

Contextual Translation of Political Terminology in English and Uzbek Political Discourse: A Lexical-Semantic Analysis Based on a Parallel Corpus

BOTIROVA NILUFAR SALIMJONOVQIZI

Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This article investigates the contextual translation of political terminology between Uzbek and English through a corpus-lexicographic and lexical-semantic analysis of a curated parallel corpus of 6,428 aligned segments drawn from official political, legal, administrative and strategic documents. The study operationalizes five translation procedures direct translation, calque, transcription/transliteration, functional equivalent and contextual substitution and examines how their distribution is conditioned by institutional status, legal force, genre, collocational environment and pragmatic function. The corpus contains approximately 110,960 Uzbek and 143,515 English surface tokens. Concordance analysis shows that stable institutional terms such as Senat/Senate and Konstitutsiya/Constitution display high lexical regularity, whereas polyfunctional items such as qaror, tartib, vakolat, reyestr, mahalla and hokim exhibit systematic contextual variation. For example, qaror occurs in 447 aligned segments and is rendered mainly as resolution and decision, while tartib appears in 478 segments and is translated principally as procedure, regulation, order and rules. Institution-bound terms demonstrate a continuum between preservation and adaptation: Oliy Majlis is retained in 134 of 136 relevant English segments, whereas mahalla is more often contextualized as neighborhood. The findings demonstrate that political terminology cannot be represented adequately by one-to-one bilingual equivalents. A corpus-informed lexicographic

entry therefore needs sense differentiation, genre and institution labels, translation-strategy metadata, collocational patterns, pragmatic notes and attested bilingual examples. The article proposes a multi-layer corpus-lexicographic model for compiling Uzbek-English political terminology resources and for improving consistency in institutional translation.

Keywords: Political terminology, contextual translation, parallel corpus; lexical semantics; corpus lexicography; institutional discourse; Uzbek-English translation

INTRODUCTION

Political language is a special form of language at the intersection of language, institutional practice and public authority. A political term is not just a name for an object or a concept, in many contexts it is the name of an institution, the calling up of a legal or administrative framework, the indication of the distribution of power, and an addition to the official voice of the state. Therefore, translation of political terminology cannot be reduced to the substitution of an Uzbek lexical unit with the closest English equivalent in the dictionary. The translator has to identify which concept is activated in a given document, which institution is speaking, what legal or pragmatic effect the expression performs and which target-language form is conventional in an equivalent institutional setting. This requirement is especially clear in the official Uzbek-English translation, which uses terms from the post-Soviet legal-administrative system together with internationally recognizable concepts and culture-specific institutions.

The analysis of the political discourse has always stressed that the language of the political is action-oriented and institutionally embedded. Van Dijk deals with political discourse as discourse produced and understood in political contexts, roles and goals. Chilton is interested in the linguistic construction of authority, legitimacy, coercion and cooperation [38; 9]. Fairclough & Fairclough also argue that political discourse is essentially argumentative: decisions are justified with reference

to goals, values, circumstances and projected consequences [13]. These observations are directly relevant to translation. When a political term changes its semantic scope or pragmatic value in the target text, the translator may also change the way in which institutional agency, obligation or legitimacy is represented.

Translation Studies has moved away from equivalence as mainly formal correspondence to functional, textual and contextual models. This move is crucial in specialized and legal translation, as the same form in the source language can perform different functions in different genres. Šarčević states that legal translation cannot be only a linguistically similar equivalent of the source text but that it has to consider the legal effect and the communicative function of the target text [30]. Legal language is also seen by Cao as a special kind of communication, with its lexicon being tied to legal systems and text types [8]. Prieto Ramos places contextual variables and legal-text categorization at the core of legal translation methodology [28]. Political terminology in official Uzbek documents exhibits the same problem: terms such as *qaror*, *tartib*, *vakolat* and *hokim* cannot be translated reliably without identifying the institutional frame in which they occur.

Corpus linguistics offers an empirical way to observe such contextual variation. Since Baker's foundational proposal for integrating corpus methods into Translation Studies, parallel and comparable corpora have become central for identifying recurrent translation choices, phraseological patterns and systemic variation [2; 3]. A parallel corpus is particularly valuable because it allows the researcher to trace the same source expression across multiple translated contexts and to compare translation solutions rather than relying on isolated examples. Doval & Sánchez Nieto emphasize that parallel corpora are not merely repositories of equivalents; they are resources for contrastive analysis, translation-process inference and bilingual resource creation [11]. Mikhailov & Cooper similarly demonstrate how aligned corpora support translation-oriented research at lexical, grammatical and discourse levels [23].

The lexicographic dimension is equally important. Traditional bilingual dictionaries frequently present a headword

followed by a short list of equivalents. Such a format is insufficient when the target choice depends on genre, collocation, institutional actor or legal status. Corpus-based terminography and lexicography instead derive meaning distinctions and usage patterns from authentic textual evidence [27; 6]. Atkins & Rundell argue that corpus evidence is central to modern dictionary-making because it reveals frequency, phraseology, syntactic behavior and contextual restrictions that introspection alone may miss [1]. For political terminology, a corpus-lexicographic approach can therefore connect translation analysis with practical bilingual resource design.

The present study addresses this need by examining contextual translation in a curated Uzbek-English parallel corpus of official political discourse. The research is organized around five translation procedures proposed as an operational taxonomy for political terms: (1) direct translation, (2) calque, (3) transcription/transliteration, (4) functional equivalent, and (5) contextual substitution. These procedures are not assumed to be mutually exclusive in every theoretical sense; rather, they identify the dominant mechanism by which the target expression is produced. For example, *Oliy Majlis* is primarily preserved through transliteration, legislative chamber is a structural calque of *Qonunchilik palatasi*, accountable to functions as an institutional equivalent for *oldida javobgar*, and *qaror* may require contextual substitution by decision, resolution, order or, in specific environments, another legally appropriate term.

