourse* can be determined as the *entire spectrum of all its possible manifestations* (geopolitically, socio-linguistically, ethno-culturally, financially, historically, individually etc. depending) *unless the set of its key characteristics and components is recognizable*, being its constant or invariant. A range of internal and external, objective and subjective factors determines the plurality of variability cases. These factors nourish and keep evolving the process of variability proliferation, contributing to the constant growth of the diplomatic discourse variants and (sub)types.

2. Bearing in mind the definitions suggested above, and taking into account the generic interpretation of variability retrievable in the explanatory dictionary (Busel,

2003 : 75) that highlights variability as the derivative noun from the verb “to vary”, understood as doing or saying the same, but in a different way; or change the proper form (“робити або говорити те саме по-різному; ВИДОЗМІНЮВАТИСЯ”⁵ – we claim that, much more than what had been determined for linguistic units of lower levels, the diplomatic discourse is apt to vary according to, at least, 21 criteria (*See par. 5*). It is important to remark immediately that the variations of the diplomatic discourse provided in my article are not limited by the already enumerated ones.

Consequently, the possibility to fulfil ever a complex analysis or research of the diplomatic discourse is called into question. It seems more scientifically faithful to investigate and draw conclusions applicable for one or several period(s) in the diplomatic discourse usage, for its particular type, a single exponent and so on. Anyways, the variations are numerous and, for the moment, there are no preconditions to consider the diplomatic discourse variability exhausted.

3. The evolution is expected not to stop ever. Thus, any phenomenon of any sphere of human life and activity, including communication in general, the vast range of its discourses and *the diplomatic discourse*, in particular, *will go on evolving thanks to the inherent variability potential* of the latter one. The very process of permanent mutation and *variability is likely to generate new forms, genres, adjacent spheres of usage, types and so on of the discourse* under investigation. It goes without saying that all processes in the society are strongly interconnected. It means that any change in domestic or foreign policy, phenomena of globalization, mediatization, some drastic issues in economy, important historical events, scientific discoveries or technological achievements will create valid basis for growth and expansion of the diplomatic discourse variability.

Thus, my **initial hypotheses** that *diplomatic discourse* follows the general laws of a natural language it is being expressed by, **proved to be the right one**. The observations of the diplomatic discourse manifestations in different contexts and communicative situations evidenced how and to what extent it *is subject to varying*, revealed the *plurality and diversity* of its types (*variants*), provided proofs that *variation is one of its inherent features*.

Perspectives for further research. Consequently, the above revealed circumstances and their material consequences are nourishing fresh ideas, and they will open new horizons for the linguistic research in the field of variability investigations. It is much likely they would change one more time the current canon

⁵ Here the quote, given in brackets, is reported exactly as used in the original source.

of the diplomatic discourse, as change appears to be, so far, the only constant in life (Wikiquote).

