

“Term” And “Terminology” In The Context Of Studying The Diplomatic Terminological System

Ilyosbek Ibrokhimjonovich Khasanov

Head of the Department of International Cooperation, Lecturer at the Department of Russian Philology
Andijan State University named after Z.M. Babur
170100, Andijan, Uzbekistan, 129 University Street
E-mail: ird@adu.uz
ORCID: 0009-0003-3081-9260

Abstract. The article examines the theoretical and methodological foundations of the concepts of “term” and “terminology” within the study of the diplomatic terminological system. It analyzes various scholarly approaches to defining a term, its structural and semantic features, and the criteria that distinguish terms from general vocabulary. Special attention is given to the specificity of diplomatic lexis as an integral part of the professional language of international relations. The study identifies the key characteristics of diplomatic terms, including their systemic nature, functional orientation, high degree of standardization, and dependence on political and legal contexts. The review of existing terminological theories provides a methodological basis for further research into diplomatic terminology as a coherent and dynamically evolving system. The results serve as a theoretical foundation for subsequent investigation into the structure, classifications, mechanisms of functioning, and evolution of the diplomatic terminological system.

Keywords: term; terminology; terminological system; diplomatic discourse; language for special purposes; terminology studies; definition; syllogism; term motivation; lexicalized phrase; metalanguage; polysemantic unit

One of the key trends in the history of linguistics is its integration with other scientific disciplines. At early stages of its development, linguistics found its roots in such fields as history, psychology, and philosophy. However, in the modern era, linguistics demonstrates significantly broader connections with various sciences, including natural and exact sciences such as biology, biochemistry, and biophysics, as well as the humanities. For example, linguistics actively interacts with cybernetics in studying language structures and information processing algorithms. This expansion of interdisciplinary connections enriches linguistics with new methods and approaches, enabling a deeper understanding of the complex mechanisms of language functioning in the context of human activity and natural processes.

The merging of disciplines has led to the emergence of numerous new branches of linguistics, such as psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, political linguistics, legal linguistics, cognitive linguistics, engineering linguistics, mathematical linguistics, and computational linguistics. These fields not only expand the horizons of traditional linguistic studies but also create opportunities for interdisciplinary approaches to analyzing communication across various domains. The synergy of scientific approaches contributes to a deeper understanding of linguistic phenomena and their interaction with other aspects of human activity.

Within the context of this study, it is important to note the development of diplomatic terminology and concepts in political and legal linguistics. Research in these areas contributes to a better understanding of the mechanisms of diplomatic communication and the interpretation of international legal norms and acts. It also enables the analysis of the language of official statements, negotiations, and other forms of interstate communication. Thus, interdisciplinary integration contributes not only to expanding the lexicon of diplomatic practice but also to enhancing the effectiveness of international relations through a more precise understanding of linguistic phenomena and contexts. Moreover, under conditions of globalization and constant changes in world politics, awareness of the specific features of diplomatic language becomes particularly significant. Terms and specialized vocabulary serve as essential elements for ensuring effective communication between states, making this research relevant for interdisciplinary studies.

“One of the elements of the cultural environment, which is both a result of the development of civilization, a means of recording its history, and one of the means of its formation, is language, and above

all, specialized vocabulary – the set of lexical units of specialized fields of knowledge, forming a distinct layer of vocabulary most amenable to conscious regulation and standardization” (Grinev-Grinevich, 2008, p. 5). The scientific and technological revolution initiated after World War II and continuing to the present has led to a significant increase in specialized vocabulary within modern languages. In particular, more than 90% of neologisms in the contemporary lexicon consist of terms belonging to specific fields of knowledge.

Whereas previously the problem of using specialized words (terms) in formulating scientific ideas, legislative acts, and conducting diplomatic negotiations concerned mainly professionals in science, industry, and politics, today – due to the rapid development of information technologies, as well as processes of computerization and digitalization across nearly all spheres of human activity – the audience interacting with terminology has expanded significantly. This necessitates the creation of effective mechanisms for interpreting and assimilating specialized vocabulary by a broader public.

