

Linguistic and cultural specifics of the formation of the diplomatic terminology system

Fariza Ismailova – Larisa L. Zelenskaya – Ekaterina A. Redkozubova – Irina G. Anikeeva – Yelena V. Sausheva

DOI: 10.18355/XL.2023.16.01.12

Abstract

The article is devoted to the linguistic and cultural specifics of the formation of the diplomatic terminology system. The purpose of the article is to identify similarities and differences in the formation of diplomatic terms in different languages. After developed states engage diplomatically with other countries, diplomatic terms are formed in their languages. This is one of the most important approaches to expanding the terminological field in the language of the country. International terms are adopted with diplomatic terms. It is essential to study carefully the terminology process and the specific implementation of diplomatic terms which were adopted from foreign languages. Care must be taken to avoid alternative meanings of words in the national language in use. The comparative method, the content-text method and methods of terminological analysis were used in our research. The article identified common diplomatic terms in the field of lexical language borrowings and in the original language. The most used equivalents of foreign terms, mainly from the English, are outlined. The vocabulary building of diplomatic terms was also noted. The study of the semantics of similar diplomatic terms in terminology systems of different languages seems promising.

Key words: diplomatic concept, diplomatic term, term phrase, international term, terminology process, English borrowing terms

Introduction

The formation of English diplomatic terms has a long history. And the ways of formation are also different. It includes all the methods of word formation in English. Diplomatic terms are systematized. On the basis of it, the scientific language of diplomatic discourse was clearly formed. And Kazakh diplomatic terms are still being formed but are developing rapidly. Kazakh diplomatic terms are still recognized only at the level of foreign terms.

Therefore, the study of their structural system in comparison with the language in which the word is adopted allows us to predict the process of development of Kazakh diplomatic terms. It is known that in any language, diplomatic terms determine the correlation of extralinguistic situations with a scientific concept and form a system of linguistic units that create a semantic group. Even though the system of diplomatic terms in Kazakh linguistics has not been completely formed, today, this process is developing dynamically.

However, the history of Kazakh diplomacy dates back to ancient times. Since the formation of the Kazakh Khanate, the Kazakh people have created excellent examples of diplomatic relations, maintaining their own cultural traditions. Abylai Khan (as a symbol of freedom in Kazakh nation) and his diplomacy can be presented as an initial example of a modern multi-vector approach in the foreign policy sphere. The Kazakh people have always attached special importance to the negotiation processes. Fine examples of diplomatic negotiations and the best words of diplomats were highly valued by the people and handed down from generation to generation. After gaining state independence, Kazakhstan became a perfect subject of international relations. That's grounds for the phenomenon, which is known as the diplomacy of modern

Kazakhstan in a dialectical synthesis (Kakenova, 2018).

According to transcendental understanding, the concept of diplomacy was understood in a positive sense as "compromise", "to reach a common decision", "reconciliation", and "bond with each other". Recently, in the process of global development, the concept of diplomacy has been used in the sense of winning in the foreign market, bipolarity, gaining

power, subordinating foreign policy, forcing recognition, and forcing to bow to economic interests and dependence. Therefore, there is a need to study the initial meaning of diplomatic terms and their functional meaning in the language. To achieve the target, we tried to analyze our research work.

