
**STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC STRUCTURE
OF INTERNATIONAL LEGAL TERMS.
PROBLEMS OF MORPHOLOGY AND TRANSLATION**

Kosenko A. V., Slobodian N. V., Shayner H. I.
DOI <https://doi.org/10.30525/978-9934-26-619-5-8>

INTRODUCTION

Terminological vocabulary is an important part of the dictionary of any modern language and accumulates the result of the intellectual development of its speakers in a certain field of science. The conceptualization of legal knowledge is represented by legal (legal) terminology, which is a system of words or word combinations related to the concepts of jurisprudence, used to denote legal phenomena. At the present stage, the term as the main unit of research is considered as a relatively expressively neutral linguistic sign (word or word combination), which performs the function of reflecting a special concept of the professional sphere in the language system (S. Vilchynsky, T. Kyvak). The meaning of a term is a complex ordered structure that is revealed by dictionary definitions through semantic components, which, depending on the importance in distinguishing objects, are divided into integrative (common) and differential (those that perform a distinguishing function). A legal term belongs to the terminological system of a certain branch of law, it is characterized by general-structural and narrow-system determinism, cognitive saturation, semantic-relational and semantic-correlational specificity, and explicit or implicit definiteness, which clearly limits the meaning of the term. The peculiarity of the functional load of a legal term lies in its conceptual-modeling function as a key one in legal discourse.

Translation of international legal terminology (*acquis communautaire*) is the dominant element of legal communication. Without it, it is impossible to imagine the functioning of multilingual institutions, in particular the European Union, NATO, the UN and the dissemination of international law. The translation of legislative acts provides information to different language communities, communication between specialists and serves as a means of

interlingual harmonization, which contributes to the integration of individual states into a single international legal space. Law and its institutions have been the object of research by lawyers, philosophers, political scientists, historians and anthropologists, but legal translation emerged as a new direction of scientific research of an interdisciplinary nature only in the late 90s of the 20th century. The problems of translating international legal terminology have been the subject of research by many foreign and some Ukrainian researchers, in particular D. Tsao, E. Wiesmann, P. Sandrini, S. Sarchevich, D. Madsen, V. Weisflog, A. Kjaer, I. Simonnes, P. Barteloot, J. de Groot, R. Arntz, R. Stolze; V. Karaban, O. Chablii, I. Sojko and others, however, the theoretical foundations of translating legal terminology as a division of translation studies have not been sufficiently covered, especially in Ukrainian areas.

In this aspect, it is advisable to pay attention to the main methods, techniques and strategies of translating international legal terminology. At the same time, the interlingual comparison of lexical units during translation is aimed at establishing the features of the linguistic conceptualization of knowledge and ideas of a person about the world around him, identifying the nationally specific and similar in the legal systems of the compared languages.

The theoretical space in which the study of the translation of international legal terminology is carried out is outlined by the issues belonging to the sphere of lexical semantics, since one of the urgent problems of modern science is the nature of establishing the conceptual side of a word and the nature of the process of reflecting cognitive content in a linguistic unit. In the field of terminology, the attention of modern scientists is attracted by the problems of organizing terminology and their comparison in different languages.

The pace of development of society, all branches of modern life require the improvement of legal vocabulary, capable of reflecting the essence of new concepts, the emergence of which is associated with the further segmentation of the world around a person. Analysis of scientific research on industry terminological systems confirms that the problems of terminology remain one of the leading in linguistics and translation studies. The focus of researchers' attention is on terminological systems of different scientific fields, as a rule, on the material of one language. In particular, English banking terms (J. Graham, H. Zerwes), automotive terms (G. Vogel), Ukrainian medical terms (N. Misnyk), Ukrainian metallurgical terms (N. Kytarova), English education terms (N. Stefanova), English marketing terms (O. Gutryyak) were studied. There are significantly fewer studies on translation studies (T. Panko, L. Rogach, S. Kryshthal), therefore, industry terminologies, in particular legal ones, remain insufficiently developed.