References

- Ahmanova, O.S. (1957). *Ocherki po obschey i russkoy leksikologii*. Moskva: Uchpedgiz (In Russian).
- Ahmanova, O.S. (1969). *Slovar lingvisticheskikh terminov*. 2-e izd. Moskva: Sovetskaya entsiklopediya (In Russian).
- Arutyunova N.D. (1969). O minimalnoy edinitse grammaticheskoy sistemyi. V: Edinitsyi raznyih urovney grammaticheskogo stroya zyika i ih vzaimodeystvie Moskva: Nauka (In Russian).
- Bagana Zh., Bondarenko E.V., Chernova O.O. (2012). Teoreticheskie osnovaniya izucheniya problemy yazykovoy variativnosti. V: Zhurnal «Nauchnyie vedomosti Belgorodskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta» [Elektronnoe izdanie]. Seriya: Gumanitarnyie nauki. Tekst nauchnoy stati po spetsialnosti «Yazykoznanie i literaturovedenie». № 6(125). Vyipusk 13. Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/teoreticheskie-osnovaniya-izucheniya-problemy-yazykovoy-variativnosti>. [Poslednee poseschenie: 30.12.2019].
- Basovets, I.M. (2019). Variativnost konstrukcij s zatemnennym referentom. *Variativnost v yazyke i rechi* : Tez. dokl. Mezhdunar. nauch. konf., Minsk, 4-5 apr. 2019 g. Minsk : MGLU, 2019, 23–25. Retrieved from <http://e-lib.mslu.by/handle/edoc/2083>.
- Bentein, K., Janse, M., Soltic, J. (2017). *Variation and Change in Ancient Greek Tense, Aspect and Modality*. Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology [Text]. Brill, 26.06.2017. 320 p. Moskva: Vysshaya shkola, P. 87.
- Berseneva, N.S., (2017). Realizaciya variativnosti slovoobrazovatelnyh modelej v lingvisticheskom registre nauchnogo diskursa. In: *Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki*. № 10-1 (76), 83–87. Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/realizatsiya-variativnosti-slovoobrazovatelnyh-modelej-v-lingvisticheskom-registre-nauchnogo-diskursa> (Data obrash eniya: 27.07.2020).
- Borodinà, M.A. (2002). Prostranstvo, territoriya, zona i areal kak lingvogeograficheskie i areologicheskie terminy [Tekst] / M.A. Borodina *Voprosy yazykoznaniiya*. № 2, 135–141.
- Britain, D. (2016), Sociolinguistic variation / *Centre for Languages, Linguistics and Area Studies*, Humbox. Retrieved from <https://www.llas.ac.uk/resources/gpg/1054.html>.
- Busel V.T. (2003). Variyuvati. U: Velikij tлумachnij slovník suchasnoyi ukrayinskoyi movi. Kiyiv; Irpin: VTF «Perun», S. 75.
- Chambers, J.K. (2003). *Sociolinguistic Theory: Linguistic Variation and its Social Significance*, 2nd edition [Text]. Oxford; Malden, MA : Blackwell, 320 p.
- Coseriu Eu. (1981) Los conceptos de “dialecto”, “nivel” y “estilo de lengua” y el sentido propio de la dialectología. En: *Lingüística española actual* [Texto]. Num. 3. P. 3–32.
- Cherepanov, G.P. (2019). *Invariant integrals in Physics*. – Springer, Kindler edition,

- 259 p. [online]. Retrieved from https://www.amazon.com/Invariant-Integrals-Physics-Genady-Cherepanov-dp-3030283364/dp/3030283364/ref=mt_other?encoding=UTF8&me=&qid= (Accessed 28.07. 2020).
- Croft W. (2000). *Explaining language Change: An Evolutionary Approach* [Text]. – United Kingdom, Harlow: Pearson Education Limited (Longman Linguistics library). XV+287 p. (304 p.).
- Croft W. (2006). The relevance of an evolutionary model to Historical linguistics. In: Thomsen O.N. (ed.), *Competing Models of Linguistic Change. Evolution and beyond* [Text]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. P. 91–132.
- Crystal D., Davy D. (1969). *Investigating English Style* [Text]. Bloomington: Indiana University Press (Language Arts&Disciplines) . xii+264+ ill.(280) p.
- Darwin Ch. *Adaptability Sayings and Quotes* [online]. Retrieved from <http://www.wiseoldsayings.com/adaptability-quotes/> [Accessed 05 Dec. 2019].
- Dillard J.L. (1965). *Afro-American vehicle and other names*[Text]. Rio Piedras, P.R.: Institute of Caribbean Studies; University of Puerto Rico.
- Dillard J.L. (1992). *A history of American English* [Text]. London; New York: Longman. 257 p. : illustrations.
- Domashnev, A.I. (2005). Ob odnom tipe otnoshenij «sistema – norma – variant» v sociolingvistike // Trudy po germanskomu yazykoznaniju i sociolingvistike / Institut lingvisticheskikh issledovanij. SPb.: Nauka.
- Dubrovina S.N. (2015). Variativnost kak universalnoe svojstvo yazyka. – Verhnevolzhskij filologicheskij vestnik [online]. № 3. Retrieved from <http://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/variativnost-kak-univrsalnoye-svoystvo-yazyka>. [Poslednee poseshenie: 30.12.2019].
- Firsova N.M. (2000). Yazykovaya variativnost i nacionalno-kulturnaya specifika rechevogo obsheniya v ispanskom yazyke: Uchebnoe posobie. Moskva: Izd-vo RUDN.
- Flydal L. (1951) Remarques sur certains rapports entre le style et l'état de langue [Text]. En: *Norsk Tidsskrift for Sprogvidenskap*. N. 16. P. 240–257.
- Franklin B. *Adaptability Sayings and Quotes* [online]. Retrieved from <http://www.wiseoldsayings.com/adaptability-quotes/> [Accessed 05 Dec. 2019].
- Fischer, J.L. (2015). Social Influences on the Choice of a Linguistic Variant. In: *WORD*. – New York (Columbia University), P. 273–309 [online]. Retrieved from http://www.danielezrajohnson.com/labov_1963.pdf [Accessed 24 Dec. 2019].
- Gadet F. (1997). La variation plus qu'une écume. In: Gadet F. *Langue française* [Text]. № 115. P. 5–18.
- Gak V.G. (2009). Yazykovyie preobrazovaniya: Nekotoryie aspekty lingvisticheskoy nauki v kontse XX veka. Ot situatsii k vyiskazyvaniyu. Moskva: Nauka.
- Gak V.G. (2010). Yazykovyie preobrazovaniya: Vidyi yazykovyih preobrazovaniy. Faktoryi i sferyi realizatsii yazykovyih preobrazovaniy. Moskva: Nauka.
- Glinkina L.A. (2012). Grammaticheskaya variantnost kak obekt istoricheskoy rusistiki.
- Golev N.D., Kim L.G., (2009). Variativno-interpretacionnoe funkcionirovanie teksta (k voprosu o rasshirenii granic lingvisticheskoy variantologii). In: *ChelGU*, № 27. *Filologiya. Iskusstvovedeniye*, Vypusk 34, Pp. 12-20. Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/variativno-interpretatsionnoe-funktsioniro>