Literature Review

During the study, lexicographic works related to industry terms and diplomatic terms as well as scientific works specifically studied different types of discourse, were used. The sources of the articles were scientific works on the study of diplomatic terms by A.V. Voloskova (1969), S. Ramazanova (2009), A.I. Pencheva (2012), O.V. Zagorovskaya and F.M.N. Naser (2013), as well as scientific works on the study of the language of diplomatic documents by M. Sharaf El Din (2007), T.A. Volkova (2011). V.E. Khranchenko (2013) and others. Discourse studies are based on works that explore different types of discourse (media discourse, PR discourse, political discourse, advertising discourse, legal discourse, educational discourse, theatrical discourse, etc.) related to diplomatic discourse in linguocultures (Wood & Serres, 1970; Cohen, 1991; Hunt, 1992; Blum & Molotkova, 2004; Baker, 2015; Popova et al., 2018; Repina et al., 2018; Baranova et al. 2020; Lynch, Salikhova, and Ereemeeva, 2020; Boeva-Omelechko et al., 2020; Ibragimov, 2021; Khodyreva et al., 2021; Khairutdinova et al., 2022; Masalimova et al., 2022; Muryasov, Zheltukhina & Zelenskaya, 2022; Sekyere-Asiedu et al., 2022; Tameryan et al., 2019; 2020; Tameryan, Zyubina & Zheltukhina, 2022; Zheltukhina, Zelenskaya & Ponomarenko, 2020; Zheltukhina et al., 2016; 2017a; 2017b; 2021).

Public-diplomatic discourse is a social and communicative act, public consciousness and status-role norms that perform the functions of positioning, transmission, and consolidation.

The socio-diplomatic discourse manifests itself in typical situational and communicative acts characteristic of the system of relations and functioning of a particular social environment. This discourse, due to its social compulsion, leaves an imprint on the normative predetermination of certain social relations and communications, and performs disciplinary functions of regulating these relations and supervising their normative compliance. In a word, public diplomatic discourse is a discourse of order and supervision in the state.

The public diplomatic discourse emphasizes the status-role behavior of norms and standards, unites binary relations, norm / non-normative, positive / negative, permissible / unacceptable, good / bad, canonical / heretical, etc. It is regulated by moral imperatives, customs, traditions, written and unwritten norms of behavior, legal acts.

The following criteria for the implementation of public diplomatic discourse in the digital space are defined:

- electronic signal as a communication channel;
- virtuality;
- distance, i.e., distribution over space and time;
- mediation (carried out with the help of technical means);
- a high degree of conductivity;
- the presence of hypertext;
- creolization of computer texts;

- transfer of emotions, facial expressions, feelings using "emoticons";
- a set of different types of discourse;
- specific computer ethics;
- status equality of participants prevails.

Another factor dominating public diplomatic relations is the general trend that has developed in the modern virtual institutional environment. According to the researchers' observations (see above), the environment itself helps to reduce the distance between the participants of the relationship due to high personal openness. According to A. Gilchrist (2013), we can see that the information revolution is, in fact, a revolution of relations. Therefore, the professional nature of institutionalism in public communication is determined by the characteristics of institutional and personal intelligence.

Diplomatic terminology covers the social aspect of language, the reason for which is that it is directly affected by the social situation in society and is, therefore, of a social nature.

Methodology

The way of developing diplomatic terms in the vocabulary of a particular language is formed by its own peculiarities, i.e., each language has its own lexical and grammatical specifics. The difference between diplomatic terms and others can be summarized as follows:

- the place of diplomatic terms in the national vocabulary;
- on this basis, the semantic expansion or narrowing;
- the connection of words with other industry terms denoting a diplomatic concept.

The model features representing public diplomatic discourse as one of the components of institutional discourse can be divided into four groups:

1) the constitutive features of the discourse are sufficiently fully covered. These are participants, conditions, organization, methods, and material of communication, etc. status-role and situational-communicative roles of people, the sphere and communicative environment of communication, motives, goals, strategies, channel, mode, shades, style, and genre, and, finally, the sign body of communication (texts and / or non-verbal signs).

2) signs of institutionalization, role characteristics of agents and clients of institutions, typical chronotopes, symbolic actions, genres of stencils and speech cliches. Institutional communication is communication in a special mask. This is a stereotypical communication that fundamentally distinguishes institutional discourse from personal discourse.

3) institutional features of public diplomatic discourse: are designated by a special name in the type of social institution existing in the collective, are embodied in the Nodal concept of this institution (in public discourse – justice);

4) the neutral features of institutional discourse include general discursive characteristics characteristic of any communication, personality-oriented traits, as well as features of other types of discourse, etc.