There exist various approaches to defining the concept of “term”, characterized by the absence of strictness and a unified foundation. Representatives of different disciplines associate the notion of “term” with their own specific concepts and interpretations, assigning it different scopes and defining it in their own ways. For a logician, a “term” is any word or concept with a strict definition; a philosopher defines it as a condensed definition, equating the concept with its extended interpretation; a sociologist understands a term as a specialized word related to science or production regardless of its origin or definitional clarity; and “a linguist may sometimes be inclined to consider a borrowed word as a term, since it stands out within the lexical system of a language as something foreign.” (Superanskaya, Podolskaya, & Vasileva, 2012, p. 11) Representatives of various professional domains often perceive words related to their field as terms without paying sufficient attention to their systematization or the theoretical justification for term formation.

For instance, N.I. Kondakov defines a term as “a word or phrase that serves as the precise name of a strictly defined concept... A term is also a special word or expression adopted to denote something within a particular environment or profession. In formal logic, terms refer to the subject and predicate of a judgment, as well as the subject and predicate of premises in a syllogism” (Kondakov, 1975, p. 594). These definitions illustrate differences in approaches to linguistic units: logic focuses on abstract entities and their relationships rather than specific linguistic forms. It is also known that “in formal logic, the word “name” is often used instead of “designation” (Superanskaya, Podolskaya, & Vasileva, 2012, p. 12). Kondakov’s examples demonstrate that logic does not necessarily distinguish between proper and common nouns, both considered “names,” while a “term” differs only in being a “precise name.”

D.N. Ushakov, in his explanatory dictionary of the Russian language, provides the following meanings: “term [Lat. terminus – boundary, limit]: 1. In formal logic—a concept expressed by a word (philosophy); 2. A word naming a strictly defined concept / a special word or expression adopted to denote something in a particular field or profession.” (Ushakov, 1940, vol. IV, p. 689). These definitions reflect the characteristic feature of the 1930s – the lack of distinction between terminological units, nomenclature designations, and professional jargon. They also illustrate the absence of consensus among scholars regarding the semantic nature of the “term”.

In the Sociological Encyclopedic Dictionary edited by G.V. Osipov, as well as in the Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary, the following interpretations of the word “term” are provided: “Term (from Latin terminus – boundary, limit, end): 1) a name with a specialized (scientific) meaning, specified within the context of a particular theory or field of knowledge; 2) in ancient philosophy, a concept that fixes the stable and enduring aspects of reality in contrast to its diverse and changeable sensory representations (analogous to the modern concept of ‘law’); 3) in Aristotelian syllogistics and traditional logic, the elements of judgments that constitute a syllogism, namely the subjects and predicates of its premises and conclusion.” (Philosophical Encyclopedic Dictionary, 1983, p. 681; Sociological Encyclopedic Dictionary, 1998, p. 364).

The first definition emphasizes the contextual nature of terms and highlights the fundamental distinction between units of general and specialized vocabulary, the latter possessing a clearly fixed semantics that varies depending on context. Moreover, from a linguistic perspective, defining the concept of a “term” through the word “name” in this case is justified and demonstrates an interesting approach to considering both common and proper nouns within various terminological systems – in our case, diplomatic

terminology, where proper names are often used alongside common nouns to denote concepts or phenomena, for example: The Monroe Doctrine - Доктрина Монро (in Russian Language) – Monro doktrinasi (in Uzbek Language), The Pueblo Incident/ Инцидент Пуэбло/ Pueblo hodisasi, The Lytton Report/ Комиссия Литтона/ Litton komissiyasi, etc.

The second definition interprets the term as a conceptual instrument for fixing stable aspects of reality. It emphasizes the philosophical function of terms, which serve not only to denote objects or phenomena but also to express deeper ideas and laws of existence. In this context, terms act as linking elements between abstract concepts and concrete realities.

The third definition illustrates the logical function of terms. Within formal logic, terms are essential for constructing arguments and drawing conclusions. Importantly, terms do not merely denote objects or properties; they also participate in the structures of thought and reasoning.

