

SCIENTIFIC AND THEORETICAL VIEWS ON THE STUDY OF DIPLOMATIC DISCOURSE IN LINGUISTICS

Bayjanova Okila Iskandarovna
PhD, Associate Professor,
Department of Translation Theory,
University of World Languages.
oqilabayjanova89@gmail.com

Annotation: Diplomatic discourse is studied in linguistics as a complex form of communication in global politics. The scientific and theoretical research in this field focuses on analyzing the linguistic structures, pragmatic features, and the role of diplomatic discourse in its socio-cultural context. Typically, diplomatic discourse is a special form of official communication, aimed at ensuring mutual understanding, conducting negotiations, and managing international relations. In this type of discourse, specific linguistic characteristics such as caution in speech, the subtlety of diplomatic language, conflict mitigation, and adaptation to social and political contexts are given particular attention. Studying diplomatic discourse also provides a deeper understanding of how language is used in political and cultural processes, communication strategies, and the role of language in global communication.

Keywords: Discourse, diplomatic discourse, communication, communicative strategy.

Аннотация: Дипломатический дискурс изучается в лингвистике как сложная форма общения в глобальной политике. Научные и теоретические исследования в этой области в основном сосредоточены на анализе лингвистических структур, прагматических особенностей и роли дипломатического дискурса в социально-культурном контексте. Обычно дипломатический дискурс представляет собой специализированную форму официального общения, целью которой является обеспечение взаимопонимания, проведение переговоров и управление международными отношениями. В этом дискурсе особое внимание уделяется таким лингвистическим характеристикам, как осторожность в речи, тонкость дипломатического языка, разрешение конфликтов и адаптация к социальным и политическим контекстам. Изучение дипломатического дискурса способствует более глубокому пониманию того, как язык используется в политических и культурных процессах, стратегиях общения и роли языка в глобальной коммуникации.

Ключевые слова: Дискурс, Дипломатический дискурс, Коммуникация, Коммуникативная стратегия.

Annotatsiya: Diplomatik diskurs tilshunoslikda jahon siyosatidagi murakkab muloqot shakli sifatida alohida o'rganiladi. Ushbu ilmiy-nazariy tadqiqotlar diplomatik nutqning til strukturalari, pragmatik xususiyatlari va ijtimoiy-madaniy kontekstdagi rolini tahlil qilishga qaratilgan. Diplomatik diskurs, odatda, rasmiy muloqotning maxsus shakli bo'lib, uning maqsadi o'zaro tushunishni ta'minlash, muzokaralar olib borish va xalqaro munosabatlarni boshqarishdan iboratdir.

Kalit so'zlar: diskurs, diplomatik diskurs, kommunikatsiya, kommunikativ strategiya.

In recent years, there has been a growing interest in studying not only linguistic units that emerge in the communication process but also non-linguistic (pragmatic, psychological, social, and cultural) factors. This has led to a broader investigation of the concept of "discourse" in linguistics. In contemporary linguistics, the term "discourse" began to gain widespread use in the mid-20th century. Today, this concept is a topic of interdisciplinary research. Besides theoretical linguistics, the term "discourse" is applied in various fields, such as computational linguistics and artificial intelligence, psychology, philosophy and logic, sociology, pragmalinguistics, psycholinguistics, law, pedagogy, politics, diplomacy, and other areas related to discourse studies. The word "discourse" originally comes from the Latin term "discursus," meaning "movement" or "to run back and forth." Later, it evolved to mean "conversation," "communication," or "speech" in French [1; 642]. Research indicates that before "discourse" became widely used as a linguistic term, it had been analyzed from logical and epistemological perspectives. The first linguist to explain it in this way was Emile Benveniste, a French linguist and follower of Ferdinand de Saussure. Ferdinand de Saussure's concepts of the linguistic system (*langue*) and speech (*parole*) are not widely accepted by some scholars. Instead, they propose replacing the term "speech" (*parole*) with "discourse" and suggest using the opposition between language and discourse. According to this view: "Discourse is the higher level of the sentence, always manifesting as an event, a discrete action that is activated through the speaker's utterance [2; 135]." The term "discourse" was first introduced as a linguistic concept in 1952 by the American scholar Z. Harris in his article *Discourse Analysis*. He defined discourse as "a set of spoken or written statements produced by one or more individuals in a particular situation" [3; 27] Furthermore, E. Popova, while analyzing the cultural-linguistic characteristics of political discourse, states that "the discourse aspect of

speech activity is the analysis of communication from cultural-historical, social, and situational perspectives," and interprets discourse as different forms of speech and speech acts directly connected to linguistic and extralinguistic factors [4; 187]

