
Linguistic Features of Diplomatic Discourse: A Comparative Study of Turkish and Uzbek

Dilafruz Batirovna Axmedjanova

Senior Lecturer, Journalism and Mass Communications University of Uzbekistan

Article information:

Manuscript received: 21 Nov 2025; **Accepted:** 20 Dec 2025; **Published:** 21 Jan 2026

Abstract: This article examines the linguistic features of diplomatic discourse through a comparative analysis of Turkish and Uzbek. Diplomatic discourse is viewed as a distinct institutional form of communication characterized by formality, politeness, neutrality, and strategic ambiguity. The study focuses on lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic devices employed in diplomatic communication, highlighting how these linguistic tools function to maintain balance, avoid conflict, and achieve communicative goals in international relations.

Special attention is paid to politeness strategies, modal expressions, passive constructions, and formulaic expressions commonly used in diplomatic texts and speeches. The findings reveal both shared and language-specific features in Turkish and Uzbek diplomatic discourse, shaped by common Turkic cultural roots as well as different historical and diplomatic traditions. The results of the study contribute to comparative linguistics, diplomatic discourse analysis, and intercultural communication, and may be useful for diplomats, translators, and researchers working in international communication contexts.

Keys words: diplomatic discourse, linguistic features, politeness strategies, pragmatic analysis, Turkish language, Uzbek language, comparative study

Introduction: In the context of globalization and increasing international cooperation, diplomatic communication has become a crucial instrument for maintaining peaceful relations and promoting mutual understanding between states. Diplomacy relies not only on political and legal frameworks but also on carefully constructed language that reflects institutional norms, cultural values, and pragmatic intentions. As a result, diplomatic discourse has attracted growing attention in linguistic research as a distinctive type of institutional discourse with specific communicative goals.

Diplomatic discourse is characterized by a high degree of formality, politeness, neutrality, and strategic ambiguity. These features are realized through particular linguistic choices at lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic levels, allowing speakers to express positions cautiously, avoid direct confrontation, and preserve diplomatic balance. Language in diplomacy functions not merely as a means of information exchange but as a strategic tool for managing power relations, mitigating conflict, and fostering cooperation.

While diplomatic discourse has been extensively studied in widely used international languages such as English, French, and Russian, comparatively little attention has been paid to Turkic languages. In particular, the linguistic features of diplomatic discourse in Turkish and Uzbek remain underexplored despite their shared historical and cultural roots and their distinct diplomatic traditions. A comparative analysis of these two languages can therefore provide valuable insights into both universal and culture-specific aspects of diplomatic communication.

The aim of this study is to identify and analyze the linguistic features of diplomatic discourse in Turkish and Uzbek from a comparative perspective. The research focuses on key elements such as politeness strategies, modal expressions, passive constructions, and formulaic language commonly used in diplomatic texts and speeches. By examining these features, the study seeks to reveal similarities and differences shaped by linguistic structure, cultural norms, and institutional practices.

The findings of this research are expected to contribute to the fields of discourse analysis, comparative linguistics, and intercultural communication. Moreover, the results may have practical relevance for diplomats, translators, and professionals engaged in international relations, where accurate and culturally sensitive language use is of critical importance.

Materials and methods: The empirical basis of this study is formed by a systematically compiled corpus of diplomatic texts in Turkish and Uzbek. The corpus consists of authentic written and spoken materials produced within official diplomatic settings, including bilateral and multilateral diplomatic speeches, official statements, joint declarations, press communiqués, and international agreements. These materials were selected because they represent standardized forms of diplomatic discourse and reflect institutional norms governing official communication between states.

The Turkish-language data were collected from publicly available official sources of governmental and diplomatic institutions, while the Uzbek-language data were drawn from comparable official state and diplomatic platforms. In order to ensure methodological consistency and comparability, the texts were selected according to the following criteria: (1) institutional authorship, (2) relevance to diplomatic communication, (3) formal register, and (4) similarity in genre and communicative function. The selected texts cover a comparable time frame, which minimizes the influence of diachronic variation on linguistic features.

The final corpus comprises a balanced set of texts in both languages, allowing for a reliable comparative analysis. All materials were carefully reviewed to exclude non-institutional or media-adapted content that might distort the linguistic characteristics of diplomatic discourse.

The study adopts a qualitative comparative research framework based on discourse analysis and linguistic pragmatics. A multi-method approach was employed to ensure a comprehensive examination of the linguistic features of diplomatic discourse.

