

Oriental Journal of Education



ORIENTAL JOURNAL OF EDUCATION

journal homepage:
<https://www.supportscience.uz/index.php/oje>



COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK LEGAL TERMINOLOGY

Sarvinoz Rakhmonova

Independent researcher

Uzbek State University of World Languages

Email: doniyors0115@gmail.com

Tashkent, Uzbekistan

ABOUT ARTICLE

Key words: Legal terminology, Legal language, English legal terms, Uzbek legal terms, Single-word terms, Compound terms, Fixed multi-word phrases, Comparative analysis, Legal translation.

Received: 17.01.26

Accepted: 18.01.26

Published: 19.01.26

Abstract: Legal terminology is a specialized vocabulary used in laws, court procedures, legal documents, and official communication, characterized by precision, clarity, and unambiguous meaning. It reflects the historical, cultural, and political context of a legal system and is essential for accurate interpretation, translation, and legal practice. Legal terms can be classified into single-word terms, compound terms, and fixed multi-word phrases, each functioning as an indivisible legal unit. Comparative analysis of English and Uzbek legal terminology highlights structural differences. English, influenced by the common law tradition, favors compounds and fixed phrases, allowing complex legal concepts to be expressed concisely. Uzbek, shaped by the civil law system and the analytical nature of the language, predominantly uses multi-word descriptive constructions. Understanding these structural and functional distinctions is crucial for legal translation, cross-cultural communication, and ensuring clarity and certainty in legal texts. The study of legal terminology enables precise expression and consistent interpretation within and across legal systems.

INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK HUQUQIY TERMINOLOGIYASINI QIYOSIY O'RGANISH

Sarvinoz Raxmonova

Mustaqil izlanuvchi

O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universteti

Email: doniyors0115@gmail.com

Toshkent, O'zbekiston

MAQOLA HAQIDA

Kalit so‘zlar: yuridik terminologiya, yuridik til, ingliz yuridik atamalari, o‘zbek yuridik atamalari, yagona so‘zli atamalar, birlashma atamalar, barqaror ko‘p so‘zli iboralar, solishtirma tahlil, yuridik tarjima.

Annotatsiya: Yuridik terminologiya qonunlar, sud jarayonlari, huquqiy hujjatlar va rasmiy muloqotda ishlataladigan maxsus lug‘at bo‘lib, anqlik, tushunarli va bir ma’nolilik bilan ajralib turadi. U huquqiy tizimning tarixiy, madaniy va siyosiy kontekstini aks ettiradi va aniq talqin, tarjima va huquqiy amaliyot uchun zarurdir. Yuridik atamalar yagona so‘zli, birikma va barqaror ko‘p so‘zli iboralarga bo‘linadi, har biri ajralmas huquqiy birlik sifatida ishlaydi. Ingliz va o‘zbek yuridik terminologiyasini solishtirish struktural farqlarni ko‘rsatadi. Ingliz tili umumiy huquq an’analari ta’sirida birikmalar va barqaror iboralardan foydalansa, murakkab huquqiy tushunchalarni qisqa va aniq ifodalash imkonini beradi. O‘zbek tili esa fuqarolik huquqi tizimi va analitik tabiat bilan ko‘p so‘zli tavsifiy tuzilmalarni afzal ko‘radi. Ushbu struktural va funksional farqlarni tushunish yuridik tarjima va madaniyatlararo muloqotda anqlik va qat’iylikni ta’minlash uchun muhimdir.

СРАВНИТЕЛЬНОЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЕ АНГЛИЙСКОЙ И УЗБЕКСКОЙ ЮРИДИЧЕСКОЙ ТЕРМИНОЛОГИИ

Сарвиноз Рахмонова

Независимый исследователь

Узбекского государственного университета мировых языков

doniyors0115@gmail.com

Ташкент, Узбекистан

О СТАТЬЕ

Ключевые слова: Юридическая терминология, Юридический язык, Английские юридические термины, Узбекские юридические термины, Однословные термины, Составные термины, Устойчивые многословные фразы, Сравнительный анализ, Юридический перевод.

