



LINGUOPRAGMATIC REPRESENTATION OF PERLOCUTIONARY ACTS IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH DIPLOMATIC DISCOURSE

D.L.Solijonova

teacher, Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages, Andijan

E-mail: dilnozaxamraboyeva048@gmail.com

97 233 94 04

ORCID: 0009-0006-4316-4736

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19447907>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 01st April 2026

Accepted: 04th April 2026

Online: 06th April 2026

KEYWORDS

When perlocutionary intentions are misconstrued, misperceptions or unintended communicative effects may result, and this is particularly the case in the diplomatic arena, where precision and nuance are crucial

ABSTRACT

This thesis aims to analyze the linguistic and pragmatic deployment of perlocutionary acts in diplomatic speech by exploring Uzbek and English discourse texts. It endeavors to discover how and in what linguistic and pragmatic ways perlocutionary effects are encoded, spread, and construed within institutional communication practices in general. From a comparative perspective, the study scrutinizes the effect on language/cultural norms of the perlocutionary influence. It demonstrates that these practices of perlocution are established by lexical, grammatical, and discourse practices of politeness norms, indirectness, and communication intentions. This research advances the theoretical study of linguopragmatic language and also presents tangible implications for intercultural and diplomatic communication.

Introduction. Language is a tool, and its linguopragmatic analysis seeks to illuminate the meaning-making processes occurring within the context of the communicative environment. In discursive language use, including diplomatic discourse with a focus on controlled communication and strategic communication strategies, communication strategies are being constructed through linguistics. A key part of this process is perlocutionary acts: influencing its listeners' cognitive and emotional environment; this is important. Diplomatic language is more than just direct modes of communication; it includes a lot of implicit meaning, indirectness, and strategic discourse tactics. The only way to understand how language might be used as a form of power to affect institutions is through linguistic criticism of acts of perlocution. Applying such arguments, this work seeks to investigate the linguistic apparatus of perlocutionary acts and to examine their deployment in Uzbek and English diplomatic texts at least at the level of some cases.

Perlocutionary acts of diplomacy. The perlocutionary acts in diplomatic discourse are strategic in nature and quite indirect to some extent. Moreover, they tend to be word strategic. That is, language speakers prefer non-descriptive phrases to explicit language, which allows for ambiguity. Such indirectness is polite and avoids confrontation. Perlocutionary effect linguistically occurs through the use of modal verbs, hedging, evaluative language, evaluative expressions, and discourse markers that structure meaning. For example, phrases like “we

would like to emphasize” or “it is important to note” are not merely the carriers of information, but serve to assist as guideposts to follow and shape the choice. These qualities show that perlocutionary performance is located within a general discourse organization (as such it cannot be read independently).

Perlocution marks in diplomatic writings from Uzbek and Anglo-Saxon. An analysis of the Uzbek and English diplomatic discourse finds some similarities and differences in the extent to which perlocutionary markers are deployed. Communication styles in the languages are indirect and polite. Thus the specific rhetoric provided may be varied, but the linguistic product of this tactic varies by other processes (both structural and cultural). In English diplomatic discourse, many perlocutionary effects that mitigate the impact of speeches originate from modal features — passive voice, hedging. In Uzbek diplomatic communication, the effect of style may be partly seen in honorific and politeness expressions and lexical-specific expressions of politeness of the particular culture, lexico-semantic change according to the situations, and lexico-semantic relations. The difference in lexical constructions and cultural standards has reflected a gap in the analysis of perlocutionary conduct in both counts.

Discovery of contrastive approaches and its practical applications. The contrastive analysis in our study shows that the application of the generalization of perlocutionary strategies notwithstanding, the language-specific and culture-specific aspects remain very important for the execution of the perlocutionary strategies. This is of importance in translation, interpretation, and intercultural communication work. When perlocutionary intentions are misconstrued, misperceptions or unintended communicative effects may result, and this is particularly the case in the diplomatic arena, where precision and nuance are crucial. Moreover, an extensive study involving the processes of linguopragmatic processing could enhance (and therefore affect) not only cross-cultural skills but also communication abilities. It further indicates that perlocutionary communication is framed by culturally contingent diplomatic expressions.

Conclusion. So the linguopragmatic analysis of perlocutionary acts leads one to understand how language is used as a strategy into shaping thought and action in diplomatic discourse. As the study suggests, on such linguistic and pragmatic effects, based on universal principles and culturally-conceived criteria, there are perlocutionary effects, which are represented. We illustrate the significance of contrastiveness in communication analysis through the juxtaposition of Uzbek and English diplomatic texts. The results enhance the theoretical development of pragmalinguistics and its application in diplomacy, translation, and communication within a group of other cultures.

References:

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). How to do things with words. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
2. Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Searle, J. R. (1979). Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics (Vol. 3, pp. 41–58). New York: Academic Press.

- 5.Sperber, D., & Wilson, D. (1986). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 6.Wilson, D., & Sperber, D. (2004). *Relevance theory*. In L. R. Horn & G. Ward (Eds.), *The handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 607–632). Oxford: Blackwell.
- 7.Levelt, W. J. M. (1989). *Speaking: From intention to articulation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- 8.Clark, H. H. (1996). *Using language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 9.Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 10.Levinson, S. C. (2000). *Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- 11.Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 12.Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An introduction* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- 13.Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 14.Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- 15.Berridge, G. R. (2015). *Diplomacy: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 16.Sharp, P. (2009). *Diplomatic theory of international relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 17.Kurbalija, J. (2013). *An introduction to diplomacy*. Malta: DiploFoundation.
- 18.Karasik, V. I. (2002). *Yazykovoy krug: lichnost', kontsepty, diskurs*. Volgograd: Peremena.
- 19.Safarov, Sh. (2008). *Pragmalingvistika*. Toshkent: Fan.
- 20.Mahmudov, N. (2010). *Til va muloqot*. Toshkent: Fan.