Asian Journal of Technology and Applied Sciences
ISSN: 2301-xxxx (online) | IF: 10.01 | Vol: 1, issue 1
Available: http://asiansciencejournal.org

THE FIELD STRUCTURE OF THE JUSTICE CONCEPT IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LINGUOCULTURES: A COMPARATIVE COGNITIVE-SEMANTIC STUDY

Yazdankulova Gulnigor Muzaffarovna
Samarqand davlat chet tillar instituti
Ingliz tili o'qitish metodikasi kafedrasi assistent o'qituvchisi
E-mail: yazdonkulova@icloud.com
ORCID: 0009-0004-0334-8501

Abstract: Justice represents one of the fundamental moral, philosophical, legal, and sociocultural concepts through which individuals and communities interpret fairness, rights, responsibility, equality, and appropriate social conduct. Although the idea of justice possesses considerable cross-cultural significance, its linguistic representation and conceptual organization are shaped by historically established values, communicative practices, and culturally specific systems of meaning. The comparison of English justice and Uzbek adolat is particularly relevant because these lexical units share a substantial semantic foundation while participating in partially different lexical, phraseological, and discourse networks. This study aims to examine the field structure of the JUSTICE/ADOLAT concept in English and Uzbek linguocultures, identify its nuclear, near-peripheral, and far-peripheral components, and explain similarities and differences in its cognitive-semantic and linguocultural representation.

Key words: phraseological constructions, measurements, lexicalization patterns, field of justice.

Introduction

The research adopts a qualitative comparative framework integrating cognitive semantics, componential analysis, lexical-semantic field theory, frame semantics, conceptual metaphor theory, and linguocultural interpretation. The analytical material consists of selected English and Uzbek lexical units, conventional expressions, illustrative phraseological constructions, and established conceptual relationships. A three-level model is employed to distinguish the semantic nucleus, near periphery, and far periphery of the concept. The classification is based on semantic directness, conceptual relevance, contextual dependence, and cultural associations rather than unverified frequency measurements. The analysis identifies fairness, moral correctness, legitimate treatment, and the evaluation of conduct as central elements of the shared conceptual nucleus. In English, the semantic field of justice is closely associated with fairness, law, rights, equality, equity, impartiality, and accountability. In Uzbek, adolat is connected with haqqoniylik (truthfulness or fairness), xolislik (impartiality), tenglik (equality), haq-huquq (rights), insof (conscientious fairness), and vijdon (conscience). The comparison suggests that both linguistic systems support legal, ethical, social, and evaluative interpretations, although their lexicalization patterns and culturally available associations are not fully equivalent. The findings demonstrate that the conceptual field of justice cannot be reduced to direct dictionary equivalence. Its structure emerges through interactions between lexical meaning, cultural knowledge, discourse conventions, and cognitive categorization. The proposed model provides a basis for subsequent corpus-based and psycholinguistic verification. JUSTICE/ADOLAT constitutes a multidimensional, culturally mediated conceptual field characterized by a shared semantic nucleus and partially differentiated peripheral structures. The findings contribute to

comparative cognitive linguistics, intercultural semantics, translation studies, and the investigation of moral concepts in English and Uzbek. Language serves not only as a system of communication but also as a mechanism for categorizing experience, transmitting collective knowledge, and representing socially significant values. Abstract concepts such as justice, freedom, dignity, responsibility, truth, and equality occupy a particularly important position within the linguistic worldview because they connect individual judgments with shared moral and institutional expectations. Their meanings cannot be understood solely through dictionary definitions; they also depend on culturally established practices, social relationships, historical experiences, and recurring patterns of discourse. Among these concepts, JUSTICE is especially significant because it provides a framework for evaluating human actions, distributing rights and obligations, interpreting institutional decisions, and determining what individuals or communities regard as legitimate treatment. The concept operates simultaneously within legal, philosophical, ethical, political, religious, and everyday communicative domains. Consequently, its linguistic representation is characterized by semantic complexity and contextual variability. In English, the lexical unit justice can designate fairness in human relationships, the administration of law, and, in certain institutional contexts, a judicial official. The Cambridge Dictionary distinguishes meanings associated with fair treatment, legal institutions, and judicial roles. This polysemy illustrates how the word connects an abstract moral value with concrete social institutions.

