УДК 811.11+811.16-44

ON THE CONTRASTIVE SEMANTICS OF THE 'LAWYER' LEXEME

Mykhaylenko V. V.

Дана стаття досліджує семантичний характер певних груп, які осно-вуються на спільних рисах у споріднених мовах. Когнітивісти вбачають у них відповідні категорії. Запропонований аналіз уможливлює виокремлення семантичних класифікацій для вербалізації концептів.
Ключові слова: концепт, поле, семантичний, лексичний, юриспруденція, адво-кат, класифікація, міжкультурне мовознавство, контрастивна семантика.

Задача данной статьи исследовать семантический характер определённых групп, которые основываются на общих чертах в родственных языках. Ког-нитивисты считают такие семантические поля определёнными катего-риями. Предлагаемый анализ делает возможным выделения семантических классификаций в качестве вербализаторов концептов.
Ключевые слова: концепт, поле, семантический, лексический, юриспруден-ция, адвокат, классификация, межкультурное языкознание, контрастивная семантика.

The paper reveals the common character of various semantic groupings, based on the same features in related languages. Semantic domains are treated as categories by cognitivists. The analysis suggested gives an opportunity to map other semantic domains to represent certain concepts.
Key words: concept, domain, semantic, lexical, jurisdiction, lawyer, mapping, cross-cultural linguistics, contrastive lexical semantics.

INTRODUCTION. Contrastive linguistics is a form of comparative linguistics, related to 'comparative diachronic linguistics' and 'synchronic linguistic typology'. Traditional CL compares the learner's mother tongue with the foreign language to be learnt, current applied CL compares the learner's version of the FL (his interlanguage) with the standard target language (TL) version. Among the central concepts in CA treated are semantic primes, pragmatic functions, and basic word order [14]. At present contrastive lexical semantics is addressed from different perspectives, from the pragmatic perspective of a corpus-oriented approach as well as from the model-oriented perspective of sign theoretic linguistics, whereas the rule-governed model-oriented approach is necessarily restricted to subsets of vocabulary, the pragmatic approach aims to analyse and describe the whole vocabulary-in-use [11; 13; 14]. Comparing the use of the lexeme 'lawyer' in the English, Russian, and Ukrainian texts of "Gospel of Luke" I came across the correspondences of 'lawyer: *законник : книжник*,' for instance:

1.1. But the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected God's purpose for themselves, not having been baptized by John. Luke 7: 30.

1.2. *а фарисеи и законники отвергли волю Божию о себе, не крес-тившись от него.*

1.3. *А фарисеї та книжники спротивились волі Божій про них, що не хрестились у нього.*

2.1. And a lawyer stood up and put Him to the test, saying, "Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Luke 10:25.

2.2. *И вот, один законник встал и, искушая Его, сказал: Учитель! что мне делать, чтобы наследовать жизнь вечную?*

3.3. *І ось законник якийсь встав і, спокушуючи Його, сказав: Учителю! що мені чинити, щоб жизнь вічну осягнути?*

3.1. One of the lawyers said to Him in reply, "Teacher, when You say this, You insult us too." Luke 11:45.

3.2. *На это некто из законников сказал Ему: Учитель! говоря это, Ты и нас обижаешь.*

3.3. *Озвавшись же, один з законників говорить Йому: Учителю! се кажучи, Ти й нас ображаєш.*

4.1. But He said, "Woe to you lawyers as well! For you weigh men down with burdens hard to bear, while you yourselves will not even touch the burdens with one of your fingers. Luke 11:46.

4.2. *Но Он сказал: и вам, законникам, горе, что налагаете на людей бремена неудобоносимые, а сами и одним перстом своим не дотрагиваетесь до них.*

4.3. *А Він сказав: і вам, законникам, горе, що людей обтяжаєте вагою, яку не під силу носити, а сами і єдиним пальцем своїм не доторкаєтесь до тої ваги.*

"The Exhaustive Concordance" refers the word 'lawyer' to the common article with 'law' and its derivatives. So in the case of "lawyer (English): *законник* (Russian): *законник*(Ukrainian)" this correspondence becomes transparent and clear, where there is widening of meaning of 'the first degree'. As for "lawyer (English): *книжник* (Ukrainian)" there is widening of meaning of 'the second degree,' i.e.*закон* → *законник* (he who interprets law) → *книжник* (he who interprets law by the book).

