COMPARATIVE STRUCTURAL, SEMANTIC, AND CORPUS-BASED ANALYSIS OF DIPLOMATIC TERMINOLOGY IN ENGLISH AND KYRGYZ

Садыкова С. З. -
доктор филологических наук,
профессор Кыргызского национального университета
имени Ж. Баласагына,
0009-0006-7914-0103
Самсалиев А.М. - старший преподаватель
кафедры романо-германских языков
Института иностранных языков КНУ имени Ж. Баласагына
0009-0006-0203-4943
Sadykova S. Z. -
Doctor of Philological Sciences,
Professor at J. Balasagyn Kyrgyz National University.
Samsaliev A.M. – Senior Lecturer
Department of Romance-Germanic Languages
Institute of Foreign Languages,
Jusup Balasagyn Kyrgyz National University
0009-0006-0203-4943

Abstract. This study investigates the structural, semantic, and translational properties of diplomatic terminology in English and Kyrgyz using a corpus-based approach. The research material consists of a bilingual corpus of 300 diplomatic terms extracted from official documents of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kyrgyz Republic (2020–2025), United Nations translations, and specialized diplomatic dictionaries. The study applies Wüster's General Theory of Terminology and Cabré's Communicative Theory of Terminology, combined with corpus linguistic methods and quantitative analysis. Results show that Kyrgyz diplomatic terminology is characterized by a hybrid system consisting of international borrowings (42%), calques (25%), hybrid formations (23%), and native lexical units (10%). The study identifies systematic structural asymmetries between English compounding and Kyrgyz postpositional phrase formation. The findings contribute to standardization efforts in Kyrgyz diplomatic language and provide recommendations for terminological policy. Special attention is given to the contributions of Kyrgyz scholars in lexicography, pedagogy, and digital terminology.

Annotatsiya. Ushbu tadqiqot ingliz va qirg‘iz tillaridagi diplomatik terminologiyaning strukturaviy, semantik va tarjimaviy xususiyatlarini korpusga asoslangan yondashuv asosida o‘rganadi. Tadqiqot materiali Qirg‘iz Respublikasi Tashqi ishlar vazirligining rasmiy hujjatlari (2020–2025), Birlashgan Millatlar Tashkilotining tarjimalari va ixtisoslashtirilgan diplomatik lug‘atlardan olingan 300 ta diplomatik termindan iborat ikki tilli korpusdan tashkil topgan. Tadqiqotda Vyusterning umumiy terminologiya nazariyasi va Kabrening kommunikativ terminologiya nazariyasi qo‘llanilgan hamda korpus lingvistikasi usullari va miqdoriy tahlil bilan uyg‘unlashtirilgan. Natijalar shuni ko‘rsatadiki, qirg‘iz tilidagi diplomatik terminologiya gibrid tizim bo‘lib, unda xalqaro o‘zlashmalar (42%), kalkalar (25%), gibrid shakllar (23%) va mahalliy leksik birliklar (10%) mavjud. Tadqiqot ingliz tilidagi qo‘shma so‘z yasash va qirg‘iz tilidagi

postpozitiv so‘z birikmasi shakllanishi o‘rtasidagi tizimli strukturaviy nosimmetrikliklarni aniqlaydi. Ushbu topilmalar qirg‘iz diplomatik tilini standartlashtirishga hissa qo‘shadi va terminologik siyosat bo‘yicha tavsiyalar beradi. Leksikografiya, pedagogika va raqamli terminologiya sohasidagi qirg‘iz olimlarining hissasiga alohida e’tibor qaratiladi.

Аннотация. В данном исследовании анализируются структурные, семантические и переводческие свойства дипломатической терминологии в английском и кыргызском языках с использованием корпусно-ориентированного подхода. Материал исследования состоит из двуязычного корпуса, включающего 300 дипломатических терминов, извлечённых из официальных документов Министерства иностранных дел Кыргызской Республики (2020–2025 гг.), переводов Организации Объединённых Наций и специализированных дипломатических словарей. В исследовании применяются общая теория терминологии Вюстера и коммуникативная теория терминологии Кабре в сочетании с методами корпусной лингвистики и количественного анализа. Результаты показывают, что дипломатическая терминология кыргызского языка представляет собой гибридную систему, состоящую из интернациональных заимствований (42%), калек (25%), гибридных образований (23%) и исконных лексических единиц (10%). В исследовании выявлены системные структурные асимметрии между английским словосложением и кыргызским постпозитивным фразообразованием. Полученные результаты вносят вклад в усилия по стандартизации кыргызского дипломатического языка и содержат рекомендации по терминологической политике. Особое внимание уделяется вкладу кыргызских учёных в лексикографию, педагогику и цифровую терминологию.

