



**CORPUS-BASED ANALYSIS OF THE LEXICAL-
SEMANTIC FIELD OF JUSTICE IN ENGLISH AND
UZBEK**

Yazdankulova Gulnigor Muzaffarovna

Samarqand davlat chet tillar instituti

Ingliz tili o'qitish metodikasi kafedrasida assistent

o'qituvchisi

E-mail: yazdonkulova@icloud.com

ORCID: 0009-0004-0334-8501

ARTICLE INFO:

Received: 25.10.2026

Revised: 26.10.2026

Accepted: 27.10.2026

KEY WORDS:

ABSTRACT

Justice represents a fundamental moral, legal, and sociocultural concept that plays an essential role in the linguistic conceptualization of human rights, fairness, equality, responsibility, and social relationships. Although English justice and Uzbek adolat share common semantic characteristics, their lexical associations, collocational patterns, and contextual interpretations may differ due to linguistic and cultural factors. The present study aims to investigate the lexical-semantic field of JUSTICE/ADOLAT in English and Uzbek from a corpus-linguistic perspective, identify its central and peripheral semantic components, and develop a comparative framework for examining collocations, semantic preferences, and discourse functions.

INTRODUCTION

Language reflects the ways in which individuals and communities conceptualize reality, organize experience, and communicate cultural values. Among the abstract concepts that structure human social relationships, justice occupies a particularly important position because it is closely connected with morality, legality, equality, responsibility, and the evaluation of human behavior. Justice is not restricted to the legal domain. It also functions as an ethical principle, a political ideal, an interpersonal expectation, and a criterion for evaluating social institutions. In English, the lexical unit justice may refer to fair treatment, the administration of law, or the moral legitimacy of decisions and actions. It participates in expressions such as



social justice, criminal justice, access to justice, justice for victims, and restore justice. In Uzbek, the corresponding lexical unit *adolat* appears in constructions such as *ijtimoiy adolat*, *adolatli jamiyat*, *adolatli qaror*, *adolatni tiklash*, and *adolat uchun kurashmoq*. These expressions reveal substantial semantic similarities. Nevertheless, direct translation equivalence does not necessarily indicate identical lexical-semantic organization. The English terms justice, fairness, equity, and equality represent related but distinct semantic categories. Similarly, Uzbek *adolat*, *haqqoniylik*, *xolislik*, *tenglik*, and *insof* possess overlapping but context-dependent meanings. Consequently, a comparative investigation must examine not only dictionary definitions but also the linguistic environments in which these units occur. Corpus linguistics provides an appropriate methodological framework for such research because it allows lexical meanings to be investigated through authentic textual evidence. Corpus linguistics investigates language through systematically collected bodies of spoken or written texts. Unlike approaches based exclusively on linguistic intuition, corpus analysis enables researchers to examine observable patterns of language use. Sinclair (1991) emphasized the importance of recurrent lexical patterns in the interpretation of meaning. His work contributed to the development of approaches in which words are examined through their typical linguistic environments rather than as isolated dictionary entries. Stubbs (2001) further demonstrated the importance of corpus evidence for studying lexical meaning, discourse patterns, and semantic associations. A corpus-based investigation of justice can examine several dimensions. First, frequency analysis can establish how often selected lexical units occur within a defined corpus. Second, collocational analysis can identify words that frequently occur near justice or *adolat*. Third, concordance analysis can reveal how these units function in authentic contexts. Fourth, semantic preference analysis can identify recurring semantic categories associated with a lexical item. Finally, semantic prosody analysis can investigate the evaluative tendencies associated with recurrent lexical patterns. These procedures are particularly useful when comparing abstract moral concepts because their meanings frequently depend on discourse context. The concept of a lexical-semantic field refers to a structured network of lexical units connected through shared semantic features. A lexical-semantic field is not simply a list of synonyms. It includes hierarchical relationships, semantic oppositions, associative connections, and contextual extensions. The field of justice may be organized into three analytical levels. The nucleus contains lexical units and semantic features most directly associated with justice. The near periphery includes closely related concepts such as equality, rights, impartiality, and responsibility. The far periphery contains broader moral and social associations such as conscience, dignity, reconciliation, solidarity, and social harmony. The boundaries between these levels are not necessarily fixed. For example, law may be central in criminal justice discourse but less prominent in interpersonal discussions of fairness. Similarly, Uzbek *insof* may become particularly relevant when speakers discuss reasonable behavior and moral consideration. A corpus-based approach can help determine how these relationships vary across discourse genres. Although English and Uzbek possess corresponding



