

Comparative study of legal terms in English and Uzbek languages with reference to international law and legal globalisation

Ugilkhon Pulatova, PhD, Associate Professor
Andijan State Medical Institute, Andijan, Uzbekistan
u.pulatova@outlook.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4260-5668>

Nodirakhon Pulatova, Full Doctor, Senior Lecturer
Tashkent State University of Law, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
n-pulatova@hotmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-8741-902X>

Iroda Umarova, Master, Lecturer
Tashkent State University of Law, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
iroda.umarova75@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7108-1969>

Sarbinaz Rasbergenova, Master, Lecturer
Tashkent State University of Law, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
rasbergenovas@outlook.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-9744-2602>

Shiyrinay Allashova, Researcher

Tashkent State University of Law, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

s_allashova@hotmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0000-8849-7004>

Abstract: This study presents a comparative analysis of English and Uzbek legal terminology within the framework of legal globalisation. Using a comparative method, it examines key terms drawn from international treaties and national legislation (e.g., “refugee”, “due diligence”, “jurisdiction”, “arbitration”), focusing on their adaptation and use in practice. The analysis highlights systemic differences: English terminology, shaped by common law and enriched with Latin borrowings, is concise and context-dependent, while Uzbek terminology, rooted in continental law, often relies on descriptive constructions and statutory rigidity. Three categories of terminological relationships are identified: direct equivalents (“arbitration” (*арбитраж*)), partial equivalents requiring cultural adaptation (“due diligence” (*международное сотрудничество*)), and non-equivalent terms requiring explanatory translation (*habeas corpus*). Findings reveal that English increasingly influences Uzbek legal practice, but borrowing without contextualisation can lead to semantic distortion. The study also underscores the role of international organisations (e.g., UN, ICC) in promoting terminological standardisation. By documenting patterns of equivalence and divergence, this research provides both theoretical insights and practical implications for legal translators, comparative lawyers, and policymakers. It demonstrates that effective legal translation requires not only linguistic competence but also an understanding of distinct legal traditions and institutional frameworks.

Keywords: unification; cultural differences; non-equivalent vocabulary; agreements; legal concepts.

Introduction

In the context of globalisation, the legal systems of countries are increasingly interacting with each other and international legal standards are becoming mandatory for national legal systems. Comparison of legal terms in English and Uzbek plays a significant role in the accuracy and effectiveness of the implementation of international agreements, treaties, and other legal documents. Understanding the differences and similarities in legal terminology between distinct legal systems, including English and Uzbek, helps to avoid errors in the interpretation of provisions and principles prescribed in international legal instruments. In a world where legal systems are increasingly striving for unification, especially within the framework of international agreements, comparative study enables the development of more accurate mechanisms of translation and adaptation of terms, which contributes to the successful integration of national legal provisions into international legal practice. This is particularly significant for countries such as Uzbekistan, which are actively developing and modernising their legal system in the context of globalisation.

Legal terminology serves as the backbone of precision in legal texts, from contracts to international treaties, where ambiguity can have far-reaching consequences (Tuleeva, 2025; Shakun & Yaremenko, 2023). Comparing English and Uzbek legal terms reveals not only linguistic disparities but also cultural and systemic differences that challenge translators and legal practitioners (Giliker, 2021; Ramos, 2021). This task is particularly relevant in the context of international law, namely the system of rules governing relations between states, organisations and individuals, based on principles such as sovereign equality and human rights (Dugard, 2023; Riffel, 2024). Concurrently, legal globalisation accelerates the convergence of national legal systems through harmonisation, institutional collaboration, and terminological standardisation (Chromá, 2011; Ramos & Cerutti, 2021). Together, these forces reshape legal terminology, demanding unified terms that transcend jurisdictional boundaries.

Legal terminology often carries elements of national legal culture and specificity (Issakova et al., 2023; Grushko, 2016). Comparison of English and Uzbek allows not only the identification of linguistic differences, but also to consider the specific cultural features and legal traditions. This is vital to ensure accuracy of translation and correct application of legal concepts in the context of different legal systems. The growing need for qualified legal translators and specialists who can work with legal terms in multiple languages requires research and development of effective translation and adaptation methods.

Thus, interaction between distinct legal systems, especially in the areas of human rights protection, the environment, international trade, and other global affairs, requires an accurate and correct understanding of terminology. Cultural and semantic differences play a key role in the study of legal terms, as they can influence how legal concepts are perceived, interpreted, and applied in different jurisdictions (Isakova et al., 2018; Hoff & Barboza, 2025). In the context of international and comparative law, these differences hold particular significance.

The following studies presented comparative analyses of legal terminology, examining differences in legal terms across languages and legal systems. Pulatova (2023) presented a comparative analysis of legal terms in English and Uzbek. The findings of the study showed the significance of understanding the differences between legal terms in English and Uzbek for effective legal communication and translation. Shahribonu (2022) focused on the learning of legal terms in English and their function in a sentence in comparison to Uzbek. This study identified the challenges that students face in learning legal English, particularly in understanding the placement of terms in sentences. Petretta (2020) discussed the role of comparative legal studies, especially in the context of exploring differences between legal systems. The research drew on ideas from philosophy, comparative law, and anthropology to provide a comprehensive understanding of the significance of comparison in legal contexts. However, these studies did not focus on exploring the problems of translating English and Uzbek terms.

A significant branch is the study of linguistic methods in a legal context. Goźdz-Roszkowski (2021) aimed at using corpus linguistics to

analyse legal language. The researcher also analysed phraseological collocations (analysis of fixed expressions and terms inherent in legal language), variation (study of differences in legal language depending on context, jurisdiction, or genre). Glohar (2023) investigated the features of legal language from a linguistic standpoint. The unification and standardisation of terms in the terminological systems of distinct languages, particularly Uzbek and English, continue to be unresolved problems.

One of the frequently researched branches is the study of translation strategies for legal terms and the problems encountered in translation. An and Sun (2022) focused on the translation strategies of legal terms specific to the Chinese legal system in the context of the Chinese Civil Code. The study classified the terms into newly created and inherited terms, analysed effective translation techniques that facilitated intercultural legal communication and academic exchange. Ramos (2021) discussed the problem of translating legal terminology and phraseology and harmonising translations across different language and legal systems. Pham et al. (2021) addressed the extraction of legal terminology using natural language processing tools. In doing so, greater recognition accuracy is achieved when a modified Termolator (software) is applied to broader semantic categories related to legal terminology. Ahn (2024) studied the legal terms and roles across age groups. The findings showed that understanding of legal concepts improved with age, but some legal concepts were still challenging for all age groups.

