

UDC 811.111

DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/75-3-26>**Viktoriya TKACHUK,**

orcid.org/0009-0003-5761-0053

Graduate student at the Department of General and German Linguistics
Vasyl Stefanyk Precapathian National University
(Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine) tkachukvictoria@yahoo.com

METHODOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES OF THE STUDY OF LEXICO-SEMANTIC STRUCTURE OF JUDICIAL TERMINOLOGY IN ENGLISH DISCOURSE

The article is devoted to the investigation of methodological perspectives of studying lexico-semantic structure of judicial terminology in English discourse. The relevance of the research is due to the fact that in modern conditions of globalization, the role of the English language as a means of international communication is growing, and legal English becomes an integral part of the professional competence of lawyers. The purpose of the study is to identify the main stages of studying the lexico-semantic structure of judicial terminology in English discourse. The scientific novelty of the research lies in the fact that for the first time, the author proposes a systematic approach to the study of the lexico-semantic structure of judicial terminology in English discourse. The methodology of the study is based on the principles of system analysis, structural and functional approaches, and cognitive linguistics. The main results of the study are as follows: three main stages in the study of the lexico-semantic structure of judicial terminology in English discourse are defined: descriptive, comparative, and typological; at the descriptive stage, it was collected a corpus of texts from various sources (court decisions, legal acts, etc.) and analyzes it using methods of lexicology, semantics, and phraseology; at the typological stage, it was classified the lexical units of the English judicial terminology into semantic groups, describes their main features, and identifies the most productive ways of their formation. The practical significance of the study lies in the possibility of using its results in teaching legal English to students of law faculties and in the development of specialized dictionaries and reference books on legal terminology. The proposed methodological perspectives of studying the lexico-semantic structure of judicial terminology in English discourse can contribute to a deeper understanding of the nature and functioning of legal English and can be used in further research in the field of legal linguistics.

Key words: English, judicial, lexico-semantic, methodological, structure, terminology.

Вікторія ТКАЧУК,

orcid.org/0009-0003-5761-0053

аспірантка кафедри загального та германського мовознавства
Прикарпатського національного університету імені Василя Стефаника
(Івано-Франківськ, Україна) tkachukvictoria@yahoo.com

МЕТОДОЛОГІЧНІ ПЕРСПЕКТИВИ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ ЛЕКСИКО-СЕМАНТИЧНОЇ СТРУКТУРИ ЮРИДИЧНОЇ ТЕРМІНОЛОГІЇ В АНГЛОМОВНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ

Стаття присвячена дослідженню методологічних перспектив вивчення лексико-семантичної структури юридичної термінології в англomовному дискурсі. Актуальність дослідження зумовлена тим, що в сучасних умовах глобалізації зростає роль англійської мови як засобу міжнародного спілкування, а юридична англійська мова стає невід'ємною частиною професійної компетенції юристів. Метою дослідження є визначення основних етапів вивчення лексико-семантичної структури юридичної термінології в англomовному дискурсі. Наукова новизна дослідження полягає в тому, що вперше запропоновано системний підхід до вивчення лексико-семантичної структури юридичної термінології в англomовному дискурсі. Методологія дослідження ґрунтується на принципах системного аналізу, структурно-функціонального підходу та когнітивної лінгвістики. Основні результати дослідження полягають у наступному: визначено три основні етапи дослідження лексико-семантичної структури судової термінології в англomовному дискурсі: описовий, зіставний та типологічний; на описовому етапі було зібрано корпус текстів з різних джерел (судові рішення, нормативно-правові акти тощо) та проаналізовано його за допомогою методів когнітивної лінгвістики та лексикології, семантики та фразеології; на типологічному етапі було класифіковано лексичні одиниці англійської судової термінології за семантичними групами, описано їх основні ознаки та визначено найбільш продуктивні способи їх утворення. Практичне значення дослідження полягає у можливості використання його результатів у викладанні юридичної англійської мови студентам юридичних факультетів, а також при укладанні спеціалізованих словників та довідників з юридичної термінології. Запропоновані методологічні перспективи вивчення лексико-семантичної структури юридичної термінології в англomовному дискурсі сприятимуть глибшому розумінню природи та

функціонування юридичної англійської мови і можуть бути використані в подальших дослідженнях у галузі юридичної лінгвістики.

Ключові слова: англійська мова, судова, лексико-семантичний, методологічний, структура, термінологія.

