

Anush Martirosyan

Lecturer and Ph.D. student of Foreign Language

Department at Eurasia International University

Email: anush.martirosyan92@gmail.com

DOI: 10.53614/18294952-2022.1-129

MODALITY'S FEATURES OF DIPLOMATIC DISCOURSE

Conditioned by the political and diplomatic developments, diplomatic discourse has become a phenomenon where the use of language is of a great interest and it has always been at the attention of analysts, media press, society, etc. Understanding and emphasizing the importance of language in diplomacy, in this work we have tried to show some important features of diplomatic speech to reveal its contexts and nuances. Based on some examples of speeches of the leaders of different countries we have tried to identify the effective aspects of the language used in diplomacy. It can help make language more effective by using modality that emphasizes and values the message. On the other hand, it can allow one to analyse the context of a diplomatic speech in order to uncover the hidden messages of the speech.

Key words: Diplomacy and language, discourse, modality, ambiguity, context, modal verbs, utterance.

Introduction

In an age of information technology and globalization, geopolitical realities and developments are getting a new hue and colour and the political arena is often subdued. On the background of these political downturns, the role of diplomacy as an important branch of politics is more pronounced. Diplomacy is an exceptional field for building constructive relations between states where the communication between countries takes place through diplomatic speech and language of diplomatic negotiations. According to postmodernists, the language of diplomacy is the main precondition for building countries (Wright, 2000, p.14) while Aristotle

generally points out that ‘man is a political animal and is different in nature from other animals, that only man has the perceptions of good and evil, justice and injustice, has the ability to think and can speak’ and highlights as well that ‘voice and speech are different phenomena and the latter is only given to human being’. (Isabela Fairclough, 2013)¹.

Political realities, military pressures, war situations, economic cooperation, trade policy and other such important public, political manifestations are effectively managed through diplomatic negotiations. In diplomatic arena, linguistic means by which the speaker transmits his signals to the audience are of great importance. From this point of view, the role of modality in diplomatic speech is emphasized. If political discourse is the language of power and authority (Ascanio, 2001, էջ 16) then the nature is different in diplomatic language.

‘The purpose of diplomatic wording is to avoid direct, brutal primary and unproductive confrontation’. (D’Acquisto, 2017, p. 42). Indeed, if we look closely at the diplomatic developments, we will see that in diplomacy due to its constructive nature, things are not often called by their names; they can get different names and can be expressed in different ways by avoiding direct wording. On the other hand, this is conditioned by the geopolitical situation, as diplomacy can be realized not only between two countries, but also between several countries, and as a result, diplomatic discourse is trying to keep balanced relationships between all those countries due to the correct usage of language in diplomacy.

Methodology

The following article is based on the approaches and theories referring to diplomacy, diplomatic language, and modality. During the analysis of the article comparative and analytic methods have been used on the basis of studies of international linguists. Diplomatic discourse has been analysed based on the speech of world leaders of the UN 73rd General Debate (52 September-1 October 2018). In the framework of the article features of modality in diplomatic speech have been revealed and analysed.

The Role of Diplomacy and Its Language

Diplomacy has always been actual, yet this is an area where the conflicts meet their pacific solutions. During the centuries diplomacy’s forms, models and conducting ways have changed by adapting them to the new system of the world².

According to Sir Ernest Satow, diplomacy is conducted with the tools of intelligence and efficient tactics between states to maintain cordial relations with both independent and vassal states (Diplomacy, 2019)³. From this point of view,

1 See Section ‘political discourse analysis and the nature of politics’

2 * For more information see the book ‘The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy’, section ‘Modes, types and techniques of diplomacy’ of OUP Oxford, 2013, p.18-20

3 See First Chapter ‘Defining Diplomacy’

it is necessary to stress that now the role of diplomacy is stronger and wider than the above-mentioned definition as there are many organizations that conduct diplomacy, and for which diplomacy is the main instrument to find effective and pacific solutions. Organizations such as UN, EU, UNESCO, NATO play a significant role in humanitarian, cultural, military, protection spheres of countries and each of them has its form of diplomacy, e.g EU is more engaged in economic diplomacy, UNESCO in cultural diplomacy, etc. Based on this assumption, we can say that diplomacy has many ways of application. Notions like public diplomacy, cultural diplomacy are specific layers of the latter. The main mission of diplomacy is to reach peaceful solution of any conflict as well as to develop bilateral and multilateral relations between countries. From this perspective the definition 'Diplomacy, the established method of influencing the decisions and behaviour of foreign governments and peoples through dialogue, negotiation, and other measures short of war or violence' (Britannica, Encyclopedia 'Diplomacy', 2020). Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy defines it in the following way: 'Diplomacy at its essence is the conduct of relationships, using peaceful means, by and among international actors, at least one of whom is usually governmental. The typical international actors are states, and the bulk of diplomacy involves relations between states directly, or between states, international organizations, and other international actors. (The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy', 2013)