Modern legal terminology is a large and extremely important fragment of the literary dictionary of any language and, as a set of nominations of legal phenomena and concepts, functions in the linguistic and legal spheres of legislation. During the formation of unified legal standards that meet modern needs, the national legal terminology system is being organized, standardized and restructured. In this regard, the study of the regularities of the formation of legal terminology, its structure, and development prospects has become one of the most important tasks of modern science. It should be noted that legal terminology is usually considered in the context of legal linguistics (from the French *linguistique* – linguistics, from the Latin *lingua* – language) – an interdisciplinary field of knowledge about the relationship between language and law, about linguistic means of expressing legal concepts and categories, and linguistic and stylistic resources in the field of legal communication. The subject of legal linguistics is the language that functions in the spheres of law-making, law enforcement and judicial proceedings, legal science and education¹.

The subject of legal linguistics is the language that functions in the spheres of law-making and judicial proceedings, legal science and education. Currently, both in Ukrainian and English linguistics, legal language has been defined as a functional variety of literary language with characteristic linguistic and structural-genre features determined by the specifics of the legal sphere and communicative professional needs in it². The main characteristics of Ukrainian and English legal languages are accuracy, officialdom, logical consistency, a high level of standardization, etc. Depending on the specific areas of legal activity (legislation, judicial proceedings, notary, advocacy, legal science, legal education, etc.), legal language has functional-stylistic and genre-stylistic features. They are the subject of study of both legal science and linguistics, in particular legal linguistics.

The analysis of theoretical sources that highlight the essence of terms as elementary units of professionally-oriented idioms used in professional discourses has allowed us to synthesize the constructive characteristics of a legal term that are relevant for the reconstruction of the content of legal concepts in the conceptual sphere of a certain branch of law. A legal term belongs to the terminological system of a certain branch of law, it is characterized by general-structural and narrow-system determinism, cognitive saturation, semantic-relational and semantic-correlational specificity, and explicit or implicit

¹ Заплітна Т. В. До проблеми генезису англійських юридичних термінів. URL : http://rusnauka.com/13_NPN_2010/Philologia/64633.doc.htm.

² Минзак О. Афікальні антоніми в терміносистемі права (на матеріалі англійського юридичного дискурсу. URL : http://nbuv.gov.ua/portal/soc-gum/Nz/8_9_3/statiti/99.pdf.

definiteness, which clearly limits the meaning of the term. The peculiarity of the functional load of a legal term lies in its conceptual-modeling function as a key one in legal discourse³.

The criterion for attributing a linguistic unit to the legal vocabulary of the English language is the legal conceptual content, legal orientation and marking of the type “law”, “legal” in dictionary articles. The analysis of paradigmatic relations of terms makes it possible to divide legal terms into groups that are included in the semantic field of legal terms that reference the system of concepts of jurisprudence in the English language. These are eight groups of terminological units that denote

- general legal concepts,
- a subject of law (a participant in civil, criminal or judicial proceedings),
- a specialist in legal activity,
- a crime,
- punishment,
- the concept of judiciary proceedings,
- property relations,
- a legal document⁴.

1. The peculiarities of the semantic groups denoting a subject of law and judicial proceedings

The greatest lexical richness is characterized by semantic groups denoting a subject of law and judicial proceedings. The concept of “person” in the legal subsystem of the English language is represented by units that form two groups:

- 1) terms for designating a specialist in legal activities;
- 2) terms for designating a subject of law⁵.

The identifier for the terms of the groups is the component “person”. The semantic group consists of three subgroups of lexemes that name persons who have committed a criminal act, units for designating a person who is a participant in the legal process and a person in the sphere of property relations. The core of the group, which most adequately reflects the ideas of the English about a person guilty of committing a criminal act, includes the terms criminal, offender. The systematic nature of this semantic group is reflected in equivalent and, especially, in privative oppositions, which provide a hierarchical, transparent

³ Скороходько Е. Ф. Термін у науковому тексті (до створення терміно-центричної теорії наукового дискурсу) монографія. Київ : Логос, 2016. 199 с.