- vanie-teksta-k-voprosu-o-rasshirenii-granits-lingvisticheskoy-variantologii.
- Gryaznova V.M. (2009). Ponyatie invarianta v lingvistike: istoriya voprosa i sovremennoe sostoyanie. V: Vestnik Stavropolskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya: Filologicheskie nauki. № 65, 183–190.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1954). *The Swabian Dialect of Washtenaw County, Michigan* [Thesis/dissertation : Manuscript]. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms.
- Hajicova E. et al. (1999), History of Ideas / *Prague School Linguistics: Unity in Diversity* // Travaux du circle linguistique de Prague n.s. / Prague linguistic circle papers [Text]. Vol. 3. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins publishing company. P. 4–7.
- Halaur, S.P., (2019). Variable nature of the addressing strategy in the modern Ukrainian literary text. In: Variativnost' v yzyke I rechi, materialy konferenzii. Poltava, Pp. 10–12. Retrieved from <https://scholar.google.com.ua/scholar?oi=bibs&hl=ru&cluster=15058074510530692762>.
- Halliday M.A.K. (1978): *Language as Social Semiotics*. The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning. London: Edward Arnold. 256 p.
- Heraclitus. Quotes. In: *Wikiquote* Quotes [online]. Available at: en.m.wikiquote.org/wiki/Heraclitus#Quotes Plato. *Cratylus (dialogue)* [online]. Retrieved from [en.m.wikiquote.org/wiki/Cratylus_\(dialogue\)](http://en.m.wikiquote.org/wiki/Cratylus_(dialogue)) [Accessed 05 Dec. 2019].
- Hjelmslev L. (1960 [2006]). Prolegomeny k teorii yazyka. V: *Novoe v zarubezhnoj lingvistike* (per. na russ.) [Tekst]. Vyp.1. Moskva: Progress.
- Hunt B. (1996). Invariants. Appendix B.1. In: *The Geometry of Some Special Arithmetic Quotients*. New York: Springer-Verlag, pp. 282-290.
- Homutova, T.N. (2005). Teoriya yazykovoy variativnosti: sociolingvisticheskij aspekt. In: *Vestnik YuUrGU*. Seriya: Lingvistika, № 11 (51), P. 28–34. Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/teoriya-yazykovoy-variativnosti-sotsiolingvisticheskij-aspekt>.
- Huspek, M. (1989), Linguistic variability and power: An analysis of you know/I think variation in working-class speech. In: *Journal of Pragmatics*. Volume 13, Issue 5. Pp. 661-683. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(89\)90073-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(89)90073-8). Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0378216689900738>.
- Jakobson R. (1939), Nikolaj Sergejevič Trubetzkoy [Text]. In: *Acta linguistica*. Vol. 1, n. 1.
- Karcevskij(j) S.O. (1931), Sur la phonologie de la phrase. In: *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de la Prague* [Text]. Vol. 4. P. 188-227 [réimprimé dans Vachek (1964 ç 206–251) and Karcevskij (2000 : 77–83)].
- Kashchyshyn N.Ye. (2016). Do problemi viokremlennya diplomatichnogo diskursu. LNU imeni Ivana Franka [Elektronne vidannya, pdf]. Dostupne na: www.seanewdim.com/uploads. (Ostannyye poklikannya: 17.12.2019).
- Keller R. (1994), On Language Change: the invisible hand in language [Text]. London, Routledge.
- Keller R. (2009). Konventionen. Regeln, Normen. Zum ontologischen Status natürlicher Sprachen. In: M. Konopka, B. Strecker (Hrsg.): *Deutsche Grammatik – Regeln, Normen, Sprachgebrauch*. [Text]. Berlin – New York: de Gruyter, P. 9–22.
- Knyazev Yu.P. (2007). Grammaticheskaya semantika: Russkij yazyk v tipologicheskoy perspektive. Moskva: Yazyki slavyanskikh kultur, 702 s.