In Uzbek, the lexical unit adolat similarly expresses a normative evaluation of human behavior, social relationships, and institutional decisions. It enters into semantic relationships with such expressions as adolatli qaror (a just decision), adolatli jamiyat (a just society), adolatni tiklash (restoring justice), and adolat tamoyili (the principle of justice). The word also participates in wider associations involving conscience, truthfulness, impartiality, rights, and social responsibility. Despite this common conceptual foundation, English justice and Uzbek adolat cannot be assumed to possess identical field structures. A lexical equivalent may reproduce the central meaning of a concept without preserving all its semantic extensions, cultural associations, or pragmatic implications. For instance, the English expressions criminal justice, social justice, procedural justice, and restorative justice represent relatively specialized terminological combinations. Their Uzbek equivalents may be expressed through corresponding institutional terminology, but the conceptual relationships among the component words may differ in ordinary usage. Conversely, Uzbek expressions involving insof, vijdon, haq, and haqqoniylik introduce moral and interpersonal dimensions that may require several English lexical choices depending on context. Such differences make comparative cognitive-semantic analysis necessary. Rather than treating translation equivalence as evidence of conceptual identity, the present research examines the internal organization of each conceptual field and the relationships among its constituent units. The study is situated at the intersection of cognitive linguistics, lexical semantics, and linguoculturology. Cognitive linguistics approaches meaning as a phenomenon connected with conceptualization, categorization, embodied experience, and encyclopedic knowledge. From this perspective, lexical units do not merely refer to isolated objects or abstract definitions. They activate interconnected conceptual structures through which speakers interpret situations. The work of Lakoff and Johnson established an influential account of conceptual metaphor, demonstrating how abstract domains can be structured through patterns associated with more concrete experiences. Their approach provides a theoretical basis for examining expressions in which justice is conceptualized through balance, restoration, movement, force, or other experiential domains. Frame semantics provides another important perspective. Within a frame-based approach, a word activates a structured situation involving

participants, actions, conditions, and expectations. The concept of justice may evoke an individual claiming a right, an alleged violation, an authority responsible for evaluation, a procedure for establishing facts, and an outcome considered legitimate or fair. Recent scholarship on framing emphasizes the distinction between cognitive structures, linguistic representations, and communicative framing. This distinction is useful because the occurrence of a lexical expression does not automatically establish the complete conceptual structure of its speaker. Lexical-semantic field theory complements these approaches by treating related lexical units as members of a structured semantic network. A conceptual field may include a central zone containing highly representative units and peripheral zones containing contextually dependent or indirectly associated meanings. For the present research, the distinction between nucleus and periphery is analytical rather than absolute. Conceptual membership may change according to genre, communicative purpose, historical period, and speaker experience. A word that is peripheral in ordinary conversation may become central in legal discourse. Linguoculturology adds a further interpretive dimension by investigating the relationship between language and culturally transmitted meanings. It allows the analysis to consider not only what words denote but also which values, expectations, and social experiences are activated through their use. Together, these approaches make it possible to examine JUSTICE/ADOLAT as a multidimensional conceptual formation rather than a collection of dictionary synonyms. The principal research problem concerns the relationship between universal moral concepts and their culturally specific linguistic realization. Justice is often discussed as a value shared across societies. However, the presence of corresponding lexical units in two languages does not demonstrate that speakers organize the concept through identical categories or associations. The English and Uzbek languages provide a productive basis for investigating this problem because they belong to different linguistic families and have developed within distinct, although historically interconnected, cultural traditions. English belongs to the Germanic branch of the Indo-European language family, while Uzbek belongs to the Turkic language family. Their lexical systems, grammatical structures, and historical sources of vocabulary differ considerably. These linguistic differences do not determine moral cognition, but they influence the conventional expressions through which moral and legal concepts are communicated. A comparative study must therefore distinguish between three analytical questions:

1. Which semantic features are central to both justice and adolat?
2. Which lexical and conceptual associations occupy peripheral positions in the two languages?
3. How can differences in linguistic representation be interpreted without making unsupported generalizations about entire cultures?

The third question is especially important. A comparison of linguistic expressions cannot establish that all members of a society share the same moral priorities. Cultural interpretations must remain grounded in identifiable linguistic evidence.

The primary aim of this study is to construct a comparative cognitive-semantic model of the JUSTICE/ADOLAT concept in English and Uzbek linguocultures. The specific objectives are to identify the central semantic features of the concept; classify its nuclear and peripheral components; compare lexical-semantic relationships; examine its metaphorical and evaluative representation; describe its connections with legal and moral discourse; and establish a methodological foundation for future empirical investigation. The study addresses the following research questions:

RQ1: What semantic features constitute the conceptual nucleus of JUSTICE/ADOLAT in English and Uzbek?

Asian Journal of Technology and Applied Sciences
ISSN: 2301-xxxx (online) | IF: 10.01 | Vol: 1, issue 1
Available: http://asiansciencejournal.org

RQ2: How are the near-peripheral and far-peripheral components of the concept organized in the two languages?

RQ3: What similarities and differences can be identified in the lexical, phraseological, and culturally associated representations of justice?

RQ4: How do cognitive-semantic and frame-based approaches explain the relationship between shared conceptual content and language-specific lexicalization?

The scientific contribution of the study lies in its integrated approach to the analysis of justice as a conceptual field. Instead of considering English and Uzbek lexical units as isolated translation equivalents, the research proposes a layered model combining semantic centrality, lexical association, conceptual frames, and cultural interpretation. The study also distinguishes between direct lexical meaning and wider cultural associations, thereby reducing the risk of presenting speculative cultural interpretations as established semantic facts. Its proposed model may be applied to the comparative investigation of other moral and sociocultural concepts, including FREEDOM/ERKINLIK, TRUTH/HAQIQAT, CONSCIENCE/VIJDON, and EQUALITY/TENGLIK.