The study pursues four objectives. First, it describes the lexical-semantic conditions under which the five translation procedures occur in Uzbek-English political discourse. Second, it identifies high-frequency terms whose official translations show systematic variation and explains the contextual variables behind that variation. Third, it evaluates how corpus evidence can distinguish stable equivalents from context-sensitive equivalents. Fourth, it proposes a lexicographic microstructure for a bilingual political terminology database in which translation equivalents are linked to sense, institution, genre, collocation, pragmatic force and authentic corpus examples. The broader aim is to contribute to the standardization of official Uzbek-English

terminology without eliminating legitimate context-sensitive variation.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RELATED RESEARCH

The theoretical foundation of the study integrates corpus linguistics, terminology studies, lexicography, political discourse analysis and translation studies. These fields converge on a shared premise: lexical meaning is not exhausted by decontextualized definition. Corpus linguistics conceptualizes meaning as observable through recurrent patterns of co-occurrence and distribution. Sinclair's idiom principle and corpus-driven view of phraseology demonstrate that lexical units acquire much of their meaning from recurrent environments rather than functioning as fully independent items [33]. Tognini-Bonelli develops this insight into a corpus-driven methodology in which categories emerge from evidence rather than being imposed in advance [37]. Stefanowitsch, from a methodological perspective, stresses that corpus analysis is an observational method requiring transparent sampling, operational definitions and replicable procedures [35].

For terminology studies, context is indispensable because specialized terms activate structured domain knowledge. Sager's terminology-processing model connects terms with concepts, communicative settings and knowledge organization [29]. Cabré's communicative theory of terminology rejects the idea that terms belong to a separate, autonomous linguistic system; specialized units are lexical items that become terminological when activated in specialized communicative contexts [7]. Temmerman similarly challenges rigid one-concept-one-term models and emphasizes prototype structure, conceptual variation and the dynamic character of specialized meaning [36]. Frame-based Terminology further models terms as access points to conceptual frames in which participants, relations and processes are organized systematically [12]. These approaches are particularly suitable for political language, where a lexical item can shift according to institutional frame and communicative function.

Corpus-based terminography translates these theoretical insights into a practical methodology. Pearson shows how specialized corpora can identify terms, retrieve definitional contexts and reveal synonymy, substitution and paraphrase [27]. Bowker and Pearson extend this approach to translators and language-for-special-purposes users, demonstrating how concordances, frequency lists and aligned corpora can support term selection and bilingual equivalence [6]. Modern corpus lexicography uses large electronic corpora and tools such as word sketches to identify statistically salient collocations and grammatical relations [19]. The same principle can be applied to a specialized political corpus even without relying exclusively on automated term extraction: the researcher can use aligned concordances to identify recurrent equivalents and contextual constraints.

Translation-oriented corpus research also contributes a crucial distinction between equivalence as a static relation and translation choice as patterned behavior. Baker argues that corpora make it possible to examine translated language empirically and to observe recurrent tendencies across texts and translators [3]. Laviosa systematizes corpus-based Translation Studies by distinguishing comparable and parallel designs and by showing how quantitative tendencies can be connected with qualitative explanation [21]. Zanettin emphasizes the role of translation-driven corpora as resources for both descriptive research and professional practice [40]. In the present study, the parallel corpus is used not to claim a universal translation rule, but to establish which official solutions are attested, how frequently they occur, and what kinds of contexts motivate them. Political and institutional translation adds further complexity because translated terminology participates in the construction of public institutions. Koskinen's ethnographic study of institutional translation demonstrates that institutional discourse is shaped by organizational norms, routines and expectations rather than by individual linguistic preference alone [20]. Gagnon defines political translation broadly as translation embedded in political communication and institutional processes [14]. Schäffner shows that political translation involves choices at lexical, syntactic and

pragmatic levels and that transformations may affect ideological positioning or communicative effect [31]. The edited volume by Schäffner & Bassnett further illustrates the interaction of politics, institutions, media and translation policy [32].

The distinction between direct translation and calque is useful but must be applied carefully. Direct translation is used here for an established target-language lexical equivalent that names substantially the same institutional or political concept and is conventional in English specialized discourse, for example *Senat* → Senate or *Konstitutsiya* → Constitution. A calque, by contrast, reproduces the compositional structure of a multiword source term through target-language lexical material. *Qonunchilik palatasi* → Legislative Chamber is therefore treated as a calque because the internal semantic structure is mirrored. Similarly, *davlat siyosati* → state policy or *davlat xizmatlari* → public services can be described as compositional formations, although frequent conventionalization may make the distinction between calque and direct translation diachronically less clear. The present taxonomy uses the dominant synchronically observable relation in the corpus.

Transcription and transliteration preserve the source-language form because the term functions as a proper institutional name or culturally specific designation. This strategy is closely related to foreignization in translation theory, although institutional naming requires a more technical explanation than a general cultural strategy [39]. *Oliy Majlis* illustrates a stable institutional borrowing: the English corpus largely retains the Uzbek name rather than replacing it with a generic phrase such as Supreme Assembly. The term *mahalla* is more complex because both retention and functional adaptation occur. When *mahalla* refers to the distinct Uzbek institution as such, transliteration may preserve institutional specificity; when the immediate communicative purpose concerns geographical or social location, neighborhood often provides a more accessible contextual equivalent.

Functional equivalence is defined here as the use of a target-language expression that performs the same institutional, legal or pragmatic function despite non-isomorphic lexical structure.

Nord's functional approach and House's functional-pragmatic quality model both support the principle that target-language adequacy depends on communicative function as well as semantic content [26; 18]. In legal-institutional translation, functional equivalence is particularly important when no direct lexical counterpart exists. Thus, *oldida javobgar* is naturally represented by *accountable to* in many English institutional contexts. Likewise, *Xalqaro shartnomani tasdiqlash to'g'risida* is translated in the corpus as *ratification of an international treaty*: *ratification* is not a literal rendering of *tasdiqlash* "approval," but it identifies the relevant legal act in international-treaty procedure.