- Koch P. (1985). Sprache der Nähe – Sprache der Distanz. Mundlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit von Sprachtheorie und Sprachgeschichte [Text]. In: Koch P., Oesterreicher W. *Romanistisches Jahrbuch*, 36. P. 15–43.
- Labov W. (1963). The social motivation of a sound change. In: *WORD*. 19 (3). New York (Columbia University), P. 273–309 [online]. Retrieved from http://www.danielezrajohnson.com/labov_1963.pdf [Accessed 23 Dec. 2019].
- Labov W. (1966/1982). *The social stratification of English in New York City* [Text]. Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics. P. 49.
- Labov W. (1969), Contraction, Deletion, and Inherent Variability of the English Copula / *Language (journal)*, *LSA Bulletin*. Vol. 45, No. 4. USA, Linguistic Society of America, Pp. 715-762. DOI: 10.2307/412333. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/412333>.
- Labov W. (1971). Variation in Language // C.E. Reed (Ed.). *The Learning of Language*. National Council of Teachers of English. N.Y.
- Labov W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. P. 8.
- Lakoff G. (1993). The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor. In: Ortony A (ed.). *Metaphor and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. P. 202-251.
- Lakoff G., Turner M. (1989). More that cool reason: a field guide to poetic metaphor [Text]. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Language Arts&Disciplines). xii+230 p.
- Lakoff R.T. (1972). Language in context. In: *Language* [Online]. Vol. 48, No. 4, (Dec., 1972). P. 907–927. Published by: Linguistic Society of America Stable. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/411994>. [Accessed: 13/07/ 2008].
- Lakoff R.T. (1975). *Language and Woman's Place* [Online]. Harper & Row, published online by Cambridge University Press: 18 December 2008. Retrieved from https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/language-in-society/article/language-and-womans-place/F66DB3D1BB878CDD68B9A79_A25B67DE6. [Accessed: 13/12/2019].
- Lakoff, R.T. (2004) [1975]. *Language and woman's place: text and commentaries* [Text]. by M. Bucholtz (Rev. and expanded ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lehmann Ch. (2013) *Dimension of variation in a language*. 11/09/2013 [online]. Retrieved from http://www.christianlehmann.eu/ling/ling_meth/data/index.html?https://www.christianlehmann.eu/ling/ling_meth/data/variation.html [Accessed 19 Dec. 2019].
- Lehmann Ch. (2019) *Variation in linguistics*. 04/19/2019 [online]. Retrieved from http://www.christianlehmann.eu/ling/ling_meth/data/index.html?https://www.christianlehmann.eu/ling/ling_meth/data/variation.html [Accessed 19 Dec. 2019].
- Linguistic Variation* (2011-2019). Official website [online]. Retrieved from <http://www.jbe-platform.com/content/journals/22116842> [Accessed 20 Dec. 2019].
- Linguistic Variation Yearbook* (2001-2010). Official website [online]. Available at: <http://www.jbe-platform.com/content/journals/15699900> [Accessed 20 Dec. 2019].
- Lipka L Variety in the Spice of Life: Language Variation and Sociolinguistics.