Keywords: diplomatic terminology, corpus linguistics, translation studies, terminology standardization, Kyrgyz scholarship.

Kalit so‘zlar: diplomatik terminologiya, korpus lingvistikasi, tarjimashunoslik, terminologiyani standartlashtirish, qirg‘iz ilmiy maktabi.

Ключевые слова: дипломатическая терминология, корпусная лингвистика, переводоведение, стандартизация терминологии, кыргызская научная школа.

1. Introduction

Diplomatic communication represents a highly specialized discourse domain characterized by precision, formulaicity, and institutional standardization. In the context of globalization and intensifying international cooperation, diplomatic terminology has become a key mechanism for ensuring linguistic equivalence across languages.

Despite the growing importance of Kyrgyz as a state language in international communication, its diplomatic terminology system remains under-standardized, particularly in relation to newly emerging global concepts such as digital diplomacy, climate diplomacy, and cyber governance.

Research problem: The absence of a unified English–Kyrgyz diplomatic terminological system leads to inconsistencies in translation practices and institutional communication.

Aim: To analyze structural, semantic, and translational patterns of diplomatic terminology in English and Kyrgyz and to develop a corpus-based classification model.

Research questions:

1. What are the dominant translation strategies in Kyrgyz diplomatic terminology?
2. How do structural patterns differ between English and Kyrgyz diplomatic terms?
3. What proportion of terminology is borrowed, calqued, or nativized?

4. How are new diplomatic terms integrated into Kyrgyz?

2. Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

2.1 Foundational Theories of Terminology

This study is grounded in three theoretical traditions:

✓ Wüster's General Theory of Terminology (GTT) (Wüster, 1979) emphasizes the principle of concept–term univocity, where each concept should correspond to a single standardized term. This principle is partially violated in Kyrgyz diplomatic discourse due to synonymic variation (e.g., multiple renderings of "resilience").

✓ Cabré's Communicative Theory of Terminology (TCT) (Cabré, 1999) argues that terminology is not isolated from general language but functions dynamically in discourse. This is particularly relevant for Kyrgyz, where diplomatic terms frequently overlap with general vocabulary (келишим 'agreement', жолугушуу 'meeting').

✓ Corpus-based terminology studies (Bowker & Pearson, 2002) emphasize empirical corpus analysis, allowing frequency-based validation of term usage in institutional contexts.

2.2 International Comparative Terminology Studies

Key international contributions include:

✓ Crystal (2008) characterizes diplomatic lexis as a specialized domain language with strict stylistic marking.

✓ Vinay & Darbelnet (1995) systematically described translation strategies (calquing, equivalence, modulation, compensation), which are directly applicable to English–Kyrgyz diplomatic translation.

✓ Tsitkina (1988) substantiates the necessity of comparative terminology for the development of translation theory.

2.3 Contributions of Kyrgyz Scholars to Diplomatic Terminology Research

A critical component of this study is the integration of research conducted by Kyrgyz linguists and terminologists, whose work has laid the foundation for systematic diplomatic terminology development in the Kyrgyz language.

2.3.1 Foundational Lexicography

The systematic study of diplomatic terminology in Kyrgyz is primarily associated with G.S. Bayymbetova. Her contributions mark the transition from sporadic translation to systematic lexicography:

✓ 2013 Dictionary: "Russian–Kyrgyz Dictionary of Terms and Expressions of International Relations and Diplomacy" (Bayymbetova, 2013). This work aimed to support the implementation of state language laws and facilitate paperwork in Kyrgyz within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and its foreign missions. The dictionary covered basic diplomatic concepts and provided Russian–Kyrgyz equivalents.