Materials And Methods

The present study employs a qualitative comparative research design based on cognitive-semantic and linguocultural analysis. The unit of analysis is the linguistic representation of the JUSTICE/ADOLAT concept rather than the individual speaker or the national culture as a homogeneous entity. The research integrates five complementary analytical procedures: lexical-semantic analysis, componential analysis, conceptual field modelling, frame-based interpretation, and comparative linguocultural analysis. The design is exploratory and interpretive. Its purpose is to develop a theoretically grounded field model that can subsequently be tested through balanced corpora, dictionary-based inventories, and associative experiments. No claim is made that the illustrative examples constitute a representative sample of contemporary English or Uzbek usage. The analytical material includes lexical units and conventional constructions associated with justice in English and Uzbek. The English material focuses on the lexeme justice and semantically related units such as fairness, equity, equality, impartiality, rights, law, legitimacy, accountability, injustice, and retribution. The Uzbek material focuses on adolat and related units including adolatli, adolatsizlik, haqqoniylik, xolislik, tenglik, haq-huquq, qonun, insof, vijdon, javobgarlik, and jazo. The analysis also considers illustrative combinations such as social justice, justice for victims, restore justice, adolatli qaror, adolatni tiklash, and adolat talab qilish. These examples are treated as lexical and semantic illustrations. They have not been extracted from a systematically sampled parallel corpus, and their relative frequencies are not evaluated. The English dictionary account of justice provides a documented point of reference for distinguishing moral and institutional senses. Uzbek expressions are interpreted through their conventional semantic relationships, with the understanding that final publication would benefit from systematic consultation of authoritative Uzbek dictionaries and a reproducible Uzbek text corpus. The proposed conceptual model consists of three interconnected levels. The nucleus contains semantic features necessary for recognizing the concept across ordinary contexts. These include fairness, justified treatment, moral appropriateness, and the evaluation of conduct according to accepted norms. The near periphery contains concepts directly associated with the implementation, interpretation, or evaluation of justice. These include rights, equality, impartiality, legal norms, responsibility, and the correction of wrongdoing. The far periphery contains wider associations that become relevant in particular cultural, ideological, religious, literary, or institutional contexts. Examples include conscience, honor, harmony, mercy, punishment, authority, and social

Asian Journal of Technology and Applied Sciences
ISSN: 2301-xxxx (online) | IF: 10.01 | Vol: 1, issue 1
Available: http://asiansciencejournal.org

solidarity. The classification is not intended to imply that every lexical unit has a permanently fixed position. Rather, it provides a model for comparing semantic relationships within a defined analytical context.

Four criteria are used to determine the proposed position of a semantic component.

Criterion	Analytical question	Interpretation
Semantic directness	Does the unit directly express fair or justified treatment?	Strong evidence of nuclear membership
Conceptual proximity	Is the unit necessary for explaining how justice operates?	Potential near-peripheral membership
Contextual dependence	Does the relationship emerge mainly in specific contexts?	Potential far-peripheral membership
Cultural association	Does the unit activate broader moral or social values?	Evidence of culturally mediated peripheral relationships

The criteria are applied qualitatively and do not produce numerical scores.

For example, fairness is closely related to the basic evaluative meaning of justice, while punishment is associated with justice only under particular normative conditions. Punishment may be unjust, excessive, or procedurally inappropriate. Therefore, punishment cannot be treated as an unconditional synonym of justice. Similarly, vijdon (conscience) is relevant to moral judgment but does not independently denote justice. Its relationship with adolat is conceptual and evaluative rather than synonymous. Componential analysis is used to identify semantic features that distinguish related lexical units.

The analysis considers such features as:

- normative evaluation;
- fairness of treatment;
- impartial decision-making;
- equality or proportionality;
- legal regulation;
- moral responsibility;
- correction of wrongdoing;
- social legitimacy.

These features help explain why justice, fairness, equality, and equity overlap without being fully interchangeable. For instance, equality concerns sameness or equivalence in specified respects, whereas justice concerns the normative justification of treatment or distribution. Equal treatment may be unjust when relevant circumstances differ, and unequal treatment may be considered just when justified by legitimate criteria. The same distinction applies to Uzbek tenglik and adolat. Their semantic relationship is close but not identical. Frame-semantic analysis is applied to the recurrent situations through which justice is conceptualized.

The following schematic elements are identified:

Frame element	Description	Illustrative realization
Claimant	Individual or group seeking justice	Victim, citizen, claimant
Norm	Principle against which conduct is evaluated	Law, fairness, moral duty

Evaluator	Individual or institution making a judgment	Judge, community, authority
Action	Conduct requiring evaluation	Decision, violation, distribution
Procedure	Means of establishing a legitimate outcome	Hearing, investigation, deliberation
Outcome	Result evaluated as just or unjust	Remedy, compensation, punishment

The frame is analytical and does not represent a claim that all six elements must appear in every use of the concept. A statement such as justice must prevail may activate a broad normative expectation without explicitly identifying a claimant, procedure, or evaluator. The comparison proceeds from semantic features to lexical representations. First, the central meanings associated with justice and adolat are identified. Second, related lexical units are classified according to the proposed three-level field model. Third, semantic relationships are examined through illustrative expressions. Fourth, the conceptual structures are compared across legal, moral, and interpersonal contexts. Finally, similarities and differences are interpreted in relation to cognitive-semantic theory. This sequence helps avoid the methodological problem of beginning with assumed national characteristics and selecting linguistic examples only to confirm them. Several limitations must be acknowledged. The research does not employ a statistically representative corpus, a controlled associative experiment, or quantitative collocation analysis. Consequently, it cannot establish the frequency, psychological salience, or population-level distribution of the identified associations. The distinction between nucleus and periphery is theoretically motivated but remains open to empirical refinement. Moreover, English and Uzbek are internally diverse linguistic communities. Regional variation, educational background, professional experience, age, and discourse setting may influence how speakers interpret justice. The results should therefore be understood as a structured qualitative interpretation rather than a definitive measurement of national conceptual systems.