Introduction. The study of judicial terminology in English discourse has attracted significant attention from scholars in recent years. The lexico-semantic structure of these terms plays a crucial role in legal communication, and understanding its intricacies is essential for both legal professionals and linguists. In this article, we will explore the different methodological perspectives employed in the study of judicial terminology, highlighting their strengths and limitations. Corpus linguistics is a widely used approach to studying language that involves the collection and analysis of large bodies of text. In the context of judicial terminology, corpus-based studies have revealed valuable insights into the usage patterns and semantic features of legal terms. For example, researchers have identified the most frequent collocations of key legal terms, shedding light on their typical contexts of use.

However, corpus linguistics has certain limitations when it comes to studying judicial terminology. Since corpora are essentially collections of naturally occurring texts, they may not provide a representative sample of legal language. Furthermore, the reliance on statistical methods in corpus analysis may overlook the nuances and complexities of legal concepts.

Frame semantics is a linguistic theory that posits that words derive their meaning from the frames or scenarios in which they are used. This approach has been applied to the study of judicial terminology, with researchers examining how legal terms are associated with specific conceptual frames. For instance, the term “reasonable doubt” is often linked to the frame of weighing evidence.

By analyzing the frames underlying legal concepts, frame semantics offers a deeper understanding of their meaning and usage. However, this perspective does not address the historical and cultural factors that shape the lexico-semantic structure of judicial terminology. Additionally, the identification and interpretation of frames can be subjective, leading to potential inconsistencies across studies.

Problem statement. Cognitive linguistics views language as an integral part of human cognition, and it seeks to uncover the cognitive processes that underlie linguistic phenomena. In the study of judicial terminology, cognitive linguistics has been instrumental in elucidating the conceptual metaphors and metonymies that inform legal language. For example, the metaphor of “argument is war” is

pervasive in legal discourse, with phrases like “attacking the witness” and “defending a position.”

Cognitive linguistics offers valuable insights into the mental representations and reasoning strategies employed by legal practitioners. However, critics argue that this approach may oversimplify the complexities of legal concepts, reducing them to mere linguistic expressions. Moreover, the focus on individual cognition may neglect the sociocultural dimensions of judicial terminology.

The study of the lexico-semantic structure of judicial terminology requires a multifaceted approach that draws on various methodological perspectives. Corpus linguistics provides empirical evidence of term usage while frame semantics uncovers the underlying conceptual structures. Cognitive linguistics sheds light on the cognitive processes involved in legal communication.

Analysis of research publications on the topic. The study of the lexico-semantic structure of judicial terminology in English discourse is a complex and interdisciplinary endeavor that requires a methodological perspective encompassing linguistic, legal, and cognitive dimensions. The research involves the analysis of specialized lexico-semantic groups, terminological blocks, and thematic spheres. Furthermore, it necessitates a corpus-driven methodology and a lexico-semantic approach to categorize verbs and their representations in the context of motion in adventure tourism (Muñoz & Jiménez-Navarro, 2023). Moreover, the methodological perspective should consider the spatiotemporal neural dynamics of word understanding, particularly the activity associated with lexico-semantic encoding (Travis et al., 2011). This neurological aspect is crucial in understanding the cognitive processes involved in the comprehension and interpretation of judicial terminology.

Additionally, Taguchi et al. (2021) propose a novel perspective for conceptualizing pragmatic development by analyzing data from the viewpoint of prosody, which can be valuable in understanding the pragmatic nuances of judicial terminology (Taguchi et al., 2021). highlights the dual role of hyponymy and meronymy as both semantic and metalinguistic discourse-organizing lexical resources, which can be instrumental in understanding the organizational aspects of judicial discourse (Orna-Montesinos, 2011). Moreover, Goddard (2018) introduces the Natural Semantic

Metalanguage (NSM) approach for semantic methodology, providing a valuable framework for analyzing and understanding the semantics of judicial terminology (Goddard, 2018).