It is necessary to mention that the term politics and diplomacy, or foreign affairs should not be confused with each other, as foreign affairs is a part of politics and diplomacy is the instrument that conducts all the negotiation connected with different types of militaries, political, cultural or other related fields. Stemming from this we tend to think that the approach of Langholtz is more appropriate according to whom 'Diplomacy is the political process by which political entities (generally issues) establish and maintain official relation, direct indirect, with one another, in pursuing their respective goals, objectives, interests, and substantive and procedural policies in the international environment; as a political process it is dynamic, adaptive, and changing, and it constitutes a continuum; functionally it embraces both the making and implementation of foreign policy at all levels, centrally and in the field, and involves essentiality, but is not restricted to the functions of representation, reporting, communications, negotiating, and manoeuvring, as well as caring for the interests of national abroad' (Langholtz, 2004, p. 1). It is especially important to understand the system of the diplomacy whose impetus is to conduct it better.

The diplomatic system works as a delivery mechanism of foreign policy, the process through which a country's external policy is implemented. It may appear as a one-way relationship with policy of driving the process, but since the diplomatic machine delivers the responses and assessments that become policy determinants (Kishan S. Rana, 2004).

In diplomacy the psychology of relations is one of the most important factors, which means that a diplomat should know how to gain the trust of the partner

as ‘trust is an essential element of successful diplomacy’ (‘The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy’, 2013, p. 34).

For this diplomacy should be transparent but not completely as it is not accepted worldwide. There are many factors that should be used in a correct way to gain not only the trust of a person but also to persuade the governmental representatives, delegates, or ambassadors, to be attractive for them. A person who is engaged in diplomacy should be able to conduct not only an official position but also an informal one.

Diplomats should have some specific professional activities. Negotiation in general has an official character, but informal communication between persons through expressions of behaviour reflects the complexity of the negotiations, the need for confidentiality, and discretion ranging from formality to informality determines the degree of its effectiveness. Charm, persuasion, or restraint may seem like clichés; however, they constitute essential features of communicative behaviour and correlate more with a person’s character than one’s training (Stanzel, 2018).

It is here the communication language of diplomacy is highlighted and the speech is not about in which language negotiations are taking place. It is important to use the language in a way that it will be effective, strong, emphasized, and influential.

A political person or a diplomat must find a common tongue, (Nick, 2001) language of trust from which the cordial atmosphere comes. Besides, diplomats need to find effective ways of language use to be persuasive as especially obtaining something in diplomacy, the persuasion is inevitable, and one should speak in that language.

General Characteristics of Diplomatic Speech

Diplomatic discourse has its own peculiarities, and there are structures that are only influential in this public sphere, while in another area they are weak and ineffective. In diplomatic discourse modality has its unique place which gives a formal and serious image to this type of speech at the same time being mitigating. There is modality in all spheres of speech. It is noteworthy that in diplomatic speech, besides its very essence, it can convey different meanings as well and this is due to the features of the modality in. If, for instance, in everyday speech we say ‘*He mustn’t do it*’, and it is just a common sentence, then the same modal verb in diplomatic speech gives a different shade to the sentence, context or utterance where the speech becomes more stressed, moulded, and influential, having a very formal nature, such as: “*North Korea must stop the production of nuclear weapons*” which means that using the modal verb ‘*must*’ means obligation and an advice too .

The main feature of diplomatic speech is that the use of language is on a professional level, this means the latter has its own vocabulary, which already tells the communicator about its essence, such as ‘*status quo*’, ‘*persona non grata*’,

'*bilateral relations*', '*accreditation*' and other words which are only characteristic to this layer of language. Furthermore, in diplomatic discourse the salutation is important, namely, how a statesman or a diplomatic representative starts his speech, expresses politeness, respect, and formality. (Ray T. Donahue, 1997, pp. 65–69). In the latter, especially in manifestations of politeness, the peculiarity of modality is evident, as this shows the expression of respect in the official speech, and the perception of the communication depends on it. At diplomatic meetings, the following ways of salutation are generally used: '*Dear Mr. Minister*', '*Dear Mr. Ambassador*', '*Your Excellency*', '*Ladies and gentlemen*', '*Mr. President*' as in the following example:

(I) '*Mr. President, Mr. Secretary General, distinguished delegates, ambassadors, and world leaders*' (Trump, 2019)

(II) '*Mr. President, Your Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen*' (Johnson, 2019)

In order to continue the conversation, the following structures are widely used: '*I have the honour*', '*It is a great honour to me*', '*It is my honour*' by means of which the communication process is shaded likewise in those examples:

(III) '***I am honoured*** to be here today' (DiCaprio, 2014).

(IV) '***It is my honour*** to address you as the president of the government of Spain' (Sánchez, 2018).