These definitions collectively present a multifaceted understanding of the concept of “term,” reflecting its complexity and underscoring its importance across different fields of knowledge. On the one hand, a term is a specialized lexical unit necessary for the precise designation of concepts in scientific discourse; on the other, it is an instrument of philosophical analysis and logical reasoning.

T.L. Kandelaki, in a work devoted to the interrelation between the semantics and motivation of technical terms, defines a term as “a word or a lexicalized phrase that requires the construction of a definition within a corresponding system of concepts in order to establish its meaning.” (Kandelaki, 1977, p. 7). This definition reflects the principle of systemic semantics, according to which the meaning of a term cannot be isolated from its context and field of application. Furthermore, the notion of “definition” presupposes the use of a metalanguage for the precise description of a term, which is an essential aspect of scientific communication. However, the emphasis on the “construction of a definition” as a necessary condition for establishing meaning, while valid for many technical domains, may be overly simplistic in the case of diplomatic terminology, where meanings are often context-dependent and subject to polysemy.

In diplomatic discourse, definitions may be implicit, embedded in practice and precedent rather than formally articulated. The meaning of a term may be referential, as in “sovereign state/ суверенное государство/suveren davlat” or ideologically marked, as in “democracy/демократия/ demokratiya”, “autocracy/автократия/avtokratiya”, “terrorism/терроризм/terrorizm” or “humanitarian intervention/гуманитарная интервенция/gumanitar intervensiya” whose meanings are continuously contested and reinterpreted by actors in international relations. Therefore, the rigid requirement of constructing a formal definition may be inadequate for diplomatic terminology.

Moreover, diplomatic terminology often relies on implicit meanings and intertextual connections, including references to previous agreements and treaties. In this context, a “word or lexicalized phrase” may in fact be an entire expression with an established meaning in a specific historical situation, which is difficult to capture in a concise definition.

In light of the above, Kandelaki’s definition serves as a valuable starting point but requires refinement to adequately describe the specificity of diplomatic terminology, taking into account its contextuality, polysemy, and reliance on implicit meanings and precedents. Rather than emphasizing formal definition-building, greater importance should be placed on analyzing the practical use and interpretation of terms within diplomatic discourse.

A.V. Superanskaya, N.V. Podolskaya, and N.V. Vasileva, in their study of the general features characteristic of terms across various scientific domains, propose three definitions of the concept of “term”:

1. “A term is a specialized word (or phrase) adopted in professional activity and used under specific conditions” (Superanskaya, Podolskaya, & Vasileva, 2012, p. 14). Indeed, diplomatic terms are not merely words but specialized lexical units with specific meanings within the diplomatic context. They are accepted by the diplomatic community (though not always formally codified) and used in specific situations such as negotiations, international agreements, and diplomatic correspondence. The notion of “specific conditions” underscores the importance of context in understanding a term.

2. “A term is the verbal designation of a concept within a system of concepts belonging to a particular field of professional knowledge” (Superanskaya, Podolskaya, & Vasileva, 2012, p. 14). This definition is also highly relevant to diplomatic terminology. Diplomacy, as a professional domain, has its

own conceptual system, and diplomatic terms serve as its verbal representations – for example, audience/аудиенция/audiensiya, dragoman/драгоман/dragoman, gunboat дипломасу/дипломатия канонерок/канонерклар diplomatiyasi, concordat/конкордат/konkordat, international law/международное право/xalqaro huquq, among others. Understanding these terms requires an understanding of the system as a whole. However, unlike many scientific fields, diplomatic concepts are not always strictly defined and may be subject to multiple interpretations; thus, a “verbal designation” does not always guarantee unambiguity.

3. “A term is the principal conceptual element of a language for specific purposes (LSP)” (Superanskaya, Podolskaya, & Vasileva, 2012, p. 14). This definition highlights the functional role of terms. The notion of LSP aptly describes diplomatic language, with its professional terminology, specific stylistic features, and formal conventions. The specialized lexical units of diplomacy, which serve communication and problem-solving within this domain, must be understood by all participants in the diplomatic process, although, as noted, this is not always easily achieved due to the politicization of many terms.