- In: *Energeia und Ergon: sprachl. Variation – Sprachgeschichte – Sprachtypologie: Studia in Honorem Eugenio Coseriu / hrsg. von Jörn Albrecht*. Tübingen: narr. (Tübingen Beiträge zur linguistic. P. 317-327.
- Lukina A.E. (2014) Ponyatie «yazykovoj variativnosti» v otechestvennoj i zarubezhnoj lingvisticheskoj tradicii. V: Ponyatijnyj apparat sovremennoj lingvistiki / Vestnik Yuzhno-Uralskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya: Lingvistika. Oblast nauk: Yazykoznanie i literaturovedenie [Elektronnoe izdanie]. Retrieved from <http://www.cyberleninka.ru/article/n/ponyatie-azykovoy-variativnosti-v-otechestvennoj-i-zarubezhnoj-lingvisticheskoy-traditsii> [Poslednee poseshenie: 30.12.2019].
- Mathesius V. (1931). Zum Problem der Belastungs- und Kombinationsfähigkeit der Phoneme. In: *Travaux du Cercle linguistique de Prague*. n.IV. Pp. 148-152.
- Milroy J., Milroy L. (2017), Varieties and Variation / *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Chapter 3. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405166256.ch3>. Retrieved from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781405166256.ch3>.
- Musaeva T.S., (2016). Lingvisticheskie osnovy ponyatij «variantnost», «variant» i «invariant». V: Problemy sovremennoj nauki i obrazovaniya / Zhurnal. Seriya: Filologicheskie nauki. Oblast nauk: Yazykoznanie i literaturovedenie. S. 41–44. [Elektronnoe izdanie]. Retrieved from <http://www.cyberleninka.ru/article/n/lingvisticheskie-osnovy-ponyatij-variantnost-variant-i-invariant> [Poslednee poseshenie: 31.12.2019].
- Nevezhina E.A., (2016). Sociolingvisticheskij podhod k varirovaniyu francuzskogo yazyka v Bryussele i Vallonii. In: Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki, № 6–1 (60). S. 135–137. Retrieved from <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/sotsiolingvisticheskij-podhod-k-voprosu-varirovaniya-frantsuzskogo-yazyka-v-bryussele-i-vallonii>.
- Nevezhina, E.A., (2017). Vektory razvitiya francuzskogo yazyka v areale Valloniya-Bryussel // FUNDAMENTALNOE i AKTUALNOE v RAZVITII YaZYKA: KATEGORII, FAKTORY, MEHANIZMY. XVIII Mezhdunarodnaya konferenciya Shkoly-Seminara imeni L.M.Skrelinoj. Sbornik statej. Moskva, MGPU «Yazyki Narodov Mira», Pp. 198–191. Retrieved from <https://www.hse.ru/data/2017/10/19/1157906690/.pdf>.
- Nordquist R. Linguistic Variation. In: *Glossary of Grammatical and Rhetorical Terms*. Updated May 25, 2019 [online]. Retrieved from <http://www.thoughtco.com/what-is-linguistic-variation-1691242> [Accessed 05 Dec. 2019].
- Olver, P.J. (1999). *Classical Invariant Theory* (London mathematical Society. Students Texts 44). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 280 p.
- Plato. *Cratylus (dialogue)* [online]. Retrieved from [en.m.wikiquote.org/wiki/Cratylus_\(dialogue\)](http://en.m.wikiquote.org/wiki/Cratylus_(dialogue)) [Accessed 05 Dec. 2019].
- Ponomarenko O.V. (2012). Etnospecificzna variativnist konceptu «respublika» v diplomachnomu diskursi romanomovnih krayin (na prikladi Italiyi, Ispaniyi, Franciyi, Argentini). In: *Svitova ta ukrajinska diplomatiya: istorichnij dosvid, suchasnij stan, perspektivi*: nauk. visnik DAU / Diplomatiya ta inozemni movi. Kyiv, DAU, 2012. Vip. 19. S. 128–132.
- Ponomarenko O.V. (2019). Arhitektonika diplomachnogo diskursu. In: «*Inozemna filologiya*». Visnik Institutu filologiyi KNU. Kyiv: VPC «Kiyivskij universitet», 2019.