Аннотация: Юридическая терминология – это специализированная лексика, используемая в законах, судебных процедурах, юридических документах и официальной коммуникации, характеризующаяся точностью, ясностью и недвусмысленным смыслом. Она отражает исторический, культурный и политический контекст правовой системы и необходима для точного толкования, перевода и юридической практики. Юридические термины можно классифицировать на однословные термины, составные термины и устойчивые многословные фразы, каждая из которых функционирует как неделимая правовая единица. Сравнительный анализ английской и узбекской юридической терминологии выявляет структурные различия. Английский язык, находящийся под влиянием традиции

общего права, отдает предпочтение составным и устойчивым фразам, что позволяет кратко выражать сложные правовые понятия. Узбекский язык, сформированный системой гражданского права и аналитической природой языка, преимущественно использует многословные описательные конструкции. Понимание этих структурных и функциональных различий имеет решающее значение для юридического перевода, межкультурной коммуникации и обеспечения ясности и определенности в юридических текстах. Изучение юридической терминологии позволяет обеспечить точное выражение и последовательное толкование внутри и между правовыми системами.

Introduction. Legal terminology refers to the specialized vocabulary used in laws, court procedures, legal documents, and official communication within any legal system. These terms carry precise and specific meanings, and they reflect the historical, cultural, and political background of the society in which they developed. Because legal language must be accurate and unambiguous, the study of legal terminology is essential for understanding how legal concepts are expressed and interpreted. Legal terminology forms a highly specialized vocabulary used in legal texts and requires precision and clarity because legal consequences depend on accurate wording. [1] Legal terminology is not merely a collection of words but a precise and specialized language that ensures clarity and consistency in legal texts. Its accuracy is essential because even slight ambiguities can have significant legal consequences, affecting the interpretation and application of laws. Understanding and studying legal terminology is therefore crucial for legal practice, translation, and effective communication within and across legal systems.

Comparing English and Uzbek legal terms is important for several reasons. First, the two languages belong to different linguistic families and have been shaped by different legal traditions: English by Germanic, French, and Latin influences, and Uzbek by Turkic, Arabic-Persian, Russian, and modern international influences. Second, as globalization increases legal cooperation, translation and communication between English-speaking and Uzbek legal systems require a clear understanding of terminology in both languages. Finally, such comparison helps identify similarities, differences, and development patterns that can improve legal translation, education, and cross-cultural legal studies.

Literature review. In recent years, the issues of legal language and terminology have become one of the important research areas of linguistics, translation studies and comparative linguistics. In particular, the comparative analysis of legal terms in English and Uzbek is becoming increasingly

relevant in connection with globalization, international legal relations and the development of legal translation. Scientific research in this area is aimed at shedding light on the semantic, structural, pragmatic and cultural aspects of legal terms.

Fundamental research on the theory of legal terminology was mainly formed within the framework of Western schools of linguistics. In particular, E. Cabré interprets legal terms as specialized communicative units, substantiating their specific, unambiguous and normative properties [2]. The author shows the functional load of terms in legal discourse and develops criteria for distinguishing them from general language units. This approach serves as a methodological basis for the analysis of English legal terminology.

The issues of the formation and development of English legal terminology are covered in detail in the studies of D. Mellinkoff, P. Tiersma and B. Garner. In particular, Mellinkoff, analyzing the historical development of the English legal language, emphasizes the strong influence of Latin and French on it [3]. As a result, most English legal terms have complex, multi-layered semantics, which creates certain difficulties in translating them into Uzbek.