While previous comparative studies on legal terms in English and Uzbek have provided insights into linguistic challenges and translation issues, there remains a gap in understanding how the processes of legal globalisation and the influence of international law shape the adaptation of these terms in national legal contexts. This study fills that gap by focusing on the dynamic interaction between legal traditions and global norms, examining how key legal terms are translated and adapted in Uzbekistan's legal system as a result of international legal practices.

The purpose of the present study was to compare Uzbek and English legal terminology systems. The tasks of this study were to investigate the specific features of Uzbek and English legal terms for

cultural differences, to study semantic differences using the examples of Uzbek and English legal terminology, to analyse terminological units from legal documents.

Materials and methods

The study adopts a comparative legal-linguistic approach to examine the adaptation and use of English and Uzbek legal terminology within international and national legal frameworks. The primary objective was to analyse how legal terms are selected, categorised, and interpreted across distinct legal traditions, specifically common law and continental law systems. The methodology was designed to identify and assess key legal terms used in international treaties and national legislation, focusing on their semantic, functional, and cultural dimensions. Although corpus frequency tools were not employed, the study relied on purposive selection from a defined set of authoritative legal documents, ensuring systematic coverage of terms central to international and Uzbek law.

The selection of terms was guided by a purposive sampling method, drawing from a corpus of foundational international legal instruments and Uzbek national legislation. International legal documents included the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1969), United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (1980), Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (International Criminal Court, 2021), Security Council Resolution No. 2745 “On Lifting of the Arms Embargo on the Central African Republic, Renewal of other Measures and Extension of the Mandate of the Panel of Experts Established Pursuant to Resolution 2127 (2013)” (2024), Security Council Resolution No. 2751 “On Extension of the Mandate of the Multinational Security Support Mission in Haiti” (2024), Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948), Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. LRU-518 “On International Treaties of the Republic of Uzbekistan” (2018). These documents were chosen for their significance in shaping global legal standards and their frequent use in cross-border legal interactions.

Terms were selected based on three key criteria: recurrence in international agreements, semantic complexity, and practical relevance

to legal globalisation. For instance, terms like “due diligence” (*тегишли текишув*), “jurisdiction” (*юрисдикция*) and “refugee” (*қочқин*) were prioritised due to their frequent appearance in treaties and their critical role in legal practice. This approach ensured that the analysis focused on terms with substantial implications for legal communication and translation. The following terms were also discussed: “offer” (*таклиф*), “acceptance” (*қабул*), “war crimes” (*уруш жиноятлари*), “sanctions” (*санкциялар*), “genocide” (*геноцид*).

The analytical process involved a three-tiered framework to categorise terms based on their equivalency. Direct equivalents, such as “arbitration” (*арбитраж*), were identified as terms with near-identical meanings in both languages. Partial equivalents, such as “due diligence” (*тегишли текишув*), required cultural or contextual adaptation to retain their intended meaning. Non-equivalent terms, such as *habeas corpus*, lacked direct analogues in Uzbek and necessitated explanatory translations to convey their legal significance. This categorisation allowed for a nuanced understanding of how legal concepts are transferred between languages and legal systems.

The study employed lexical-semantic analysis to dissect the denotative and connotative meanings of each term, ensuring that both literal and contextual interpretations were considered. Contextual validation was conducted by examining the usage of terms in legal texts, highlighting systemic differences between common law flexibility and continental law rigidity. For example, the term “consideration” in English contract law was analysed for its absence in Uzbek legal frameworks, where contracts may be concluded on a gratuitous basis. Cultural-linguistic adaptation was also assessed, particularly for non-equivalent terms, to determine how descriptive constructions or loanwords are integrated into Uzbek legal terminology. To illustrate broader patterns of legal and cultural divergence, theoretical examples such as “tort” and “trust” were included. These examples were selected based on their theoretical significance in comparative law and their recurrent challenges in legal translation, even if they were not part of the primary corpus.

The theoretical framework of the study draws from legal globalisation theory, which explores the harmonisation and unification of legal systems across borders. It also incorporates principles from comparative law, particularly the interaction between monism and dualism in international and national legal contexts. Additionally, insights from translation studies were applied to address the challenges

of adapting legal terminology while preserving its original meaning and legal function.

Results

Translation Challenges in Legal Terms

The English legal system is based on case law, which gives terms more contextual flexibility. The Uzbek legal system corresponds to continental law and is characterised by rigid fixation of terms in legislative acts. For example, the English term “equity” expresses the concept of fairness, which is linked to the historical development of common law. The Uzbek language lacks such a concept, which complicates translation. Uzbek often relies on constructions containing several words to describe legal concepts. Thus, Uzbek terms include more elements than English terms. For instance, the English term “unilateral contract” is translated as *бир томонлама шартнома*, while the English term “minimum wage” as *энг кам иш ҳақи*. Semantic differences between the English and Uzbek languages often manifest themselves in the interpretation of key concepts. For example, “consideration” in contract law implies remuneration or counter-provision, which has no direct equivalent in Uzbek legislation. In Uzbek judicial practice, the interpretation of “force majeure” has occasionally been broadened beyond the standard international scope. For instance, in a ruling by the Uzbek Supreme Court, the court recognised pandemic-related restrictions as a valid reason for non-performance of contractual obligations. This reflects the tendency of Uzbek courts to contextualise international legal terms in light of socio-economic factors specific to Uzbekistan (Pulatova, 2023). Thus, the translation of terms from English into Uzbek is accompanied by a lack of equivalents for many English-language concepts, such as “fiduciary duty” and “punitive damages” (Valcke, 2019).

English has become the global language of international law, which leads to the borrowing and adaptation of English-language legal terms into national legal systems. For example, terms such as “compliance”, “due diligence”, “rule of law” are actively used in legal practice. Legal systems interact through international organisations

such as UN, International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Trade Organization (WTO), which contributes to the borrowing of terminology. Table 1 presents translations of English terms into Uzbek.