Contextual substitution is the broadest and most productive category in the present study. It refers to the selection of one target term among several possible lexicalizations because the local and global context activates a specific sense, legal status, genre convention or collocational pattern. The source term *qaror* is a clear case: depending on the issuing body and textual function, it may correspond to *resolution*, *decision*, *order* or other contextually justified forms. *Tartib* may denote a *procedure*, *regulation*, *order*, *set of rules* or *institutional arrangement*. *Vakolat* may be *powers*, *authority* or *competence*. Such variation is not necessarily inconsistency; it can be evidence of semantic differentiation. The lexicographic challenge is to distinguish motivated variation from accidental variation and to encode that distinction in a bilingual reference resource.

MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGY

The empirical material is a curated Uzbek-English parallel corpus compiled from official translations of political, legal, administrative and strategic texts published in the national legal-information environment. The working spreadsheet contains 6,428 non-empty aligned Uzbek-English segments. Segment-level metadata include the Uzbek political text, its English translation, extracted political terms where available, the source link, and fields intended for text type, function, style, syntactic features and pragmatic characteristics. The present study uses the

aligned segment pair as the basic analytical unit because it allows contextual equivalence to be traced without isolating the term from its immediate syntactic and institutional environment.

A simple surface-token count yielded approximately 110,960 Uzbek tokens and 143,515 English tokens. These figures are descriptive rather than morphologically normalized: the purpose is to characterize corpus scale rather than to provide lemma-based frequency statistics. The corpus includes constitutional and administrative legislation, presidential and governmental decisions, strategic programmes, social-policy documents, institutional regulations, international-treaty material and other official texts. Because the study concerns terminology rather than personal reference, names of individual office-holders and date expressions were not treated as analytical variables even when present in the original segment.

The methodological procedure consisted of four stages. In the first stage, candidate political terms were identified through the existing term columns, frequency inspection and concordance-style searches of the Uzbek segments. Priority was given to institutional nouns, legal-administrative terms, performative formulas and recurrent multiword units. In the second stage, aligned English renderings were collected and normalized only for counting purposes; the original corpus wording was preserved for qualitative analysis. In the third stage, translation choices were classified according to the five operational strategies: direct translation, calque, transcription/transliteration, functional equivalent and contextual substitution. In the fourth stage, the resulting patterns were interpreted lexicographically by asking what information a bilingual dictionary or terminology database would need in order to guide a translator toward the appropriate equivalent.

The classification was context-sensitive. A term was assigned to direct translation when a stable conventional equivalent could be identified without substantial structural or functional adjustment. A calque was assigned when the multiword semantic structure was reproduced compositionally. Transcription/transliteration was assigned when the source institutional designation was retained with minimal orthographic adaptation.

Functional equivalent was assigned when the target expression differed lexically but matched the source term's institutional or legal function. Contextual substitution was assigned when the equivalent depended on sense, genre, collocation or institutional context and could not be represented adequately by a single target form. When more than one process was plausible, the dominant process explaining the translation decision was recorded.

Quantitative counts were used selectively. The study does not claim that the five strategies can be fully distinguished through automatic string matching. Instead, corpus counts are reported for high-frequency source terms and their recurrent English realizations. For example, all aligned segments containing *qaror*, *tartib*, *vakolat*, *reystir*, *mahalla*, *hokim* and *farmoyish* were retrieved, and recurrent English forms were counted. This procedure reveals translation variation while avoiding the false precision of automatically assigning every corpus token to a theoretical strategy.

Qualitative analysis focused on lexical-semantic relations, collocation, institutional reference and pragmatic force. Particular attention was paid to cases in which a literal equivalent would either overgeneralize or narrow the source concept. The analysis also considered variation within the official translations themselves. Such variation was not automatically treated as error. It was evaluated in terms of whether the alternative target forms corresponded to distinct meanings or functions. Where two target forms occurred in highly similar contexts, the difference was interpreted as a potential standardization issue rather than as semantic polysemy.

Table 1. *Corpus composition and analytical design*

Parameter	Corpus value	Analytical role	Comment
Aligned segments	6,428	Basic bilingual unit	Non-empty Uzbek-English pairs
Uzbek surface tokens	≈110,960	Source-language scale	Simple surface-token count
English surface tokens	≈143,515	Target-language scale	Simple surface-token count
Primary evidence	Official parallel translations	Equivalence and variation	Source links retained at segment level

Core procedures	5	Translation-strategy taxonomy	Direct, calque, transliteration, functional, contextual
Main analysis	Concordance + lexical-semantic interpretation	Context-sensitive explanation	Quantitative counts used for recurrent terms

4. RESULTS

The parallel corpus confirms that no single translation procedure can account for the treatment of political terminology. Stable internationally recognizable concepts often favor direct translation; transparent multiword institutional formations frequently favor calque; culturally and institutionally bound names may be retained through transliteration; legal or administrative formulas may require functional equivalents; and semantically broad source terms regularly undergo contextual substitution. The categories are best understood as a continuum from lexical stability to contextual dependence rather than as five isolated boxes.

Direct translation is most visible where the two languages share an established political or legal concept. *Senat* is overwhelmingly rendered as “Senate,” and *Konstitutsiya* as “Constitution.” These are cases in which conceptual structure and institutional reference are sufficiently close that no additional semantic adaptation is required. Direct translation is therefore not merely word-for-word replacement; it presupposes terminological conventionality in the target language. If the target-language term is not conventional in the relevant institutional genre, formal similarity alone does not make it a reliable direct equivalent.