Diplomatic speech often uses official vocabulary. This means that it is free of jargon, dialects, and has no grammatical incorrect uses such as:

(V) «Հայաստանը կարևորում է Թաիլանդի հետ հարաբերությունների զարգացումը երկկողմ հնարաքրքրություն ներկայացնող ոլորտներում և պատրաստակամ է գործադրելու անհրաժեշտ ջանքեր երկկողմ համագործակցությունը ընդլայնելու ուղղությամբ» (Pashinyan, 2019)

Armenia highlights the importance of the development of relationships with Thailand in areas of mutual interest and is ready to make the necessary efforts to expand bilateral cooperation. (Pashinyan, 2019), or

(VI) *It was agreed amongst all of us that 70 years after its foundation here in London, it is absolutely true to say that NATO is the most successful alliance in history and it now guarantees the peace and prosperity of a billion people around the world in 29 countries.* (Johnson, 2019)

Based on the above-mentioned examples, the language use is on a professional level. Vocabulary differs from every day or other related field's speech; grammatical structures are correct and formal. For instance, we do not see in the examples above phrase manifestation like '*u'r*' '*love ya*' (grammatically you are, love you) and other type of structures. All this together create modality since semantic field of the latter is expressed by the correct combination of syntactic and grammatical structures. Structures like '*allies*' '*mutual interest*', '*bilateral cooperation*' remind us of the formal meaning of the sentences. Continuing the discussion of the most prominent peculiarities of diplomatic discourse, we will first discuss the general

features of diplomatic discourse based on officials' personal written and oral notes, memoranda, resolutions and a number of other similar documents in order to understand how these peculiarities are manifested, by what grammatical means and what kind of semantic shades they can have, after this, we will outline the most important peculiarities that according to us are needed to analyse separately.

In diplomatic speech, no word is written or spoken just like that. They all have their own meanings and each of them gives a unique colouring to the word and the pragmatic value of the context. In the framework of such communication the role of modality is much more highlighted. As Panfilov mentions there is no sentence without modality as it is the inseparable part of the speech. According to him the communicator or the speaker cannot express his or her thoughts, attitude, formulate them, and address them to the interlocutor or listener without modality (Panfilov, 1977, pp. 40–44). Therefore, in this sphere, the role of modality is emphasized. It should be noted that evaluative modality has its unique role in the words of diplomats and politicians. Let us consider a few examples, and by examining them try to discover what pragmatic role they have from the perspective of modality and what special meaning it transmits to the speech or text.

(VII) South Africa does not condone any form of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia, and related actions. (Naledia Pandor, 2019)

(VIII) Islam is not radical, neither is Judaism, or Christianity, or Hinduism. The basis of all religion is compassion. (Imran Khan, 2019)

In the first example, South Africa's Minister of International Relations, N. Pandor, speaks of discrimination, where by counting the types of discrimination, it is shown that the listed phenomena are not encouraged by the state, this is why the phrase '*and related actions*' is emphasized at the end of the speech in order to make it clear that all phenomena stemming from discrimination are not acceptable to their government. Here we notice the notion of impossibility is the main concept of modality. In the second example, former Pakistani Prime Minister I. Khan, while speaking about Islam, points out that it is not a radical religion, which allows the interlocutors to understand that the negative manifestations that society has towards this religion are not true, and the word '*radical*' already indicates its essence, yet the latter generally is used for negative meaning. The Pakistani Prime Minister's remark is particularly interesting when he points out that Christianity, Hinduism, and Judaism are not radical either. The point of notions identical wording is to put all those religions on the equal platform. The following part of the speech '*The basis of all religion is compassion*' is an impetus for the audience to adopt different attitude towards Islam. There is a special emphasis on evaluative modality, which has been an instrument in the speech of I. Khan to express the desire towards Islam by giving a general tone to the reality of religions. The words '*not radical*' and '*compassion*' embody the very meaning of the utterance. Here we notice evaluative version of subjective modality. In the first

part of the preference, by denialist method, I. Khan tries to generalize all religions, based on which he emphasizes the equality of the aforementioned religions.

(IX) It is our right to defend our rights by all possible means regardless of consequences while remaining committed to international law and combatting terrorism” (Abbas, 2019)

In the example above, permission and obligation seem to be expressed in a coded form. Palestinian President M. Abbas notes: *‘It is our right to defend our rights’* which from modality point of view gets two shades: first, the president expresses commitment and obligation which means it is their duty to protect their rights, and second, no one has the right to prohibit or allow Palestine to defend its rights. Through *‘By all possible means’* structure, the president demonstrates all the possible and impossible means that they can use for the protection of their rights. In this case the subjective modality is used as it allows to imagine probable and possible events that will happen as subjective modality is limitless and allows one to think or judge in his/her own way.

One of the peculiarities of the modality of diplomatic discourse, which is noted frequently is another semantic application of the modal verbs. The English word *‘must’*, for example, can be used in another sense. For example, we often hear such sentences: *‘We must say that the meeting was amazingly effective for both sides’*, *‘we must mention that we are surprised by the hospitality of your country’*. In these sentences the verb *‘must’* is not used in terms of compulsion or necessity, but in quite another meaning. The first example expresses a good result, and the second expresses gratitude or pleasant surprise.

