

ISSN 1999-4214 (print)

ISSN 2957-5095 (online)

ЕУРАЗИЯ ГУМАНИТАРЛЫҚ ИНСТИТУТЫНЫҢ

ХАБАРШЫСЫ

ВЕСТНИК

ЕВРАЗИЙСКОГО
ГУМАНИТАРНОГО
ИНСТИТУТА

BULLETIN

OF THE EURASIAN
HUMANITIES
INSTITUTE

№2/2025

Жылына 4 рет шығады
2001 ж. шыға бастаған

Выходит 4 раза в год
Начал издаваться с 2001 г.

Published 4 times a year
Began to be published in 2001

Астана, 2025

Бас редактор **Дауренбекова Л.Н.**
А.Қ. Құсайынов атындағы Еуразия гуманитарлық институтының доценті,
филология ғылымдарының кандидаты
Жауапты редактор **Алимбаев А.Е.**
А.Қ. Құсайынов атындағы Еуразия гуманитарлық институтының доценті,
философия докторы (PhD)

Редакция алқасы

Аймұхамбет Ж.Ә.	филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы ЕҰУ, Астана, Қазақстан
Ақтаева К.	филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, А. Мицкевич атындағы Польша университеті, Познань, Польша.
Әбсадық А.А.	филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, А. Байтұрсынов атындағы Қостанай өңірлік университеті, Қостанай, Қазақстан
Бредихин С.Н.	филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Солтүстік Кавказ федералды университеті, Ставрополь, РФ
Аасланд Е.	философия докторы (PhD), профессор
Гайнуллина Ф.А.	филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, доцент Ә. Бөкейхан атындағы университеті, Семей, Қазақстан
Ермекова Т.Н.	филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Қазақ ұлттық қыздар педагогикалық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан
Есиркепова К.Қ.	филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, қауымдастырылған профессор, А. Байтұрсынов атындағы Қостанай өңірлік университеті, Қостанай, Қазақстан
Жүсіпов Н.Қ.	филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Торайғыров университеті, Павлодар, Қазақстан
Каранфил Г.	философия докторы (PhD), профессор, Комрат мемлекеттік университеті, Кишинев, Молдова
Курбанова М.М.	филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Алишер Навои атындағы Ташкент мемлекеттік өзбек тілі мен әдебиеті университеті, Ташкент, Өзбекстан
Қамзабекұлы Д.	ҚР ҰҒА академигі, филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы ЕҰУ, Астана, Қазақстан
Құрысжан Л.Ә.	филология ғылымдарының кандидаты, профессор, Ханкук шетелтану университеті, Сеул, Оңтүстік Корея
Онер М.	философия докторы (PhD), профессор, Эгей университеті, Измир, Туркия
Олдфилд А.	Философия докторы (PhD), профессор, Каролина Университеті Каролина, АҚШ
Пименова М.В.	филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Шет ел тілдері институты, Санкт-Петербург, РФ
Сайфулина Ф.С.	филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Қазан федералды университеті, Қазан, Татарстан, РФ
Сенмез О.Ф.	философия докторы (PhD), профессор, Токат Газиосманпаша университеті, Токат, Түркия

Редакцияның мекенжайы: 010009, Астана қ., Жұмабаев даңғ., 4
Телефон/факс: (7172) 561 933; e-mail: eagi.vestnik@gmail.com, сайт: ojs.egi.kz

Еуразия гуманитарлық институтының Хабаршысы.
Меншіктенуші: «А.Қ. Құсайынов атындағы Еуразия гуманитарлық институты»
Қазақстан Республикасы Ақпарат және қоғамдық даму министрлігі Ақпарат комитетінде қайта есепке қойылды. Тіркеу № KZ92VPY00046970 17.03.2022
Басуға 27.06.2025 ж. қол қойылды. Пішімі 60*84 1\8. Қағаз офсеттік Көлемі. БТ.
Таралымы 200 дана. Бағасы келісім бойынша. Тапсырыс № 89
«Ақтаев У.Е.» баспасында басылып шықты

© А.Қ. Құсайынов атындағы Еуразия гуманитарлық институты

Главный редактор **Дауренбекова Л.Н.**
Кандидат филологических наук, доцент Евразийского гуманитарного института имени
А.К. Кусаинова
Ответственный редактор **Алимбаев А.Е.**
Доктор философии (PhD), доцент Евразийского гуманитарного института имени
А.К. Кусаинова