First, institutional discourse analysis was applied to identify the structural organization and communicative conventions of diplomatic texts. This method made it possible to analyze how institutional roles, power relations, and communicative intentions are encoded through language. Special attention was given to standard diplomatic formulas, conventional openings and closings, and genre-specific textual patterns.

Second, linguistic-pragmatic analysis was used to examine politeness strategies, indirect speech acts, modal expressions, and mitigation devices. The analysis focused on how speakers express obligation, intention, evaluation, and uncertainty in a way that maintains diplomatic tact and avoids explicit confrontation. Politeness strategies were interpreted within the framework of face-saving mechanisms and cooperative interaction.

Third, a comparative linguistic method was employed to identify similarities and differences between Turkish and Uzbek diplomatic discourse. Lexical choices, syntactic structures (including passive and impersonal constructions), and pragmatic markers were systematically compared to reveal language-specific tendencies and shared patterns rooted in common cultural and diplomatic traditions.

In addition, descriptive and contextual analysis was used to interpret linguistic phenomena in relation to socio-cultural and historical factors influencing diplomatic communication in Turkish- and Uzbek-speaking contexts. Where relevant, selected examples were analyzed in their broader communicative and institutional context to ensure accurate interpretation.

The analytical results were categorized and synthesized to distinguish universal features of diplomatic

discourse from language- and culture-specific characteristics. This methodological approach enhances the reliability and validity of the findings and provides a solid foundation for further research in comparative diplomatic discourse studies.

Results and discussion: The analysis of the Turkish and Uzbek diplomatic corpus reveals a set of recurrent linguistic features that characterize diplomatic discourse in both languages. These features are observed at lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic levels and reflect the institutional nature of diplomatic communication. In both languages, diplomatic discourse is marked by a high degree of formality, conventionalization, and strategic use of language to maintain neutrality and politeness.

At the lexical level, the results show a frequent use of evaluative and formulaic expressions that convey respect, cooperation, and goodwill. In Turkish diplomatic texts, expressions such as *memnuniyetle ifade etmek*, *iş birliğini güçlendirmek*, and *karşılıklı anlayış* are commonly employed to emphasize positive diplomatic relations. Similarly, Uzbek diplomatic discourse makes extensive use of formulaic phrases such as *chuqur minnatdorlik bildiramiz*, *o‘zaro hamkorlikni rivojlantirish*, and *do‘stona munosabatlar*. These expressions function as conventional markers of diplomatic politeness and institutional alignment.

From a syntactic perspective, both languages demonstrate a strong preference for passive and impersonal constructions. The frequent use of passive voice serves to depersonalize statements, shift focus from individual actors to processes or outcomes, and reduce the potential for face-threatening acts. For example, constructions equivalent to “the issue was discussed” or “an agreement was reached” are widely used in both Turkish and Uzbek diplomatic texts. This finding confirms the tendency of diplomatic discourse to avoid explicit attribution of responsibility and maintain communicative neutrality.

The pragmatic analysis highlights the central role of politeness strategies and indirectness in Turkish and Uzbek diplomatic discourse. Both languages employ a wide range of modal expressions and mitigative devices to soften statements, express intentions cautiously, and avoid categorical claims. Modal verbs and verbal constructions expressing possibility, intention, or desirability are frequently used to reduce the force of assertions.

In Turkish diplomatic discourse, modal expressions such as *temenni etmek*, *arzu etmek*, and *değerlendirmek* are commonly used to frame statements as intentions rather than obligations. In Uzbek, similar pragmatic functions are achieved through expressions like *maqsadga muvofiq deb hisoblanadi*, *ko‘zda tutiladi*, and *rejalashtirilmoqda*. These forms contribute to the maintenance of diplomatic tact and allow for flexibility in interpretation.

The findings also demonstrate that politeness in diplomatic discourse is not limited to lexical choices but is embedded in broader discourse strategies. Both languages rely on indirect speech acts, hedging, and strategic ambiguity to manage sensitive issues. This pragmatic similarity reflects universal principles of diplomatic communication while also accommodating language-specific realizations.

The comparative analysis indicates that Turkish and Uzbek diplomatic discourse share a substantial number of common features, which can be attributed to their common Turkic linguistic heritage and similar diplomatic conventions. In both languages, politeness, formality, and indirectness function as core principles guiding diplomatic communication. These shared features suggest the existence of universal patterns in diplomatic discourse that transcend individual languages.