Term in English	Term in Uzbek	Definition	Examples
Prosecution	Айблов томони	The party representing the prosecution in court.	The prosecution must prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Айблов томони айбланувчининг айбини шубҳасиз исботлаши керак.
Mitigating circumstances	Енгиллаштирувчи ҳолатлар	The term refers to circumstances that may mitigate a sentence.	The judge considered mitigating circumstances before delivering the sentence. Судья ҳукм чиқаришдан олдин енгиллаштирувчи ҳолатларни кўриб чиқди.
Merger and acquisition	Қўшилиш ва сотиб олиш	A term for a variety of transactions that result in a combination of assets to create a new company.	The merger and acquisition process was completed within a year. It is important to have a dialogue with the local authorities.
Unfair dismissal	Адолатсиз ишдан бўшатиш	A term referring to unfair dismissal without just cause	The employee filed a lawsuit for unfair dismissal.

			Ходим адолатсиз ишдан бўшатиlgани учун судга мурожаат қилди.
Cybersecurity	Киберхавфсизлик	A term referring to a set of techniques related to telecommunications and information technology.	Cybersecurity is essential for protecting sensitive data from unauthorised access and ensuring the integrity of digital systems. Киберхавфсизлик махфий маълумотларни ноқонуний қиришдан ҳимоя қилиш ва рақамли тизимларнинг яхлитлигини таъминлаш учун муҳим аҳамиятга эга.
Intellectual property	Интеллектуал мулк	A term associated with the result of a creative or intellectual endeavour.	Intellectual property rights protect the creations of the mind, such as inventions, literary and artistic works, and symbols, names, and images used in commerce. Интеллектуал мулк ҳуқуқлари ақл-идрок маҳсуллари,

			масалан, ихтиролар, адабий ва санъат асарлари, ҳамда савдода қўлланиладиган рамзлар, номлар ва тасвирларни химоя қилади.
Due diligence	Тегишли текширув	The process companies undertake to assess risks and ensure compliance with legal and financial obligations before making significant decisions.	Due diligence is a process conducted by companies to assess risks and ensure compliance with legal and financial obligations before making significant decisions. Тегишли текширув – бу компаниялар томонидан катта қарорларни қабул қилишдан олдин хавфларни баҳолаш ва юримдик ҳамда молиявий мажбуриятларга мувофиқликни таъминлаш учун ўтказиладиган жараён.

Table 1. Examples of translations of English terms into Uzbek.

International agreements promote the introduction of unified legal terminology, which ensures a uniform understanding of legal provisions and facilitates international cooperation. Many legal terms used in English and Uzbek have been standardised through global legal instruments such as the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1969), Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (1980), Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948), Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (International Criminal Court, 2021), Security Council Resolution No. 2745 (2024), Security Council Resolution No. 2751 (2024), Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. LRU-518 (2018). English, being the primary language of international law, rarely requires adaptation of terms. Some standardised terms, such as “non-refoulement”, are unique and are used without translation in many national legal systems, including Uzbekistan.

Organisations such as UN and ICC have actively promoted the standardisation of terms, which is reflected in Uzbekistan’s legal texts. The United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (1980) promoted the introduction of universal terms such as “offer” (*таклиф*) and “acceptance” (*қабул*).

The term “genocide” (*геноцид*) was first introduced in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948). In Uzbek, the term is also transcribed as *геноцид* and is used to refer to offences aimed at the destruction of national, ethnic, or religious groups. In Uzbekistan’s criminal legislation, the term is set out in articles dealing with international offences.

The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (International Criminal Court, 2021) makes extensive use of the term “crimes against humanity”. In English, its meaning does not require adaptation, while in Uzbek it is translated as *инсониятга қарши жиноятлар*. The term is used to describe mass killings, torture, and other acts against civilians.

The term “refugee” is consolidated in the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees (1951). In Uzbek, *қочоқ* refers to people who have been forced to leave their country due to persecution based on race, religion, politics, etc. The term “jurisdiction” in international law

refers to the power of a court to hear and decide cases. In Uzbek, it is adapted as *юрисдикция*. In Uzbek legal practice, the term is used to define the competence of national courts in international cases.

The term “peacekeeping operations” has become widely used through Security Council Resolution No. 2745 (2024) and Security Council Resolution No. 2751 (2024). In the Uzbek language, the term *тинчликни сақлаш операциялари* is used to describe UN missions aimed at conflict prevention and peacekeeping in war zones. The term “self-determination” is particularly significant in the context of the rights of nations and indigenous peoples. In Uzbek, it is translated as *ўз тақдирини ўзи белгилаш ҳуқуқи*.

In Security Council Resolution No. 2745 (2024) and Security Council Resolution No. 2751 (2024), the term “sanctions” is often used to refer to international restrictive measures. In Uzbek, it is translated as *санкциялар*. The term is used in both economic and political contexts. The term “war crimes” is formalised in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (International Criminal Court, 2021). In Uzbek, it is translated as *уруш жиноятлари*. The term covers severe violations of the laws and customs of war, such as the killing of civilians, torture, and destruction of cultural sites.

The Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. LRU-518 (2018) introduced such terms as *барқарор ривожланиш* (“sustainable development”), *иқлим ўзгаришига оид ҳуқуқ* (“climate change law”). These terms are used both in international documents and in national legislation. Some terms of international law require clarification in translation (local adaptation). For example, the term “non-refoulement” (*қайтармаслик принципи*) is related to international refugee protection and needs supplementary comments in Uzbek legal texts. The Uzbek term *яхши бошқарув* (“good governance”) does not capture the complexity of the concept, which includes transparency, accountability, and citizen participation. With the expansion of international contacts, Uzbek has adopted terms borrowed from English: “arbitration” (*арбитраж*), “sanctions” (*санкциялар*), “jurisdiction” (*юрисдикция*).

Cultural specificities in legal terminology

Legal language can be culturally distinctive due to variations in legal systems, cultural values, and historical evolution. For example, in English, the term “law” refers to both legislation and case law, reflecting the Anglo-Saxon system where court judgments are binding. In Uzbek, *qonun* primarily refers to regulations adopted by state bodies.

English law has a term “common-law marriage” which refers to an informal marriage relationship recognised under certain conditions. Uzbek legislation does not have an analogous term, as marriage must be registered. The Uzbek word *nikoh* has religious connotations, as in the Islamic tradition marriage is not only a legal but also a religious commitment.

The term “trust” in English denotes a complex mechanism of property management popular in Anglo-Saxon countries. There is no direct analogue in the Uzbek legal system, as there is no tradition of separation of ownership and management. The Uzbek language has a term *vakf* (вакф), which refers to property donated for religious or charitable purposes. This term has Islamic roots and reflects the influence of Sharia law. While *vakf* is rooted in Islamic endowment traditions, it serves a different function from the Anglo-Saxon concept of “trust”. This aligns with the Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations” (1998), which regulates *vakf* as a religious institution, not a commercial tool. Consequently, the concept of trusts remains foreign to Uzbek legal practice, particularly in purely domestic contexts.

