

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF DISCURSIVE PROPERTIES OF DIPLOMATIC TERMS

Khasanova Shakhnoza Abduraupovna

French teacher at University of World Economy and diplomacy
Uzbekistan

shahnoz74.74@mail.ru

Abstract: This article covers examples of discourse and textual attitudes and the expression of diplomatic discourse in diplomatic documents, the methodological characterization of diplomatic discourse in its oral form if the formal style, which is strictly required in the written form of diplomatic discourse.

Keywords: diplomatic text, diplomatic discourse, official style, diplomatic negotiations, diplomat tactics

INTRODUCTION

The research of diplomatic dialogue in the context of discursivity plays an vital role in the development of the system of international relations. In recent decades, the term "discourse" has been frequent in a number of disciplines such as political science, diplomacy, international relations and sociology. The term discourse has been interpreted differently by scholars in world linguistics. In Particular, V.E. Chernyavskaya's concept explains **this term** as a complex connection of **small texts in the communicative process**. The scientist describes this term in two ways:

1. Discourse as the recording of a specific event-phenomenon, carried out cognitively and typologically in a conditionally communicative space, in written texts and oral speech.

2. Thematically, the term as a set of texts that connect in a speech process and focus on one common topic[1.14].

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In the first case, a sentence is considered as a linguistic category that includes the concept of a text and its "inner-textual background" or extralinguistic factors affecting the text. V.E. Chernyavskaya notes that no discourse is equated with text, that discourse is not structured as a separate text, that is in a spontaneous state. It notes that the text is reflected as a fragment of the discourse. These thoughts T.A. van Deyk recognized that the discourse is a phenomenon formed in the communicative process between the speaker and the listener in a specific time and space, and this phenomenon can be verbal/nonerbal, written/oral[2.].

In the second case, it is considered as the relationship of types of speech or text in a communicative process belonging to a particular area. Elements of types of text and genres of discourse in the communicative process are studied in a correlation relationship. For example, the speaker in diplomatic discourse belongs both to the genre and the type of discourse in text at the same time. Discourse is basically known as a communicative phenomenon and generates communicative action. In this, the presence of a speaker and a listener is visible, both in text and discourse. The application of discourse in various informal or mass communicative circles of

discourse generates species, while the division into areas requires the use of terms in their place.

The communicative nature of the text gives rise to a difference between the text and the discourse. K.F. Sedov defines a speech text as an integral speech product, taking into account the variety of its cognitive and communicative functions[3.5].

In a broader and more general sense, the consideration of "text" as well as "discourse" as spoken/written text forms their contradiction. There are different opinions on the text and discourse, M.A. Hellidey argues that the basis of text and discourse in the study of discourse is context. Through discourse, the author understands the text that is applied in the context of a particular situation. While the distinctive features of discourse are determined by text and context, M.A. Hellidey identifies three discursive markers that fully reveal the context of the situation and are implemented in the text through language units. These are: a) the meaning formed by experience - the definition of the area of discourse through the knowledge of the individual about being and the description of the sphere of discourse, b) the determination of the direction of speech through categories of persons in the context of the situation and the identification of the features of the interaction of speech participants, c) the fact that text markers are as a set of specific speech characters.

The types of discourse are determined by the types of social and communicative activity of a person. When analyzing the discursive component of a particular field of activity, it is appropriate to list what properties discourse has. E.S. Kubryakova says that the main features of discourse are the historical component that is determined in the real time indicating the type of social activity (since speech can only be in a certain social context). The scientist identifies the following features of discourse: a) *interactionism* (reflection of discourse in dialogical oral speech), b) *addressability* (target audience of discourse), c) *intentionality* (interaction of communication partners, that is, the sender and receiver of information), d) *goal setting* (setting certain tasks in discourse activity)[4.528].

In modern linguistics, there are many approaches of the study and description of discourse, as well as various methods of analyzing this phenomenon, which are considered both from the point of view of psycholinguistics and as a kind of special social mentality, as well as a view of critical analysis.

In the new era of linguistics, attention is paid not to speech as a communicative unit, but to text. This requires the study of the structural features of the sentence at the level of the characteristics of the text. V.I. Karasik interprets discourse as the text and describes it as "discourse refers to two or more sentences that have a semantic connection with each other." In discursive analysis, context is viewed as the linguistic realities of text-level discourse content. Text is an integral element of discourse. Since the concepts of "text" and "discourse" are derivatives of the linguistic order arising through linguistic forms and the result of the mental activity of people, it is difficult to give a clear description of these concepts [5.5].

