

Kosovych O. V.

Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University

Kotovska T. I.

Western Ukrainian National University

Kulyk S. A.

Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University

DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATION. DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

The article examines the structure of diplomatic discourse in terms of its organisation, the specifics of the agent, the client and the aims of this discursive practice. A comparative analysis of diplomatic and political discourse is conducted and their similarities and differences are highlighted. It is proved that one of the forms of diplomatic discourse is public diplomatic discourse, similar in its main parameters to political communication.

The study of diplomatic discourse involves identifying the main characteristics of this type of institutional communication and how it differs from other types of communication that are similar to diplomatic communication in certain parameters. A comparative analysis of these definitions shows that the main focus of the definition of diplomacy is the policy of the state, which is conducted by its leaders and professional representatives, the scientific activity of conducting international relations through negotiations. Hence, it is clear that diplomatic discourse has a peculiar agent whose specificity lies not just in its group character, but also in the fact that, as the definition of diplomacy implies, it is represented by two categories: firstly, by the highest state officials, i.e. professional politicians; secondly, by representatives of the diplomatic corps – professional diplomats. Diplomatic discourse is a closed process of negotiation that is prepared and conducted based on specific theoretical positions and practical developments in communication theory, conflictology, communication psychology etc., and can therefore be regarded as a specific academic activity of members of the diplomatic corps.

The authors conclude that, diplomatic discourse can be seen as a special form of communicative activity, whose main difference from other types of communication lies in its multidirectional nature, which is due to the different goals and objectives realised in different contexts – public and private.

Key words: *diplomatic discourse, political discourse, diplomatic communication, communication psychology, public contexte, negotiation process.*

Problem statement. One of the central problems which attracts the closest attention of scientists in modern science is the problem of communication, and the capacity of this phenomenon, its direct connection with the world of the individual and with society as a whole, has determined the extreme diversity of research in this subject area. In full accordance with U. Eco's observation about the "sign of communication", which is placed not in any particular scientific field, but on the boundaries of semiology and the horizons of practice [Eco 1998: 411], the diverse aspects of communication are studied in a variety of fields of science.

The methodological basis for the scientific analysis of communication is the theory of discourse, which has long been the object of interdisciplinary study and has been explored in philosophy and logic, psychology and sociology, in political science, as well

as in linguistics, where works analysing different kinds of discursive practices occupy a significant place.

Analysis of recent studies and publications. Among the most studied in linguistic science are such types of institutional discourse as mass-informational [Zilbert 1986, 1991; Aleshchanova 2000; Olyanich 2007 and others], political [Serio 1993; Baranov 1997; Sheigal 2004; Chudinov 2001], scientific [Bogdanova 1989; Slyshkin 2000 and others], religious [Krysin 1996; Karasik 1999 and others], pedagogical [Karasik 1999; Karasik 2004; Lemyaskina 2000 et al.], business [Astafurova 1997; Kuznetsova 2001], advertising [Pirogova 1996; Krasavskii 1999; Livshits 2001 et others].

Setting the task. Against this background, it seems paradoxical that diplomatic discourse remains practically unstudied, although this type of discourse cannot but be of interest to linguistics.

Introduction to basic material. The study of diplomatic discourse involves identifying the main characteristics of this type of institutional communication and its differences from other types of communication that are similar to diplomatic communication in certain parameters.

According to a number of researchers, the nature of discourse is determined by two parameters: 1) the specificity of the agent of social action [7; 11]; 2) the intentional basis of discourse [11; 6; 10]. In other words, diplomatic discourse is about who speaks, to whom the speaker speaks, and what goal the speaker sets for himself. First of all, it seems that an analysis of the definitions of diplomacy, both those given in dictionaries and the definitions of diplomatic communication by experts in the field themselves, helps to identify the answers to the questions posed.

According to the Ukrainian Diplomacy Dictionary: “Diplomacy is a mean of implementing foreign policy and the internal regulation of government and public diplomacy, which is a combination of non-military practical measures, techniques and methods used in accordance with specific circumstances and the nature of the tasks to be accomplished” [9, c. 65]. Similar definitions of diplomacy are given in other dictionaries published both in our country and abroad [14; 15; 16; 17] The diplomatic corps itself is said to be “diplomacy is the science of international relations and the art of negotiation by the heads of state and the special agencies of foreign affairs: ministries of foreign affairs, diplomatic missions, the participation of diplomats in determining the course of a country’s foreign policy and its implementation by peaceful means. Its main objective and task is to protect the interests of the state and its citizens’ interests” [8, c. 15–16].

A comparative analysis of these definitions shows that the main emphasis in defining diplomacy is placed on the policy of the state, which is conducted by its leaders and professional representatives, the scientific activity of conducting international relations through negotiations.