Редакционная коллегия

Аймухамбет Ж.А.	доктор филологических наук, профессор, ЕНУ имени Л.Н. Гумилева, Астана, Казахстан
Актаева К.	доктор филологических наук, профессор, университет имени Адама Мицкевича, Познань, Польша.
Абсадық А.А.	доктор филологических наук, профессор, Костанайский региональный университет имени А.Байтурсынова, Костанай, Казахстан
Аасланд Е.	доктор философии (PhD), профессор
Бредихин С.Н.	доктор филологических наук, профессор, Северо-Кавказский федеральный университет, Ставрополь, РФ
Гайнуллина Ф.А.	кандидат филологических наук, доцент университет имени А. Бокейхана, Семей, Казахстан
Ермекова Т.Н.	доктор филологических наук, профессор, Казахский национальный женский педагогический университет, Алматы, Казахстан
Есиркепова К.К.	кандидат филологических наук, профессор, Костанайский региональный университет имени А. Байтурсынова, Костанай, Казахстан
Жусипов Н.К.	доктор филологических наук, профессор, Торайгыров университет, Павлодар, Казахстан
Каранфил Г.	доктор философии (PhD), профессор, Комратский государственный университет, Кишинев, Молдова
Курбанова М.М.	доктор филологических наук, профессор, Ташкентский государственный университет узбекского языка и литературы им. Алишера Навои, Ташкент, Узбекистан
Камзабекулы Д.	академик НАН РК, доктор филологических наук, профессор, ЕНУ имени Л.Н. Гумилева, Астана, Казахстан
Курысжан Л.А.	кандидат филологических наук, профессор, Университет иностранных языков Ханкук, Сеул, Южная Корея
Онер М.	доктор философии (PhD), профессор, Эгейский университет, Измир, Турция
Олдфилд А.	доктор философии (PhD), профессор, Университет Каролины Каролина, США
Пименова М.В.	доктор филологических наук, профессор, Институт иностранных языков, Санкт-Петербург, РФ
Сайфулина Ф.С.	доктор филологических наук, профессор, Казанский федеральный университет, Казань, Татарстан, РФ
Сенмез О.Ф.	доктор философии (PhD), профессор, Университет Токат Газиосманпаша, Токат, Турция

Адрес редакции: 010009, г. Астана., пр. Жумабаева, 4
Телефон/факс: (7172) 561 933; e-mail: eagi.vestnik@gmail.com, сайт: ojs.egi.kz

Вестник Евразийского гуманитарного института.
Собственник: «Евразийский гуманитарный институт имени А.К. Кусаинова».
Министерством информации и общественного развития Республики Казахстан Комитет информации постановлено на переучет № KZ92VPY00046970 17.03.2022
Подписано в печать 27.06.2025 ж. Формат 60*84 1\8. Бум. Типогр.
Тираж 200. Цена согласовано. Заказ № 89
Напечатано в издательстве «У.Е. Актаева»

©Евразийский гуманитарный институт имени А.К. Кусаинова

Chief Editor **Daurenbekova L.N.**
Candidate of Philological Science, Associate Professor of the A.K. Kussayinov Eurasian Humanities
Institute
Editor-in-Chief **Alimbayev A.E.**
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Associate Professor of the A.K. Kussayinov Eurasian Humanities
Institute

Editorial Board

Aimuhambet Zh.A.	Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, L.N. Gumilyov ENU, Astana, Kazakhstan
Aktayeva K.	Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Poznan Adam Mitskevich University, Poznan, Poland
Absadyk A.A.	Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Kostanay Regional University named after A.Baitursynov, Kostanay, Kazakhstan
Aasland E.	
Bredikhin S.N.	Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, North-Caucasus Federal University, Stavropol, RF
Гайнуллина Ф.А.	Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor Alikhan Bokeikhan University, Semey, Kazakhstan
Yermekova T.N.	Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Kaz. National Women's Pedagogical University. Almaty, Kazakhstan
Yesirkepova K.K.	Candidate of Philological Sciences, Professor, Kostanay Regional University named after A.Baitursynov, Kostanay, Kazakhstan
Zhusipov N.K.	Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Toraighyrov University, Pavlodar, Kazakhstan
Karanfil G.	Doctor of Philological (PhD), Professor, Komrat Devlet Univerditesi, Kishinev, Moldova
Kurbanova M.M.	Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Tashkent State University of the Uzbek Language and Literature named after Alisher Navoyi, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
Kamzabekuly D.	Academician of NAS RK, Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, L.N. Gumilyov ENU, Astana, Kazakhstan
Kuryszhana L.A.	Candidate of Philological Sciences, Professor, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Seoul Korea
Oner M.	Doctor of Philological (PhD), Professor, Aegean University, Izmir, Turkey
Oldfield A.	Doctor of Philological (PhD), Professor, Coastal Carolina University Carolina, USA
Pimenova M.V.	Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Foreign Languages Institute, St-Petersburg, RF
Seifullina F.S.	Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Kazan Federal University, Kazan, Tatarstan, RF
Senmez O.F.	(PhD), Professor, Tokat Gaziosmanpasa University, Tokat, Turkey

Editorial address: 010009, Astana., 4, Prospect Zhumabayev
Tel/Fax: (7172) 561 933; e-mail: eagi.vestnik@gmail.com, сайт: ojs.egi.kz

Bulletin of the Eurasian Humanities Institute.

Owner: «A.K. Kussayinov Eurasian Humanities Institute».

The Ministry of Information and Public Development of the Republic of Kazakhstan Information Committee decided to re-register No. KZ92VPY00046970 17.03.2022

Signed for printing 27.06.2025 Format 60 * 84 1 \ 8. Paper. Printing house

Circulation 200. Price agreed. Order No. 89

Printed in the publishing house of «U.E. Aktaev»

