

**ЎЗБЕКИСТОН РЕСПУБЛИКАСИ ОЛИЙ ВА ЎРТА МАХСУС**

**ТАЪЛИМ ВАЗИРЛИГИ**

**ЎЗБЕКИСТОН ДАВЛАТ ЖАҲОН ТИЛЛАРИ УНИВЕРСИТЕТИ**

**ИНГЛИЗ ТИЛИ СТИЛИСТИКАСИ КАФЕДРАСИ**

**Набиева Фахрия Алижон қизи**

инглиз тили 2- факультети 4 А - гуруҳ

**БОҒЛИҚ БЎЛМАГАН МАДАНИЯТЛАРДА ДИПЛОМАТИК  
ТИЛНИНГ ХУСУСИЯТЛАРИ**

**5220100 – филология ва тиллар ўқитиш (инглиз тили) таълим  
йўналиши бўйича бакалавр даражасини олиш учун**

**БИТИРУВ МАЛАКАВИЙ ИШИ**

**“ҲИМОЯГА ТАВСИЯ ЭТИЛАДИ”**

Инглиз тили стилистикаси кафедраси

муздир \_\_\_\_\_

2015 йил “ \_\_\_\_\_ ” \_\_\_\_\_

**ИЛМИЙ РАҲБАР:**

\_\_\_\_\_

2015 йил “ \_\_\_\_\_ ” \_\_\_\_\_

Тошкент – 2015

**MINISTRY OF HIGHER AND SECONDARY SPECIAL EDUCATION OF  
THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN**

**THE UZBEK STATE WORLD LANGUAGES UNIVERSITY**

**THE ENGLISH STYLISTICS DEPARTMENT**

**Fakhriya**

English faculty- 2 group- 4 A

**QUALIFICATION PAPER**

**SPECIFICITY OF DIPLOMACY LANGUAGE IN NON RELATED  
CULTURES**

**5220100-Philology and teaching languages (The English Language) for  
granting the bachelor's degree**

**THE QUALIFICATION PAPER  
IS ADMITTED TO DEFENSE**

The head of the English Stylistics

Department \_\_\_\_\_

2015 “ \_\_\_\_\_ ” \_\_\_\_\_

**SCIENTIFIC ADVISOR:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
2015 “ \_\_\_\_\_ ” \_\_\_\_\_

**TASHKENT-2015**

## Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	
<b>Chapter one. General outlines on diplomacy.</b>	
1.1. The style of official documents.....	9
1.2. Diplomacy and its historical development throughout the world..	12
1.3. English as a language of diplomacy.....	17
<b>Chapter two. Extra-linguistic and linguistic aspects of diplomacy</b>	
2.1. Extra-linguistic aspects of the language of Diplomacy.....	40
2.2. Linguistic aspects of the language of Diplomacy.....	50
<b>Chapter three. Specificity and translation of diplomacy language in non related cultures</b>	
3.1. About translation of diplomatic documents	
3.2. The analysis of translation of English diplomatic correspondence into Uzbek	
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	78
<b>THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE</b> .....	82

## INTRODUCTION

The President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov speaking about the future of Uzbekistan underlines: “The task of science is to form our future, trends for tomorrow the laws of nature, to show the way it will be. Science must be the means and the force driving forward the development of society”<sup>1</sup>.

Under the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On Education” and the National Program of Personal Training a comprehensive system of teaching foreign languages, aimed at upbringing of harmoniously developed, highly educated, modern-thinking young generation, the further integration of the republic into the world community was established in the country<sup>2</sup>.

However, analysis of the current system of organization of foreign language learning shows that educational standards, current system of organization of foreign language learning shows that educational standards, curricula and textbooks do not fully meet modern requirements, especially in the use of advanced information and media technologies. Education is carried out mainly under traditional methods. The organization of continuous foreign languages learning at all levels of the education system. As well as the work on upgrading the skills of teachers and the provision of modern teaching materials should be further improved.

To ensure the implementation of measures for the further development of learning foreign languages, and to upgrade and improve the quality of training of qualified teachers of foreign languages for secondary schools, vocational colleges and academic lyceums in accordance with international standards to determine the Uzbekistan state of World Languages as a state basic educational and scientific-methodological institution for the system of continuous education in foreign languages<sup>3</sup>.(1)

---

<sup>1</sup> I.Karimov. There is no future without historical memory/we are constructing our future with our own hands. Vol.7. Tashkent: “Uzbekistan”; 1999. P.146

<sup>2</sup> President of the Republic of Uzbekistan I.Karimov. Decree № 18/75 on Measures for Further Improvement of Foreign Languages Learning System, Tashkent, December 10, 2012.

<sup>3</sup> President I. Karimov. Decree № 1971, on Measures to Improve the Activity of Uzbekistan State University of World Languages, Tashkent, May 23, 2013.

According to these rules, there a notable place is a signed to applied Linguistics which carries responsibility for such socially and scientifically important sphere of knowledge as methods of training. One of the up-to-date problems of training language teachers is to prepare a skillful and knowledgeable teacher who not only knows the foreign language but also know how to use language perfectly and correctly in every branch of social life. The above mentioned point out the actuality of the qualification paper.

The reason of my intent choosing the topic on writing Language of Diplomacy is based on the necessity learning and teaching the significant features of Diplomacy and Diplomatic Correspondence for me. Because after graduating this University I am going to continue my study to get a degree in University of World Economy and Diplomacy. Up to this time I must be aware of at least linguistic features of diplomacy and diplomatic correspondence which include lexical, grammatical, structural, stylistic peculiarities.

After gaining sovereignty Uzbekistan started to independently conduct its foreign policy. So far Uzbekistan established diplomatic relations with more than 120 countries of the world. Forty two embassies of foreign countries, one Consulate General, eight honorary consuls, nine representatives of international organizations, five international financial organizations, three trade delegates with diplomatic status operating now in Tashkent. At the time, there are 46 diplomatic and consular representatives of the Republic of Uzbekistan in foreign countries and international organizations, including permanent missions at the UN in New York and the UN European Department and other international organizations in Geneva.

There are many reasons why we should know diplomatic language and how to write effective diplomatic correspondences, regardless of the type of equipment to which we have access. In the first place, for centuries, maintaining relationships between nations through the exchanges of representatives has been the task of diplomacy.

Secondly, it may be said that the advantages of phrasing communications between governments, or important pronouncements on foreign affairs, in “diplomatic language” far outweigh any disadvantages which the system may possess.

Thirdly, diplomacy involves the function of representations, administering our overseas establishments, caring for the interests of our country citizen’s abroad; and reporting, communicating, and negotiating on political, economic, consular, and administrative affairs.

Finally, we shall be trained to monitor, analyze, evaluate and reliably report on the situation in contemporary global system of diplomacy. We shall master diplomatic skills of clear, concise and purposeful speaking; timely and thorough problem analysis; clear written expression; steady performance and rational choice of appropriate diplomatic instruments for action in the given circumstances. The acquired knowledge, capacities and skills initially train for performance of the most important tasks in diplomatic language.

Diplomacy and diplomatic correspondence play an important role in the implementation of contracts in International, Social, Economic and other sphere of our life.

In this qualification paper we consider the analysis of structure and meaning of diplomatic language and diplomatic correspondence and compare it with the Uzbek Diplomatic language and correspondence.

**The actuality** of the work can be seen in the necessity of teaching students not only grammar or some other levels of general linguistics but also the main peculiarities of diplomatic, business relations to communicate with people in official sphere. We know the way of speaking differs in every group and it is connected with stylistic classification of vocabulary, the differentiation of types of Functional styles according to the theme of the context.

**The aim** of this qualification paper is to fulfill the quality and impact of language of diplomacy. Coming out the aim we have chosen this theme on the base

of fact that the students studying English at our University are almost unable to use diplomatic ways in communications and to write proper Diplomatic correspondences. It is very up to date problem to teach the students how to write official documents, especially, diplomatic and business letters in the English language correctly.

**The tasks** of the qualification paper are:

- To give general notes on functional styles and its types in the English language;
- To present the main features of diplomacy or history of diplomacy;
- To point out structural-semantic features of Language of Diplomacy;
- To reveal the stylistic peculiarities of diplomatic language;
- To investigate and lexical features of diplomatic language;
- To inform grammatical features of Language of Diplomacy and diplomatic correspondence;
- To reveal the extra linguistic features of Language of Diplomacy.

As the **source** for our qualification paper we addressed to a list of decisions of President, laws of Republic of Uzbekistan, prints of President Islam Karimov, diplomatic books, journals, dictionaries, language textbook, real pieces of diplomatic correspondence and Internet web sites.

**The subject** of the qualification paper is linguistic and extra linguistic features of diplomatic language and correspondence.

**The object** of this qualification paper is the role and character of linguistic and extra-linguistic aspects of diplomatic language. The history of diplomacy and diplomatic correspondences, the role of persons feeling for the proper use of phrases as well as the knowledge of grammar is taken into consideration.

**The novelty** of this investigated theme is that the usage of place of language in social life and usage of different expressions, abbreviations, word combinations utilized on diplomatic correspondence.

The following **methods** of investigating have been applied in the present scientific research: descriptive method, comparative method, component analysis.

The method of the research includes the works of foreign and native linguistics' in the sphere of stylistics. General linguistics and tactical value of the present paper can be used in the process of teaching of such linguistic aspects of diplomatic language. The work is surely of theoretical and proposal value.

**The theoretical significance** of the qualification paper is that semantic and linguistic descriptions of Language of Diplomacy and Diplomatic correspondence promote to reveal systematic connection in diplomatic language. The work we have begun may serve as a base or hint for further complicated and complete investigation on this problem.

**The practical** quality of this work is appreciated as the analyzed examples can be helpful to study diplomatic language and get effective diplomatic communications in diplomatic sphere. Also, the analysis and directions teach us the basic rules of language of diplomacy and shows the main linguistic and extra-linguistic features of language in Diplomacy.

**The structure** of the qualification paper is as follows: Introduction, three Chapters, Conclusion and the list of used literatures.

**Introduction** includes brief contents of the work; reflects the reason of choosing the problem the actuality, tasks of the paper; the methods used to reveal the investigated problem.

**The first chapter** deals with the problem of Functional styles and brief notes on official documents and also is analyzed history of diplomacy and diplomatic language and its problems. It consists of three paragraphs. Here importance of learning and investigating the language of diplomacy and its problems are described with the examples.

**The second chapter** is devoted to the practical work and it deals with the properties of extra-linguistic and linguistic aspects of language of Diplomacy.

**The third chapter** is also devoted to the practical work on the translation of Diplomatic correspondence and its peculiarities, and compares it with the Uzbek Diplomatic language and correspondence used in Contemporary English.



**Conclusion** contains main results of the research and recommendations on further linguistic investigation of diplomacy and diplomatic correspondence in modern English and Uzbek.

**The list of used literatures** deals with the alphabetical list of literatures used while carrying out the given qualification paper.

## CHAPTER I. GENERAL OUTLINES ON DIPLOMACY

### 1.1. The style of official documents

At the beginning of our work we want to do some sketches on stylistics and its subject matter. Stylistics seems to be a new subject matter in general linguistics, but, if we deal with it thoroughly, we change our minds. Stylistics is a non-basic level of general linguistics which deals with functional styles.

A functional style of language is a system of interrelated language means which serves a definite aim in communication<sup>4</sup>. “Style” is the mode of expressing thought in writing or speaking by selecting and arranging words, considered mostly with respect to their clearness and effectiveness. A functional style is thus to be regarded as the product of a certain concrete task set by the sender of the message. A functional style appears mainly in the literary standard of the English language, like that of any other developed language, is not as homogenous as it may seem. In fact the Standard English literary language in the course of its development has fallen into several subsystems each of which has acquired its own peculiarities which are typical of the given style.

There are five major functional styles in the Literary English language. They are:

1. The language of belles-lettres.
2. The language of publicistic literature.
3. The language of newspapers.
4. The language of scientific documents.
5. The language of official documents.

The style of official documents is one of the most types of functional styles in modern English. Sometimes this style is called as “*officialise*” as has already been pointed out, this F.S. is not homogeneous.

---

<sup>4</sup> I.R.Galperin. Stylistics, Moscow: “Higher School”,- 1977.p.32-33

The style of official documents is divided into sub-styles of the language of business documents, legal documents, diplomatic documents and military documents. The aim of the style of official documents is to state conditions binding two parties in an undertaking and to reach agreement between them. There are following sub-styles or variants of the style of official documents.

- 1) The language of business documents
- 2) The language of legal documents
- 3) The language of diplomacy
- 4) The language of military documents

Like other styles of language, this style has a definite communicative aim and accordingly, has its own system of interrelated language and stylistic means. The main aim of this type of communication is to state and citizen, or citizen and citizen, a society and its members (statue ordinance); two or more enterprises governments (pacts, treaties); a person in authority and a subordinate (orders, regulations, instructions, authoritative directives), a board of presidium and on assembly or general meeting (procedures, acts, minutes), etc.

The aim of communication in this style of language is to reach agreement between two contracting parties. Even protest against violations of statues; contracts, regulations etc., can also be regarded as a form by which normal cooperation is sought on the basis of previously attained concordance.

The most general function of the style of official documents predetermines the peculiarities of the style. The most striking, though not the most essential feature is a special system of clichés, terms and set expressions by which each sub-style can easily be recognized.

For example: *provisional agenda, the above mentioned, herein-after-named, on behalf of, private advisory, Dear sir, we remain, your obedient servant* and etc.

In fact each of the subdivisions of this style has its own difference from the corresponding terms, phrases and expressions of other variants of this style. Thus,

in finance we find terms like “*extra revenue, taxable capacities, liability to profit tax*” and etc.

It appears logical to examine the examples of favorite document phrases, which will help ease the way to fuller examination of entire negotiations and contracts. A full glossary is beyond reach but in what follows there is a listing of words and phrases that turn up in great many documents, with comments on each one.

In strong stance one can send back the offending document and request a substitute document in comprehensible English. Otherwise a series of questions may be put by letter, and the replies often will have contractual force if the document is later contested. The words and phrases are presented in plausible contract sequence, not alphabetically.

In legal language, examples are: *to deal with a case; summary procedure; a body of judges, as laid down in.*

Likewise, other varieties of official language have their special nomenclature, which is conspicuous in the text and therefore easily language style.

Besides the special nomenclature characteristic of each variety of the style, there is a feature common to all these varieties – the use of abbreviations, conventional symbols and contractions; for example: *M.P.* (*Member of Parliament*), *\$* (*dollar*), *Ltd* (*limited*) and etc.

There are so many of them that there are special agenda in dictionaries to decode them. Abbreviations are particularly abundant in military documents. Here they are used not only as conventional symbols but as signs of the military code, which is supposed to be known only to the initiated. Examples are: ATAC – Air Transport Auxiliary Service.

Another feature of the style is the use of words in their logical dictionary meaning just as the other matter of fact styles and in contrast intrinsically to the belles-lettres style, there is no room for contextual meanings or for any kind of simultaneous realization of two meanings. In military documents sometimes given

to mountains, rivers, hills, villages but these metaphors are perceived as code of signs and have no aesthetic value, as in:

*“2.102. d. Inf. Div. continues at/c 26 Feb. 45 to captive obis. Spruce peach Cherry and prepares to take over obis Plum and apple after capture by CCB, 5<sup>th</sup> aim. Div.”*

Words with emotive meaning are not to be found in the style of scientific prose. Some words may be found in the style of scientific prose. Some words may be found which reveal the attitude of the writer, his individual evolution of the facts and events of the issue. But no such words are to be found in official style, except those which are used in business letters as conventional phrases of greeting and close, as Dear Sir, yours faithfully.

From the viewpoint of its stylistic structure, the whole document is one sentence. It looks like separate, shaped clauses often divided by commas or semicolons, and not by full stops, often numbered. Every predicate construction begins with a capital letter in the form of a participial or an infinitive construction.