The second approach to the study of discourse is a functional and structural analysis of speech in the language. According to N.D. Arutyunova, discourse is an activity introduced into life and, when considering it, requires taking into account the social parameters of what is happening, all the pragmatic factors of its

implementation. In this case, discourse is understood as a special form of language use at all levels. K.F. Sedov understands discourse as "an objectively existing verbal sign construction that accompanies the process of socially significant interaction of people." From the views of scientists, it seems that the relationship between discourse and text has still found its full description. This suggests that the research continues to find confirmation only when the specifics of the text and discourse are determined.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As mentioned above, since human knowledge is reflected in various fields, there are such types of discourse as political discourse, business discourse, sociological discourse, etc. In this place, the interdisciplinary nature of discourse is manifested. The reason why the subject of the study is diplomatic terminology is the emphasis on diplomatic discourse. Diplomatic discourse covers the formal style range of functional styles. Diplomatic discourse is used in interstate communication and interagency relations. The approach to the analysis of diplomatic discourse is associated with the study of the language of diplomatic communication in close connection with practical activities in the field of diplomacy and international relations.

Linguistic analysis of diplomatic discourse consists of the analysis of the lexical-semantic and stylistic features of diplomatic activity, including the study of the peculiarities of discourse and the identification of speech signs at the level of language units.

V.I. Karasik proposes to replace the concept of a functional style with the sentence "form of speech", and it is used as the meaning of a variety of speech, which, according to the author, is distinguished on the basis of communicative distance, the degree of self-expression of the speaker, the registers of communication and the means of cliché language [6.246].

In this case, two different forms of diplomatic discourse are distinguished: formal and general types of abuse. The first is typical for the written form of diplomatic activity, which includes such types of text as documents of diplomatic correspondence, internal documents, etc. The general form of abuse in turn includes such types of text as publications for the media, transcripts of briefings, etc.

It is necessary that the tasks of diplomatic discourse correspond to the tasks of the concept of foreign policy of the state. Diplomatic values and discourse consist of following the principles of a sovereign state, resolving disputes through diplomatic means, that is, through negotiations, focusing on multilateral cooperation. From this, values and principles are elements of diplomatic documentation and integral parts of diplomatic protocol. Diplomatic discourse is used in diplomatic events, conferences, summits, briefings, press conferences, receptions of various levels and other meetings of diplomatic purpose.

Some researchers describe the concept of strategism as a characteristic feature of speech in terms of communication. "Speech strategy is a complex of speech actions aimed at achieving a communicative goal"[7.54]. I.P. Tarasova combines the concepts of communication strategy and tactics that are implemented in the process of speech communication in order to achieve the planned speech results. The tactics of conducting a conversation are manifested in the joint mastery of speech techniques

that serve different purposes – from persuading a communicator to bringing emotionality into the conversation. Defining a text strategy as a communication process is designed to determine the purpose of its creation. A communicative strategy, considered as a set of speech acts, is aimed at solving the general communicative task of the speaker [8.110].

Diplomatic negotiation, as noted above, is based on the use of certain speech strategies and tactics, the purpose of which is to protect interests and maintain public image. T. Haifa in his scientific research, analyzes tactics of avoiding a direct answer and using silence or euphemism. The purpose of applying this tactic is not to disclose confidential information or information that is not published in the media. The tactic of veiling (applying euphemism) is expressed in the fact that communicants use aerodynamic words in their speech. That is, diplomatic communication is officially held, while detailed information is replaced by aerodynamic formulas of a broad meaning. For example: in areas that meet the interests of both countries, such as a series of organizational aspects, discussion of topical issues of bilateral relations, etc.

The forms of diplomatic activity of states on the implementation of foreign policy goals and objectives are diplomatic documents, as mentioned above. The written form of diplomatic discourse is reflected in diplomatic documents. A.N. Kovalev by speaking about the diplomatic language, considers the idea of the style and language of diplomatic documents to be simple, but justified in structure and intelligibility. The scientist notes that "smoothness and elegance" are signs of a weak and unfinished diplomatic document, but the language of diplomatic documents also states that it is necessary to have certain freedoms, such as the use of epithets. The determining factor for the ideal of diplomatic language is the degree of accuracy and completeness of expressing the desired content without the use of "excess" words. This opinion of the scientist expresses the main feature of diplomatic discourse.

The written form of diplomatic discourse is manifested in diplomatic documents. Diplomatic documents are documents that record the political or international political position of the state. On the one hand, among them are documents of diplomatic correspondence (official letters, personal and verbal notes, memoranda, notes, statements), etc., and on the other hand, participation in Congresses, Conferences, Meetings of representatives of foreign ministries, press coverage of the state's position on foreign policy issues, publication of official information of foreign ministries of countries, etc. That is, written and oral are documents of diplomatic communication.