Results

The comparative analysis indicates that English justice and Uzbek adolat share a substantial semantic foundation. Both concepts involve evaluating actions, decisions, and relationships according to standards of fairness, moral appropriateness, and legitimate treatment. The shared nucleus can be represented through four principal components: fairness, normativity, justified treatment, and evaluative judgment. Fairness refers to the expectation that individuals should be treated according to defensible criteria rather than arbitrary preference. Normativity concerns the principles against which conduct is evaluated. Justified treatment relates to the appropriateness of a decision or distribution, while evaluative judgment involves determining whether an action conforms to accepted standards. These components are closely interconnected. Justice cannot be fully described through fairness alone because different interpretations of fairness may depend on equality, proportionality, merit, need, rights, or procedure. Likewise, legal conformity does not necessarily guarantee justice, since a legal decision may be criticized as morally unfair. In English, the noun justice connects the moral assessment of fairness with institutional procedures. The distinction between justice as fairness and justice as the operation of a legal system is explicitly reflected in English lexicographic descriptions. In Uzbek, adolat also functions as a general evaluative concept capable of describing individual conduct, institutional decisions, and social arrangements.

For example:

Adolatli qaror qabul qilindi. — A just decision was made.

Asian Journal of Technology and Applied Sciences
ISSN: 2301-xxxx (online) | IF: 10.01 | Vol: 1, issue 1
Available: http://asiansciencejournal.org

Har bir inson adolatli munosabatga loyiq. — Every person deserves fair treatment.

Adolat jamiyat barqarorligining muhim shartidir. — Justice is an important condition of social stability.

These illustrative sentences demonstrate how adolat can operate within individual, interpersonal, and collective contexts.

The common nucleus may therefore be summarized as follows:

Comparative conceptual-field model

Nucleus

Near periphery

Far periphery

Figure 1. Proposed analytical model of the shared conceptual field. The diagram represents semantic relationships, not measured lexical frequency or psychological salience.

The model shows that the common conceptual nucleus is surrounded by additional semantic domains whose relevance depends on the communicative situation.

The nuclear structure can be examined through corresponding lexical and semantic components.

Conceptual feature	English realization	Uzbek realization
Fairness	Justice, fairness	Adolat, haqqoniylik
Impartial evaluation	Fair judgment, impartiality	Xolis baholash, xolislik
Legitimate treatment	Just treatment	Adolatli munosabat
Normative correctness	Just decision	Adolatli qaror
Opposition to wrongdoing	Injustice, unjust conduct	Adolatsizlik, adolatsiz xatti-harakat

The table demonstrates a high degree of semantic correspondence. However, the lexical relationships are not completely symmetrical.

In English, fairness frequently expresses the interpersonal and procedural dimensions of justice. It can describe a competition, a personal decision, or a distribution without necessarily invoking legal institutions. The noun justice can carry a more explicit legal or moral-institutional interpretation, although it is not restricted to those domains. In Uzbek, adolat is similarly applicable to moral and institutional evaluation. The related word haqqoniylik may emphasize truthfulness, factual accuracy, or fairness depending on context. Consequently, it cannot be translated mechanically as justice in every occurrence. The word xolislik expresses impartiality and the absence of personal bias. Although impartiality contributes to just decision-making, it is not sufficient by itself to guarantee a just outcome. Thus, the shared nucleus is best understood through semantic features rather than one-to-one lexical correspondences. The near periphery contains concepts that are strongly associated with justice but do not constitute its complete definition. Five principal domains are identified: equality, rights, impartiality, responsibility, and legal regulation. Equality is closely related to justice because unjust treatment frequently involves inappropriate distinctions between individuals. Nevertheless, justice and equality are not equivalent. A decision may distribute resources equally while failing to account for differences in need, responsibility, or relevant circumstances. Rights provide a normative framework for determining what individuals are entitled to receive or demand. In English, the expression justice for victims may involve recognition of rights, accountability, compensation, and appropriate institutional action. In Uzbek, haq-huquq similarly introduces the language of legitimate claims and entitlements. Expressions such as fuqarolarning huquqlarini himoya qilish (protecting citizens' rights) are

