

The Role Of Lexical Choices And Semantic Interpretation In Legal Term Usage: A Comparative Study Of English And Uzbek

Tatiana Ivanova¹, Amirova Zohida², Khushmanova Gulshod³, Khujakulov Sunnatullo⁴

¹Associate Professor at Kazan (Volga region) Federal University, Russia,
<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5355-6430>, tatiana.ivanova@kpfu.ru

²Associate Professor at Karshi State University, Uzbekistan,
<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-8883-6456>, zohidaamirova@gmail.com

³Senior Lecturer at the University of Economics and Pedagogy, Uzbekistan,
<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-4980-1147>, xushmanovagulshoda@gmail.com

⁴Senior Lecturer at the University of Economics and Pedagogy, Uzbekistan,
Ph.D. researcher at Kazan (Volga region) Federal University, Russia,
<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-5233-586X>, sunnatulloxojakulov6@gmail.com

Corresponding author: Khujakulov Sunnatullo
<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-5233-586X>, sunnatulloxojakulov6@gmail.com

Cite this paper as: Tatiana Ivanova¹, Amirova Zohida², Khushmanova Gulshod³, Khujakulov Sunnatullo⁴ (2024) The Role Of Lexical Choices And Semantic Interpretation In Legal Term Usage: A Comparative Study Of English And Uzbek. *Frontiers in Health Informatics*, 13 (6), 194-204

Abstract. This article explores the critical role of lexical choices and semantic interpretation in the usage of legal terms within the legal systems of English and Uzbek. By conducting a comparative study, the paper aims to examine how legal language functions in both languages and how subtle differences in terminology impact legal interpretation and application. It investigates the influence of historical, cultural, and socio-political contexts on the evolution of legal lexicons in these two languages. A special focus is placed on how certain legal terms, despite their apparent equivalence in translation, may carry distinct meanings due to varying legal traditions, practices, and frameworks. The study employs a qualitative methodology, analyzing a selection of key legal terms from both English and Uzbek legal texts. It delves into the process of semantic shifts and the challenges of translating legal concepts between languages with different legal traditions. The paper highlights instances where lexical choices can lead to ambiguities or misinterpretations in cross-jurisdictional legal contexts, and discusses how these discrepancies can affect legal outcomes. Furthermore, the article examines the role of legal dictionaries and the impact of globalization on legal terminology. It concludes by emphasizing the necessity of a nuanced approach to legal translation and interpretation, suggesting that legal professionals and translators must be acutely aware of the cultural and contextual significance of legal terms in both languages. The study provides valuable insights for improving cross-cultural legal communication and advancing the precision of legal language in international and comparative law.

Keywords: Interpretation, legal terms, lexical analysis, semantic analysis, comparative analysis, conduct, investigate, witness, agreement, law, court, evidence.

Introduction

Language is the cornerstone of law, shaping how legal concepts are understood, interpreted, and applied. The precise use of terminology is essential in ensuring that legal systems function with clarity and consistency. In the realm of legal language, even small differences in the meaning of terms can have significant consequences, making it crucial to understand the nuances that exist between legal languages. This article explores the role of lexical choices and semantic interpretation in the use of legal terms, specifically focusing on a comparative study of English and Uzbek. Given that English and Uzbek belong to different language families, their legal systems, traditions, and terminologies have evolved along distinct paths. This study aims to highlight how variations in lexical choices and the interpretation of legal terms can impact legal outcomes in these two languages.

Legal language serves as the primary medium through which rights, duties, and obligations are communicated, both within domestic jurisdictions and in the context of international law [1]. Legal terms often have specialized meanings that differ from their common usage in everyday language. A single term, in fact, can be laden with implications that may vary significantly from one legal system to another, especially when translated across languages with different historical and cultural backgrounds. Therefore, a deep understanding of how legal terms are used and interpreted in different languages is crucial for lawyers, judges, translators, and anyone involved in cross-cultural legal exchanges [2].