## **1.2. Diplomacy and its historical development throughout the world**

Diplomatic history is an old sub discipline. Having amassed a wealth of information about specific eras or incidents from antiquity onwards, diplomatic historians have failed to forge any strong links with international relations (IR) theorists. Although diplomatic history and international relations have been characterized as “brothers under the skin,”<sup>5</sup> academic parochialism as well as stereotypical and caricatured readings of one another’s subfield has hampered interdisciplinary cross-fertilization. Witness, for example, the lament of one diplomatic historian:

Those with a strong theoretical bent consigned historians to the role of the hewers-of-wood and the drawers-of-water in their world of international relations

---

<sup>5</sup> J.A. Lynn, “Reflections on the History and Theory of Military Innovation and Diffusion,” in Elman and Elman (eds), *Bridges and Boundaries*, p. 363.

theory. The historians were to toil in the archives, constructing detailed case studies on which social scientists were to raise grand explanatory structures that would account for enduring patterns in international relations and that would command the respect of policymakers. Whereas IR theorists have considered their historian colleagues, a theoretical, diplomatic historians have accused IR theorists of being “illusionists rather than scientists because they rig the course before they roll ball.”<sup>6</sup>

Sharing the both an interest in a common subject matter and the experience of marginalization, student of diplomacy, regardless of disciplinary background, ought to draw on each other’s accomplishments. While avoiding stereotypical views of diplomatic historians as “hewers-of-wood and draws-of-water”, we will build on their work. As their story, unlike those of diplomatic historians, will not be told chronologically, we might at this juncture delineate the major epochs of diplomacy, chronicled by diplomatic historians, which will constitute our empirical foundation.

The first historical records of organized polities exchanging envoys date back to the third millennium BC, to the cuneiform civilizations of Mesopotamia. The excavated diplomatic archive of the king of Mari on the Euphrates contains letters from other rulers in the early second millennium BC, and diplomatic records of the Egyptian Hittite empires include correspondence and treaties among kings. The Amarna letters, a remarkable cache of diplomatic documents found at Tell el-Amarna in Egypt in 1887, reveal intensive and sophisticated relations among the polities of the Ancient Near East in the fourteenth-century BC.<sup>7</sup> The Hittite treaties of the thirteen-century BC constitute another valuable source. The Ancient Near East, in short, is the earliest well-documented epoch of diplomacy.

During the first millennium BC, China, India and the Greek city-states developed complex patterns of communication and diplomatic practices. They all

---

<sup>6</sup> C. Elman and M.F. Elman, “Introduction: Negotiating International History and Politics,” in Elman and Elman (eds), *Bridges and Boundaries*, p. 16.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 211.

displayed a pattern of a number of roughly equal independent polities and a shared linguistic and cultural infrastructure. In contrast to the Greek city-states, however, both the Indian and Chinese systems looked back to an idealized empire uniting all the fragmented territories. In view of its organization and longevity, the Roman Empire contributed surprisingly little to the development of diplomacy. It is symptomatic that no major works on diplomatic methods have survived from the Roman period, whereas there are many about military matters. "Rome did not use the diplomacy, as Byzantium was to do, as a means of maintaining its supremacy, but as a means of transacting often very humdrum business, and this may be why it was the methods of managing long-distance legal or commercial business principally within the Empire which were to constitute its more important legacy".<sup>8</sup>

Byzantine diplomacy had a more lasting impact. In its effort to avoid war, Byzantium used a broad range of methods, including bribery, flattery, intelligence-gathering, misinformation and ceremonial manifestations of its superiority. By repeatedly saving the empire from invasion and by attracting many pagan peoples into the orbit of Greco-Roman civilization and Christendom, Byzantine diplomacy was extremely successful. As a result the close relationship between Byzantium and Venice, Byzantine diplomatic traditions were passed on to the East.

Renaissance Italy is generally considered the birthplace of the modern system of diplomacy. The most important innovation was the introduction of permanent embassies and the resident ambassadors. In the sixteenth century, the diplomatic techniques and ideas that emerged in northern Italy with medieval as well as Byzantine origins - spread across the conflict-prone European continent, as sovereigns found the use of complex diplomacy essential to their statecraft.<sup>9</sup>

"Classic" diplomacy was advanced by the French particularly during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It was characterized by elaborate ceremonial,

---

<sup>8</sup> H. Bull, *The Anarchic Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (London: Macmillan, 1977), p. 182.

<sup>9</sup> S. Haber, D.M. Kennedy and S.D. Krasner, "Brothers Under the Skin: Diplomatic History and International Relations," *International Security*, 22 (1997) 34-43.

secrecy and gradual professionalization. The concern about gathering and protecting information in combination with the established practice of conducting negotiations in secret tended to foster excessive secretiveness. In the wake of the First World War, the secretiveness of the “classic” or “old” diplomacy came under heavy criticism, and the entire diplomatic system was held responsible for the failure to prevent the outbreak of war. Demands for a “new” diplomacy became widespread, as epitomized in US President Woodrow Wilson’s call for “open covenants, openly arrived at.” Since then the “newness” and possible “decline” of modern diplomacy have been prominent themes among observers.<sup>10</sup>

Our country also has own old diplomatic history. It is depended on name of Amir Temur. Amir Temur had numerous epistolary and diplomatic exchanges with various European states, especially Spain and France.

Relations between the court of Henry III of Castile and that of Temur played an important part in medieval Spanish Castilian diplomacy. In 1402, the time of battle of Ankara, two Spanish ambassadors were already with Amir Temur: Pelayo de Sotomayor and Fernando de Palazuelos. Later Amir Temur sent to the court of Castile and Leon a Chagatay ambassador named Haji Muhammad al-Qazi with letters and gifts.

In return, Henry III of Castile sent a famous embassy to Amir Temur’s court in Samarkand in 1403-1406 led by Ruy Gonzales de Clavijo with two other ambassadors, Alfanso Palez and Gomez de Salazar. On their return, A.Temur affirmed that he regarded the king of Castile “as his very own son”.

According to Clavijo, Amir Temur’s good treatment of the Spanish delegation contrasted with the disdain shown by his host toward the envoys of the “lord of Cathay”. The Chinese ruler, whose title was “lord of realms of the face of the earth” was called by Temur a “thief and a bad man” and his ambassadors were seated below the Spaniards.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> G.P. Lauren, “Diplomacy: History, Theory, and Policy,” in G.P. Lauren (ed.), *Diplomacy: New Approaches in History, Theory, and Policy*(New York: Free Press, 1979), p. 4.

<sup>11</sup> Narrative of the embassy of Ruy Gonzales de Clavijo to the court of Temur at Samarkand A.D. 1403-1406, p.p.133-134



A. Temur's relations with Europe develop in early 15<sup>th</sup> century, as the Mongol ruler Temur and European monarchs attempted to operate a rapprochement against the expansionist Ottoman Empire. Although the A. Temur had been Muslim since the early 14<sup>th</sup> century, a strong hostility remained between them and the Ottoman Turks as well as the Egyptian Mamluks. Although his self-proclaimed title was ghazi (or "Warrior for Islam"), A. Temur maintained relatively friendly relations with Europe. Europe at the time was threatened by the invading armies of the Ottoman Turks and was desperate for allies.

A. Temur sent an ambassador to the court of Charles VI in the person of Dominican monk Jean, Archbishop of Sultaniya. Jean arrived in Paris on 15 June 1403. A. Temur's letter was delivered to Charles VI, describing him as:

"The most serene, most victorious King and Sultan, the King of the French and many other nations, the friend of Most-High, the very beneficent monarch of the world, who has emerged triumphant from many great wars." – Letter from A. Temur to Charles VI.<sup>12</sup> A. Temur offered an offensive and defensive alliance to Charles VI, as well as the development of commercial relations. Charles VI was only able to send an envoy shortly before A. Temur's death (1405).

A. Temur died in 1405, and his son Shahrukh continued to campaign against the Ottomans, creating hope in the Christian West that the invading Ottoman Empire might be diverted away from Europe.

A Bavarian adventurer, Johann Schiltberger, is known to have remained in the service of A. Temur from 1402 to 1405. Also, numerous Venetian and Genoese traders were active in Sultaniya at that time, since the time of their establishment in Sultaniya under the Il-Khanids.

The next contacts between Europe and Persia would be those of the Venetian traveler Nicola de Conti from 1420 to 1425. Contacts failed to develop much further thereafter, although Spain's desire for rapprochement with the Mongols

---

<sup>12</sup> Atiya, Aziz Suryal, 1938, *The Crusade in the Later Middle Ages*, p.256

remained until the time of Christopher Columbus in 1492, whose objective was to reach the Great Khan in China.

Of course, we also need to add the relatively few, yet quite valuable systematic studies of diplomacy that do exist within the field of international relations. We will discuss some of them in Chapter 2, and draw on them throughout our undertaking.

### **1.3. English as a language of Diplomacy**

The term “language in diplomacy” obviously can be interpreted in several ways. First, as tongue (“mother” tongue or an acquired one), the speech “used by one nation, tribe, or other similar large group of people”; in this sense we can say, for example, that French used to be the predominant diplomatic language in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Second, as a special way of expressing the subtle needs of the diplomatic profession; in this way it can be said, for example, that the delegate of a such and such a country spoke.

Communication is to diplomacy as blood is to the human body. Whenever communication ceases, the body of international politics, the process of diplomacy, is dead, and the result is violent conflict or atrophy. There has never been a good diplomat who was a bad communicator.

Observers and practitioners alike testify to the vital role of communication in diplomacy. In fact, diplomacy is often defined in terms of communication – as “a regulated process of communication” or “the communication system of the international society,” to mention but two examples. “The pristine form of diplomacy,” argues Hedley Bull “is the transmitting of messages between one independent political community and another.” Etymologically, the word “diplomacy” is derived from the Greek verb *diploun*, “to double,” and from the Greek noun *diploma*, which refers to an official document written on double leaves joined together and folded. *Diploma* has the double connotations of a secret

message and an official paper conferring certain rights to the bearer. Symbolic representations of diplomacy, too, tend to highlight its communicative aspects. For instance, the illustrations in Byzantine manuscripts of a scroll handed from a bowing envoy to a seated figure are clear shorthand for an embassy”<sup>13</sup>.

The association of diplomacy with communication goes far back in history. Sixteenth-century theorists argued that the first diplomats were angels, messengers between deities and human beings. Even if modern observers dismiss this notion as “mytho-diplomacy,” we should remember that “in two classical languages, Hebrew and Greek, the words for messenger (‘mal’ach’ in Hebrew and ‘angelos’ in Greek) convey the idea of sacredness as well as of secular mission”<sup>14</sup>. In Ancient Greece Hermes, the divine messengers was the deity of language and diplomacy, and the most prominent diplomatic emissaries, heralds (kerykes), and were regarded as the offspring of Hermes.

In short, diplomats are messengers and diplomacy involves communication between polities. Today the need to communicate is most graphically demonstrated, paradoxically, when diplomatic relations are broken and the parties almost always look for, and find, other ways of communicating. In this chapter we will outline and illustrate a number of pertinent dimensions of the communicative aspects of diplomacy. In doing so, we rely on a perspective on communication that emphasizes its constructive elements. All social communication involves the transmission of messages to which certain meanings are attached. The traditional approach to the study of communication highlights the process, in which senders and receivers encode and decode messages, while treating the meaning of these messages as given. This view of communication is in keeping with our everyday understanding of language, which is structured by a complex “conduit metaphor,” according to which language is a carrier of ideas, thoughts and so on, so that all a listener reader needs to do is to “unpack” the message and “take out” what was

---

<sup>13</sup> M. Mullett, “The Language of Diplomacy,” in J. Shepard and S. Franklin (eds), *Byzantine Diplomacy*(Aldershot: Variorum, 1992), p. 204.

<sup>14</sup> M.J. Reddy, “The Conduit Metaphor – A Case of Frame Conflict in Our Language about Language,” in A. Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).

“in” it. A constructivist approach to communication, by contrast, treats the production and negotiation of meaning as central and problematic. Meaning does not reside in the message itself but is produced in interactive processes. Rather than viewing meaning as an absolute, static concept, constructivists see “signification” as an active process. Context and cognition enter into the production of meaning. In the constructivist perspective, therefore, communication is far from effortless and success is by no means automatic.

Let us first look into different aspects of diplomatic language in its basic meaning - that of a tongue.

1. Obviously, the first problem to solve is finding a common tongue. Diplomats only exceptionally find themselves in the situation to be able to communicate in one language, common to all participants. This may be done between, for example, Germans and Austrians, or Portuguese and Brazilians, or representatives of different Arab countries, or British and Americans, etc. Not only are such occasions rare, but very often there is a serious difference between the same language used in one country and another. There are several ways to overcome the problem of communication between people who speak different mother tongues. None of these ways is ideal. One solution, obviously, is that one of the interlocutors speaks the language of the other. Problems may arise: the knowledge of the language may not be adequate, one side is making a concession and the other has an immediate and significant advantage, there are possible political implications, it may be difficult to apply in multilateral diplomacy, etc. A second possibility is that both sides use a third, neutral, language. A potential problem may be that neither side possesses full linguistic knowledge and control, leading to possible bad misunderstandings. Nevertheless, this method is frequently applied in international practice because of its political advantages. A third formula, using interpreters, is also very widely used, particularly in multilateral diplomacy or for negotiations at a very high political level - not only for reasons of equity, but because politicians and statesmen often do not speak foreign languages.

This method also has disadvantages: it is time consuming, costly, and sometimes inadequate or straightforwardly incorrect (even if the translator has a good knowledge of both languages, he/she may not be familiar with the particular subject which can be extremely specific - from the protection of the ozone layer to the homologation of sports records; it was not without reason that the slogan *traduttore-traditore*, *translator = traitor*, could be found in mediaeval Italy). Finally, there is the possibility of using one international synthetic, artificial language, such as Esperanto; this solution would have many advantages, but unfortunately is not likely to be implemented soon, mostly because of the opposition of factors that dominate in the international political - and therefore also cultural and linguistic - scene. So, which language is the diplomatic one? The answer is not simple at all. To start with, there is no single diplomatic lingua franca that could be inscribed in the above-mentioned catchphrase. In the past there were periods when one language or another served as a common, widely-used means of inter-state communication, although usually limited to certain geographic areas or political groups of countries. Such a role was played by Acadian (Asyrian-Babylonian), by literary Chinese, by Greek "*koin`e*" (a mixture of dialects, based mainly on Ionic and Attic), and later by mediaeval Greek, then Latin, Arabic, Turkish, and yet later by Spanish, Portuguese, Russian, Italian, Dutch, German, French, and recently, more and more, by English. Very often attempts have been made to impose one language or another, with the argumentation that it is "clearer", "more flexible", "more expressive", "more eloquent, subtle or refined", "most suitable for international negotiations", etc. The mere fact that historically such a role has been taken in turns by so many languages proves that linguistic or semantic reasons are not decisive. On the contrary, it can be said that the dominant role of one language or another in diplomacy has resulted from the political, strategic, economic, cultural or other domination of one power or another in international relations. Let's take a very precise example; the linguistic requirements of a counselor in the embassy of a small European country in Vienna.

Obviously, his/her first need is a good knowledge of German, particularly if his professional activity is oriented towards business circles, press, consular work or cultural life. (In the Austrian Foreign Ministry at Ballhausplatz everybody speaks English and many also speak French, but they like very much to hear foreign representatives speaking good German - particularly if it is not the harsh German of northern Germany, but the soft and melodious Austrian German!) However, many diplomats in Vienna have not read my paper and many of them do not speak German. If our colleague wishes to mix freely with other diplomats he will first need English, and possibly also French and Russian as well (depending on the sections of the diplomatic corps he/she is primarily interested in contacting). If his work includes covering the activities of international organizations in Vienna (more than a dozen!), he will definitely need English, while some knowledge of French, Russian, Spanish, and perhaps also Arabic (specifically for the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) would be very useful...not a very simple answer to the first question, is it?! Let's suppose our qualification paper is a well-trained and experienced diplomat, speaking several languages more or less fluently. Which language out of his repertoire should he use in a particular situation? Mechanically, the answer is the language he can speak best. It is logical choice, of course, but professionally not always the wisest one. There are some tactics, even politics, involved in making that decision. Sometime it might be reasonable to use a language which one speaks less perfectly - be it to avoid the maternal tongue of the interlocutor and put him on a more equitable foot, or to avoid a language which might have an undesirable political connotation (for example to speak Hebrew to an Arab - although this language might be your best spoken one!); or to make a gesture of goodwill, courtesy, or a sign of special respect for your partner in conversation or for his country. This is very often done by statesmen arriving on an official visit to a foreign country or by delegates at international conferences saluting the chairman and paying tribute to the host country, when even a few words pronounced in the local language may break the

ice and create a positive atmosphere. The "colleague" from whom we can learn the most in this respect is His Holiness the pope John Paul II, one of the very best polyglots in the entire diplomatic history.

