

## **UNIVERSAL-LINGUISTIC FEATURES OF DIPLOMATIC TERMINOLOGY**

**Axmadjonova Xumora Murodjon kizi**

Master student of university of ISFT

[axumora9930@gmail.com](mailto:axumora9930@gmail.com)

**Abstract.** This article examines the universal linguistic features of diplomatic terminology based on contemporary linguistic and terminological theories. The study focuses on the semantic stability of diplomatic terms in international communication, their relative equivalence across different languages, and their role as a means of ensuring precision and clarity in official discourse. The universality of diplomatic terminology is analyzed in close connection with global political processes, international law, and norms of formal communication. Particular attention is paid to the standardization of diplomatic terms and their linguistic and pragmatic characteristics.

**Keywords:** diplomatic terminology, universality, linguistic features, official discourse, diplomatic discourse, terminology theory, international communication

**Introduction.** Globalization processes are increasingly enhancing the role and significance of language in all spheres of international communication, particularly in diplomatic relations. The effectiveness of interstate relations is determined not only by political or legal mechanisms, but also by the precision and consistency of the linguistic means used in official communication. In this regard, diplomatic terminology requires special scholarly attention as an essential component of international communication.

Diplomatic terms are characterized by their precise, stable, and widely accepted semantic meanings within official discourse. Their relatively consistent usage across different languages helps prevent misunderstandings in diplomatic communication. This very feature gives rise to the universal nature of diplomatic terminology. However, such universality is manifested not only at the lexical level but also in linguistic, pragmatic, and discursive dimensions.

In recent years, the number of studies devoted to diplomatic language within the frameworks of terminology theory, discourse analysis, and the linguistics of official speech has been increasing. Nevertheless, the issue of the universal linguistic features of diplomatic terminology has not yet been sufficiently explored through a systematic and comprehensive approach. Most studies tend to focus on the political or pragmatic aspects of diplomatic discourse, while the universality of terms is often treated as a secondary issue.

The relevance of this article is determined by the need to substantiate the universality of diplomatic terminology from a linguistic perspective, to reveal its functional potential in official discourse, and to define its role in international communication. The aim of the research is to analyze the universal linguistic features of diplomatic terminology and to highlight their communicative significance in official discourse. To achieve this goal, the study examines the semantic stability of diplomatic terms, the process of standardization, and their pragmatic characteristics.

In linguistics, a term is interpreted as a special lexical unit that expresses a precise concept within a particular field of science, profession, or social activity. Unlike general vocabulary, terms are less dependent on context and are characterized by such features as precision, stability, and unambiguity. These qualities make terms an essential tool of scientific and official communication.

In terminology theory, the concept of a term is primarily explained through its nominative and definitional functions. A term not only names a specific scientific or practical concept but

also defines the boundaries of its meaning. Therefore, terms have a systematic character and function within a particular terminological system, maintaining semantic and functional relationships with other terms in the same field. In modern terminology studies, the standardization and normativity of terms are of particular importance. The formation of terms based on unified standards ensures clarity in scientific and official communication and prevents multiple interpretations and semantic ambiguity. This is especially significant in fields related to international communication.

Diplomatic terms, as a distinct group of terms, are formed within the framework of interstate relations, international law, and official political communication. They are characterized by a high level of precision, stable semantics, and wide recognition. These features give rise to the universal nature of diplomatic terminology and make it a relevant object of linguistic research.

**Literature review.** The issue of diplomatic terminology and its linguistic features has been studied within several branches of linguistics, including terminology theory, the linguistics of official speech, discourse analysis, and pragmatics. Research conducted in these areas contributes to the understanding of the formation of diplomatic language, its functional potential, and its communicative significance through various theoretical approaches. Therefore, a systematic analysis of existing scholarly perspectives is of great methodological importance in the study of diplomatic terminology.

The theoretical foundations of the concept of “term,” as well as issues such as semantic precision, unambiguity, and standardization, occupy a central place in both classical and modern terminology studies. These works substantiate the distinctive features of terms compared to general vocabulary and highlight their role in scientific and official communication. Such perspectives serve as a theoretical basis for understanding the linguistic nature of diplomatic terminology.

Alexander Reformatsky defines a term as “special words” and emphasizes that they are formed within the framework of a particular scientific or professional field. This approach demonstrates that, unlike general language units, terms are oriented toward expressing precise conceptual meanings. In Reformatsky’s theory, terms are interpreted as lexical units functioning within a specific type of communication – namely, scientific and official discourse – and their primary function is to ensure conceptual clarity [1, p. 12].