⁴ Товстик В. О. Проблеми класифікації юридичної термінології. Актуальні проблеми економіки і права. 2013. №2 (26). С. 176-182.

⁵ Товстик В. О. Проблеми класифікації юридичної термінології. Актуальні проблеми економіки і права. 2013. №2 (26). С. 176-182.

structure of the semantic group, e.g., accessory (accessory) – accessory before the fact, accessory after the fact. The concept of denoting a subject of law in English is also represented by units with opposite (first offender – old offender) and common (criminal – offender) semantics ⁶.

Analyzing the semantic group of English terms denoting a specialist in legal activities, one should pay attention to the specifics of the group structure, which consists in the fact that terminological units, e.g., lawyer (jurist), can function as semantic components, since they are elements of the definition. This determines the closedness of the semantic system of the group. The components of this semantic group form a semantic structure, the high order and hierarchy of which is emphasized by hyper-hyponymic oppositions (solicitor (lawyer) – Solicitor General), the relations of which unite specific names around the generic unit, which specify the meaning of the dominant. The creation of equivalent oppositions is inherent in the elements of this semantic group. The basic semantic feature of the semantic group of terms for designating a person in the sphere of property relations is manifested by the semes ‘property’, ‘person’. The specificity of the units of this semantic group is the ability of its elements to form oppositions of identity (between ideographic synonyms pledger-pawner) and to enter into antonymic relations, which are established between the units of the group, such as devisor (testator) and devisee (heir to real estate under a will). These terms are paired associations due to the contractual nature of legal relations. The names of the patient are formally and semantically correlated with the source word, through which their semantics are presented in explanatory dictionaries, e.g., legatee – a person who receives legacy (person who receives inheritance). This semantic group is not characterized by hyper-hyponymy relations, with the exception of the oppositions legatee-residuary legatee (heir to the property remaining after the payment of debts) and devisee-residuary devisee, in which the meaning of one word includes the meaning of the other, supplementing the semantic structure with a part that delimits these terms ⁷.

2. The semantic structure of units denoting the concept of “judicial proceedings”

Analysis of the semantic structure of units denoting the concept of “judicial proceedings” in the English language revealed certain features of the process of verbalization of judicial activity. The concept of judicial proceedings is presented in subgroups of terms:

⁶ Снігур С. Юридичні терміни як перекладознавча проблема. Проблеми української термінології. Львів : Львівська політехніка, 2013. №490. С. 71-75.

⁷ Товстик В. О. Проблеми класифікації юридичної термінології. Актуальні проблеми економіки і права. 2013. №2 (26). С. 176-182.

- bringing a criminal charge (trial, be/go on trial for), in which the semantics ‘charge’, ‘accusation’ are distinguished;
- a subgroup of units with the semantics of “giving testimony” (for example, pleadings, testimony), which covered by the semes “evidence”, “statement”, “declaration”;
- presentation to a person who has committed an illegal act, accusation in court (arraign, recrimine, charge);
- a subgroup of units with the semantics of legal sanctions, resolutions and decisions, in the oppositions between which the semes “order”, “authority” act as integrative;
- units for denoting the concept of the process of investigating criminal or civil cases, such as inquest, process, the basic feature of the structure of which are the components “inquire”, “claim”, “case”.

The systematicity of the group is ensured by the ability of its elements to be components of the semantic structure of the units of the semantic group. Between the constituents of the semantic group, mainly equivalent oppositions are fixed, genus-specific relations are rare, which indicates the opacity of their connections.

3. The linguistic means for designating the concept of “crime”

Semantic analysis of linguistic means for designating the concept of “crime” showed that the core of the SG is represented by the units crime, offence, which are characterized by the essential features of the designated concept, as indicated by the semantic components (“punishable”, “law”, “illegal”, “activity”). Equivalent oppositions that arise between logically equal terms that have common and specific components are significant for the constituents of the semantic group. The reflection of semantically close, but not identical concepts, e.g., murder, homicide, is significant for the units of the specified semantics. The terms suborn, poach, ineligible are fixed on the periphery of the semantic group, which denote illegal actions of various types or characterize them by the quality and strength of danger.