2. The use of language in written diplomatic communication is usually explicitly determined (most often by bilateral agreement). Generally speaking, it is based upon one of the fundamental principles of contemporary international law - the principle of sovereign equality of states. In application of this principle to the linguistic ground there are several formulas - each implemented in a symmetric way: a) each side writes its communications (notes, letters, etc.) in its own language (e.g., the Croatian Ministry in Zagreb, as well as the Croatian Embassy in Budapest, write in Croatian, while the Hungarian Ministry and their Embassy in Zagreb write in Hungarian); b) each side writes in the language of the other side (opposite from practice a); c) the correspondence in each country is conducted in the local language (e.g. both sides in Zagreb correspond in Croatian, while in Budapest they do so in Hungarian); d) both sides use a third, mutually agreed, language - e.g., Russian, French or other. Again, each of these formulas has its advantages, but also its deficiencies.

3. Communication in multilateral diplomacy, of course, is even more complicated, inadequate and costly. Various international organizations and numerous diplomatic conferences try - more or less successfully - to solve the linguistic problem by reducing the innumerable possibilities of intercommunication to a relatively small number of selected languages - so called official or working languages. It is obvious that the growing democratization of international relations results - among other things - in an ever growing number of languages used in multilateral diplomacy. While the idea of the sovereign equality of nations and states, small and large, rich and poor, cannot be questioned, the astronomical cost of interpretation at conferences and translation of an enormous amount of written material for international organizations speaks very much against this aspect of its implementation in practical life. Besides, the use of

interpretation is slow, impersonal, very often incorrect, and sometimes grossly wrong. As an illustration, an almost unbelievable example could be mentioned which concerns nothing less than the very name of the United Nations in different linguistic versions of the world organization's "bible" - its charter. In English, French, and Spanish it is called the "United Nations". In Russian, however, it is named "Organization of the United Nations". The same has been transferred - probably from Russian -to Bulgarian as well. Another phenomenon is well known to all diplomats with experience in the work of international organizations or various other multilateral conferences: delegates who do not speak one of the official or working languages well (or who are simply too self-critical about it) hesitate to take the floor at all, or miss the best moment to do so. Thus, they considerably reduce their own delegation's input and probably also reduce the potential value of the final result of the meeting.

4. Leaving the question of the choice of language aside, we can examine a more substantial aspect of language and diplomacy - the aspect of the message itself, the message contained in every diplomatic communication, oral or written. Oral communication is the quintessence of personal contact, which - in turn - remains the very substance, even the *raison d'etre* of diplomatic work. Written communications, telegraph, telephone, fax, and recently various interactive IT systems (Minitel, Internet, electronic mail, etc.) are undoubtedly extremely useful and often much faster and more efficient than personal contacts, but they cannot and probably for a long time shall not be able to substitute for a friendly, confidential chat over a cup of coffee. Every verbal discourse, be it a simple chat, conversation, exchange of views, formal diplomatic *démarche*, official negotiation or any other form, basically is a dialogue, and therefore consists of speaking and listening to the other person. Speaking is the use of words, linking them into sentences, and then arranging the sentences in a logical order; in addition, it includes accentuation of some words or emphasis of particular parts of a sentence. Oral communication also includes a number of "side effects", such as tone of voice



(friendly, solemn, confidential, menacing, nonchalant, etc.), pauses between words or sentences, order in which different parts of the message presented, gesticulation, face mimic, are smiling and so on. The choice of the right words is extremely important in diplomacy. Through the centuries a very carefully balanced, restrained, moderate vocabulary has been developed, ensuring a particular way of refined control over nuances in the meaning of words - both when agreeing with one's interlocutor (but taking care not to give the impression of undue enthusiasm!) as well as in rejecting his views (again with fitting concern to avoid undesired offence). When a diplomat interprets his interlocutor's language and even single words used in a dialogue or correspondence, he always starts from the presumption that the choice of words and phrasing has been conscientious and deliberate. Nobody should nor indeed does assume that the words used are the result of insufficient knowledge of a language, inadequate translation or even less - a momentary bad mood! Knowing that the text will be scrutinized in such a way, the speaker or writer has to be accordingly careful about the formulations he uses. This is more sensitive when preparing a written text since it cannot be softened or corrected once it has been sent out, while in conversation - if the reaction of the other side is negative - one can always say "Let me explain..." or "In other words..." and then declare something completely different from the original version. Words are bricks from which sentences are made. Each sentence should be a wound-up thought. If one wants to be clear, and particularly when using a language which he does not master perfectly, it is better to use short, simple sentences. On the contrary, if one wishes to camouflage his thoughts or even not say anything specific, it can be well achieved by using a more complicated style, complex sentences, digressions, interrupting one's own flow of thought and introducing new topics. One may leave the impression of being a little confused, but the basic purpose of withholding the real answer can be accomplished. One of the typical characteristics of "diplomatic" language is a certain subdued tone, some kind of understatement. It is correct to say that the real weight of words and terms

in diplomatic professional jargon is much stronger than those same words in "normal" everyday speech. Just a few examples: the assistant minister of foreign affairs invites the ambassador of a neighboring country late in the afternoon to his office and expresses the "concern of his government over reporting in the ambassador's country's press which is not in harmony with the existing friendly relations between the two countries." Translated to standard language this means "we believe that your government is encouraging unfriendly, even hostile, press against our country and in doing so you have passed the limits and I must warn you that we shall not tolerate it anymore." The fact that the ambassador has been summoned to the ministry after office hours indicates that the local authorities consider the matter to be urgent and even beyond the regular framework of bilateral relations. If the minister adds that "he is afraid that the continuation of such practices might reflect negatively on relations between the two countries", it means that these relations are already disrupted (quite evidently, otherwise there would be neither unfriendly press nor sharp reactions on the other side), so that one could expect the postponement of an already agreed bilateral visit or signing of a bilateral cooperation agreement. If the minister even says he is afraid that "his government will not be able to control outbursts of anger in the media or restrain the feeling in the parliament anymore" the ambassador would not make a mistake in interpreting it as an announcement of a broad hostile campaign against his country, probably even of a fierce parliamentary debate with an utmost unfriendly charge. There are several specialized types of diplomatic language in various fields of diplomatic activity - for the redaction of *communiqués* ("atmosphere of friendliness", "closeness of views", "complete openness", etc.), for negotiations (hence the difference between so-called soft and hard negotiators - although I recognize only the distinction between *good and bad ones!*), for unofficial contacts outside of official premises and for informal occasions, for participation in international conferences, for the conclusion of international treaties, etc<sup>15</sup>. There

---

<sup>15</sup> E. Satow, *Satow's Guide to Diplomatic Practice*, 5th edn, ed. Lord Gore-Booth (London and New York: Longman, 1979), p. 38.

are many other aspects - both linguistic or semantic and also metaphoric - of the use of language in diplomacy.

After reviewing the significance of language to diplomacy, we out-line the basic aspects of diplomatic communication, the gathering and transmission of information – diplomats as the “eyes and ears” and the “mouthpieces” of governments. Next we turn to negotiations, processes of back-and-forth communication, as key instruments to solve issues in ways acceptable to the involved polities. We will identify two important dimensions of choice or options in the diplomatic repertoire: verbal vs. nonverbal communication, and private vs. public communication. Finally, we will focus on technological developments as vehicles of change in diplomatic communication.

We need to be reminded that the very word “communication” derives from the Latin verb *communicare*, which means “to make shared or common.” The problem of achieving shared meanings has been central to diplomatic communication throughout the ages. Diplomacy usually involves communication among polities that are separated by different languages. The search for shared meanings is then facilitated by the existence of a common diplomatic language. The notion of a common language has two different connotations: language in a purely linguistic sense, and language in a broader sociological sense.

The linguistic aspect may seem trivial but has to be taken seriously. Since the dawn of history, the use of different languages in international communication has been a source of misunderstanding and discord. To mention but one early example: Artaxerxes of Achaemenid Persia sent to Sparta a special messenger, named Artaphernes, with a complaint that he was unable to understand the many ambassadors who had been dispatched to his court, and urged the Spartans to choose someone who could speak plainly and be understood by him. Of interest, perhaps, is the highly complicated method involved in the transmittal of the above communication: it was prepared in Aramaic, written in Assyrian script, and in order to be acted upon by the Spartans required translation into Greek. Thus, there

has always been a tendency toward developing a lingua franca of diplomacy. Sumerian, the first known linguistic medium of culture and civilization in the Tigris–Euphrates valley, may be considered the “earliest language of diplomatic intercourse and expression.” From the third millennium BC Akkadian, a rather peripheral Semitic language, became the recognized diplomatic language. It is puzzling that Akkadian was adopted as the diplomatic language by kings as powerful and different as the Egyptian, the Babylonian, the Hurrian, the Hittite or the Elamite. Even though Akkadian was not such a dominant language as Egyptian, Hebrew or Phoenician, it had certain advantages that allowed it to remain the diplomatic lingua franca until the time of Alexander the Great. Akkadian, like Sumerian, used cuneiform script that could be easily used by speakers of other tongues. Egyptian scripts, by contrast, were intended for the use of Egyptian only. In addition, Akkadian had some technical advantages as a diplomatic language. Here is no denying that an impression left by a stylus on soft clay tablets rapidly drying in the sun was more usable and versatile for the keeping of records than hieroglyphs carved on stone or wood. Furthermore, it was obviously much easier to transport and storage tablets made of dried or baked clay than tablets made of rock and ebony. In fact, the use of clay tablets for cuneiform writing spread to the most remote parts of the ancient world and became the mainstay of the Cretan–Minoan civilization of prehistoric Greece. When Akkadian ceased to exist as a living language, it was superseded by Aramaic as the leading diplomatic language. The native tongue of the Arameans in Syria, Aramaic made its way into the polyglot society of Persia and became a lingua franca along the caravan routes of the desert. The great advantage of Aramaic was that, by the tenth-century BC, it had adopted the best writing technique hitherto known to mankind – the alphabet.

Greek, and later Latin, became common diplomatic languages in the wake of expanding empires. Chinese, like Akkadian script, had the quality of being understood by speakers of different tongues and was thus useful as the diplomatic

language for empire-building in Asia<sup>16</sup>. The choice between Greek and Latin became an issue in Byzantine diplomacy. By the end of the sixth century, Constantinople abandoned Latin and used only Greek as the language of diplomacy, whereas Latin dominated in Rome. Without skillful translation, mutual incomprehension could occur. As the written language of not only the Roman Empire but also of its successor, the Holy Roman Empire, and of the Roman Catholic Church, Latin eventually became the natural language of European diplomacy. Most treaties were written in Latin, and Latin was used in conversations between diplomats. Letters between rulers of the Franks, Longboards and other successor kingdoms were written in Latin. Moreover, these letters continued to use the “rhetoric appropriate for the late Roman letters of state.” By and large, it was this rhetoric, evoking the unity of the former Roman Empire that “bound the sub-Roman world in east and west into a common orbit.”

By 1600, command of conversational Latin began to be rare among European diplomats, and negotiations through interpreters became common. No other common language of diplomacy arose until the eighteenth century, when French became the language of the European nobility and, by implication, the diplomatic language par preference. The French language, argues Nicolson, “is better adapted than any other to an intercourse requiring the perfect fusion of courtesy with precision.”

There were efforts in the nineteenth century to make English a rival. For instance, in 1800 Lord Grenville conducted his relations with foreign diplomats accredited to the Court of St. James in English instead of French. British Foreign Secretary George Canning in 1826 instructed his diplomats to use English in official international relations. And Lord Palmerston in 1851 insisted that every country was entitled to use its own language in official communications. But it was the multilateral conferences of the twentieth century that “offered the English language the first real opportunity to oppose French linguistic supremacy.” Only in

---

<sup>16</sup> B. Lafont, “International Relations in the Ancient Near East: The Birth of a Complete Diplomatic System,” *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, 12 (2001) 43.

the aftermath of the First World War did English emerge as one of two languages of diplomacy.

The predominance of French as the official language of diplomacy suffered a severe setback at the Paris Peace Conference following World War I, where two of the Big Four – Wilson and Lloyd George – could not speak the language, and Clemenceau could speak English as well as French. Much of the discussion therefore took place in English. Following the Conference, with the establishment of the League of Nations, English was elevated to the stature of French as a coordinate language of diplomacy.

While English has increasingly become the lingua franca of diplomatic and most other professional communication, the multitude of languages continues to represent challenges to diplomats and opportunities for interpreters.

Multilateral diplomacy has added to the linguistic problems; “unilateralism in diplomatic language is a thing of the past.” Yet it has also generated creative solutions. For instance, a constructive distinction between working languages and official languages was introduced at the 1945 San Francisco Conference. Then English, Russian, Chinese, French and Spanish were granted the status of official languages of the conference, whereas only English and French were accepted as working languages.

Sometimes linguistic variety can be an asset rather than a liability. When the Ukrainian leader Leonid Kuchma appeared uninvited at the NATO summit in Prague in November 2002, he created an acute diplomatic crisis. If he were to be placed in alphabetical order following the English spelling of participating countries, the controversial Kuchma, who was suspected of providing Iraq with radar equipment, would sit next to US President George W. Bush and UK Premier Tony Blair. The embarrassing situation was solved by changing to French, whereby USA became Etats Unis, United Kingdom Royaume Uni, and Kuchma

ended up between the Turkish president and EU High Commissioner Javier Solana<sup>17</sup>.

Language, in sum, may contribute to – but is by no means the sole source of – communication problems in diplomacy. Successful communication requires more than a mutually understood language. According to semioticians, it presupposes a common code, a certain (often unconscious) pre knowledge that is necessary for understanding a message. A common code establishes what German hermeneutic philosophers call Interpretations *gemeinschaft*, initial commonality with respect to interpretation. Later-day followers of Jürgen Habermas use the term “life world” to denote “the linguistically acquired and organized stock of patterns of understanding.” Whatever the label, diplomatic communication rests on such intersubjective structures of meaning and collective understanding. This harks back to what we referred to as the first, cognitive level of institutionalization in Chapter 3, and is in line with the constructivist perspective on communication, alluded to earlier, which treats the meaning of messages as the result of interactive processes.

In fact, we may think of diplomats as “intuitive semioticians,” as conscious producers and interpreters of signs. Although semiotics is rarely part of their formal education, diplomats are by training and experience experts at weighing words and gestures with a view to their effect on potential receivers. We may also be reminded that hermeneutics, the science of interpretation, is explicitly associated with Hermes, the Ancient Greek deity of diplomacy.

As shown, the institutionalization of diplomacy has involved the development of a common language with ritualized phrases, which have allowed cross-cultural communication with a minimum of unnecessary misunderstanding. The diplomatic dialogue, therefore, can be seen to be based on a code that is shared by members of the diplomatic community. Courtesy, non-redundancy and constructive ambiguity are prominent features of diplomatic language. The salience of courteous, nondramatic phrases led the American writer Caskie Stinnett to characterize a

---

<sup>17</sup> Ostrower, *Language, Law, and Diplomacy*, p. 408.

diplomat as “a person who can tell you to go to hell in such a way that you actually look forward to the trip.” The principle of non-redundancy means that “a diplomatic communication should say neither too much nor too little because every word, nuance of omission will be meticulously studied for any shade of meaning”<sup>18</sup>. Another ironic characterization of a diplomat is thus a person who “thinks twice before saying nothing.” Constructive ambiguity avoids premature closure of options. Circumlocution, such as understatements and loaded omissions, permits controversial things to be said in a way understood in the diplomatic community but without needless provocation.