lexical units for justice, their semantic networks cannot be assumed to be identical. The central research problem is whether similarities and differences in the lexical-semantic field of justice can be systematically identified through collocational patterns, contextual usage, and semantic associations. The comparison is complicated by differences in linguistic structure. English is primarily analytic, while Uzbek is an agglutinative language with extensive suffixation. For example, the Uzbek lexical family includes *adolat*, *adolatli*, and *adolatsizlik*. These forms are morphologically related but may function differently in corpus searches. A researcher who searches only for the exact form *adolat* may overlook important occurrences of related forms. Similarly, English *justice*, *just*, *unjust*, and *injustice* should not automatically be combined without a clearly defined morphological and semantic procedure. The study must therefore distinguish between the frequency of an individual word form and the distribution of a wider lexical-semantic field. The main aim of the study is to develop a comparative corpus-based framework for examining the lexical-semantic field of JUSTICE/ADOLAT in English and Uzbek. The objectives are to identify central lexical units, classify semantic relationships, examine potential collocational patterns, compare discourse functions, and establish procedures for future quantitative verification. The study addresses four research questions:

1. Which lexical units constitute the central and peripheral components of the JUSTICE/ADOLAT field?
2. What collocational patterns can be investigated in English and Uzbek corpora?
3. How do legal, moral, social, and interpersonal contexts influence the interpretation of justice?
4. How can corpus methods distinguish shared semantic features from language-specific lexicalization?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study employs a contrastive corpus-linguistic framework supported by qualitative semantic analysis. Its methodological foundation combines frequency analysis, concordance examination, collocational analysis, semantic-field modelling, and cognitive-semantic interpretation. The proposed empirical design requires comparable English and Uzbek datasets. For English, established resources include the British National Corpus and the Corpus of Contemporary American English. For Uzbek, relevant resources include available Uzbek-language corpora and electronically accessible collections of journalistic, literary, and institutional texts. Because the present manuscript does not report an extracted dataset, these resources are identified as potential research materials rather than as corpora from which numerical findings have already been obtained. The principal English search unit is *justice*. Related units include *fairness*, *equity*, *equality*, *impartiality*, *legitimacy*, *rights*, *accountability*, *injustice*, and *unfairness*. The principal Uzbek search unit is *adolat*. Related units include *adolatli*, *adolatsizlik*, *haqqoniylik*, *xolislik*, *tenglik*, *haq-huquq*, *javobgarlik*, *insof*, and *vijdon*.

The lexical inventory is organized according to semantic proximity.



Field component	English	Uzbek
Central concept	Justice	Adolat
Fair treatment	Fairness	Haqqoniylik, adolatli munosabat
Impartiality	Impartiality	Xolislik
Equality	Equality	Tenglik
Rights	Rights	Huquq, haq-huquq
Responsibility	Accountability	Javobgarlik, mas'uliyat
Moral conscience	Conscience	Vijdon
Conscientious fairness	Decency, fair-mindedness	Insof
Negative evaluation	Injustice, unfairness	Adolatsizlik, nohaqlik

The table represents a qualitative lexical inventory. It does not imply that the listed words are exact synonyms. For an empirical implementation, English and Uzbek texts should be selected according to comparable genre categories. These may include journalistic discourse, legal and administrative texts, literary prose, and public commentary. Genre comparability is important because lexical distributions can be strongly influenced by the types of texts included in a corpus. For example, legal texts may contain relatively more institutional terminology, whereas literary texts may foreground interpersonal and moral evaluation. The sampling procedure should record corpus size, publication period, genre composition, and source characteristics. Where possible, the comparison should use equivalent time periods and similar proportions of text genres. Frequency analysis measures the occurrence of a lexical unit within a corpus. Raw frequencies are not directly comparable when corpora differ in size. This procedure allows researchers to compare lexical occurrence across datasets of different sizes. However, normalized frequency alone cannot establish conceptual importance. A word may occur frequently because of the topic or genre of a corpus rather than because it occupies a psychologically central position in the conceptual field. Collocational analysis investigates lexical units that occur near a target word more frequently than expected under a specified statistical model. For English, potential combinations include social justice, criminal justice, justice system, access to justice, and justice for victims. For Uzbek, relevant combinations include ijtimoiy adolat, adolatli jamiyat, adolatli qaror, adolatni tiklash, and adolat uchun kurash. These expressions provide candidates for investigation, not measured collocation results. An empirical analysis could apply a defined context window, such as five tokens to the left and right of the target. Statistical association measures, including mutual information and log-likelihood, may then be used to evaluate collocational strength. The choice of measure should reflect the research objective. Mutual information may highlight relatively infrequent but strongly associated combinations, while other measures may be more appropriate for identifying