The semantic structures of groups of legal terms denoting criminal punishment, general legal concepts, and property relations are opaque and are represented by networks of interconnected units depending on the nature of the correlation of their meaning components. In the semantic field of legal terms of the English language, the semantic group “legal document” has the lowest lexical richness, e.g., habeas corpus (subpoena), summons (court summons). The integrative seme of the semantic group is the component ‘document’. The terms of the semantic group are characterized by equivalence relations (writ-warrant) and hyper-hyponymy (warrant-search-warrant) ⁸.

⁸ Чередниченко О. І. Євролект і проблеми його перекладу. URL : <http://anvsu.org.ua/index.files/Articles/evrolect.htm>.

The legal terminological system actualizes a complex of legal concepts that are fundamental for native speakers of English. The systemic relations of legal terms revealed in semantic groups reflect the general regularities of the system of legal terms of the English language.

4. The verbalization of the conceptual apparatus of two legal terminological systems

The study of the process of verbalization of the conceptual apparatus of two legal terminological systems (Ukrainian and English) is based on a comparison of the corresponding semantic groups of lexical units that manifest the concepts of jurisprudence in the compared languages. As a result of a comparison of the lexical content of the semantic fields of legal terms, it was established that the most numerous in the compared languages are semantic groups for designating the subject of law and semantic groups for designating the concepts of judicial proceedings.

Terms to denote the concept of “person” in the compared languages represent common semantics: a person who committed a crime, a person who is a participant in civil, judicial or criminal proceedings, a specialist in legal activities and a person in the field of property relations.

The national-cultural specificity of the Ukrainian and English terminological systems is manifested in units of non-equivalent semantics and semantically close meanings (advocate – barrister, solicitor). An example of lexical asymmetry is the non-equivalent lexemes of the English language (sheriff, constable, coroner), which reveal the concepts of officials inherent in the English legal system. The semantic structures of these units include ethno-cultural components, which characterize the peculiarities of legal cultures, for example, the prerogatives of royal power, belonging to a county.

Common to the speakers of the languages studied is the disclosure of the concept of intentional murder. Terms of a simple three-component structure to denote a criminal who intentionally encroaches on life (Ukrainian: убивця and English: murderer) demonstrate the similarity of semantic organization in both languages. However, the originality of the worldview and different legal principles are emphasized in the systems of the compared languages by the differentiation of the concepts of various types of murders and, accordingly, the criminals who commit them in English (murderer, homicide, assassinator). A feature of the terms of the two languages, which have the component ‘person’ in their semantic organization, is that the relationship of SG terms to denote criminals with terms that disclose the concept of the corresponding crimes is recorded, for example, Ukrainian:

грабіжник – one who robs, English: pillager – one that pillages (one who pillages) ⁹.

In both languages, terminological elements are recorded to denote legal concepts related to ich with the possession and use of property (pledge and mortgage, confiscation and forfeiture) and to designate crimes related to the theft of property. In the compared terms that denote them, there is a partial coincidence of semantic structure, the units of the English language are characterized by a narrower meaning. But a peculiar view of the concepts of property relations and crimes against property is reflected in the system of the English language, where most lexical units form semantic groups of terms of a diverse spectrum of property relations, compared to units in the Ukrainian terminological system. This is explained by the fact that property is one of the key legal concepts of Great Britain, where historically the conditions of a special attitude to property, in particular, private, have developed.

The concepts of perpetrators of property crimes are denoted by the terms of both languages being compared (thief, thief, robber and burglar). There is semantic symmetry, but not equivalence, between the meanings of these units (Ukrainian злодій, for example, compared to English thief has a broader semantic structure and includes the components “traitor”, “criminal”, not inherent in the English unit). A characteristic feature of the internal structure of the terms of the semantic group for designating illegal actions in the two language systems is the indication of the violation of various rules accepted in society, which is manifested by the components “violate”, “criminal”, “illegal”.