Calque is productive with multiword political terms whose semantic components can be reconstructed transparently in English. *Qonunchilik palatasi* → Legislative Chamber preserves the internal relation between “legislative” and “chamber.” *Davlat siyosati* → state policy and *davlat nazorati* → state control likewise reproduce the conceptual composition of the Uzbek term. However, calques must be evaluated against target-

language collocational norms. The corpus demonstrates that compositional transparency does not guarantee idiomaticity: some structurally faithful translations remain less natural than established institutional formulations.

Transcription/transliteration is especially important for unique institutions. *Oliy Majlis* occurs in 136 relevant Uzbek segments and is preserved as *Oliy Majlis* in 134 English segments. This high retention rate indicates strong institutional lexicalization: the name functions in English as a borrowed official designation rather than as a descriptive noun phrase. The corpus also records *khokim/khokimiyat* in a substantial number of contexts, alongside functional translations such as governor. Mahalla shows an even clearer contextual split between preservation and adaptation. These patterns indicate that transliteration is not a mechanical default; it is one option on an institutional-specificity scale.

Functional equivalence becomes necessary when the source expression encodes a legal or administrative function not naturally expressed by literal lexical correspondence. The corpus pair *Vazirlar Mahkamasi ... oldida javobgardir* → The Cabinet of Ministers is accountable ... to the *Oliy Majlis* and the President is a representative example. The lexical meaning of *javobgar* may suggest responsible, but accountable to is the institutional collocation that captures answerability to a superior or supervising authority. A second example is *tasdiqlash* in the title *Xalqaro shartnomani tasdiqlash to'g'risida*, translated as On ratification of an international treaty. The target term identifies the legally relevant treaty procedure rather than the general act of approval.

Contextual substitution is the dominant explanation for high-variation items. It occurs when the source lexical item is semantically broad or institutionally underspecified relative to the target-language system. Instead of treating all target forms as synonyms, corpus analysis makes it possible to identify patterns of contextual specialization. *Qaror*, *tartib*, *vakolat*, *reyestr*, *mahalla* and *hokim* are among the clearest examples. Their variation is analyzed below.

Table 2. *Operational classification of political-term translation strategies with corpus examples*

Strategy	Operational criterion	Uzbek item	English realization	Lexical-semantic interpretation
Direct translation	Stable conventional equivalent	<i>Senat</i>	Senate	High conceptual and institutional overlap
Direct translation	Stable conventional equivalent	<i>Konstitutsiya</i>	Constitution	Standard legal-political equivalent
Calque	Compositional structure replicated	<i>Qonunchilik palatasi</i>	Legislative Chamber	Transparent institutional composition
Calque	Compositional structure replicated	<i>davlat siyosati</i>	state policy	Component-wise semantic correspondence
Transcription/transliteration	Source institutional name retained	<i>Oliy Majlis</i>	Oliy Majlis	Institution-specific official borrowing
Transcription/transliteration	Local institutional designation retained	<i>hokim</i>	khokim	Preserves national administrative naming
Functional equivalent	Same legal/institutional function	<i>oldida javobgar</i>	accountable to	Institutional answerability, not literal responsibility
Functional equivalent	Target legal act matches source function	<i>xalqaro shartnomani tasdiqlash</i>	ratification of an international treaty	Legal-procedural equivalence
Contextual substitution	Equivalent selected by context	<i>qaror</i>	resolution/ decision/ order	Genre and issuing authority guide selection
Contextual substitution	Sense differentiated by context	<i>tartib</i>	procedure/ regulation/ order/rules	Procedural vs normative meanings
Contextual substitution	Institutional role determines equivalent	<i>mahalla</i>	neighborhood/ mahalla	Accessibility vs institutional specificity

Note: Examples are drawn from the aligned official corpus. The strategy label identifies the dominant translation mechanism; some cases can involve more than one process.

The strongest evidence for contextual translation comes from high-frequency source terms with several recurring English equivalents. Table 3 summarizes the most salient variant profiles. The counts are string-based observations within the aligned corpus and therefore should be interpreted as distributional evidence rather than as a complete morphological analysis. Nevertheless, the pattern is sufficiently clear to show that several central political terms are systematically context-dependent.

The Uzbek term *qaror* appears in 447 aligned segments. Among recurrent English realizations, resolution is the most frequent, followed by decision; order and decree also occur in smaller numbers. The distribution reflects document genre and issuing authority. In English institutional usage, resolution is strongly associated with formal acts adopted by collegial or deliberative bodies and is also conventional in official translations of many presidential and governmental normative acts. Decision is semantically broader and can describe both the legal instrument and the act of deciding. Order typically appears when the source context foregrounds an authoritative instruction or when *qaror* interacts with a conventional English document label. Decree is less frequent and may reflect translation overlap with *farmon* or document-title conventions. The corpus therefore argues against a dictionary entry *qaror* = decision as a sufficient translation rule.

Tartib is even more frequent, occurring in 478 aligned segments. Procedure is the dominant English realization, but regulation, order and rules are also recurrent. The lexical-semantic reason is that *tartib* spans several related concepts: a prescribed sequence of actions, an established procedure, a regulatory framework, an organizational order, and a set of rules. In phrases such as ... *tartibi*, where the source defines how an administrative action is carried out, procedure is usually appropriate. In titles of normative instruments or when *tartib* refers to a codified regulatory scheme, regulation or rules may be preferable. Where *tartib* denotes general organizational order rather than a formally codified text, neither procedure nor regulation may capture the full meaning. Contextual substitution is therefore obligatory.

Vakolat occurs in 202 segments and is rendered recurrently by powers, authority and competence. The variation corresponds to different conceptual profiles. Powers tends to refer to legally conferred capacities of an institution or office; authority can refer both to legal power and to the right to make decisions; competence is often used in international or continental legal discourse to delimit jurisdiction or subject-matter responsibility. The source term *vakolat* can activate any of these profiles. A

bilingual terminological entry must therefore distinguish “legally conferred powers,” “institutional authority,” “sphere of competence” and related collocations such as *vakolat muddati* “term of powers/term of office” rather than presenting an undifferentiated list.