In English law, the term “punitive damages” refers to compensation awarded to punish the defendant and prevent repeat offences. Uzbek legislation does not provide for such a mechanism, as the punishment system is centred on administrative and criminal sanctions. The Uzbek term *ярашув орқали ижтимоий адолатни тиклаш* is associated with the tradition of restoring social justice through reconciliation of the parties, which is rarely found in Anglo-Saxon law.

The English term “impeachment” refers to the procedure of bringing to justice high-ranking officials, including the head of state.

The constitutional mechanism of *импичмент* was introduced in Uzbekistan's 1992 Constitution but has never been applied in practice. Legal scholars criticise this dormant provision as a terminological borrowing without institutional enforcement (Shahribonu, 2022). Thus, the term functions more as a symbolic legal transposition than an operative category within Uzbek governance. The Uzbek term *махалла* denotes a local community council, which has traditional functions of regulating social relations. There is no equivalent in English terminology, as such an institution is not inherent in Anglo-Saxon culture. In English, the term "Sharia law" is used to refer to Islamic law overall, often in the context of multicultural societies. In Uzbek, *шариат* refers to norms related to religious precepts, which have no official status but continue to be influential in family and inheritance law.

Attention should be paid to differences in the interpretation of international terms. For example, in terms of cultural differences, the term "rule of law" (*қонун устуворлиги*) refers to the rule of law, the independence of the judiciary and the protection of individual rights. In Uzbekistan, *қонун устуворлиги* is often associated with state stability. The English term "extradition" in international practice implies the transfer of a person between States. In Uzbek, it has acquired a connotation of political caution, given historical precedents. Differences in law enforcement should also be considered: in the English context, the term "due diligence" (*тегишли тегишув*) is actively used in corporate law and merge-and-acquisition transactions. In Uzbekistan, it is rarely used in legal practice and requires adaptation. In international law, the term "customary law" (*одатлар ҳуқуқи*) refers to traditional rules applied equally with written law. In Uzbek, *одатлар ҳуқуқи* refers mainly to local customs.

Semantic differences in English and Uzbek legal terminology arise from differences in legal systems, historical backgrounds, and cultural contexts. In Anglo-Saxon law, an "affidavit" is a written statement made under oath and certified by an authorised person (e.g., a notary public). It is legally enforceable in court. There is no similar institution in Uzbek law. The closest equivalent to this term is *нотариал тасдиқланган ариза*, which is not always used as evidence in court.

In Anglo-Saxon law, “consideration” (literal translation into Uzbek – *қарздорлик ёки хизмат кўрсатиши мажбурияти*) is a mandatory element for the conclusion of an agreement, implying the provision of some value by one party in exchange for a promise by the other party. Uzbek law does not have the concept of “consideration” as a mandatory element of an agreement. An agreement may be concluded on a gratuitous basis, which is contrary to the Anglo-Saxon concept.

The concept of plea bargain (literal translation into Uzbek – *айбни тан олиш бўйича келишув*) in Anglo-Saxon law is a deal between the accused and the prosecutor, where the accused pleads guilty in exchange for a reduced sentence. It expedites the judicial process. For example, the defendant agrees to plead guilty to a less serious offence to avoid a more severe punishment. There is no such institution in Uzbek law. Penalty mitigation is possible with a candid confession (*чин дилдан айбни тан олиш*), but this is not the result of negotiation, but a court decision based on the circumstances of the case.

The term “trust” (literal translation into Uzbek – *ишончли бошқарув*) in Anglo-Saxon law is a legal construct that allows property to be transferred to a trustee for the benefit of a beneficiary. There is no direct analogue in Uzbek law. The closest equivalent is *ишончнома билан тасдиқланган бошқарув*, but it does not have a separate legal structure. The term “subpoena” (literal translation into Uzbek – *судга чақирув қозғоши*) is an official demand to appear in court or to provide documents. Uzbek law uses an analogous document *судга чақирув қозғоши*, but the sanctions for ignoring it are less severe.

In Anglo-Saxon law, a “tort” (literal translation into Uzbek – *фуқаролик ҳуқуқбузарлиги*) is a civil offence for which a person can be held liable. In Uzbek law, the term *фуқаролик ҳуқуқбузарлиги* covers many aspects, but does not include a clear category of tort law as in the Anglo-Saxon system. The term “common law” (literal translation into Uzbek is *оддий ҳуқуқ қоидалари*) is associated with a system of law based on judicial precedents. The Uzbek legal system belongs to the continental tradition and is based on legislative acts, and therefore court decisions do not create binding precedents. The term “equity” (*адолат ҳуқуқи*) is a separate legal system that ensures fairness where strict application of the law is not suitable. In Uzbek law, the term “equity” does not exist as a separate legal category. Equity is

factored in within the framework of judicial practice, but not as a separate institution.

Equivalence in legal terminology

Based on the existence of analogies in legal systems, legal terminology in Uzbek and English is separated into equivalent and non-equivalent categories. For example, “force majeure” (Uzbek equivalent – *форс-мажор ҳолати*) is an international term denoting circumstances of insuperable force such as natural disasters, wars, strikes. An analogous term “force majeure ҳолати” is consolidated in agreements. In English, the term “contract” is used as a general term for all types of agreements, while in Uzbek an analogous term *шартнома* is used. In addition, the term “arbitration” (*арбитраж*) – an alternative way of resolving disputes through an arbitration court – can be referred to as equivalent lexemes.

Among the non-equivalent terminology, the following terms can be distinguished. *Habeas corpus* is a valuable tool for the protection of individual rights in the Anglo-Saxon legal system. There is no analogue in the Uzbek language, but transliteration is used in international documents. An explanation such as *ҳибсга олиш қонунийлигини суд орқали текшириш мурожаати* may also be used. In English law, “consideration” is a mandatory element of an agreement, meaning the provision of value by one party in exchange for a promise by the other. There is no direct equivalent in Uzbek, as contracts can be compensated or non-reimbursable. To explain this term, the construction *шартноманинг қиймат алмашувига асосланган қисми* is used.