These definitions represent a more comprehensive approach to understanding terms and more adequately reflect the specificity of terminologies across different fields of knowledge, particularly diplomatic terminology. By emphasizing context, conceptual systems, and professional usage, the definitions proposed by contemporary scholars such as Superanskaya, Podolskaya, and Vasileva more accurately capture the nature of diplomatic terminology.

From our perspective, definitions of terms should reflect such features as systemicity, the presence of a definition, a tendency toward monosemy within a given terminological field, lack of expressiveness, and stylistic neutrality. Based on this, we propose an understanding of the term that is particularly applicable to technical, scientific, and formalized domains of knowledge, where precision, unambiguity, and objectivity are prioritized.

However, considering the specificity of diplomatic terminology, the definition proposed by A.A. Reformatskiy – who argued that “terms are special words limited by their specific purpose; words striving for unambiguity as precise expressions of concepts and designations of things, which is necessary in science, technology, politics, and diplomacy” (Reformatskiy, 1996, p. 61), and further claimed that “a term does not require context, since it is 1) a member of a particular terminology, which replaces context; 2) may be used in isolation; and 3) must be unambiguous within its terminological system” (Reformatskiy, 1996, p. 61) – is not fully applicable to diplomatic terminology for several reasons.

First, although the definition correctly notes the tendency toward unambiguity, in diplomacy this principle is only partially valid, as unambiguity often serves different purposes – achieving consensus, enabling maneuverability, preserving space for negotiation, and accommodating political nuance.

Second, in diplomatic discourse, context is of primary importance and cannot be replaced by a term’s membership in a terminological system. Consequently, diplomatic terms are rarely used in isolation, as their semantics depend not only on their position within a terminological system but also on political circumstances, historical background, cultural context, and the intentions of the speaker or writer. A more detailed analysis of the semantics of such terms will be provided in subsequent sections of this study.

Within the framework of this research, it is also important to analyze the definition of the concept of “term” in the Uzbek language, where both the borrowed word “termin” (O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati, 2023, p. 222) and the native word “atama” (O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati, 2023, p. 165) are used to denote specialized lexical units. The latter derives from the verb “atamoq” (O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati, 2023, p. 165, see word “atamoq”) (“to name” or “to designate”), emphasizing the nominative function of the term as a means of designating concepts, phenomena, or processes in various fields of knowledge. The use of the word termin in Uzbek also reflects the influence of international standards and the globalization of scientific language. Borrowing terms from other languages is a common practice in the development of specialized vocabulary, facilitating more universal and comprehensible communication among specialists and promoting more effective exchange of knowledge and technology.

In this regard, the etymology of the word “term,” derived from the Latin terminus (“boundary,” “limit,” “end”), is noteworthy. In Latin, this word referred to land boundaries; over time, its meaning expanded to denote the limits of a concept or phenomenon in various fields of knowledge. In Russian, the

word “term” was borrowed “via the Polish “termin” (Vasmer, 1987, p. 48) and retains its core meaning as the designation of conceptual boundaries between different notions.

As for the concept of “terminology,” like the concept of “term,” it has multiple definitions reflecting different approaches to its study and application. The absence of a single universally accepted definition is due to the multifaceted nature of the phenomenon and diverse research paradigms: some scholars focus on functional aspects, others on semantic properties, and still others on sociocultural dimensions.

The study of terms as lexical units was long conducted within the framework of traditional lexicology, focusing on their semantic and morphological features. Academic discourse was dominated by the concept of monosemy as a defining feature of terms, their systematic organization within terminological fields, and their paradigmatic relations, as well as requirements of conciseness and definitional precision. The term “terminology” itself exhibited polysemy, with two main meanings: (1) “the set of words and phrases denoting specialized objects and expressing professional concepts; (2) a branch of linguistics studying such sets, their grammatical organization, and laws of functioning” (Golovin & Kobrin, 1987, p. 7). In the late 1960s Russian scholars adopted the term “terminovedeniye” to identify the scientific study of terminologies in different professions, thereby reserving “terminology” for the first sense.

However, in order to distinguish the meaning of the term terminology, the term “терминоведение” [terminovedeniye] (“terminology studies”) was introduced at the end of the 1960s; by this one should understand the scientific discipline whose subject matter is the terminologies of various fields of human professional activity. Thus, only the first meaning was retained for the term terminology.