In the context of this study, English and Uzbek are two languages with distinct linguistic roots and legal traditions. English, a Germanic language, has a long history influenced by Roman law, common law traditions, and international treaties. Uzbek, a Turkic language, reflects a legal system shaped by Soviet influences, Islamic law, and the post-independence legal framework of Uzbekistan [3]. Consequently, the two languages exhibit different semantic interpretations of legal concepts, even when terms may seem to have equivalent translations. For instance, a legal term in English such as "contract" may carry certain expectations regarding enforceability and legal remedies that differ from the usage of the term "shartnoma" in Uzbek. Similarly, English legal terms like "rights" and "freedom" may have distinct connotations in Uzbek legal discourse due to the historical context of Soviet rule and its influence on the legal culture.

Understanding these differences is critical for avoiding misinterpretation, especially in the context of international law, where legal terms must be translated and applied across multiple jurisdictions [4]. Legal translations are often prone to errors, and without an in-depth understanding of the subtle distinctions in meaning and usage, legal professionals may inadvertently contribute to legal uncertainty or miscommunication. This research aims to examine the complex relationship between language and law by comparing the lexical choices and semantic interpretations of key legal terms in English and Uzbek.

The Importance of Lexical Choices in Legal Terminology

In legal language, precision is paramount, as even a slight alteration in wording can lead to a significant shift in meaning. Lexical choices are not simply about selecting words that are grammatically correct but also about ensuring that the terms convey the correct legal meaning. For example, the word "contract" in English refers to a legally binding agreement between two or more parties [5]. In contrast, the Uzbek term "shartnoma" carries similar connotations but may involve distinct procedures or expectations under Uzbek law. Lexical choices in legal terminology are crucial in maintaining the integrity of legal systems and ensuring that legal texts are understood and applied as intended [6].

Legal systems are deeply intertwined with the historical, cultural, and political contexts in which they evolve. English, for example, has absorbed legal concepts from various jurisdictions, including Roman law, common law, and international conventions. As a result, English legal terms can sometimes have multiple layers of meaning. The term "property," for example, can refer to both tangible and intangible assets, as well as the rights associated with owning or using these assets [7]. In Uzbek law, "mulk" (property) might carry similar meanings but may also involve specific cultural or political nuances due to the country's Soviet past and its ongoing transition to a market economy [8].

The difference in legal frameworks between English-speaking and Uzbek-speaking countries is reflected in their legal terminologies. English, with its common law tradition, emphasizes principles of equity, precedent, and individual rights. Conversely, Uzbekistan, influenced by both Soviet and Islamic legal traditions, has a civil law system that may prioritize state interests and collective responsibility. These distinctions give rise to different interpretations of what constitutes a "right" or "freedom," for instance, and how these terms are applied in practice [9].

Semantic Interpretation and its Challenges in Cross-Jurisdictional Contexts

Semantic interpretation is another critical aspect of legal language. The meaning of a legal term may shift depending on the jurisdiction in which it is used, as well as the context in which it is applied. This becomes particularly evident when translating legal terms between languages, where even slight variations in meaning can result in confusion or legal discrepancies. The process of translating legal documents from English into Uzbek or vice versa involves not just a simple word-for-word translation but a nuanced understanding of both the source and target legal systems.

For instance, the English term "right" may be understood in different ways depending on the legal framework [10]. In international human rights law, "rights" often refers to fundamental freedoms guaranteed by treaties or conventions, such as the right to free speech or the right to a fair trial. In Uzbek legal discourse, "huquq" may have a similar meaning, but its application may be shaped by Uzbekistan's unique political and historical context, including the influence of Soviet legal ideology and Islamic law [11]. The semantic interpretation of terms like "justice," "freedom," or "sovereignty" can vary widely between the two languages, as each legal tradition brings its own conceptual framework to these terms [12].

The challenge of semantic interpretation is particularly relevant in the context of legal translation, where misinterpretations can lead to serious legal consequences. Translators must navigate not only the linguistic challenges of translating legal terms but also the broader cultural and legal differences that shape the meaning of these terms. Furthermore, the process of translating legal texts must account for the dynamic nature of legal language, as legal systems evolve and new concepts are introduced.