Among the diplomatic languages English is the most popular; it is the first choice amongst the masses and the elite alike. In addition to the 375 million native speakers, it has been suggested that 1.1 billion people know English as a second or foreign language, outnumbering the native speakers by 3 to 1. 51 % of Europeans speak English as their native or as a foreign language. With a great tolerance for linguistic variations, English as a global language has become the language of power and prestige and thereby an international gate-keeper to social and economic progress. The current dominance of English as a world language is undisputed. It plays an official or working role in most international organizations.

English has replaced French as the lingua franca of diplomacy since World War II. The rise of English in diplomacy began in 1919, in the aftermath of World War I, when the Treaty of Versailles was written in English as well as in French, the dominant language used in diplomacy at that time. The widespread use of English was further advanced by the prominent international role played by English-speaking nations (i.e. The United States and the Commonwealth of Nations) in the aftermath of World War II, particularly in the establishment and organization of the United Nations and the development of the Internet. English is one of the six official languages of the UN and, along with French, one of its two working languages (the others are Arabic, Chinese, Russian, and Spanish). English

---

<sup>18</sup> James, “Diplomacy and International Society,” p. 942.



is the current lingua franca of international business, science, technology, and aviation.

The modern trend to use English outside of English-speaking countries has a number of sources. In the latter half of the 20th century, its widespread use was mostly due to the military, economic, and cultural dominance of the United States of America. English is also regarded by some as an unofficial global lingua franca owing to the economic, cultural, and geopolitical power of most of the developed Western nations in world financial and business institutions. The de facto status of English as the lingua franca in these countries has carried over globally as a result. English is also overwhelmingly dominant in scientific and technological communications, and all of the world's major scientific journals are published in English. English is also the lingua franca of international Air Traffic Control communications.

Talking about the history of diplomatic language it is very important to say that from the 17<sup>th</sup> century to 20<sup>th</sup>, French was the main language of international relations. In this context in 1539, François the First passed an important ordinance in the history of the French language: The Villers-Cotterêts Ordinance decreed that all French administrative documents must be in French. This ordinance was a crucial turning point in the French language, making it an official language and creating a sense of nationalism within the country. From 1550 through the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when France was the leading European power, the French language flourished and was spoken throughout the world. For this reason, French became known as a language of diplomacy and international relations in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. French was widely used in international diplomacy for two main reasons: first, because France used to be a huge political power. It was commonly used in the whole of Europe from the 18<sup>th</sup> century, with the reign of Louis XIV. Later, Napoleon "helped" the language spread even further. The use of French in international treaties declined with the emergence of the USA after the First World War; in fact, the Treaty of Versailles was written both in English and in French.

The second main reason is that it is the language of clarity and precision: it uses many determiners, adverbs, conjunctions, and the like to link parts of sentences and clarify their relationships. This links very well with the "*foisonnement*" (expansion) phenomenon in translation from English to French, with the French translation being on average 15% longer than the source text. Conversely, English is more likely to create ambiguity and its concision can be seen as bluntness, which was described in the programed as "the enemy of polite discourse"<sup>19</sup>. Nowadays, despite the French language losing much of its prestige, the language of English diplomacy is still haunted by a few French ghosts, here and there: regime, coup, etiquette, rapprochement and others.

The term "language of diplomacy" obviously can be interpreted in several ways. In this sense, the use of language in diplomacy is of major importance, since language is not a simple tool, vehicle for transmission of thoughts, or instrument of communication, but often the very essence of the diplomatic vocation, and that has been so from the early beginnings of our profession. That is why from early times the first envoys of the Egyptian pharaohs, Roman legates, mediaeval Dubrovnik consuls, etc., had to be educated and trained people, well-spoken and polyglots.

Let us first look into different aspects of diplomatic language in its basic meaning – that of a tongue. Obviously, the first problem to solve is finding a common tongue. Diplomats only exceptionally find themselves in the situation of being able to communicate in one language, common to all participants. This may be done between, for example, Germans and Austrians, or Portuguese and Brazilians, or representatives of different Arab countries, or Britishers and Americans, etc. Not only are such occasions rare, but very often there is a serious difference between the "same" language used in one country and another.

There are several ways to overcome the problem of communication between people who speak different mother tongues. None of these is ideal. One solution, obviously, is that one of the interlocutors speaks the language of the other.

---

<sup>19</sup> Eban, *The New Diplomacy*, p. 336.

Problems may arise: the knowledge of the language may not be adequate, one side is making a concession and the other has an immediate and significant advantage, there are possible political implications, it may be difficult to apply in multilateral diplomacy, etc. A second possibility is that both sides use a third, neutral, language. A potential problem may be that neither side possesses full linguistic knowledge and control, leading to possible serious misunderstandings. Nevertheless, this method is frequently applied in international practice because of its political advantages. A third formula, using interpreters, is also very widely used, particularly in multilateral diplomacy or for negotiations at a very high political level - not only for reasons of equity, but because politicians and statesmen often do not speak foreign languages. This method also has disadvantages: it is time consuming, costly, and sometimes inadequate or straightforwardly incorrect (even if the translator has a good knowledge of both languages, he/she may not be familiar with the particular subject which can be extremely specific – from the protection of the ozone layer to the homologation of sports records; it was not without reason that the slogan *traduttore-traditore* ‘translator = traitor’, was found in mediaeval Italy). Finally, there is the possibility of using one international synthetic, artificial language, such as Esperanto; this solution would have many advantages, but unfortunately is not likely to be implemented in the near future, mostly because of the opposition of factors that dominate in the international political – and therefore also cultural and linguistic – scene.

So, which language is the best choice for diplomatic use? The answer is not simple at all. To start with, there is no single diplomatic lingua franca that could be inscribed in the above-mentioned catchphrase. In the past there were periods when one language or another served as a common, widely-used means of inter-state communication, although usually limited to certain geographic areas or political groups of countries. Such a role was played by Acadian (Asyrian-Babylonian), by literary Chinese, by Greek "*koin`e*" (a mixture of dialects, based mainly on Ionic

and Attic), and later by mediaeval Greek, then Latin, Arabic, Turkish, and yet later by Spanish, Portuguese, Russian, Italian, Dutch, German, French, and recently, more and more, by English. Very often attempts have been made to impose one language or another, with the argumentation that it is "clearer", "more flexible", "more expressive", "more eloquent, subtle or refined", "most suitable for international negotiations", etc. The mere fact that historically such a role has been taken in turns by so many languages proves that linguistic or semantic reasons are not decisive. On the contrary, it can be said that the dominant role of one language or another in diplomacy has resulted from the political, strategic, economic, cultural or other domination of one power or another in international relations.

Let's consider a very precise example: the linguistic requirements of diplomats in the Permanent Representations of the Council of Europe. Obviously, diplomats first need a good knowledge of French, particularly if their professional activity is oriented towards social circles, press, consular work or cultural life. If diplomat wishes to mix freely with other diplomats he will first need English, and possibly also German and Russian as well (depending on the sections of the diplomatic corps they are primarily interested in contacting).

The use of language in written diplomatic communication is usually explicitly determined (most often by bilateral agreement). Generally speaking, it is based upon one of the fundamental principles of contemporary international law - the principle of sovereign equality of states. In application of this principle to the linguistic ground there are several formulas - each implemented in a symmetrical way:

- a) each side writes its communications (notes, letters, etc.) in its own language (e.g., the Croatian Ministry in Zagreb, as well as the Croatian Embassy in Budapest, write in Croatian, while the Hungarian Ministry and their Embassy in Zagreb write in Hungarian);
- b) each side writes in the language of the other side (opposite from practice a);

c) the correspondence in each country is conducted in the local language (e.g. both sides in Zagreb corresponds in Croatian, while in Budapest they do so in Hungarian);

d) both sides use a third, mutually agreed, language - e.g., Russian, French or other. Again, each of these formulas has its advantages, but also its deficiencies.

Communication in multilateral diplomacy, of course, is even more complicated, inadequate, and costly. Various international organizations and numerous diplomatic conferences try – more or less successfully – to solve the linguistic problem by reducing the innumerable possibilities of intercommunication to a relatively small number of selected languages - so called official or working languages.

It is obvious that the growing democratization of international relations results, among other things, in an ever growing number of languages used in multilateral diplomacy. While the idea of the sovereign equality of nations and states, small and large, rich and poor, cannot be questioned, the astronomical cost of interpretation at conferences and translation of an enormous amount of written material for international organizations speaks very much against this aspect of its implementation in practical life. Furthermore, the use of interpretation is slow, impersonal, very often incorrect, and sometimes grossly wrong. As an illustration, an almost unbelievable example could be mentioned which concerns nothing less than the very name of the United Nations in different linguistic versions of the world organization's "bible" – its charter. In English, French, and Spanish it is called the "United Nations". In Russian, however, it is named "Organization of the United Nations". The same has been transferred, probably from Russian, to Bulgarian as well.

Another phenomenon is well known to all diplomats with experience in the work of international organizations or various other multilateral conferences: delegates who do not speak one of the official or working languages well (or who are simply too self-critical about it) hesitate to take the floor at all, or miss the best

moment to do so. Thus, they considerably reduce their own delegation's input and probably also reduce the potential value of the final result of the meeting. Leaving the question of the choice of language aside, we can examine a more substantial aspect of language and diplomacy – the aspect of the message itself, the message contained in every diplomatic communication, oral or written.

Oral communication is the quintessence of personal contact, which, in turn, remains the very substance, even the *raison d'être* of diplomatic work. Written communications, telegraph, telephone, fax, and recently various interactive IT systems (Minitel, Internet, electronic mail, etc.) are undoubtedly extremely useful and often much faster and more efficient than personal contacts, but they cannot and probably for a long time shall not be able to substitute for a friendly, confidential chat over a cup of coffee.

Every verbal discourse, be it a simple chat, conversation, exchange of views, formal diplomatic *démarche*, official negotiation, or any other form, basically is a dialogue, and therefore consists of speaking and listening to the other person. Speaking includes accentuation of some words or emphasis of particular parts of a sentence. Oral communication also involves a number of "side effects", such as tone of voice (friendly, solemn, confidential, menacing, nonchalant, etc.), pauses between words or sentences, the order in which different parts of the message are presented, gesticulation, facial miming, smiling and so on.

The choice of the right words is extremely important in diplomacy. Through the centuries a very carefully balanced, restrained, moderate vocabulary has been developed, ensuring a particular way of refined control over nuances in the meaning of words - both when agreeing with one's interlocutor (but taking care not to give the impression of undue enthusiasm!) as well as in rejecting their views (again with fitting concern to avoid undesired offence).

When a diplomat interprets their interlocutor's language and even single words used in a dialogue or correspondence, they always start from the presumption that the choice of words and phrasing has been conscientious and

deliberate. Nobody should, nor indeed does, assume that the words used are the result of insufficient knowledge of a language, inadequate translation or, even less, a momentary bad mood! Knowing that the text will be scrutinized in such a way, the speaker or writer has to be accordingly careful about the formulations used. This is more sensitive when preparing a written text since it cannot be softened or corrected once it has been sent out, while in conversation, if the reaction of the other side is negative, one can always say "Let me explain..." or "In other words..." and declare something completely different from the original version.

Words are bricks from which sentences are made. Each sentence should be a wound-up thought. If one wants to be clear, and particularly when using a language which one does not master perfectly, it is better to use short, simple sentences. On the contrary, if one wishes to camouflage one thoughts or even not say anything specific, it can be well achieved by using a more complicated style, complex sentences, digressions, interrupting one's own flow of thought and introducing new topics. One may leave the impression of being a little confused, but the basic purpose of withholding the real answer can be accomplished.

One of the typical characteristics of "diplomatic" language is a certain subdued tone, some kind of understatement. It is correct to say that the real weight of words and terms in diplomatic professional jargon is much stronger than those same words in "normal" everyday speech. Just a few examples: the assistant minister of foreign affairs invites the ambassador of a neighboring country late in the afternoon to his office and expresses the "concern of his government over reporting in the ambassador's country's press which is not in harmony with the existing friendly relations between the two countries. "Translated to standard language, this means "we believe that your government is encouraging unfriendly, even hostile, press against our country and in doing so you have passed the limits and I must warn you that we shall not tolerate it anymore." The fact that the ambassador has been summoned to the ministry after office hours indicates that the local authorities consider the matter to be urgent and even beyond the regular

framework of bilateral relations. If the minister adds that "he is afraid that the continuation of such practices might reflect negatively on relations between the two countries", it means that these relations are already disrupted (quite evidently, otherwise there would be neither unfriendly press nor sharp reactions on the other side), so that one could expect the postponement of an already agreed bilateral visit or signing of a bilateral cooperation agreement. If the minister states that he is afraid that "his government will not be able to control outbursts of anger in the media or restrain feelings in the parliament anymore" the ambassador would not make a mistake in interpreting it as an announcement of a broad hostile campaign against his country, probably even of a fierce parliamentary debate with an utmost unfriendly charge.

There are several specialized formulations in the diplomatic language used in various fields of diplomatic activity, such as for the redaction of communiqués— "atmosphere of friendliness", "closeness of views", "complete openness", etc. – for negotiations (hence the difference between so-called soft and hard negotiators, although I recognize only the distinction between good and bad ones!), for unofficial contacts outside of official premises and for informal occasions, for participation in international conferences, for the conclusion of international treaties, etc.

So language as a system may figuratively be depicted as exploiter of language in action. All rules and patterns of language which are collected and classified in works of grammar, phonetics, lexicology and stylistics first appear in language in action, whence they are generalized and framed as rules and patterns of language as a system.

At the beginning of our work we want to do some sketches on stylistics and its subject matter. Stylistics seems to be a new subject matter in general linguistics, but, if we deal with it thoroughly, we change our minds. Stylistics is a non-basic level of general linguistics which deals with functional styles.



The term “language in diplomacy” obviously can be interpreted in several ways. First, as tongue (“mother” tongue or an acquired one), the speech “used by one nation, tribe, or other similar large group of people”; in this sense we can say, for example, that French used to be the predominant diplomatic language in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Second, as a special way of expressing the subtle needs of the diplomatic profession; in this way it can be said, for example, that the delegate of a such and such a country spoke.

Communication is to diplomacy as blood is to the human body. Whenever communication ceases, the body of international politics, the process of diplomacy, is dead, and the result is violent conflict or atrophy. There has never been a good diplomat who was a bad communicator.

When a diplomat interprets their interlocutor's language and even single words used in a dialogue or correspondence, they always start from the presumption that the choice of words and phrasing has been conscientious and deliberate. Nobody should, nor indeed does, assume that the words used are the result of insufficient knowledge of a language, inadequate translation or, even less, a momentary bad mood! Knowing that the text will be scrutinized in such a way, the speaker or writer has to be accordingly careful about the formulations used.

## **CHAPTER II. EXTRA-LINGUISTIC AND LINGUISTIC ASPECTS OF DIPLOMACY**

### **2.1. Extra-linguistic aspects of the language of Diplomacy**

At the most simplistic level, a diplomat acts as a representative of his or her home country. Diplomats usually live in a country different from their home one and work as a delegate for and representative of their home country in votes and activities. This means that they are responsible for understanding the culture in which they live as a diplomat but they must always work to keep the best interests of their home country in mind.

Diplomats serve as delegates for the United Nations. They are expected to represent the views and standpoints of their home country, and therefore must vote on issues accordingly. They work with other ambassadors to pass legislation that will bring positive change to all countries involved. Diplomats are responsible for understanding the world's key issues. Another major part of the diplomat's role is his or her reporting function. Because diplomats serve on different administrative bodies and committees, they must gather lots of facts and regularly report back to their home country. Their home government then makes important decisions based on this information.

So in this Chapter we intended to speak the important points of extra-linguistic aspects of diplomacy and depend on with language.

The task of diplomacy is to follow, promote and maintain international relations, to eliminate and settle misunderstandings and problems which have arisen in relations between subjects of international relations and international law in general. Like any organization or society which has to function according to certain rules, the same is true of relations between states where it is necessary to ensure that their contacts and cooperation are in accordance with a number of universally accepted rules and customs, and within the framework of pre-planned

arrangements. These rules have changed, been upgraded and improved with new knowledge and customs, and have become generally accepted, thus forming an international diplomatic protocol.