In terminology theory, the scientific foundations of normative requirements for terms were first systematically developed by Dmitry S. Lotte [11]. The scholar emphasizes that the effective functioning of terms directly depends on their compliance with certain criteria. In particular, systematicity implies that a term does not exist as an isolated unit but functions within a terminological system, maintaining interrelated connections with other terms. The requirement of independence from specific contexts means that a term should not be heavily dependent on situational usage, but rather preserve its semantic stability across different communicative conditions.

Moreover, the requirements of brevity and precision ensure the functional convenience of terms in official communication. Unambiguity is considered one of the most important features of a term, as it limits semantic vagueness and prevents multiple interpretations. The criteria of simplicity and clarity aim to ensure that terms are correctly understood not only by specialists but also by a broader professional audience. The degree of applicability reflects the active use of a terminological unit in real communicative practice.

According to Viktor V. Vinokur, in every terminological field there may exist terms that formally coincide with those from other terminologies or with general literary vocabulary. This situation leads to the emergence of terminological homonymy and polysemy, thereby increasing the need to interpret terms based on context and domain-specific boundaries. Vinokur explains

this phenomenon through the dynamic nature of terminology, emphasizing that the meaning of a term is determined not only by its lexical form but also by the terminological system to which it belongs [1, p. 13].

Vladimir M. Leychik considers terms as a language for special purposes and provides a detailed analysis of their functional diversity in modern national languages [10]. At the same time, Boris N. Golovin and Roman Y. Kobrin, studying the theoretical and linguistic foundations of terminology, reveal its use as a conceptual model in information systems [9]. Alexandra V. Superanskaya and her collaborators comprehensively investigate the general theoretical issues of terminology, highlighting the importance of terms in both scientific and practical contexts [12]. Viktor L. Israelyan examines the terminology and speech strategies used in face-to-face diplomatic communication and reveals their practical significance [3, p. 8].

In Uzbek linguistics, studies on the terminology of various fields have been conducted by scholars such as S. Ibrohimov, S. Akobirov, S. Usmonov, R. Doniyorov, N. Mamatov, A. Hojiyev, H. Shamsiddinov, I. Pardayeva, N. Usmonov, A. Sh. Sobirov, I. Yuldashev, Z. Isaqova, G. Ismailov, A. To'raxojayeva, A. Madvaliyev, and H. Dadaboyev. These studies are mainly aimed at the systematic investigation of the vocabulary and lexicology of the Uzbek language, as well as terminological units across different domains, thereby establishing a solid scientific foundation. It should be noted that terminological research is widely presented not only in scientific articles and monographs but also in textbooks and teaching manuals.

In 2021, I. U. Shamsimuhamedov published the "Explanatory Dictionary of Diplomatic Terms", which systematically describes the practical aspects of terms used in diplomatic discourse and provides a scientific account of their functional and linguistic characteristics. Based on this, studies in both global and Uzbek linguistics create a strong scientific basis for investigating the universal-linguistic features of diplomatic terminology, as well as for analyzing its standardization and communicative role in official discourse.

**Methodology.** In this study, a comprehensive approach was applied to investigate the universal linguistic features of diplomatic terminology. During the research process, the analytical-methodological method was used to examine the functional and linguistic characteristics of terms from a theoretical perspective, and relevant sources from both international and Uzbek linguistics were systematically analyzed.

Through the comparative method, the semantic stability and unambiguity of terms across different languages were examined, while discourse analysis made it possible to identify their contextual use in diplomatic speech and official documents. In addition, a normative-analytical approach was employed to evaluate the standardization of terms and their communicative role in official communication.

Taken together, these methods provide a comprehensive framework for the systematic study of the linguistic, semantic, and pragmatic features of diplomatic terminology.

**Discussion and results.** The results of the study show that diplomatic terms are semantically stable across different languages and are often characterized by unambiguity. This reveals their primary function in ensuring communicative precision in official discourse and preventing misunderstandings. Through comparative and discourse analysis methods, it was determined that the universal linguistic nature of terms is associated with their ability to retain corresponding semantic content across various national languages. At the same time, the standardization and normativity of terms contribute to the effective implementation of diplomatic communication and strengthen their scientific and practical applicability. The study also identified the contextual usage and pragmatic functions of terms, which further enhance their role and practical significance in diplomatic discourse.