- Ponomarenko, O.V. (2020). Ethically or diplomatically? Broadening the boundaries of the acceptable in the modern diplomatic discourse/ In: *Yazyk a Kultúra* : Internetový časopis Lingvokulturologického a prekladateľsko-tlmočnického centra excelentnosti pri Filozofickej fakulte Prešovskej univerzity v Prešove. Ročník 11, číslo 41–42/2020. Lingvokulturologické a prekladateľsko-tlmočnického centrum excelentnosti pri FF PU, Pp. 116–123. Retrieved from https://www.ff.unipo.sk/jak/rus/aktualnecislo_r.html.
- Popov V.L. (2001) [1994]. Invariant. In: Hazewinkel M. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of mathematics*. Springer Science+Business Media B.V. / Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Pražskij lingvističeskij kruzhok*. Sb. statej. Sost. – red. Kondrashov N. A. Moskva, 1967.
- Preston, D. R. (1993-2001). “Variation linguistics and SLA” / In: *Second Language Research*. 9 (2). London: Arnold, 153–172. [online]. Retrieved from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/026765839300900205> [Accessed 22 Dec. 2019].
- Reppen R. et al. (2002). *Using Corpora to Explore Linguistic Variation*. John Benjamins.
- Rosa de, E. (2017) Linguistic Variation in English. In: *Revista de Letras*. – Vol. 19, n. 25. Curitiba, P. 35-46 [online]. Retrieved from <http://periodicos.utfpr.edu.br/rl> [Accessed 25 Dec. 2019].
- Rosche E.H. (1973). Natural categories. In: *Cognitive Psychology* [Text]. Num. 4. P. 328–350.
- Rosche E. (1978). Principles of categorization. In: Rosch E. & Lloyd B.B. (eds), *Cognition and categorization* [Text]. Hillsdale, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers. P. 27–48.
- Rosche E. & Mervis C.B. (1975). Family Resemblances: Studies in the Internal Structures of Categories. In: *Cognitive Psychology* [Text]. Vol. 7. Num. 4 (Oct., 1975). P. 573–605.
- Rosche E., Mervis C.B., Gray W., Johnson D & Boyes-Braem P. (1975). *Basic Objects in Natural categories, Working paper Num. 43* [Text]. Berkeley, university of California: Language Behaviour Research Laboratory.
- Rozental D.E., Telenkova M.A. (2001). *Slovar-spravochnik lingvisticheskikh terminov: Posobie dlya uchitelya*. Moskva: Prosveshenie.
- Rozental M.M., Yudin P.F. (1968). *Filosofskij slovar*. Moskva: Izd-vo politicheskoy literatury (Politizdat), 432 s.
- Rydén M. (1987). Syntactic variations and paradigmatic typology. In: *Studia linguistica* [Text and Online]. Vol. 41, issue 1. Wiley Online Library. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-9582.1987.tb00772.x> [Accessed 31 Dec. 2019].
- Ryzhenkova, G. (2008). Grecheskie prefiksy v russkom yazyke. – Svidetelstvo o publikacii №208061900343. [Elektronnoe izdanie]. Retrieved from <http://www.proza.ru/2008/06/19/343> [Poslednee poseshenie 30.12.2019].
- Sandalova, N.V. (2015). Problema unifikatsii metayazyika teorii variologii v professionalnom obuchenii. V: *Pedagogicheskoe obrazovanie v Rossii / Zhurnal*. № 10. Oblast nauk: Yazykovedenie i literaturovedenie. [Elektronnoe

