

**Rashidova Nargiza Normurod kizi**

Samarqand state institute of foreign languages Senior Lecturer

[nargizarashid374@gmail.com](mailto:nargizarashid374@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** The article is about the theoretical study of a diplomatic discourse as an object of research from the linguistic perspectives. It includes approaches and views of some scholars who contributed to the research study of diplomatic speeches of state representatives, official speeches of diplomats and politicians and etc.

**Аннотация:** Статья посвящена теоретическому изучению дипломатического дискурса как объекта исследования в лингвистическом аспекте. В ней представлены подходы и взгляды некоторых ученых, внесших вклад в исследование дипломатических выступлений представителей государств, официальных речей дипломатов и политиков и др.

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in the study of formal speech communication and its variants. In particular, diplomatic discourse, diplomatic texts, and the type of diplomatic verbal communication have been studied by a number of Western and Eastern scholars until now. Diplomatic discourse is pragmatic in nature and requires a well-organized and well-grounded international dialogue from this perspective. That's why the study of the specifics of language and speech is one of the most important problems in linguistics. In a diplomatic discourse, there are always participants in the communication, situational and socio-cultural contexts, and the purpose of the communication. But at the same time, diplomatic discourse has a number of functions. These include informational, emotional, and affective functions.

Diplomatic discourse is a distinct form of political discourse, which can be seen as the official language of government, through which a politician expresses his or her ideas in speech and has the necessary impact on the audience. Studying the speeches of political figures allows us to articulate their future actions and goals, as well as to identify the most effective tactics and confidence strategies.<sup>1</sup>

When we talk about diplomatic communication, we should first of all pay attention to the fact that it is divided into oral and written forms.

Political discourse texts can be presented in oral or written form. Such texts may include debates, speeches by political leaders, news stories, political interviews, debates, party programs, and more. Characteristics of such texts include a high density of information, a commanding tendency to be conveyed through imperative sentences, and the use of expressive language tools. Also, as mentioned above, nonverbal tools are also important - maintaining a rhythm, observing pauses, and so on.<sup>2</sup>

A broader definition of diplomacy is found in Broca's and Efron's Small Encyclopedic Dictionary, which defines diplomacy as "the sphere of state activity concerned with the representative and political relations between states; concerned with the protection of the national

<sup>1</sup> Седина И.В. Особенности дипломатического дискурса / И.В. Седина, Е.И. Тоцкая // Дневник науки. – 2017. – № 5 (5). – С. 17. – <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=29318688>

<sup>2</sup> Седина И.В. Особенности дипломатического дискурса / И.В. Седина, Е.И. Тоцкая // Дневник науки. – 2017. – № 5 (5). – С. 17. – <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=29318688>

and international interests of that state, as well as the maintenance of peace, the strengthening and development of the economic and spiritual interests of international relations".<sup>3</sup> In addition, a number of other sources cite definitions of diplomacy. Diplomacy is a method of implementing a state's foreign policy; it is carried out in the form of official activities by states, governments, state bodies of external relations, and diplomats directly assisting in achieving foreign policy goals and objectives and in protecting the interests of their state and individual citizens abroad.<sup>4</sup>

According to G. Nicholson, diplomacy is a method of establishing, regulating and conducting international relations through negotiation; the work or art of the diplomat; the creation of international trust.<sup>5</sup>

Another definition is given by E. Satou. His definition of diplomacy is the body of knowledge and principles necessary for the proper conduct of public affairs between states; the application of reason and tactics in the conduct of official relations between the governments of sovereign states; the conduct of affairs between states by peaceful means.<sup>6</sup>

In view of the validity of the above ideas and definitions, it can be concluded that diplomacy is a means of peaceful communication between governments. The current process of globalization and the rapid pace of development is also causing the widespread use of diplomacy.

As the Russian diplomat Yu.B. Kashlev noted, modern diplomacy is first of all "multifaceted", which is explained by the increasing complexity, expansion, enrichment of the content of modern human life, the diversity of topics, the palette of subjects of international dialogue, the increase in the number of world organizations; the number of actors of world politics has increased immeasurably.<sup>7</sup>

In the world arena diplomatic discourse is primarily defined and studied by V.I. Karasik, L.M. Terentiy, S.G. Gas.

Among modern linguistic scholars, V.I. Karasik's definition of diplomatic discourse is of particular interest. According to him, a discourse is a communicative phenomenon that involves the communicative intention of the addresser (the speaker) affecting the addressee (the listener). In addition to the components of language, discourse also includes extra-linguistic factors, such as the participants of communication, the situation and socio-cultural context, the intensity of communication, and so on.<sup>8</sup>

L.M. Terentiy, in his book "The Question of Psycholinguistics", distinguishes diplomatic discourse as a distinct form of communication. L. M. Terentiy considered the similarities between one of the types of diplomatic discourse, that is, non-public diplomatic discourse, and academic dialogue, and concluded that the peculiarity of the types of diplomatic communication stems from the position that its collective agent, the agent's activity is directed to a specific audience and is determined by the purpose of the activity in a particular situation.