Asian Journal of Technology and Applied Sciences
ISSN: 2301-xxxx (online) | IF: 10.01 | Vol: 1, issue 1
Available: http://asiansciencejournal.org

conceptually connected with justice even when the word adolat is absent. Impartiality concerns the manner in which decisions are made. The English expressions impartial judgment and fair hearing correspond conceptually to Uzbek xolis qaror and xolis ko‘rib chiqish.Responsibility links justice with the consequences of human actions. English accountability and Uzbek javobgarlik can activate the expectation that individuals or institutions should answer for their conduc Legal regulation connects justice with rules, procedures, and institutions. However, the relationship is not one of identity: legality describes conformity to law, whereas justice evaluates whether an outcome or procedure is normatively defensible. These distinctions demonstrate that the near periphery contains several related but conceptually independent categories. The far periphery includes concepts whose relationship with justice is more indirect and contextually dependent. In English, such associations may include mercy, forgiveness, dignity, reconciliation, social harmony, moral courage, and public trust. In Uzbek, relevant lexical associations may include vijdon (conscience), insof (conscientious fairness or moral consideration), or-nomus (honor and dignity), mehr-oqibat (compassion and solidarity), halollik (honesty or integrity), and totuvlik (harmony). These concepts are not synonyms of adolat. Rather, they belong to wider moral and social networks in which judgments about justice may occur. For example, insof may be relevant when a speaker evaluates whether a person has behaved fairly or reasonably toward another individual. Its use can introduce an interpersonal moral dimension that may be translated into English through fairness, decency, consideration, or conscience, depending on the situation. Similarly, vijdon can function as a moral reference point in evaluating conduct. A person may be described as acting according to conscience, but conscientious action is not necessarily identical to just action. The relationship between justice and mercy is particularly important because the two concepts may support or challenge each other. Mercy can mitigate a punishment regarded as excessively harsh, but it can also be criticized if it undermines accountability or the rights of victims. Consequently, the far periphery should be represented as a network of potentially compatible and potentially conflicting values.

The analysis reveals several patterns of correspondence and differentiation.

Semantic domain	**English lexical units**	**Uzbek lexical units**	**Relationship**
Central evaluation	Justice, fairness	Adolat, haqqoniylik	Strong overlap
Equality	Equality, equal treatment	Tenglik, teng munosabat	Close correspondence
Impartiality	Impartiality, objectivity	Xolislik, betaraflik	Context-dependent overlap
Rights	Rights, entitlement	Huquq, haq-huquq	Strong institutional overlap
Responsibility	Accountability, responsibility	Javobgarlik, mas’uliyat	Related but distinct
Legal order	Law, legality	Qonun, qonuniylik	Institutional association
Conscience	Conscience	Vijdon	Broad moral correspondence
Conscientious fairness	Decency, fairness, consideration	Insof, insoflilik	Partial equivalence
Unjust	Injustice,	Adolatsizlik,	Strong overlap

Asian Journal of Technology and Applied Sciences
ISSN: 2301-xxxx (online) | IF: 10.01 | Vol: 1, issue 1
Available: http://asiansciencejournal.org

treatment	unfairness	nohaqlik	
Social harmony	Harmony, solidarity	Totuvlik, hamjihatlik	Peripheral association

A significant result is that the two languages exhibit considerable overlap in the central moral and legal domains while differing in the lexical pathways through which associated values are expressed.

The English word equity, for example, has specialized meanings in legal, administrative, and distributive contexts. Depending on usage, Uzbek translation may require adolat, tenglik, xolislik, or a more explanatory construction. Similarly, Uzbek insof does not correspond to one invariant English equivalent. It may express moral restraint, reasonable conduct, fairness, or consideration for others.

This partial equivalence illustrates why comparative conceptual research must move beyond bilingual word lists. Antonymic relationships help clarify the semantic structure of justice. The most direct English opposition is justice–injustice, corresponding to Uzbek adolat–adolatsizlik.

However, the field also contains less direct oppositions:

- fairness versus bias;
- impartiality versus favoritism;
- legitimate treatment versus arbitrary treatment;
- accountability versus impunity;
- equality versus discrimination;
- lawful procedure versus procedural abuse.

In Uzbek, comparable oppositions include xolislik–tarafkashlik, tenglik–kamsitish, and haqqoniylik–nohaqlik.

These relationships are not necessarily exact antonym pairs in all contexts. Their significance lies in identifying situations in which the normative expectations associated with justice are violated. For example, favoritism may be unjust because it substitutes personal preference for relevant criteria. However, unequal treatment is not automatically favoritism, and impartial treatment does not automatically produce equality. The semantic boundaries of justice therefore emerge through relations among several normative principles rather than through a simple binary contrast. Phraseological and collocational patterns provide additional insight into how justice is represented linguistically.

The following expressions illustrate recurring semantic possibilities in the two languages.

English expression	**Uzbek expression**	**Conceptual interpretation**
To seek justice	Adolat izlash / adolat talab qilish	Justice as an objective
To restore justice	Adolatni tiklash	Justice as a recoverable condition
To fight for justice	Adolat uchun kurashmoq	Justice as a contested value
A just decision	Adolatli qaror	Justice as a quality of judgment
Social justice	Ijtimoiy adolat	Justice as a social principle
In the name of justice	Adolat nomidan	Justice as a source of legitimacy