During the study, there was used the method of comparing Kazakh and English terms, the method of describing differences between two languages, the method of accumulation of features, the method of file systematization, the method of semantic analysis, the method of component analysis and comparison. In the process of writing the article, more than 20 Kazakh diplomatic terms and more than 50 English diplomatic terms were collected.

Results and Discussion

Now let's imagine the components that characterize the public diplomatic discourse.

- 1) The participants of the discourse are representatives of a certain social group who enter communication and perform certain communicative roles; the communicative roles of the participants within it directly depend on the type of discourse.
- 2) Chronotope-time and place of communication links.
- 3) The purpose of the discourse is the intended result of communication, depending on the reasons for the creation and implementation of the discourse.
- 4) The system of basic values is determined by the mission of a particular public diplomatic discourse and the professional codes inherent in its sphere of activity.
- 5) Communication methods-strategies and tactics were chosen by the discourse participants. A communicative strategy is understood as a plan for the optimal implementation of communicative intentions, which, considering objective and subjective factors and conditions, determines the structure of the text in which the act of communication is implemented and, in turn, the text. Each discursive strategy is implemented using a specific tactical complex. Tactics is a certain stage in the implementation of a communicative strategy, determined by the speaker's intention, an explanatory set of methods and techniques that determine the use of language tools (Kurkimbayeva et al., 2020).
- 6) The topic of public diplomatic discourse.
- 7) Genres of public-diplomatic discourse-formalized structures of stereotypical experiences, manifested in acts of ritual, administrative procedures, speech, and writing.
- 8) Precedent (cultural) texts in public diplomatic discourse are its written and oral sources, based on which the whole essence of internal and external institutional communication is built, its mission, credo, main strategic attitudes, provisions, the main provisions of the status-role game are determined.
- 9) Discursive formulas are peculiar turns of speech characteristic of communication in the corresponding social institution.

Consequently, public diplomatic discourse is a stable system of status-role relations that develop in the communicative space between the masses of life of a particular diplomatic institution, within which the power functions of symbolic coercion are implemented in the form of normative prescriptions and legitimation. The socio-diplomatic discourse reflects a person's worldview, known ways of perceiving the world, vectors of value orientations and behavioral models.

At the same time, the language of diplomacy is sharp and somewhat aggressive but not ideologized, as expected. Such constructions as a "consolidated West" on the world stage, "sanctions confrontation", and opposition of one's culture to the values of the "Anglo-Saxons" are the result of the degradation of bilateral and multilateral relations with the subjects.

It is represented that with the normalization of the situation, the rhetoric will become calmer and more restrained, but a one-sided change of tone is unrealistic. Of course, there are always strong diplomats who call for a reduction in the degree of verbal battles.

Public diplomacy terminology includes wide means of communication, which include not only specific information but also impact, and soft power and, therefore, acquire the status of strategic resources of a modern state on the world stage. Public diplomacy does not stop at any limited set of tools, like any other type of communication nowadays; they can cover all forms of interaction. The most common of these are, in particular:

1. Interpersonal relationships (relations between relatives, friends, and acquaintances living in different states);
2. Tourism (travel of citizens of one state to another, acceptance and transfer of culture, values, patterns);

3. Folk culture (the spread of cultural patterns created in some states to others: music, movies, dining, gadgets, etc.);
4. Mass media (transmission of information materials created in one state to another: newspapers, magazines, television, radio, etc.);
5. Internet, social networks, and new media (prompt dissemination of information by users themselves living in different countries of the world);
6. Education system (universities, internships, educational programs that provide training for citizens of other states);
7. Youth and professional trips and exchange of experience (participation in the education of the elite of other states);
8. Transnational corporations and international trade (production and consumption of goods and services in accordance with the standards created in other states, obtaining a career and income).

By themselves, these tools do not reflect the depth and quality of influence. They do not confirm or rule out the possibility of the external influence of the state. However, the degree of development of public diplomacy diversifies the possibilities of state power and allows it, firstly, to manage the effectiveness of its soft power (if it exists), and, secondly, to develop what is commonly called reasonable power. Here is the urgent use of what is in demand and now the effective use of mechanisms of persuasion or coercion.

