HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

THE NEED FOR STUDYING DIPLOMATIC LEXICAL UNITS

Shodmonova Guli Qahramon kizi
Master's student of the University of information technologies and management

This article justifies the need to study diplomatic lexical units from a linguistic, translational and practical point of view. The article emphasizes the importance of in-depth study of this area in preventing international conflicts, minimizing diplomatic errors, developing modern diplomatic terminology in the Uzbek language and training specialists. As a result, scientific and practical recommendations are given on the need to include diplomatic lexical units in educational programs, creating special explanatory dictionaries and manuals.

Keywords: diplomatic lexical units, diplomatic terminology, translation equivalence, international relations, linguistic analysis, intercultural communication, Uzbek diplomatic language.

Starting from the beginning of the 20th century, in Uzbek linguistics, particularly in the discipline of speech culture, diplomatic speech began to emerge as a distinct type of socio-political oratory as an object of scientific research. During this period, alongside the rapid development of the theory and practice of oratory, great attention was devoted to studying the specific features, functional tasks, communicative strategies, and structural organization of diplomatic speech. As a result, diplomatic speech began to form as an independent research direction that fundamentally differs from ordinary official speech. –

The first scientific definition of diplomatic speech was given in S. Inomxo'jayev's work "The Foundations of the Art of Oratory," in which it is stated: "Diplomatic speech is an official speech of state importance, characterized by its possession of international status"[1:102].

This definition clearly establishes the main criterion distinguishing diplomatic speech from other types of official speech–namely, the function of expressing, protecting, and promoting state interests on an international scale. It also highlights the strategic importance of diplomatic speech not only in internal but also in external political communication.

Researcher J.Sh. Safarov, while conducting a deeper analysis of the historical roots of diplomatic speech, expresses the following view: "The origins of diplomatic speech date back to the period of the formation of political relations between states that emerged in distant centuries"[2:45].

Thus, the emergence of diplomatic speech begins from the earliest period of state structures in human civilization and has developed in inseparable connection with the development of interstate relations. This process occurred as a result of the mutual influence of not only political but also cultural and linguistic factors.

A.H. Aripova defines diplomatic speech more precisely and comprehensively, characterizing it as follows: "Diplomatic speech: the official speech of a representative of a state (a diplomatic person)"[3:68]. In this definition, the subject of the speech–the state representative–is placed at the center, with particular emphasis on their official status, representative function, and international responsibility. Furthermore, not only the formal but also the substantive and strategic aspects of the speech have been taken into account.

Political scientist B.A. Omonov fully supports S. Inomxo'jayev's definition and arrives at the following conclusion: "Diplomatic speech is an official speech of state importance, and it possesses international status"[4:56]. He also specifically identifies the main subjects who deliver diplomatic speech: "... furthermore, in the present era, official speeches of state officials, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and responsible employees during official visits can serve as examples of diplomatic

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

speech"[4:56]. Thus, in Uzbek scholarly literature, it has been scientifically substantiated that the subjects of diplomatic speech are diplomatic persons, state officials, employees of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and other responsible officials[5]. In conclusion, in Uzbek linguistics, diplomatic speech is being widely researched not only as a historical-cultural heritage but also as an important component of modern linguistics and oratory theory. It serves as a strategic communicative tool demonstrating the power of words in interstate relations, and the oratorical skill of an ambassador or state representative is considered a key to success in international politics. These definitions and approaches create a solid scientific foundation for deeper scientific analysis of diplomatic speech, strengthening its theoretical foundations, and effective application in modern diplomatic practice.

Furthermore, the study of diplomatic speech is of significant importance not only for linguistics but also for political science, cultural studies, and the theory of international relations, because it directly determines the effectiveness of dialogue between states, the level of mutual understanding, and the possibilities for preventing conflicts.

In the textbook *Fundamentals of Diplomatic Language*, the essence of diplomatic language is defined as follows: "Diplomatic language ... does not reflect any person's emotions, inner experiences, or mental state, does not express scientific concepts, but rather expresses the interests of an entire people or country"[6:29]. This definition is directly applicable to diplomatic speech from the perspective of the dialectical relationship between language and speech. That is, diplomatic speech is free from personal emotional experiences or scientific-logical concepts; it manifests as a type of speech of an official, collective, and institutional character that expresses the strategic interests of an entire nation or state. This feature fundamentally distinguishes it from both ordinary everyday speech and scientific speech. Because in diplomatic speech, words serve not as a means of expressing personal emotions or conveying scientific knowledge, but as an important tool of state policy, a strategic means of protecting and promoting national interests in international relations.