МАЗМҰНЫ – СОДЕРЖАНИЕ – CONTENTS

ТІЛ БІЛІМІ – ЯЗЫКОЗНАНИЕ – LINGUISTICS

АБЖАМАЛОВА Ж.Е. САҒИДОЛДА Г.	Қазақ және өзбек тілдеріндегі заттық-тұрмыстық лексиканың семантикалық салыстырмалы талдауы	7
АХМЕТОВА Б.З., ТЛЕУЛЕСОВА А.Ш., ЖАЕВА Р.Р.	Производные имена как отражение языкового сознания в высказываниях на территории северного Казахстана	14
АХТАЕВА Н., СҮЛЕЙМЕНОВА Ә., САРЫБАЕВА Б.	Контекстік синоним парадигмасы	22
ӘДІЛОВ М.Е., ЕКИЖИМ., ЖИЕМБАЙ Б.С.	Алакөл атауының этимологиясы: жаңаша көзқарастар мен топонимдік талдау аспектілері	31
БАТЫРБЕКОВА К.А., АЛИМБАЕВ М.Е., МЕДЕТБЕКОВА Н.Н.	Lexico-semantic character of somatic names occurring in the written monument «Baytaratu'l-Vazih»	42
ИСЛАМА., БЕІСЕБАҢҒАА. САРЕКЕНОВА Қ.Қ., ОСЕРОВ Б.М.	Comparative analysis of political and diplomatic discourse М. Жұмабаевтың «Педагогика» еңбегі және терминология мәселесі	51 60
ПАШАН Д.М., ХАБИЕВА А.А., ЕЛУБАЙ Ә.М.	«Нарғыз» антропонимінің семантикасы, орфографиялық нормасы және қолданылу жиілігі	67
ТӨКЕНҚЫЗЫ Г., ОМАРОВА С.Қ., КАДИРХАН А.К.	Қазіргі телебағдарламалар тілі (қазақ тілі ұлттық корпусының кіші корпустары негізінде)	78

ӘДЕБИЕТТАНУ – ЛИТЕРАТУРОВЕДЕНИЕ – LITERATURE STUDIES

АНАНЬЕВА С.В., ИБРАЕВА Ж.Б., ЖУМСАКБАЕВ А.Т.	Динамические и статические мотивы в повествовательной структуре романа Ильяс Есенберлина «Влюбленные»	91
ЖӨЛЕЛОВА М.С., АРСЛАН М.	Қалқаман Сарин поэзиясындағы ауылға сағыныш: поэзиядағы көркемдік өрнектер («Арқаттағы біздің үй» өлеңінің негізінде)	102
КАЖЫТАЙ Б.К.	Асқар Алтайдың «Туажат» романындағы оксюморондық бейнелеу тәсілі	111
ҚАДЫЛ Т.	Мағаз Разданұлы поэзиясындағы философиялық тереңдік	120

НҰРМАХАНОВА М.Қ., МҰСАЛЫ Л.Ж., СОВЕТОВА З.С.	Белгілі сыншы Қалжан Нұрмахановтың бағалауындағы қазақ-украин әдеби байланыстары	131
СЕРАЛИМОВА С.А., БЕЙСЕНОВА Ж.С	Культурные коды в художественном переводе	140
ТЛЕУБЕКОВА Б.Т., ИБРАЕВА А.Д., ҚИАРЫСТАНОВА Г.Қ.	Көркемдік әдістің әдеби ағымдары мен бағыттары	151

**ТІЛ ЖӘНЕ ӘДЕБИЕТТІ ОҚЫТУ ӘДІСТЕМЕСІ – МЕТОДИКА ПРЕПОДАВАНИЯ ЯЗЫКА И
ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ – METHODOLOGY OF TEACHING LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE**

ИСЕНОВА Ф.К., КАУДЫРОВА А.О., ДҮКЕМБАЙ Г.Н.	Роль рефлексии в формировании языковой личности студентов	162
ЖУМАДИЛОВА М.Н. БЕРКЕНОВА Р.А.	Өзге тілді студенттердің жазу дағдысын қалыптастырудың линводидактикалық әдістеме негіздері	173

A. ISLAM¹ *A. BEISEBAYEVA² Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World languages, Almaty,
Kazakhstan^{1 2}(e-mail: aisha_ling@mail.ru¹, aygerabb@gmail.com²)

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL AND DIPLOMATIC DISCOURSE

Annotation. The article examines the key differences and similarities between political and diplomatic discourses, their goals, functions, as well as linguistic features. Particular emphasis is placed on the analysis of lexical and grammatical means used in both discourses and their role in achieving communicative goals. Political discourse is oriented towards a mass audience and is aimed at attracting support and shaping public opinion. In contrast, diplomatic discourse is characterized by restraint, neutrality and a desire to find compromises in interstate interactions. Diplomatic and political discourse have many intersections, and they complement each other, but their communicative acts and goals differ a lot. The differences and similarities considered allows to gain a deeper understanding of the mechanisms of communication in these areas and their impact on public perception and international relations. The study employs methods of content analysis, discourse analysis, comparative analysis and lingua-stylistic analysis. The results reveal the main stylistic features and communicative functions of each type of discourse. The obtained results allow us to deepen our understanding of the essence and role of political and diplomatic discourses in modern society, and they can also be useful for specialists in the field of political linguistics, international relations, intercultural communication and translation.

Keywords: discourse, political discourse, diplomatic discourse, agents, communication, politicians, diplomats.

Introduction. Political and diplomatic discourses are among the most important aspects in international and internal relations, which play a decisive role in shaping public opinion and decision-making. Despite apparent external similarities, these two types of discourse differ significantly in purpose and methods of audience influence. Political discourse, which is aimed at shaping public opinion and policy agendas, can directly impact diplomatic discourse by setting priorities for international negotiations and foreign relations. Conversely, diplomatic discourse, which focuses on negotiation, consensus-building, and conflict resolution, can influence political rhetoric by shaping how leaders present international matters to their domestic audiences.

While political discourse often employs persuasive, ideological, and sometimes confrontational language to mobilize support, diplomatic discourse tends to be more measured, neutral, and focused on compromise. However, in practice, these boundaries can blur, particularly in high-stakes negotiations where political considerations must be carefully balanced with diplomatic objectives.