Few things are as anxiety provoking for the first-time embassy or mission employee or family member as the notion of diplomatic protocol<sup>20</sup>. Protocol can sound both stuffy and mysterious at the same time; and most of us believe we have had little experience in our non-government lives to prepare us. In fact, the rules and processes of diplomatic protocol are based in pragmatic thinking, common sense, and good manners — areas where we all have had some experience.

### **Protocol**

Protocol is not an end in and of itself. Rather, it is a means by which people of all cultures can relate to each other. It allows them the freedom to concentrate on their contributions to society, both personal and professional. Protocol is, in effect, the frame for the picture rather than the content of it. Protocol is a rule which describes how an activity should be performed, especially in the field of diplomacy. In diplomatic services and governmental fields of endeavor protocols are often unwritten guidelines. Protocol specify the proper and generally accepted behavior in matters of state and diplomacy, such as showing appropriate respect to a head of state, ranking diplomats in chronological order of their accreditation at court and so on. One definition is: **Protocol** is commonly described as a set of international courtesy rules. These well-established and time-honored rules have made it easier for nations and people to live and work together. Part of protocol has always been the acknowledgement of the hierarchical standing of all present. Protocol rules are based on the principles of civility.

There are two meanings of the word *protocol*. In the legal sense, it is defined as an international agreement that supplements or amends of treaty. In the diplomatic sense, the term refers to the set of rules, procedures, conventions and ceremonies that relate to relations between states. In general protocol represents

---

<sup>20</sup> R. Numelin, *The Beginnings of Diplomacy: A Sociological Study of Inter-tribal and International Relations*(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950), p. 227.

the recognized and generally accepted system of international courtesy. Protocol is an important part of diplomatic practice linked with history, royalty, religion, culture and language. Protocol involves etiquette on a local and international scale, and the practice of good manners on a daily basis. It evolved as a result of old traditions, when in the early days civilization hospitality was extended to an arriving guest. Today it is a particularly important because it not only covers the ceremonial rules that are followed during official functions and how to behave on these special occasions, but it also provides a set of established rules of courteousness that are to be respected in society.

### **International Culture**

At gatherings that include representatives from the host country as well as from other countries, the timeless formality of international diplomatic culture remains in place. It ensures that each country will be respected uniformly and without bias. The necessary respect is expressed most visibly through spoken courtesies. Below are some tips on how to address and introduce diplomatic representatives.

### **Addressing Others**

Although guidelines exist, proper forms of address vary greatly from culture to culture. Be sure to check local customs, but a few general rules follow. The spirit of formality among diplomatic representatives usually means not addressing others by their first names as quickly as is done in the United States. One should rely on courtesy titles until invited to do otherwise. Socially, one can refer to a spouse by his/her first name or as "my husband" or "my wife" rather than as "Mr./Mrs. Smith." When dealing with household employees however, you should still refer to your spouse as "Mr. /Mrs. Smith." "Ambassadors are addressed as Mr. /Madam Ambassador or Ambassador Jones. Only by special invitation or long friendship should one address an ambassador by first name and then only when not in the public eye. In indirect address, refer to the ambassador as "the ambassador", with his/her spouse as "the ambassador and Mr. /Mrs. Jones," or if the

ambassador's spouse is a woman who kept her maiden name after marriage, "the ambassador and his wife, Ms. Smith." An ambassador of the United States may continue to be addressed as "Mr. /Madam Ambassador" after retirement or after returning from his/her duties abroad. In some French-speaking countries, the wife of the ambassador may be referred to as Madam Ambassador<sup>21</sup>. Therefore, in those countries, refer to a female ambassador by her last name (Ambassador Jones) to avoid confusion and ensure that she receives her due respect. Those of rank below Ambassador are addressed as Mr., Ms. or Mrs., if marital status is known. When referring to a U.S. post, "the Embassy of the United States of America" is preferred over "the American Embassy." As references to America can be ambiguous, especially in the Western Hemisphere, avoid using terms such as "American ambassador" or "American citizen". Similarly, to be clear and to avoid offending others by suggesting that the U.S. Constitutes the entire continent use "United States" in all references to this country.

### **Introductions**

The purpose of making introductions is to exchange names between people so that a conversation can follow. For a formal occasion, the traditional "Mrs. Smith, may I present Mr. Jones?" is used internationally. For less formal occasions simply stating the two names, "Mrs. Smith, Mr. Jones," is acceptable. Making personal introductions (i.e., introducing one) is perfectly acceptable and encouraged. Adding context about yourself and your role is helpful. For example, "Hello, I'm Jane Smith, Vice Consul at the United States Embassy." In English, the accepted, formal response to any introduction is, "How do you do?" Informally, a smile, "Hello," or, "It's nice to meet you," are fine. Other languages have very particular phrases, so be sure to learn them upon arriving at post.

When making introductions, honor is recognized by the name spoken first. Courtesy gives honor to those who are older, higher in rank, titled, have a professional status, or are female. To make the introductions more pleasant, tell

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Jönsson, "Diplomatic Signaling in the Amarna Letters," p. 203.

each individual a bit of information about the other. This encourages the conversation to continue. As they do when a woman enters the room, men should rise when being introduced to a woman.

In some countries, a man kisses a married woman's hand. Men also rise when being introduced to another man. Women should rise when being introduced to another woman for whom she wishes to show great respect, such as the hostess, a very distinguished woman, or much older woman. In some countries, women rise when introduced to all others.

Throughout the world, greeting and leave-taking customs may include handshakes, salutatory gestures or other specific expressions. If there is such a tradition, use it with host country nationals, foreigners and fellow staff members. Failure to abide with tradition may be interpreted as rudeness or a lack of respect for colleagues.

The best and most courteous way to handle recognizing someone without recalling his or her name is to mention your name again. For example, "Good evening, I'm Jim Smith. We met recently at the ambassador's home. I'm pleased to see you again." More than likely, he/she will reintroduce himself/herself. Starting from the assumption that he/she may also not remember your name could save both of you potential embarrassment.

### **Titles**

Forms of address for foreign government officials and people holding professional, ecclesiastical, or traditional titles vary among countries. The correct local usage can be verified at post. Following are titles for U.S. and some foreign officials that are widely used in both spoken and written address. It is appropriate to begin letters and refer to others directly and indirectly with the following titles.

## **Diplomatic Titles<sup>22</sup>**

### **Chiefs of Mission**

- Mr. /Madam Ambassador (this also applies to an ambassador with a military title), or
- Ambassador Reed.\*
- Sir Richard—British ambassador who is a knight (Sir Richard's wife would be addressed as "Lady Smith.")
- Lord Montgomery—British ambassador who is a baron
- Mr./Mrs. Douglas or Ms. Williams—the ambassador's spouse

### **Chargé d'Affaires**

- Mr./Ms./Mrs./Madam Randal

### **Ministers and Others**

- Mr./Madam Taylor

Special note should be made of how to address ambassadors. Over the years, and recently as well, there has been discussion about the use of the honorific title of Ambassador by former ambassadors, both those who remain active in the Foreign Service and those who are retired. For years, Department regulations have forbidden this usage unless actually in the job of ambassador or for those few who retired with the personal rank of career Ambassador.

For current employees, long-standing custom and practice, however, has established a clear tradition in the Department and in the Foreign Service that persons who have served as ambassador after Senate confirmation may continue to use the title after such service in appropriate communications with others, may be referred to in communications and conversations by the title of Ambassador, and may be introduced to public audiences by the title. The Department has also clarified the use of the title for persons who have retired from the Foreign Service or left government service who served as ambassador after Senate confirmation.

---

<sup>22</sup> Eban, *The New Diplomacy*, p. 356.

An amendment to the various regulations permits the use of the title, “Ambassador, Retired,” for all such persons.

Although the United States does not use the term, "Excellency," some countries do when referring to ambassadors. Even if the host country uses the term "Excellency," American chiefs of mission in those countries are addressed as "Mr. /Madam Ambassador" by U.S. citizens. Foreign chiefs of mission who are accredited to the U.S. are also referred to as ambassadors.

### **HOST COUNTRY CULTURE**

Outside the formal international diplomatic culture, another circle of customs and attitudes exists at the homes and private gatherings of host country citizens. Remember that as a guest, one is expected to respect the host’s culture. Culture, of course, is unique to each country. Researching publications that describe in detail the particular customs of your new post before your departure will facilitate the transition process.

In this Chapter outlines several areas of common concern. The following "social red flags" signal situations of which one should be particularly aware.

#### **Social Red Flags**

##### **Invitations and Responses**

Cultural differences abound in issuing and responding to invitations. In most cases, the invitation will come addressed to all the family members invited. If a spouse is not specifically named, he/she is probably not invited. It is inappropriate to bring a date to a working event. However, in some places, one invitation addressed to the family is meant to include everyone in the house, even guests and visitors. Responding is very important and should be done, generally by phone, within two days of receiving the invitation. Be sure to observe the request on the invitation. "Regrets only" means to call only if you will not attend, and "RSVP" means to respond whether you will or will not attend<sup>23</sup>.

##### **Greetings and forms of address**

---

<sup>23</sup> P. Sharp, “Representation in a Nationalist Era,” Discussion Papers in Diplomacy, No. 15 (Leicester: Centre for the Study of Diplomacy, University of Leicester, 1996), p. 5.



Although you should follow the guidelines about greeting, addressing and introducing someone in the formal international scene, you will need to learn about the local informal customs as well. Try to learn a few polite greetings in the native language that will get you through the more casual social situations. You will also need to be aware of different greeting rituals such as kisses, handshakes or bows. In some countries, for example, it is not uncommon to see men show affection. Tremendous differences exist in how close people stand to socialize, how loudly they speak, and how much eye contact they maintain. The best advice is to be observant and ask questions of the Foreign Service nationals and experienced officers at post. Show interest and concern in learning a different culture; most people will respond graciously.

### **Dressing**

Through tradition and usage, diplomats have come to wear certain kinds of clothes for certain occasions. Your "uniform" will depend on the function, be it casual or formal. This section gives a description of each kind of dress and the occasions for which they are appropriate. Keep in mind that local customs impose many modifications, so be sure to check at post. Sometimes, wearing the country's ethnic or national dress in lieu of traditional dress is appropriate.

In various parts of the world, a specific nomenclature for dress has arisen. Contrary to the common meaning within U.S. culture, in the diplomatic community, "informal dress" equates to business dress (see below). In some parts of the world, other terms for informal dress for men include "lounge suit", "national dress," "tenue de ville," "planters," "shirt and tie," "island casual," and "bush shirt." "Planters" refers to a long sleeved white shirt with a tie and dark trousers. "Bush shirt" is a long or short-sleeved shirt with a finished bottom edge worn outside rather than tucked into the slacks, or a long or short sleeved embroidered man's shirt. "Island casual" means a Hawaiian shirt and casual (usually khaki) slacks.

Similarly, various terms apply to formal dress for men. "Tuxedo" and "smoking jacket" mean black tie, whereas a "Red Sea Rig" or "Gulf Rig" means a tuxedo minus the jacket. "Dinner jacket" may refer to either a dark-colored or white jacket. If you are unsure of the terminology used, it is always appropriate to clarify before the event.

For many posts, the overwhelming choice for day-to-day business is a suit and tie for men and a business suit or conservative dress for women. Men and women of all ranks of staff and spouses are expected to bring this type of clothing. Many posts stress that daily attire closely resembles that seen in Washington, DC. Although suitable dress clothing for men can often be purchased at post, it is often limited and expensive. The selection for women may be larger, but the clothing is often limited and expensive as well. Business attire for women is usually appropriate for official evening functions.

Occasionally, business attire will not be appropriate. Below are some dressing guidelines to help clarify the lines between formal and casual wear, day and evening wear. As always, exceptions to the rule exist, so are observant and inquire at post.

### **Formal "Black Tie" or "White Tie"**

Formal wear may be worn at evening performances of the opera, the theater, balls, and for the most formal of dinners and evening affairs. Black tie is generally not worn in the daytime<sup>24</sup>. White tie requires the additional formality of a cutaway ("tails") and white tie for men and a floor-length ball gown for women. Above all, let the information on the invitation be your guide. If the invitation is unclear, ask when you respond to the invitation.

### **Male Attire**

- Black, hip-length coat without tails and with silk or satin lapels (a white dinner coat may be worn in hot weather and the tropics)

---

<sup>24</sup> P. Sharp, "Representation in a Nationalist Era," Discussion Papers in Diplomacy, No. 15 (Leicester: Centre for the Study of Diplomacy, University of Leicester, 1996), p. 5.

- Low-cut black waistcoat or cummerbund may be worn with a single-breasted coat.
- Black trousers
- White starched or pleated shirt or a soft evening shirt with studs instead of buttons
- Wing, turn down, or attached collar and black bow tie
- Black shoes and socks
- Hats and gloves are optional but not worn or carried indoors

### **Female Attire**

- Knee-length cocktail dress
- Floor length ball gown
- Long skirt with top
- High heeled shoes or dressy flats
- Above-elbow gloves are optional with a sleeveless evening gown, and short gloves may be worn with a long sleeved gown. If worn, gloves need not be removed for a receiving line or dancing, but are removed prior to eating or drinking

### **Semi-formal/informal**

Semi-formal/informal wear may be worn for cocktail parties, dinners, some dances, the theater, the opera, and evening receptions.

### **Male Attire**

- Dark suit
- Tie or bow tie
- Dark shoes and socks

### **Female Attire**

- Short cocktail dress
- Gloves are optional
- High-heeled shoes or dressy flats

### **Casual**

Most countries do not define casual as jeans and sneakers or sportswear. Shorts and jeans, for men and women, are considered inappropriate attire for social functions in many parts of the world. Instead, you will find that business attire is usually appropriate for an event specified as casual. Breakfast, lunch, daytime meetings, afternoon tea, and some receptions are generally considered casual, but the invitation should specify.

### **Male attire**

- Business suit (light or dark) or
- Sports jackets and pants
- Tie or bow tie
- Dress shoes or loafers

### **Female attire**

- Business suit or daytime dress
- Pumps or pants
- Head covering may be considered a requirement at some events. Wide-brim hats may also provide welcome and necessary protection from the sun; check with the post.

Dress, too, varies according to country and event. Women should be particularly mindful of conservative dress rules, such as skirt length, low necklines, and having one's arms covered.

Remember that "casual" in other countries almost never means jeans or shorts. It is always better to be too dressed up than too dressed down.

## **2.2. Linguistic aspects of the language of Diplomacy**

The diplomatic communication is a privileged mode of work which is often complex, but which provides liaison in international dialogue between the countries. While communications between the countries are in constant development, they require the full enforcement of rules and procedures established

for such actions, according to the nature and importance of the matters to be discussed and agreed upon. Unlike other communication systems, the diplomatic network is not neutral, since they further the interests, of wills, powers and rivalries, and for the conciliation of vital interests. In essence, the diplomatic language is called a cautious form of expression that gives the opportunity to stay, to some extent, below the exacerbation of statements that can generate “hostility.” The exercise of diplomacy has created expressions and idioms which are essential to communicate with propriety not only in this task, but also in the diverse international settings. The essential use in certain oral and written presentations of presidents, foreign ministers, diplomatic agents, referred to as the professional language of diplomacy, is the only instrument that allows, through cautious gradation, to make a serious warning to counterparts without using threatening words, in accordance with the rules of international coexistence. The language allows for properly handling conflict situations or critical foreign policy, even in conciliatory terms, and without being considered as provocation or rudeness. Therefore, statesmen, foreign ministers, diplomats and international civil servants have adopted a series of conventional phrases that, however amiable they may seem, convey a message that their counterparts clearly understand. Thus, when one of those other high officials informs that his government “cannot remain indifferent” to certain international controversy, it is clear he means that, without doubt, his government will intervene in this dispute. If his letter or speech uses phrases such as “my government is concerned,” then it is obvious to everyone that his government intends to adopt a strong push in a particular case. If it says “in that case my government would be inclined to carefully reconsider its position” it means that friendship is about to break down. When it says “my government feels obliged to express reservations with regard to ...” it actually can be translated to mean that “my government will not allow ...” The term “in that case my government will be forced to consider its own interests” or “to declare itself free of

compromises,” indicates that there will be a deterioration in relations<sup>25</sup>. If a foreign government warns that a certain action on its part would be considered “as an unfriendly act,” the government to which the statement is directed must interpret the words as a tacit threat to measures of retaliation recognized by the international community. In this regard, saying that “it compelled to decline all responsibility for the consequences” means that it about to provoke an incident that would lead to enforceable actions. And if asked, even in terms of the most exquisite courtesy, for a response, for example, “before six in the evening,” such communication is considered an ultimatum. While a professional diplomat will be very careful and selective in his diplomatic language, any careless language used by one who is inexperienced or ignorant of these forms of diplomatic communication, may exacerbate the gravity of a situation greater than it really is. Thus, diplomacy requires the application of intelligence and tact in the conduct of official relations between countries.