For example, A.A. Reformatskiy, within a structuralist framework, defines terminology as “the totality of terms of a given field of production, activity, or knowledge, forming a special sector of vocabulary most accessible to conscious regulation and standardization” (Reformatskiy, 1996, p. 61). A similar interpretation is provided by O.S. Akhmanova, who views terminology “as a system of specialized lexical units subject to normative regulation” (Akhmanova, 1966, p. 473).

A more comprehensive definition is offered by B.N. Golovin and R.Yu. Kobrin, who describe terminology as “a set of terms associated with a professional sphere of activity (a field of knowledge, technology, administration, culture) and interconnected at conceptual, lexical-semantic, word-formation, and grammatical levels” (Golovin & Kobrin, 1987, p. 5), thus adopting a structural approach that considers both meanings and interrelations.

In the Dictionary of the Russian Language and in the Sociological Encyclopedic Dictionary edited by Academician G. V. Osipov, the most general and simplified definitions of the lexeme “terminology” are given, reducing it to the idea that terminology is simply “the totality of terms used in some field of knowledge, technology, art, or social life” (Dictionary of the Russian Language, 1988, p. 357; Sociological Encyclopedic Dictionary, 1998, p. 364).

However, simplified definitions found in general dictionaries reduce terminology to merely “the set of terms used in a particular field,” overlooking structural, functional, pragmatic, and sociocultural aspects—especially relevant in complex domains such as diplomatic discourse, where terminology performs not only nominative but also regulatory, ideological, and manipulative functions.

In a work devoted to the fundamental concepts of terminological theory in linguistic, logical, semiotic, and systemic aspects, K. Ya. Averbukh defines a term as a sign, and terminology or the “terminological system” as “a sign system of a specialized sphere of use limited by professional practice” (Averbukh, 2006, p. 13). By this definition, the author emphasizes the communicative and semiotic nature of terminology, as well as its connection with a particular professional discourse. At the same time, it should be noted that this definition, although an important step in understanding terminological systems, somewhat abstracts away from the pragmatic and, as was noted in the case of the concept of “term,” contextual conditioning of terms, especially in the humanities and social sciences, including diplomacy, where the interpretation of the sign may vary depending on the intentions of participants in communication and on the political situation. This makes it necessary to supplement the semiotic approach with a pragmatic analysis of the actual use of terms in concrete situations.

A similar approach, which also demonstrates limitations in the analysis of terminological systems, is found in the definition offered by S. V. Grinev-Grinevich, who, outlining the foundations of the modern

theory of terms, defines terminology as “the totality of terms used in a specific field of knowledge” (Grinev-Grinevich, 2008, p. 9).

T. V. Zhrebilo proposes a two-component definition of terminology: “1. The totality of terms used in some field of science, technology, or art; 2. A branch of linguistics that studies different terminological systems” (Zhrebilo, 2010, p. 402). By including the second meaning, which defines terminology as a metalinguistic discipline, the author explicates the dialectical interaction between the terminological system and the field of terminological research, thereby expanding the understanding of terminology beyond a simple list of specialized lexical units and supplementing it with an epistemological dimension that includes research activity and reflection in this field. This, in turn, requires attention not only to the static structure of a terminological system but also to the dynamic processes of its formation, use, and interpretation, especially in such discursively complex areas as diplomacy.

V. P. Danilenko notes that the lexeme terminology corresponds to two semantic variants differing in the scope of denotation. According to the author, in the narrower sense terminology is defined as “the totality of terms of one field of knowledge (one science or one scholarly direction), reflecting the corresponding totality of concepts. The broader concept of terminology corresponds to the general totality of terms of all fields of activity” (Danilenko, 1977, p. 15). This idea demonstrates the complexity of the concept under consideration, its polysemy, and its dependence on context. By treating terminology as a polysemantic unit, Danilenko demonstrates a dialectical approach to understanding this term, emphasizing the interrelation of the general and the particular.