✓ 2025 Revised Edition: "Russian–Kyrgyz Dictionary of Terms in the Field of International Relations and Diplomacy" (Bayymbetova, Zhusubakunova, & Tumanova, 2025). Significantly expanded, this edition was produced with institutional support from the National Commission on State Language and Language Policy and the Kyrgyz Encyclopedic and Terminological Center. Its presentation at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in January 2026 was a major event, attended by the Minister of Foreign Affairs and the Chairman of the National Commission. The dictionary includes key terms, official names of states and international

organizations, and is positioned as a tool for unifying and systematizing international terminology in the state language.

Commentary: Bayymbetova's dictionaries represent the first systematic attempt to record diplomatic terminology in Kyrgyz. However, they are oriented primarily towards translation from Russian and do not fully cover many newest English-language terms (digital diplomacy, hybrid threats). This gap is addressed in the present study.

2.3.2 Pedagogical Frameworks

G.A. Kongaitieva and Ch.R. Imanalieva contributed to the educational dimension of diplomatic terminology through their "Glossary of Diplomatic, Consular, Judicial and Economic Terms" (Kongaitieva & Imanalieva, 2014). This bilingual (English–Kyrgyz) glossary targets students of international relations, international law, and international economic relations. The glossary focuses on building terminological competence for professional communication in diplomatic settings, summits, and forums.

Commentary: While primarily pedagogical, this work provides a valuable English–Kyrgyz terminological resource and demonstrates the practical need for standardized diplomatic vocabulary in university training.

2.3.3 Emerging Digital Approaches

R.K. Bektenova, a PhD candidate in Applied Linguistics at the Diplomatic Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kyrgyz Republic, is researching the practical aspects of creating an automated (digital) dictionary of diplomatic terminology (Bektenova, 2022–present). Her research focuses on corpus-based extraction of terminological units, automated translation algorithms, and the integration of Kyrgyz diplomatic terminology into digital resources. She is proficient in Kyrgyz, Russian, English, and French.

Commentary: Bektenova's work represents the future direction of Kyrgyz diplomatic terminology studies – moving from static printed dictionaries to dynamic, corpus-driven digital platforms. Her emphasis on automation and standardization aligns directly with the recommendations of the present study.

2.3.4 Cognitive-Pragmatic Analysis of Central Asian Diplomatic Discourse

A broader, cross-linguistic perspective is offered by J. Abduganiev (2026), whose study examines Central Asian diplomatic language, including Kyrgyz, as a multilingual lexicon influenced by a combination of historical, political, and cultural factors. Using Conceptual Metaphor Theory alongside speech-act and politeness approaches, Abduganiev finds significant cross-linguistic differences in metaphorical framing – for example, conceptualizing negotiation as a 'transactional procedure' versus 'collective deliberation'. This research highlights that diplomatic meaning is not simply transmitted but is constituted by deeply embedded cognitive and pragmatic conventions, making it highly relevant to any comparative typological study.

Commentary: Abduganiev's cognitive-pragmatic approach complements the structural-semantic focus of the present study, demonstrating that terminology operates within broader discourse strategies.

2.4 Summary of Literature Review

A comprehensive review reveals that while Kyrgyz scholars have made significant strides in lexicography (Bayymbetova), pedagogy (Kongaitieva & Imanalieva), digital terminology (Bektenova), and cognitive-pragmatic analysis (Abduganiev), a corpus-based, structurally

quantified, comparative typological study of diplomatic terms in English and Kyrgyz has not yet been conducted. The present study fills this gap.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The study uses a mixed-method corpus-assisted design combining qualitative linguistic analysis with quantitative statistics.

3.2 Corpus

A specialized bilingual corpus (English–Kyrgyz) of 300 diplomatic terms was compiled from:

- ✓ Official documents of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kyrgyz Republic (2020–2025)
- ✓ United Nations official translations into Kyrgyz
- ✓ Bilingual diplomatic dictionaries (Bayymbetova, 2013, 2025; Kongaitieva & Imanalieva, 2014)
- ✓ Institutional diplomatic discourse (press releases, treaties, statements)

Total corpus size: ~120,000 tokens.

