

A Linguopragmatic Study Of Diplomatic Discourse And its Significance In The Semantic Field

Isroilova Dilbarkhon Ikramdzhonovna

Andijan State Medical Institute, Teacher of the Department of "Uzbek Language and Literature, Languages", Uzbekistan

Received: 29 November 2025; **Accepted:** 21 December 2025; **Published:** 25 January 2026

Abstract: The current article analyzes the development of a psycholinguistic interpretation of the diplomatic communication process, in which success is ensured by the content of the main components of the individual worldview and their manifestation in the verbally expressed thoughts of the dialogue participants.

Keywords: Communicative factors, diplomatic process, successful diplomatic discourse, special goals, participants, intentions.

Introduction: The concept of "discourse" can be considered as a process (taking into account the impact of extralinguistic and communicative-situational factors) and as a result in the form of a fixed text, thus embodying the character of completeness, coherence, and integrity. The end of the 20th – and beginning of the 21st century in linguistics are marked by the proclamation of a fundamental position that the study of language can be considered adequate only when describing its functioning in the process of communication. "If the previous linguistics in the cognition of language proceeded from such linguistic objects as a text, a sentence, a word or its grammatical form, then activity linguistics (in the person, first of all, of pragmatics in the broadest sense of the word) proceeds from a person, his needs, motives, goals, intentions, and expectations, from his practical and communicative actions, from communicative situations in which he participates either as an initiator and leader or as a performer of the "second role" [2]. One of the most important elements of human activity and at the same time one of its most valuable products - speech - became the object of such disciplines as discourse analysis, conversation analysis, and the analysis of dialogue developing within it. Diplomatic discourse is a special type of communicative activity, in which, unlike other types of discursive practices, two

forms are distinguished -public/open diplomatic discourse and non-public/closed diplomatic discourse. The existence of these forms of diplomatic discourse is due to the difference in their main goals and methods of achieving them, different contexts of implementation and the specificity of their main addressee. Successful diplomatic discourse is a co, cognitive transaction between its participants, during which the main goal of communication is achieved - the protection of the interests of their state realized through some intermediate goals, each of which corresponds to its object of reference and its directions with specific sets of typical intentions. All intentional directions characteristic of successful closed-type diplomatic discourse, as well as the intentions included in each of them, can be attributed to one of the levels of joint activity: subject-matter, procedural, or emotional. The effectiveness of interaction, which determines the achievement of the main goal of diplomatic discourse, is ensured only in the presence of a set of intentional directions, each of which is aimed at realizing one of the speaker's intermediate goals and, accordingly, at organizing activity at one of its levels. Against this background, it seems paradoxical that the discourse of diplomacy remains practically unstudied, although this type of discourse cannot but be of interest to linguistics. The study of diplomatic

discourse involves identifying the main characteristics of this type of institutional communication and its differences from other types of communication similar to diplomatic communication in certain parameters. According to a number of researchers, the nature of discourse is determined by two parameters: the specificity of the agent of social action, and the intentional basis of discourse. In other words, diplomatic discourse is who speaks, to whom he speaks, and what goal the speaker sets for himself. It seems that, first of all, the answers to the questions posed help to identify the analysis of the definitions of diplomacy, both those given in dictionaries and the definitions of diplomatic communication by specialists in this field themselves. "Diplomatic discourse - typology, communicative-linguistic characteristics "is devoted to the characteristics of diplomatic discourse, its types, description of open professional diplomatic discourse, its communicative and linguistic properties. A fixed text is diplomatic correspondence, which performs the function of written diplomatic discourse. This is a set of various types of official correspondence and documentation of a diplomatic nature. From the standpoint of linguopragmatics, discourse can be presented as an interactional activity, the participants of which exchange information, and influence each other, using various communication strategies. According to I. P. Susov, the pragmatic approach to discourse analysis is defined as "an area of linguistic research that has as its object the relations between units and the conditions of their use in ascertain communicative-pragmatic space in which the speaker/writer and the listener/reader interact, and for the characterization of which specific indications of the place and time of their speech interaction, as well as the goals and expectations associated with the act of communication, are important"[2] Diplomatic discourse is one of the types of institutional discourse, the specificity of which is determined by the sphere of diplomatic communication and international relations. The tasks of diplomatic communication, as researchers believe, are the protection of national interests, the implementation of foreign policy activities of the state, the prevention of armed conflict, the strengthening of peace, as well as ensuring state security, the search for agreement and coinciding interests with foreign partners. As T. A. Volkova