The tools of public diplomacy make it possible to trace the effectiveness of the state most clearly in the external environment: they link the current foreign policy priorities of the country with its objective humanitarian resources. The public diplomatic discourse itself, as a space for civil dialogue on international issues, is constantly expanding: it forms views, opinions, and proposals in society and increasingly embraces new problems. If earlier it concerned value judgments about world events and current personalities, today it becomes a requirement associated, under certain conditions, with the elimination of visa restrictions, customs, and tariff differences and ensuring the compatibility of educational and professional standards.

The mechanisms of interaction on various topical issues in the societies of the two countries at this level are enough for public diplomacy (based, of course, on deep traditions of mutual penetration of cultures and joint development). Public diplomacy makes international a communication ship. This leads to pressure through mechanisms to disseminate certain experiences between different countries.

Digital diplomacy as an element of public diplomacy has become an important component of the "soft power" of world powers. Social networks, as a convenient tool for telling tourists about the sights, culture, history, traditions, and values of life in any country, are indispensable assistant to the press services of foreign affairs agencies. Digital diplomacy, as an element of public diplomacy, has become an important component of the "soft power" of world powers.

In this regard, diplomatic terms can be divided into three groups:

a) socio terms:

democracy,
Conservative Party,
Labour Party,
Liberal Party.

b) public terms:

security,
state,
parliament,
independence,
government, etc.

c) terms characterizing various systems:

wahabi,
jihad,
radicalism,
separatism,
extremism, etc.

Thus, we see that the diplomatic terms of the English language have come into Kazakh language. Seventy percent of Kazakh diplomatic terminology contains terms borrowed from English. But 60 percent of them can be considered as international terms because the terms of diplomacy are common to Kazakh and English.

The study revealed the main methods of formation of Kazakh and English diplomatic terms:

- 1) giving terminological meaning to generic words;
- 2) international terms;
- 3) terms created by calquing.

A characteristic feature of the term is its individuality and usage only in the literal sense. The meanings of generic words significantly impede the terminology process in Kazakh language.

For example, the word *mediator* could be used as an equivalent of the word *ambassador* in a diplomatic term.

But it is obvious that in the Kazakh culture, the use of cultural and semantic concepts of the word *ambassador* prevails.

In the same way, the term *aggression* is translated into the Kazakh language as *conquest*.

Its widespread use in various fields impedes the process of terminologization.

There are many such words:

diplomat – mediator,
covenant, pact – agreement,
convention – contract,
apartheid – isolation, etc.

Diplomatic terms are added to the lexical fund, such as names in other style groups, or become obsolete, losing meaning. The appearance of neologisms in the composition of terms or the archaization of words is also not out of this field. A word-term should not only be a generic word. It may be a term referring to a certain sphere or dialectism. For example:

bi (judge),
bolys (head of volost),
jandaral (military governor),
jasayyl (captain, esaul),
júzbasý (commander, sotnyk),
nóker (retinue),
oiáz (district marshal),
starshyn (senior representative),
sultan (sultan),
tóre (aristocrat)

and other obsolete words are recognized as archaisms in Kazakh diplomacy.

Using archaisms in the language from time to time allows acquiring a new meaning of words. For example,

the word dýan – in modern means doyen (dean) (employee of diplomatic missions);
jayshy – mediator-in modern diplomat or ambassador;
alien – in modern means foreigner.

However, the main vocabulary of Kazakh diplomacy consists of neologisms. We note that national diplomatic terms are formed by modernized historical names:

lankestik (terrorism);
sodyr (extremist), etc.

Diplomatic terms are formed in two main ways:

- 1) the implementation of borrowed words from another language in terminology activities;
- 2) the giving of terminological meaning to the words of the native language.