3.3 Analytical Methods

Method	Application
Structural analysis	Identification of compounding vs. phrase formation patterns
Semantic classification	Distinguishing monosemy vs. polysemy, core vs. peripheral terms
Translation strategy analysis	Vinay & Darbelnet model (borrowing, calquing, equivalence, modulation)
Frequency analysis	Descriptive statistics on term distribution
Distribution modeling	Percentage-based classification (4 translation strategies)
Stability Index (SI)	Consistency of term usage across documents (0–1 scale)

3.4 Classification Scheme

Four translation strategies were operationalized:

1. Borrowing (direct internationalism) – term retains foreign form (e.g., *консенсус, демарш*)
2. Calquing (structural translation) – literal morpheme-by-morpheme translation (e.g., *эл аралык укук from international law*)
3. Hybrid formation – borrowed stem + Kyrgyz affix (*кибердипломатия, дипломатиялык*)
4. Native lexical equivalence – indigenous Kyrgyz word *(элчи 'ambassador', келишим 'agreement'*)

4. Results

4.1 Distribution of Translation Strategies

Strategy	Percentage	Examples
Borrowing (direct internationalisms)	42%	*консенсус, демарш, ратификация, санкция*

Calquing	25% |	*эл аралык укук, тышкы саясат, дипломатиялык кол тийбестик*
Hybrid formation	23%	*дипломатиялык, кибердипломатия, глобалдашуу*
Native terms	10%	*элчи, келишим, мамиле, жолугушуу*

Figure 1 (conceptual): Borrowing dominates, but calquing and hybrid strategies account for nearly half of the terminological stock, indicating active localization.

4.2 Structural Asymmetry Analysis

Feature	English	Kyrgyz
Dominant pattern	Compounding, nominal modification, lexical compression	Postpositional phrase structures, affixation *(-лык/-тык)*, analytic constructions
Length	Short (e.g., *statecraft, ceasefire*)	Longer, multi-word (*дипломатиялык кол тийбестик*)
Modification order	Pre-modification	Post-modification (definitive + defined)

Example contrast:

✓ *diplomatic immunity* (2 words, 18 chars) → *дипломатиялык кол тийбестик* (3 words, 27 characters)

✓ *cyber diplomacy (*2 words, 14 chars) → *кибердипломатия* (1 word, 16 characters – hybrid form shows compression)

4.3 Semantic Classification of Diplomatic Terms (6 Groups)

Based on corpus analysis, six semantic groups were identified:

Group	Description	Share	Examples (Eng → Kyr)
G1	Generalized lexical units (common words with diplomatic meaning)	18% |	*agreement → келишим, meeting → жолугушуу*
G2	Core diplomatic terms (institutional concepts)	34%	*diplomatic immunity, consul, memorandum*
G3	Legal-diplomatic hybrids (law + diplomacy)	21%	*sanctions, arbitration, extradition*
G4	Formulaic/etiquette expressions	12%	*friendly visit, exchange of views*
G5	Metonymic and phraseological units	(included in G4)	*White House → Ак үй, Cold War → кансыз/муздак согуш*
G6	Neologisms (21st century)	15%	*digital diplomacy, climate diplomacy, hybrid threats*

Note: Group 5 (metonymies) is treated as a subset of Group 4 in quantitative counts.

4.4 Neologism Integration Patterns (Group 6)

Analysis of 45 neologisms (terms that entered Kyrgyz after 2015) reveals three dominant integration mechanisms:

Mechanism	Example	Frequency
Direct calquing	*climate diplomacy → климаттык дипломатия*	44%
Hybrid derivation	*cyber + diplomacy → кибердипломатия*	38%
Descriptive equivalence	*resilience → туруктуулук потенциалы*	18%

4.5 Frequency-Based Stability Index (SI)

A Stability Index (SI) was calculated based on the consistency of term usage across 50 official documents (2020–2025). SI ranges from 0 (inconsistent) to 1 (fully consistent).

Term type	Stability Index (SI)	Interpretation
Borrowed terms	0.87	High stability – internationalisms are consistently used
Calques	| 0.74	Moderate stability – some variation exists
Hybrid forms	0.69	Moderate to low – ongoing variation *(e.g., цифралык vs санариптик дипломатия)*
Native terms	0.91	Very high stability – deeply entrenched *(e.g., элчи, келишим*

Key finding: Native terms show the highest stability, followed by borrowings. Hybrid forms are the least stable, indicating ongoing terminological competition.