notes, the study of discourse should be conducted from the positions of: purpose, chronotype, subject matter, participants in discourse, authorship of the text and its addressee, and the relationship of the studied texts within the framework of the narrative. A comprehensive study of diplomatic communication involves an analysis of its typical properties, functions, and strategies. According to V. Yapparova, among the distinctive features of diplomatic discourse, one can identify specific participants, special goals of communication, and the use of stable linguistic means inherent only to the language of diplomacy. Internal diplomatic documentation belongs to the non-public form of diplomatic discourse. A characteristic feature of the diplomatic messages we study is that the sender and addressee of the messages are representatives of the same state. The categories of persuasiveness and informativeness inherent in the texts of diplomatic documentation are realized through implicitly and explicitly expressed logical-semantic structures that form argumentative connections between the cause and purpose of statements. According to A. V. Golodnov, the linguistic markers of persuasiveness contained in the structure of the text act, along with the thematic content of the text and certain extralinguistic parameters, as indicators of the persuasive intention of the addresser. The character of the agent and the client determines the third feature of diplomatic discourse – its goals. On the one hand, the agent's task is to inform the general public, both in his country and abroad, about the point of view of the government of the state he represents on certain international issues. In such a situation, diplomatic discourse is public and represents a specific form of political activity. On the other hand, the goal of the agent of action is to reach an agreement between the various participants in communication on issues of international politics, establish relations between countries based on mutual benefit, coordinate their interests, expand cooperation, limit conflicts, etc. In this case, diplomatic discourse is a closed process of negotiations that are prepared and conducted based on specific theoretical provisions and practical developments in the theory of communication, conflictology, psychology of communication, etc., and therefore can be considered as a specific scientific activity of the diplomatic corps. The purpose and

situation of diplomatic communication determine the communicative aspect of the utterance, its speech acts, and the genre as a whole. However, the communicative component is only one aspect of any speech utterance. In parallel with the communicative aspect, i.e. "with a specific situation of speech communication with all its circumstances" [3], there is also a transition of thought into word, expressed in the translation of cognitive formations determined by the subject of discussion (situation-topic, according to A.A.Leontiev) into linguistic structures. [1] Thus, holistic speech work combines communicative, cognitive, and linguistic aspects. Together, these aspects reflect the internal program of the utterance, existing in the consciousness of an individual linguistic personality and representing a "hierarchy of propositions underlying it"

Thus, diplomatic discourse can be considered a special form of communicative activity, the main difference from other types of communication is its multidirectional nature, which is due to different goals and objectives implemented in different contexts - public and closed. The specificity of the context, and, accordingly, the specificity of the addressee - a wide mass audience or an equal, prepared, and informed partner - determines the social model of interaction, the course of interaction itself, the possibility of achieving the set goals, the choice of speech strategies and the features of the use of linguistic means directly depend on the degree of development of the linguistic personalities participating in communication. The public form of diplomatic discourse refers to a type of institutional communication, which in its characteristics largely coincides with political communication. Diplomatic reports related to the internal non-public form of diplomatic discourse reflect the goals of diplomatic communication of the 18th century, consisting of the protection of the state, in particular territorial interests, as well as in the search for mutually beneficial trade cooperation. Taking into account the pragmatic attitudes of diplomatic discourse, the choice of strategically important linguistic means of expressing the intention of the participants in communication is manifested in the strategies and tactics of persuasiveness and informativeness. The non-public form of diplomatic discourse observed in the texts of internal diplomatic correspondence is characterized by a high degree of

secrecy, while the nature of the relationship between the addresser and the addressee determines the desire for maximum accuracy, one of the key value components for this type of discursive practices is truth and the absence of deliberate misinformation.

REFERENCES

1. Crystal D. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language and Linguistics, 1995.
2. Кожетева А. С. Лингвопрагматические характеристики дипломатического дискурса: на материале вербальных нот: дис. ... канд. филол. наук. Москва, 2012.
3. Карасик В.И. Религиозный дискурс // Языковая личность: проблемы лингвокультурологии и функциональной семантики: сб. науч. тр. Волгоград: Перемена, 1999.
4. Полякова, Л. С. Теоретические подходы к определению понятия «дискурс» / Л. С. Полякова. / под ред. проф. Г.Н. Манаенко. — Ставрополь : Изд-во СГПИ, 2009. — Вып. 7. — С. 87–91