Superanskaya, Podolskaya, and Vasileva give the following definitions of terminology: “1. A totality or some indefinite multitude of words in general; 2. A totality of terms (concepts and names) of a particular field of knowledge (medical terminology, geographical terminology); 3. The study of the formation, composition, and functioning of terms in general; 4. The study of the formation, composition, and functioning of the terms of a particular field of knowledge used in a particular language, and of their equivalents in other languages; 5. General terminological theory” (Superanskaya et al., 2012, p. 14). These definitions, proposed by modern scholars, are distinguished by their multi-aspectual and integrative character, reflecting the evolution of terminology studies from a narrow understanding of terminology as a set of terms to a broader and more complex vision of it as a multilevel system including structural-semantic, functional, metalinguistic, and cross-linguistic aspects. In essence, the authors’ definitions amount to a classification of different semantic paradigms for understanding terminological activity.

It is therefore reasonable to expect that a certain corpus of terms – for example, etymology, which denotes both the linguistic study of the origin of words and the establishment of the origin of an individual word, or phraseology, which denotes both the set of phraseological units and the study of them – by virtue of the specific features of its morphological, structural, or lexical-semantic organization, inherently possesses the potential for polysemantic use, as in the case of the term terminology considered here.

However, this regularity does not hinder mutual understanding among researchers, since the conditions of context or situation help to ensure the unambiguous correlation of the concept of terminology in each of its uses. In addition, in our case there is the concept “terminovedeniye”, which is unambiguously assigned to the science that studies terms, their structure, formation, functioning, and use in different fields of knowledge. In our view, “terminovedeniye” functions as a clarifying and differentiating concept that makes it possible to avoid confusion in the interpretation of the polysemantic term “terminology” when it refers specifically to the scientific discipline rather than to the totality of terms. The use of “terminovedeniye” underscores the methodological and research-oriented character of the activity associated with the study of terms.

In Uzbek, just as in Russian, the concept of “terminology” also displays a dual nature: “terminology” means “1. A set of terms used in a certain field of science, technology, or profession. 2. A branch of linguistics engaged in studying and regulating terms” (O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati, 2023, p. 223). It is therefore understood both as a corpus of specialized lexemes functioning in a particular subject field and as a metalinguistic discipline that studies these lexemes. Confirmation of this duality is also found in the existence of the notion “atamashunoslik” (O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati, 2023, p. 165), which functions as a full equivalent of the Russian “terminovedeniye” and denotes the science of terms.

This observation opens prospects for integrative linguistic analysis, making it possible to identify not only typological similarities and differences in the terminological systems of the languages under study but also to gain a deeper understanding of the cognitive mechanisms underlying the formation of specialized knowledge and its linguistic embodiment.

In other words, in the context of linguistic analysis of terminology it is necessary to take into account that terms are not isolated units but exist within a system in which they are linked to one another by specific relations. Analysis of the system makes it possible to reveal the logical structure of a subject field and to understand how various concepts are conceptualized. In the analysis of diplomatic terminology, it is important to consider its ideological coloring. Terms may not only reflect objective reality but may also express specific evaluations and attitudes. Accordingly, critical analysis of diplomatic discourse must take into account the political and social factors that influence the choice and interpretation of terms.

The analysis conducted of the concepts of “term” and “terminology” in relation to diplomatic discourse makes it possible to assert that these categories possess a complex and multilayered nature determined both by general linguistic laws and by the special conditions under which diplomatic communication functions. The rapid expansion of the interdisciplinary connections of linguistics, encompassing cognitive, logical, political, legal, and socio-cultural approaches, has created the basis for rethinking traditional views of the status of the term and the specification of terminological systems. In this context, diplomatic terminology constitutes one of the most dynamic and discursively loaded terminological systems, which creates the need to develop theoretical foundations capable of taking into account both its systemic properties and its unique pragmatic characteristics.