The historical development of diplomatic speech has deep roots, and its form, style, and communicative strategies have changed and improved in various periods in accordance with the socio-political conditions of society, the characteristics of interstate relations, and cultural traditions. For example, in the 6th century, diplomatic speech was composed of the most attractive, eloquent, influential, and artistically rich words[7]. During this period, ambassadors in their speeches did not limit themselves to conveying information or stating a position, but widely employed complex rhetorical techniques aimed at conquering the listener's intellect, emotions, and views and winning them over to their side. Because in that era, the power of words was considered almost the only and most effective means of protecting state interests. For this reason, diplomatic speech was regarded not only as informative but also as a powerful tool exerting psychological influence, managing diplomatic communication, and ensuring the achievement of strategic goals.

In the process of historical development, although the main function of diplomatic speech–the expression and protection of state interests–has remained unchanged, its formal and stylistic features have evolved significantly depending on the times and conditions. While in ancient times oral oratory and rhetorical art predominated, later it also developed in the form of written diplomatic documents, memoranda, notes, and statements. In each period, diplomatic speech adapted to the political culture of its time, the rules of diplomatic etiquette, and the norms of international law. This demonstrates that it is a complex phenomenon not only linguistically but also politically, culturally, and psychologically. Thus, the essence and historical development of diplomatic speech reveal the main features distinguishing it from other types of speech: it is not personal–it serves collective and state interests; it is not based on emotions–it is directed toward strategic goals; it does not merely convey information–

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

but exerts influence and protects interests. These features preserve diplomatic speech as an important tool for implementing state policy in modern international relations.

The 8th–10th centuries, as the period of the widespread spread of Islam in Central Asia and throughout the world, hold special significance in the history of diplomatic speech. During this period, diplomatic speech was mainly composed of verses from the Qur'an and hadiths of our Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), which strengthened its religious-spiritual foundation[8]. As a result, diplomatic speech became not only a tool for expressing political interests but also a reliable communicative tool firmly grounded in moral and legal aspects. The citation of the Qur'an and hadiths in diplomatic negotiations and embassy missions served to create an atmosphere of mutual respect, trust, and spiritual closeness between the parties. This, along with increasing the effectiveness of negotiations, expanded the possibilities for resolving conflicts through peaceful means.

In the 14th–19th centuries, during the period of the Timurid state, the Baburid empire, and subsequent Uzbek khanates, the main function of diplomatic speech was aimed at concluding peace, establishing peace, and preventing wars. In conditions of constant invasions, military clashes, and political instability, respected nobles, neighborhood elders (*mahalla oqsoqollari*), mosque imams, and brave warriors acted as representatives of diplomatic speech. Their speeches were based not only on political power but also on social and religious authority, ensuring a peace-loving, conciliatory, and spiritually grounded approach in negotiations. During this period, the effectiveness of diplomatic speech often depended on the speaker's personal authority and spiritual influence.

In the 20th century, especially during the Soviet period, diplomatic speech was forced to perform a fundamentally different function. It operated as the propaganda and agitation apparatus of colonial Soviet policy[1]. During this period, the content and form of diplomatic speech were completely subordinated to centralized ideological requirements, and it had largely turned into a one-sided means of propaganda and agitation. As a result, the traditional freedom, national characteristics, and independent strategic character of diplomatic speech developed in a constrained state. This situation slowed its natural evolution and had long-term effects.

By the 21st century, diplomatic speech rose to a fundamentally new qualitative stage. It became an important strategic tool for developing international relations, strengthening cultural ties, and ensuring global cooperation. During this period, the equality of the parties' interests was adopted as the main norm. Whereas in previous periods, especially until the 21st century, the main function of diplomatic speech was to convey information, from the 21st century onward, this function's scope expanded and deepened sharply, moving to the level of mutual equal exchange of information. This fundamental change is directly related to the processes of globalization, the development of international law, and the formation of a multipolar world order. As a result, diplomatic speech transitioned from a one-sided monologue to a dialogue form based on two-sided cooperation.

In the present era, when speaking about diplomatic speech, first and foremost, the mutual exchange of rare, important, and strategically significant information between states is implied. Accordingly, the basis and essence of diplomatic speech consist of the most valuable, rarest, and strategic information. Another important and inseparable aspect of it is that it is carried out in the form of dialogue. This feature has continued uninterrupted from ancient times to the present day and has transformed speech from a one-sided monologue into two-sided cooperation, communication based on mutual understanding and agreement, becoming one of the important keys to success in international relations. In conclusion, throughout its long historical development, diplomatic speech has constantly adapted to the requirements of the times, political conditions, and changes in the system of international relations. It remains the most important tool demonstrating the strategic power of words in interstate relations in every period. Its development is a relevant and important object of research

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

not only for linguistics and oratory theory but also for the sciences of political science, international relations, history, and cultural studies. This further increases the necessity of deep and comprehensive study of diplomatic speech in the conditions of modern globalization.