The relations of opposition of the defense and the prosecution in the legal process formed in the human consciousness are manifested in pairs of terminological units of the languages being compared: Ukrainian defense – accusation, English the defense – the prosecution, which reflect similar legal concepts. Analysis of the semantic structure of the terms Ukrainian innocent, guilty and English innocent, guilty indicates the presence in the systems of the studied languages of pairs of lexical units denoting the same semantic opposition.

The absence of a corresponding semantic equivalent in the compared terminological systems is due to extralinguistic realities, for example, the English term right of primogeniture belongs to the non-equivalent vocabulary, since the Ukrainian legal system does not provide for the indisputable right of the eldest son to inherit property. The presence of specific conjunctions and adverbs used in jurisprudence (forasmuch, here-to-fore) that do not have counterparts in the

⁹ Чередниченко О. І. Євролект і проблеми його перекладу. URL : <http://anvsu.org.ua/index.files/Articles/evrolect.htm>.

terminological system of legal units of the Ukrainian language is characteristic of English general legal terminology.

The US legal system has clearly defined national and cultural features that are reflected in its legal terminological system. According to the semantic criterion, the following lexical-semantic groups of American legal terms reveal national-cultural specificity:

- terms for designating persons – participants in legal relations (e.g.: Attorney General, bailiff sheriff),
- terms for designating legal institutions, organizations, etc., which is due to differences in the structure of the American legal system (e.g.: superior court, territorial court, Federal Bureau of Investigation, etc.);
- terms for designating regulatory legal acts and legal documents (Smith Act, Alien Registration Act), judicial precedents (Escobedo V. Illinois, the accused has the right to legal assistance), etc.;
- terms for designating concepts of civil and criminal proceedings, procedural actions;
- terms of individual branches of law, in particular American criminal law, among which there are names of crimes and offenses that are characterized by differences in names, or which are absent in the legal terminology systems of other English-speaking countries. Thus, American criminal law recognizes the degree of severity of a crime – degree (system for classifying murders), therefore the terms first degree murder, second degree murder are absent in the terminology of British criminal law.

Structurally, in modern terminology, two main classifications of terms are distinguished: structural classification, i.e. word-forming types, and lexical-semantic. Structural classification involves identifying structural models that determine the method of formation of a term. On this basis, its belonging to a certain type of word or phrase is determined.

In terms of expression the systematicity of legal terminology is achieved by the “uniformity of word-forming models”. The following types of terms are distinguished:

- terms – root words: a) root non-derivative vocabulary; b) borrowed non-derivative vocabulary;
- derivative vocabulary – terms formed by affixal means;
- terms – compound words;
- terms-word combinations;
- terms-abbreviations;
- nomenclature ¹⁰.

¹⁰ Товстик В. О. Проблеми класифікації юридичної термінології. Актуальні проблеми економіки і права. 2013. №2 (26). С. 176-182.

According to their structure, legal terms are simple, complex and compound, which, in turn, are divided into two- or multi-component. For example, simple: legal, government, crime, obstacle; complex: tortious capacity, tyrant; composed of: direct democracy, guarantees of rights and obligations, democratic state regime, housing contract, privatization of state housing stock, constitutional principles of the legal status of a person, etc.

Attributed term combinations as a special type of word combinations are heterogeneous in their structure. The role of the main component is performed by a noun, the dependent component can be represented by different parts of speech: adjective, pronoun, numeral, adverb, noun. The study of the structural and semantic features of attributive groups in modern English reveals a larger, compared to Ukrainian, range of semantic connections between members of word combinations.

Attributive term combinations with a complex syntactic connection between components have a number of features.

The key word in English is always located at the end of the attributive term combination. In English multi-member attributive combinations, the main word of the group is the last noun. The correct disclosure of semantic connections between the components of an attributive combination is of particular importance in cases where nouns act as definitions: "Payment service user".