These correspondences took me further to the English novel "The Associate" by John Grisham [7] which here is considered as a sample of 'professional' discourse and its Russian translation. The present paper is focused on the concept "lawyer" and its conceptual system in English, Ukrainian, and Russian represented by lexemes registered in the lexicographic and encyclopedic dictionaries and then verified in the original English text and its Russian translation by Ю. Г. Кирьяк [4], unfortunately, the Ukrainian translation was not available. Therefore the comparison of the English and Russian semantic domain 'lawyer' with that of Ukrainian has to be limited by the language system only.

DISCUSSION. The thesis that the meaning of lexical word must be defined as a unit of language system, while the meaning of the syntactical word must be considered as a unit of discourse [cf.; 3] is the essential for the present investigation. In use one component of the fixed complicated semantic structure of the lexical word is actualized wherein its realization is preconditioned by the author's intention, word combinability, and discourse register.

The most basic problem in any cross-linguistic analysis of meaning is the limited linguistic range of the analyst. The semantic analysis has been particularly dependent on the linguist's intuitions, and thus it is often limited to the languages in which the analyst is (nearly) native. The ethnolinguistic field studies have provided some methods for semantic investigation in unfamiliar languages, such work has mostly explored limited semantic fields (e.g., kinship systems, colour, disease).

The word meaning has been analyzed by linguists from several different perspectives. First, the meaning of a lexical word (as opposed to function word) can be specified according to the kinds of elements it combines with in various syntactic constructions: such an approach is called syntagmati*c*. Second, a word can be defined according to its relationships with other words that occur in analogous grammatical contexts: this approach is called paradigmatic. Third, the meaning of a single word can be characterized as a structured system of interrelated senses and one or more of these senses is often extended to create new meaning(s) for the same word: this last approach to lexical semantics is known as structured polysemy. In our study of lexical semantics, we will take up the second and third approaches to analyzing word meaning. As we focus on the paradigmatic approach [13], we will first consider some ways in which words can be related to each other, such as synonymy, hyponymy, and incompatibility.. As we consider lexical semantics in terms of structured polysemy, we will analyze the meaning of a given word as a network of interrelated senses. Some of these senses are more central, or basic, and others are less central, or peripheral.

The present paper is focused on the concept "lawyer" and its conceptual system in English, Russian, and Ukrainian The most numerous system is available in English due to correlation of all national variants of Global English. Notably, England, the mother of the common law jurisdictions, emerged from the Dark Ages with similar complexity in its legal professions, but then evolved by the 19th century to a single

dichotomy between 'barristers' and 'solicitors'. An equivalent dichotomy developed between 'advocates' and 'procurators' in some civil law countries, though these two types did not always monopolize the practice of law as much as 'barristers' and 'solicitor, in that they always coexisted with 'civil law notaries' [cf.: , 113]. No matter what differences they may have in the denotation their connotation must include the following components:

1. Effectivity: in order for an individual to be an effective lawyer, he/she must have certain traits and attributes in order to excel in this occupation. One important trait which lawyers should have is that of articulation. A lawyer who can articulate effectively is one who will be more likely to succeed, not only against opposition parties in the court but also to impress and put their client at ease as well. An articulate lawyer is one who will see result.

2. Intelligence: a positive attribute will ensure that the person representing the client is one who is smart enough to know what to do, when to do it and how to go about getting the results which are necessary to win the case.

3. Good comprehension: It is another favorable trait which all lawyers should have. Although one who likes to read may be a candidate for the legal profession, this in and of itself means nothing if the person reading does not comprehend that which they just read. Statutes and procedural rules are difficult to understand at times and those who have good comprehension skills may prosper at being a lawyer as they will have to read the pertinent documentation much less than those without good comprehension skills.

4. Willingness to work well with others is an additional positive trait which all lawyers should possess. Some people may think that lawyers have to be tough as nails in order to excel in the legal profession, but this is not entirely true. The saying that one catch more flies with honey than vinegar is relevant with regard to being a lawyer. Negotiations go much better when the lawyers put their best foot forward and are willing to come to an amicable solution.

5. Persuasiveness: it is an additional trait which all lawyers should possess. Since, the legal profession is based around lawyers persuading individuals to see the point of view, a lawyer must be persuasive in his/her speech and tactics.