Hence, it is obvious that diplomatic discourse has a peculiar agent, the specificity of which lies not just in its group character, but also in the fact that, as the definition of diplomacy suggests, it is represented by two categories: firstly, by the highest state officials, i.e. professional politicians; secondly, by representatives of the diplomatic corps – professional diplomats.

The addressee of diplomatic discourse is no less specific. The client here can be both the widest mass audience (when various diplomatic events

and decisions are covered in the media) and a rather narrow circle of persons – diplomats of various ranks who take part in negotiations.

The nature of the agent and the client also determines the third feature of diplomatic discourse – its objectives. On the one hand, the agent's task is to inform the general public, both inside and outside his country, about the views of the government of the state he represents on certain international problems. In such a situation, diplomatic discourse is public and represents a specific form of political activity. On the other hand, the objective of the agent of action is to reach an agreement between the various participants of communication on international policy issues, to establish relations between countries on the basis of mutual benefit, to harmonise their interests, to enhance cooperation, to limit conflicts, etc. In this case, diplomatic discourse is a closed process of negotiations, which are prepared and conducted with the support of specific theoretical provisions and practical developments of communication theory, conflictology, communication psychology etc., and can therefore be regarded as a specific academic activity of members of the diplomatic corps.

The purpose and situation of diplomatic communication determine the communicative aspect of an utterance, its individual speech acts and the genre as a whole. However, the communicative aspect is only one aspect of any speech utterance. Parallel to the communicative aspect, i.e. “with the specific situation of speech communication with all of its individual circumstances” [2, p. 256], there is also the transition of thought into word (according to L. S. Vygotsky), expressed in the translation of the cognitive formations defined by the subject of discussion (situation-topic, according to A. A. Leontiev), into linguistic structures. Thus, a coherent speech work combines communicative, cognitive and linguistic aspects. Together, these aspects reflect the internal programme of the utterance, which exists in the consciousness of a separate linguistic personality and represents the “hierarchy of propositions underlying it” [5, p. 114].

As A. A. Leontiev points out: “This hierarchy is formed in the speaker on the basis of a certain strategy of orientation in the situation described, which depends on the “cognitive weight” of this or that component of the situation” [5, c. 114]. In other words, the presence of a common theme of communication, just as the presence of the same goal, does not mean that the psychological structure of the situation-theme in the minds of speakers and listeners who differ in their psychological characteristics will

be the same. It is this circumstance that allows us to single out another parameter in the general structure of diplomatic discourse – the linguistic personality of the diplomat – whose communicative, cognitive and linguistic abilities ultimately determine the success of all communication.

Thus, diplomatic discourse can be considered as a special form of communicative activity, the main difference of which from other types of communication lies in 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, trained and information-enabled partner – determines the social model of interaction, and the course of interaction itself, the possibility of realizing the set goals, the choice of speech strategies and the peculiarities of the use of language means directly depend on the degree of development of linguistic personalities participating in communication.

The public form of diplomatic discourse refers to this type of institutional communication, which in its characteristics largely coincides with political communication. The connection between politics and diplomacy is most clearly manifested in the fact that, unlike a number of other areas of activity, political and diplomatic actions are predominantly speech actions, and in both cases, language is not only a means of reflecting political reality and a component of the political field. Its much more important role lies in the fact that the language serves as a “hidden source of power” [1, p. 192], which allows those who use it to have a direct impact on the course of events. In other words, in both political and diplomatic communication, language does not just affect the state of affairs between states. With its help, a special vision of these relations, demanded by the state and certain political forces, is created both in the minds of the negotiating partners and in the public mind.

The second important factor that determines the similarity of these types of speech practices is a certain identity of the goals of diplomatic and political discourses, although this proximity is not obvious and can only be revealed in the course of a comparative analysis.

At first glance, the goals of these types of discursive practices are fundamentally different. If the goal of political discourse is the struggle for power [11], then from the general definition of diplomacy it follows that, in addition to the tasks

of informing and reconciling interests, the functions of diplomatic communication include protecting the interests of the country and its citizens. However, an analysis of international documents shows that in practice the concept of “protection of interests” is often replaced by the task of establishing control over one's partners, by the desire to take a leading position in the world through various forms of pressure on the international community and various international organizations, which initially excludes taking into account the positions of other participants in communication. It is this line that is characteristic, for example, of the “new” US diplomacy, which, speaking in words for equal rights, cooperation with other countries, in fact “begins from the fact that the world should be the way the United States wants it to be” [8, p. 451].