Through studying diplomatic documents, A.N.Kovalev touches on its structure separately and determined that these documents contain the following mandatory elements:

- a) protocol formulas (available only in messages and notes, memoranda);
- b) semantic core of documents;
- c) argumentation part;
- g) statement of facts.

Thus, the scientist gives a conditional classification of diplomatic documents containing official characteristics [10.98].

1. Documents containing proposals;
2. Protest documents;
3. Warning documents;
4. Record of political or international legal position on a specific action or international phenomenon of another state documents;
5. Documents informing about planned or implemented activities of international importance;
6. Documents formalizing the agreement or the level of agreement reached.

In the study on this presented classification, there are documents of the fourth and fifth categories for research, examples of which are statements and briefings of an official representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in modern diplomacy.

One of the goals of the documents is to declare the position of the state as well as to make other states aware of this position[11.415-429]. V.I. Popova categorized the classification of taking into account these goals. This includes: a) notes (verbal, personal); b) personal letters of a semi-official nature; c) notes; d) memoranda, e) government statements; f) speeches of heads of state; g) internal correspondence documents (annual political report, political letters, information letters/ thematic links, press comments, political features, telegrams (cipher telegrams); h) diplomatic documents on economic topics; i) notes of diplomatic conversations are also included.

However, the fact that this classification of the scientist is incomplete, its full state is widely studied internationally and all aspects of diplomatic discourse are covered by L.I. Evtoshenka and I.I. Borisenko, which appears in the classification of diplomatic documents proposed. This classification is containing:

1. Treaties and other international agreements (treaties, conventions, agreements, declarations, protocols);
2. Constitutional acts of the United Nations and other international organizations (UN Charter, International Judicial Charter, constitutions of specialized agencies of the United Nations);
3. Unilateral legal acts (ratification and disclosing it);
4. Resolutions and reports of the UN General Assembly and other international organizations (resolutions, directives, regulations, procedures, summary notes);
5. Final documents:
 - a) Final documents of intergovernmental visits and negotiations (comunicasias, joint statements, declarations, memorandum of understanding);
 - b) Final documents of international conferences (final acts, declarations);
6. Diplomatic correspondence:
 - a) UN correspondence (official letters, informal letters, verbal notes, notes / memoranda);
 - b) Interstate diplomatic documents;
 - c) Other diplomatic documents (agremans, consular patent, exekvatura, letters of trust, powers).

We also believe that this classification is complete, since the types of documents cover all aspects of the foreign policy activities of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

As soon as the classification of diplomatic documents is determined, the peculiarities of diplomatic discourse come to mind. The basic principles of the state's foreign policy correspond to the implementation of international legal norms enshrined in the diplomatic documents of internal regulatory acts and conventions, meetings and conferences on the implementation of the country's foreign policy. Applied to diplomatic discourse, diplomacy is defined as the official open activity of a state aimed at achieving foreign policy goals and objectives through diplomatic means and methods aimed at developing international relations. The topic of diplomatic discourse is determined by the historically formed Institute of international relations. The institute of diplomacy, which defines the features of diplomatic discourse, refers to the set of norms aimed at preparing and creating foreign relations of states, their forms of representation abroad, issues of diplomatic etiquette, diplomatic documents [5.5]. The peculiarities of institutional diplomatic discourse are the versatility of interaction, the desire for cooperation, a comprehensive information component, complex aspects of foreign policy relations and the protection of the interests of their state by diplomats. One of the features of diplomatic texts is their informational content and collective image of the recipient.

The institutional nature of diplomatic discourse presupposes compliance with the rules and norms of diplomatic protocol. The goal of institutional diplomatic discourse is to preserve the interests of the state. In diplomatic discourse, the role of the institutional element prevails, while the role of the personal element is practically eliminated. Institutional diplomatic discourse is dialogue – standardized diplomatic communication.

CONCLUSION

A distinctive feature of diplomatic texts from a communicative point of view is their reflection in a dialogical form. But its difference from diplomatic discourse is determined by the fact that in the discourse the speaker can in some ways convey to the listener the goal of his intention. Any written diplomatic activity is aimed at bilateral/multilateral dialogue, the purpose of which is to establish and support cooperation. As for oral diplomatic activities (negotiations, press conferences, briefings, statements of official representatives, etc.), clearly manifested in a dialogical form. In this case, the address of diplomatic communication, representing the interests of its state, refers to representatives of a foreign state.

The opinions on diplomatic discourse and text were examined, and the following different conclusions were drawn.