In English law, “tort” (literal translation into Uzbek – *ҳуқуқбузарлик туфайли зарарни қоплаш*) means a civil offence for which damages may be recovered. There is no full equivalent to this term in Uzbek, but analogous aspects are regulated under civil law. The English term “indemnity clause” (literal translation into Uzbek – *жавобгарликни қоплаш банди*) requires clarification in the Uzbek translation, as this concept is used in international practice but is not

always directly reflected in Uzbek agreements. There is no direct equivalent for the term *habeas corpus* in Uzbek legislation, but the term *ҳабеас корпус тўғрисидаги мурожаат* is used in international documents.

Challenges often arise in the translation of legal terms due to differences in legal systems and languages (Strilets, 2021; Palekha & Aliexsieienko, 2022). Consideration should be given to how some terms are calcified without regard to context, which may distort their meaning. For instance, in the Anglo-Saxon legal system, a “class action” is a lawsuit brought by a group of people who share a common interest or claim against a defendant. Such a lawsuit allows a group of people to join, which makes litigation more efficient. In English law, “class action” is often used in cases of mass infringement of rights, such as consumer claims or environmental damages. The term *группавий даъво* is often used in new contracts, but in practice the concept is perceived as a novelty. While the term “class action” is sometimes used in contracts, it is not operationalised in judicial practice, as there is no legal infrastructure supporting such claims.

The term “due diligence” (literal translation into Uzbek – *ўзғаришни текшириш или юридик текширув*) is associated with the definition of the process of verifying financial, legal, and other aspects of a company or transaction before its finalisation. This process avoids risks associated with ignorance of possible legal, financial, or other problems. English law uses “due diligence” in mergers and acquisitions, investments, and corporate transactions to guarantee safety. Uzbek language lacks a clear counterpart for this phrase, although the idiom *юридик текширув ёки ўзғаришни текшириш* meaning appropriate diligence is used. Nevertheless, in Uzbek practice, this process may not be as developed and organised as in international practice, especially in commercial transactions.

The legal term “indemnity clause” (literal translation into Uzbek – *жавобгарликни қоплаш банди*) is a provision in an agreement that prescribes the obligation of one party to indemnify the other party for certain acts or events. It is one of the key elements of agreements in international practice, especially in commercial transactions. In English law, the term is widely used in contract law and implies the protection of one party against financial loss arising from

certain events, such as breaches of contract by the other party. There is no direct analogue in Uzbek legislation, although such provisions are found in some contracts, but their interpretation and application require further clarification.

Morphological differences in legal terminology

The morphology of words in the Uzbek language is more complicated, which makes standardising legal terminology much more difficult. This is conditioned by the specific features of the language structure, its grammar, and traditions of translation of legal concepts. Unlike English, where many terms have direct analogues or borrowings, the Uzbek language requires a more detailed approach in translation, considering the variety of declensions and word formation processes.

The English term “arbitration clause” requires careful lexical analysis when translated into Uzbek. A direct translation of “arbitration clause” into Uzbek is *арбитраж шартлари*. However, such a translation may not always accurately convey the legal meaning if the context requires an indication of a contractual provision rather than simply the arbitration clause. In this case, it is correct to use more detailed phrases, such as *арбитражни ўтказиш бўйича шартлар*, illustrating how the Uzbek language requires more words and explanations to be added for the translation to be accurate. English legal texts are characterised by brevity, which is due to the use of many Latin expressions such as *pro bono*, *habeas corpus*, etc. These Latin expressions are often used in legal documents, which makes it easier to convey ideas provided that the audience is familiar with the context.

However, in Uzbek legal practice, as in other languages of the continental legal system, a more descriptive approach is often adopted. This is caused by the lack of universal Latin expressions, which requires a detailed description of legal processes and concepts. For instance, the term *pro bono* in Uzbek law can be translated as *бепул ёрдам кўрсатиш*, which is more detailed and less concise. This approach complicates the translation of English-language legal terms that are full of abstract and concise expressions. Therewith, such translation

inevitably requires a greater effort and increases the volume of the text, which may be undesirable in international legal practice.

The Anglo-Saxon legal system is characterised by a strong level of dependence on terminology in judicial practice. This makes it more flexible in the interpretation and application of certain terms, due to the presence of concepts such as “case law” and “precedent”. These terms are essential to the Anglo-Saxon system because court judgements become part of the legal basis for future cases. For example, “precedent” is the obligation to follow previous court decisions, which is the basis of the Anglo-Saxon system of law.

In Uzbek law, as in other countries of the continental legal system, judicial practice plays a smaller role in the formation of legal norms. Here, legal provisions are consolidated in legislation, which reduces flexibility in the interpretation of terms. The terms “case law” and “precedent” in Uzbek require a clarifying context, as in the continental system courts are not obliged to follow the decisions of previous instances. In Uzbek legal practice, the analogue *таърифлари* is used, but it lacks the same force and meaning as in the Anglo-Saxon system. Table 2 summarises the key characteristics of Uzbek and English terminology.

Uzbek terminology	English terminology
Multicomponent	Strictness of wording
Use of a descriptive approach	Use of Latinisms
Major cultural and religious influences	Dependence on judicial practice
Calquing of terminology	Polysemy

Table 2. Features of Uzbek and English terminology.

The continental legal system represented by Uzbekistan has its specific features, such as the strict consolidation of terms in legislation. This means that the Uzbek legal system is less susceptible to changes based on judicial practice and is more orientated towards written legislation. Whereas in the Anglo-Saxon system legal rules can change and develop through judicial precedents, in a continental system such as Uzbekistan’s, such changes require legislative amendments. This contrast between the two legal systems also affects the translation of

legal terms. Terms such as “judicial review” or “equity” may have complex and multiple translations in the context of Uzbek law, as the national legal system has other mechanisms to protect citizens’ rights.

Overall, the comparative analysis of the terms reveals several recurring patterns. First, there is a consistent tendency for Uzbek legal terminology to adopt multi-component descriptive structures, while English legal terms remain more concise, often drawing on Latinisms. Second, frequency of borrowing is asymmetric: English terms such as “due diligence”, “compliance”, and “arbitration” appear repeatedly in Uzbek legal texts, whereas reverse influence is almost absent. Third, semantic shifts are observable in culturally specific contexts, for instance, “force majeure” in Uzbek encompasses a broader range of social and natural phenomena than its English equivalent. These patterns indicate that translation is not merely a matter of lexical substitution but reflects deeper systemic differences: the continental tradition of statutory rigidity in Uzbekistan versus the case-law flexibility of Anglo-Saxon systems. Identifying such tendencies goes beyond listing equivalents and demonstrates how globalisation drives both convergence (through borrowing and standardisation) and divergence (through cultural reinterpretation) of legal terminology.