This goal of diplomatic discourse, as a rule, characteristic of superpowers, brings it closer to political communication, understood as any transmission of messages, the content of which is reduced to a public discussion of three fundamental issues: a) the distribution of public resources; b) control over decision-making / the right to make decisions (judicial, legislative, executive); c) application of sanctions (the right to punish or reward) [13, p. 14].

From the proximity of goals follows the third point that unites diplomatic and political discourses – the coincidence of their orientation towards the performance of one or another language function.

First of all, this remark concerns the general language function that determines the nature of the language as a whole. As emphasized by E. I. Sheigal: “Political discourse, along with religious and advertising, is included in the group of discourses for which the regulatory function is the leading one” [11, p. 34]. The same function of regulating the activity of the addressee, inducing him to the necessary actions by creating favorable conditions for activity, is also revealed in the public form of diplomatic discourse.

As part of its instrumental function, the language of diplomacy, like the language of politics, is called upon to perform several tasks. Firstly, it forms a certain vision of reality among communication partners, i.e. performs the function of orientation. Secondly, these languages have in common the functions of integration and social differentiation, as well as the actional function, i.e. the function of mobilization for activity, which manifests itself in various genres of diplomatic discourse reflected in the media.

It seems that the public form of diplomatic discourse is intended, first of all, to form public opinion on a number of international problems, i. its main public purpose is identical to that of political discourse, which is to inspire addressees with the need for “politically correct” actions and/or assessments, since this is beneficial to the one who seeks power. By disseminating previously interpreted information in a certain way, the agent of diplomatic discourse creates “the ground for beliefs” [3, p. 39] of society in the correctness of its position (interpretation/orientation), while outlining the circle of its supporters (integration/differentiation). The last stage is the stage of developing a line of struggle against the enemy (atonality). As in political discourse, in diplomatic communication all these functions are implemented with the help of special markers, i.e. explicitly, as well as implicitly, through the ideological connotations of political terms, the tone of the entire discourse, a special selection of evaluative vocabulary.

The publications of the content of diplomatic negotiations and some other diplomatic documents, which are increasingly common in the media, bring us to another, fourth, point of intersection of diplomatic and political discourses – a certain “blurring” and “transparency” of their borders.

On the one hand, these types of discourse remain institutional forms of communication. But the changes taking place in modern society cannot but leave a certain imprint on them, bringing these types of discursive practices closer to other types of communication.

In the monograph by E. I. Sheigal [11], devoted to a comprehensive analysis of political discourse, notes that political discourse in its peripheral genres is intertwined with the functions of other types of discourse – mass media discourse, pedagogical, legal, religious and some others.

This specificity is also characteristic of the public form of diplomatic communication, which has changed significantly in recent decades.

New features that diplomatic discourse has acquired at the present stage of development, are directly related to the global changes that have taken place in the world over the past decades. Among the most important events should be noted the collapse of the superpower – the USSR; the formation of a number of new states expressing territorial claims to each other; activation of ethnic groups striving for

state independence; acute conflicts associated with the desire of some states to possess nuclear weapons; a global financial and economic crisis, the way out of which is possible only with the joint participation of all industrialized powers and international financial organizations; as well as some other equally important reasons. The complication and change in the international (and in many countries, internal) situation has led to the fact that:

a) commerce is increasingly included in the sphere of diplomacy, and diplomacy itself is increasingly reoriented towards integration;

b) the influence of the press has significantly increased, which, by widely covering issues of diplomacy, has become a means of having a direct impact on society. This, in turn, forces modern diplomacy to be more open and accessible;

c) in the modern world, issues of international politics are quite often the subject of party struggle, and therefore they are covered in the media from the point of view of narrow party interests, and not the state, which, in turn, forces diplomats to make wider contacts with the media, informing society about the opinion of the government they represent;

d) a huge influence on diplomacy is beginning to have, on the one hand, cultural large diasporas within the country, and, on the other hand, the ever-increasing “lobbyism in the field of foreign policy and diplomacy on the part of foreign states” [8, p. 457];

e) the heads of state and government are increasingly involved in solving international problems, which further highlights the personal qualities of the participants in diplomatic negotiations, which can hardly be overestimated in informal communication, which currently occupies a significant share of the entire negotiation process.

Conclusions. All of the above reasons give reason to believe that the boundaries of diplomatic discourse have now expanded significantly. In addition to the characteristics typical of political discourse, it increasingly reveals features characteristic of other types of discursive practices. Moreover, in one case this is due to the current situation of social development, in the other – deep historical roots. So, due to the fact that diplomacy itself grew out of trade, these types of discursive practices were initially close. However, subsequently diplomacy took on a political character, and in many diplomatic services there were formidable barriers between the actual diplomatic service and consulates and trade missions.