1. Table

Diplomatic discourse and the relationship aspects of the diplomatic text

Features of diplomatic
discourse:

1. Accuracy
2. Compactness
3. Privacy
4. Relevance to actual
time
5. Dynamics

Features of diplomatic text:

1. Accuracy
2. Compactness
3. Common
4. Completion of speech
5. Static

Common features of
diplomatic text and
discourse:

1. Communicability
2. Pragmatism
3. Informativeness
4. Purposefulness
5. Creativity

References:

- 1.V.E Chernyavskaya. Text and discourse. Problems of economic discourse: A collection of scientific articles. St. Petersburg: Publishing House of SPbGUEF, - 2001, -P.14,16.
2. file:///C:/Users/samsung/Downloads/diskurs-kommunikatsiya-tekst-k-voprosu-okorrelyatsiyah-i-sistemnyh-harakteristikah.pdf
- 3.K.F.Sedov. The formation of the structure of oral discourse as an expression of the evolution of linguistic personality. Autoref.diss... doctor of phil.sciences. – Saratov, 1999. - P.5.
4. E.S. Kubryakova. Language and knowledge: On the way to gaining knowledge about language: Parts of speech from a cognitive point of view. The role of language in the knowledge of the world. - M.: Languages of Slavic culture, 2004.-P. 528.
6. V.I.Karasik. About the types of discourse // Linguistic personality: institutional and personal discourse: Collection of scientific tr. Volgograd: Peremena, 2000. - P. 5.
7. V.I. Karasik V.I. Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse. 2004. – P.246.
8. O.S. Issers Communicative strategies and tactics of Russian speech / O.S. Issers. – 4th edition, stereotypical. – Moscow : KomKniga, 2006. - p. 54.
9. I.P. Tarasova. The structure of meaning and the structure of the communicant 's personality. Questions of linguistics. 1992. № 4, -pp.107-110.
10. A.A. Kovalev. On the problem of the word in Arabic linguistics [Text] // Arabic Philology. Collection of articles. — Moscow: Publishing house of Moscow. un-ta, 1968.-P.p. 166-167.
11. N.V. Popova . Interdisciplinary discursive line in the linguists' training program. St. Petersburg: SPbSPU, 2009. - 330p.
12. N.V. Solovyov . In-t linguist. research RAS. - M. : Astrel [et al.], 2005. -P. 5.
13. M.S.Ishanjanova. Comparative study of deictic units expressing "space" (on the example of the analysis of texts of the french and uzbek languages). Diss. abstract for (phd) in philological science. Andizan, 2020.- 49 p.
- 1.V.E Chernyavskaya. Text and discourse. Problems of economic discourse: A collection of scientific articles. St. Petersburg: Publishing House of SPbGUEF, - 2001, -P.14,16.
2. file:///C:/Users/samsung/Downloads/diskurs-kommunikatsiya-tekst-k-voprosu-okorrelyatsiyah-i-sistemnyh-harakteristikah.pdf
- 3.K.F.Sedov. The formation of the structure of oral discourse as an expression of the evolution of linguistic personality. Autoref.diss... doctor of phil.sciences. – Saratov, 1999. - P.5.
4. E.S. Kubryakova. Language and knowledge: On the way to gaining knowledge about language: Parts of speech from a cognitive point of view. The role of language in the knowledge of the world. - M.: Languages of Slavic culture, 2004.-P. 528.
6. V.I.Karasik. About the types of discourse // Linguistic personality: institutional and personal discourse: Collection of scientific tr. Volgograd: Peremena, 2000. - P. 5.
7. V.I. Karasik V.I. Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse. 2004. – P.246.
8. O.S. Issers Communicative strategies and tactics of Russian speech / O.S. Issers. – 4th edition, stereotypical. – Moscow : KomKniga, 2006. - p. 54.

9. I.P. Tarasova. The structure of meaning and the structure of the communicant 's personality. Questions of linguistics. 1992. № 4, -pp.107-110.
10. A.A. Kovalev. On the problem of the word in Arabic linguistics [Text] // Arabic Philology. Collection of articles. — Moscow: Publishing house of Moscow. un-ta, 1968.-P.p. 166-167.
11. N.V. Popova . Interdisciplinary discursive line in the linguists' training program. St. Petersburg: SPbSPU, 2009. – 330 p.
12. N.V. Solovyov . In-t linguist. research RAS. - M. : Astrel [et al.], 2005. -P. 5.
13. M.S.Ishanjanova. Comparative study of deictic units expressing "space" (on the example of the analysis of texts of the french and uzbek languages). Diss. abstract for (phd) in philological science. Andizan, 2020.- 49 p.