The interrelation between political and diplomatic discourse is complex and dynamic, as both play crucial roles in shaping international and domestic affairs. While they are distinct in their objectives and communicative strategies, they often overlap and influence one another in significant ways.

This article will examine how exactly political and diplomatic discourses differ in their nature, goals and linguistic means. Although this work aims to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the differences between political and diplomatic discourses, exploring their underlying principles,

communicative goals, and distinctive linguistic features. By examining various case studies and applying discourse analysis methodologies, this study will highlight the unique functions of each type of discourse and their broader implications for contemporary political and diplomatic interactions.

Methodology and research methods. This study adopts a comparative qualitative approach to analyze the differences and similarities between diplomatic and political discourse. The analysis is based on a corpus of textual materials selected to represent both discourses, ensuring a balanced and diverse range of sources. This study employs a comparative qualitative approach to analyze the distinctions and overlaps between diplomatic and political discourse. This methodology provides a robust foundation for identifying both the shared characteristics and distinct features of political and diplomatic discourse, contributing to a deeper understanding of their respective roles in communication and linguistics.

Discussion and observation. Discourse is a multifaceted phenomenon with no universally accepted definition encompassing all its features and applications, as the term is widely used across various scientific fields. As it is known, this term was initially used to denote an utterance in its formulation and further development. With the formation of cognitive science, it acquired a new understanding and is quite applicable to oral and written discourse, but from the point of view of space and time, the concept of *discourse* denotes an active attitude to the text, its consideration in the process of communication. The shift in linguistic science toward functionalism, which emphasizes language as a crucial tool for categorizing the world and reflecting human cognitive activity, introduced a new approach to defining discourse [1, 244]. From the standpoint of modern approaches, discourse is considered “as a complex communicative phenomenon that includes, in addition to the text, also extralinguistic factors (knowledge of the world, values, attitudes, goals of the addressee) necessary for understanding the text” [2, 8].

In the context of rapidly developing linguistic science and the increased interest of linguistics in the problems of communicative interaction, specific types of discourse that reflect the characteristics of different groups, strata and different goals of communicants attract close attention of researchers. The professional discourse is of particular interest, the identification of principles for their research is a relevant and in-demand task, therefore it would be appropriate to study each linguistic phenomenon simultaneously from cognitive and communicative positions; social cognition [3, 19].

V.I. Karasik suggests distinguishing two main types of discourse: personal (personally oriented) and institutional. In the first case, the speaker acts as a person, reflecting the full depth of his inner world, while in the second case, he acts as a representative of a specific social institution. According to Karasik, institutional discourse is “a specialized clichéd form of communication between people who may not know each other, but who must communicate in accordance with the norms of society” [4, 385].

In the classification of institutional discourse, political and diplomatic ones occupy a special place. Although political and diplomatic discourse are considered the same by most people, and even interchangeable in some characteristics, they have significant differences from each other. In this study, political and diplomatic discourse will be studied comparatively, an attempt will be made to distinguish them, identify their similarities and specific features.

The similarities between diplomatic and political discourses are evident, as heads of state, politicians, and foreign policy officials often act as agents (participants) in both. Moreover, diplomatic and political discourses intersect according to another parameter of Halliday's classification, namely, the parameter of the form of discourse. It is worth noting here that an important factor in the convergence and intersection of the discourses under consideration is that diplomatic and political relations are largely determined by speech processes. We can note the connection between diplomatic discourse and political communication, the purpose of which, in general, can be summarized as the discussion and resolution of important issues: a) the allocation of state resources; b) the control/right to make decisions (judicial, legislative, executive); c) the application of sanctions (the right to punish or reward) [5, 14].

Another similarity of political and diplomatic discourse is their strategy. Both discourses are constructed with a long-term strategy in mind: in politics to maintain power or popularity; in diplomacy to maintain relationships and reach mutual agreements. Two types of communication rely on certain norms, rules and traditions that dictate how and what can be said within the framework of these discourses.

Political and diplomatic turbulence occurring in modern society introduces certain corrections both to the definition itself and to the functional means of diplomatic and political discourses, bringing together and complementing the analyzed types of discursive practices with other types of communication. Often in the scientific works of researchers, it is noted that the interpenetration, complementarity, convergence of lexical systems of political and diplomatic discourses with other types: media discourse, legal, non-economic, confessional, etc. can be traced in both discourses.

Obviously, diplomatic and political discourse have much in common, they are complementary, but the communicative acts of each have their own specific features, the aim of these types of discursive practices are fundamentally different. The goal of political discourse is to influence the recipient from dominant positions. Communicative acts of political discourse are usually addressed not to individuals, but to the masses. According to D.B. Gudkov "Dialogue occurs according to the "leader – crowd" scheme, and the leader can also be collective (for example: a newspaper, a television channel, etc.)" [6, 33]. If the goal of political discourse is the struggle for power [7, 326], then from the general definition of diplomacy it follows that, in addition to the tasks of informing and coordinating interests, the functions of diplomatic communication include protecting the interests of the country and its citizens.

Despite the apparent similarity between diplomatic and political discourses, there are a number of factors that prevent diplomatic and political communication from being similarly identified. From the point of view of cognitive linguistics, the content of political discourse includes "knowledge that can influence the production and perception of speech; other texts, the political views of the author and his tasks, as well as the political situation" [8, 20].