Another type of diplomatic relationship is a closed conversation or negotiation, with partners of equal status and occupation. The main purpose of such a dialogue is to reach an

<sup>3</sup> [<http://slovari.vandex.ru/dict/brokmirror/>]

<sup>4</sup> [[www.glossary.ru](http://www.glossary.ru)].

<sup>5</sup> Никольсон Г. Дипломатическое искусство: четыре лекции по истории дипломатии [Текст] / Г. Никольсон. - М.: Междунар. отношения, 1962. -137 с.

<sup>6</sup> Сатоу, Э. Руководство по дипломатической практике [Текст] / Э. Сатоу. - М.: Издательство Института международных отношений, 1961.-496 с.

<sup>7</sup> Кашлев, Ю.Б. Многоликая дипломатия: исповедь посла [Текст] / Ю.Б. Кашлев - М.: Известия, 2004. – 12 с

<sup>8</sup> Карасик В. И. Язык социального статуса. М.: ИТДГК «Гнозис», 2004. 230 с.

agreement on an international issue, or at least to ease the burden of the conflict. One of the most important characteristics of diplomatic discourse is that formal and informal diplomatic discourse is carefully planned. The purpose and roles of the speech or conversation are clearly defined; the information is analyzed and the partners are informed; the characteristics of the interlocutor are familiarized; arguments and specific tactics are developed for the presentation of evidence; the speech is carefully prepared.<sup>9</sup>

Indeed, in a diplomatic speech, heads of state, embassy representatives, ministers, and special envoys speak to the public, expressing their country's social and political position.

Diplomatic discourse has its own peculiarities, and its analysis from a linguistic point of view presents particular complexities. Considering the characteristics of political texts, especially diplomatic texts, which are seen as a form of political translation, can be clearly seen in the views of the Russian linguist I.V. Sedina. She believes that the peculiarity of diplomatic discourse is that it has a great pragmatic potential, in which the author of the speech must be sufficiently communicated through translation to ensure effective negotiations between heads of state. Therefore, the problem of analyzing the properties of language and its speech behavior can be considered one of the most important problems of linguistic research.<sup>10</sup>

Russian linguist T.A. Volkova is another scholar who has chosen the diplomatic discourse as her object of study. In his dissertation *Diplomatic Discourse: Lexical-Semantic Features and Strategies of Translation*, she focused on the concepts of "text", "discourse", and "communication" and explained their differences.

From a linguistic point of view, it remains important to study the linguistic subtleties of the organization of diplomatic texts in both oral and written form. The drafting of diplomatic texts involves a great deal of linguistic work, as the texts not only address the formal requirements of international diplomatic protocol and ceremony, but also the need for constructive dialogue between states, the expansion of political ties, the elimination of interstate conflict, and the acquisition of strategic partners as leading world powers. Lack of ability to use specific language techniques, lack of communication skills, and lack of professional conduct in the diplomatic field can lead to international conflicts and armed conflicts. A brief review of the linguistic work devoted to the analysis of diplomatic speech shows that researchers often focus on the genres of diplomatic speech, such as negotiations, verbal note, personal note, credential, call sign, communique, memorandum, contract, agreement, convention, pact, and so on.<sup>11</sup>

At the same time, studying the diplomatic discourse, V.Yarapova aimed to determine the structure of the texts being studied, as well as the characteristics of the language, which consisted of the verbal genre of the diplomatic discourse before her.

Another Russian scholar, D.A. Golovanova, who has studied the similarities and differences between the diplomatic and political discourse, has expressed the following opinion: "It is evident that a great deal of importance in understanding diplomacy is given to the state policy

---

<sup>9</sup> Терентий Л.М. Дипломатический дискурс как особая форма научной коммуникации / Л.М. Терентий // Вопросы психолингвистики. – 2015. – № 24. – С. 176–185. – Режим доступа: <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=23641287>

<sup>10</sup> Седина И.В. Особенности дипломатического дискурса / И.В. Седина, Е.И. Тоцкая // Дневник науки. – 2017. – № 5 (5). – С. 17. – <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=29318688>

<sup>11</sup> Япарова В.Н. Дипломатический дискурс как объект междисциплинарного исследования / В.Н. Япарова // Филология и культура. – 2016. – № 2 (44). – С. 165–170. – Режим доступа: <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=26510208>

## THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

### VOLUME-4, ISSUE-6

implemented by Presidents (and other high-level leaders) and professional diplomats. So the intersection of the diplomatic discourse and the political discourse is clear: heads of state can be agents of the diplomatic discourse who can also speak in the political arena. The two types of discourse coincide not only in the parameters of "participants", but also in the form of the discourse: the strong factor that unites diplomatic and political discourse is that the main political and diplomatic actions are speech, the language of the speech actions is mainly influencing the development of events, that is, language influences the relations between states, which allows the relationship to be imagined in the minds of the participants of the discussion, professionals and the public".<sup>12</sup>

It is clear from the foregoing that in many cases, diplomatic and political discourse are treated as one and the same phenomenon, whereas diplomatic discourse is a process built on the foundation of political discourse, which serves to express political views while adhering to a set of ethical norms and language characteristics.