Reyestr appears in 36 segments and alternates mainly between register and registry. Both forms are standard English terms, but their collocational preferences differ. Register often denotes the list or formal record itself, particularly in constructions such as Register of Professional Mediators. Registry can foreground the record-keeping system, institutional database or administrative mechanism. In actual English usage the distinction is not absolute, and institutional naming conventions frequently override general semantic tendencies. Corpus evidence is therefore useful because it shows which form is attested with a particular institution and collocational pattern.

Mahalla appears in 215 segments. The English translations contain neighborhood in 177 of those segments, retain *mahalla* in 30, and use community in a smaller number of contexts. This pattern illustrates the interaction of transliteration and contextual substitution. *Mahalla* is a culturally and institutionally specific term in Uzbekistan, but many official English texts prioritize communicative accessibility when the term refers to a geographical-social unit in crime prevention, social services or local programmes. Neighborhood is then a functional contextual substitute. When institutional identity itself is relevant, retaining *mahalla* can be preferable. A high-quality lexicographic entry should therefore include a usage note: “retain *mahalla* when referring to the named Uzbek self-governance institution; use neighborhood/community only where the context foregrounds locality or social area rather than institutional status.”

Hokim provides a similar case. The source form occurs in a broad set of administrative contexts. The corpus contains both *khokim* and governor. *Khokim* preserves the nationally specific office name and is especially frequent in official institutional naming, while governor is used in contexts that require immediate intelligibility for an international reader. Neither form is universally superior. Transliteration foregrounds legal-

institutional specificity; functional substitution foregrounds communicative accessibility. The choice should therefore be attached to document purpose and audience.

Farmoyish, although less frequent, illustrates lexical differentiation within a family of normative acts. It is rendered mainly as order, with smaller numbers of instruction and directive. The term co-occurs with *farmon* and *qaror* in sequences describing presidential acts. Because English legal-administrative systems do not map perfectly onto the Uzbek hierarchy of acts, equivalent selection must take account of the document type and not merely the dictionary meaning of the verb from which the noun is derived.

Table 3. *Contextual variation profiles of selected Uzbek political terms in the parallel corpus*

Source term	Corpus occurrences	Recurrent English realizations	Observed counts	Primary explanation
<i>qaror</i>	447	resolution; decision, order; decree	265; 118; 26; 14	Document genre and issuing authority
<i>tartib</i>	478	procedure; regulation; order; rules	315; 62; 30; 14	Procedural vs normative sense
<i>vakolat</i>	202	powers; authority; competence	60; 24; 14	Institutional/legal semantic profile
<i>reyestr</i>	36	register; registry	24; 11	Collocational and institutional convention
<i>mahalla</i>	215	neighborhood; mahalla; community	177; 30; 4	Accessibility vs culture-specific institution
<i>hokim</i>	184	khokim; governor	79; 11	Institutional preservation vs functional adaptation
<i>farmoyish</i>	21	order; instruction; directive	15; 3; 2	Type of authoritative administrative act

Note: Counts refer to recurrent string realizations in aligned English segments and do not exhaust all possible paraphrastic translations.

Not all political terminology is highly variable. The corpus contains a substantial set of stable equivalents whose distribution supports standardization. *Oliy Majlis* is retained in 134 of 136 relevant English segments. *Senat* is rendered as Senate in 81 of 84 segments, *Qonunchilik palatasi* as “Legislative Chamber” in 92 of 93 segments, and *Konstitutsiya* as “Constitution” in 93 of

95 segments. Such figures do not mean that every unmatched segment contains an incorrect translation; some instances may be embedded in longer paraphrases or affected by segmentation. Nevertheless, the concentration around a single equivalent demonstrates a stable institutional norm.

The relation between direct translation and calque is particularly interesting in multiword names. Legislative Chamber is both a literal compositional rendering and an established official English designation. From a synchronic lexicographic perspective, once such a translation is institutionalized, users may treat it as a fixed equivalent rather than consciously reproduce its components. The category calque remains analytically useful because it explains how the target form relates structurally to the source; the category direct equivalent explains its present terminological status. This illustrates why a lexicographic database should be capable of assigning more than one descriptor to an entry: etymological translation mechanism, present conventionality and institutional status need not coincide. The corpus also reveals that direct translation can be destabilized by polysemy. *Davlat xizmatlari* occurs 162 times and is translated as public services in 99 segments and state services in 52. Both are formally plausible. Yet public services is more idiomatic when the reference is to services delivered to citizens, whereas state services can be useful when the institutional provider or formal system of state-provided services is foregrounded. A bilingual dictionary that lists only one form would conceal this contextual distinction. This example further supports the need for corpus frequencies to be connected with sense labels rather than treated as simple popularity rankings.

Similarly, *ijro etuvchi hokimiyat* does not map to a single fixed English form. The corpus includes executive authorities, executive body, executive branch and executive power. The difference arises partly from grammatical context: the abstract branch of state power is naturally executive power or executive branch, whereas an individual organ is an executive body or executive authority. The Uzbek term combines an abstract institutional domain with productive nominal modification; English requires the translator to lexicalize the relevant

ontological level. This is a lexical-semantic distinction that a context-free bilingual equivalence list cannot capture.

Political terminology in official documents is not limited to nouns. Recurrent performative and deontic formulas function as semi-fixed terminological-pragmatic units. *Belgilansinki* occurs in the corpus as It is determined that and, less frequently, It is hereby determined that. *Zimmasiga yuklansin* is translated by shall be entrusted to, shall be responsible for, are responsible for and related structures. These formulas organize the legal force of the text by assigning duties, defining responsibility or establishing a normative state of affairs.