Considering all these complexities, there is a need to develop uniform standards for the translation of legal terms, accommodating the differences in legal systems and linguistic features. It is vital not only to convey the meaning of terms, but also to factor in the cultural, legal, and social contexts in which they are used. This will ensure accuracy and uniformity in legal translations and promote better understanding between different legal systems. Thus, the difference between the English and Uzbek legal systems requires careful work when translating terms. Calquing problems, differences in legal practice and terminology, and the Uzbek language’s tendency towards a more descriptive style make the translation of legal texts a complex process. Understanding these challenges is vital to produce accurate and understandable legal documents that follow international practices.

Discussion

To comprehend the distinctions between the legal systems and legal cultures of Uzbekistan and England, it is important to compare the legal vocabulary used in these two legal systems. The present study also highlighted the complexities involved in translating legal terms, which is particularly relevant considering the globalisation and increasing international legal interactions. Thus, several key aspects can be highlighted that enable a deeper understanding of the challenges of translating and adapting legal concepts between these two linguistic and legal cultures.

The historical and cultural features of the Anglo-Saxon legal tradition, which uses many Latin loanwords, closely influence the legal terminology in English law (Lychuk, 2021). These terms can be directly translated into Uzbek without losing their legal precision. An example is the term *habeas corpus*, which in the English legal system means the right to a trial for unlawful detention. In Uzbek law, an analogous principle can be expressed through other legal constructions, which require precise translation with an explanation of the legal context. According to Goddard (2021), English legal terminology is universal, but at the same time, this view cannot be fully accepted, as each national terminology system requires adaptation of terminology.

Since Uzbek legal terminology is directly related to continental law, this requires attention to the differences in legal traditions when translating legal texts, especially when using terms such as “case law” or “statute”. At the same time, Anglo-Saxon law is associated with the use of case law, which is also emphasised by Rodriguez-Puente and Hernandez-Coalla (2023). The researchers investigated the principles of the use of specialised terminology in Anglo-Saxon law.

Different legal systems may interpret terms like “sovereignty” or “human rights” differently. Based on the findings of the present study, in the Uzbek legal system, where considerable emphasis is placed on sovereignty and national interests, these terms may have different perceptions and usage. In this context, it is worth agreeing with the findings presented by Canfield et al. (2021), who emphasised the role of transnational norms and terms used in international practice and

adapted for distinct legal systems. Shaffer and Terence (2021) also emphasised the influence of transnational legal systems on national legal terms.

With increasing globalisation and the expansion of international relations, the value of harmonising legal terms is growing (Tukhtarova et al., 2021; Doszhan, 2023). This necessitates the harmonisation of legal terminology, which is crucial when translating international treaties and agreements. Depending on their legal tradition, different countries may perceive the term “international law” differently. In the Uzbek context, international law is often perceived through the lens of national jurisdiction and legislation, which makes translation of such terms challenging and requires further legal interpretation. Marcos (2023) explored the globalisation of legal systems and attempted to create a unified international legal order. At the same time, the concept of globalisation presented by the author may lead to the loss of local legal traditions.

The practical aspects of translating legal terms focus on preserving their meaning and ensuring compliance with legal standards. Kothalawala et al. (2022) and Wood (2022) observed that differences in the lexico-grammatical characteristics of legal terms in various languages can significantly affect the accuracy and clarity of translations, particularly in legal letters and requests. Issues surrounding the implementation of global standards and human rights are increasingly pertinent in the context of globalisation, which is crucial for analysing legal terminology in diverse systems, such as those of Uzbekistan and English-speaking countries. Warrouw (2021) emphasises the need for a legal system grounded in justice and human values, highlighting the challenges of incorporating human rights and sustainable development into international economic agreements.

In Uzbekistan, legal terms are often closely tied to the historical evolution of the national legal system, whereas the English legal system is more complex, incorporating borrowings from various languages and traditions (Pozhar & Yemets, 2021). For example, terms like “contract law” or “civil law” in English may be more diverse in application, while in Uzbekistan, they are more specific to local practices. Gathii (2021) and Ikejiaku (2014) also highlighted the differences in legal language and systems. The study suggests that as globalisation continues,

national legal terminology must adapt to international standards. Marelli (2023) discussed the interaction of international organisations with national laws in areas such as personal data protection, while Krish (2021) noted the declining impact of international norms on national legal systems, raising questions about how international laws can be integrated into national contexts like those of Uzbekistan and English-speaking countries.

Policy changes in international practice may affect how certain terms are perceived and used in different countries, including the Uzbek context. This also raises the question of how these terms may be adapted or modified in the translation process, considering the political and legal differences. Voulgaris (2022) explores the influence of political factors on the progressive development of international law, which directly relates to issues of terminology. Changes in the political situation may alter not only concrete legal rules, but also their very interpretation (Oliveira, 2024). While individual interests often play a key role in national law, the international legal order requires consideration of broader, collective interests, which complicates the translation and adaptation of legal terms. Tin (2021) discussed community of interest and public international law, emphasising the significance of collective interests in the context of international law.

The study demonstrates that legal terminology is not merely a linguistic challenge but a reflection of deeper systemic, cultural, and historical differences. Effective translation and adaptation require a nuanced understanding of both legal traditions and the broader context of globalisation. As international law continues to evolve, bridging these terminological divides will be essential for fostering legal clarity and cooperation across jurisdictions.

Conclusions

The appropriateness and correctness of legal language are becoming more important for the proper execution of international accords and treaties as a result of globalisation and the growing interconnectedness of legal systems across nations. The comparison of legal terms in

different languages helps to identify both similarities and differences in legal systems, which is essential for the effective functioning of the international legal order.

The development of international law requires a deeper consideration of linguistic and cultural differences in the creation and application of legal instruments. An accurate understanding of legal terms and concepts is an important element in ensuring legal security and stability in international relations. Therefore, the study of legal terms, considering their functioning in different languages, contributes to the creation of more effective legal translation methods that help to avoid errors in the interpretation and application of international legal instruments.

Semantic differences in legal terms between languages arise because of differences in the understanding and interpretation of the same concepts in different legal systems. For example, English law has many terms that have differing meanings in different jurisdictions, and their understanding depends on the concrete legal context. In Uzbek law, there may be similar concepts but with differences in application and meaning, which requires careful attention in translation. In Uzbek terms, descriptive multi-component constructions are more often used to overcome semantic differences than in English.