5. Discussion

5.1 Hybrid Nature of Kyrgyz Diplomatic Terminology

The results confirm that Kyrgyz diplomatic terminology is a hybridized system shaped by:

- ✓ Historical Russian mediation (most borrowings entered via Russian)
- ✓ Increasing direct English influence (since independence, especially post-2010)
- ✓ Active localization through calquing and hybrid derivation

The dominance of borrowings (42%) reflects ongoing dependency on international lexical sources, a pattern observed in many smaller languages (Cabré, 1999). However, the relatively high proportion of calques (25%) and hybrid formations (23%) indicates strong institutional efforts to create Kyrgyz-appropriate forms.

5.2 Structural Asymmetry and Translation Implications

Unlike English, which relies on lexical condensation and compounding, Kyrgyz prefers analytic syntactic structures with postpositional modification. This structural asymmetry leads to longer terminological constructions in Kyrgyz, which may affect document length and real-time interpretation.

Practical implication: Translators often need to compress or expand. For simultaneous interpretation, hybrid forms (кибердипломатия) are preferred over analytic calques (санариптик дипломатия) because they are shorter.

5.3 Neologism Integration and Standardization Challenges

The neologism analysis reveals that Kyrgyz is rapidly adapting to global diplomatic discourse, particularly in digital diplomacy, climate diplomacy, and cyber governance. However,

the relatively low Stability Index for hybrid forms (0.69) indicates that multiple competing variants exist. For example:

- *digital diplomacy* appears as *санариптик дипломатия, цифралык дипломатия*, and *электрондук дипломатия*.

- resilience appears as *туруктуулук, туруктуулук потенциалы*, and *калыбына келтирүү*.

Recommendation: The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in coordination with the National Commission on State Language, should establish a working group on diplomatic terminology standardization.

5.4 Contribution of Kyrgyz Scholars

The integration of Kyrgyz scholarly contributions is critical:

- Bayymbetova's dictionaries (2013, 2025) provide the foundational lexicographic baseline. The 2025 edition, in particular, represents a significant step toward systematization.

✓ Kongaitieva & Imanalieva's glossary (2014) demonstrates the pedagogical demand for English–Kyrgyz diplomatic terminology.

✓ Bektenova's ongoing dissertation (automated dictionary) aligns with the corpus-based and digital orientation of the present study.

✓ Abduganiev's cognitive-pragmatic analysis (2026) broadens the perspective beyond structural semantics to include discourse strategies and metaphorical framing.

Gap addressed by this study: None of the previous works provide a quantified, corpus-based comparative typology of English and Kyrgyz diplomatic terminology. This study fills that gap.

5.5 Comparison with Other Turkic Languages

Preliminary comparison with Uzbek (Khaydarova & Idalgo, 2024) and Kazakh (Kaidarov, 1993) suggests that similar hybrid patterns exist across Turkic languages, but Kyrgyz shows a higher proportion of calques (25%) compared to Uzbek (estimated 18%), possibly due to stronger institutional support for state language policy.

6. Conclusion

6.1 Summary of Findings

This study provides the first corpus-based, structurally quantified comparative typology of diplomatic terminology in English and Kyrgyz. The main findings are:

1. Distribution: Borrowings (42%) dominate, followed by calques (25%), hybrid formations (23%), and native terms (10%).

2. Structural asymmetry: English prefers compounding and pre-modification; Kyrgyz prefers analytic postpositional phrases.

3. Semantic classification: Six groups identified, with neologisms (Group 6) accounting for 15% of the corpus.

4. Stability: Native terms show highest stability (SI 0.91); hybrid forms show lowest (SI 0.69), indicating ongoing variation.

5. Neologism integration: Three mechanisms – calquing (44%), hybrid derivation (38%), descriptive equivalence (18%).

6. Kyrgyz scholarship: Foundational contributions by Bayymbetova, Kongaitieva & Imanalieva, Bektenova, and Abduganiev provide the necessary baseline, but a quantified corpus-based comparative study was missing until now.

6.2 Recommendations

For the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the National Commission on State Language:

1. Establish a terminological working group to standardize unstable hybrid forms (e.g., choose *санариптик дипломатия over цифарлык дипломатия*).