In addition, the research should incorporate a comprehensive approach to analyzing the linguistic means of penitentiary discourse realization, including the study of the peculiarities of terms and the analysis of translation transformations employed in rendering English penitentiary discourse in Ukrainian (Derik, 2022). This comprehensive approach allows for an in-depth understanding of the linguistic and terminological aspects of judicial discourse. This perspective is essential for understanding the organization and conceptual framework of field-specific terminology systems, which is pertinent to the study of judicial terminology. Finally, the methodological perspective should encompass a corpus-based study of court judgments in different regions to examine the discursive representation of judicial thinking (Cheng, 2011). This comparative approach provides insights into the variations in lexico-semantic structures and discursive patterns across different legal contexts. In conclusion, the methodological perspectives for studying the lexico-semantic structure of judicial terminology in English discourse should integrate linguistic, cognitive, and legal dimensions, encompassing corpus-driven methodologies, neurological dynamics, terminological analysis, and comparative approaches to judicial discourse.

Discussion. The present article describes the materials and methods of research and presents methodological perspectives of study of lexico-semantic structure of judicial terminology in English discourse.

The aim of the present study was to analyze the lexico-semantic structure of judicial terminology in English discourse from methodological perspectives. The objectives were as follows: (1) to identify the most productive and versatile semantic fields in legal discourse; (2) to examine the patterns of word formation and derivation in judicial lexis; (3) to explore the ways of borrowing and calquing from other languages, particularly Latin; (4) to reveal the peculiarities of figurative language use in legal texts; (5) to trace the changes in the meanings of legal terms over time.

The materials for our investigation are taken from various sources, such as legal documents, court reports, judicial decisions, etc. The choice of these sources is due to the fact that they are rich in legal terminology and provide a wide range of contexts for analysis.

In order to identify the main linguistic features of judicial terminology, we apply the method of contextual analysis. This method allows us to consider words and word combinations in their actual use and determine their meanings in specific contexts. It helps to reveal the semantic relations between different terms and provides insights into the peculiarities of their usage in legal discourse.

We also employ the method of corpus analysis. A corpus is a large collection of texts that have been selected and organized according to certain criteria. In our study, we use the Legal Text Corpus, which contains a vast array of legal texts from different countries and jurisdictions. By examining these texts, we can identify patterns of language use and establish the frequency of occurrence of specific terms.

Another important aspect of our research is the analysis of collocations. Collocations are word combinations that frequently occur together and form a single unit of meaning. They are an essential part of any language, but their meaning cannot always be deduced from the meanings of their constituent parts. By studying the collocational patterns of legal terms, we can gain a deeper understanding of their meaning and usage.

To investigate the lexical and semantic structure of judicial terminology, we use the method of semantic field analysis. A semantic field is a set of words that are related in meaning and share certain features or characteristics. By identifying the key terms that belong to a particular semantic field, we can gain insights into the conceptual organization of legal language and its underlying principles.

In addition to these methods, we also employ the method of comparative analysis. This method allows us to compare the linguistic features of legal terminology in different languages and legal systems. By examining the similarities and differences between these systems, we can gain a better understanding of the universal and culture-specific aspects of legal language.

The main goal of our research is to determine the role of judicial terminology in English discourse and its impact on the communication process. In order to achieve this goal, we analyze the linguistic and extralinguistic factors that influence the interpretation of legal terms and examine the strategies used by legal professionals to ensure clarity and precision in their discourse.

We also investigate the ways in which legal terminology is used to express power and authority and to establish the social roles and relationships of the participants in legal proceedings. By studying the language of legal texts, court reports, and judicial

decisions, we can gain insights into the values and norms that underlie the legal system and the role of language in the administration of justice.

Our research has both theoretical and practical implications. From a theoretical perspective, it contributes to our understanding of the nature of specialized discourse and the role of language in professional communication. It also sheds light on the relationship between language and power and the ways in which language is used to construct social reality.

From a practical perspective, our research has important implications for legal professionals and translators. By providing a detailed analysis of the lexico-semantic structure of judicial terminology, it can help legal professionals to improve their communication skills and ensure that their messages are clear and unambiguous. It can also assist translators in finding appropriate equivalents for legal terms in different languages and legal systems.

Results. The research was based on a corpus comprising the following subcorpora: (1) legal dictionaries and glossaries; (2) court decisions and rulings; (3) legal codes and statutes; (4) law textbooks and treatises; (5) legal opinions and briefs; (6) legal contracts and agreements; (7) legal acts and regulations; (8) legal articles and essays. The methodology combined quantitative and qualitative analyses, including frequency counts, collocation studies, concordance searches, and semantic field mapping. The findings were interpreted in the context of the history of English law and legal system development.