Cultural differences are evident in areas such as family law, the protection of women's and children's rights, and attitudes towards property. In countries with an Eastern legal tradition, such as Uzbekistan, there are often deeply rooted cultural norms that may define legal terms and principles differently than in Western countries. For example, in the context of family law, there may be a greater emphasis on family values and traditions in Uzbekistan than in countries with Western legal systems, where the rights of individual liberty and independence play a significant role. Uzbek terminology combines complexity, use of a descriptive approach, significant cultural and religious influences, and calquing of terminology; English terminology is associated with features such as complexity, dependence on jurisprudence, polysemy, strictness of wording, and use of Latinisms.

The limitations of the present study are related to the fact that not all terms in Uzbek and English terminology were considered.

Building on the findings of this study, future research could further expand the understanding of legal terminology by utilizing a variety of methodologies. One promising avenue for future exploration is corpus-based analysis, which would allow for a deeper, data-driven examination of legal texts and terms across different languages. By using large legal corpora in both English and Uzbek, researchers could identify additional terminological discrepancies, common patterns, and shifts in language use over time. Another potential direction is conducting surveys with legal practitioners to gather insights into how legal terms are interpreted and used in practice. This would help contextualize theoretical findings and contribute to the development of practical translation strategies. Furthermore, case studies could be employed to explore the application of legal terms in specific legal contexts, such as international arbitration or human rights law, to better understand how terminology functions in various legal proceedings and frameworks.

This research concludes by highlighting the important influence of legal globalisation on the development of Uzbek and English legal terminology adaption. This study addresses a gap in the literature about the effects of legal globalisation on the translation and standardising of legal words by investigating the influence of international legal instruments on national law. For academics and legal professionals involved in comparative legal studies, the results provide insightful information, especially when considering developing nations like Uzbekistan where international legal integration is still taking place.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

AI Use statement

AI was not used in the paper.

Statement of Contributions

The authors contributed equally to the preparation of the manuscript.

Bibliography

- Ahn, J. (2024). Assessing Korean Children's Understanding of Legal Terms and Roles across Age Groups. *Communications of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11, Article 347. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-02878-w>
- An, J., & Sun, J. (2022). Translation Strategy for Legal Terms with Chinese Characteristics in the Civil Code of the People's Republic of China based on Skopos Theory. *PLoS ONE*, 17(9), Article e0273944. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0273944>
- Canfield, M. S., Dehm, J., & Fassi, M. (2021). Translocal Laws: Local Encounters with Transnational Law. *Transnational Legal Theory*, 12(3), 335-359. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20414005.2021.2012368>
- Chromá, M. (2011). Synonymy and Polysemy in Legal Terminology and their Application to Bilingual and Bilingual Translation. *Language Research*, 9(1), 31-50. <https://doi.org/10.2478/v10015-011-0004-2>
- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. (1948). <https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/assets/treaties/357-IHL-51-EN.pdf>
- Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees. (1951). <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-relating-status-refugees>

- Doszhan, R. (2023). Multi-vector cultural connection in the conditions of modern globalisation. *Interdisciplinary Cultural and Humanities Review*, 2(1), 27-32. <https://doi.org/10.59214/2786-7110-2023-2-1-27-32>
- Dugard, J. (2023). The Choice Before Us: International Law or a 'Rules-Based International Order'? *Leiden Journal of International Law*, 36(2), 223-232. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0922156523000043>
- Gathii, J. T. (2021). The Promise of International Law: A Third World View. *American University International Law Review*, 36(3), 377-477.
- Giliker, P. (2021). Codification, Consolidation, Restatement? How Best to Systemise the Modern Law of Tort. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 70(2), 271-305. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020589321000087>
- Glohar, O. (2023). The Concept of Legal Language: What Makes Legal Language "Legal"? *International Journal of Legal Semiotics*, 36, 1081-1107. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-023-10010-5>
- Goddard, C. (2021). Legal Terminology in English: The Challenges of International Contexts. *ESP Across Cultures*, 18, 105-123. http://dx.doi.org/10.4475/0062_6
- Goźdz-Roszkowski, S. (2021). Corpus Linguistics in Legal Discourse. *International Journal of Legal Semiotics*, 34, 1515-1540. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-021-09860-8>
- Grushko, S. (2016). Document linguistics of scientific and technical direction in modern applied linguistics. *Society. Document. Communication*, 1(1), 195-201. <https://sdc-journal.com.ua/en/journals/vipusk-1/dokumentna-lingvistika-naukovo-tekhnichnogo-spryamuvannya-u-suchasnomu-prikladnomu-movoznavstvi>
- Hoff, S. L., & Barboza, G. (2025). Languages, Language, and Linguists: The Study of the Diversity of Languages According to Saussure and Benveniste. *Bakhtiniana*, 20(1), Article e65692e. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2176-4573e65692>
- Ikejiaku, B.-V. (2014). International Law is Western Made Global Law: The Perception of Third-World Category. *African Journal of*

- Legal Studies*, 6(2-3), 337-356.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/17087384-12342022>
- International Criminal Court. (2021). Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. <https://www.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/2024-05/Rome-Statute-eng.pdf>
- Isakova, S. S., Kusaiynova, Z. A., Kenzhemuratova, S. K., Zhuminova, A. B., Utegulov, O. Z., & Mukhtarullina, A. R. (2018). Worldview within the terms of concepts, sphere of concepts and conceptualization. *Analele Universitatii din Craiova - Seria Stiinte Filologice, Lingvistica*, 40(1-2), 298-317.
<https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=749222>
- Issakova, S. S., Kultanbayeva, N. K., Tukhtarova, A. S., Zhetessova, Z. A., & Kartzhan, N. Ye. (2023). Linguocultural Analysis of Ethnic Stereotypes in Humorous Discourse: A Comparative Analysis. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(3), 33-47.
<https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.903004>
- Jiao, J. (2024). Theoretical and applied aspects of modern linguoculturology based on intercultural communication. *Dragoman*, 14(16), 171-193.
- Kothalawala, C., Kothalawala, T., & Pereira, S. S. (2022). Differences in the Lexico-grammatical Features of Legal Letters of Demand Written by Lawyers and Students. *Sri Lanka Journal of Education*, 1(2), 41-57.
- Krish, N. (2021). The Dynamics of International Law Redux. *Current Legal Problems*, 74(1), 269-297.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/clp/cuab008>
- Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan “On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations”. (1998). <https://lex.uz/docs/4830084>
- Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. LRU-518 “On International Treaties of the Republic of Uzbekistan”. (2018).
<https://lex.uz/docs/4830084>
- Lychuk, M. (2021). Markers-Identifiers of English Language International Legal Discourse. *International Journal of Philology*, 25(3), 21-25.
<https://doi.org/10.31548/philolog2021.03.021>
- Marcos, H. (2023). From Fragmented Legal Order to Globalised Legal System: Towards a Framework of General Principles for the