The obtained results are consistent with findings in both global and Uzbek linguistic research. For instance, Vladimir M. Leychik analyzed terms as a language for special purposes, while Boris N. Golovin and Roman Y. Kobrin explored terminology theory and its conceptual modeling in information systems [9]. Alexandra V. Superanskaya and her collaborators provided a comprehensive account of general theoretical issues in terminology. O. Borisenko and O. Yevtushenko investigated the use of the English language in international documents, while Viktor L. Israelyan examined face-to-face diplomatic communication and the practical aspects of terminology. In Uzbek linguistics, scholars such as S. Ibrohimov, I.U. Shamsimuhamedov and others have systematically studied the lexical and lexicological aspects of terminology, highlighting the universality and practical application of diplomatic terms.

At the same time, the findings demonstrate that the universal linguistic features of terms are not limited to semantic stability but are also closely connected with pragmatic and functional aspects. Diplomatic terms increase the effectiveness of international communication through their standardized usage, consistent meaning in official discourse, and ability to convey equivalent meanings across languages. The study also shows that terms are interconnected within both the linguistic system and discourse context; therefore, they should be analyzed not merely as lexical units but with consideration of their communicative, pragmatic, and normative dimensions. From this perspective, the study of diplomatic terminology requires a comprehensive conceptual approach that integrates linguistic, semantic, and pragmatic features.

The results indicate that the universal-linguistic nature of diplomatic terminology encompasses not only theoretical foundations but also practical application. These features play an important role in ensuring the effective organization of diplomatic discourse, as well as clarity and precision in international communication. At the same time, the study integrates global and Uzbek linguistic research, creating a solid scientific foundation that combines the theoretical and practical aspects of terminology.

**Conclusion.** The results of the study demonstrate that diplomatic terms are characterized by semantic stability and unambiguity across different languages, serving as an important means of ensuring communicative precision and clarity in official discourse. Their universal-linguistic nature lies in the ability of terms to convey equivalent meanings in various national languages, while their standardization and normativity play a significant role in the effective implementation of diplomatic communication. The findings of discourse analysis and the comparative approach made it possible to identify the contextual and pragmatic functions of terms, further reinforcing their scientific and practical significance.

Furthermore, the study is consistent with both global and Uzbek linguistic research and provides a solid scientific foundation for the comprehensive investigation of the linguistic, semantic, and pragmatic aspects of diplomatic terminology. The universal-linguistic nature of diplomatic terms encompasses not only theoretical foundations but also practical applications, enabling their effective and clear use in international communication.

The results also indicate that terms should be analyzed not merely as lexical units but with consideration of their communicative, pragmatic, and normative dimensions. This approach contributes to a more effective organization of diplomatic discourse, ensures semantic equivalence across languages, and helps reduce errors in diplomatic documents and communication. At the same time, the findings of the study open up opportunities for further research into the universal-linguistic and functional characteristics of terminology, as well as for new studies on the practical application of diplomatic terms.

#### **REFERENCES:**

1. Akobirov, S.F. *Til va terminologiya*. – Toshkent, 1968.

2. Akobirov, S.F. Terminologiya ishining mazmuni va vazifalari haqida // O'zbek tili va adabiyoti masalalari. – Toshkent, 1964. – №3. – B. 31–38.
3. Doniyorov, R. O'zbek tili texnik terminologiyasining ayrim masalalari. – Toshkent: Fan, 1977.
4. Doniyorov, R. O'zbek tilining ilmiy-texnikaviy terminlari tarixidan. – Toshkent: Fan, 1979.
5. Usmonov, S. O'zbek terminologiyasining ba'zi masalalari. – Toshkent: O'qituvchi, 1968.
6. Даниленко, В.П. Русская терминология: Опыт лингвистического описания. – М., 1977.
7. Канделаки, Т.Л. Семантика и мотивированность терминов. – М., 1977.
8. Кобрин, Р.Ю. Лингвистическое описание как база концептуального моделирования в информационных системах: Дисс. ... док. филол. наук. – Горький, 1989.
9. Головин, Б.Н., Кобрин, Р.Ю. Лингвистические основы учения о терминах. – М., 1987.
10. Лейчик, В.М. Языки для специальных целей – функциональные разновидности современных развитых национальных языков // Общие и частные проблемы функциональных стилей. – М., 1986.
11. Лотте, Д.С. Основы построения научно-технической терминологии: Вопросы теории и методики. – М., 1961.
12. Суперенская, А., Подольская, Н.В., Васильева, Н.В. Общая терминология. Вопросы теории. – М.: Либроком, 2012