A. Shevchenko differentiates between two definitions of discourse. According to the first perspective, discourse is a form of speech representation that encompasses necessary linguistic and non-linguistic elements and is interpreted as a judgmental structure. According to the second perspective, discourse is defined as a coherent text, a dialogue, or a group of judgments, seen as a unit larger than a sentence [5; 153]

Michel Foucault examines the term "discourse" in a broad sense, considering it not just as a linguistic concept but as a general cultural one. According to him: "... Discourse is undoubtedly a sign phenomenon, but it is something that does much more than merely using signs to represent things. It is precisely this added functionality that ensures it cannot be compared to language and speech" [6; 207]

In Foucault's view, the unit and "atom" of discourse is the thought. A collection of thoughts forms discursive formations. Foucault's discursive formations include discourses that allow society to discuss subjects like the economy, politics, medicine, and the sciences. He includes discourses such as climatic discourse, natural history discourse, and psychiatric discourse. While Foucault recognizes that his use of the term "discourse" has not been universally accepted, he acknowledges that linguists have a completely different interpretation. In linguistic studies, "discourse" is understood as a text connected with extralinguistic, pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological, and other factors. Yu.S. Stepanov considers the definition of discourse provided by V.Z. Demyankov to be the most accurate. According to Demyankov: "Discourse is a fragment of text larger than a single sentence or an independent clause. Often (but not always), it is centered around a key conceptual theme. It forms a general context that depicts the actions of individuals, objects, circumstances, times, and events. Discourse is defined not by a sequence of sentences, but by the world it creates, the world it interprets, and the world it 'constructs' through its use." It is important to note that this part of the definition expresses the intensional structure of discourse, as it discusses the world of interpretation i.e., the intentional horizon and the context of interpretation. At the same time, the author of this definition asserts that discourse also possesses a logical structure. The foundational structure of discourse consists of a sequence of elementary propositions that are connected through logical relations such as conjunctions, disjunctions, and other logical operations. The elements of discourse include: the narrated events, their participants, performative information, and events, meaning: a) states following the events; b) the background that clarifies the events; c)

the evaluation of the participants in the events; d) information that compares the discourse with the events [7; 35-73]. Based on the perspectives of the aforementioned scholars, it can be concluded that discourse is a text or a live speech process that encompasses all linguistic and extralinguistic factors, including the speaker's goals. Yu.S. Stepanov links discourse to the concepts of alternative worlds, facts, and causes. He also provides a broader linguo-philosophical explanation of discourse as a "language within a language," manifested as a specific social reality [8; 784] According to him, discourse cannot simply be considered as language in terms of grammar, style, or lexicon. It primarily exists within texts, but these texts are those where there are distinct grammar, lexicon, word usage, syntax rules, and semantics. In other words, discourse constitutes a separate world. Although Stepanov acknowledges that discourse exists in texts, his view of it as a separate world leads to the conclusion that discourse is a concept beyond the boundaries of text itself.

We can also examine how foreign linguists define the concept of discourse. Deborah Shifrin approaches it from three perspectives. 1) From a formal linguistic standpoint, she considers discourse as existing above the level of sentences or clauses "language above the sentence or clause" [9; 199] 2) She also defines discourse as "the study of any aspect of language use" and as a "functional definition of the variety of language use." This perspective focuses on understanding language's role within a broad socio-cultural context. 3) The third approach emphasizes the relationship between form and function: discourse-thought "discourse as utterances." According to this definition, discourse is not merely a collection of linguistic structures larger than a sentence, but rather a set of functionally organized, contextually determined units of language use.

Robert de Bogrand offers an approach to this concept that certainly generates interest. He explores it from a different, almost entirely original perspective. Bogrand argues that in the real world, language does not exist on its own. "You won't find Dutch spoken while walking along a canal, English spoken while enjoying a cup of tea, or German spoken while working. You only find discourses, that is, real communicative events" [10; 35-63]

This perspective is also shared by one of the leading scholars in discourse theory, Dutch linguist T. van Dijk. He also views discourse as a communicative event. People use language to express their thoughts and ideas, which is, in turn, part of more complex social actions. According to T. van Dijk, discourse involves the use of language, the transmission of ideas and beliefs, and a form of speech act. When

discussing the concept of discourse, it is necessary to clarify the relationship between "discourse" and "text."