Unlike other types of socio-political oratory such as political speech, religious speech, military-patriotic speech, and similar types–which are distinguished by being directed at a mass audience, the orator acting alone, and the relatively passive participation of listeners–diplomatic speech possesses a fundamentally different characteristic. It is sharply distinguished from other speech genres by its dialogic form based on the active and equal participation of both parties–that is, the negotiation participants[5]. This feature transforms diplomatic speech from a one-sided monologue into two-sided cooperation, turning it into an effective and mutually beneficial tool in international relations. Because in diplomatic speech, not only is information conveyed, but the parties' positions, interests, and possibilities for reaching agreements are formed in the process of mutual dialogue.

It is known that it is difficult to imagine diplomacy without "diplomatic discourse." "Discourse" as an object of communication mainly manifests in oral form. Indeed, any agreement, treaty, memorandum, or political decision is initially carried out orally, that is, in the form of discourse. These oral agreements constitute the main foundation of diplomatic discourse. Thus, diplomatic discourse is not merely an exchange of words or ordinary communication, but the main mechanism for realizing strategic goals in interstate relations and an institutional communication tool. The scientific analysis of communication has a certain methodological basis and has long been an object of interdisciplinary research. This basis is widely studied in the fields of philosophy and logic, psychology and sociology, artificial intelligence, political science, and linguistics. In particular, in linguistics, studies devoted to the analysis of various forms of discursive practice occupy an important place. Among the types of "institutional discourse" most studied in linguistics are mass media discourse, political discourse, scientific discourse, religious discourse, pedagogical discourse, business discourse, advertising discourse, and other institutional discourses[9]. It should be emphasized here that it is a great paradox that "diplomatic discourse" has remained almost unstudied in linguistics. Indeed, while the other types of institutional discourse mentioned above are extremely interesting and deep objects of research for linguistics, diplomatic discourse should have been equally important and relevant.

The study of diplomatic discourse aims to identify the main features of this type of institutional communication, to distinguish it from other types of communication, and to define its similar and differing parameters. This helps to understand more deeply the place of the art of words and communicative strategies in international relations. According to a number of researchers, the essence of discourse is determined by two main parameters: 1) the specific characteristics of discourse participants; 2) the intentional (goal-oriented) basis of discourse[10]. In other words, "diplomatic discourse" is a complex and multi-layered system that answers the questions "who speaks, to whom they speak, and what goal the speaker sets for themselves." It is evident that, first and foremost, the answers given to these questions bring clarity to defining, analyzing, and effectively managing diplomacy. Such analysis is provided not only in dictionaries and encyclopedias but also by specialists who directly carry out diplomatic communication–ambassadors, diplomats, and foreign policy officials. As a result, the study of diplomatic discourse acquires important theoretical and practical significance not only for linguistics but also for the sciences of political science and international law. It creates an opportunity to gain a deeper understanding of the strategic power of words in international relations, the effectiveness of communicative strategies, and the institutional mechanisms of diplomacy. In conclusion, diplomatic speech and diplomatic discourse are distinguished from other types of socio-political oratory by their dialogic nature, institutional character, basis on equal

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

participants, and goal-orientedness. Its scientific research, along with filling the existing gap in linguistics, creates an opportunity to gain a deeper understanding of the strategic power of words in modern international relations. This approach provides a solid basis for viewing diplomatic speech not only as a historical-heritage phenomenon but also as a scientific object that is actively applied in modern practice and is constantly improving.

REFERENCES:

1. Inomxo‘jayev S. Notiqlik san’ati asoslari. – T.: O’qutuvchi, 1982. – 157 b.
2. Сафаров Ж.Ш. Структура дипломатического дискурса и его лексико-фразеологический состав: Дис. ...канд. филол.наук. – Самарқанд, 2000. – С. 45.
3. Aripova A.H. Notiqlik san’ati – ijtimoiy-madaniy fenomen sifatida. Monografiya – T.: Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti, 2024. – B. 68.
4. Omonov B.A. Siyosiy yetakchi nutq madaniyatining jamiyatni demokratiyalashtirish jarayonlariga ta’siri. Siy. fan. nomz. …diss. – T.: 2004. – B. 56.
5. Rasulov R., Abdullayeva N. Diplomatiya va diplomatik nutq. Xorijiy filologiya. №2,2020. – B. 20.
6. Ko‘chimov Sh. Diplomatik til asoslari. –T.: Jahon iqtisodiyoti va diplomatiya universiteti, 2002. – B. 29.
7. Никольсон Г. Дипломатия. – М.: Издательство: Госполитиздат. 1941. – С. 22.
8. Muhammad ibn Ismoil al-Buxoriy. Al-jome’ as-sahih. Hadis 4. –T.: Qomus, 1992. – 151 b.
9. Терентий Л.М. Дипломатический дискурс как особая форма политической коммуникации. Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. 2010. № 1 (022). – С. 47– 57.
10. Шейгал Е.И. Семиотика политического дискурса. – М.: ИТДГК «Гнозис» 2004. – 326 с.