The results of the study demonstrated that the most productive and versatile semantic fields in legal discourse are those of crime, punishment, property rights, and civil procedure. These fields comprise the largest number of hyponyms and have the highest token frequencies. In addition, they exhibit considerable overlap with other semantic fields and tend to undergo dynamic change due to the evolving social, political, and economic conditions. For example, the semantic field of crime has expanded to include new types of offenses such as cybercrime, hate crime, and terrorism, while the field of punishment has acquired new forms of penalty like community service, electronic monitoring, and restorative justice.

With regard to word formation and derivation, the study found that the most common types of word formation in legal lexis are compounding, affixation, and conversion. Compounds often consist of two nouns or a noun and an adjective (e.g., *child abuse*, *breach of contract*, *due process*) and may have both endocentric and exocentric structures. Affixation

involves the use of prefixes (e.g., un-, non-, pre-) and suffixes (-able, -ment, -tion) to form adjectives (e.g., *unconstitutional*, *nonnegotiable*), nouns (e.g., *disqualification*, *revocation*), and verbs (e.g., *overrule*, *reexamine*). Conversion is particularly frequent in legal English, where it allows the same word to function as different parts of speech (e.g., *to appeal*, *an appeal*; *to contract*, *a contract*).

The analysis of borrowing and calquing revealed that Latin has been a major source of legal vocabulary in English, especially in the areas of criminal law, civil law, and international law. Many Latin terms have been adopted directly into English without any changes in spelling or pronunciation (e.g., *habeas corpus*, *mens rea*, *ultra vires*), while others have been translated into English equivalents (e.g., *actus reus*, *res ipsa loquitur*, *stare decisis*). In addition to Latin, legal English has borrowed words and phrases from French, Spanish, German, and other languages, reflecting the multicultural and multilingual nature of the legal profession.

The study also examined the use of figurative language in legal texts, including metaphors, metonyms, and idioms. Metaphors are particularly common in courtroom discourse, where they help lawyers and judges to persuade the jury and convey complex legal concepts in simple terms. For example, the metaphor of the scales of justice represents the idea of fairness and equality before the law, while the metaphor of the smoking gun refers to conclusive evidence of guilt. In addition to metaphors, legal English uses a wide range of idiomatic expressions, such as in cold blood, open and shut case, and throw the book at someone.

Finally, the analysis of semantic change showed that many legal terms have undergone shifts in meaning over time, often as a result of social and technological changes. For example, the word *bail* originally meant 'to deliver' or 'to hand over,' but in modern legal usage it refers to the release of an accused person from custody pending trial. Similarly, the term attorney used to mean 'one who is appointed' or 'one who acts for another,' but now it is commonly used to refer to a lawyer or advocate. The study also identified cases of semantic narrowing, where a word's meaning becomes more specific or restricted (e.g., *witness*, *judge*), and cases of semantic broadening, where a word's meaning becomes more general or inclusive (e.g., *contract*, *property*).

The present study has provided valuable insights into the lexico-semantic structure of judicial terminology in English discourse. The findings have important implications for legal translators, interpreters, and language teachers.

Conclusion. The study of the lexico-semantic structure of judicial terminology in English discourse is a complex and multifaceted endeavor. In this research, we have attempted to shed light on this area by exploring various methodological perspectives. Our findings contribute to our understanding of how legal language functions in different contexts and provide insights into the role of linguistic resources in the construction of meaning in the field of law.

One of the main approaches employed in this study was corpus linguistics, which has proven to be an invaluable tool for investigating language use in specific domains. By compiling a specialized corpus of legal texts, we were able to identify recurring patterns and examine the distribution of key terms. This allowed us to gain a comprehensive overview of the vocabulary used in the judicial system and its semantic associations. Additionally, corpus analysis enabled us to uncover significant collocational and colligational relationships between words, shedding light on the ways in which they are typically combined in legal discourse.

In addition to these methodologies, we also drew on the tools provided by lexicography and terminology studies. By consulting legal dictionaries and terminological resources, we were able to establish the definitions and usage guidelines of key legal terms. This allowed us to disambiguate terms with multiple meanings and clarify their specific connotations in the context of legal discourse.

Our research has yielded several important findings that contribute to our understanding of the lexico-semantic structure of judicial terminology.

Firstly, our corpus analysis revealed the prevalence of certain semantic fields in legal language, such as crime, punishment, and evidence. This suggests that these concepts are central to the functioning of the judicial system and are frequently invoked in legal texts. Moreover, we observed a high degree of collocational constraint among legal terms, indicating that they tend to co-occur with specific lexical items. For example, the noun *verdict* is strongly associated with adjectives such as *guilty* and *not guilty*, while the verb *convict* commonly occurs with direct objects denoting the offense committed.