The translation of such formulas cannot be evaluated only through lexical meaning. Shall be entrusted to foregrounds the assignment of a task or supervisory responsibility, whereas shall be responsible for foregrounds accountability. In some Uzbek provisions, both meanings are simultaneously relevant; in others, one is clearly dominant. The corpus therefore provides a valuable basis for constructing a formula dictionary in which pragmatic force is explicitly recorded. This is particularly important for machine-assisted translation, because a translation-memory system may retrieve a formally similar sentence even when the responsibility relation is different.

The same principle applies to *yo'l qo'yilmaydi, tasdiqlansin, amalga oshirilsin, ta'minlansin* and other recurrent official formulas. Their English realizations should be described not as free phrase-level translations but as standardized institutional patterns linked to specific speech-act functions: prohibition, approval, implementation, obligation to ensure, delegation and control. Corpus lexicography can model these functions through pattern-based entries rather than isolated headwords.

The results have direct implications for bilingual lexicography. A conventional entry of the form *qaror* decision, resolution is too compressed to guide a translator. It does not indicate which equivalent is preferred for a presidential act, a collegial-body act, an internal administrative decision or a general reference to decision-making. A corpus-informed entry should treat the term as a structured set of senses and usage frames. The same is true of *tartib, vakolat, mahalla, hokim* and *reyestr*.

The proposed microstructure contains ten information fields: 1) Uzbek headword; 2) normalized lemma and grammatical category; 3) political/legal concept definition; 4) domain and institution label; 5) default English equivalent; 6) alternative context-conditioned equivalents; 7) dominant translation strategy; 8) collocations and grammatical patterns; 9) pragmatic or legal-force note; and 10) authentic aligned examples with source metadata. Frequency data should be displayed as supporting evidence but should not replace semantic analysis.

For *qaror*, for example, the entry could distinguish at least three contexts: a formal normative act translated as resolution in the corpus tradition; a general institutional or administrative decision translated as decision; and a directive/order context in which order may be appropriate. The entry would also include collocations such as *qaror qabul qilmoq*, *qaror ijrosi*, *qaror bilan tasdiqlamoq* and *qaror loyihasi*, because the preferred English equivalent may be partly predictable from collocation. For *mahalla*, the entry would explicitly contrast institutional retention *mahalla* with functional neighborhood, accompanied by a note on audience and institutional specificity.

Such a model also supports terminology management. Translators, editors and government agencies could query a term by institution, document genre or collocation rather than by headword alone. A translation-memory environment could prioritize approved equivalents when the context matches an established pattern and flag high-variation terms for human review. The corpus therefore becomes not only a research dataset but a continuously updatable evidence base for official terminology standardization.

Table 4. *Proposed lexicographic entry structure for context-sensitive political terminology*

Field	Purpose	Example for <i>qaror</i>	Example for <i>mahalla</i>
Headword	Canonical source form	<i>qaror</i>	<i>mahalla</i>
Core concept	Conceptual definition	formal act / decision of an authorized body	local self-governance and socio-territorial institution
Default equivalent	Most conventional target form	resolution / decision (sense-dependent)	<i>mahalla</i> or neighborhood (context-dependent)
Strategy label	Dominant translation mechanism	contextual substitution	transliteration / contextual substitution

Genre label	Document-type restriction	normative act; administrative decision	social policy; local governance; public safety
Collocations	Predictive phraseology	<i>qaror ijrosi</i> ; <i>qaror qabul qilmoq</i>	<i>mahalla raisi</i> ; <i>mahallada</i> ; <i>mahalla tizimi</i>
Pragmatic note	Institutional/legal force	identify issuing body and legal status	preserve institutional specificity when relevant
Corpus examples	Evidence and traceability	aligned official examples + source URL	aligned official examples + source URL

DISCUSSION

The findings support a contextual rather than purely equivalence-list approach to political terminology. Three broader conclusions emerge. First, lexical stability is gradient. Some terms display near one-to-one regularity, whereas others have structured but substantial variation. Second, translation strategy is partly predictable from the ontological status of the term: internationally shared institutional concepts favor direct translation; transparently compositional institutional phrases favor calque; unique national institutions favor transliteration; speech-act and legal-effect formulas favor functional equivalence; and semantically broad administrative terms favor contextual substitution. Third, even within one source term, more than one strategy can be legitimate because the communicative purpose changes.

These conclusions align with corpus-based terminology theory. Pearson's account of terms in context shows that specialized meaning can be retrieved from recurrent textual environments rather than abstracted from isolated word lists [27]. The present corpus extends this principle to bilingual political terminology: the most useful unit of lexicographic evidence is often not the isolated term but the aligned term-plus-collocation pattern. *Qaror* acquires a more specific translation profile in *qaror ijrosi*, *qaror qabul qilmoq* or *qaror bilan tasdiqlansin*; *tartib* becomes easier to translate when combined with *belgilash*, *joriy etish*, *amalga oshirish* or *nizom*.

The results also reinforce the distinction between concept equivalence and text equivalence. A target-language expression can refer to a similar concept but fail to fit the genre convention. For example, *responsible before* may be semantically

interpretable for *oldida javobgar*, yet accountable to is a more conventional English institutional collocation. Conversely, a literal term may be lexically elegant but legally misleading. Functional equivalence therefore requires knowledge of target institutional discourse, not only bilingual vocabulary. This point is consistent with Šarčević's and Cao's emphasis on legal effect and legal-system knowledge [30; 8].

The *Oliy Majlis* and *mahalla* patterns raise an important issue in political translation: when should a national institution be translated and when should its name be preserved? Internationalization does not necessarily mean domestication. *Oliy Majlis* has become a stable English-language official designation through repeated use, which makes transliteration the conventional option. *Mahalla* has a dual status. It is both a culturally specific institution and an everyday socio-territorial unit. Translating every occurrence as *mahalla* would burden international readers with an unexplained localism; translating every occurrence as neighborhood would erase institutional specificity. Corpus evidence provides a principled middle path: the distribution of existing official translations can be examined alongside the communicative function of each context.