In studies devoted to the study of Uzbek legal terminology, the inextricable link between the terms and the national legal system is emphasized. In the works of Sh. Rahmatullayev and A. Madvaliyev, the sources of formation of legal terms in the Uzbek language, including units borrowed from Arabic, Persian and Russian, were analyzed [4]. The authors point out the presence of synonymy and variant forms in Uzbek legal terminology, and emphasize that this aspect to a certain extent affects the principle of clarity in the language of regulatory legal documents.

Although there are relatively few studies devoted to the comparative study of English and Uzbek legal terminology, some translation studies have paid attention to this issue. N. Komilov and G. Salomov analyze the problem of equivalent and non-equivalent terms in the process of legal translation and show through examples cases when English legal terms do not have a complete alternative in the Uzbek language [5]. This situation indicates the need to translate legal terms not literally, but on the basis of functional-semantic correspondence.

The research of A. Šarčević is of particular importance in the issue of comparative legal terminology. The author emphasizes the need to take into account not only linguistic differences, but also differences between legal systems when translating legal terms [6]. This approach serves as an important theoretical basis for a comparative analysis of the terminology of the English (common law) and Uzbek (influenced by continental legal traditions) legal systems.

Methods. This study employs a комплекс of qualitative and comparative linguistic methods aimed at identifying similarities and differences between English and Uzbek legal terminology. The methodological framework is grounded in modern terminology studies, comparative linguistics, and legal translation theory.

First, the descriptive method is used to define and systematize legal terms in both languages. Legal terms are selected from authoritative sources, including legal dictionaries, statutory documents, and academic publications. This method allows for the identification of structural features, semantic scope, and usage patterns of legal terminology in English and Uzbek.

Second, the comparative method serves as the core approach of the research. English and Uzbek legal terms are compared on the basis of their form, meaning, and function within their respective legal systems. Particular attention is paid to identifying equivalent, partially equivalent, and non-equivalent terms. This method makes it possible to reveal both universal and language-specific features of legal terminology.

Third, the semantic analysis method is applied to examine the conceptual content of legal terms. Through componential and contextual analysis, the study explores semantic shifts, polysemy, and terminological specificity. This method is especially important in cases where a single English legal term corresponds to multiple Uzbek terms or vice versa.

Results. Also, modern research is paying increasing attention to the discursive properties of legal terms. While English legal texts tend to use terms in strict formality, passive constructions, and complex syntactic structures, Uzbek legal texts tend to use relatively simpler syntax and explanatory units. These differences indicate the role of national linguistic thinking and legal culture in the functional use of legal terms.

In general, the analyzed literature scientifically substantiates the need for a comparative study of English and Uzbek legal terminology. Although existing research has covered the origin, semantics, and translation problems of legal terms, their systematic study from a comparative-semantic and linguocultural perspective remains a pressing issue. Therefore, this study aims to make a scientific contribution to the issues of legal translation and terminological standardization by identifying the similarities and differences between English and Uzbek legal terminology.

English legal terminology makes wide use of: compound terms, lawsuit, case-law, landlord, fixed multi-word phrases, burden of proof, breach of contract.

Uzbek legal terminology predominantly uses: multi-word analytical terms rather than compounds, e.g. burden of proof - isbotlash majburiyati. [7] The structural differences between English and Uzbek legal terminology arise from both linguistic and legal-system factors. English, influenced by the common law tradition and historical processes of word formation, frequently employs compound terms and fixed multi-word phrases that function as single legal units. Compounds such as lawsuit and landlord allow complex legal concepts to be expressed concisely, while stable phrases like burden of proof and breach of contract preserve traditional meanings that have developed through judicial practice.

Uzbek legal terminology, by contrast, reflects the analytical nature of the Uzbek language and the civil-law system. Legal concepts are mainly expressed through multi-word analytical constructions, where meaning is conveyed by syntactic combinations rather than by lexical compounding. As a result, English legal terms are often translated into Uzbek using descriptive phrases, for example burden of proof - isbotlash majburiyati.