The order of the components in the English and Ukrainian languages is different. The noun in the English term combination is postpositive, and in the Ukrainian it is prepositive. The term combination "payment service" allows for the correct dissection of the attributive group, as a result of which the type of semantic connection does not change: "Life insurance intermediary".

One of the features of the syntactic structure of a compound term is that, based on the connection of its elements, they can be considered free (because its components retain their direct meaning) and at the same time – closed (because when other words are arbitrarily included in their composition, they lose their terminological nature). Within the framework of legal terminology, a significant percentage of terms formed syntactically is distinguished. By the number of components, the following can be distinguished: two-component; three-component; multi-component.

Two-component syntactic types of legal terms: "noun in the present tense + noun in the present tense without a preposition", "adjective + noun in the present tense", "noun in the present tense + noun-preposition construction". For example: place of events, commission of a crime, subjects of legal relations, court verdict, divorce, elements of a crime, imposition of arrest, property rights, suppression of hooliganism, deprivation of liberty, prosecutor's sanction, traces of a crime, adult charge, accommodation of dispute, scene of a crime, property

rights, evidence of a crime; legal practice, criminal proceedings, copyright, individual, intentional murder, civil plaintiff, legal assistance, legal fact, pre-trial investigation, repeat crime, child crime, death penalty, conditional release, legal practice, criminal proceedings, civil plaintiff, legal assistance, legal fact, direct intent, the death penalty, conditional release; detention, transfer under supervision, murder on demand, penal code, preparation for murder, incitement to suicide, to escalate accusation, killing on demand, the Code of curfew, incitement to suicide, etc.

Polycomponent syntactic types of legal terms can include four, five, six or more units. For example: voluntary refusal to commit an attempted crime, attempted use of firearms, intentional murder with aggravating circumstances, to acknowledge recognition in false name, acquisition by discovery and occupation, the murder with aggravating circumstances.

Terms are combined into terminological systems that express concepts of one field. In each terminological system, certain groups are formed, for which their common feature is their belonging to a class of objects or to a class of processes, properties. The main number of terms was formed due to commonly used words, mutual penetration from different branches of technology, borrowings from international vocabulary according to word-formation models that are characteristic of modern English.

It should be noted that among legal terms, mainly phrase terms prevail, and they represent the main problem in the translation of a legal text. The most important feature of a phrase term is its reproducibility in the professional sphere of use to express a specific special concept. A compound term will be stable only for a certain system of understanding. Outside a specific terminological system, such a phrase will not be stable and will not be perceived as a connected linguistic unit. Behind each compound term (phrase term) there is a stable, standardly reproducible structure of a complex (dissected) professional concept.

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, having analyzed the structural and semantic features of modern legal terminology, it should be noted that the term should be short and precise, should clearly and completely present the characteristics of the concept, the terminological name should be unambiguous within the framework of a separate industry terminology and not have synonyms and must comply with the word-forming laws of the language. The transfer of English legal terms into Ukrainian requires knowledge of the field to which the translation relates, the interaction of the term with the context is of great importance. The main problem of translating legal terms is their ambiguity not only among different branches of science, but also within the legal field itself. . The semantic

structure of legal terms in English and Ukrainian has been analyzed. Modern legal terminology is a large and extremely important fragment of the literary dictionary of any language and, as a set of nominations of legal phenomena and concepts, functions in the linguistic and legal spheres of legislation. During the formation of unified legal standards that meet modern needs, the national legal terminological system is being organized, standardized and restructured. In this regard, the study of the regularities of the formation of legal terminology, its structure, and development prospects has become one of the most important tasks of modern science. At the same time, the intensification of integration processes requires the organization and standardization, and possibly the restructuring of the legal terminological system.