A comparison of different interpretations of the concept of “term” proposed in logic, philosophy, sociology, linguistics, and the modern tradition of terminology studies shows the absence of a universal definition equally relevant to all fields of knowledge. Unlike the exact sciences, where the term strives for maximum unambiguity and functional neutrality, a diplomatic term cannot be fully correlated with such parameters. It preserves systemicity and professional orientation, yet often displays contextual variability, ideological markedness, and dependence on historical and political realities. In diplomacy, the semantic boundaries of a term may be mobile, and its substantive components may become the subject of international dispute, interpretive divergence, or diplomatic maneuver. Thus, the diplomatic term proves to be simultaneously an element of professional language and an instrument of political strategy.

The study of the properties of terms in Russian and Uzbek traditions also reveals interesting conceptual divergences. The Uzbek “atama”, etymologically linked to the act of naming, emphasizes the nominative function of the term and its connection with the establishment of categorical boundaries, whereas the borrowed “termin” reflects the influence of international scholarly discourse and contributes to the unification of professional communication. The presence of these two parallel designations demonstrates the cognitive flexibility and historical multilayeredness of the Uzbek terminological system, which creates favorable conditions for a bilingual analysis of diplomatic vocabulary. In turn, the Russian terminological legacy, including structuralist approaches of the twentieth century and modern functional interpretations, provides a rich methodological basis for identifying those characteristics that are preserved or transformed in cross-linguistic comparison.

The concept of terminology also displays polysemy, combining the meaning of a professional vocabulary and that of an independent linguistic discipline. The evolution of terminology studies – from viewing terminology as a set of words to understanding it as a complex system of interrelated signs serving professionally restricted spheres – makes it possible to regard diplomatic terminology not only as a lexical inventory but also as a mechanism for shaping and regulating international communication. In diplomacy, terminology performs complex functions: nominative, regulative, pragmatic, cognitive, and ideological. Unlike many other professional languages, the diplomatic terminological system relies not only on fixed definitions but also on precedents, traditions, intertextual references, diplomatic rituals, and political conjuncture, which makes its study impossible without reference to context and discursive practices.

Of particular importance is the identification of the degree of systemicity of diplomatic vocabulary. Despite the existence of terminological fields, categorical structures, and fixed concepts, diplomatic terminology is characterized by a high degree of openness. It is constantly replenished through international

agreements, the integration of political and legal concepts, and the emergence of new threats and challenges (such as hybrid wars, cybersecurity, humanitarian interventions, digital diplomacy, and many others). This makes the terminology of diplomacy not static but evolutionary, sensitive to changes in the global order. The interaction of general language, the professional language of diplomacy, and the legal language of international law creates a complex, multilayered continuum in which the boundaries of terms and their status may be reconsidered depending on circumstances.

An important consequence of the analysis conducted is the conclusion that several traditional terminological features – such as obligatory monosemy, strict definiteness, and stylistic neutrality – need to be reconsidered when applied to the diplomatic sphere. Polysemy and contextual variability in diplomatic language are not deficiencies of the term but natural mechanisms by which professional communication adapts to political realities. Instead of rigid definition, the decisive role is played by interpretation ensured by professional knowledge, precedents, and diplomatic norms.

An analysis of Uzbek and Russian terminological traditions shows that both systems reflect common regularities in the formation of professional vocabulary while at the same time possessing their own cognitive and cultural specificity. Their comparison makes it possible not only to identify the typological features of the diplomatic terminological system but also to determine the parameters of equivalence and asymmetry between the two languages, which is especially important for the high-quality translation of diplomatic texts and for optimizing interstate communication.

Thus, the study of the concepts of “term” and “terminology” in the context of the diplomatic terminological system demonstrates the need for a comprehensive interdisciplinary approach integrating linguistic, cognitive, legal, political, and semiotic analysis. Diplomatic terminology emerges as a flexible, dynamic, and multilayered system in which the norms of professional language, the requirements of international law, the political interests of states, and the specific features of the cultural-linguistic worldview interact. Understanding this specificity is key to the further development of comparative studies of diplomatic vocabulary in Russian and Uzbek, as well as to the formation of a methodology capable of describing it as a complex and adaptive means of international communication.