Many borrowed diplomatic words are a product of cultural, economic, political ties, a productive way of enriching the lexical fund of a diplomatic language.

Among the Kazakh diplomatic terms, words borrowed from the Russian and English languages are predominated. They rank among the diplomatic terms. It is doubtful how correctly hybrid terms are formed among them. For example,

geopolicy – geosaasat,
diplomatic visa – diplomatalyq viza.

In examining diplomatic terms and comparing their differences from other terms, it has been established that diplomacy is closely related to the spheres of culture, politics, and law and has common meanings. For example, the terms of international law are often found in diplomatic documents:

religious extremist forces;
interethnic security,
orthodox norms, etc.

The general terms in Kazakh and English can be grouped according to their scope as follows:

1) *Name of diplomatic persons and positions:*

Атташе – Attache
Дипломатия – Diplomacy
Дуайен – Dean, doyen
Елші – Ambassador
Интернунция – Internuncio
Консул – Consul
Консулдық қызмет – Consular service
Сенімді өкіл – Vice-agent

2) *Terms relating to diplomatic relations between states:*

Арбитраж – Arbitration
Детант – Détente
Интервенция – Intervention
Паритет – Parity
Репатриация – Repatriation
Репресалия – Reprisal

3) *terms characterizing the state structure:*

Конфедерация – Confederation
Аншлюс – Anschluss
Апартеид – Apartheid
Коалиция – Coalition
Неоколониализм – Neocolonialism

4) *unilateral diplomatic documents:*

Декларация – Declaration

Вербалды нота – Note verbale
Меморандум - Memorandum
Әжеқватура – Exequatur
5) *bilateral or multilateral diplomatic documents:*
Акт – Act
Декларация - Declaration
Келісім - Agreement
Пакт - Covenant, pact
Келісімшарт - Treaty
Коммюнике - Communiqué
Конвенция - Convention
Конкордат – Concordat

It is known that the recognition of political, economic, and cultural relations between States by diplomacy is a deeply stereotyped concept in mind. But now, the scope of the idea of diplomacy has expanded.

Interpersonal relationships in the family and the team also have diplomatic features. In the broadest sense, diplomacy is increasingly becoming the meaning of reaching an agreement, even a compromise, without disputes.

Therefore, diplomacy is not only an indicator of communication but also a compromise speech, meeting in a certain formal etiquette, respectful reception of guests, understanding the meaning of gestures and facial expressions, appropriate adaptation and assimilation of national values and traditions, persuasion in cases of various discussions and debates, self-control during the conflict, the ability to get out of an impasse, containment of emotions and the conceptual idea formed from the system of communicative, psychological, cultural, ethnographic, and rhetorical knowledge.

Diplomatic style requires clarity and precision first of all. A feature of diplomatic language is that each word is selected that corresponds to each topic.

The article focuses on diplomatic language and diplomatic documents. Their classification and main features are considered. The article deals with the features of the vocabulary of diplomatic procedure. Analysis of the lexical system of the language within the thematic lexical groups of diplomatic office work has been proven to make the lexical material accessible for reading in various aspects. It is recommended to classify thematic lexical groups based on criteria in diplomatic proceedings.

Types of diplomatic documents, personal notes, verbal notes, partial notes, memorandums, and declarations were reviewed. Diplomatic language has a vocabulary and a lexical-semantic basis. Also, the status of being the language of international relations and the stylistic features of the diplomatic language were considered. The issue of registration of diplomatic documents will be determined.

When drawing up diplomatic documents, it is necessary to distinguish between truth and falsehood. Many suggestions and wishes are published in the system of international relations.

Due to the branching nature of draft contracts, agreements, and resolutions, it is difficult for a person unfamiliar with this area to accept and understand these proposals fully. That is why one of the essential aspects of diplomatic documents is to ensure that the content of these articles is understandable to the world community and is open to everyone.

The message about the problem only after the narration does not reveal the meaning of diplomatic documents. Because it is published here in the form of a statement known to everyone from printed pages, radio, TV channels, or previous diplomatic documents, simply reporting a problem is equivalent to repeating a well-known truth.