### **Lexical features of the language of Diplomacy**

From the lexicological point of view isolated words and phrases mean very little. In context they mean a great deal and in the special context of contractual undertaking they mean everything. Diplomatic correspondence in English is a prose organized according to plan and it includes without limitation, the right but not the obligation, to select words from a variety of verbal implements and write clearly, accurately, and/or with style.

There are several diplomatic phrases which help to ease the way to full examination of entire diplomatic negotiation and contracts. A glossary is beyond reach but in what follows there’s a listing of words and phrases that turn up in great many documents, with comments on each one. The words and phrases are presented in plausible contract sequence, not alphabetically.

Let’s analyze to distinguish between *protect* and *defend*, study the illustration of their use.

---

<sup>25</sup> Oxford Dictionary of English, 3rd Edition , Oxford University Press – 2010

**Defend** denotes forcing back or driving away actual or threatened attack (e.g. in battle, in court).

**Protect** implies the use of something as a bar to the admission or impact of what may attack, injure, or destroy (e.g. rights by law, constitution). For example it would be follow to write: “*Decontrol alone does not constitute an adequate oil policy. It isn’t likely to protect the economy against temporary shortages*” or “*Trade unionists continue to defend and improve their working conditions*”.

**Non-aggression pact** absence of the desire or intention to be aggressive, especially on the part of nations or government. If a country adopts a policy of *non-aggression*, it declares that will not attack or try to harm a particular country in way. For example: “*The agreement includes a pledge of non-aggression...*” or “*A non-aggression pact will be signed between the two countries*”.

**My compliments...** an expression of your admiration or respect: “*That was an excellent meal! My compliments to the chef*”. ... **With your compliments** if you give something to someone with your compliments, you give it to the free: “*we enclose a copy our latest brochure, with our compliments*”.

**Put a construction on something** to understand something as having a particular meaning, especially others people’s actions and statements: “*I don’t want them to put the wrong construction on my actions*”.

**And/or** it is an essential barbarism occasionally the alternatives became overwhelming, thus and/or is convenient and generally accepted, although more detail is better.

**Confirm** it suggests, of course, that something has been agreed upon before. You are writing now only to make a record of it. “I write to confirm that you admit substantial default in delivery, “*Frequently we encounter it in ordinary correspondence: “confirming your order” “confirming the main points of your agreement*”, and so on.

“*Furnish*” it is a handy word which usefulness lies in the avoidance of worse alternatives. Suppose you transact to deliver a variety of elements as a package.

*“Deliver”* leaves out, even though it will may be implied, the preliminary purchase or engagement of these elements, and at the other end it goes very far in suggesting responsibility for getting the package unscathed to where it belongs. Alternatives also may go wrong, slightly, each with its implications.

*“Furnish”* is sometimes useful when more popular words fall short or go too far. It has a good professional ring to it as well: *Furnish with a compass and sandwiches, they set off for a day’s hiking.*

**Assign** involves legal title; *“give”* is lame and probably untrue; *“transmit”* means send. Thus each word misses some important detail or implies unnecessary things: *she was assigned to the newspaper’s Berlin office.*

### **Abbreviations**

Abbreviations can be useful because they are quick to write and easy to read. But both parties need to know what the abbreviation stand for. The word abbreviation, strictly meaning a shortening or abridgment, commonly refers to a letter or a group of letters taken from a single word or phrase, and used, for brevity’s sake, to represent that word or phrase.

In diplomatic correspondence, abbreviations are often used to save space and time. This conforms to the principle of conciseness required by diplomatic letters. However, the use of abbreviations poses of two prerequisites: the reader understands their meanings and the writer knows where they are appropriate to be used. In diplomacy, most abbreviations have fixed meanings. The abbreviations **c.i.f.** and **f.o.b.**, for example, are recognized internationally as meaning **cost insurance and freight** and **free on board**. But can you be sure that your correspondent would know that **o.n.o.** means **or nearest offer**? Some international organizations, e.g. **NATO** are known in all countries by the same set of initial, but many are not, e.g. **E.E.C. (European Economic Community)**, **UNO (United Nations Organization)** National organizations, e.g. **C.B.I. (Confederation of British Industry)** and **TUS (Trades Union Congress)** are even less other countries.



So, if you are not absolutely certain that an abbreviation will be easily recognized do not use it.

The International Chamber of Commerce uses a set of terms for delivery in overseas contracts-these are called **incoterms** terms.

Below we are going to list some terms frequently used on business correspondence.

**C.I.F. – cost, insurance, freight.** If consignment is to be delivered according to **c.i.f.** -, then the supplier insures the goods and pays for the whole delivery<sup>26</sup>.

**AFAQ - Association for Academic Quality**

**CFSP - Common Foreign and Security Policy**

**EC - European Community**

**ECSC - European Coal and Steel Community**

**Eco Fin - Economic and Financial affairs council**

**EEAS - European External Action service**

**EEC - European Economic Community**

**EU - European Union**

**FAO - Food and Agriculture Organization**

**FCO - Foreign and Commonwealth Office**

**FIT - Flanders Investment and Trade agency**

**FDI - Foreign Direct Investment**

**IFAD - International Fund for Agriculture Development**

**ISO - International Organization for Standardization**

**MFA - Ministry of Foreign Affairs**

**MoU - Memorandum of Understanding**

**MT - Ministry of Trade**

**MS - Member State**

**NGO - Non-Governmental Organization**

**OECD - Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development**

---

<sup>26</sup> [http:// en.wikipedia.org/wiki/abbreviation](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/abbreviation)

**R&D - Research and Development**

**TPO - Trade Promotion Agencies**

**TTE - Transport, Telecommunications and Energy council**

**UES - Unified External Services**

**VIE - Volontariat International en Entreprise (French voluntary graduates programmer for international Enterprises)**

**WTO - World Trade Organization**

**UNCTAD - United Nations Conference on Trade and Development**

**UNESCO - United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization**

**UNIDO - United Nations Industrial Development Organization.**

**Grammatical features of Diplomatic language**

If you've ever found yourself in a situation where you have to tell some bad news, then you'll know just how important it is to be able to use diplomatic English. Choosing the right words and the right grammar can go a long way to removing some of the unpleasantness of the message we have to deliver. It can also help us to maintain a level of deference that we wish to show to superiors or clients in the normal course of business. Using language diplomatically can be a challenge, even when speaking our mother tongue, but it is especially difficult when speaking a foreign language since we often lack the appropriate vocabulary, and knowledge of alternative grammatical structures.

Most people connect the word style with fashion, particularly with clothes. In a sense, language too is either "dressed up" or "dressed down", depending on the situation you are in or who you are talking to. Style covers a variety of subjects but two aspects of style which are vitally important in business communication are formality and diplomacy.

English is different from many other languages in that its spoken form differs considerably from its written form. Naturally, written English tends to be more formal.

You can use the following techniques to sound more diplomatic in English<sup>27</sup>.

1. Use the past continuous to sound more distant

*E.g. We were hoping to hammer out the details today. / We were thinking of offering you a three month trial.* Using the past continuous helps the speaker to sound more tentative and not overly direct.

2. Use negative questions to make suggestions

*e.g. Wouldn't it be better to.....? / Don't you think we could.....? / Couldn't we.....?* These questions carry the speaker's opinion and ask for a reaction.

3. Use modifiers to make things seem less or smaller

*E.g. That may cause a slight problem for us. / We have a bit of a problem with the accounts.* Using 'slight' here makes helps the speaker to be softer, phrases like a bit of, sort of, kind of came have the same effect.

4. Modal verbs can be used in a similar way

*E.g. We might be able to agree to that, provided...../ We may be able to help you there.....*

The modal verbs make the verb weaker and not as definite.

5. Use positive adjectives with 'not' instead of negative adjectives

*E.g. That might not be possible / That's not as reasonable as we hoped you would be.* The positive adjectives are nicer for people to hear than negative ones.

6. Use phrases to signal bad news for the listener

*E.g. Unfortunately..... / I'm afraid..... / I'm sorry but..... / With respect.....* These phrases can soften bad news.

Spoken English contains a great many contractions such as "it's", meaning "it is" or "it has", "I've", meaning "I have", "he's", meaning "he is" or "he has", "we'd", meaning "we would" or "we had". These contractions, used widely in conversation, are not used in written English (except, perhaps, in informal friendly letters). They would not be used in a formal letter or report.

---

<sup>27</sup> [www.LiveEnglishProgram.com](http://www.LiveEnglishProgram.com)

Another aspect of formality which is important in report writing is the use of the passive voice. If you were giving advice in spoken English, for example, you would probably use an "active" sentence, such as "if I were you, I'd relocate the factory." This type of sentence would not be used in a business letter or report. The sentence would probably read: "It is recommended that the factory be relocated." In formal written English, it is also often preferable to avoid using personal pronouns, such as I or we, in order to make the text more impersonal.

In addition to formal written style, English also has a unique diplomatic spoken style. Native speakers often try not to sound too direct. Examples of this tactful style include using I'd like instead of I want, eg "I'd like to hear your proposals", rather than "I want to hear your proposals...". Another example is "Perhaps we should now consider..." rather than "Now, it's time to consider..."

Native speakers also try to avoid giving an unnecessarily negative impression. For example, instead of saying "That is impossible" they say "That is not very likely". Or, instead of saying, "Wednesday is impossible" they might say "Would Monday be more convenient?". Notice the use of would which gives a more tentative sound to a statement or question. For example, "That is too expensive" can become "That would be rather expensive". Statements are usually softened by qualifiers such as rather, somewhat, quite, some etc. For example, "I don't **fully** agree" or "There is a **slight** problem".

Modifying your language in this way can be a useful tactic in business dealings when you are trying to establish a pleasant cooperative atmosphere, particularly with people of other cultural backgrounds. Indeed, in many business meetings and negotiations such diplomatic use of the English language can be a very positive aid to avoiding direct confrontation with your counterparts and a useful tactic.

Non-native speakers whose own language is far more direct may find it odd to use such diplomatic language. However, they should at least be aware of its existence, especially if they are doing business with native speakers of English.

Speech is a tool of social communication. We understand spoken remarks within the context of an exchange of ideas between rational and emotional beings in a social situation. We become aware not only of what one says, but what one does by uttering such a remark, and the effect they might bring about by such a remark.

Remarks may serve as expressions of feelings or ideas.

*Don't give it another thought.*

This is more than a command not to think about something. It is a promise meaning "I'll take care of it."

People not only state ideas, they can also threaten, inquire, and dare. They can be ironic or sarcastic.

*Can you pass the ketchup?*

This remark may have the form of a question, but functions as a request. If someone says

*I can't find the ketchup.*

They are probably not just announcing their inability to locate a condiment. They are asking for help.

Language can be used to request, persuade, convince, scare, promise, insult, order, and, as above, elicit action. Remarks often convey ideas that extend beyond their literal meaning. Listeners must infer unstated meaning. If someone says

*The government once classified ketchup as a vegetable in the school lunch program.*

They are probably not simply providing a lesson about the school lunch program. They are offering an example of bureaucratic stupidity.

We assume common rules for the use of language, and infer meaning accordingly. Thus if someone says:

*The robber appeared to have a beard.*

We assume that they are not sure, not that they are commenting on the mechanics of sight.

Listeners infer meaning within the context of social roles and settings. The meaning of an utterance can thus vary with the occasion, the relationship of speaker and listener (or writer and reader) or the listener's expectations of the speaker's purpose.

*Do you have the time to help me?*

This question carries different meaning when uttered by an employer or an employee. When uttered by an employer, the remark is a strong request for assistance; one would not generally answer "no." When spoken by an employee, it is more a respectful request for help.

An assertion that there is racism in the United States Army takes on different meaning and significance if asserted by a black soldier (an allegation), a white General (an admission), an Army Task Force report (official recognition), or a Moslem priest in Iran (a condemnation). The same comments take on different significance when asserted in a bar, a Senate hearing room, or an elementary school classroom.

When learning to speak, we learn degrees of courtesy and "turn-yielding" cues that function somewhat like "over" in a walkie-talkie conversation. We learn social communication strategies—such as how to appeal to someone's vanity (Anyone who buys this cream can look better in days!), or how to imply a fact (Do you still beat your wife?). The late Lord Denning, often referred to either as the best known or the most colorful English judge of the 20 century, observed:

*When a diplomat says yes, he means perhaps. When he says perhaps, he means no. When he says no, he is not a diplomat. When a lady says no, she means perhaps. When she says perhaps, she means yes. But when she says yes, she is no lady*<sup>28</sup>.

While this may be an obviously sexist and politically incorrect statement, the remark nonetheless demonstrates ways in which language is a complex social tool for communication.

---

<sup>28</sup> Hill and Wallace, "Diplomatic Trends in the European Community," p. 50.

In this place, we'll explore a few more techniques that will come in handy when you're communicating with colleagues, organizations in diplomatic environment and in everyday life.

Let's start with some news that your boss or clients probably won't want to hear:

**- *There will be a delay in the completion of the project.***

The speaker has made no attempt here to soften the negative content of the message. A more diplomatic and polite version might look something like this:

**- *There might be a slight delay in the completion of the project.***

We have added just two words to the sentence, but we have made it considerably more diplomatic. First, we have added the modal verb '*might*', a technique we discussed in **our previous post**, and second, the qualifier '*slight*'<sup>29</sup>.

Consider the following sentence:

**- *I haven't finished the report.***

The speaker has done nothing here to soften the negative content of the message. A more diplomatic version might look something like this:

**- *I'm afraid I haven't finished the report.***

## **1. Softeners**

*'I'm afraid'* is commonly referred to as a '*softener*', a linguistic tool used to soften the tone of our content or convey politeness when we speak. Softeners often occur at the beginning of a sentence to prepare us for bad news: *I'm afraid, so sorry, to be honest, unfortunately, with all respect*

**- *To be honest, I think we need to rethink our marketing strategy.***

**- *With all respect, I don't agree with what you just said.***

## **2. Modal Verbs**

---

29 Белякова Е. И., "Переводим с английского/Материалы для семинарских и практических занятий по теории и практике перевода" (с английского на русский). — СПб: КАРО, 2003. — с. 92

Modal verbs such as *would, could, may or might* are great for softening a request or giving a command:

- *I want more time to finish this presentation.*
- *I could use more time to finish this presentation.*
- *It would be nice to have more time to finish this presentation.*
  
- *Hand me the telephone, please.*
- *Would you hand me the telephone, please?*
- *Could you hand me the telephone, please?*

### **3. Rephrasing a Negative Sentence**

Negative sentences can be rephrased in order to make them appear more positive.

Our very first sentence can be made even more diplomatic in this way:

- *I'm afraid I haven't finished the report.*
- *I'm afraid I haven't been able to finish the report yet.*

Using '*be able to*' here places emphasis on your attempt to finish the report rather than your failure to do so. It implies that you are still working to complete the task and that your inability to do so is perhaps due to circumstances beyond your control (such as a heavy workload etc.).

The addition of '*yet*' at the end of the sentence reinforces the idea that you are still working on the report and it is almost completed, thus helping to reduce the negative impact of the sentence's underlying content.