Another peculiarity is the use of impersonal verbs in order to make the sentence more neutral and emphasized but if political discourse emphasizes the image of ‘I’ through rhetoric then in diplomatic discourse the speech is more neutral or expresses a collective image.

Especially in this case, modality becomes very necessary, and its use gives a different shade, such as *‘it is necessary to mention’*, *‘should be emphasized’*, *‘should be organized’* and similar structures. Stemming from this specification a non-personal form of verb or gerund is also used in English diplomatic speech, which floods the resolutions of the UN Security Council and the EU. Let us consider some examples:

(X) Stressing the important role that the United Nations will continue to play in promoting peace and stability in Afghanistan” (S/RES/2489, 2019)

(XI) Urging all parties to make every effort to ensure that the cessation of hostilities is sustained, exercise maximum calm and restraint and refrain from any action or rhetoric that could jeopardize the cessation of hostilities or destabilize the region” (S/RES/2485, 2019)

(XII) Having regard to Article 24 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, which stipulates that the best interests of the child

must be a primary consideration and that every child has the right to maintain a personal relationship and direct contact with both of his or her parents. (Resolution:2733, 2019).

In UN-EU resolutions words ending in -ing are more prominent and several grammatical structures, such as “is sustained”, which denotes passive voice and through the modal verbs ‘will’, ‘could’, ‘must’ colour the meaning of the sentences.

Manifestations of Ambiguity Expressed by Modality

D’Acquisto mentions that ‘one of the features of diplomatic discourse is the ambiguity of speech. Ambiguity occurs unwillingly without any intention. To be flexible politicians don’t say everything literally and leave an option for alternative versions. (D’Acquisto, 2017, p. 10). Moreover, ambiguity in diplomatic communication is considered constructive and creative (Christer Jönsson, 2005, pp. 75-77). It is often noted that ambiguity can also be intentional. Speaking from the point of view of ambiguity, it should be mentioned that traditionally modality is divided into two parts: objective and subjective. In this case, it should be noted that subjective modality is very typical to all diplomatic contexts which imply duality. This stems from the fact that subjective modality reflects one’s attitude towards reality and incorporates into its nature those phenomena that between speaker, communicator, and interlocutor a semantic field is appeared which all members of the communication can understand in their own way.

Generally speaking of modality, the first essential quality that is mentioned is by its objective nature, it shows reality, and by its subjective nature, it permits one to speak of a possible phenomenon which has not yet taken place in reality, which can be interpreted quite differently by various subjects. As we will see in the examples, this peculiarity of the modality is remarkably interesting in this case, yet the communicators, namely, the speakers, the readers and interlocutors stay in dilemma. The problem is that in this case, modality expresses the meaning that lies between the two options ‘yes’ or ‘no’ (Slavik, 2004, p. 288).

Stemming from this remark let us consider the US President Donald Trump’s 2019 message on the Remembrance Day of the Armenian Genocide.

The example is illustrated with some reductions.

(XIII) Today, we remember and honour the memory of those who suffered during the Meds Yeghern, one of the worst mass atrocities of the 20th century. Beginning in 1915, one and a half million Armenians were deported, massacred, or marched to their deaths in the final years of the Ottoman Empire.

I join the Armenian community in America and around the world. We must remember atrocities to prevent them from occurring again. We welcome the efforts of Turks and Armenians to acknowledge and reckon with painful history, which is a critical step toward building a foundation

for a more just and tolerant future. (Trump, 2017).

In the US President's condolence message instead of the use of the problematic word 'Genocide' (before Armenian Genocide Recognition by the USA of 2021) the word '*Medz Yeghern*', is used which is another name for the notion of 'atrocities' in Armenian language, while simultaneously through superlative adjectives " '*one of the worst mass atrocities of the 20th century*' the very essence of these historical realities is emphasized. This is the evasion diplomacy expressed in Trump's diplomatic message. On the other hand, in the message of the latter obligation and responsibility are noted by means of '*must*' as a modal verb. The use of the latter can also be understood as a duty, in this case it is related to deontic modality, yet the latter involves meanings expressing compelling.

In the Condolence Message the US president supports Armenians, but at the same time avoids calling things by their names, without facing Turkish Government. The peculiarity of modality's expression is the latter expresses the primary feature of the diplomatic speech – ambiguity. Consequently, a question arises, when Trump says, '*we must remember*', will the president ultimately call these historical realities in their own names, whether he recognizes the genocide or not? As a result, we face the fact that this is a reality between 'yes' and 'no'. Here we see two manifestations of modality; the first is an objective one that captures the undeniable reality of genocide, and the second is the representation of subjectivity, which yields several interpretations and assumptions.