According to French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu "political discourse is the opinions and discussions expressed on political issues in society" [9, 201]. Russian scientist V.A. Maslova, in her definition of political discourse, draws attention to its psychological foundations and the influence of extralinguistic circumstances: "Political discourse is the result of the formation and perception of texts, as well as the influence of extralinguistic factors participating in the process of text perception" [10, 208]. Political discourse is rooted in specific ideological views, which are expressed through texts disseminated within society [11, 177]. According to Islam, political discourse is a special type of discourse that aims to conquer and maintain political power. In linguistics, political discourse is presented as a multidimensional and multifaceted phenomenon, as a complex of elements forming a single entity [12, 352].

Based on the research of political discourse by Kazakhstani researcher B.A. Akhatova, it is obvious that participants in the political process prefer to use language with semantic ambiguity, since this gives them the opportunity to manipulate public opinion. This ambiguity contributes to the obscuring of negative information, disguising data, hiding objective facts and even avoiding personal responsibility, which facilitates the transfer of the burden of responsibility [13, 21].

The difference between diplomatic communication and political communication lies, first of all, in the specifics of the social institution and its representatives. If we consider the social institution as "a socially legitimized expertise together with those persons authorized to implement it" [14, 164], then in diplomatic communication it is relevant to a very limited group of people.

The social purpose of political discourse is to instill in the addressees – citizens of the community – the need for "politically correct" actions and assessments. In other words, the goal of political discourse is not to describe, but to convince, awakening intentions in the addressee, providing grounds for conviction and encouraging action. Some researchers are of the opinion that persuasion is the main characteristic of political discourse.

A politician, using symbols in his speech, must be able to reach the mass consciousness. Trying to attract listeners to his side, they do not always resort to logically coherent arguments. Sometimes it is enough to simply make it clear that the position in favor of which the proponent speaks is in the interests of the addressee. Defending these interests, they can also influence emotions, play on feelings of duty, on other moral attitudes. The tasks of diplomatic discourse can generally be reduced to the tasks of the concept of foreign policy of the state. The values of diplomacy and, consequently, diplomatic discourse, are reduced to compliance with the principles of a sovereign state, dispute resolution by diplomatic means, i.e. through negotiations, orientation towards multipolar cooperation, etc. All of the listed values and principles are elements of international legal documents and integral parts of diplomatic protocol. The events of diplomatic discourse include conferences, summits, briefings, press conferences, receptions at various levels, etc.

The addressee of the diplomatic discourse is a representative of the same diplomatic institution or another institution or a representative of the society as a whole in relation to the representatives of the institution. In a political discourse, communication takes place between three participants: the addressee (the speaker is a politician who claims power), the direct addressee (the listener is most often a political opponent) and the addressee-observer (the people). According to V.I. Karasik, "in the context of formal (institutional) relations, there are two typical participants in the relationship: agents and clients. Agents are representatives of a given social institution, and clients are people who are not associated with social institutions" [4, 385].

The addressees of diplomatic discourse are representatives of the institution of diplomacy, who can be professional diplomats – officials of the foreign ministry, persons involved in the foreign policy of the state – heads of state, heads of government, heads of special bodies, that is, persons who implement the foreign policy of the state, represent and protect the interests and positions of the country. As the addressee (client) of diplomatic discourse, we consider the same players of the institution of diplomacy or representatives of any other opposing institution, including representatives of the media, representatives of the general public, people from the business world, ordinary citizens, and citizens of the state.

The next distinguishing feature of diplomatic discourse is peculiar turns of speech or special discursive formulas adopted in diplomatic communication. "Special attention is devoted to the form, first of all, to the address, the final compliment, the correct spelling of the addressee's last name and his title" says Popov [15, 576]. These formulas vary depending on the addressee of the message, its content, genre, but in each individual case, the rules regulate the entire type of document or form that must be used in a speech of one or another type. The characteristic features of institutional diplomatic discourse are the multipolar nature of interaction, the desire for cooperation, the comprehensive information component, the complex nature of foreign policy relations, and the defense by diplomats of the interests of their state. One of the characteristics of diplomatic texts is their informativeness, the collective image of the addressee.

Modern political discourse is characterized by features of various functional styles. Although a politician's public speech usually belongs to the journalistic style, it is obvious that within the framework of one speech, depending on the communication situation, elements of other styles, for example, the conversational style, can be used. In official situations, the degree of control over speech increases. The larger the audience, the more official the speech style becomes. The use of the conversational style in an official setting is a stylistic device that achieves the effectiveness of discourse.

Any speech message conveys the author's point of view with the help of the linguistic means used and thus exerts influence. It is influence, as noted above, that is the communicative goal of the politician. Thus, political communication is a special form of influencing communication. Political discourse forms a certain ideological attitude, value orientations and ideals, as well as a political picture of the world in the addressee. Thus, the main feature of public political discourse is its pragmatic focus, namely, managing public opinion, forming a certain assessment of information and an emotional reaction to it in the collective addressee.

Turning to the most significant linguistic features of political discourse, it is worth noting the careful choice and use of syntactic constructions, primarily the active and passive voice. The active voice is used by politicians in speeches within the framework of an appeal to the people in order to show readiness to fulfill promises and to act in general. The use of a verb in the passive form allows the attention of listeners to be refocused from the actor, thereby removing some degree of responsibility from him for any actions.

At the word-formation level, a number of linguistic features of political discourse can also be identified. American and English political speeches frequently feature nouns formed through conversion or compounding of verbs and adverbs: *take-over* (seizure of power), *lay-out* (a person who has lost his job), *push-over* (an easily surmountable obstacle), *shut-down* (closure, liquidation), etc.