frequent recurrent patterns. Concordance analysis examines the target lexical unit within its immediate linguistic context. This procedure is essential for distinguishing meanings that may be difficult to identify through frequency statistics alone. For example, English justice may occur in contexts involving courts, political rights, interpersonal fairness, or moral evaluation. Uzbek adolat may similarly appear in institutional, social, and interpersonal contexts.

A concordance-based coding scheme can distinguish these semantic domains.

Semantic category	Coding criterion
Legal justice	Reference to courts, laws, legal rights, or judicial procedures
Social justice	Reference to social equality, distribution, or collective welfare
Moral justice	Evaluation of conduct according to ethical principles
Interpersonal fairness	Fair treatment within personal or professional relationships
Restorative justice	Correction of wrongdoing, compensation, or restoration

Individual concordance lines may contain more than one semantic category. A reproducible study should therefore specify whether multiple coding is permitted and how ambiguous cases are resolved. English and Uzbek require different preprocessing procedures. English corpus searches may use lemmatization to group inflected forms where appropriate. Uzbek requires careful handling of agglutinative morphology. For example, the noun *adolat* can occur with grammatical suffixes, while derived words such as *adolatli* and *adolatsizlik* belong to the same morphological family but have distinct lexical meanings. A valid analysis must specify whether the research examines exact word forms, lemmas, or derivational families. Failure to distinguish these categories may distort frequency comparisons. A reproducible corpus study should document search queries, corpus versions, inclusion and exclusion criteria, preprocessing procedures, collocation windows, and semantic coding rules. If concordance lines are manually annotated, independent coding and inter-annotator agreement should be considered. These procedures would strengthen the reliability of the proposed lexical-semantic classification.

RESULTS

The qualitative comparison identifies a shared semantic nucleus involving fairness, legitimate treatment, normative evaluation, and moral appropriateness. English justice and Uzbek *adolat* can both describe the evaluation of actions and decisions according to accepted standards of right conduct.

Illustrative examples include:

English: Justice requires impartial decision-making.

Uzbek: *Adolat xolis qaror qabul qilishni talab etadi.*



Both constructions connect justice with impartiality.

However, the words justice and adolat are not synonymous with impartiality itself. Impartiality represents one component of a broader normative evaluation. This distinction is important when constructing the lexical-semantic field. The near periphery contains concepts directly associated with the operation of justice. These include rights, equality, impartiality, responsibility, and legal regulation.

Semantic domain	English lexical units	Uzbek lexical units
Equality	Equality, equal treatment	Tenglik, teng munosabat
Rights	Rights, entitlement	Huquq, haq-huquq
Impartiality	Impartiality, objectivity	Xolislik, betaraflik
Responsibility	Responsibility, accountability	Mas'uliyat, javobgarlik
Legal regulation	Law, legality	Qonun, qonuniylik

The comparison indicates substantial semantic correspondence. Nevertheless, the relationships among the lexical units are not identical. English equity, for example, may require different Uzbek translations depending on whether the context concerns distributive fairness, legal doctrine, or institutional policy. Similarly, Uzbek haqqoniylik may refer to truthfulness or factual accuracy as well as fairness. The far periphery includes concepts associated with justice through broader moral and cultural relationships. English examples include conscience, dignity, compassion, reconciliation, and solidarity. Uzbek examples include vijdon, insof, or-nomus, mehr-oqibat, and hamjihatlik. These units do not directly denote justice but may become relevant when speakers discuss the moral legitimacy of behavior. For instance, insof can describe reasonable or conscientious conduct. The expression insof bilan ish tutmoq may be translated as to act fairly and conscientiously, depending on context. The example illustrates how an Uzbek lexical unit can activate a combination of moral and interpersonal meanings that may require more than one English word. The proposed corpus framework distinguishes several collocational categories.