- izdanie]. Retrieved from <http://www.cyberleninka.ru/article/n/roblema-unifikatsii-metazykyka-teorii-variologii-v-professionalnom-obuchenii-lingvistov> [Poslednee poseschenie: 31.12.2019].
- Sankoff, G. (1980). *The social life of language*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 373 p.
- Saussure de, F. (1916), *Course de linguistique générale (1906-1910)*. 1^{re} ed. Lausanne–Paris: Payot (Collection: Bibliothèque scientifique Payot. P. 109, 117.
- Saussure de, F. (1993), *The third course of lectures on General Linguistics (1910-1911)*. Pergamon Press. Retrieved from <http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/fr/saussure.htm>
- Schee G. (2001) Language and Ethnicity. In: *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. Editors-in-Chief Nail J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes. 26 volumes. Elsevier, 17500 p. [Text and online]. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/referencework/9780080430768/international-encyclopedia-of-the-social-and-behavioral-sciences> [Accessed 25 Dec. 2019].
- Scott F.K. (2011) *Linguistic Variation and Change* (Edinburgh Sociolinguistics) [Text]. 1st ed. Edinburgh University Press, 208 p.
- Selivanova, O.O. (2006) Variativnist. U: Suchasna lingvistika: terminologichna enciklopediya. Poltava: Dovkillya-K, P. 57.
- Serazhym, K.S. (2002) Diskurs yak sociolingvalne yavishe: metodologiya, arhitektonika, variativnist [na materialah suchasnoyi gazetnoyi publicistiki] [Tekst]. Kiyiv.
- Shahbagova D.A. (1992). Foneticheskaya sistema angliyskogo yazyka v diahronii i sinhronii (na materiale britanskogo, amerikanskogo, avstraliyskogo, kanadskogo variantov angliyskogo yazyka). Moskva.
- Shcherba, L.V. (1974). O troyakom aspekte yazykovykh yavlenij i ob eksperimente v yazykoznanii / L.V. Sherba. *Yazykovaya sistema i rechevaya deyatel'nost* [Tekst]. Moskva, Pp. 24–39.
- Skrelina, L.M. (2009). *Grammaticheskaya sinonimiya: ucheb. posobie k spetskursu* [The Grammatical Synonymy: the manual]. Leningrad, Leningrad. gos. ped. institut im. A.I. Gercena Publ., 84 p.
- Slozhenikina Yu.V. (1971). O sootnoshenii ponyatij «znachenie» i «smysl». K probleme terminologicheskoy variativnosti. Moskva: Nauka, 2006.
- Smirnitskij, A.I. (1956). *Leksikologiya angliyskogo yazyka*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo literatury na inostrannykh yazykakh, 260 p.
- Solntsev V.M. (1977). *Yazyk kak sistemno-strukturnoe obrazovanie*. Moskva: Nauka. 342 c.
- Solntsev V.M. (1981). Variativnost kak obshee svojstvo yazykovoj sistemy. *Voprosy yazykoznanija*. № 2.
- Stanko N., Ambassador (2001). Chapter 2. Use of Language in Diplomacy. In: *Language and Diplomacy*. Ed. by J. Kurbaliya and H. Slavik, P. 39–47. [Online]. Retrieved from <http://www.diplomacy.edu/resources/use-language-diplomacy> [Accessed 05 Dec. 2019].
- Stewart W.A. (1968). A Sociolinguistic Typology for Describing National Multilingualism. In: Fishman J.A. (ed.). *Reading in Sociology of Language* [Text and online]. The Hague, Paris: Mouton. P.