Consequently, the given features will enable the construction of separate conceptual systems in their national world views, which will be naturally interconnected due to their common component in the system of the higher level.

In the conceptual system of "Jurisprudence" all subsystems are interconnected that enables them to change their positions or even to join the neighbouring subsystems, for instance, lawyer and jurist, law and jurisprudence, etc.

According to Cognitive linguistics there can be no boundary between 'linguistic meaning' and general conceptual structure, and therefore no boundary between 'dictionary' meaning and 'encyclopedic information'. The typical meaning of a word or a sentence is simply the part of general conceptual structure that is activated in the mind of the speaker and hearer. Words can be analyzed and described in terms of their semantic components, which usually come in pairs called semantic oppositions: The analysis of a set of related linguistic items, especially word meanings, into combinations of features in terms of which each item may be compared with every other. This view of meaning is one of the tenets of cognitive linguistics (including Word Grammar) in contrast with the more 'classical' or 'objectivist' approaches to semantics that have dominated linguistic semantics. Eleanor Rosh admits that the issues in categorization with which we are primarily concerned have to do with explaining the categories found in a culture and coded by the language of that culture at a particular point in time. When we speak of the formation of categories, we mean their formation in the culture [9, 2].

Cognitive linguistics cannot match the massive apparatus of formal logic that these approaches bring to bear on the analysis of meaning, but once again the Cognitive Assumption may be able to guide us towards somewhat more formal analyses than have been possible so far. Semantic structure is also a network, and allows detailed analyses of both compositional and lexical meaning [6].

INVESTIGATION. In the Conceptual System of Jurisprudence (Law science) we will focus on the "Legal profession concept" in our case this is "lawyer": attorney,

solicitor, barrister, juris consult, barrister at law, legal adviser, King's or Queen's counsel (K.C.), advocate (noun. person who recommends, teaches, or otherwise helps), authority, buttinski, clubhouse lawyer, judge, advocate (person supporting an idea or cause publicly)pleader, consul (representative), jurist (jurisprudent), defender, justice, legal adviser, legal expert, legal scholar, representative (a person who acts in the stead of another), councilperson, 'Dutch uncle, adviser, authority, pettifogger, confidant, consultant, counselor, expert, judge, shyster, counsel, solicitor'. All these units constitute the conceptual system of "Lawyer" which in semantics is represented by the Lexical-Semantic Domain of "Lawyer" sharing a common component in their lexical meaning: "a person whose profession is to represent clients in a court of law or to advise or act for clients in other legal matters." It is defined as a person learned in the law; as an attorney, counsel, or solicitor; any person who, for fee or reward, prosecutes or defends causes in courts of record or other judicial tribunals of the United States, or of any of the states, or whose business it is to give legal advice in relation to any cause or matter whatever [4; 8; 10].

In Ukrainian *адвокат "юрист, що захищає обвинуваченого або веде якусь справу в суді, а також дає поради з правових питань; захисник, оборонець"* Пор, : *1. адвокат – "юрист, що захищає обвинуваченого або веде якусь справу в суді, а також дає поради з правових питань; захисник, оборонець?. Захисник –" той, хто відстоює на суді інтереси обвинуваченого; оборонець." Синдик 1.– захисник у суді, адвокат. 2. У деяких сучасних країнах – представник якої-небудь установи, ... Оборонець – "той, хто відстоює інтереси обвинувачу-ваного під час судового процесу; адвокат"; юрист– "фахівець з правознавства, юридичних наук; практичний діяч у галузі права"* [1].

The Ukrainian lexical semantic domain "*адвокат*" includes the following lexemes:*"юрист, правник, іст. присяжний повірений, повірник; (у суді) оборо-нець, захисник; заступник, правознавець, оборонник рідко, речник заст., синдик (у ст. .Греції)"* [1].

In Russian *адвокат* – (лат. advocatus, from advoco 'приглашаю') *юрист, оказывающий профессиональную правовую помощь физическим и юридичес-ким лицам (посредством консультаций, представительства их интересов в суде), защиту обвиняемого* [2].

The definition of English 'lawyer' and Russian '*адвокат*' and their common origin fully stress their international and terminological character.