Negative sentences that are formed with *can't* and *won't* make the speaker sound particularly negative and unhelpful and can often be rephrased with *be able to*, or a similar expression:

- *I can't give you a better deal than that.*
- *I am not able to give you a better deal than that.*
- *I am unable to give you a better deal than that.*
- *I am not in a position to give you a better deal than that.*



Similarly, affirmative sentences containing words with a negative meaning can be rephrased in order to soften the message and achieve a more indirect effect:

- *I am unhappy with this agreement.*
- *I am not entirely happy with this agreement.*
- *I am not totally happy with this agreement.*

Here the negative adjective unhappy is replaced with its positive counterpart happy, modified with an adverb such as *entirely*, *totally* or *completely*, and the sentence is changed to the negative form.

Of course, to achieve the best results we'll need to combine these techniques to make sentences that contain several of these elements:

*- I'm afraid I haven't been able to finish the report yet, so I'm not in a position to send it to you right now. Could you give me a little more time, please?*

#### **The usage of the capital letters in Diplomatic sentence**

The capital letters are used in following situations:

1. In proper nouns concerning nations.
2. The names of all organizations, companies, firms are written with capital letters (except conjunction, preposition, and article). Article is written with capital letter if it comes at the beginning of the sentence: *A.Smith and Company, Limited, The Modern Engineering Co. Incorporated.*
3. The words concerning post, profession: *President, Chief Accountant*
4. State departments and office departments. *Accounts department, Department of Fire Insurance.*
5. The names of all weeks and months.
6. All cities, streets, locations, hotels, rooms are written with capital letters: *Main Street, Grand Avenue, New York, N.Y. Bush House, London, and W.C.*
7. Introduction words: *Dear Sir, Gentlemen, Dear Madam.*
8. Complimentary words: *Yours faithfully, Yours truly, Yours Sincerely.*

#### **The usage of punctuation marks in Diplomatic letters**

The comma is used at the end of short forms of the words (*Mr., Mrs., Messrs., Co., Ltd., Sept.,*)

The comma is used between months and a year. If number comes before the name of a month or a year: *11th September, 1935;*

The comma is used between state, city or country: *Chicago, Illinois Glasgow, England; Samarkand, Uzbekistan.*

The comma is put after the solution in England, but in America they put columns (:) and exclamation sign is never used:

*Dear Sirs,*

*In answer your letter...*

*Gentlemen:*

*We have received your letter...*

Comma is always put after complimentary close words: *Yours faithfully, Yours truly, Yours Sincerely.*

The signed track is not divided by comma.

*Yours faithfully,*

*Smith & Company, Ltd.*

The comma (,) is put after the solution (in England) or column is put after the complimentary close (in the USA). Full stop is put after the word: *Messrs. A.Robinson and sons. John Brown and Ltd.*

### **Passive voice**

Writing handbooks usually include warnings about the passive voice – it is wordy and clumsy and leads to static rather than dynamic writing. There is truth to this, certainly, but the passive voice also has legitimate uses, and in many instances it is preferable to the active voice.

Such phrase as “*The material will be delivered*”; “*The start date is to be decided*”; “*the figures must be approved*” are obscure ones leaving unsettled who it is that delivers, who decides, who does the approving. Which side it is to be? Lawsuits are the plausible outcome of leaving it all unsettled. Passive used in

contracts can destroy the whole negotiations. “*You will deliver*” is better for it identifies the one who will do delivering. Certainly, “must be approved by us” violates other canons. “We shall have the right but not the obligation to approve” is less unfortunate.

There is no doubt that passives do not suit diplomatic letters, and if they go all the way through without adding something like “by you” or “by us” they are intolerable. Once in a long while one may find passives used purposely to leave something unresolved.

We can notice in the preceding examples that all the “A” letters are written in the passive voice and all the “B” letters in the active voice. When you use the active voice, your message is much livelier and more personalized. Here are additional examples of both voices.

*Passive voice:*

1. Your letter was received and read with great interest.
2. Extended credit terms are available upon request.
3. When the market research was completed, it was evident that the Crunchiest package would have to be resigned.

*Active voice:*

1. I was pleased to receive you letter and read it with great interest.
2. I cordially invite you to make use of our extended credit terms.
3. When the product manager completed her market research, she was convinced that the Crunchiest package would have to be resigned.

### **Diplomatic Sentence Examples**

1. **Diplomatic** immunity normally reserved for high-ranking foreign envoys.
2. You have a very **diplomatic** answer about the size.
3. I must be getting **diplomatic** in my middle age.
4. This is also why it was not **diplomatic** intervention by the UN and the US that prevented war.
5. **Diplomatic** ties with China.

6. Of course we were all too **diplomatic** to mention this again!
7. **Diplomatic** missions were also damaged by NATO smart bombs.
8. So not only has he made military success but also **diplomatic** success.
9. **Diplomatic** relations with either Baghdad or Tehran.
10. So **diplomatic** in fact that he nearly ripped Maces legs off with a horrendously late challenge.
11. **Diplomatic** correspondent for News 24 in October 2004.
12. But your language has been very delicate and perhaps even **diplomatic**, dare one say.

### **Modal verbs**

Modal verbs can denote obligation and necessity (must, be to, ought to, should), absence of necessity (needn't, didn't, don't have to), prohibition (not be to, cannot, must not, shouldn't), permission (may, can), ability (can, could), (un)willingness, characteristic behavior (will, would).

**Must** is used to express strong obligation. The past is expressed by **had to** and the future is expressed by **will have to**.

*You must work hard to master the language.*

*I had to work hard to pass my exam.*

*He will have to work hard to make a career in diplomacy.*

**Be to** is used to express an agreed or expected action in the future, present or past. The modal verb **be to** does not have a future form.

*You are to give the library books at the end of the term.*

*We were to meet at the entrance.*

**Should/ought to** (more emphatic) are used to express milder obligation or advice. The past is expressed by **should/ought to + have past participle**.

*You are behind the group; you should/ought to work hard.*

*You should/ought to thank your parent for the education.*

**Needn't** is used to express absence of necessity to do something. **Needn't have + past participle** express to action that was completed but was not necessary.

*You needn't speak at the meeting if you don't feel like speaking.*

*He needn't have learned the text by heart. Why did he do it?*

The sharpest prohibition is expressed by **is/was not to** and **may not**. **Cannot** is used to express less sharp prohibition. **Must not** is used to authoritatively prohibit something. **Shouldn't do / ought not to do** express mild prohibition or advice not to do. **Should not have done / ought not to have done** express reproach, disapproval, regret.

*There was something in his manner that was not to be resisted.*

*Leave the conference hall. You may not stay here.*

**Willingness or intention** is expressed by **will (won't)** or **would (wouldn't)**. **Won't / wouldn't** express a refusal, by either people or things.

*He was angry because nobody would lend him any money.*

**Characteristic behavior** is expressed by **will** (for the present or future) or **would** (for the past).

*He'll sit for hours starrng into the fire.*

The modal verbs make the verb weaker and not as definite in the sentence.

So, language of diplomacy is an essential part of social communication, an intimate part of diplomacy and life experience. Each aspect linguistic and extra-linguistic of diplomacy has a characteristic way of expressing thoughts, facts, etc. But it must be emphasized that the routine of the official language of diplomacy requires certain accepted idioms, phrases, patterns and grammar, which are found in general use today. Therefore certain skills must be acquired by practice, and details of writing must be carefully and thoroughly learnt.

It is very important to know a constituent part of Modern diplomatic communication as nowadays more and more agreements are made in English is the nearest thing we have to a universal diplomatic language. Joint ventures, international conference, Foreign Affairs frequently are spelled out in this language even though it is not native to at least one of the contracting parties. What makes the letter so attractive and pleasing is not always the message of the letter; it's

often the manner and style in which the message is written. Modern diplomatic language tends towards using the language of conversational style. Writing is not only a means of communications and contact, but also a record of affairs, information, events, etc. So, it is necessary to feel the spirit and trend of the style in order to write a perfect letter.

## CHAPTER THREE. SPECIFICITY AND TRANSLATION OF DIPLOMACY LANGUAGE IN NON RELATED CULTURES

### 3.1. About translation of diplomatic documents

In this Chapter we intended to speak about the important points of translation and structure of official letters in the sphere of Diplomacy.

Uzbekistan is rapidly entering the world community and the need to establish mutually beneficial relations with developed foreign countries in different fields, including international relations and diplomacy day by day.

It is stipulated by the National Program of Specialists in Uzbekistan, adopted in 1997, to establish mutually beneficial relations with prestigious highly qualified specialists... . Official letters or correspondence plays an important role in the implementation of these tasks<sup>30</sup>.

In this qualification paper, we consider etiquette and structure of official letters. This matter has been mentioned in the works of Halpern I.R., Muratov E.N., Nuriddinov X.A., Uskenbayev U.Y. But it was not thoroughly studied until now.

“...most general function of the style of official documents, predetermines the peculiarities of the style. The most striking, though not the most essential feature, is a special system of cliché, terms and set expressions...”

The generally accepted forms of diplomatic documents often used in correspondence between diplomatic missions, as well as in contacts with the Foreign Ministry of the receiving state, are notes, memoranda, aides-memoires, and personal letters.

We should be careful when we prepare and send letters to the Ambassador or heads of diplomatic missions in Uzbekistan or Foreign countries. *Dear* is not enough here. *Your Excellency* or *His Excellence* has to be used in such official

---

<sup>30</sup> The President I. A. Karimov's report at the OliyMajlis session of the first convocation, February, 1995

letters. Usually we write in English or other foreign languages. But if the letter is written in Uzbek it can be translated as *Janobi Oliylari... ga*. It can be followed by *Dear*. And all of them have to be written in capital letters only. Thus, we should pay attention to the level of formality. We use our language at different levels of formality. The receiver can be Department of External Foreign Affairs or Ambassador or fund whom we ask for investment of grant to enrich the technical or financial bases of our University, or even the President or Rector of higher educational institution we address with the request to assist in establishing bilateral or mutual relations.

Trans-cultural communications play an important role as well. In some instances your letter will have to cross cultural lines. This often occurs when you write to people of different social group, different mentality or of a different technical specialty. It mostly occurs when you write to people overseas, to people who use English as a second language. Your intent and ideas have to be clarified when writing such letter.

Talking about mentality, letters prepared and send by the representative of different countries, nationalities or religion differ in some way. For example, when you receive a letter from the representatives of Arabic or Muslim countries you often see at the beginning of a letter the words "*In the Name of Allah*" (*Olloh nomi bilan*). However, one doesn't have to write the same words in reply. So, we can say that European standard of official letter differs in content and form from the letters prepared by the representatives of other countries and nations.

Timelines is one of the forms of etiquette in writing official letters. One should be sure that the letter arrives in time. The receiver needs time to look through your letter and make some decisions. It happens in the cases when you ask for some appointment, address receiver with request to do something within the fixed period of time or while receiver in his/her department but not out of department or country at the time you need reply to. Receiver also needs time to consider your letter, consult with colleagues or specialists or someone else before



making any decision. Receiver may send your letter to people or call a committee to consider it. Besides, receiver may put quite a different value to your letter while you think it vital for your diplomacy or business or arrangement.

And official letters usually start with: ...*expresses its sincere respect or avails itself for the highest consideration of respect or has the honor to*<sup>31</sup>. It is important to use the words of same importance or value or even higher appreciation in your letter if you want to achieve goals you put forward. Showing respect to your colleague or other receiver can be of great use for your diplomacy.

We can say a lot about the etiquette, but the matter of structure is of great importance as well. Though the theme is wide enough, we will consider some aspects of structure of official letters only.

Let's talk about European standard first as we learned a lot and preparing most of our official letters according to those standards. Here we want to mention that we didn't completely introduce European standard and we have develop a new standard the date, address and name of the person whom the letter was addressed is given on the top left corner of the letter. However, when we prepare a letter we always write the above mentioned information on the top right corner. Besides we put the date on the top left corner, in the place in Letter headed paper which is specially prepared for the organization or University in the publishing house to write date and registration number of the letter.

There is also difference in designing at the end of official letter. After writing *Sincerely (Hurmat bilan)* the signature, the senders and organization name is given at the bottom left corner of official letter according to European standard. We, being sender, write position and title of the sender t the bottom left corner and name at the bottom right corner. Signature is in the center.

However, in the official letters sent by the embassies or heads of diplomatic missions in Uzbekistan, sometimes, receiver's name with position and title, and

---

<sup>31</sup> Жирмунский.В.М. Вопросы теории Литературе. Сб. статей. Л: «Acamedia», 1928. – с.354

organization is given on the top left or right corner of the letter. Information about sender is given at the bottom left corner of the letter.

There is also difference in the form of the text. Intent is missing in the official letters of European standard. They just omit one line before starting the next paragraph. When starting and at the end of the letter they can omit two or more lines. While preparing official letters we design the paragraph with omission of 5 signs at the beginning of the line. No line omission is met in our letters, even if European standard is used in such letters.

One more point related to the structure and form of official letters is the font size 14 as standard one.

Thus, we should take in to account all lexical, structural and semantic points when they deal with official; style.

The term “culture” addresses three salient categories of human activity: the “personal”, whereby we as individuals think and function as such; the “collective” whereby we function in a social context; and the “expressive”, whereby society expresses itself.

Language is the only social institution without which no other social institution can function; it therefore underpins the three pillars upon which culture is built.

Translation, involving the transposition of thoughts expressed in one language by one social group into the appropriate expression of another group, entails a process of cultural de-coding, re-coding and en-coding. As cultures are increasingly brought into greater contact with one another, multicultural considerations are brought to bear to an ever-increasing degree. Now, how do all these changes influence us when we are trying to comprehend a text before finally translating it? We are not just dealing with words written in a certain time, space and socio-political situation; most importantly it is the cultural aspect of the text that we should take into account. The process of transfer, i/e., re-cording across

cultures, should consequently allocate corresponding attributes vis-à-vis the target culture to ensure credibility in the eyes of the target reader.

Multiculturalism, which is a present-day phenomenon, plays a role here, because it has had an impact on almost all peoples worldwide as well as on the international relations emerging from the current new world order<sup>32</sup>. Moreover, as technology develops and grows at a hectic pace, nations and their cultures have, as a result, started a merging process whose end (point) is difficult to predict. We are at the threshold of a new international paradigm. Boundaries are disappearing and distinctions are being lost. The sharp outlines that were once distinctive now fade and become blurred.

As translator we are faced with an alien culture that requires that its message be conveyed in anything but an alien way. That culture expresses its idiosyncrasies in a way that is culture bound: cultural words, proverbs and of course idiomatic expressions, whose origin and use are intrinsically and uniquely bound to the culture concerned. So, we are called upon to do a cross-culture translation whose success will depend on our understanding of the culture we are working with.

Is it our task to focus primarily on the source culture or the target culture? The answer is not clear-cut. Nevertheless, the dominant criterion is the communicative function of the target text.

Finally, attention is drawn to the fact that among the variety of translation approaches, the “Integrated approach” seems to be the most appropriate. This approach follows the global paradigm in which having a global vision of the text at hand has a primary importance. Such an approach focuses from the macro to the micro level in accordance with the Gestalt principle, which states that an analysis of parts cannot provide an understanding of the whole; thus translation studies are essentially concerned with a web a relationships, the importance of individual items being decided by their relevance within the larger context: text, situation and culture.

---

<sup>32</sup> Duke, “A Foreign Minister for the EU,” p. 7.

In conclusion it can be pointed out that the transcoding (de-coding, re-coding and en-coding the terms transcoding appearance here at the first time) process should be focused not merely on language transfer but also and most importantly on cultural transposition. As an inevitable consequence of the previous statement, translator must be both bilingual and bicultural, if not indeed multicultural.

Business correspondence translation rather based towards the practical effect its main function is to deliver accurate financial information, rather than in order to achieve aesthetic effects and enjoy the results; according to different purposes, using different means to deal with different means to deal with different content; more stylized, the content does not allow mistakes. Thus, the translator on the one hand need to understand, familiar and precise terms; the other hand, as much as possible with the right language etc., would be relevant information more concise and accurate expression.