To better understand the impact of lexical choices and semantic interpretation, this study examines a set of key legal terms in both English and Uzbek. These terms have been selected based on their fundamental importance in both legal systems, providing insight into how legal concepts are represented and interpreted in each language [13]. The comparison of these terms highlights the linguistic and semantic challenges faced when translating between English and Uzbek legal systems. Each term carries its own set of legal, cultural, and historical implications that are crucial to understanding how legal concepts function in practice. By analyzing these key terms, this study will provide a deeper understanding of the role that lexical choices and semantic interpretation play in the legal language of both English and Uzbek.

Materials and Methods

This section outlines the materials and methods used in the comparative study of legal terminology and semantic interpretation in English and Uzbek legal systems. The study aims to examine how lexical choices in both languages affect the interpretation and application of legal terms. By focusing on key legal concepts, this section provides an in-depth explanation of the materials used, the approach to data collection, and the analytical methods employed in the research.

The materials for this study consist of a variety of primary and secondary sources related to legal terminology in both English and Uzbek. These sources include legal texts, legal dictionaries, case law, statutes, international treaties, and academic works. The study specifically focuses on terms that are crucial to both English and Uzbek legal systems, aiming to identify both commonalities and differences in how these terms are used and understood. The following materials were selected for this comparative analysis:

Legal Texts: Key legal documents from both English and Uzbek legal systems, such as constitutions, civil codes, criminal codes, and international treaties, served as primary sources. For English, sources such as the Constitution of the United States, the UK Legal System, and various legislative acts were used. For Uzbek legal materials, texts like the Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan, the Civil Code of Uzbekistan, and Criminal

Code of Uzbekistan were consulted.

Legal Dictionaries: The study utilized both English and Uzbek legal dictionaries, which provide definitions of legal terms and explain the specific legal contexts in which these terms are applied. In English, works such as Black's Law Dictionary and The Oxford Dictionary of Law were used. For Uzbek, the Uzbek Legal Dictionary and Legal Terminology in Uzbek were consulted to understand the definitions and interpretations of legal terms in the Uzbek context.

Case Law: Judicial decisions and rulings from courts in both English-speaking and Uzbek-speaking countries were examined. Case law helps provide practical examples of how legal terms are interpreted and applied in real-world situations. The study reviewed cases from common law systems in English-speaking countries, particularly the UK and the United States, as well as decisions from the Supreme Court of Uzbekistan.

Academic Articles and Books: A significant portion of secondary sources consists of academic articles, research papers, and textbooks on comparative legal systems, legal translation, and the theory of legal language. These works provide insight into the conceptual frameworks that govern legal terminology in both systems.

International Treaties and Conventions: The study also refers to international legal texts such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights to analyze how certain legal terms are defined and interpreted in international law. These international documents are useful for understanding the broader implications of legal terms that are used in multiple legal systems, including English and Uzbek.

Translations of Legal Documents: To compare how legal terms are translated between English and Uzbek, the study included parallel texts of translated legal documents. These translations provided real examples of how legal concepts and terms are rendered from one language to the other. Notably, the quality and accuracy of these translations were examined to assess the potential for semantic discrepancies.

The methods used in this study involve a combination of qualitative and comparative research techniques. The primary focus is on analyzing the meaning and usage of legal terms in both English and Uzbek, as well as identifying how lexical choices influence the interpretation of these terms. The research process involves the following stages:

Selection of Legal Terms: The first step in the methodology is the identification of key legal terms that are essential to the legal systems of both English and Uzbek. A set of core legal concepts was selected, such as "contract," "property," "rights," "justice," "freedom," "obligation," and "liability," among others. The selection process was based on the following criteria:

Relevance to both legal systems: The terms must be foundational to both English and Uzbek law.

Frequency of use: The terms selected must be used frequently in legal texts, cases, and academic literature.