REFERENCES

1. Averbukh, K. Ya. (2006). *Obshchaya teoriya termina* [General theory of the term]. Moscow: Izdatelstvo MGOU.
2. Akhmanova, O. S. (2009). *Slovar lingvisticheskikh terminov: lingvostilistika, sintaksis, morfologiya, fonomorfologiya, fonetika, leksikologiya: okolo 7000 terminov* [Dictionary of linguistic terms: linguostylistics, syntax, morphology, phonemorphology, phonetics, lexicology: about 7000 terms] (5th ed.). Moscow: Librokom, URSS.
3. Golovin, B. N., & Kobrin, R. Yu. (1987). *Lingvisticheskie osnovy ucheniya o terminakh* [Linguistic foundations of the study of terms]. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.
4. Grinev-Grinevich, S. V. (2008). *Terminovedenie* [Terminology studies]. Moscow: Akademiya.
5. Danilenko, V. P. (1977). *Russkaya terminologiya: Opyt lingvisticheskogo opisaniya* [Russian terminology: An experience of linguistic description]. Moscow: Nauka.
6. Zhrebilo, T. V. (2010). *Slovar lingvisticheskikh terminov* [Dictionary of linguistic terms] (5th rev. ed.). Nazran: Pilgrim.
7. Kandelaki, T. L. (1977). *Semantika i motivirovannost termina* [Semantics and motivation of the term]. Moscow: Nauka.
8. Kondakov, N. I. (1975). *Logicheskiy slovar-spravochnik* [Logical dictionary-handbook] (2nd ed.). Moscow: Nauka.
9. Reformatskiy, A. A. (1996). *Vvedenie v yazykoznanie* [Introduction to linguistics] (V. A. Vinogradov, Ed.). Moscow: Aspekt Press.
10. *Slovar russkogo yazyka: v 4 t. T. 4. S–Ya* [Dictionary of the Russian language: In 4 vols. Vol. 4. S–Ya] (A. P. Evgenyeva, Ed.). (1988). Moscow: Russkiy yazyk. / *Sotsiologicheskii entsiklopedicheskiy slovar. Na russkom, angliyskom, nemetskom, frantsuzskom i cheshskom yazykakh* [Sociological encyclopedic dictionary. In Russian, English, German, French, and Czech] (G. V. Osipov, Ed.-coord.). (1998). Moscow: INFRA M – NORMA.

11. Sotsiologicheskiiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar. Na russkom, angliyskom, nemetskom, frantsuzskom i cheshskom yazykakh [Sociological encyclopedic dictionary. In Russian, English, German, French, and Czech] (G. V. Osipov, Ed.-coord.). (1998). Moscow: INFRA M – NORMA.
12. Superanskaya, A. V., Podolskaya, N. V., & Vasileva, N. V. (2012). Obshchaya terminologiya: Voprosy teorii [General terminology: Theoretical issues] (T. L. Kandelaki, Ed.) (6th ed.). Moscow: Knizhnyy dom LIBROKOM.
13. Ushakov, D. N. (1940). Tolkovyy slovar russkogo yazyka [Explanatory dictionary of the Russian language] (Vol. IV). Moscow.
14. Vasmer, M. (1987). Etimologicheskiiy slovar russkogo yazyka [Etymological dictionary of the Russian language] (Vol. 4; O. N. Trubachev, trans. and add.) (2nd stereotype ed.). Moscow: Progress.
15. Filosofskiiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar [Philosophical encyclopedic dictionary] (L. F. Ilyichev, P. N. Fedoseev, S. M. Kovalev, & V. G. Panov, comps.). (1983). Moscow: Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya.
16. O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati: 80 000 ortiq so‘z va so‘z birikmasi. J. I. A–D [Explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language: More than 80,000 words and phrases. Vol. I. A–D] (A. Madvaliyev & D. Xudayberganova, Eds.). (2022). Tashkent: G‘afur G‘ulom nomidagi nashriyot matbaa ijodiy uyi.
17. O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati: 80 000 dan ortiq so‘z va so‘z birikmasi. J. V. T–V [Explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language: More than 80,000 words and phrases. Vol. V. T–V] (A. Madvaliyev & D. Xudayberganova, Eds.). (2023). Tashkent: G‘afur G‘ulom nomidagi nashriyot-matbaa ijodiy uyi.