2. Adopt the Stability Index as a metric for prioritizing terms for standardization.

3. Develop an English–Kyrgyz corpus-based diplomatic dictionary (digital, searchable, updatable) – Bektenova's work should be supported institutionally.

4. Integrate the six-group classification into translator training and official guidelines.

For translators and practitioners:

✓ For high-stability terms (borrowings, native), use existing standards.

✓ For low-stability hybrid forms, prefer the most frequent variant according to corpus analysis.

✓ For neologisms without established equivalents, use calquing as the default strategy, but prioritize hybrid derivation where structurally possible (e.g., кибердипломатия rather than санариптик дипломатия for speed).

For researchers:

✓ Expand the corpus to include spoken diplomatic discourse (press conferences, interviews).

✓ Conduct acceptability judgments with native-speaker diplomats (e.g., which variant of "digital diplomacy" is preferred?).

✓ Compare Kyrgyz patterns with other Turkic languages (Kazakh, Uzbek, Turkish) to identify areal typological features.

6.3 Limitations and Future Research

Limitations:

✓ The corpus is limited to written documents (120,000 tokens). Spoken diplomatic discourse may show different patterns.

✓ The sample (300 terms) is representative but not exhaustive.

✓ Stability Index calculations are based on frequency consistency, not experimental validation.

✓ Future research directions:

1. Spoken corpus: Record and transcribe diplomatic press conferences in Kyrgyz.

2. Experimental validation: Test translator preferences and comprehension of competing variants.

3. Diachronic study: Track how hybrid forms stabilize over time (2020–2030).

4. Cross-Turkic comparison: Systematic comparison of diplomatic terminology across Turkic languages.

Bibliographic List of Sources Used

1. Bowker, L., & Pearson, J. (2002). Working with Specialized Language: A Practical Guide to Using Corpora. London: Routledge.

2. Cabré, M.T. (1999). Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

3. Crystal, D. (2008). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics (6th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

4. Vinay, J.-P., & Darbelnet, J. (1995). Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

5. Wüster, E. (1979). Introduction to the General Theory of Terminology. Vienna: Springer.
6. Tsitkina, F.A. (1988). Terminology and Translation (Towards the Foundations of Comparative Terminology). Moscow: Nauka. (in Russian)
7. Abduganiev, J. (2026). Cognitive–Pragmatic Dynamics in the Re-Lexicalization of Central Asian Diplomatic Language. Journal of Academic Research and Culture, (1), 31-37.
8. Bayymbetova, G.S. (2013). Russian–Kyrgyz Dictionary of Terms and Expressions of International Relations and Diplomacy. Bishkek: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kyrgyz Republic. (in Kyrgyz)
9. Bayymbetova, G.S., Zhusubakunova, N., & Tumanova, V. (2025). Russian–Kyrgyz Dictionary of Terms in the Field of International Relations and Diplomacy. Bishkek: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kyrgyz Republic. (in Kyrgyz)
10. Bektenova, R.K. (2022–present). Applied aspects of creating an automated dictionary of diplomatic terminology (PhD dissertation). Diplomatic Academy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kyrgyz Republic. (in Kyrgyz and Russian)
11. Kaidarov, A.T. (1993). A New View on Kazakh Terminology. Almaty: Rauan. (in Russian)
12. Khaydarova, D.Z., & Idalgo, R.M.R. (2024). Comparative typological study of diplomatic terms in Spanish and Uzbek. Journal of Humanities and Natural Sciences, (9), 36-46.
13. Kongaitieva, G.A., & Imanalieva, Ch.R. (2014). Glossary of Diplomatic, Consular, Judicial and Economic Terms. Bishkek: Kut-Ber.
14. Pigolkin, A.S. (Ed.). (1990). The Language of Law. Moscow: Yuridicheskaya literatura. (in Russian)
15. Paisieva, R.I. (2002). Diplomatic Protocol and Diplomatic Etiquette. Moscow: Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya. (in Russian)
16. Khaydarova, D.Z. (2022). Terminology today: concepts, trends and applications. Bulletin of Science and Education, 2-2(122), 15-18.
17. Khaydarova, D.Z. (2024). The task of the diplomatic text translator. Bulletin of Science and Education, 10(153)-2, 13-16.