Another scholar who has studied diplomatic discourse in recent years is N.S. Aminova, who has focused on the linguistic aspects of diplomatic lexical units in English and Uzbek. In his dissertation, he aims to study the degree of use of words that express the national political worldview and thought of each people in diplomatic documents and correspondence, and to reveal their nature, mainly through a broad analysis of the semantic scope of diplomatic lexical units in English and Uzbek; to justify the use of units in international discourse on Uzbek culture, diplomacy/politics.<sup>13</sup>

While noting that the approach taken in the above dissertation work is very correct, it is very appropriate to apply the term and other lexical units in the study of diplomatic discourse, taking into account the internal politics of the country, the attitudes, culture and worldview of the society.

One of the most recent works on political discourse in Uzbekistan is N.S.Zubareva's dissertation "Cognitive-pragmatic properties of phraseological intensifiers in political discourse (on the example of English, Russian and Uzbek)". In this dissertation, the researcher discovered the cognitive-pragmatic properties of the expression of phraseological intensifiers related to the communicative space of political discourse.<sup>14</sup>

Taking into consideration all the opinions and theoretical studies above, it can be summarized that diplomatic discourse is quite recent object of scientific research due to globalization and rapid changes in various aspects of life. In this term, diplomacy as a key factor in the establishment of stability and peace around the world that is needed further in depth exploration in linguistical direction in particular.

### REFERENCES

---

<sup>12</sup> Голованова Д.А. Интердискурсивность дипломатического дискурса / Д.А. Голованова // Известия Волгоградского государственного педагогического университета. – 2014. – № 7 (92). – С. 25–30. – Режим доступа: <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=22595365>

<sup>13</sup> Аминова Н.С. Инглиз ва ўзбек тилларидаги дипломатияга оид лексик бирликларнинг лингвомаданий аспекти. Филология фанлари номзоди илмий даражасини олиш учун тақдим этилган диссертация автореферати.-Тошкент: 2010.-28 б.

<sup>14</sup> Zubareva N.S. Siyosiy diskursda frazeologik intensivatorlarning kognitiv-pragmatik xususiyatlari (ingliz, rus va o'zbek tillari misolida). Filologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori dis. avtoref. -Toshkent: 2023.-63 b.

1. Аминова Н.С. Инглиз ва ўзбек тилларидаги дипломатияга оид лексик бирликларнинг лингвомаданий аспекти. Филология фанлари номзоди илмий даражасини олиш учун тақдим этилган диссертация автореферати. - Тошкент: 2010.
2. Базылев В.Н. Политический дискурс [Текст] / В.Н. Базылев // Эффективная коммуникация: история, теория, практика: Словарь справочник. - М.: Агентство «КРПА Олимп», 2005.
3. Бурлацкий Ф.М. Социология. Политика. Международные отношения [Текст] / Ф.М. Бурлацкий, А.А. Галкин. - М.: Международные отношения, 1974.
4. Водак Р. Язык. Дискурс. Политика [Текст] / Р. Водак: Перевод с англ. и нем. В.И. Карасика и Н.Н. Трошиной. - Волгоград: Перемена, 1997.
5. Голованова Д.А. Интердискурсивность дипломатического дискурса / Д.А. Голованова // Известия Волгоградского государственного педагогического университета. – 2014. – № 7 (92). – Режим доступа: <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=22595365>
6. Кашлев, Ю.Б. Многоликая дипломатия: исповедь посла [Текст] / Ю.Б. Кашлев - М.: Известия, 2004.
7. Карасик В. И. Язык социального статуса. М.: ИТДГК «Гнозис», 2004.
8. Никольсон Г. Дипломатическое искусство: четыре лекции по истории дипломатии [Текст] / Г. Никольсон. - М.: Междунар. отношения, 1962.
9. Сатоу, Э. Руководство по дипломатической практике [Текст] / Э. Сатоу. - М.: Издательство Института международных отношений, 1961.
10. Седина И.В. Особенности дипломатического дискурса / И.В. Седина, Е.И. Тоцкая // Дневник науки. – 2017. – № 5 (5). – С. 17. – <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=29318688>
11. Терентий Л.М. Дипломатический дискурс как особая форма научной коммуникации / Л.М. Терентий // Вопросы психолингвистики. – 2015. – № 24. – Режим доступа: <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=23641287>
12. Шейгал Е.И. Семиотика политического дискурса: монография
13. [Текст] / Е.И. Шейгал. - Волгоград: Перемена, 2000. - 368 с.
14. Яппарова В.Н. Дипломатический дискурс как объект междисциплинарного исследования / В.Н. Яппарова // Филология и культура. – 2016. – № 2 (44). – Режим доступа: <https://elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=26510208>
15. Zubareva N.S. Siyosiy diskursda frazeologik intensivliklarning kognitiv-pragmatik xususiyatlari (ingliz, rus va o'zbek tillari misolida). Filologiya fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori dis. avtoref. - Toshkent: 2023.
16. <http://slovari.vandex.ru/dict/brokminor>
17. <http://www.glossary.ru>.