References:

1. Ажеж К. Человек говорящий: Вклад лингвистики в гуманитарные науки: пер. с фр. 2-е изд., стереотип. М. : Едиториал УРСС, 2006. 408 с.
2. Бахтин М. М. Проблемы поэтики Достоевского. Азбука, 2015. 416 с.
3. Демьянков В. З. Политический дискурс как предмет политологической филологии // Политическая наука. Политический дискурс: история и современные исследования. М., 2002. № 3. С. 32–43.
4. Косович О. В. Дихотомія «мова – дидактика» у перспективі сьогодення : монографія. Тернопіль : ФОП Осадца Ю. В., 2021. 176 с.
5. Леонтьев А.А. Основы психолингвистики. 3-е изд. М. : Смысл; СПб. : Лань, 2003. URL: https://bookap.info/book/leontev_osnovy_psiholingvistiki/
6. Павлова Н. Д., Григорьева А. А., Пескова Е. А. Психолингвистика общения: интенциональное пространство предвыборного политического дискурса // Общение и познание / Под ред. В. А. Барабанщикова, Е. С. Самойленко. М. : Изд. «Институт психологии РАН», 2007. С. 353–373.
7. Паршин П. Б. Понятие идиополитического дискурса и методологические основания политической лингвистики. URL: <http://www.elections.ru/biblio/lit/parshin.htm>
8. Попов В. И. Современная дипломатия: теория и практика : курс лекций. Часть 1: Дипломатия – наука и искусство. М., «Научная книга», 2000. 277 с.
9. Український дипломатичний словник. За ред. М. З. Мальського. Знання, 2014. 495 с.
10. Ушакова Т. Н., Павлова Н. Д., Алексеев К. Н., Латынов В. В., Цепцов В. А. Слово в действии. Интент-анализ политического дискурса. М., 2000. URL: <https://lib.ipran.ru/upload/papers/20101842.pdf>
11. Шейгал Е. И. Семиотика политического дискурса : монография. Волгоград : Перемена, 2000. 368 с.
12. Эко У. От Интернета к Гуттенбергу // Новое литературное обозрение. 1998. № 32. С. 5–13.
13. Denton R. E. Jr., Woodward G. C. Political Communication in America. New York : Praeger, 1990, 363 p.
14. Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, Fifth Edition. Longman (Pearson Education), 2009. 2082 p.
15. MacMillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners. Macmillan Ltd, 2012. 1748 p.
16. Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford University Press, 2020. 1680 p.
17. Oxford Dictionary of Foreign Words And Phrases. Oxford University Press, 2010. 408 p.

Косович О. В., Котовська Т. І., Кулик С. А. ДИПЛОМАТИЧНЕ СПІЛКУВАННЯ. ДИСКУРС-АНАЛІЗ

У статті розглядається структура дипломатичного дискурсу з точки зору його організації, специфіка агента, клієнта і цілі цієї дискурсивної практики. Проведено порівняльний аналіз дипломатичних і політичних дискурсів, висвітлено їх схожість і відмінності. Доведено, що однією з форм дипломатичного дискурсу є публічний дипломатичний дискурс, подібний за основними параметрами до політичної комунікації.

Вивчення дипломатичного дискурсу передбачає виявлення основних особливостей даного виду інституційної комунікації та його відмінностей від інших видів комунікації, схожих на дипломатичне спілкування за певними параметрами. Порівняльний аналіз цих визначень показує, що основний акцент у визначенні дипломатії робиться на політиці держави, яка здійснюється її керівниками і професійними представниками, науковою діяльністю з ведення міжнародних відносин шляхом переговорів. Звідси очевидно, що дипломатичний дискурс має свого роду агента, специфіка якого полягає не просто в його груповому характері, а й у тому, що, як впливає з визначення дипломатії, він представлений двома категоріями: по-перше, вищими державними чиновниками, тобто професійними політиками; по-друге, представники дипломатичного корпусу – професійні дипломати. Дипломатичний дискурс – це замкнений процес переговорів, які готуються і ведуться на основі конкретних теоретичних положень і практичних розробок теорії спілкування, конфліктології, психології спілкування і т.д., а тому можуть розглядатися як специфічна наукова діяльність співробітників дипломатичного корпусу.

Авторами робиться висновок, дипломатичний дискурс можна розглядати як особливу форму комунікативної діяльності, основною відмінністю від інших видів комунікації є його різноспрямований характер, який обумовлений різними цілями і завданнями, реалізованими в різних контекстах – публічних і закритих.

Ключові слова: дипломатичний дискурс, політичний дискурс, дипломатичне спілкування, психологія спілкування, публічний контекст, переговорний процес.