If the issue is not a narrative, and new aspects are interconnected with available

information and can be disclosed from a new side, interest in the diplomatic document will increase. The content of a diplomatic document becomes meaningful if the proposal makes a person familiarized with the document think in an interrogative sense in the form of an exchange of views, and each word has its emphasis, i.e., is brought closer to the language of conversation.

Conclusion

The terminological meanings of diplomatic terms in Kazakh and English are determined by the ratio of their special scientific concepts and the place occupied by the term in the corresponding terminological field.

The system of diplomatic terms in the Kazakh and English languages is defined, on the one hand, by the laws of the national vocabulary, on the other hand, by the semantic concept of the term. The article reveals the main lexical and grammatical features and similarities of diplomatic terms in Kazakh and English.

Comparing Kazakh and English diplomatic terms, the following was concluded.

- The original meaning of the borrowed diplomatic terms that entered the English language has not been preserved, and foreign diplomatic terms that have entered the Kazakh language have retained their original meaning, although they also undergo phonetic changes.

- Correlative diplomatic terms in English are given in the Kazakh language in the form of term phrases, during the development of which they can be included in the number of alliterating terms.

- In the Kazakh and English languages, the composition of diplomatic terms is the vocabulary of the native language, borrowed words and international terms, but when forming correlative international terms, the components that unite the word consist entirely of an international lexeme.

- The formation of diplomatic terms in the Kazakh and English languages using semantic, morphological, and analytical approaches is based on the specific linguistic patterns of each language.

- Comparative study of the system of Kazakh and English diplomatic terms contributes to the terminological lexicography and terminology.

The results of the study can serve as a basis for the formation of a fund of general scientific, international, interdisciplinary terms, the creation of a linguistic theory of scientific and technical translation, and the formation of a new methodology for teaching a foreign language.

It has been established that diplomatic language in different linguocultures is characterized by the similarity of semantics and the main method of formation by borrowing. The revealed features of the diplomatic language imply the stabilization of the language of international relations. In the future, it is planned to consider and compare diplomatic documents in different linguocultures to establish universal diplomatic terminology for conducting intercultural dialogue and achieving mutual understanding between states.

Acknowledgments

The publication was carried out as a part of the program of supporting the publication activity of the Southern Federal University.

Bibliographic references

Baker, W. (2015). Culture and identity through English as a Lingua franca: Rethinking concepts and goals in intercultural communication. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. ISBN 10 1501510622.

Baranova, E.A., Zheltukhina, M.R., Shnaider, A.A., Redkozubova, E.A., & Zdanovskaya, L.B. (2020). New media business philosophy in conditions of mass