As the commercial communication related to English and Chinese language translation and application, and the correspondence has its language, grammar, sentence structure, etc. specificity, coupled with cultural differences between Western and other factors, which determines the translation cannot be in business correspondence is the absolute right and so on, but a relative and dynamic equivalence. Therefore, the dynamic equivalence theory in diplomatic correspondence translation plays an important role.

### **3.2. The analysis of translation of English diplomatic correspondence into Uzbek**

#### **Notes**

There are two kinds of notes: verbal and personal. They differ in their form.

The verbal note is written in the third person and unsigned, while the personal note is composed in the first person and is always signed. The word verbal takes its origin in the Latin word *verbalis* which means “oral”, “in words”. As applied to the verbal note the word implies that such note is equal to an oral statement or

information. The verbal note is a rather popular and common form of diplomatic documents. As any other document it may pertain to a serious question or refer to everyday routine matters – informing the Foreign Ministry of the receiving state about the arrival of a new staff-member of the mission or a delegation, asking for entry visas, etc. According to tradition, the verbal note begins with an addressing sentence (complementary beginning) which has a unified form. For example, verbal note of Russian Federation Embassy in India would begin as follows: “*The Embassy of the Russian Federation presents its compliments to the Ministry of External Affairs of India and has the honour to inform the Latter that...* ”. The verbal note has a mastic official seal, while the personal note has none; the verbal note bears the number, and sometimes the index attributed to it by the sender, while the personal note has none.

Verbal notes have a number; they are written in the third person (singular and plural) and, as a rule, are unsigned although each verbal note has at its end the seal of issuing office and, in many states, has the sender’s initials.

Verbal notes are destined to clarify details or to give a summary of an important conversation.

Exhibit 1

*(State Emblem of Australia)*

*Note No. ...*

*The Department for External Affairs presents its compliments to the Embassy of the Russian Federation and has the honor to acknowledge receipt of the Embassy’s Note No. 40 of 6 May 20..., advising that Mr. A. ... has been appointed as an official personal secretary and interpreter to the R.F. Ambassador to Australia.*

*The Department of External Affairs avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Embassy of the Russian Federation the assurances of its highest consideration.*

*10 May 20...*

*(Seal of the Embassy)*

CANBERRA

*(Avstraliya Respublikasi Davlat Gerbi)*

*№...*

*Avstraliya Respublikasi Tashqi ishlar vazirligi Rossiya Federatsiyasi elchixonasiga o'z hurmatini izhor etib quyidagilarni xabar berishni sharaflab deb biladi. Avstraliya Respublikasining 20.. 6-maydagi №40 qaroriga ko'ra Mr. A... Avstraliya Respublikasining Rossiya Federatsiyasidagi rasmiy shaxsiy kotibi va tarjimoni etib belgilanganini ma'lum qiladi.*

*Tashqi ishlar vazirligi fursatdan foydalanib Elchixonaga takror o'zining chuqur ehtiromini bildiradi.*

*10 may 20...*

*Kanberra*

*( Vazirlik muhri)*

If we stop at the analysis of translation ways we can state the following:

*The Department for External Affairs* – In fact when the omission of surnames can be frequently met. In Uzbek we come across the same way of usage.

*Tashqi ishlar vazirligi* – complete lexical correspondence.

The word “*advise*” is translated as “*maslahat bermoq*”

But the specific feature of business correspondence is to be far from personal emotions. Therefore the introductory word “*advise*” is changed with the word “*ma'lum qilmoq*”. The way of translation is grammatical difference of translation. Type is: morphemic substitution.

As a result of the analysis of the translation we can say that translation comes across with lexical grammatical difficulties.

The importance of any document is determined not so much by its form as by its contents. It is up to the sender to choose the form of the document in each specific case.

The personal note may also refer both to a very important matter of principle and to a relatively minor problem, or simply contain a piece of information. Personal notes are sent by ambassadors to their colleagues, the heads of other

diplomatic missions. They may convey congratulations on the appointment or election to an important state post, express condolences, etc.

Both personal and verbal notes are typed on special stationery. The form always carries a painted, printed, or engraved national emblem and the name of sender (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, mission, etc.).

*Canadian Embassy*

*May 21, 19...*

*Moscow*

*Excellency:*

*I have to honor to inform Your Excellence that I returned to Moscow today and have resumed charge of the Embassy.*

*I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.*

*(Signed)*

*(name)*

*Ambassador*

*His Excellency Mr....,  
Minister of Foreign Affairs of  
the Russian Federation,  
Moscow*

*Kanada elchixonasi*

*May 21, 19...*

*Moskva*

*Hurmatli (ism) Janobi Oliylari*

*Sizning ruxsatingiz bilan men bugun Moskva shariga qaytganimni hamda Elchixonadagi faoliyatimni davom ettirishimni ma'lum qilshni sharaf deb bilaman.*

*Men fursatdan foydalanib Siz Janobi Oliylariga o'zimning chuqur ishonchimni izhor etaman.*

*(imzo)*

*(...) Janobi Oliylari*

*Rossiya Federatsiyasi Tashqi*

*Ishlar vaziri, Moskva.*

In the English language the place of clauses in compound sentences are not stable i.e. Main sentence can come in the first or second part. But in Uzbek in traditional form of speech the clause part is always in the 1<sup>st</sup> part and the main part follows it.

That's why the way of grammatical transformation is used in this sentence.

The ways of grammatical and lexical transformation are met in this sentence.

## **CONCLUSION**

The President of the Republic of Uzbekistan Islam Karimov speaking about the future of Uzbekistan underlines: “The task of science is to form our future, trends for tomorrow the laws of nature, to show the way it will be. Science must be the means and the force driving forward the development of society”.



The result of the work can surely be considered of theoretical importance, as from methodological points of view, our University is directed to teach English only basic skills, general grammar and the ways of using language.

In this qualification paper we defined the term of “use of diplomatic language”; history of diplomacy; translational points of diplomatic correspondence between English and Uzbek which are mentioned in the introduction.

In the each paragraph, we gave the information according to our plan. Firstly, we answered to the question what diplomacy is. In the first paragraph, we defined the official documents and their usage in diplomatic language and history of diplomacy and using English in diplomacy. Diplomacy is used in all independent countries. Diplomacy has many fields and its history which are mentioned in the first paragraph. The first chapter is devoted to theory part of qualification paper.

In the each paragraph, we gave the information according to our plan. Firstly, we answered to the question what colloquialism is. In the first paragraph, we defined the subgroups of colloquialism and their usage in colloquial speech. Colloquial speech is used in all English speaking countries. Colloquialism has many subgroups which are mentioned in the first paragraph. These subgroups have differences from each other, but they are considered colloquial words. The first chapter is devoted to theory part of qualification paper. In the second chapter, we defined extra linguistic and linguistic aspects of diplomacy and analyzed from point of lexical, grammatical and stylistically. In the third chapter we pointed out translation of diplomatic correspondence and its problems in English and Uzbek languages.

After gaining sovereignty Uzbekistan started to independently conduct its foreign policy. So far Uzbekistan established diplomatic relations with more than 120 countries of the world. That’s why, the demand for qualified professional specialists for the development of our country increased rapidly. The necessity for the language of diplomacy and its flourishing is increased as the progress of the branch of diplomacy. So, we should know diplomatic language and how to write

effective diplomatic correspondences, regardless of the type of equipment to which we have access. In the first place, for centuries, maintaining relationships between nations through the exchanges of representatives has been the task of diplomacy. It may be said that the advantages of phrasing communications between governments, or important pronouncements on foreign affairs, in “diplomatic language” far outweigh any disadvantages which the system may possess. Diplomacy involves the function of representations, administering our overseas establishments, caring for the interests of our country citizen’s abroad; and reporting, communicating, and negotiating on political, economic, consular, and administrative affairs.

The task of diplomacy is to follow, promote and maintain international relations, to eliminate and settle misunderstandings and problems which have arisen in relations between subjects of international relations and international law in general. Like any organization or society which has to function according to certain rules, the same is true of relations between states where it is necessary to ensure that their contacts and cooperation are in accordance with a number of universally accepted rules and customs, and within the framework of pre-planned arrangements. These rules have changed, been upgraded and improved with new knowledge and customs, and have become generally accepted, thus forming an international diplomatic protocol. There are several diplomatic phrases which help to ease the way to full examination of entire diplomatic negotiation and contracts. A glossary is beyond reach but in what follows there’s a listing of words and phrases that turn up in great many documents, with comments on each one. The words and phrases are presented in plausible contract sequence, not alphabetically. Choosing the right words and the right grammar can go a long way to removing some of the unpleasantness of the message we have to deliver. It can also help us to maintain a level of deference that we wish to show to superiors or clients in the normal course of business. Using language diplomatically can be a challenge, even when speaking our mother tongue, but it is especially difficult when speaking a

foreign language since we often lack the appropriate vocabulary, and knowledge of alternative grammatical structures. Modifying your language in this way can be a useful tactic in business dealings when you are trying to establish a pleasant cooperative atmosphere, particularly with people of other cultural backgrounds. Indeed, in many business meetings and negotiations such diplomatic use of the English language can be a very positive aid to avoiding direct confrontation with your counterparts and a useful tactic. Timeliness is one of the forms of etiquette in writing official letters. One should be sure that the letter arrives in time. The receiver needs time to look through your letter and make some decisions.

To study Diplomacy in Linguistics, from the view of Stylistics is important for future English teachers too.

But as subject, to stylistics the amount of lesson hours are not sufficient for students and we can't go over deeply in the subtypes of Functional styles. Therefore, such works can be very helpful for further researches in master's degree study or for teachers to have seminars on stylistics and lexicology lessons. Besides them, the students who are interested in high levels or extra curriculum study of English can use the materials and schemes beneficially. The aim of this work was to point out some linguistic, structural peculiarities of language of diplomacy and diplomatic correspondence and we hope this work will give at least some new information or message to anybody about it. Finally, English diplomatic correspondence and diplomatic language may also be denied by the way it is practiced in the wide range of proprietary, academic, and company based programs that serve diplomatic English learners. These programs encompass a large body of material and many approaches. However, there may be a gap between pedagogical assumptions about diplomatic English – say, about the relative importance of various genres of writing and the language used in meetings – and actual language use in the workplace. These gap results both from limitations of research and instructor preparation and from enormous changes in technology and globalization that are affecting communication in the diplomatic world. The variety of programs

that teach diplomatic English vary by content, approach, format, and the competence and experience of instructors. Yet much of this rich and varied activity is difficult to discuss because it is described only partially in the literature.

#### **THE LIST OF USED LITERATURE:**

1. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On Measures for further Improvement of Foreign Languages Learning System”, Tashkent – December 10, 2012.
2. The President I. A. Karimov’s report at the Oliy Majlis session of the first convocation , February, 1995

3. Karimov I.A. There is no future without historical memory/we are constructing our future with our own hands. Vol.7. Tashkent: "Uzbekistan"; 1999. P.146
4. Арнольд И. В. Лексико-семантическое поле в языке и тематическая сетка текста. Текст как объект комплексного анализа в вузе. - К.: Высшая школа, 1984. – с.87
5. Арнольд И. В. Стилистика современного английского языка: Стилистика декодирования. – М: Просвещение, 1990. – с.93.
6. Арнольд И. В. Стилистика современного английского языка. – Л: Просвещение, 1981. – с.68.
7. А.Н.Мороховский, О.П.Воробьева, Н.И.Лихошерст, З.В.Тимошенко - Стилистика современного английского языка. - К.: Высшая школа, 1991. – с. 54
8. Белякова Е. И., “Переводим с английского/Материалы для семинарских и практических занятий по теории и практике перевода” (с английского на русский). — СПб: КАРО, 2003. – с. 92
9. Валентин Владиславович Сытель, “РАЗГОВОРНЫЕ АНГЛИЙСКИЕ ИДИОМЫ” – Л: Просвещение, 1968. – с.123
10. Гальперин И.Р. «Информативность единиц языка». М: Просвещение, 1974. – с. 45.
11. Гальперин И.Р. Очерки по стилистике. – М.: Литература на иностранных языках, 1958. – с. 49
12. Жирмунский В.М. Вопросы теории Литературы. Сб. статей. Л: «Acamedia», 1928. – с.354
13. Задорнова В.Я. Стилистика английского языка – М: Моск. университета, 1986. – с. 45
14. Кузнец М.Д., Скребнев Ю. М. Стилистика английского языка – Л.: «Просвещение», 1972. – с.102.

- 15.Потебня А.А. из записок по теории с Ловесности, Харьков – М: Литература на иностранных языках, 1905. – с.204.
- 16.Разинкина Н.М. Функциональная стилистика. М: «Просвещение», 1989. – с. 76
- 17.Aznaurova E. S., Kh. I. Abdukhrahmanova, “Translation theory and practise” – T: “Ukituvchi”, 1989. – p. 12
- 18.Arnold I. V. “The English word” – Moscow: “Vishaya shkola”, 1973. – p. 224
- 19.Arnold I., Dyakonova N. Analytical Reading – M: Moskva, 1962. – p.89
- 20.Felicity O’Dell Michael McCarthy, “English collocations in advanced use” – B: Cambridge University press, 2008. – p.5
- 21.Galperin.L.R. “Stylistics” – Moscow: Higher school, 1977. – p.48
- 22.Galperin I.R. “Stylistics” – M: Higher School Publ. House, 1981. – p. 40.
- 23.Halliday M. Linguistic function and social communication – The Hague, 1971. – p.101.
- 24.Ivashkin, M, Sdobnikov, V. A Manual of English Stylistics: Практикум по стилистике английского языка – Нижний Новгород: Н.А. Добролюбова, 2002. – p.152
- 25.A. Eban, “The New Diplomacy” – B: The M. I. T. Press, 1966. – p. 109.
- 26.Kukhareno, V.A. A Book of Practice in Diplomacy. – M: « Vishaya shkola », 1986. – p. 93
- 27.Lafont B., “International Relations in the Ancient Near East: The Birth of a Complete Diplomatic System,” Diplomacy and Statecraft, 12 (2001) 43.
- 28.Matyakubov J., Qo’shoqova B.,”Seminars in modern English stylistics” – Tashkent: “Muharrir nashriyoti”, 2012. – p.11- 12
- 29.Michael McCarthy Felicity O’Dell, “Conduct of American Diplomacy” – B: Cambridge University press, 2008. – p. 7-8
- 30.Michael O’Mara, “A Foreign Minister for the EU” – B: Cambridge university press, 2007. – p. 34

31. Musayev. Q. English stylistics – Toshkent: Adolat, 2003. – p. 6-12
32. Rosangela C. Taylor, “Diplomacy: History, Theory, and Policy” – New York: “Academia”, 2010. – p. 45
33. Bradford Richard, “Stylistics” – New York: “Academia”, 1997. – p.48
34. Narrative of the embassy of Ruy Gonzales de Clavijo to the court of Temur at Samarkand A.D. 1403-1406, p.p.133-134
35. Satow E., Satow’s Guide to Diplomatic Practice, 5th edn, ed. Lord GoreBooth (London and New York: Longman, 1979), p. 38.

### **Dictionaries:**

36. ABBYY Lingvo x5 – 2011
37. Berg P.C. A dictionary of New Words in English. Lnd – 1953.
38. Cambridge Advanced Learner’s dictionary, third edition – 2008
39. Webster's New Encyclopedic Dictionary – (1994: 752).
40. Oxford Dictionary of English, 3rd Edition , Oxford University Press – 2010
41. New Oxford American Dictionary, 3rd Edition, Oxford University Press Inc. – 2010
42. Collins English Dictionary. 8th Edition, HarperCollins Publishers – published in 2006
43. Webster's Third New International Dictionary. Springfield, Mass – 1961.

### **Internet recourses:**

44. <http://how to greet people in America. com>
45. <http://englishlife.uz>
46. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/torch>
47. <http://diplomacy.study.program.com>
48. [www.papyr.com/Oxford University Press textbook/eng](http://www.papyr.com/Oxford University Press textbook/eng)
49. [http:// en.wikipedia.org/wiki/abbreviation.](http:// en.wikipedia.org/wiki/abbreviation)

50. [www.LiveEnglishProgram.com](http://www.LiveEnglishProgram.com)