Another similar example is the answer of the Russian President Vladimir Putin to a journalist for an announcement of the meeting invitation by the President of Ukraine V.Zelensky at the International Economic Forum in St. Petersburg.

(XIV) (Журналистка) –Вы готовы с ним встретиться
(Владимир Путин)–*Послушайте меня. Я не знаю этого человека, надеюсь мы когда-нибудь познакомимся. Судя по всему, он хороший специалист в той области, в которой до сих пор работал, он хороший актер. (участники смеются). Я говорю серьезно (Путин тоже улыбается), а вы смеётся, вот значит, но одно дело кого-то играть от другое дело быть кем-то. Для того чтобы играть нужен талант, это точно и один из этих талантов — это талант перевоплощение. Ты через каждый десять минут можешь менять ампула, принц и нищий через каждые 10 минут и это надо быть убедительным, это действительно талант а для того чтобы заниматься государственными делами нужны другие качества, нужны опыт определенные знания, нужно уметь найти главные проблемы, увидеть их, найти инструменты решения этих проблем, уметь собрать дееспособных людей в одну команду, наладить с ними хорошие отношения, поверить в них, дать им возможность свободно мыслить и предлагать решения, выбирать эти решения, что очень важно*

объяснить миллионам людей, мотивы своего поведения при принятии этих решений и самое главное иметь мужество и характер брать на себя ответственность за последствия этих решений. Я не говорю, что у господина Зеленского нет этих качеств они вполне могут быть, ну опыт может них не хватать, но это дело как у нас в народе говорят наживное, это быстро приходит. Если другие качества у него которые перечислю вполне, может быть, но я этого не знаю. Он пока себя никак не проявил, а то, что мы видим, мы видим противоречивые высказывания в ходе предвыборной кампании одно, после выборов другое, поживем увидим, просмотрим. (Putin, 2019)

(Journalist) –Are you ready to meet him?

(V.Putin) –Listen to me please. I do not know this person; I hope someday we will get to know each other. Apparently, he is a good professional in the field where he had been working; he is a good actor. (Participants are laughing) I mean it seriously, and you are laughing (Putin also smiles), so, it is another thing to play as someone, and it is quite another thing to be someone. To play the role well you must have talent and one of those talents is the talent of reincarnation. You can change roles every ten minutes and transform from the prince to a pauper within ten minutes and you must be convincing in both roles, indeed it is a talent, but in order to engage in public affairs other qualities are obligatory, you need certain experience, some knowledge, you have to be able to find the main problems, see them, find the tool to solve those problems, you have to be able to bring together a team of capable people, cultivate a good relationship with them, believe in them, give them the opportunity to think freely and offer solutions, choose those solutions and most importantly, explain to millions of people, for those decisions that are made and most crucial, have the courage and character to take responsibility for the consequences of those decisions. I do not say that Mr. Zelensky does not have these qualities, they quite can be, but experience may not suffice for them, but as the people say it is a matter of time, it will pass quickly. He may have all the qualities I listed, but I don't know them. He has not shown up himself yet, and what we see, we see contradictory statements during the election campaign, and after elections, we will live and see, let's just see it. (Putin, 2019)

The Russian president builds his speech on assumptions. The first assumption is ‘*Apparently, he is a good professional in the field...*’. It seems as if the president by using the word ‘*apparently*’ draws a conclusion, but in the general sentence it has the meaning of assumption. ‘*He is a good professional*’, here the word ‘*good*’ is used to give a positive tone to the speech. To play a good role, he points out that one ‘*must*’ have certain qualities, but in order to govern a state some skills are ‘*obligatory*’. By applying to the modal verb ‘*must*’, and adjective ‘*obligatory*’ the president shows that in the first case it is simply the logical process of the

things, yet, in the latter case, the structure *'are obligatory'* demonstrates the importance and existence of those qualities that are needed or are obligatory to govern the country. The Russian president's words are ambiguous and ambiguity is more evident at the end of V.Putin's speech *'we will live and see, let's just see it'*. The first meaning is he might meet him, and the second he might not meet him. Generally, Putin's answer is directly comparative to the partially accepted definition of modality, which is interpreted as 'the speaker's attitude to the reality', yet by reading the whole speech of the president we see his opinion towards the questions of the journalist. In the president's speech, the possibility and the probability are obvious, and V.Putin in order not to rudely reject or refuse V. Zelenisky's invitation to meet each other, the answer is formulated in an alternative way.

In the section *«Я не говорю, что у господина Зелинского нет этих качеств они вполне могут быть, ну опыт может не хватать»/ 'I am not saying that Mr. Zelinsky does not have these qualities, they quite can be, but experience may not suffice for them'* the words *могут (mogut/can)* and *может (mozhet/might)* express probability.

