

**THEMATIC GROUPS OF LEGAL TERMS AND PROFESSIONALISMS  
AND THE PECULIARITIES OF THEIR SIGNIFICANCE**

**Nicoleta BAGHICI**, *University Assistant,  
Faculty of Philology,  
Alec Russo Balti State University*

**Rezumat:** *Articolul dat contribuie la elucidarea semnificației grupurilor tematice, profesionalismelor și analizarea semnificației acestor cuvinte ce nu sunt interconectate și depind unele de altele. Concretizând sensul acestui termen, adaugăm că orice grup tematic poate fi perceput ca asociere de cuvinte bazată nu pe conexiuni lexico-semantice, ci pe clasificarea obiectelor și fenomenelor în sine. Sunt aduse exemple de conexiuni la nivel de conținuturi între termeni, profesionalizme și argouri folosite în SUA și Marea Britanie în domeniul juridic.*

**Keywords:** *grupuri tematice, termeni juridici, profesionalism, argou, anglicisme și americanisme.*

For the convenience of analyzing the denotative correlation of legal terms and professionalisms, it is necessary, firstly, to find out into which thematic groups the units of each of these types of special vocabulary fall apart.

The concept of "thematic group" is traditionally defined as "a series of words that more or less closely coincide in their main (core) semantic content, i.e. by belonging to the same semantic field" [3, p.11]. Filin, concretizing the meaning of this term, adds that a thematic group can be called "associations of words based not on lexical-semantic connections, but on the classification of the objects and phenomena themselves" [6, p. 231] The meanings of these words are not interconnected and dependent on each other. The thematic group may include words of different parts of speech, nominating the concepts of one specific area of reality. The meanings of these words are not interconnected and dependent on each other. The thematic group may include words of different parts of speech, nominating the concepts of one specific area of reality.

Within the thematic vocabulary group, we distinguish lexico-semantic groups that are more closely related to each other in their meaning, which include words "having close (including opposed - antonyms) and identical meanings with different shades, differential features (synonyms)" [6, p. 239]. Each lexeme included in the lexico-semantic group, denoting an independent concept, is at the same time semantically dependent on other members of the same group. All words included in the lexico-semantic group are also united by belonging to one part of speech.

As long as the initial classifying feature for differentiating units of special vocabulary is the relation of the objects and phenomena they designate to a certain area of reality, and this does not take into account the presence or absence of their unity or closeness of meaning and does not limit their part-of-speech affiliation, then the groups of words we single out should be classified as thematic.

Substantial for this study is the consideration of the lexical meaning of terms and words, which, as you know, is close to the conceptual (significative) [5, p. 32], although the concept and lexical meaning do not coincide even from a quantitative point of view, since the same concept can be expressed in different words in the language and vice versa [5, p. 33]. In addition, the lexical meaning of a word is often connotative [5, p. 34]. The terminological meaning has no connotation. The term has a closer meaning and concept than a word, including a professional one. Often terminologists generally talk about the identity of the meaning and concept of a term.

To determine how terms relate to professionalisms, it is important to find out whether the denotative correlation of individual terms and professionalisms within each thematic group coincides.

Legal terminology is a coherent system. The denotations that name the terms can be divided into the following groups:

- 1) law enforcement agencies and their staff;
- 2) prevention of unlawful acts and criminal procedure;
- 3) unlawful acts;
- 4) subjects of unlawful acts;

- 5) lawful activities of non-lawyers subject to legal regulation;
- 6) non-lawyers involved in lawful activities subject to legal regulation;
- 7) victims;
- 8) items used in law enforcement activities;
- 9) penitentiary institutions and their realities.

The terms of each of the thematic groups are strictly organized and are in interrelationships, as they reflect the classification of subjects of legal reality.

The professionalisms we have identified do not reflect the full breadth of areas of legal specialties. Lawyers work in law enforcement agencies (courts, prosecutors, police, counterintelligence, advocacy, etc.), in correctional institutions, in legislative bodies and executive authorities. The vast majority of examples in our material refer to police vocabulary, the rest are also used by other law enforcement officers and staff of penitentiary institutions. [2]. Depending on their denotative correlation, these professionalisms are combined into the following main thematic groups:

- 1) law enforcement agencies and their staff;
- 2) prevention of unlawful acts and criminal procedure;
- 3) unlawful acts;
- 4) subjects of unlawful acts;
- 5) non-lawyers participating in legal activities subject to legal regulation;
- 6) victims;
- 7) items used in law enforcement activities;
- 8) penitentiary institutions and their realia.