An unjust system	Adolatsiz tizim	Justice as institutional evaluation

The expressions demonstrate that justice can be conceptualized as an objective to be pursued, a condition to be restored, a principle to be defended, or a standard against which decisions are assessed. In both languages, verbal constructions involving seeking, restoring, defending, or demanding justice indicate that the concept is not restricted to a static moral property. Instead, justice can be represented as the outcome of human action and social transformation. The similarity between English restore justice and Uzbek adolatni tiklash is especially notable. Both expressions presuppose a desirable condition that has been disrupted and can potentially be re-established. However, the existence of parallel expressions does not demonstrate identical usage frequencies or discourse distributions. Such claims would require corpus evidence. Conceptual metaphor theory provides a framework for explaining how an abstract value such as justice can be understood through more concrete domains. The image of balance can represent proportionality, impartiality, and the weighing of competing claims. The scales of justice are a familiar symbol in legal iconography, while expressions involving balanced judgments can connect physical equilibrium with normative evaluation. In Uzbek, muvozanat (balance) may similarly be used to discuss competing interests and fair arrangements. Nevertheless, the symbolic and lexical productivity of this metaphor in Uzbek requires direct textual verification. Expressions such as seek justice, fight for justice, and adolat uchun kurashmoq conceptualize justice as a desirable objective that may require sustained effort. The metaphor highlights agency, struggle, and the possibility of overcoming obstacles. English restore justice and Uzbek adolatni tiklash present justice as a condition that can be damaged, lost, or re-established. This model is particularly relevant to discourse concerning wrongdoing, compensation, rehabilitation, and institutional reform. Expressions such as justice will prevail personify or dynamize justice as a force capable of overcoming opposing conditions. Equivalent Uzbek constructions, including adolat qaror topadi, may present justice as a state that becomes established. Although these expressions can be interpreted through metaphorical models, a distinction should be maintained between conventional metaphor, personification, and ordinary abstract predication. The proposed metaphors are therefore analytical hypotheses supported by illustrative expressions, not claims about their relative dominance in either language. The comparison also reveals that justice can activate several interconnected conceptual frames. Conceptual connections identified for qualitative comparison. The arrangement is schematic rather than a statistically estimated semantic network. The legal frame involves rules, procedures, judgments, and institutional outcomes. The moral frame involves fairness, conscience, responsibility, and the evaluation of human conduct. The social frame concerns relations among individuals and groups, including equality, discrimination, and access to resources. The rights frame emphasizes claims, entitlements, duties, and protection against violations. The restoration frame involves responding to wrongdoing and re-establishing a normatively acceptable condition. The evaluation frame concerns the criteria by which decisions and behavior are judged. These frames overlap. A single expression may activate more than one frame, and the same lexical unit may function differently according to context. The analysis supports four principal observations. First, English justice and Uzbek adolat possess a shared semantic nucleus involving fairness, justified treatment, normative evaluation, and moral appropriateness. Second, their near-peripheral fields contain strongly corresponding concepts such as rights, equality, impartiality, law, and responsibility. Third, the wider moral associations of the two concepts are not fully reducible to direct translation equivalents. Uzbek insof, for example, may require context-sensitive translation, while English equity can activate specialized distinctions not consistently represented by a single Uzbek lexical item.

Fourth, the concepts participate in similar candidate metaphorical and frame-based structures, including justice as an objective, a condition to be restored, and a principle for evaluating conduct.] The results thus support a model of substantial conceptual overlap combined with partial lexical-semantic differentiation.

Discussion

The findings contribute to the broader question of how universal moral concerns are represented in different linguistic systems. The shared nucleus of JUSTICE/ADOLAT suggests that both English and Uzbek provide linguistic resources for evaluating the legitimacy and fairness of human conduct. This is consistent with the general observation that moral and institutional concepts frequently involve common problems of cooperation, conflict, obligation, and social regulation. Nevertheless, common conceptual concerns do not imply identical semantic structures. Languages differ in the lexical distinctions they conventionally encode, the expressions they make available for particular communicative situations, and the historical associations attached to culturally important words. The comparison therefore supports a moderate interpretation of linguistic and cultural specificity. Language contributes to the organization and communication of conceptual knowledge, but lexical differences should not be interpreted as evidence that speakers of different languages possess fundamentally incompatible moral capacities. The relationship between language and conceptualization is better understood as dynamic and context-sensitive. The nuclear-peripheral approach offers several advantages for comparative research. First, it separates the essential semantic properties of a concept from related but nonessential associations. Without this distinction, a researcher might incorrectly treat law, punishment, conscience, and equality as interchangeable meanings of justice. Second, the model makes it possible to explain why a concept can remain recognizable across languages despite differences in its lexical environment. Third, it allows the field structure to be interpreted as flexible rather than fixed. For example, law may be central in a discussion of criminal justice but less prominent in an interpersonal disagreement about fair treatment. Conversely, insof may become particularly relevant in a discussion of moral responsibility between individuals. This flexibility is important because conceptual fields are activated through discourse rather than existing as unchanging lists of words. The model also raises a methodological question: how should nuclear and peripheral membership be established empirically? In future studies, the proposed classification could be tested through free-association tasks, semantic similarity judgments, dictionary definition comparisons, and corpus-based collocation analysis. If independent evidence from these methods converges, confidence in the proposed field structure would increase. One of the most important findings concerns the semantic boundaries among justice, fairness, equity, and equality. These concepts are frequently associated but should not be treated as exact synonyms. Justice is a broad normative concept concerning what is right, legitimate, or deserved in human relations and institutions. Fairness emphasizes appropriate treatment and the absence of unjustified advantage or disadvantage. Equality concerns equivalence in status, opportunity, treatment, or distribution, depending on context. Equity may involve fairness in outcomes, procedures, or resource allocation, sometimes with explicit attention to relevant differences in circumstances. The relationships among these concepts depend on the normative framework being applied. For example, distributing identical resources to individuals with different needs may satisfy a simple criterion of numerical equality while failing a needs-based interpretation of justice. Conversely, allocating different resources according to justified criteria may be consistent with justice even though the distribution is unequal. The Uzbek terms adolat, tenglik, haqqoniylik, and xolislik likewise represent overlapping but distinguishable meanings. This

finding has implications for translation. Translating equity automatically as tenglik may obscure its emphasis on fairness, while translating every occurrence of haqqoniylik as justice may overlook meanings related to truthfulness or factual accuracy. A reliable translation must therefore consider the conceptual frame activated by the source expression. The wider moral field surrounding adolat includes several lexical units that deserve particular attention. Insof is especially relevant because it can express the expectation that individuals act reasonably, fairly, and with appropriate consideration for others. Unlike a narrowly institutional understanding of justice, insof may foreground personal moral responsibility and interpersonal judgment. However, this does not mean that English lacks equivalent moral concerns. English expressions such as a sense of fairness, basic decency, good conscience, and consideration for others can communicate related evaluations. The difference concerns lexical organization rather than the presence or absence of a moral value. Similarly, Uzbek vijdon and English conscience exhibit substantial semantic overlap. Both can function as reference points for evaluating one's own conduct. Their connection with justice becomes especially relevant when speakers discuss the moral legitimacy of an action beyond its formal legality. The distinction between moral legitimacy and legal validity is important in both linguistic systems. An action may comply with a rule while being criticized as unfair. Conversely, an individual may consider an action morally justified even when it conflicts with an existing legal requirement. The JUSTICE/ADOLAT field therefore occupies an intermediate position between formal institutions and personal moral evaluation. The metaphorical analysis indicates that justice can be understood through several experiential patterns. The model JUSTICE IS A GOAL emphasizes purposeful human action. The model JUSTICE IS A RESTORABLE CONDITION highlights the possibility of correcting wrongdoing. The balance model emphasizes proportion and impartiality. These interpretations are compatible with conceptual metaphor theory, which explains how abstract domains may be structured through mappings from more concrete experience. However, metaphorical similarity should not automatically be interpreted as evidence of identical cultural meanings. Two languages may employ formally similar expressions while differing in their conventionality, emotional associations, preferred contexts, or rhetorical force. For example, English justice will prevail and Uzbek adolat qaror topadi can both express confidence in a desirable normative outcome. Yet the lexical structures are not identical, and their discourse distributions may differ. The English verb prevail can evoke overcoming opposition, whereas Uzbek qaror topmoq emphasizes establishment or becoming settled. This contrast illustrates how apparently similar statements can foreground different aspects of a conceptual event. Further investigation using authentic texts would help determine whether such differences represent stable linguistic tendencies or merely possibilities within individual expressions. The findings have practical implications for intercultural communication. Legal and political translation frequently requires precise distinctions among related normative concepts. Inaccurate equivalence can alter the intended meaning of a document or introduce ambiguity. For example, the phrase equal access to justice contains two conceptually separate elements: equality of access and the institutional or normative domain of justice. A translation must preserve both elements rather than collapsing them into a general statement about fairness. Likewise, the Uzbek expression adolatli munosabat may be translated as fair treatment in interpersonal contexts, whereas just treatment may be appropriate when the discourse emphasizes legal or moral legitimacy. The choice depends on genre, audience, and communicative purpose. The analysis also has implications for language teaching. Students may learn that justice corresponds to adolat, but this initial equivalence should be supplemented by instruction on collocations, semantic contrasts, and contextual

usage. Teaching the conceptual relationships among justice, fairness, equity, and equality may improve both comprehension and translation accuracy. Similarly, English-language explanations of Uzbek insof, haqqoniylik, and xolislik should acknowledge that a single English translation may not preserve every relevant semantic component. The present analysis demonstrates the usefulness of combining lexical-semantic field theory with cognitive and frame-based approaches. Nevertheless, a stronger empirical study would require a systematically constructed dataset. A suitable research design could combine comparable English and Uzbek corpora representing legal, journalistic, literary, and everyday discourse. The researcher could identify occurrences of justice and adolat, extract surrounding lexical contexts, and compare statistically significant collocations. Such an approach would help establish whether concepts identified in the present qualitative analysis are frequently associated in authentic language use. A second stage could employ associative experiments involving native speakers of English and Uzbek. Participants could be asked to provide words or phrases associated with justice or adolat. Responses could then be categorized according to semantic domains, response frequencies, and individual variation. A third stage could examine metaphorical expressions using explicit identification procedures. These methods would allow the proposed field model to be tested rather than merely illustrated. They would also make it possible to distinguish between lexical availability, actual discourse frequency, and psychological salience. The conclusions must be interpreted within the limits of the research design. The study does not demonstrate that English speakers prioritize legal justice more strongly than Uzbek speakers, or that Uzbek speakers prioritize interpersonal morality more strongly than English speakers. Such claims would require representative empirical evidence and careful control of discourse context. Likewise, the presence of insof in the Uzbek moral lexicon does not establish that conscientious fairness is culturally exclusive to Uzbek society. The study instead identifies differences in lexical-semantic organization that warrant further investigation. Another limitation concerns translation. English glosses of Uzbek lexical units may simplify meanings that are contextually variable. A fully developed comparative study should therefore include native-speaker judgments and multiple authentic examples for each important lexical distinction. Finally, the proposed three-level field model is a heuristic representation. It should not be treated as a direct map of cognitive structures in individual speakers without independent psycholinguistic evidence.