The modality of the above-mentioned sentence is expressed through the structure *'will+ see'* (*we will leave and see, we will see it yet.*) which mitigates V.Putin's answer directed to the journalist's question about expectations of a possible meeting with the Ukrainian President V. Zelinsky. It allows us to think that there is no atmosphere of tension, but on the other hand the use of those structures shows a not yet made decision about possible meeting. In case we are dealing with epistemic modality. The president leaves the audience in ambiguity and assumptions. The peculiarity of modality, however, is that the president softens the essence of his speech, not being abruptly and rudely in it, and such manifestations are an important part of diplomacy and diplomatic discourse.

(XV) On behalf of my nation and state I would like to announce that our response to any negotiation under sanctions is negative. (Rouhani, 2019)

The above example is an excerpt from Iranian Ex-President Hassan Rouhani's speech at the 74th UN General Assembly. Let us start with the fact that diplomatic relations between the US and Iran are in non-constructive phase. The reason is Iran's goal to produce nuclear weapons, which the US opposes, and therefore imposes sanctions. In this speech, the head of the country expresses his wish, that there will not be any negotiations under sanctions. Here it is noteworthy that the President expresses a denial attitude. The emphasis is on the word *'negative'* which denotes denial meaning giving a possibility to H.Rouhani to steer clear of sharply and refuted diplomacy. The sentence could be just *'Iran will not negotiate with the US if the US continues to impose sanctions'*. But in that case the very meaning of the speech of Iran's president would not be effective and would be coloured by multifaceted meanings that's why the Iranian president's statement has been presented in a milder way, in which the meaning of the modality is the expression

of the will of the Iranian government. The message was expressed through the modal ‘would’. The president has avoided expressing his official position directly by applying these linguistic structures. Here we notice the idea of will and obligation. What is the peculiarity of the modality in this sentence of the president of Iran?

Thus, if the sentence had the following syntax: *‘Iran will not negotiate because the US is imposing sanctions’*, it would be harsh and rude in an international building such as the UN, as it would have a tone of intolerance which is not stemming from the country’s interests. If it had been expressed by means of the modal verb ‘must’, suchlike *‘If the United States wants to negotiate, then it must stop the sanctions’* then Iran’s official position would not have been expressed completely yet here we would have reverse image, namely, negotiations are only desirable for the United States and Iran is not interested in it, which would damage Iran’s image as non-collaborative and irresponsible country.

Peculiarities of the Meaning of Modality in the Contexts

The diplomatic field is a platform of caution and prudence, thus in many cases contexts are used that have their own and distinctive role. The speech is especially meaningful when it is seasoned with modality. To understand this, we will discuss a few examples below.

(XVI) *‘You may take this lightly, but these doors [to Europe] will open and these [ISIS] members will be sent to you. Do not try to threaten Turkey over developments in Cyprus’* (Erdogan, 2019)

To understand the context, we must first clarify the fact that Turkey has hosted three and a half million refugees and is engaged in arresting ISIS members. On the other hand, it wants to become a member of EU. Let us carefully consider the President’s words. The general idea is of blackmail, the president addresses EU leaders in the following way: *‘You may take this lightly’* by using probability in his speech. Then addressing perseverance, he points out that those doors will open, and those refugees will be sent to Europe. With the use of future tense Erdogan expresses veracity and reliability of the events. *‘These doors [to Europe] will open’, ‘these [ISIS] members will be sent to you’*. The usage of modality is essential here and it is applied in the right place namely in the beginning of the sentence. If we consider the sentence without *‘You may take this lightly’* then this would mean that there is no emphasis on the seriousness of Turkey’s position which the EU can ignore, therefore the president highlighted it. The true meaning of the text is that Turkey will send all refugees (currently Europe is avoiding refugees) and ISIS members if the EU continues to raise the issue of Cyprus (some part of the Cyprus peninsula is occupied by Turkey). This context of the speech could not be said directly for several reasons that are probably not in Turkey’s interest and such kind of drastically use of the meaning would create an atmosphere that Turkey is an aggressor country.

The next example is an extract from the letter North Korea's U.N. ambassador Kim Song to the fourteen members of the UN Council, within which the North Korean ambassador expresses his attitude and an official position of the country to the US criticism of human rights abuses in North Korea and states further the following:

(XVII) If the Security Council would push through the meeting on 'human rights issue' of the DPRK the situation on the Korean Peninsula would take a turn for the worse again. The United States and those countries on board shall bear full responsibility' (Song, 2019)

The context of the first sentence is not to organize such a meeting, where consequences are indicated. Second, it hints that all countries agreeing with that and having their participation will bear full responsibility. Based on diplomatic skills, the very essence of the message is not explicitly stated, otherwise it would be an open war with the United States. However, the basis of the sentence is the menace according to which North Korea will take steps for which, not North Korea, but the US and other cooperating countries are responsible for undesirable consequences. We note that the subjunctive tense was used in the first part of the text *'If the Security Council would push'*, with the use of comparative adjective *'the worse'*, the degree of worsening negativity is indicated. At the end of the text *'shall bear full responsibility'*, where *'shall'* has several subtexts: the first – obligation, the second – commitment, and the third – inevitability. The adjective *'full'* emphasized in the sentence makes it clear that the United States and its partner countries will not be partially responsible for the events but will completely shoulder the responsibility.