- media convergence. *Online Journal of Communication and Media Technologies* 10(4), e202021. ISSN 1986-3497.
- Blum, M.A., & Molotkova, N.V. (2004). PR technologies in commercial activities. Tambov: Tambov State University of Technology. ISBN 5-8265-0267-3.
- Boeva-Omelechko, N.B., Zheltukhina, M.R., Ryabko, O.P., Matveeva, G.G., Murugova, E.V., & Zyubina, I.A. (2018). Unusual Antonyms: Inter-Part-Of-Speech Interaction in English Fictional Discourse. *Space and Culture India* 6(4), 112-121. E-ISSN 2052-8396.
- Cohen, R. (1991). *Negotiating Across Cultures: Communication Obstacles in International Diplomacy*. New York: United States Institute of Peace Press. ISBN 13-978-1878379085; ISBN-10: 1878379089.
- Gilchrist, A. (2013). On revolutions and the 'Information Revolution'. *Ibersid* 7, 13-20.
- Hunt, J.W. (1992). *Managing People at Work: A Manager's Guide to Behavior in Organizations*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co Ltd. ISBN 978-0077076771.
- Ibragimov, G.I. (2021). Project-and research-based learning as a technology for developing master students' methodological culture development. *Education and Self Development*, 16(3), 310-321. ISSN 1991-7740.
- Kakenova G.M. (2018). *Multilateral diplomacy*. Astana: L.N. Gumilyov ENU. ISBN 978-601-326-242-0.
- Khairutdinova, R.R., Gromova, C.R., Zheltukhina, M.R., Chistyakov, A.A., & Daitgadzhiev, G.M. (2022). Adaptation of the Classroom Cultural Diversity Climate Scale for Russia. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies* 9(2), 248-265. ISSN 2192-4880.
- Khodyreva, E.A., Kalimullin, A.M., Zheltukhina, M.R., & Chizh, N.V. (2021). Transformation of the Assessment of the Quality of Educational Activities and Training of Future Science Teachers in the Context of the Pandemic. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education* 17(10), 1-12. ISSN 1305-8223.
- Khranchenko, V.E. (2013). *Business communication with foreign partners*. Kemerovo: Kemerovo State University. ISBN 978-5-8353-1520-8.
- Kurkimbayeva, A.M., Akhatova, B.A., Gumovskaya, G.N., Kotenyatkina, I.B., & Khuziakmetov, A.N. (2020). Communicative strategies in modern linguistics (on the material of English travel blogs). *XLinguae* 13(2), 33-49. ISSN 1337-8384.
- Lynch, M.F., Salikhova, N.R., Eremeeva, A.V. (2020). Basic needs in other cultures: Using qualitative methods to study key issues in self-determination theory research. *Psychology, Journal of the Higher School of Economics*, 17(1), 134-144. ISSN 18138918.
- Masalimova, A.R., Khairullina, E.R., Lapidus, N.I., Zheltukhina, M.R., & Baranova, E.A. (2022). Exploring Preservice STEM Teachers' Smartphone Addiction. *Contemporary Educational Technology* 14(3), ep371. ISSN 1309-517X.
- Muryasov, R.Z., Zheltukhina, M.R., & Zelenskaya, L.L. (2022). Reflexives in the lexical and grammatical system of language and artistic discourse: linguocultural contrastive aspect. *XLinguae* 15(3), 36-50. ISSN 1337-8384.
- Pencheva, A.I. (2012). Peculiarities of word formation of diplomatic terminology (based on diplomatic documents in Russian and Bulgarian). *Bulletin of the Center of International Education of Moscow State University* 4, 23-28. ISSN 2074-8361.
- Ramazanova, S. (2009). Language diplomatic communication as a language substructure of political communications. *Russian Language Studies* 4, 24-32. ISSN 2618-8163.
- Repina, E.A., Zheltukhina, M.R., Kovaleva, N.A., Popova, T.G., & Garcia Caselles, C. (2018). International media image of Russia: trends and patterns of perception. *XLinguae* 11(2), 557-565. ISSN 1337-8384.
- Sekyere-Asiedu, D., Mashkin, N.A., Mochelevskaya, E.V., Petrova, M.G., &