One of the methods of word formation is “blending”, which became widespread in the English language in the twentieth century, although some scholars argue that this method appeared long before the nineteenth century [16, 20]. “Blending” involves combining two words into one, and the resulting formation includes the lexical meanings of both words. Often, the new word consists of the beginning of one word and the end of another word. Thanks to “blending”, a large number of new words have appeared in the language, which are common in the fields of politics, advertising, as well as in the media and everyday communication. For example: *ObamaMania*, *Obamamomentum*, *cameracature*, *Oxbridge*, etc.

The lexical features of political discourse are further characterized by specific linguistic techniques. Metaphor is widely used in constructing a political picture of the world, but it serves not only to attract the attention of a potential audience. Metaphor in political communication is not limited to the artistic side. It affects both the subconscious and unconscious components of human behaviour. With the help of metaphor, politicians can establish contact with the audience, create an atmosphere appropriate to the situation. In particular, such expressions as *fight a war*, *win a battle*, *line of defence*, *firing line/line of fire*, when used metaphorically, should certainly be classified as a military metaphor.

In the metaphorical picture of American politicians, reality is regularly presented as a *war* being waged on various fronts. The following nominations belong to the frame under consideration: *battle*, *fight*, *combat*, *struggle*, etc. Depending on the sphere of activity to which a particular politician appeals in their metaphor, various types of “wars” can be found in their discourse: *war on terror*, *war on coal*, *battle for healthcare*, etc.

Results. Summing up, political discourse is functional; its main function is persuasion; the subject implements a strategy of argumentation and positive self-representation. Political discourse is not characterized by unique linguistic strategies that are inherent to it exclusively but demonstrates selectivity in the choice of certain linguistic means and stylistic devices depending on their effectiveness in the conditions of a certain speech situation.

Diplomatic language is fixed and universal. It should be noted that the language of diplomacy is always limited by the choice of speech means. The difference between diplomatic and other types of discourse is the presence of strict linguistic frameworks that limit the choice of lexical means of expression and determine the functional style. The lexical feature of documents in the diplomatic sphere is the use of international diplomatic terminology, terminology of international law and socio-political terminology, which covers foreign policy terms. Diplomacy is closely connected with the legal sphere, since it relies on the norms of international law when conducting a state’s foreign policy.

The use of imperative structure in the language of diplomacy is not allowed. In such cases, the document may be rejected, returned, and even lead to a diplomatic crisis. According to K.A. Logunova, the language of diplomacy includes conditional-adversarial sentences, words aimed at finding an agreement, and phrases that ensure diplomatic etiquette [17, 125].

Since Latin was originally the diplomatic language, most international terms in the diplomatic sphere are of Latin or French origin. In the 20th century, the terminological system of diplomatic language began to be influenced by English, which at that time acquired the status

of an international language. The German language is no exception in the continuity of the facts of the development of the diplomatic language system. Thus, most of the diplomatic terms are borrowings from the above-mentioned languages. Among the actual borrowings from Latin and French in diplomatic practice today, the following lexemes appear: *attaché, diplomam, demarche, communiqué, consul*. Such terminology is manifested in the texts of verbal notes, in which calques are clearly present: *де-факто (defacto), персона нон грата (persona non grata), статус кво (status quo), modus vivendi* – these terms are not subject to assimilation during calques.

Any international meeting is organized strictly in accordance with the requirements of international law and observance of diplomatic ceremonial. Thus, any diplomatic event begins with an exchange of pleasantries, with welcoming, friendly words addressed to the parties present. The most common forms of address in diplomatic meetings as: *mister, friend, friends, colleagues, comrades, mister Secretary General, Mr. President, etc.* For example: *Dear Mr. President! Dear friends! Good afternoon, Your Excellency, Mr. Secretary General!*

Conclusion. *Political and diplomatic discourses* are fundamental components of both international and domestic relations, playing a crucial role in shaping public opinion, influencing political decisions, and facilitating communication between various actors on the global stage. These forms of discourse contribute to the development of national strategies, international cooperation, and the resolution of conflicts. Despite certain external similarities, political and diplomatic discourses exhibit distinct characteristics in their objectives, rhetorical strategies, and linguistic structures.

To sum up, we can state that *political discourse* as a type of institutional discourse has a number of systemic features that largely determine its nature, the strategies and tactics used in it, in particular, determining its manipulative potential. Political discourse is primarily directed at engaging the general public, mobilizing support, and shaping political narratives to influence governance and policy-making. It often employs persuasive techniques, emotional appeals, and ideological framing to reinforce particular viewpoints and gain public trust. Political leaders, parties, and institutions utilize this form of discourse to assert authority, legitimize actions, and establish dominance in the political arena.

In contrast, *diplomatic discourse* focuses on fostering friendly international relations, maintaining sovereignty and cooperation, and promoting a positive national image. It serves as a mechanism for negotiation, conflict resolution, and fostering cooperation among states and international entities. It is characterized by its measured tone, emphasis on neutrality, and strategic ambiguity, ensuring that communication remains constructive and conducive to mutual understanding. Diplomats and international representatives employ specific linguistic conventions to maintain decorum, avoid direct confrontation, and seek compromise in complex geopolitical contexts.