Now let's compare the lexical semantic domain "*адвокат*" in Russian (лат. advocatus, от advoco 'приглашаю'): *стряпчий, защитник, (присяжный, частный) поверенный, ходатай; юрист, законовед, правовед, атторней, барристер, защитник, солиситор, юрист, поверенный, устар. устар. стряпчий, присяж-ный поверенный, правовед, берущий на себя ведение тяжб и защиту подсуди-мого; частный ходатай по тяжбам.* Russian "*доверенное лицо, занимающееся ведением судебных дел, поверенный*" and English litigator have the common nucleus component. The lexeme '*атторней*', refers to the American legal system, while '*барристер*', '*солиситор*' underline their English origin [2] and adds 'American' flavor to enjoy. We must specify that the functional feature of the given word is limited by the legal domain. Scholars of all schools of language studies must 'agree in the assumption that it language use is the genuine matter for linguists [11, p. 29].

CONCLUSION AND PERSPECTIVE. There is a prevalent assumption that lexical items must be studied, first in language system, second, in use. A lexical semantic domain corresponds to what cognitive linguistics describes as a cognitive category. Categories are not universal but depend on the system of experiences, beliefs, and practices of a particular social or ethnic group [9, p. 1-25]. Different people may perceive the world around them in different ways which will automatically be reflected in different categories. Each category has a prototype, i.e. a mental representation, a cognitive reference point for that category [cf.: 12], for instance, whenever you come across the word 'lawyer' you will conjure up an image in your mind of a typical lawyer or Russian '*защитник*', c.f.: Ukrainian '*захисник*.' Contra-stive Lexical Semantics raises several issues that deserve further exploration, and it demonstrates the value of corpus investigation for lexical semantics across languages. The present paper will prove particularly valuable to those interested

contrastive semantics of the professional (legal) discourse and professional (legal) translation because of its comparative and descriptive bent. Next, we will look at basic configurations such as hierarchy and taxonomy which will enable us to express a number of relationships among words belonging to the same semantic class.

References

1. Академічний тлумачний словник української мови. В 11-и томах. Під ред.. Івана Білодіда – Київ: Наукова думка, 1970-1980.

2. Большой академический словарь русского языка. – М.: Российская Академия наук, 2012.

3. Гришэм Джон. Юрист [роман] /Джон Гришэм; пер.с англ. Ю.Г.Кирьяка. – М.: Москва, Владимир: ВКТ, 2010. – 382 с.

4. Приходько А. М. Концепти і концептосистеми в когшітивно-дискурсивній парадигмі лінгвістики / А. М. Приходько. – Запоріжжя: Прем'єр, 2008. – 332 с.

5. The American Heritage. New Dictionary of Cultural Literacy / E. D. Hirsh, J. F. Kett, J. Trefil (eds). – Boston, New York: Third Edition Houghton Mifflin Company, 2005. – 650 p.

6. Fellbaum Christiane. Co-occurrence and Antonymy / Christiane Fellbaum. – International Journal of Lexicography. – 1995. – Pp.281-303.

7. Goddard Cliff. Semantic Analysis /Cliff Goddard. - Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. – 512 p.

8. Grisham John. The Associate. John Grisham.– New York: Doubleday,2009. – 448 p.

9. Law J. (Eds). Dictionary of Law / J. Law, E. A. Martin. – Oxford: OUP, 2014. – 458 p.

10. Rosh Eleanor. Principles of Categorization. / E. Rosh // Cognition and Categorization. E. Rosh and B.Lloyd (eds) – Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1978. – Pp.1-25.

11. Weekley Ernest. An Etymological Dictionary of Modern English / Ernest Weekley. – London: John Murray, 1954. – 400 p.

12. Weigand Edda. Contrastive Lexical Semantics / Edda Weigand// Edda Weigand (edr). Contrastive Lexical Semantics. –Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing, 1998. – Pp. 25-44.

13. Wierzbicka Anna. Semantics: Primes and Universals / Anna Wierzbicka. - Oxford: OUP, 1996. – 512 p.

14. Wierzbicka A. Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction / Anna Wierzbicka. – New York: Mouton De Gruyter, 2003. – 516 p.

15. Willems D. (Eds.). Contrastive Analysis in Language. Identifying Linguistic Units of Comparison / D. Willems, B. Defrancq, T. Colleman, D. Noël. – Basingstoke, Hampshire & New York, N.Y.: Palgrave Macmillan. 2004. – 220 p.