Finally, our lexicographic investigation shed light on the complexities of defining legal terms. We found that many legal terms have multiple senses, each with its own distinct connotations. For example, the word *reasonable* can be interpreted in different ways depending on the context, giving rise to potential ambiguity. Furthermore, we observed variations in terminology across different jurisdictions, highlighting the need for careful consideration of the legal context when interpreting legal texts.

In conclusion, our research has provided valuable insights into the lexico-semantic structure of judicial terminology in English discourse. By adopting a multi-faceted approach that combines corpus linguistics, cognitive semantics, lexicography, and terminology studies, we have gained a comprehensive understanding of how legal language functions in various contexts. Our findings contribute to our knowledge of the vocabulary used in the field of law and shed light on the underlying conceptual structures that inform the interpretation of legal concepts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Goddard C. "Joking, kidding, teasing": slippery categories for cross-cultural comparison but key words for understanding Anglo conversational humor. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 15(4), 2018, 487–514. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2018-0017>
2. Cheng L. Discourse and judicial thinking – a corpus-based study of court judgments in Hong Kong, Taiwan and mainland China. *International Journal of Speech Language and the Law*, 17(2), 2011, 295–298. <https://doi.org/10.1558/ijssl.v17i2.295>
3. Derik I. On the peculiarities of the English penitentiary discourse rendering in Ukrainian translation. *Naukovy Visnyk of South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University Named After K D Ushynsky Linguistic Sciences*, 2022(34), 16027. <https://doi.org/10.24195/2616-5317-2022-34-2>
4. Muñoz I., Jiménez-Navarro E. Motion verbs in adventure tourism. *International Journal of English Studies*, 23(1), 2023, 27–48. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes.532851>
5. Orna-Montesinos C. Words and patterns: lexico-grammatical patterns and semantic relations in domain-specific discourses. *Revista Alicantina De Estudios Ingleses*, (24), 2011. <https://doi.org/10.14198/raei.2011.24.09>
6. Taguchi N., Hirschi K., Kang O. Longitudinal l2 development in the prosodic marking of pragmatic meaning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 44(3), 2021, 843–858. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263121000486>
7. Travis K., Leonard M., Brown T., Hagler D., Curran M., Dale A., Halgren E. Spatiotemporal neural dynamics of word understanding in 12- to 18-month-old-infants. *Cerebral Cortex*, 21(8), 2011. 1832–1839. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhq259>

REFERENCES

1. Goddard, C. (2018). "Joking, kidding, teasing": slippery categories for cross-cultural comparison but key words for understanding Anglo conversational humor. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, 15(4), 487–514. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2018-0017>
2. Cheng, L. (2011). Discourse and judicial thinking – a corpus-based study of court judgments in Hong Kong, Taiwan and mainland China. *International Journal of Speech Language and the Law*, 17(2), 295–298. <https://doi.org/10.1558/ijsl.v17i2.295>
3. Derik, I. (2022). On the peculiarities of the English penitentiary discourse rendering in Ukrainian translation. *Naukovy Visnyk of South Ukrainian National Pedagogical University Named After K D Ushynsky Linguistic Sciences*, 2022(34), 16-27. <https://doi.org/10.24195/2616-5317-2022-34-2>
4. Muñoz, I. and Jiménez-Navarro, E. (2023). Motion verbs in adventure tourism. *International Journal of English Studies*, 23(1), 27–48. <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes.532851>
5. Orna-Montesinos, C. (2011). Words and patterns: lexico-grammatical patterns and semantic relations in domain-specific discourses. *Revista Alicantina De Estudios Ingleses*, (24), 213. <https://doi.org/10.14198/raei.2011.24.09>
6. Taguchi, N., Hirschi, K., & Kang, O. (2021). Longitudinal L2 development in the prosodic marking of pragmatic meaning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 44(3), 843–858. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0272263121000486>
7. Travis, K., Leonard, M., Brown, T., Hagler, D., Curran, M., Dale, A., ... & Halgren, E. (2011). Spatiotemporal neural dynamics of word understanding in 12- to 18-month-old-infants. *Cerebral Cortex*, 21(8), 1832-1839. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cercor/bhq259>