Literature

1. Зяблова О.А. Новое понимание языков для специальных целей и их роли в профессиональной деятельности: познание, опыт, дискурс. – М.: Русайнс, 2023. – 244 с.
2. Караулов Ю.Н., Петров В.В. От грамматики текста к когнитивной теории дискурса // Ван Дейк Т.А. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация: Пер. с англ. / Сост. В.В. Петров; Под ред. В.И. Герасимова; Вступ. ст. Ю.Н. Караулова и В.В. Петрова. – М.: Прогресс, 1989. – С. 5–11.
3. Кубрякова Е.С., Александрова О.В. Виды пространств текста и дискурса // Категоризация мира: пространство и время. – М.: Диалог МГУ, 1997. – С. 19–20.
4. Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. – Волгоград: Перемена, 2002. – 385 с.
5. Robert E. Denton, Gary C. Woodward. Political Communication in America. – New York: – Political Science, 1985. – P. 14.
6. Гудков Д.Б. Ритуалы и прецеденты в политическом дискурсе // Политический дискурс в России. – М.: Диалог МГУ, 1998. – С. 30–36.

7. Шейгал Е.И. Семиотика политического дискурса. – М.: Гнозис, 2000. – 326 с.
8. Беляков М.В. Дихотомия лингвистического и экстралингвистического в дипломатическом дискурсе // Филологические науки в МГИМО. – №46 (61). – М.: Московский государственный институт международных отношений (университет) Министерства иностранных дел Российской Федерации. – 2011. – С. 20-48.
9. Бурдые П. Политические позиции и культурный капитал. – М.: Социология политики, – 1993. – 201 с.
10. Маслова В.А. Лингвокультурология: Учеб. пособие для студ. высш. учеб. заведений. – М.: Академия, 2001. – 208 с.
11. Цуциева М.Г. Политический дискурс как интегративный феномен // Вестник Ленинградского государственного университета им. А.С. Пушкина. – 2012. – №2 – С. 174-178.
12. Islam A., Zikhrullayev E., Ismagulova B., Roziyeva D., Translation Issues of Political Interview // ASTRA Salvensis, Supplement. – 2021. – № 1 – P. 351-364. URL: <http://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?eid=2-s2.0-85107078581&partnerID=MN8TOARS>.
13. Ахатова Б.А. Анализ медиадискурса Ассамблеи народа Казахстана // Вестник КазНУ. Серия журналистики. – 2022. – № 64 (2). – С. 85-93.
14. Agar M. Institutional Discourse // Text – Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse. – Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers, 1985. – P. 147–168.
15. Попов В.И. Современная дипломатия: теория и практика. Дипломатия – наука и искусство: курс лекций. 2-е изд. – М.: Международные отношения, 2003. – 576 с.
16. Филоненко Т.А. Жанрово-стилистические характеристики англоязычного научно-методического дискурса: автореф. дис. канд. фил. наук. – Самара: 2005. – 20 с.
17. Логунова К.А. Язык дипломатии как язык для специальных целей // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. – № 7-1 (49). – 2015. – 124-126 с.

А. ИСЛАМ, А.Е. БЕЙСЕБАЕВА

Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері университеті,
Алматы, Қазақстан

САЯСИ ЖӘНЕ ДИПЛОМАТИЯЛЫҚ ДИСКУРСҒЫ САЛЫСТЫРМАЛЫ ТАЛДАУ

Аңдатпа. Мақалада саяси және дипломатиялық дискурстардың негізгі айырмашылықтары мен ұқсастықтары, олардың мақсаттары, қызметтері және тілдік ерекшеліктері қарастырылады. Екі дискурста да қолданылатын лексикалық және грамматикалық құралдарды талдауға және олардың коммуникативтік мақсатқа жетудегі рөліне ерекше назар аударылады. Саяси дискурс көпшілік аудиторияға, халықтың қолдауын алуға және қоғамдық пікірді қалыптастыруға бағытталған. Өз кезегінде, дипломатиялық дискурс ұстамдылықпен, бейтараптықпен және мемлекетаралық өзара әрекеттестікте ымыраға келуге ұмтылумен сипатталады. Дипломатиялық және саяси дискурстың ортақ тұстары көп және олар бірін-бірі толықтырады, әйтсе де әрқайсысының коммуникативті актілері әртүрлі және дискурстың мақсаттары күрт ерекшеленеді. Қарастырылған айырмашылықтар мен ұқсастықтар осы салалардағы коммуникация механизмдерін және олардың қоғамдық пікір мен халықаралық қатынастарға әсерін тереңірек түсінуге мүмкіндік береді. Зерттеуде мазмұнды талдау және дискурстық талдау, сонымен қатар салыстырмалы және лингвистикалық талдау әдістері қолданылады. Мақала нәтижелері дискурстың әрбір түрінің негізгі стилистикалық ерекшеліктері мен коммуникативтік қызметтерін айқындайды. Алынған нәтижелер қазіргі қоғамдағы саяси және дипломатиялық дискурстардың мәні мен рөлін түсінуді тереңдетуге мүмкіндік береді. Сонымен қатар аталмыш дискурс түрлері саяси лингвистика, халықаралық қатынастар, мәдениетаралық коммуникация және аударма саласындағы мамандар үшін де пайдалы болуы мүмкін.

Түйін сөздер: дискурс, саяси дискурс, дипломатиялық дискурс, агенттер, коммуникация, саясаткерлер, дипломаттар.