Already such a comparison of terms and professionalisms shows that the system of terms and professionalisms does not completely coincide, since there are no nominees in the system of professionalisms that indicate the legitimate activities of non-lawyers. At the same time, only a certain limited circle of concepts denoted by terms receives a large number of professional names, and most of the terminating concepts do not have matches in professional vocabulary.

The wide spread of professionalisms denoting evidence and objects used in law enforcement work is explained by their material essence, which causes a large number of figurative associations that underlie the formation of most professionalisms.[1].

In thematic groups, the lexical units which denote illegal actions and subjects of illegal actions, is approximately the same relative number of terms and professionalisms; these denotata receive a fairly large number of terminological and informal colloquial designations due to their diversity and frequent use in the activities of professional lawyers.

Despite some differences between the legal systems of the United States and England, the main fund of legal terms is common to both countries, since the United States has adopted many principles, concepts and terms from English law. Mismatches of terms are observed in cases of nomination of specific concepts that reflect the national realities of only one of these legal systems, such as the nomenclature of authorities, officials and their functions, the principles of state structure, etc. According to E.S. Maksimenko, 6% of legal terms are used only in England or the USA, as they name concepts that are characteristic of only one of these cultures. Cases of different ways of terminologisation general concepts are rare and count about 1.2% of the total number of English legal terms.

It is characteristic that most of the Americanisms and Anglicism are composite, in which the core terminological element is common to the legal terminological systems of England and the USA, and the second one indicates the specifics of legal principles. [7, pp. 89-136]. Thus, one of the most significant differences between the legal systems of these countries is that Great Britain is a constitutional monarchy in its state structure, and the United States is a federal state. Therefore, with the generality of such universal terms as *case*, *arrest*, *court*, *correction*, *bench*, for both terminologies, only in American legal terminology can the terms *federal case*, *government case*, *state case*, *federal arrest*, *federal be found*, *correction*, *local correction*, *federal court*, *state court*, *federal bench*, and only in English legal terminology there are such lexical units as *Crown case*, *court for Crown Case Reserved*.

Single-word terms that are characteristic of only one of these systems are rare, for example, the lexemes *barrister*, *King*, *Queen* refer only to an English court official, king, queen, and the terms *Senate*, *Congress*, *inaugural*, *president* are associated with the nomination of specific American realia.

Some English terms were reviewed in American law and received a new semantic content that reflects the facts of American legal activity, for example, the English term *county* - "*shire*" acquired the meaning of "*state division*" in American terminology, and the English term *solicitor* - "*a lawyer who gives advice, and speaks on behalf of his clients in the lower courts*" is used in the US to mean "*one who seeks money, trade, support*". Differently equivalent terms, according to E.S. Maksimenko, make up 1.7% [4, p. 21].

Among the examples of professionalisms the majority are used both in America and in England. Some are known only in the USA and some only in England. It is also characteristic that many American professionalisms are characterized by greater territorial limitations: for example, they are used only in California (*cellie* - "*a prison cell mate*") or in the southern United States (*fur-traders* - "*those who traffic in women, esp. white slavers*"), Los Angeles (*rundown* - "*an update on a crime*") or New York (*skell* - "*a member of the New York City homeless class*"). At the same time, both professionalisms-anglicisms and professionalisms-americanisms, as a rule, are created not to nominate national realities unfamiliar in another country, but to designate concepts that are common to both England and the United States, which have received or even more not received codified names in legal terminology. As an example, the following Anglicism professionalisms can be given: *the Met* - "*the Metropolitan police*", *heaven* - "*the office of the chief constable*", *college* - "*Newgate Prison, England*", *the Moor* - "*Dartmoor Prison in Britain*"; as well as professional americanisms: *feebee* - "*FBI agent*", *state bear* - "*a state policeman operating outside the jurisdiction of the cities*", *new joint* - "*Stateville Penitentiary in Joliet, Illinois*", *Miporn* - "*Pornography in Miami*", *Hit and Run Fel-ony* - "*Hit and Run Felony Division of the Los Angeles Police Department*".

Professional nominations, known only in the USA or England, are associated with the designation of concepts common to both legal systems, i.e. for them, only the form of expression is specific, and not the internal content of these professionalisms. So, only in the UK the following professional lexemes are used: *yellow perils* - "*Traffic Police*", *nick* - "*to apprehend or arrest, usually for a small crime*", *trap* - "*to apprehend, arrest*", *queen bee* - "*a senior policewoman*", *factory* - "*a police station*". Americanisms are such professionalisms as *harness* - "*police uniform*", *squeeze, slangs* - "*handcuffs*", *clean out* - "*to search someone completely*", *trip* - "*to apprehend, arrest*", which refer to concepts that are common to both the United States and England.