Hokim shows a parallel tension. *Khokim* preserves the formal national office title, whereas governor activates a familiar functional concept for English readers. The choice can be linked to text type. In a legal document defining the office, transliteration may be preferable because it identifies the institution precisely. In explanatory or internationally oriented prose, governor may facilitate comprehension if the relevant scope is clear. A corpus-informed lexicographic note can present both forms and describe their appropriate environments instead of designating one as universally correct.

The variation in *qaror* also has implications for institutional standardization. The corpus contains resolution and decision as the major English forms. Some variation is motivated by context; some may reflect different translation traditions across documents. Standardization should therefore not simply force every *qaror* into one English label. A better approach is controlled differentiation: define the institutional and genre conditions under which

resolution, decision and order are approved. This requires collaboration between translators, legal experts and terminologists. Corpus frequency can identify candidate norms, but normative approval remains an institutional task.

The same principle applies to machine translation and large language models. A system trained on parallel official texts may learn that *qaror* is frequently associated with resolution, but without metadata it may not know when decision is more appropriate. Adding document type, issuing authority and collocational features to a terminology database can improve retrieval and post-editing. High-variation terms should be treated as risk items. They can be automatically flagged when a draft translation uses a form that is rare or incompatible with the surrounding institutional pattern. In this sense, corpus lexicography becomes a quality-control layer for human and machine translation rather than a static dictionary exercise.

The proposed five-strategy taxonomy is also useful pedagogically. Direct translation and calque train students to recognize stable conceptual correspondences and compositional structures. Transliteration draws attention to culture-bound institutions and official naming. Functional equivalence shifts attention from words to institutional acts. Contextual substitution teaches sense discrimination and genre awareness. When these categories are illustrated with aligned corpus evidence, translation students can move from intuition-based choice toward evidence-based reasoning.

Nevertheless, the categories should not be reified. Calque can become conventionalized and function like a direct equivalent; transliterated forms can develop English-language collocations; contextual substitutions can stabilize over time; and functional equivalents can become terminological norms. The taxonomy is therefore best treated as an analytical model of translation behavior at a given stage of institutional language development. Diachronic corpus research would be needed to trace how particular forms become standardized.

The study has several limitations. The corpus is curated from official translations, which means it represents institutional translation practice rather than the full range of English and

Uzbek political discourse. Official translations themselves may contain inconsistency, literalism or editing artifacts; corpus frequency should not be confused with prescriptive correctness. The token counts are surface counts rather than lemmatized statistics, and the present quantitative analysis focuses on selected high-frequency terms rather than automated annotation of every political term. Future work should add morphological normalization, part-of-speech tagging, automatic term extraction, collocation statistics, semantic annotation and inter-annotator validation of translation-strategy labels.

A further step should compare the official parallel corpus with a native-English comparable corpus of legislation, government strategies and institutional websites. Such comparison would reveal whether a frequent official equivalent is also idiomatic in target-language political discourse. Parallel corpora show what translators did; comparable corpora help establish whether the result fits target norms. This triangulation is particularly necessary for terms such as executive authority, state services and responsible before, where structurally plausible forms may differ in idiomaticity from conventional English institutional usage.

Finally, the corpus-lexicographic approach can contribute to Uzbek terminology policy. Political and legal vocabulary is highly visible in international communication, investment documents, diplomatic materials, multilingual government portals and AI-assisted translation. An evidence-based bilingual terminology resource would improve consistency while preserving legitimate conceptual distinctions. The key is not to maximize uniformity at all costs but to standardize at the level where the concept and context are stable, and to document variation where the concept is genuinely context-dependent.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the contextual translation of political terminology in Uzbek and English official discourse through a lexical-semantic and corpus-lexicographic analysis of 6,428 aligned segments. The evidence confirms that political terms vary substantially in their degree of translational stability. Direct

translation is appropriate for conventional shared concepts such as *Senat*/Senate and *Konstitutsiya*/Constitution. Calque is productive for transparent multiword structures such as *Qonunchilik palatasi*/Legislative Chamber. Transcription and transliteration preserve institution-specific designations such as *Oliy Majlis* and, in selected contexts, *khokim* and *mahalla*. Functional equivalents are required when the target expression must reproduce an institutional or legal function rather than lexical form, as in *oldida javobgar*/accountable to and *xalqaro shartnomani tasdiqlash*/ratification of an international treaty. Contextual substitution is essential for semantically broad terms such as *qaror*, *tartib*, *vakolat*, *reyestr*, *mahalla* and *hokim*.

The frequency profiles show that contextual variation is patterned rather than random. *Qaror* is realized primarily as resolution and decision; *tartib* as procedure, regulation, order and rules; *vakolat* as powers, authority and competence; *reyestr* as register and registry. These alternatives correspond to differences in genre, legal status, collocation and institutional reference. Therefore, a bilingual political dictionary should not present equivalence as an unstructured list. It should encode sense, institution, genre, collocation, pragmatic force, translation strategy, preferred variants and authentic corpus evidence.

The article proposes a multi-layer corpus-lexicographic microstructure capable of supporting translators, editors, terminology managers and language-technology systems. Future research should extend the corpus, introduce morphological and semantic annotation, validate the strategy taxonomy through multiple expert annotators, and compare official translations with native-English institutional corpora. Such work would provide a stronger empirical basis for the standardization of Uzbek-English political terminology while preserving contextually necessary variation.