Conclusion.

Language is an important instrument in human communication and is the only means that allows people to exchange ideas and come to a common consensus. As we can see in the examples mentioned in the paper, we can clearly state that especially in diplomatic and political processes, language should be used with greater care and caution. From this point of view, the process of modality is significant, as it can give different shades to the sentence and speech. In this article, by identifying, discussing, and analysing several examples voiced by some politicians in the UN and other diplomatic platforms, we can come to the following conclusion:

The main purpose of diplomatic discourse is to find a positive way. Negotiating is to find a peaceful solution, and the role of modality is more emphasized here, and the modality should hold a positive message.

The diplomatic speech must be highly thought-out and organized, and modality here should contribute to the constructiveness of the speech.

Modality of negation is not that much accepted in the diplomatic sphere, so the words must be structured in such a way that the sentence expresses a negative

modality, meaning, at the same time having no negative grammatical component. Negation should not be expressed in a straightforward and rude sense, which will allow the diplomat to adopt a policy of flexibility in the choices. For instance, we can express the sentence of Iran's president Hassan Rouhani speech in this way *'The negotiations between Iran and the US under sanctions are lifeless'* where the word lifeless means that the negotiations have no continuation or future, or it is impossible to negotiate in these conditions.

Modal verbs, such as 'may', 'should', 'must', 'can' have a wide application in this area, which emphasize or weaken the meaning of the sentence, and which may also be expressed in another sense. Modality can be expressed without modal verbs. It can be expressed by certain grammatical structures, nouns, adjectives, adverbs, etc; for example, if we use the adjective "good" then it gets a positive meaning and if we use "ineffective" it gets a negative colouring.

In diplomatic discourse, the concepts of the category of modality, likewise 'probability', 'possibility', and 'compulsion' are often used which helps us to determine the purpose pursued by diplomacy.

Bibliography

- Abbas, M. P. (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2019/09/hold-general-assembly-2019-latest-updates-190916224113531.htm>
- Ascanio, A. (2001). *Análisis del contenido del discurso político*. Equinoccio.
- Britannica, E. o. (2020). Diplomacy. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/diplomacy>
- Christer Jönsson, M. H. (2005). *Essence of Diplomacy*. Springer.
- D'Acquisto, G. (2017). *A Linguistic Analysis of Diplomatic Discourse: UN Resolutions on the Question of Palestine*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- D'Acquisto, G. (2017). *A linguistic Analysis of Diplomatic Discourse: UN Resolutions on the Question of Palestine*. Cambridge Shcolars Publishing.
- DiCaprio, L. (2019). Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vTyLSr_VCcg
- Diplomacy. (2019). *Diplomacy*. IntroBooks , Can Akdeniz,.
- Diplomacy. T. O. (2013). *The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy*. OUP Oxford.
- Erdogan, R. (2019). *CBC*. Retrieved from <https://www.cbc.ca/news/world/turkey-erdogan-cyprus-isis-1.5356221>
- Imran Khan, P. M. (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2019/09/hold-general-assembly-2019-latest-updates-190916224113531.html>
- Isabela Fairclough, N. F. (2013). *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. Routledge.
- Johnson, B. (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zf4YEyh7erE>
- Johnson, B. (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pm-statement-at-nato-meeting-4-december-2019>
- Kishan S. Rana. (2004). *'The 21st Century Ambassador: Plenipotentiary to Chief Executive'*. Diplo Foundation.
- Langholtz, H. (2004). *' The Psychology of Diplomacy'*. Greenwood Publishing Group,.