Cross-jurisdictional applicability: The terms should also be relevant in international law and widely recognized in legal practice.

Once selected, these terms were analyzed in their respective legal contexts in both languages.

Lexical and Semantic Analysis: The second stage involved conducting a detailed lexical and semantic analysis of the chosen terms. This analysis examined the definitions and meanings of each term in both languages, as well as the historical and cultural contexts in which they evolved. The process included:

Dictionary Definitions: Definitions from English and Uzbek legal dictionaries were compared to identify key differences in meaning and usage.

Contextual Usage: The study also reviewed how these terms are used in specific legal contexts, including case law and legislative documents. This helps to uncover the practical implications of the terms within their respective legal systems.

Semantic Shifts: Special attention was paid to any semantic shifts that may have occurred due to historical, cultural, or political factors. For instance, terms like "property" or "rights" may have different connotations in English law compared to Uzbek law due to the legacy of Soviet legal influence in Uzbekistan.

Cross-Language Comparison: After the lexical and semantic analysis, the study performed a cross-language comparison of the selected legal terms. This comparison aimed to identify both the similarities and differences

in the meaning and application of the terms in English and Uzbek legal systems. In particular, the study focused on:

Equivalence of Terms: Whether a direct equivalent term exists in the other language or if different terms are used to convey similar concepts.

Translation Challenges: The study examined how certain legal terms are translated from English to Uzbek and vice versa. This involves identifying instances where translations may fail to capture the full meaning or nuance of a term, leading to potential misunderstandings or misapplications of the law.

Jurisdictional Differences: The comparison also examined how the legal context in which a term is used affects its meaning. For example, the term “contract” may have a slightly different interpretation in common law countries compared to its usage in civil law systems such as that of Uzbekistan.

Case Studies: To deepen the understanding of how legal terms function in practice, the study included several case studies that illustrate the practical application of legal terms in both systems. These case studies were drawn from actual legal cases and judicial decisions from both English-speaking countries (primarily the UK and the US) and Uzbekistan. The goal was to highlight instances where differences in legal terminology may have led to varying interpretations or outcomes in legal proceedings.

Case Study 1: A case involving a breach of contract in English law and its comparison with an Uzbek legal case involving the termination of a shartnoma (contract).

Case Study 2: The interpretation of “property” and “rights” in the context of inheritance laws in both English and Uzbek legal systems.

Case Study 3: A comparative analysis of “justice” and “freedom” in the context of human rights law, with a focus on how these terms are framed in international treaties and local legal contexts.

Legal Translation Analysis: The study also analyzed translations of key legal terms in both languages. Specifically, the study examined:

Official Translations: Translations of major legal documents (e.g., constitutions, international treaties) into Uzbek and English.

Legal Translator Interviews: Interviews were conducted with professional legal translators to gain insight into the challenges they face when translating legal terms between the two languages. These interviews helped to identify issues such as the lack of equivalent terms, the difficulty of conveying legal concepts across different legal traditions, and the impact of political and historical factors on legal translation.

Quantitative Analysis: Although the primary focus of the study is qualitative, a limited quantitative analysis was also performed. The study counted the frequency of key legal terms in the legal texts and case law reviewed, providing a statistical measure of how often certain terms are used in each system. This analysis helps to provide a clearer picture of which terms are most significant in each legal context.

Expert Review: To validate the findings, the study incorporated feedback from legal experts familiar with both English and Uzbek law. These experts provided their perspectives on the accuracy of the interpretations, the nuances of legal terms, and the implications for cross-cultural legal communication.

The methods outlined in this study were designed to offer a comprehensive analysis of legal terminology and its semantic interpretation in English and Uzbek. By combining lexical analysis, case study examination, and translation research, the study provides valuable insights into the challenges and nuances involved in translating and interpreting legal terms across different legal systems. The ultimate goal of this research is to enhance understanding and improve communication in the field of comparative legal studies and international legal practice, ensuring that legal professionals can navigate the complexities of multilingual and multicultural legal environments effectively.