- Consistency of International Law. *Athena: Critical Inquiries in Law, Philosophy and Globalization*, 3(1), 90-124. <https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.2724-6299/17223>
- Marelli, M. (2023). The Law and Practice of the Interaction of International Organizations with Domestic Regulation of Personal Data Protection: At the Crossroads of International and Domestic Legal Order. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 50, Article 105849. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2023.105849>
- Oliveira, É. M. D. (2024). The Sociolinguistic Interview Genre and Its Chronotopic Dimensions. *Bakhtiniana*, 19(4), Article e64132e. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2176-4573e64132>
- Palekha, Y., & Aliksieienko, K. (2022). “Narrow and wide” definition of the term “document”. *Society. Document. Communication*, 7(1), 100-115. <https://doi.org/10.31470/2518-7600-2022-14-100-115>
- Petretta, I. (2020). The Question of Comparison. *American Journal of Comparative Law*, 68(4), 893-928. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcl/avab003>
- Pham, N., Pham, L., & Meyers, A. (2021). Legal Terminology Extraction with the Termolator. *Natural Legal Language Processing Workshop 2021*, 155-162.
- Pozhar, A., & Yemets, N. (2021). Model of Translation of International Legal Discourse: To the Problem of Applying the Transformation Model and the Model of the Reference Set Of. *International Journal of Philology*, 25(4), 35-39. <https://doi.org/10.31548/philolog2021.04.006>
- Pulatova, U. S. K. (2023). Comparative Analysis of Legal Terms in English and Uzbek Languages. *European International Journal of Pedagogics*, 3(11), 1-3.
- Ramos, F. P. (2021). Translating Legal Terminology and Phraseology: Between Inter-Systemic Incongruity and Multilingual Harmonization. *Prospects*, 29(2), 175-183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2021.1849940>
- Ramos, F. P., & Cerutti, G. (2021). Terminology as a Source of Difficulty in Translating International Legal Discourses: An Empirical Cross-Genre Study. *International Journal of Legal*

- Discourse*, 6(2), 155-179. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijld-2021-2052>
- Riffel, C. (2024). Constitutional Law-Making by International Law: The Indigenization of Free Trade Agreements. *European Journal of International Law*, 35(2), 445-468. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/cha027>
- Rodriguez-Puente, P., & Hernandez-Coalla, D. (2023). The Corpus of Contemporary English Legal Decisions, 1950—2021 (CoCELD): A New Tool for Analysing Recent Changes in English Legal Discourse. *ICAME Journal*, 47(1), 109-117. <https://doi.org/10.2478/icame-2023-0006>
- Security Council Resolution No. 2745 “On Lifting of the Arms Embargo on the Central African Republic, Renewal of other Measures and Extension of the Mandate of the Panel of Experts Established Pursuant to Resolution 2127 (2013)”. (2024). <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/4055582?ln=en&v=pdf>
- Security Council Resolution No. 2751 “On Extension of the Mandate of the Multinational Security Support Mission in Haiti”. (2024). <https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/4062838?ln=en&v=pdf#files>
- Shaffer, G. H., & Terence, C. (2021). International Law and Transnational Legal Orders: Permeating Boundaries and Extending Social Science Encounters. *Chicago Journal of International Law*, 22(1), Article 15.
- Shahribonu, S. (2022). Teaching Legal Terms in English and Learning their Functions and Placements in a Sentence, Compared with Uzbek. *Journal of Medicine*, 3(1), 104-110. <https://doi.org/10.47689/2181-1415-vol3-iss1/S-pp104-110>
- Shakun, N., & Yaremenko, N. (2023). Essential and structural aspects of the basic problem competences of future translators. *Humanities Studios: Pedagogy, Psychology, Philosophy*, 11(3), 137-142. [https://doi.org/10.31548/hspedagog14\(3\).2023.137-142](https://doi.org/10.31548/hspedagog14(3).2023.137-142)
- Strilets, V. (2021). Application of corpus technologies in teaching specialized translation. *Humanities Studios: Pedagogy, Psychology, Philosophy*, 9(4), 48-52. <https://doi.org/10.31548/hspedagog2021.04.048>

- Tin, S. (2021). Community Interest and the International Public Legal Order. *Netherlands International Law Review*, 68, 35-59. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40802-021-00186-7>
- Tukhtarova, A. S., Issakova, S. S., Kussaiynova, Z. A., Kenzhemuratova, S. K., & Nassyritdinova, A. N. (2021). Linguocultural approach to audiovisual translation on the example of “game of thrones”. *International Journal of Society Culture and Language*, 9(3), 49-63. https://www.ijscel.com/article_246221.html
- Tuleeva, C. (2025). Phonetic Interference in The Intercultural Communication Environment (Linguo-Methodological Aspect). *Dragoman*, 2025(18), 144-166. <https://doi.org/10.63132/ati.2025.phonet.37187200>
- United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods. (1980). https://uncitral.un.org/en/texts/salegoods/conventions/sale_of_goods/cisg.
- Universal Declaration of Human Rights. (1948). <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>.
- Valcke, C. (2019). Comparing Legal Styles. *International Journal of Law in Context*, 15(3), 274-296. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1744552319000284>
- Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. (1969). <https://www.legal-tools.org/doc/6bfcd4/pdf/>.
- Voulgaris, N. (2022). The International Law Commission and Politics: Taking the Science Out of International Law’s Progressive Development. *European Journal of International Law*, 33(3), 761-788. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chac051>
- Warrouw, A. (2021). Fundamental Changes of International Economic Law: Challenges Toward Legal System Based on Fairness and Human Values. *Indonesian Journal of International Law*, 7(1), 41-65. <https://doi.org/10.17304/ijil.vol7.1.227>
- Wood, M. (2022). A Lexico-Grammatical Comparison of Statutory Law and Popular Written Language. *Research in Corpus Linguistics*, 10(2), 16-45. <https://doi.org/10.32714/ricl.10.2.03>