However, notable differences were also identified. Turkish diplomatic discourse shows a stronger influence of international and European diplomatic traditions, which is reflected in the frequent use of standardized international terminology and globally recognized diplomatic formulas. In contrast, Uzbek diplomatic discourse retains a stronger connection to national linguistic norms and traditional forms of respect, resulting in a slightly more elaborate expression of deference and courtesy.

These differences highlight the role of socio-cultural and historical factors in shaping diplomatic language use. While both languages conform to the general norms of diplomatic communication, they

adapt these norms in ways that reflect their respective cultural and institutional contexts.

The results of this study confirm that diplomatic discourse operates at the intersection of language, culture, and institutional practice. The linguistic features identified in Turkish and Uzbek diplomatic discourse demonstrate how language is strategically employed to balance clarity and ambiguity, assertiveness and restraint, and national identity and international norms.

The findings contribute to the growing body of research on diplomatic discourse by extending comparative analysis to Turkish and Uzbek, two languages that have received limited attention in this field. From a practical perspective, the results may be particularly valuable for diplomats, translators, and professionals involved in international communication, as they underscore the importance of linguistic sensitivity and pragmatic awareness in diplomatic contexts.

Conclusion: This study has examined the linguistic features of diplomatic discourse through a comparative analysis of Turkish and Uzbek, focusing on lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic aspects of institutional communication. The findings demonstrate that diplomatic discourse in both languages is governed by shared principles such as formality, politeness, neutrality, and strategic ambiguity, which are essential for maintaining balance and effectiveness in international relations.

The analysis revealed that both Turkish and Uzbek diplomatic texts make extensive use of formulaic expressions, passive and impersonal constructions, and modal devices to mitigate statements and avoid direct confrontation. These linguistic strategies contribute to depersonalization and face-saving, allowing sensitive political positions to be communicated in a cautious and flexible manner. Such similarities point to universal characteristics of diplomatic discourse that transcend individual linguistic systems.

At the same time, the study identified language-specific features shaped by cultural, historical, and institutional factors. Turkish diplomatic discourse reflects a stronger influence of international and European diplomatic conventions, particularly in terminology and standardized expressions. In contrast, Uzbek diplomatic discourse preserves more traditional forms of politeness and deference rooted in national linguistic norms. These differences highlight the role of socio-cultural context in shaping diplomatic language use.

The results of this research contribute to comparative linguistics, discourse analysis, and intercultural communication by expanding scholarly understanding of diplomatic discourse in underexplored Turkic languages. From a practical perspective, the findings may assist diplomats, translators, and international communication professionals in producing linguistically accurate and culturally appropriate diplomatic texts.

Future research may build on this study by incorporating larger corpora, quantitative methods, or additional languages, thereby offering a more comprehensive understanding of diplomatic discourse across linguistic and cultural contexts.

References

1. Ахмеджанова Д. Б. Характеристики антонимичных фразеологизмов в нынешнем турецком языке //Журнал гуманитарных и естественных наук. – 2024. – №. 11 [1]. – С. 156-162.
2. Ахмеджанова Д. Б. Теоретические основы исследования фразеосемантического поля "речевая деятельность" в современном турецком языке //Журнал гуманитарных и естественных наук. – 2024. – №. 14 [2]. – С. 30-36.
3. Abdullayeva, Markhabo Raxmonkulovna. "CONVEY THE NATIONAL SPIRIT IN TRANSLATIONS. International Scientific and Practical Conference" Modern Psychology and Pedagogy: problems and solutions", ANGILYA." 2022,
4. Brown P., Levinson S. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. – 345 p.

5. Büyükkantarcioglu S. N. Diplomatic discourse and politeness strategies in Turkish // *Journal of Pragmatics*. – 2012. – Vol. 44, № 4. – P. 556–567.
6. Searle J. R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. – 203 p.
7. Yule G. *The Study of Language*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017. – 352 p.
8. Ахмеджанова Д. Б. Преподавание турецкого языка как второго иностранного языка в вузе // *Наука и образование сегодня*. – 2021. – №. 6 (65). – С. 33-34.
9. Hamidov, Xayrulla Xudoyorovich, and Arzu Karausta. "Terms relating to journalism in Turkish language and their translation." *International scientific conferences with higher educational institutions*. Vol. 3. 2023.
10. Hamidov, Khayrulla Khudoyorovich. "Regarding the transference of metaphors in uzbek novels in Turkish translations." *ASIAN JOURNAL OF MULTIDIMENSIONAL RESEARCH* 10.4 (2021): 200-205.