Thus, judging by the dictionary definitions, most of the professionalisms-Anglicisms and Americanisms correspond to the terms used in both legal systems; but compared to the codified nominees, they tend to be more territorially limited.

Legal professionalism do not nominate all denotata marked by terms, but only the most common in law enforcement work. The significative meaning of the majority of legal professionalisms and the terms associated with them do not coincide, which proves the inconsistency of the concept, widespread among linguists, that all professionalisms are colloquial equivalents of terms. The discrepancy between the significative meaning of most professionalisms and terms is due to various criteria that serve as the basis for designating the nominated concepts of the studied types of lexical units. Legal terms refer to the objective general and specific concepts of science, and legal professionalisms more often denote specific phenomena that specialists encounter in their daily work. The formal features of the latter and the nature of the meaning indicate a high degree of their subjective perception by law enforcement officials.

Legal professionals actively use terminological elements for their education, transforming the form and / or content of terms in the process of their reception into their environment. Morphological, lexico-semantic or syntactic transformation of terms contributes to the change in the linguistic status of these units, leading to their stylistic reduction. At the same time, the most productive ways of forming professionalisms on the basis of terms are the reduction of the formal structure of the latter, the metonymic transfer and the use of the term as part of a colloquial polyverbal nominee. Professional vocabulary often includes lexemes of criminal jargon without changing their form and meaning. Jargons can be subjected to reception into terminology indirectly through the professional sphere of functioning.

Legal terms are rarely formed on the basis of professionalisms. Only isolated cases of the transition of professionalisms into terms without a change in meaning or with its change as a result of metaphor, narrowing, expanding the meaning or conversion were noted. Rare cases of migration of

professionalisms into terms indicate that their various extra- and intralinguistic characteristics, their stylistic reduction prevent the penetration of such units into the codified terminological system.

In conclusion, I should note that a special professional sublanguage - is one of the subsystems of the national language that does not have special phonetics and grammar, but is characterized by its own vocabulary, naming the concepts of science and technology, known only to representatives of certain professions.

Terms and professionalisms are characterized in modern linguistics as lexical units that have largely opposite linguistic properties.

The distinctive features of the term are the accuracy and severity of the meaning expressed in its definition, the desire for contextual immutability, the restriction of connotative meaning (the terms of socio-political sciences remain evaluative, but, like other terms, are characterized by emotional, expressive and stylistic neutrality within the sphere scientific communication).

#### **Bibliografie:**

1. DR RICHARD W. WHITECROSS, Lecturer in Law, Edinburgh Napier University, Teaching Legal Professionalism: A Comparative Study of Teaching Professional Values and Lessons for Legal Education. [citat 4.09.2022]. Disponibil [https://law\\_school.open.ac.uk/sites/lawschool.open.ac.uk/files/files/Teaching%20legal%20professionalism.pdf](https://law_school.open.ac.uk/sites/lawschool.open.ac.uk/files/files/Teaching%20legal%20professionalism.pdf) ISSN: 1476-0401
2. PODOLIUC, T., Terms And Professionalisms In Fiction. INTERTEXT 1-2, 2015 [citat 5.09.2022]. Disponibil: [https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag\\_file/Terms%20and%20professionalisms%20in%20fiction.pdf](https://ibn.idsi.md/sites/default/files/imag_file/Terms%20and%20professionalisms%20in%20fiction.pdf) ISSN 1857-3711
3. АХМАНОВА О.С., Словарь лингвистических терминов. М.: Сов. энциклопедия, 1966. 608 с. РНБ: ИБО-2, РНБ: Л1 Ш10/А-954.
4. МАКСИМЕНКО Е.С., Национально-культурная специфика отраслевых терминосистем. Автореф. дисс. канд. филол. наук. Саратов, 2002, 26
5. ПЛОТНИКОВ Б.А., Основы семасиологии. М.: Высш. шк. 1984. 233 с.
6. ФИЛИН Ф.П., Очерки по теории языкознания. М.: Наука, 1982. 336 с. ISBN В пер. (В пер.): 2 р. 30 к.!
7. ХИЖНЯК С.П., Юридическая терминология: формирование и состав. Саратов: Изд-во Саратов. ун-та, 1997. 136с.