- Naledia Pandor, S. A. (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2019/09/hold-general-assembly-2019-latest-updates-190916224113531.html>
- Nick, S. (2001). Use of language in diplomacy. Retrieved in 2020, from <https://www.diplomacy.edu/resources/general/use-language-diplomacy>
- Panfilov, V. (1977). *Категория модальности и ее роль в конструировании структуры предложения и суждения*. В. З. Панфилов. – М./ Panfilov, V 'Category of modality and its role in constructing the structure of sentences and judgments
- Pashinyan, N. (2019). *Prime Minister of Armenia*. Retrieved from <https://www.primeminister.am/hy/congratulatory/item/2019/12/05/Nikol-Pashinyan-Congratulations/>
- Putin.V (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lxtagauQxw9M>
- Ray T. Donahue, M. H. (1997). *Diplomatic Discourse: International Conflict at the United Nations— Addresses and Analysis*.. Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Resolution:2733, E. (2019). Retrieved from http://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2019-0005_EN.html?redirect
- Sánchez, P. (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ftIPJwOduFk>
- Slavik, H. (2004). *Intercultural Communication and Diplomacy*. Diplo Foundation.
- Song, K. (2019). Euronews Retrieved from <https://www.euronews.com/2019/12/04/north-korea-warns-un-security-council-not-to-discuss-rights>
- S/RES/2485, U. r. (2019). Retrieved from [https://undocs.org/S/RES/2485\(2019\)](https://undocs.org/S/RES/2485(2019))
- S/RES/2489, U. r. (2019). Retrieved from [https://undocs.org/S/RES/2489\(2019\)](https://undocs.org/S/RES/2489(2019))
- Stanzel, V. (2018). *New Realities in Foreign Affairs: Diplomacy in the 21st Century*. Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik,. Retrieved in 2020, from https://www.swp-berlin.org/fileadmin/contents/products/research_papers/2018RP11_sze.pdf
- The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy. (2013). *'The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy'*.. OUP Oxford.
- Trump, D. (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eICiLRyKTFg>
- Trump, D. (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/statement-president-donald-j-trump-armenian-remembrance-day-2017/>
- Wright, S. (2000). *Community and Communication: The Role of Language in Nation State Building and European Integration*. Multilingual Matters.

Անուշ Մարտիրոսյան

Եվրասիա միջազգային համալսարանի օգտար լեզուների և գրականության
ամբիոնի դասախոս, նայն ամբիոնի հայցորդ
lj.huuugle`anush.martirosyan92@gmail.com

ԵՂԱՆԱԿԱՎՈՐՄԱՆ ԱՌԱՆՁՆԱՀԱՏԱԿՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԸ ԴԻՎԱՆԱԳԻՏԱԿԱՆ ԽՈՍՈՒՅԹՈՒՄ

Քաղաքական և դիվանագիտական իրադարձություններով պայմանավորված դիվանագիտական խոսույթը դարձել է մի երևույթ, որտեղ լեզվի օգտագործումը մեծ նշանակություն և հետաքրքրություն է ներկայացնում, և միշտ գրավել է վերլուծաբանների, լրատվամիջոցների, հասարակության և

այլոց ուշադրությունը: Հասկանալով և ընդգծելով դիվանագիտության մեջ լեզվի կարևորությունը, այս աշխատության շրջանակներում մենք փորձել ենք ցույց տալ դիվանագիտական խոսույթի մի քանի կարևոր առանձնահատկություններ՝ բացահայտելու դիվանագիտական խոսքի ենթատեքստն ու երանգները: Հիմք ընդունելով և կիրառելով դիվանագիտության և եղանակավորման վերաբերյալ արդի ուսումնասիրությունները և տարբեր երկրների ղեկավարների ուղերձները, մենք փորձել ենք բացահայտել դիվանագիտության մեջ օգտագործվող լեզվի արդյունավետ կողմերը: Այն կարող է օգնել ավելի արդյունավետ դարձնել լեզուն՝ կիրառելով եղանակավորումը, որն ավելի է շեշտադրում և արժևորում խոսքը: Մյուս կողմից, այն կարող է թույլ տալ վերլուծել դիվանագիտական խոսույթի ենթատեքստը՝ խոսույթի թաքնված ուղերձները բացահայտելու համար:

Հիմնաբառեր. դիվանագիտություն և լեզու, խոսույթ, եղանակավորում, երկակիություն, ենթատեքստ, պակասավոր բայեր, նախադասություն:

Ануш Мартиросян

*Преподаватель и соискатель кафедры иностранных языков и литературы
Международного университета Евразия
Эл. адрес: anush.martirosyan92@gmail.com*

ОСОБЕННОСТИ МОДАЛЬНОСТИ В ДИПЛОМАТИЧЕСКОЙ РЕЧИ

В связи с политико-дипломатическими событиями дипломатический дискурс стал явлением, где использование языка представляет большое значение и интерес, и всегда привлекал внимание аналитиков, СМИ, общественности и др. Осознавая и подчеркивая важность языка в дипломатии, в рамках этой работы мы постарались показать некоторые важные особенности дипломатического дискурса, чтобы раскрыть контекст и нюансы дипломатической речи. На основе и применении современных исследований по дипломатии и модальности, и посланий лидеров разных стран мы попытались раскрыть эффективные аспекты языка, используемого в дипломатии. Это может помочь сделать язык более эффективным, используя модальность, которая больше подчеркивает и оценивает слово. С другой стороны, это может позволить проанализировать контекст дипломатической речи, чтобы раскрыть скрытые послания речи.

Ключевые слова: дипломатия и язык, дискурс, модальность, двусмысленность, контекст, модальные глаголы, предложение.

Հոդվածը խմբագրություն է ներկայացվել 2022թ. փետրվարի 28-ին:

Հոդվածը հանձնվել է գրախոսման 2022թ. ապրիլի 4-ին:

Հոդվածն ընդունվել է տպագրության 2022թ. ապրիլի 20-ին: