ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889,
2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-6

SOFT POWER IN SYNTAX: THE SEMIOTICS OF MODERN DIPLOMATIC RHETORIC

Khamrakulova Ravshanoy Abdulakhatovna
Department of Exact and Natural Sciences, Fergana State University
ravshanoyhamrakulova@gmail.com
ORCID ID 0000-0002-5523-8337
Mamatova Matluba Abdukhalilovna
Department of Exact and Natural Sciences, Fergana State University
lyuba.mamatova.22@mail.ru
ORCID ID 0009-0004-5954-5061

Abstract

This article examines four high-profile diplomatic speeches' linguistic, morphological, and paralinguistic features, emphasising their rhetorical construction, lexical choices, and performative strategies. Drawing on speeches delivered by Ambassador Scott C. Miller and a senior British diplomat, the study analyzes how political actors strategically blend formal rhetoric with emotional and symbolic language to promote national identity, reinforce international alliances, and sustain geopolitical legitimacy. By employing a comparative discourse analysis framework, the article situates these speeches within the broader contexts of contemporary soft power diplomacy and science diplomacy, highlighting the evolving nature of political communication in a globalised, media-driven world.

Keywords: Diplomatic discourse, political speech, rhetorical strategy, morphological analysis, paralinguistic features, soft power, science diplomacy, linguistic analysis, comparative discourse, international relations communication

Introduction

Diplomatic speeches represent a sophisticated intersection of political intent, cultural storytelling, and rhetorical strategy. In the contemporary geopolitical landscape, such speeches have evolved from ceremonial formalities into potent instruments of soft power, used for identity construction, alliance building, and ideological positioning. This study analyzes four recent diplomatic addresses—two by U.S. Ambassador Scott C. Miller (delivered at the Art in Embassies exhibition, 2023, and the Artemis Accords signing, 2024), a U.S. Independence Day speech in Switzerland (2024), and a UK foreign policy address—focusing on how linguistic, morphological, and paralinguistic strategies contribute to persuasive force and institutional credibility.

Theoretical Framework

This research draws upon critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1995), rhetorical theory (Charteris-Black, 2005), and morphology-oriented political linguistics (Beard, 2000). The tripartite analytical model—linguistic, morphological, and paralinguistic—follows the framework developed by Chilton and Schäffner (1997), which conceptualizes language as both a symbolic and strategic tool for exercising soft power. Additionally, the study incorporates insights from science diplomacy literature (Turekian et al., 2015; Gluckman et al., 2017) to contextualize the diplomatic implications of techno-scientific narratives.

Methodology

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889,
2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-6

This study adopts a qualitative, interpretive methodology, focusing on selected excerpts from officially recorded diplomatic speeches. Each speech was categorised based on its dominant diplomatic function:

- Cultural diplomacy (Art in Embassies)
- Science diplomacy (Artemis Accords)
- National commemoration (U.S. Independence Day)
- Foreign policy articulation (UK speech)

Speeches were analyzed across three dimensions:

- Linguistic (syntactic structure, tonal shifts, lexical strategies)
- Morphological (word formation processes, affixation, compounding, and nominalization)
- Paralinguistic (inferred prosody, rhythm, pacing, emotional emphasis)

This tripartite approach allows for a comprehensive understanding of how diplomatic language operates on multiple levels of communication.

Analysis and Discussion

Linguistic Analysis. The selected speeches demonstrate deliberate modulation of tone and register, ranging from ceremonial to conversational and from abstract to emotionally charged. For instance, the Art in Embassies speech employs high-formality markers—such as honorific titles ("Excellencies," "distinguished guests")—to establish diplomatic decorum and institutional ethos. Metaphors like "America is a tapestry" evoke national unity through culturally resonant imagery (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). Recurrent use of inclusive pronouns ("we," "our") fosters a sense of shared purpose and collective identity. In contrast, the Artemis Accords speech features a more semi-formal tone, interweaving personal address ("Georg") with legalistic and aspirational rhetoric. This hybrid register reflects the demands of science diplomacy, where interpersonal trust complements intergovernmental agreements. The UK foreign policy address exemplifies strategic rhetorical layering. It integrates historical allusions (e.g., Thucydides, Shakespeare), emotional appeals ("agonising deaths"), and moral urgings ("curse our complacency"), effectively synthesizing Aristotle's rhetorical appeals—ethos, pathos, and logos—into a persuasive and ideologically cohesive narrative.