Conclusion

The comparative cognitive-semantic analysis of the JUSTICE/ADOLAT concept in English and Uzbek linguocultures demonstrates that justice is a multidimensional conceptual formation involving moral evaluation, legitimate treatment, rights, responsibility, and socially recognized standards of fairness. The study has established a qualitative model comprising a shared semantic nucleus and two interconnected peripheral levels. The following conclusions can be drawn. First, the conceptual nucleus of JUSTICE/ADOLAT is characterized by fairness, normative appropriateness, justified treatment, and moral evaluation. These features provide the principal foundation for semantic correspondence between English justice and Uzbek adolat. Second, the near-peripheral structure contains concepts associated with the implementation and interpretation of justice, including equality, rights, impartiality, legal regulation, and responsibility. These components are represented in both languages, although their lexical boundaries and contextual uses are not always identical. Third, the far-peripheral structure includes broader moral and sociocultural associations such as conscience, mercy, dignity, solidarity, and social harmony. Uzbek lexical units such as insof, vijdon, and haqqoniylik illustrate the importance of context-sensitive interpretation, while English

expressions involving decency, conscience, and fairness demonstrate corresponding semantic possibilities. Fourth, the analysis identifies several candidate conceptual metaphors, including JUSTICE IS A GOAL, JUSTICE IS BALANCE, and JUSTICE IS A RESTORABLE CONDITION. These models offer a framework for examining how abstract moral judgments are represented through more concrete experiences. Fifth, the comparative analysis confirms that lexical equivalence does not necessarily imply complete conceptual equivalence. English justice and Uzbek adolat share central semantic features but participate in partly differentiated networks of related meanings, discourse conventions, and cultural associations. Sixth, the integrated application of lexical-semantic field theory, cognitive semantics, frame semantics, and linguocultural interpretation provides a useful methodological framework for the comparative study of abstract moral concepts. The theoretical significance of the research lies in its treatment of justice as a structured and context-sensitive conceptual field rather than a single lexical meaning. Its practical significance concerns comparative linguistics, translation, intercultural communication, and language education. The principal limitation is the absence of a systematically sampled bilingual corpus and experimental evidence. Accordingly, the proposed distribution of nuclear and peripheral components should be regarded as a theoretically motivated model requiring further empirical validation. Future research should incorporate authentic corpus examples, collocation statistics, native-speaker association experiments, and genre-specific comparisons. Such investigations would clarify the relative salience of individual semantic components and establish the extent to which the proposed field structures reflect stable linguistic patterns. Overall, the study suggests that JUSTICE/ADOLAT possesses a substantial cross-linguistic semantic foundation while remaining sensitive to the lexical and cultural resources through which speakers conceptualize fairness, moral legitimacy, and social responsibility.

REFERENCES

1. Barsalou, L. W. (1983). Ad hoc categories. Memory & Cognition, 11, 211–227. https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03196968
2. Croft, W., & Cruse, D. A. (2004). Cognitive Linguistics. Cambridge University Press.
3. Evans, V., & Green, M. (2006). Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction. Edinburgh University Press.
4. Fillmore, C. J. (1982). Frame semantics. In Linguistics in the Morning Calm (pp. 111–137). Hanshin Publishing.
5. Geeraerts, D. (2010). Theories of Lexical Semantics. Oxford University Press.
6. Kövecses, Z. (2010). Metaphor: A Practical Introduction (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
7. Lakoff, G. (1987). Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind. University of Chicago Press.
8. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). The metaphorical structure of the human conceptual system. Cognitive Science, 4(2), 195–208. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog0402_4
9. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors We Live By. University of Chicago Press.
10. Langacker, R. W. (1987). Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Volume I: Theoretical Prerequisites. Stanford University Press.
11. Murphy, M. L. (2003). Semantic Relations and the Lexicon: Antonymy, Synonymy, and Other Paradigms. Cambridge University Press.
12. Nida, E. A. (1975). Componential Analysis of Meaning: An Introduction to Semantic Structures. Mouton.
13. Rawls, J. (1971). A Theory of Justice. Harvard University Press.

14. Rosch, E. (1975). Cognitive representations of semantic categories. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 104(3), 192–233. https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.104.3.192
15. Taylor, J. R. (2003). Linguistic Categorization (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
16. Wierzbicka, A. (1997). Understanding Cultures Through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese. Oxford University Press.
17. Cambridge University Press. (n.d.). Justice. In Cambridge Dictionary. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/justice
18. Sullivan, K. (2023). Three levels of framing. WIREs Cognitive Science. https://doi.org/10.1002/wcs.1651