А. ИСЛАМ, А.Е. БЕЙСЕБАЕВА

Казахский университет международных отношений и мировых языков им. Абылай хана,
Алматы, Казахстан

**СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОГО И ДИПЛОМАТИЧЕСКОГО
ДИСКУРСА**

Аннотация. В статье рассматриваются ключевые различия и сходства политического и дипломатического дискурсов, их цели, функции, а также языковые особенности. Особый акцент сделан на анализе лексико-грамматических средств, используемых в обоих дискурсах, их роли в достижении коммуникативных целей. Политический дискурс ориентирован на массовую аудиторию и направлен на привлечение поддержки и формирование общественного мнения. В отличие от него дипломатический дискурс характеризуется сдержанностью, нейтральностью и стремлением к поиску компромиссов в межгосударственных взаимодействиях. Дипломатический и политический дискурс имеют много точек соприкосновения и дополняют друг друга, но их коммуникативные акты и цели различаются. Рассмотренные различия и сходства позволяют глубже понять механизмы коммуникации в данных сферах и их влияние на общественное восприятие и международные отношения. В исследовании используются методы контент-анализа и дискурс-анализа, а также сопоставительного и лингвистического анализа. Результаты раскрывают основные стилистические особенности и коммуникативные функции каждого типа дискурса. Полученные результаты позволяют углубить понимание сущности и роли политического и дипломатического дискурсов в современном обществе, а также они могут быть полезны для специалистов в области политической лингвистики, международных отношений, межкультурной коммуникации и перевода.

Ключевые слова: дискурс, политический дискурс, дипломатический дискурс, агенты, коммуникация, политики, дипломаты.

References

1. Zjablova O.A. Novoe ponimanie jazykov dlja special'nyh celej i ih roli v professional'noj dejatel'nosti: poznanie, opyt, diskurs. – M.: Rusajns, 2023. – 244 s.
2. Karaulov Ju.N., Petrov V.V. Ot grammatiki teksta k kognitivnoj teorii diskursa // Van Dejk T.A. Jazyk. Poznanie. Kommunikacija: Per. s angl. / Sost. V.V. Petrov; Pod red. V.I. Gerasimova; Vstup. st. Ju.N. Karaulova i V.V. Petrova. – M.: Progress, 1989. – S. 5–11.
3. Kubrjakova E.S., Aleksandrova O.V. Vidy prostranstv teksta i diskursa // Kategorizacija mira: prostranstvo i vremja. – M.: Dialog MGU, 1997. – S. 19–20.
4. Karasik V.I. Jazykovoj krug: lichnost', koncepty, diskurs. – Volgograd: Peremena, 2002. – 385 s.
5. Robert E. Denton, Gary C. Woodward. Political Communication in America. – New York: Political Science, 1985. – P. 14.
6. Gudkov D.B. Ritualy i precedenty v politicheskom diskurse // Politicheskij diskurs v Rossii. – M.: Dialog MGU, 1998. – S. 30–36.
7. Shejgal E.I. Semiotika politicheskogo diskursa. – M.: Gnozis, 2000. – 326 s.
8. Beljakov M.V. Dihotomijalingvisticheskogo i ekstralingvisticheskogo diplomatičeskogo diskursa // Filologičeskie nauki v MGIMO. – №46 (61). – M.: Moskovskij gosudarstvennyj institut mezhdunarodnyh otnoshenij (universitet) Ministerstva inostrannyh del Rossijskoj Federacii. – 2011. – S. 20–48.
9. Burd'e P. Politicheskie pozicii i kul'turnyj kapital. – M.: Sociologija politiki, – 1993. – 201 s.
10. Maslova V.A. Lingvokul'turologija: Ucheb. posobie dlja stud. vyssh. ucheb. zavedenij. – M.: Akademiya, 2001. – 208 s.
11. Cucieva M.G. Politicheskij diskurs kak integrativnyj fenomen // Vestnik Leningradskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. A.S. Pushkina. – 2012. – №2 – S. 174–178.

12. Islam A., Zikhrollayev E., Ismagulova B., Roziyeva D., Translation Issues of Political Interview // ASTRA Salvensis, Supplement. – 2021. – № 1 – R. 351-364. URL: <http://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?eid=2-s2.0-85107078581&partnerID=MN8TOARS>.
13. Ahatova B.A. Analiz mediadiskursa Assamblei naroda Kazahstana // Vestnik KazNU. Serija zhurnalistiki. – 2022. – № 64 (2). – S. 85-93.
14. Agar M. Institutional Discourse // Text – Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse. – Amsterdam: Mouton Publishers, 1985. – P. 147-168.
15. Popov V.I. Sovremennaja diplomatija: teorija i praktika. Diplomatiya – nauka i iskusstvo: kurs lekcij. 2-e izd. – M.: Mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija, 2003. – 576 c.
16. Filonenko T.A. Zhanrovo-stilisticheskie harakteristiki anglojazыchnogo nauchno-metodicheskogo diskursa: avtoref. dis. kand. fil. nauk. – Samara: 2005. – 20 s.
17. Logunova K.A. Jazyk diplomatii kak jazyk dlja special'nyh celej // Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki. – № 7-1 (49). – 2015. – 124-126 s.

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Ислам Айбарша – филология ғылымдарының докторы, Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері университетінің профессоры, Алматы, Қазақстан.

Ислам Айбарша – доктор филологических наук, профессор Казахского университета международных отношений и мировых языков имени Абылай хана, Алматы, Казахстан.

Islam Aybarsha – Doctor of Philology, Professor of the Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages, Almaty, Kazakhstan.

Бейсебаева Айгерим – Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері университетінің докторанты, Алматы, Қазақстан.

Бейсебаева Айгерим – докторант Казахского университета международных отношений и мировых языков имени Абылай хана, Алматы, Казахстан.

Beisebayeva Aigerim – doctoral student, Kazakh Ablai khan University of International Relations and World Languages, Almaty, Kazakhstan.