Results and Discussion

This section presents the findings of the comparative analysis between English and Uzbek legal terminology and semantic interpretation. The objective was to identify key differences and similarities in the meanings and usages of legal terms across both legal systems. The analysis focuses on how lexical choices and the semantic interpretation of key legal terms can lead to varying applications in practice, particularly in the areas of contract

law, property law, rights, obligations, and justice. The results discussed here are drawn from a comprehensive review of primary and secondary legal materials, case studies, translations, and expert feedback.

Lexical Comparison: Legal Terms in English and Uzbek

One of the primary objectives of this study was to identify and compare key legal terms in English and Uzbek. The results show that while both languages share many core legal concepts, the terminology used to express these concepts can be significantly different. The comparison process revealed that, in some instances, there are direct equivalents between the two languages, while in others, the terms differ not only linguistically but also in their legal and cultural connotations.

Contract: English: "Contract" vs. Uzbek: "Shartnoma"

The term "contract" in English refers to a legally binding agreement between two or more parties, typically written, but it can also refer to oral agreements, provided they fulfill certain legal criteria. The Uzbek term "shartnoma" carries a similar meaning but is predominantly used to refer to formal, written agreements in Uzbekistan. The key difference is that Uzbek law, influenced by the civil law tradition, places greater emphasis on formal written contracts compared to English common law, where verbal agreements may hold legal weight. This difference can lead to misunderstandings when translating contracts between the two systems, particularly in terms of enforceability.

Property: English: "Property" vs. Uzbek: "Mulk"

The concept of "property" is central to both legal systems. In English law, "property" encompasses both tangible and intangible assets and refers to the legal rights associated with ownership and possession. Similarly, in Uzbek, the term "mulk" refers to ownership, possession, and the physical assets themselves, but it also carries connotations shaped by the Soviet legacy, in which state ownership of property was prevalent. In Uzbekistan's current legal framework, private property is acknowledged, but the term "mulk" can sometimes still carry overtones of state control, especially when it pertains to land or natural resources. This difference in the conceptualization of property could influence legal disputes involving ownership, especially in the context of land reform or privatization.

Rights: English: "Rights" vs. Uzbek: "Huquq"

In both English and Uzbek, the term "rights" refers to legal entitlements or freedoms guaranteed by law. However, the understanding and application of these rights differ due to historical and political contexts. In English-speaking countries, rights have evolved within a framework that emphasizes individual liberties and freedoms, including civil and political rights. In contrast, Uzbek law, influenced by Soviet socialism and Islamic traditions, places a strong emphasis on collective rights and duties, with individual rights sometimes subordinated to the welfare of the state. This distinction is particularly noticeable in the interpretation of rights related to social welfare, education, and employment. The term "huquq" in Uzbek, therefore, can imply a broader societal context than its English counterpart, which emphasizes individual autonomy.

Justice: English: "Justice" vs. Uzbek: "Adolat"

Both "justice" in English and "adolat" in Uzbek refer to the principle of fairness and the impartial application of laws. However, in the Uzbek context, "adolat" also carries strong connotations of moral and ethical justice, influenced by Islamic values and the traditional understanding of fairness within Uzbek society. In English, justice is closely tied to the legal framework and is often defined by legal principles such as equality before the law, due process, and the rule of law. In Uzbekistan, while legal justice exists within the state's legal framework, the concept of "adolat" also emphasizes social harmony and ethical behavior, which may impact legal decision-making in cases involving family law, inheritance, or social issues.

Freedom: English: "Freedom" vs. Uzbek: "Erkinlik"

The concept of "freedom" in English law is typically associated with individual autonomy, such as the right to free speech, freedom of movement, and freedom of assembly. In Uzbek law, "erkinlik" (freedom) similarly refers to individual rights but is often viewed through the lens of national unity and social stability, particularly due to Uzbekistan's Soviet history. This difference is especially relevant in the interpretation of laws related to

political freedoms, public assembly, and freedom of speech. While English law tends to focus on the protection of individual freedoms, Uzbek law places greater importance on the balance between individual freedoms and the protection of public order and national interests.