- Zheltukhina, M.R. (2022). Determining the Readiness of the Mechanical Engineering Programme Candidates for Distance Education. *International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy* 12(2), 101–114. ISSN 2192-4880.
- Sharaf El Din, M. (2007). The word of the diplomat. *Russian speech* 4, 46-48. ISSN 0131-6117.
- Tameryan, T.Y., Zheltukhina, M.R., Anikejeva, I.G., Arkhipenko, N.A., Soboleva, E. I., & Skuybedina, O.N. (2020). Language Explication of the Conceptualized Meanings. *Ethno-cultural and Socio-political Aspects of Discourse. Opcion* 26, 456-475. ISSN 1012-1587.
- Tameryan, T.Yu., Popova, T.G., Redkozubova, E.A., Anikeeva, I.G., Sedlyarova, O.M., & Solovieva, N.S. (2019). Feminine perspective of ethnic business communication. *Espacios* 40(34), 18. ISSN 0798-1015.
- Tameryan, T.Yu., Zyubina, I.A., & Zheltukhina, M.R. (2022). Polycode as a Strategic Resource of Intercultural Communication. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics* 13(3), 750-768. ISSN 2313-2299.
- Volkova, T.A. (2011). Discourse analysis method in diplomatic texts translation modeling. *Political linguistics* 3, 17-24. ISSN 1999-2629.
- Voloskova A.V. (1969). Foreign language words in diplomatic terminology of the beginning of the 18th century. *Scientific notes of the Ural State University* 80(8), 31-44. ISSN 2310-757X.
- Wood, J.R., & Serres, J.Ch. (1970). *Diplomatic ceremonial and protocol: principles, procedures & practices*. New York: Columbia University Press. ISBN 0231-03138-6.
- Zagorovskaya, O.V. & Naser, F.M.N. (2013). Strong and weak innovations in diplomatic vocabulary of the Russian language at the turn of the XXth-XXIst centuries. *Philological sciences* 12(30), part 2. ISSN 1997-2911.
- Zheltukhina, M.R., Klushina, N.I., Ponomarenko, E.B., Vasilkova, N.N., & Dzyubenko, A.I. (2017b). Modern Media Influence: Mass Culture – Mass Consciousness – Mass Communication. *XLinguae* 10(4), 96-105. ISSN 1337-8384.
- Zheltukhina, M.R., Vikulova, L.G., Mikhaylova, S.V., Borbotko, L.A., & Masalimova, A.R. (2017a). Communicative Theatre Space in the Linguistic and Pragmatic Paradigm. *XLinguae* 10(2), 85-100. ISSN 1337-8384.
- Zheltukhina, M.R., Vikulova, L.G., Serebrennikova, E.F., Gerasimova, S.A., & Borbotko, L.A. (2016). Identity as an Element of Human and Language Universes: Axiological Aspect. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education* 11(17), 10413-10422. ISSN 1306-3065.
- Zheltukhina, M.R., Zelenskaya, L.L., & Ponomarenko, E.B. (2020). Indicating success with material symbols after the collapse of the USSR. *Visual Anthropology* 33(2), 104-115. ISSN 0894-9468.
- Zheltukhina, M.R., Zelenskaya, L.L., Ostrikova, G.N., Redkozubova, E.A., & Chernova, O.O. (2021). Home reading effective organization as independent work form during foreign language teaching in conditions of forced isolation. *XLinguae* 14(1), 249-269. ISSN 1337-8384.

Words: 5062

Characters: 35 365 (19,6 standard pages)

Fariza Ismailova

Department of Kazakh Language and Literature named after Academician S.S. Kirabaev

Kazakh National Pedagogical University named after Abay
050010,

Republic of Kazakhstan

Almaty, Dostyk avenue 13
Fari1996@mail.ru
ORCID: 0000-0001-9685-6791

Prof. Larisa Laktemirovna Zelenskaya, PhD
Department of English Language no. 6
MGIMO (University)
76 Prospect Vernadskogo
119454 Moscow
Russia
zelenskaya@yahoo.com
ORCID: 0000-0002-7349-4027

Associate Prof. Ekaterina Anatolyevna Redkozubova, DrSc.
Department of the Theory and Practice of the English Language
Institute of Philology, Journalism and Cross-Cultural Communication
Southern Federal University
105/42 Bolshaya Sadovaya Str.
344006 Rostov-on-Don
Russia
kateredkozubova@mail.ru
ORCID: 0000-0002-0475-6855

Associate Prof. Irina Goderzovna Anikeeva, PhD
Department of Linguistics and Theory of Translation
Moscow Aviation Institute
4 Volokolamskoe highway
125993 Moscow
Russia
Irganik3@mail.ru
ORCID: 0000-0001-9628-4287

Associate Prof. Yelena Vladimirovna Sausheva, PhD
Institute of Foreign Languages
14 B. Sadovaya Street
123001 Moscow
Russia
spring25@mail.ru
ORCID: 0000-0002-7744-9071