Legal terms can be classified according to their structure into simple, compound, and multi-word terms. Simple legal terms consist of a single word, such as law, court, judge, or contract. Compound legal terms are formed by combining two elements into one word and function as a single lexical unit, for example lawsuit, case-law, or landowner. Multi-word legal terms, also known as complex terms, consist of two or more separate words that together form a fixed legal expression, such as breach of contract, burden of proof, statute of limitations, or power of attorney. These types of terms together make up the core vocabulary of legal language and play a crucial role in achieving accuracy and certainty in legal communication. Legal vocabulary consists of single-word terms, compound terms and fixed legal phrases, which function as indivisible legal units. [8] In conclusion, legal vocabulary is characterized by a structured system of terms that includes single-word terms, compound terms, and fixed legal phrases. Although these terms differ in form, they function as indivisible legal units with precise and stable meanings. This structural diversity allows the law to express complex concepts clearly and accurately, ensuring consistency, certainty, and effective communication within legal texts and professional practice. Single-word legal terms include words such as law, court, judge, crime, and contract. Each of these terms represents a distinct legal concept and is used independently without the need for additional elements.

Compound legal terms are formed by combining two lexical elements into one word, often written as a single word or with a hyphen. Examples include lawsuit, case-law, landowner, bylaw, and courtroom. These terms function as single units with specific legal meanings. Legal English frequently forms new meanings by compounding ordinary words, and once established, such compounds function as single, fixed legal terms. [9] Compound legal terms are created by combining two lexical elements - words that may have independent meanings - into a single term, either written as one word, lawsuit, landowner, courtroom or with a hyphen, case-law, bylaw. This process of compounding is particularly common in legal English because it allows the language to express complex legal ideas efficiently and precisely.

Fixed legal phrases consist of two or more separate words that together express one stable legal concept and cannot be freely modified. Examples include breach of contract, burden of proof, statute of limitations, power of attorney, and rule of law. Despite their multi-word structure, these phrases operate as single terminological units in legal discourse. Certain multi-word constructions

in legal English, though composed of ordinary words, form a stable legal term. They are not freely modifiable and must be treated as a unit for purposes of interpretation. [10]

Conclusion. Legal terminology is a highly specialized and structured system that ensures precision, clarity, and consistency in legal communication. The vocabulary of any legal system includes single-word terms, compound terms, and fixed multi-word phrases, each functioning as an indivisible unit with specific and stable meanings. Comparative analysis of English and Uzbek legal terminology highlights significant structural and functional differences shaped by linguistic characteristics and legal traditions. English favors compound terms and fixed phrases that efficiently express complex concepts, while Uzbek relies on multi-word analytical constructions reflecting the civil law system and the analytical nature of the language. Understanding these differences is essential for accurate legal translation, effective cross-cultural communication, and the proper interpretation of legal texts. The study of legal terminology not only facilitates clarity and certainty in legal practice but also supports education, research, and the development of legal systems across languages and cultures.

References:

- 1.H. C. Gibbons. Language and the Law. - London: Longman, 1994. - 224p, 476.
- 2.Cabré M. T. Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications. - Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999. - 248 p.
- 3.Mellinkoff D. The Language of the Law. - Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1963. - 526 p.
- 4.Garner B. A. Legal Writing in Plain English: A Text with Exercises. - 2nd ed. - Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013. - 240 p.
- 5.Tiersma P. M. Legal Language. - Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999. - 303 p.
- 6.Šarčević S. New Approach to Legal Translation. - The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 1997. - 308 p.
- 7.Abduaizizov. Tilshunoslik nazariyasi. -Toshkent: O‘qituvchi nashriyoti, 2004. - 205p, 352.
- 8.Garner. A Dictionary of Modern Legal Usage. - New York: Oxford University Press, 1995. - 719p, 1013.
- 9.David Mellinkoff. The Language of the Law. - Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1963. - 209p, 526.
- 10.Peter M.Tiersma. Legal Language. - Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999. - 154p, 314.