- 529–545. Retrieved from <http://www.degruyter.com/view/books/9783110805376/9783110805376.531/9783110805376.531.xml>. [Accessed 31 Dec. 2019].
- Tagliamonte S.A. (2006 – printed; June 2012 – online). The linguistic variable. Chapter 5. In: *Analysing Sociolinguistic variation* [Text and Online]. Cambridge University Press. P. 70–98. Retrieved from <http://www.cambridge.org/core/books/analysing-sociolinguistic-variation/linguistic-variable/3631D2EEA3D9762E70E7EC803C7BD62F>. [Accessed 31.12.2019].
- Tagliamonte, S. A. (2012). *Variationist Sociolinguistics: Change, observation, interpretation* [Text]. UK, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 402 p.
- Thomson R., Murachver T., Green J. (2016). Where is the Gender in Gendered Language? In: *Psychological Science* [Text]. n.12 (2). Pp. 171–175.
- Torsuev G.P. (1977). Konstantnost i variativnost v foneticheskoj sisteme. Moskva.
- Trubezkoj N.S. (1929), *Polabische Studien* [Text]. W.
- Trubezkoj N.S. (1954), *Altkirchenslavische Grammatik. Schrift-, Laut- und Formensystem* [Text]. Wien: Rudolf M. Rohrer.
- Trubezkoj N.S. (1960), *Osnovy fonologii (perevod na russ.)* [Tekst]. Moskva: Izdatelstvo inostrannoj literatury, 1960. 372, [1] p.
- Trudgill, P. (1974/83). *Sociolinguistics. An Introduction*. – Harmondsworth.
- Trudgill, P. (1974). *The social differentiation of English in Norwich* [Text]. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trusk, R.L. (1999/2005). *Key Concepts in Language and Linguistics*. Routledge.
- Uluhanov I.S. (1977). Slovoobrazovatel'naya semantika v russkom yazyke [Tekst]. Moskva.: Nauka, 256 s.
- Variativnost v yazyke i rechi : tez. dokl. Mezhdunar. nauch. konf., Minsk, 4–5 apr. 2019 g. / redkol. : L. M. Leshyova (otv. red.) [i dr.]* [Tekst]. Minsk : MGLU, 300 s.
- Variability. In: *Oxford Learner's Dictionary* Retrieved from <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/variability?q=variability>.
- Variation. In: *Oxford Learner's Dictionary* Retrieved from <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/variation?q=variation>.
- Vasilev, L.M. (1990). *Sovremennaya lingvisticheskaya semantika*. Moskva: Vysshaya shkola, P. 160.
- Verbitskaya L.A. (1976). Russkaya orfoepiya (K probleme eksperimental'no-foneticheskogo issledovaniya osobennostey sovremennoy proiznositel'noy normy). [Tekst]. Leningrad: LU, 124 s
- Vinogradov, V.V. (1947). *Russkij yazyk (Grammat. uchenie o slove) : [Ucheb. posobie dlya vyssh. ucheb. zavedenij]*. Moskva; Leningrad: Uchpedgiz, 784 p. : shem.
- Völker H. (2009) La linguistique variationnelle et la perspective intralinguistique. In: *Revue de linguistique romane* [Texte]. Vol. n. 73. Société de linguistique romane, P. 27–76.
- Wardhaugh, R. and Fuller, J.M. (2015). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics* [Text]. 7th ed. Oxford, Wiley Blackwell (John Wiley & Sons Inc.), 451 p.
- Weisstein, E.W., (2019). *Invariant* [Online]. Available at Mathworld: <http://mathworld.wolfram.com/Invariant.html>. (Accessed 31.12.2019).
- Weinreich, M. (1972) *Odnogazy'chije i mnogogazy'chije* [Monolinguisism and

- multilinguism]. Novoje v lingvistike, P. 135-141. (in Russian).
- Wolfram, W. (1969). *A Sociolinguistic Description of Detroit Negro Speech* [Text]. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Wolfram W. (1973). Review of J. L. Dillard, Black English. In: *Language* [Text]. V. 49. P. 670–8.
- Wolfram, W., Christian, D.; Hatfield, D. (1986). “*The English of adolescent and young adult Vietnamese refugees in the United States*”. *World Englishes*. 5: 47–60.
- Wolfram, W. (1969). *A Sociolinguistic Description of Detroit Negro Speech* [Text]. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Wolfram, W., Fasold R. (1974). *The Study of Social Dialects in American English* [Text]. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc. P. 239–367.
- Wolfram, W., & Schilling-Estes, N. (2005/1998). *American English: Dialects and Variation*. Malden, Mass: Blackwell Publishers, Pp. xvii + 398.
- Yakubinskij, L.P. O dialogicheskoj rechi / L.P. Yakubinskij // *Izbrannye raboty: Yazyk i ego funkcionirovanie* [Tekst]. Moskva, 1986. S. 17–58.
- Yartseva V.N., (1983). Problema variativnosti i vzaimootnoshenie urovnej grammaticheskoj sistemoj yazyka. *Voprosy yazykoznanija*, 1983. № 5. S. 17–24.
- Zhirmunskij, V.M. (1936). *Razvitie stroya nemeckogo yazyka* [Tekst]. Moskva; L.: Izz-vo Akad. nauk SSSR; In-t yaz. i myshleniya im. akad. N.Ya. Marra. 81 (86) p.
- Zhirmunskij, V.M. (1964). *Vvedenie v sravnitelno-istoricheskoe izuchenie germanskih yazykov* [Tekst]. Moskva: Nauka. 313 p.
- Zielinski S. (2008). *Deep time of the Media: Toward an Archeology of Hearing and Seeing by Technical Means* / 1st MIT Press paperback edition.

Received: 15.07.2020

Accepted: 15.08.2020

Cite materials as:

Ponomarenko, Olga (2020). Variation as inherent feature of diplomatic discourse: a case study of its invariant, variants and the process of varying. *Astraea*, 1(2), 53-87. doi: 10.34142/astreaa.2020.1.2.04