Category	English candidates	Uzbek candidates
Institutional	Criminal justice, justice system	Sud adolati, odil sudlov
Social	Social justice, economic justice	Ijtimoiy adolat, iqtisodiy adolat
Evaluative	Fair decision, just outcome	Adolatli qaror, adolatli natija
Restorative	Restore justice, seek justice	Adolatni tiklash, adolat izlash
Political	Justice and equality	Adolat va tenglik

These examples demonstrate the range of semantic domains that can be investigated through corpus extraction. They do not establish which combinations are more frequent or statistically



stronger. Semantic preference refers to the tendency of a lexical unit to occur with words belonging to particular semantic categories.

For the field of justice, the following categories are relevant:

Legal-institutional preference: court, law, judge, rights, procedure.

Social-distributive preference: equality, opportunity, resources, welfare.

Moral-evaluative preference: fairness, conscience, legitimacy, responsibility.

Restorative preference: compensation, restoration, accountability, reconciliation.

These categories provide a coding framework for future corpus analysis.

The relative strength of each category cannot be established without observed concordance data. Semantic prosody concerns the evaluative associations that emerge from recurrent patterns of co-occurrence. Although justice is generally a positively evaluated concept, its discourse environments may involve negative situations such as injustice, discrimination, violence, or institutional failure. For example, the phrase demand justice often presupposes a perceived violation or unresolved grievance. Similarly, Uzbek adolat talab qilish can activate a situation in which justice is regarded as absent or insufficient. This demonstrates an important distinction between the positive evaluation of justice itself and the potentially negative situations in which justice is discussed. A corpus study could investigate whether these contexts form recurring evaluative patterns. The meaning of justice changes according to discourse context. In legal discourse, justice may emphasize rights, procedure, and legitimate institutional decisions. In political discourse, it may concern social equality, distribution, and institutional accountability. In educational discourse, justice may involve fair assessment, equal opportunity, and impartial treatment. In interpersonal discourse, justice may concern reciprocity, honesty, and reasonable behavior. These distinctions demonstrate that the lexical-semantic field is dynamic. The same lexical unit can activate different semantic components depending on the communicative situation. The qualitative results support three principal observations. First, English justice and Uzbek adolat share a substantial semantic nucleus. Second, both languages possess lexical resources for expressing legal, social, moral, and interpersonal dimensions of justice. Third, differences in lexical organization and contextual interpretation make direct word-for-word comparison insufficient. The proposed corpus framework provides a method for testing these observations through authentic linguistic evidence.

DISCUSSION

The relationship between corpus linguistics and cognitive semantics is particularly important for the investigation of abstract moral concepts. Traditional semantic analysis may identify relationships among lexical units through definitions and linguistic intuition. Corpus linguistics provides an additional empirical perspective by examining how those units occur in authentic texts. The two approaches are complementary. Cognitive semantics helps explain why lexical units belong to related conceptual domains, while corpus analysis can establish how these relationships are realized in observable language use. For example, the association between



justice and equality may be theoretically meaningful, but a corpus is needed to determine how frequently the two words occur together in particular genres. Likewise, the relationship between Uzbek adolat and insof may be culturally relevant, but authentic discourse evidence is required to establish its distribution and communicative functions. The comparison suggests that justice possesses a shared conceptual foundation in English and Uzbek. Both languages can express fairness, impartiality, rights, equality, and responsibility. However, the lexical organization of these meanings differs. English distinguishes justice, fairness, equity, and equality through overlapping semantic domains. Uzbek uses adolat, haqqoniylik, xolislik, tenglik, and insof to express related concepts. These differences should not be interpreted as evidence that speakers of the two languages possess fundamentally different moral values. Rather, they illustrate how shared concerns can be expressed through distinct lexical resources. Genre is a major factor in the interpretation of corpus evidence. A legal corpus is likely to foreground institutional meanings of justice, whereas literary discourse may provide a wider range of interpersonal and moral contexts. Therefore, differences between English and Uzbek corpora may reflect differences in genre composition rather than differences between linguistic communities. A reliable comparative study should control for this possibility. Where genre balance is impossible, results should be reported separately for each discourse category. This would allow researchers to distinguish language-related differences from genre-related effects. The morphological contrast between English and Uzbek presents an important methodological challenge. Uzbek suffixation can produce multiple grammatical forms of a lexical unit. A search restricted to one orthographic form may therefore underestimate the distribution of the target lexeme. Conversely, grouping all words sharing a root may combine semantically distinct items. For example, adolat, adolatli, and adolatsizlik belong to the same derivational family but express different meanings and grammatical functions. A corpus study must therefore establish whether it is comparing individual lexemes, morphological families, or conceptual fields. This distinction is necessary for valid cross-linguistic interpretation. The findings have practical implications for English–Uzbek translation. The English expression fair treatment may be translated as adolatli munosabat, whereas impartial assessment may require xolis baholash. The word equity may require context-specific translation rather than automatic substitution with tenglik. Similarly, Uzbek insof may be translated through fairness, decency, consideration, or conscience depending on the context. Corpus-based translation research could examine authentic parallel texts to determine which equivalents are preferred in different genres. Such evidence would be valuable for legal translation, public administration, education, and intercultural communication. A subsequent empirical study should include a defined English–Uzbek corpus dataset and a reproducible analytical procedure. The research could compare normalized frequencies of the target lexical units, identify statistically significant collocations, classify concordance lines, and examine semantic preferences across genres. The results could be presented through frequency tables, collocation networks, and comparative semantic-field