V.G. Borbotko points out that the concept of "text" is more general than that of discourse. According to him, discourse is a type of text, but one that is made up of communicative units. The joining of sentences into larger units and the internal semantic connections among them allow these larger units to be seen as a unified structure. Discourse can be, for example, stories, texts, articles, speeches, and poems. However, V.G. Borbotko does not dismiss the status of discourse as a "higher communicative unit" [11; 352]. Some linguists attempt to distinguish between the categories of "discourse" and "text" and aim to clarify the relationship between these two concepts. They propose classifying discourse as "text plus situation," while text is seen as "discourse minus situation". Sometimes, when making this distinction, written text is contrasted with spoken text. I.R. Galperin defines text as "the written manifestation of speech creation." Z.Ya. Turaeva, excluding spoken discourse, offers a much narrower definition of text. She states that "text is the product of a speech production process, which is objectified in the form of a written document that has a sense of completeness." Research shows that in modern linguistics, the concept of "discourse" is approached from various perspectives. For example, A.M. Kaplunenko clearly defines the relationship between the concepts of "discourse" and "text." According to him, "discourse is a much broader and more universal object in linguistics. It includes not only the linguistic structure of speech but also the parameters of communicative situations, the distinct characteristics of communicants, and the strategies involved in constructing communication." In contrast, text represents a narrower and more specific concept that is confined to the structural and semantic parameters of speech. This broader understanding of discourse is now widespread in contemporary linguistic literature. Of course, capturing all these aspects comprehensively is challenging. However, it would be beneficial to adopt the views of T. Van Dijk, a prominent scholar in the field. According to Van Dijk, discourse is a complex communicative phenomenon that goes beyond the linguistic features of speech and includes extralinguistic factors (such as the knowledge, beliefs, and views about the world needed to understand the text, as well as the communicator's objectives). Based on Van Dijk's approach, we can examine discourse from three different aspects:

1. The use of language,
2. The expression of ideas and beliefs (communication),
3. Interaction in socially conditioned situations.

From this, it is clear that the terms "discourse" and "text" do not express the same conceptual meaning. "Discourse" is interpreted in a broader context compared to "text." Thus, while a text is created during the process of discourse, discourse itself can be regarded as a specific type of human speech activity, with text being one of its forms.

Conclusion: The study of diplomatic discourse in linguistics holds significant importance as a complex and specialized form of communication in global politics. This type of discourse, with its unique linguistic structures, pragmatic features, and socio-cultural context, serves as a valuable subject for academic research. The primary goal of diplomatic discourse is to ensure mutual understanding, facilitate negotiations, and maintain peace between states and international organizations. The linguistic characteristics of diplomatic speech, including caution, subtlety, and adaptability to social and political contexts, are essential elements. For linguists, this offers not only an opportunity to analyze political processes but also a rich resource for understanding communication strategies on a global scale. The study of diplomatic discourse provides a deeper understanding of the role of language in international relations and its significance in shaping communication on a global level.

REFERENCES:

1. Инжечик А. К истории развития понятия «дискурс» в современной лингвистике // Доклады Башкирского университета. – 2019. – №6. – С. 642.
2. Goodrich P. Legal Discourse: Studies in Linguistics, Rhetoric and Legal analysis. – London: The Macmillan Press LTD, 1987. – P. 135
3. Harris Z. Discourse analysis // Language. Robins R. H. General Linguistics. An Introductory Survey. – London, 1971. – P. 27; 1952. – №1. – P.3.
4. Попова Е.А. Культурно-языковые характеристики политического дискурса (на материале газетных интервью). Дис. ...канд. филол. наук. – Волгоград. 1995. – С. 187.
5. Shevchenko A. Discursive analysis of mass media texts. // bulletin of Russian Communication Association "Theory of communication and applied communication". Issue 1 / edited by I.N. Rozina, 2002. – P. 153-160. (168)
6. Фуко М. Археология знания / М.Фуко. – Киев: Ника – центр, 1996. – С. 207.
7. Степанов Ю.С. Альтернативный мир, Дискурс, Факт и принцип Причинности // Ю.С.Степанов // Язык и наука конца XX века. – М.: Российский Государственный гуманитарный институт, 1995. – С. 35-73.
8. Степанов Ю.С. Язык и метод. К современной философии языка / Ю.С. Степанов. – М.: "Языки русской культуры", 1998. – С. 784.

9. Макаров М.Л. Интерпретативный анализ дискурса в малой группе / М.Л. Макаров. – Тверь: Изд-во Тверского госуд. университета, 1998. – С. 199.10.
10. Beaugrande de R. The Story of Discourse Analysis / R. de Beaugrande // Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction. – London-Thousand Oaks – New Delhi: SAGE Publications, 1997. Vol.1. – P. 35-63.
11. Dijk van T.A. The Study of Discourse. Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction / van T.A.Dijk. – London – Thousand Oaks – New Delhi: SAGE Publications. – 1997. – Vol.1. – P. 352.
12. Nematov, O. (2022). HEAVY INDUSTRY INFRASTRUCTURE IN JIZZAKH PROVINCE: ACHIEVEMENTS, PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS. International Journal Of History And Political Sciences, 2(11), 41-44.
13. Nematov, O. (2022). HEAVY INDUSTRY INFRASTRUCTURE IN JIZZAKH PROVINCE: ACHIEVEMENTS, PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS. International Journal Of History And Political Sciences, 2(11), 41-44.