CORPUS AND OFFICIAL SOURCES

1. National Database of Legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan (Lex.uz). Constitutional Law/Cabinet of Ministers corpus material: <https://lex.uz/ru/docs/-7172667>

2. National Database of Legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan (Lex.uz). "Uzbekistan-2030" strategy-related corpus material: <https://lex.uz/uz/docs/-6600390>
3. National Database of Legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan (Lex.uz). Small-business support corpus material: <https://lex.uz/uz/docs/-7093832>
4. National Database of Legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan (Lex.uz). International-treaty ratification corpus material: <https://lex.uz/ru/docs/-6587545>
5. National Database of Legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan (Lex.uz). Public-safety / mahalla corpus material: <https://lex.uz/docs/7330260>
6. Research parallel corpus compiled for the study: 6,428 aligned Uzbek-English political and legal segments with segment-level official source links.

REFERENCES

1. Atkins, B. T. S. & Rundell, M. 2008. *The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199277704.001.0001>.
2. Baker, M. 1993. Corpus linguistics and translation studies: Implications and applications. In M. Baker, G. Francis & E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds.), *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair* (pp. 233-250). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/z.64.15bak>.
3. Baker, M. 1995. Corpora in translation studies: An overview and some suggestions for future research. *Target*, 7/2, 223-243.
4. Baker, M. 2006. *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. Routledge.
5. Biel, L. 2014. *Lost in the Eurofog: The Textual Fit of Translated law*. Peter Lang.
6. Bowker, L. & Pearson, J. 2002. *Working with Specialized Language: A Practical Guide to Using Corpora*. Routledge.
7. Cabré, M. T. 1999. *Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications*. Ed. J. C. Sager. Trans. J. A. DeCesaris. John Benjamins.
8. Cao, D. 2007. *Translating Law*. Multilingual Matters.
9. Chilton, P. 2004. *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. Routledge.
10. Church, K. W. & Hanks, P. 1990. Word association norms, mutual information, and lexicography. *Computational Linguistics*, 16/1, 22-29.

11. Doval, I. & Sánchez Nieto, M. T. (Eds.) 2019. *Parallel Corpora for Contrastive and Translation Studies: New Resources and Applications*. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.90>.
12. Faber, P. (Ed.) 2012. *A Cognitive Linguistics View of Terminology and Specialized Language*. De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110277203>.
13. Fairclough, I. & Fairclough, N. 2012. *Political Discourse Analysis: A Method for Advanced Students*. Routledge.
14. Gagnon, C. 2010. Political translation. In Y. Gambier & L. van Doorslaer (Eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies* (pp. 252-256). Vol. 1. John Benjamins.
15. Gotti, M. 2003. *Specialized Discourse: Linguistic Features and Changing Conventions*. Peter Lang.
16. Granger, S., Lerot, J. & Petch-Tyson, S. (Eds.) 2003. *Corpus-based Approaches to Contrastive Linguistics and Translation Studies*. Rodopi.
17. Halliday, M. A. K. & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. 2014. *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 4th ed. Routledge.
18. House, J. 2015. *Translation quality assessment: Past and Present*. Routledge.
19. Kilgariff, A., Baisa, V., Bušta, J., Jakubiček, M., Kovář, V., Michelfeit, J., Rychlý, P. & Suchomel, V. 2014. *The Sketch Engine: Ten years on. Lexicography*, 1, 7-36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40607-014-0009-9>.
20. Koskinen, K. 2008. *Translating Institutions: An Ethnographic Study of EU Translation*. St. Jerome.
21. Laviosa, S. 2002. *Corpus-based Translation Studies: Theory, Findings, Applications*. Rodopi.
22. McEnery, T. & Hardie, A. 2012. *Corpus Linguistics: Method, Theory and Practice*. Cambridge University Press.
23. Mikhailov, M. & Cooper, R. 2016. *Corpus Linguistics for Translation and Contrastive Studies: A Guide for Research*. Routledge.
24. Munday, J. 2007. Translating ideology: A textual approach. *The Translator*, 13/2, 195-217.
25. Newmark, P. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. Prentice Hall.
26. Nord, C. 1997. A functional typology of translation. In A. Trosborg (Ed.), *Text Typology and Translation* (pp. 43-66). John Benjamins.
27. Pearson, J. 1998. *Terms in Context*. John Benjamins.
28. Prieto Ramos, F. 2014. Legal translation studies as interdisciplinary: Scope and evolution. *Meta*, 59/2, 260-277. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1027475ar>.

29. Sager, J. C. 1990. *A Practical Course in Terminology Processing*. John Benjamins.
30. Schäffner, C. 1997. Strategies of translating political texts. In A. Trosborg (Ed.), *Text Typology and Translation* (pp. 119-143). John Benjamins.
31. Schäffner, C. 2004. Political discourse analysis from the point of view of translation studies. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 3/1, 117-150.
32. Schäffner, C. & Bassnett, S. (Eds.) 2010. *Political Discourse, Media and Translation*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
33. Sinclair, J. 1991. *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford University Press.
34. Šarčević, S. 1997. *New Approach to Legal Translation*. Kluwer Law International.
35. Stefanowitsch, A. 2020. *Corpus linguistics: A guide to the methodology*. Language Science Press. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3735822>
36. Temmerman, R. 2000. *Towards New Ways of Terminology Description: The Sociocognitive Approach*. John Benjamins.
37. Tognini-Bonelli, E. 2001. *Corpus Linguistics at work*. John Benjamins.
38. van Dijk, T. A. 1997. What is political discourse analysis? *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 11, 11-52.
39. Venuti, L. 2017. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. 3rd ed. Routledge.
40. Zanettin, F. 2012. *Translation-driven Corpora: Corpus Resources for Descriptive and Applied Translation Studies*. St. Jerome.

BOTIROVA NILUFAR SALIMJONOVQIZI

PHD STUDENT,

UZBEKISTAN STATE WORLD LANGUAGES UNIVERSITY,

TASHKENT, UZBEKISTAN.

E-MAIL: <NILUFARABDIYEVA73@GMAIL.COM>