Morphological Analysis. All four speeches exhibit a high frequency of abstract nominalizations (e.g., resilience, commitment, opportunity, innovation), which generalize complex processes and assign them institutional weight. This depersonalized style contributes to an authoritative tone, often characteristic of bureaucratic and diplomatic discourse (Halliday, 1994; Schäffner, 1996). Additionally, the use of complex compound noun phrases (e.g., "civil exploration of outer space," "shared achievement") serves to compress multidimensional ideas into policy-friendly units. Affixation patterns (e.g., -tion, -ity, -less, -ful) heighten both emotional and evaluative intensity while maintaining lexical formality. A noteworthy moment occurs in the Independence Day speech, where humorous neologisms like "Ambassadarling" break protocol-bound conventions to establish personal warmth and audience rapport—without undermining the speaker's diplomatic authority.

Paralinguistic and Rhetorical Strategies. Although direct audio-visual data is unavailable, prosodic and emotional cues can be inferred from textual features such as punctuation, sentence rhythm, and syntactic structure. The Art in Embassies speech utilizes periodic sentences, with semicolons and colons generating a formal, contemplative cadence. Repetitive phrasing ("Thank you… Thank

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889,
2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-6

you…") functions as anaphora, reinforcing gratitude and symbolic values. In contrast, the Artemis Accords speech includes shorter, punctuated exclamations ("Congratulations, and welcome to Artemis!"), which inject energy and optimism—hallmarks of science diplomacy's future-oriented narrative (Gluckman et al., 2017).The UK foreign policy speech intensifies urgency and gravity through metaphorical imagery (e.g., "hurricane-force change," "water on stone diplomacy") and rhetorical parallelism, enhancing memorability and moral force.

Table.1

Comparative Summary Table

Dimension	**Art in Embassies**	**Artemis Accords**	**U.S. Independence Day**	**UK Foreign Policy Speech**
Linguistic	High-formal, inclusive	Semi-formal, interpersonal	Modular, symbolic, moralistic	Formal-mixed, persuasive, historical
Morphological	Abstract nouns, metaphor	Legalistic terms, nominalization	Neologisms, compounds, intensifiers	Nominalization, modality, repetition
Paralinguistic	Ceremonial rhythm, warmth	Crisp tone, exclamatory energy	Emotional modulation, climax-driven	Gravitas, vivid metaphor, urgency

Conclusion

This comparative analysis underscores how modern diplomatic speeches function as performative, strategic acts that blend rhetoric, morphology, and paralinguistic inference to influence both domestic and international audiences. Through careful modulation of tone, syntactic rhythm, and lexical construction, these speeches articulate national values, forge alliances, and assert ideological legitimacy in increasingly complex global arenas. Far from being ceremonial relics, such speeches operate dialogically—positioning diplomacy as a symbolic, semiotic performance shaped by evolving media ecosystems, realpolitik, and public sentiment. In an era characterized by hybrid threats, science-policy integration, and soft power rivalries, the diplomatic speech emerges as a critical instrument of political narrative and geostrategic influence.

References

1. Beard, A. (2000). *The language of politics*. Routledge.
2. Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor*. Palgrave Macmillan.
3. Chilton, P., & Schäffner, C. (1997). Discourse and politics. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 206–230). Sage.
4. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
5. Gluckman, P., Turekian, V., Grimes, R. W., & Kishi, T. (2017). Science diplomacy: A pragmatic perspective from the inside. *Science & Diplomacy*, 6(4).
6. Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar* (2nd ed.). Edward Arnold.
7. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.

ISSN: 2582-4686 SJIF 2021-3.261,SJIF 2022-2.889,
2024-6.875 ResearchBib IF: 9.948 / 2024

VOLUME-5, ISSUE-6

8. Schäffner, C. (1996). Building a European house? Or at two speeds into a dead end? Metaphors in the debate on the united Europe. In A. Musolff, C. Good, P. Points, & R. Wittlinger (Eds.), *Attitudes towards Europe: Language in the unification process* (pp. 31–59). Ashgate.

9. Turekian, V. C., Macindoe, S., Copeland, D., Davis, L. S., Patman, R. G., & Gluckman, P. D. (2015). The emergence of science diplomacy. In S. D. Turekian, V. C. Turekian, & L. S. Davis (Eds.), *Science diplomacy: New day or false dawn?* (pp. 3–24