1. Table of Legal Terms in English and Uzbek

This table provides a side-by-side comparison of key legal terms in both languages, showing their definitions and any significant differences or nuances between the two systems.

English Term	Uzbek Term	Definition in English	Definition in Uzbek	Differences
Contract	Shartnoma	A legally binding agreement between two or more parties.	A formal written agreement in Uzbekistan, often required by law.	Uzbek law places greater emphasis on formal contracts compared to English law.
Property	Mulk	Ownership of tangible and intangible assets.	Ownership, possession, or control of property, particularly influenced by state ownership.	Uzbek "mulk" may still carry connotations of state control, particularly regarding land.
Rights	Huquq	Legal entitlements or freedoms granted by law.	Legal entitlements, with an emphasis on both individual and collective rights.	In Uzbek law, collective rights may take precedence over individual rights in some cases.
Justice	Adolat	Fairness and impartiality in legal processes.	A concept of fairness that includes social and moral dimensions, influenced by Islamic values.	"Adolat" in Uzbek emphasizes social harmony and moral justice more than English "justice."
Freedom	Erkinlik	The condition of being free to act, speak, or think without restrictions.	The right to act without undue constraint, but often balanced with national security considerations.	"Erkinlik" in Uzbek law is balanced with state interests and national security.

2. Table of Legal Concepts with Different Applications

This table outlines how the same legal concept is applied differently in English and Uzbek law, focusing on how terminology influences legal outcomes in practice.

Legal Concept	English Law Application	Uzbek Law Application	Differences
Contract	Common law allows both written and verbal contracts, as long as they meet specific legal criteria.	In Uzbek law, written contracts are typically required for enforceability.	Uzbek law is more formalistic, while English law allows more flexibility with verbal contracts.

Property	English law allows private ownership, with protections for individual property rights.	In Uzbekistan, property rights are heavily influenced by the legacy of state ownership and collectivism.	The influence of state control over land and resources is more pronounced in Uzbekistan.
Rights	Emphasis on individual civil and political rights, such as freedom of speech and right to fair trial.	Collective rights are emphasized, especially in areas like social welfare and public health.	Uzbek law prioritizes collective rights over individual liberties in certain contexts.
Justice	Legal justice focuses on the application of laws impartially, with courts being central in its enforcement.	"Adolat" emphasizes not only legal but also moral justice, with potential influence from Islamic and socialist principles.	"Adolat" includes a broader, more social and ethical dimension than the English concept of justice.
Freedom	Freedom is largely framed in terms of individual rights, including speech, assembly, and privacy.	Freedom must be balanced with the state's interests in security, stability, and public welfare.	The balance between individual freedom and national security is more explicit in Uzbek law.

Challenges in Legal Translation and Semantic Interpretation

A key finding of this study is the challenge of accurately translating legal terms between English and Uzbek due to differences in the conceptual underpinnings of each legal system. While many legal terms appear to have direct equivalents, the translation process often reveals subtle differences in meaning that can result in legal misinterpretation. The following are some key challenges identified during the study:

Cultural and Legal Context: Legal terms in both languages are deeply influenced by the cultural and historical contexts of the respective legal systems. For example, the term "property" in English reflects a system where private ownership and the protection of property rights are fundamental principles, while in Uzbek, "mulk" may carry overtones of collective ownership and state involvement, especially in the context of land and natural resources [14]. When translating such terms, translators must account for the broader legal, economic, and cultural frameworks within which they are used.

Ambiguity in Translation: Some legal terms, particularly those related to rights, justice, and freedom, can be highly ambiguous. A term like "rights," for example, can refer to fundamental human rights in English but may also encompass state-granted privileges or collective duties in the Uzbek context. Translators must navigate these ambiguities to ensure that the intended meaning is preserved, especially when translating laws, contracts, or international treaties [15].

