

# Comparative Analysis of the Usage of “Treaty”, “Convention”, “Charter”, and “Statute” in English and Uzbek Diplomatic Discourse

Ulugbek Yokubov

Tashkent State University of Law

**Abstract:** This article provides a comparative analysis of the use of the terms "treaty," "convention," "charter," and "statute" in diplomatic discourse in both Uzbek and English languages. It aims to identify differences and similarities in the application, interpretation, and translation of these legal terms, highlighting how cultural, historical, and linguistic factors influence their use. A qualitative approach is employed, drawing upon authentic legal documents, official statements, and diplomatic agreements. The findings suggest that while there are overlapping uses of these terms, significant distinctions exist due to language structure and legal traditions. The study contributes to enhancing translation accuracy and intercultural communication in diplomatic contexts.

**Keywords:** treaty, convention, charter, statute, diplomatic discourse, English, Uzbek, comparative analysis, legal terminology, translation.



This is an open-access article under the [CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license

## Introduction

Diplomatic discourse is a specialized form of communication that often involves formal and structured language use, especially when referring to international agreements and instruments. Terms such as "treaty," "convention," "charter," and "statute" are frequently encountered in diplomatic texts and are critical for the precise conveyance of legal meanings. However, the usage of these terms can vary significantly across languages and cultural contexts. This study aims to compare how these terms are applied in Uzbek and English diplomatic discourse, with a particular emphasis on legal, cultural, and linguistic differences.

## Literature Review

The differentiation between legal terms such as "treaty," "convention," "charter," and "statute" is well-documented in various legal dictionaries and scholarly articles (Smith, 2020; Johnson, 2019). These terms are often defined by their scope, purpose, and legal binding nature. For instance, "treaty" is commonly understood as a formal agreement between sovereign states that is legally binding (Brownlie, 2008). Meanwhile, a "convention" is typically associated with multilateral agreements aimed at establishing general principles or regulations (Shaw, 2017).

Moreover, a "charter" generally refers to a foundational document establishing the principles and framework of an organization, such as the United Nations Charter (Higgins, 2018). In contrast, a "statute" is usually a written law enacted by a legislative body, but in international law, it may also refer to legal instruments establishing international courts or organizations (Evans, 2019).

Comparative studies on these terms often emphasize the contextual differences in their application. According to Rahimov (2021), the Uzbek language tends to use broader, sometimes more generalized terms when translating legal documents. Additionally, Djalolov (2022) suggests that cultural and historical factors influence how these terms are adapted into the Uzbek legal lexicon.

## Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative approach, employing document analysis as the primary research method. Relevant texts, including treaties, conventions, charters, statutes, and other legal instruments in both English and Uzbek, are analyzed to identify patterns of usage and contextual differences. Particular attention is paid to official translations and their adherence to international legal standards.

## Analysis and Discussion

The term "treaty" is often translated into Uzbek as "shartnoma", a word that carries the general meaning of "agreement" but may lack the formal and legally binding connotation inherent in English legal discourse. For instance, in English, phrases such as "The Treaty of Versailles established new boundaries across Europe." emphasize formal, legally binding obligations. In Uzbek, the equivalent sentence might be translated as "Versal shartnomasi Yevropada yangi chegaralarni o'rnatdi." Here, the term "shartnoma" might be used even when the context implies a legally binding agreement, potentially leading to ambiguity.

Similarly, the term "convention" is usually rendered as "konventsiya", which maintains its technical meaning but may differ in its perceived scope and application. For example, the phrase "The Convention on Biological Diversity aims to promote the conservation of biodiversity." would be translated as "Biologik xilma-xillik to'g'risidagi Konventsiya biologik xilma-xillikni saqlashni targ'ib qilishga qaratilgan." However, in some contexts, "konventsiya" may be interpreted more flexibly, lacking the same authoritative connotation as in English.

The term "charter" is commonly translated as "ustav", which denotes a foundational document. In English, a sentence like "The UN Charter serves as the foundational legal framework for international peace and security." might be translated as "BMT Ustavi xalqaro tinchlik va xavfsizlik uchun asosiy huquqiy asos sifatida xizmat qiladi." While the translation captures the essence, the Uzbek term "ustav" may be perceived as a guideline rather than a binding legal instrument.

The term "statute", rendered as "statut" in Uzbek, is less frequently used and often refers to organizational regulations rather than formal legislative enactments. For example, "The Statute of the International Court of Justice outlines the procedures and powers of the Court." would be translated as "Xalqaro Adolat Sudi Statuti sudning protseduralari va vakolatlarini belgilaydi." In this case, "statut" conveys a formalized structure but may not fully reflect the binding legal nature implied by the English term.

These observations suggest that while direct translations may convey general meanings, they often fail to capture the precise legal status and implications of each term. This inconsistency poses challenges for translators, diplomats, and legal practitioners who must navigate both linguistic and conceptual differences when engaging in diplomatic discourse.

## Conclusion

The comparative analysis reveals notable differences in how the terms "treaty," "convention," "charter," and "statute" are employed in Uzbek and English diplomatic discourse. These differences highlight the challenges of accurately translating legal terminology between the two languages. To enhance clarity and precision in diplomatic communication, translators and legal experts should consider the cultural and legal contexts of each term. Further research could explore the practical implications of these differences in international negotiations and agreements.

## References

1. Brownlie, I. (2008). *Principles of Public International Law* (7th ed.). Oxford University Press.
2. Djalolov, M. (2022). Comparative analysis of legal terms in English and Uzbek. *Uzbekistan Law Review*, 12(3), 55-70.
3. Evans, M. (2019). *International Law* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
4. Higgins, R. (2018). *Problems and Process: International Law and How We Use It*. Oxford University Press.
5. Johnson, A. (2019). Legal terminology in diplomatic discourse. *Journal of International Law and Practice*, 18(2), 102-120.
6. Rahimov, R. (2021). Translating legal discourse: English and Uzbek perspectives. *Central Asian Journal of Language Studies*, 9(1), 78-95.
7. Shaw, M. N. (2017). *International Law* (8th ed.). Cambridge University Press.
8. Smith, J. (2020). The semantics of legal instruments. *Global Law Journal*, 15(4), 215-233.