diagrams. A further stage could investigate whether corpus-derived associations correspond to native-speaker judgments. Combining corpus evidence with psycholinguistic data would provide a stronger foundation for distinguishing linguistic patterns from broader cognitive associations.

CONCLUSION

The present study has developed a comparative corpus-linguistic framework for examining the lexical-semantic field of JUSTICE/ADOLAT in English and Uzbek. The qualitative analysis identifies a shared semantic nucleus involving fairness, legitimate treatment, normative evaluation, and moral appropriateness. The near-peripheral field includes equality, rights, impartiality, responsibility, and legal regulation. The far-peripheral field contains broader moral and sociocultural associations such as conscience, dignity, solidarity, and conscientious fairness. The comparison demonstrates substantial semantic correspondence between English and Uzbek while also identifying differences in lexical organization and contextual interpretation. English justice, fairness, equity, and equality represent related but distinguishable meanings. Uzbek adolat, haqqoniylik, xolislik, tenglik, and insof similarly participate in an interconnected semantic network. The study also highlights the importance of collocation, concordance, semantic preference, and discourse genre for investigating abstract concepts. A central methodological conclusion is that conceptual similarity should not be equated with identical lexical distribution. Although English and Uzbek possess comparable resources for discussing justice, empirical corpus analysis is necessary to establish the frequency and contextual prominence of individual semantic components. The principal contribution of the research is therefore methodological and theoretical: it proposes a structured framework for future empirical comparison of the JUSTICE/ADOLAT field. Further research should employ balanced corpora, reproducible search procedures, morphological normalization, statistical collocation analysis, and independent semantic annotation. Such investigations would provide stronger evidence concerning the relationship between linguistic meaning, discourse practices, and cultural conceptualization.

REFERENCES

1. Baker, P. (2006). Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis. Continuum.
2. Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use. Cambridge University Press.
3. Church, K. W., & Hanks, P. (1990). Word association norms, mutual information, and lexicography. Computational Linguistics, 16(1), 22–29.
4. Croft, W., & Cruse, D. A. (2004). Cognitive Linguistics. Cambridge University Press.
5. Davies, M. (2008–). The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>



6. Fillmore, C. J. (1982). Frame semantics. In *Linguistics in the Morning Calm* (pp. 111–137). Hanshin Publishing.
7. Geeraerts, D. (2010). *Theories of Lexical Semantics*. Oxford University Press.
8. Hunston, S. (2002). *Corpora in Applied Linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Kilgariff, A., Rychlý, P., Smrž, P., & Tugwell, D. (2004). The Sketch Engine. In *Proceedings of EURALEX 2004* (pp. 105–116).
10. Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind*. University of Chicago Press.
11. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press.
12. McEnery, T., & Hardie, A. (2012). *Corpus Linguistics: Method, Theory and Practice*. Cambridge University Press.
13. Murphy, M. L. (2003). *Semantic Relations and the Lexicon: Antonymy, Synonymy, and Other Paradigms*. Cambridge University Press.
14. Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford University Press.
15. Stubbs, M. (2001). *Words and Phrases: Corpus Studies of Lexical Semantics*. Blackwell.
16. Taylor, J. R. (2003). *Linguistic Categorization* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
17. Wierzbicka, A. (1997). *Understanding Cultures Through Their Key Words*. Oxford University Press.

Important for publication: The article is written in IMRAD format and can be copied directly into Word. However, because the title explicitly says Corpus-Based Analysis, a journal reviewer will normally expect actual corpus extraction results, including corpus sizes, observed frequencies, collocation statistics, and authentic concordance examples. These have not been fabricated here. The manuscript should be supplemented with that evidence before submission as an original empirical article.