Lack of Direct Equivalents: In some instances, there is no direct equivalent for a legal term in one language that exists in the other. For example, the English legal term "trust" has no exact equivalent in Uzbek legal terminology, which creates challenges when translating legal concepts related to fiduciary duties, property rights, and estate management. Translators often have to adapt the term or use a descriptive phrase to convey the underlying legal meaning, which can introduce a degree of uncertainty in legal documents [16].

Influence of Legal Traditions: The historical development of legal systems plays a crucial role in shaping the meaning of legal terms. English law, with its common law roots, places great emphasis on case law, precedent, and judicial interpretation, which is different from the civil law tradition followed in Uzbekistan. This distinction can lead to differences in how terms such as "contract," "tort," or "liability" are understood and applied, even when the terms are translated directly between languages [17].

Case Studies: Real-World Applications of Legal Terms

Several case studies were reviewed to understand how the differences in legal terminology and semantic

interpretation affect the application of law in practice. These case studies highlight the practical consequences of lexical choices in the English and Uzbek legal systems.

Case Study 1: Contract Law

A comparative case study of contract disputes in both legal systems illustrates how differences in the interpretation of the term "contract" can lead to divergent legal outcomes. In an English case, a verbal agreement between two parties was enforced under common law principles, whereas in an Uzbek case, the absence of a written agreement led to the rejection of the claim, as Uzbek law requires formal documentation for enforceability. This demonstrates how differences in legal traditions can influence the interpretation and enforcement of contractual agreements.

Case Study 2: Property Disputes

A property dispute case from the UK involved the transfer of ownership of land through a written deed. In contrast, a similar case in Uzbekistan focused on the concept of state-owned land and involved complicated considerations of land redistribution policies. In Uzbekistan, the term "mulk" (property) was interpreted not just in terms of private ownership but also in relation to state control over land, demonstrating the legacy of Soviet-era policies in the country's legal system. These differences led to distinct legal strategies and outcomes.

Case Study 3: Human Rights and Freedom of Expression

In a case involving freedom of expression, an individual in the United Kingdom challenged the government's surveillance practices under the European Convention on Human Rights. In contrast, a similar case in Uzbekistan was dismissed due to national security concerns and the state's overriding interest in maintaining public order. These cases demonstrate how the term "freedom" is interpreted differently in the two legal systems, with English law emphasizing individual rights and liberties, while Uzbek law prioritizes national security and stability.

Implications for Legal Practice and Cross-Cultural Legal Communication

The findings of this study have significant implications for legal practice, particularly in the context of cross-border legal communication and international legal transactions. The differences in legal terminology and the semantic interpretations of key legal terms highlight the challenges faced by legal professionals when working in bilingual or multilingual environments.

Training for Legal Professionals: Legal professionals involved in international or comparative law must be trained not only in the technical aspects of legal translation but also in understanding the cultural and legal differences that influence the meaning of terms. This will enable them to avoid errors in interpretation that could lead to misunderstandings or legal disputes.

Legal Translation and Lexical Accuracy: The study emphasizes the importance of precise and culturally informed legal translation. Legal translators must be aware of the nuances of legal terms in both languages and should consult with legal experts to ensure the accurate conveyance of meaning [18].

Improving Legal Interpretation: Legal systems and practitioners must develop strategies for interpreting terms that do not have direct equivalents in other languages, especially in cross-jurisdictional disputes. This could involve establishing clearer guidelines for translating legal concepts or creating hybrid terms that reflect the intersection of legal systems.

The results of this study reveal significant differences and challenges in the interpretation of legal terminology between English and Uzbek legal systems. While there are many commonalities in the underlying legal concepts, the lexical choices and semantic interpretations of terms like "contract," "property," "rights," and "freedom" vary significantly due to differences in legal traditions, historical contexts, and cultural norms. These differences have important implications for legal translation, cross-border legal communication, and the practice of international law. The findings underscore the need for careful, context-sensitive translation and interpretation of legal terms to ensure clarity and consistency in legal discourse across different legal systems.

Conclusion

This comparative study of legal terminology and semantic interpretation in English and Uzbek has highlighted the intricate ways in which lexical choices and cultural contexts influence the understanding and application of

legal terms in different legal systems. Through the detailed analysis of key terms such as "contract," "property," "rights," "freedom," and "justice," the study has demonstrated that while there are common legal concepts between the two languages, their meanings and implications can differ significantly due to historical, cultural, and legal system influences.

The research reveals that differences in legal traditions—common law in English-speaking countries and civil law in Uzbekistan—affect how terms are defined and applied. For example, the interpretation of terms like "contract" and "property" in English law often allows for more flexible, informal understandings, whereas Uzbek law, influenced by its Soviet past, places greater emphasis on formal written agreements and state ownership in specific areas such as land and natural resources. These distinctions lead to diverse legal outcomes and highlight the challenges in translating legal terms between the two languages.

Furthermore, the study has underscored the complexities involved in legal translation. Terms that seem equivalent on the surface can carry nuanced meanings, shaped by the legal, political, and cultural environments in which they exist. The process of translating legal documents between English and Uzbek requires a deep understanding of both the legal concepts at play and the broader societal contexts in which they are embedded. In conclusion, this study calls for greater attention to the challenges of legal translation and the importance of context in interpreting legal terminology. Legal professionals, translators, and scholars working across languages must remain vigilant to these subtleties to ensure accurate communication and avoid misinterpretation, ultimately improving the practice of comparative law and international legal discourse.

References

1. Cabré, M.T., 2000. *Terminology: Theory, Methods, and Applications*. John Benjamins Publishing, pp. 45-67.
2. Tiersma, P.M., 2000. *Legal Language*. University of Chicago Press, pp. 112-130.
3. Gibbons, J., 2009. *Language and the Law: A Resource Book for Students*. Routledge, pp. 215-230.
4. Hobbs, R., 2004. *Comparative Law: A Handbook*. Blackwell Publishing, pp. 50-75.
5. Faruqi, S., 2018. *Introduction to Legal Lexicography: A Comparison of English and Uzbek Legal Terminology*. Springer, pp. 82-100.
6. Khujakulov S., Ivanova T., Khushmanova G., Kurbonova Sh. (2024). Hermeneutic And Doctrinal Method Of Lexico-Semantic And Normative-Stylistic Analysis Of legal Terms In The English And Uzbek Languages. *Library Progress International*, 44(5), 15-25
7. Krieger, M., 2008. 'Comparative Legal Systems: The Influence of Tradition and Modernity'. *Harvard Law Review*, 121(6), pp. 1557-1579.
8. Pérez-González, L., 2014. *Translation and Interpreting in Legal Settings*. Routledge, pp. 33-56.
9. Munday, J., 2001. *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. Routledge, pp. 75-90.
10. Alford, R., 2014. *The Legal Environment of Business and Online Commerce*. Cengage Learning, pp. 230-245.
11. Hymes, D., 2011. *Legal Discourse and Multilingualism: A Study of Courtroom Interaction*. Oxford University Press, pp. 48-68.
12. Jazayeri, S., 2013. *The Role of Legal Translation in Shaping International Law: A Comparative Approach*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 23-40.
13. Birdsong, D. and Searle, J.R., 2010. *Language and the Law: A Linguistic Approach to Legal Discourse*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 101-115.
14. Mahmudov, A., 2016. 'The Evolution of Legal Terminology in Uzbekistan: From Soviet Legacy to Modernization'. *Tashkent Law Review*, 1(2), pp. 33-45.
15. Langer, M., 2012. *Language and the Law: Linguistic Analysis in Legal Contexts*. Oxford University Press, pp. 152-169.
16. Byrne, P. and McGrath, M., 2007. *Legal Language and the Challenges of Translation*. Oxford University Press, pp. 58-70.
17. Beknazarov, A., 2012. *Uzbekistan's Legal System and Its Historical Roots*. Tashkent University Press, pp.

14-29.

18. Bhatia, V.K., 2004. Worlds of Written Discourse: A Genre-Based View. Continuum, pp. 92-110.