Having analyzed the structural and semantic features of modern legal terminology, it has been proven that a term must be short and precise, must clearly and completely present the characteristics of the concept, the terminological name must be unambiguous within the framework of a separate industry terminology and must not have synonyms and must necessarily correspond to the word-forming laws of the language. Legal translation has its own characteristics. Legal documents have a clearly defined form, which must be preserved during translation. Sometimes it is the constancy of the form and the standardization of many parts of identical documents that allows a specialist to quickly find the necessary information. A large number of fixed expressions (formulations) in legal documents sometimes turns translation into a search and combination of their counterparts in the Ukrainian language. It is important that legal documents use special terminology and a special, "office" language, so you need to be careful with the formulations, since the slightest mistake can cause the document to be interpreted completely differently, which can lead to adverse consequences. To determine the main features of legal terms, a comprehensive methodology should be applied that will ensure the necessary degree of objectivity of the conclusions obtained.

SUMMARY

The purpose of the study is to comprehensively analyze the features of the reproduction of English-language international legal terms in the modern Ukrainian language. To achieve the set goal, the following tasks were performed: the essence and functions of international legal terms were determined, the content and semantic structure of international legal terms were shown, the conditions for the formation of the terminological system of English-language international legal acts and the prerequisites for their reproduction in the modern Ukrainian language were identified. The study material was English-language versions (electronic and printed) of legislative acts of the

EU, other countries of the European and American continents and their official and unofficial translations into Ukrainian. Specialized legal publications and electronic materials from the Internet were also used to study English-language international legal terms in the modern Ukrainian language and the specifics of their translation. It is proved that legal terminology, like any historically formed terminological system, is characterized by both universal and national specific linguistic regularities. The level of development of the legal dictionary depends on the state's accumulated experience in legal regulation of social relations, lawmaking and law enforcement, the depth of scientific study of legal phenomena and categories, measures to streamline and systematize the terminological system of law. Thus, the analyzed linguistic studies of domestic and foreign scientists testify, on the one hand, to the intensity of development of legal terminology over the past decades, which is associated with the interpretation and globalization of world development, on the other hand, to the formation and allocation of a separate linguistic branch – legal linguistics, in the bosom of which all scientific developments of current problems of legal terminology are concentrated today. At the same time, the activation of integration processes requires the ordering and normalization, and possibly even restructuring of the legal terminological system. In this regard, an applied discipline has emerged in the depths of legal linguistics – terminology, which is gradually clarifying its independent functions at the intersection of several sciences – linguistics, logic and legal specialty.

Bibliography

1. Заплітна Т. В. До проблеми генезису англійських юридичних термінів. URL : http://rusnauka.com/13_NPN_2010/Philologia/64633.doc.htm.
2. Минзак О. Афіксальні антоніми в терміносистемі права (на матеріалі англійського юридичного дискурсу. URL : http://nbuv.gov.ua/portal/soc-gum/Nz/8_9_3/statti/99.pdf.
3. Скороходько Е. Ф. Термін у науковому тексті (до створення терміноцентричної теорії наукового дискурсу) : монографія. Київ : Логос, 2016. 199 с.
4. Снігур С. Юридичні терміни як перекладознавча проблема. Проблеми української термінології. Львів : Львівська політехніка, 2013. №490. С. 71-75.
5. Товстик В. О. Проблеми класифікації юридичної термінології. Актуальні проблеми економіки і права. 2013. №2 (26). С. 176-182.
6. Чередниченко О. І. Євролект і проблеми його перекладу. URL : <http://anvsu.org.ua/index.files/Articles/evrolect.htm>.

Information about the authors:

Kosenko Anna Volodymyrivna,

Candidate of Philological Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department
of Communicative Linguistics and Translation,
Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University
5, Sadova str., Chernivtsi, 58012, Ukraine

Slobodian Nazarii Vasyliovych,

Doctor of Philosophy in Philology,
Associate Professor at the Department
of German Philology and Methods of Teaching German,
Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University
2, M. Kryvonosa str., Ternopil, 46027, Ukraine

Shayner Hanna Ihorivna,

Candidate of Pedagogic Sciences,
Associate Professor at the Department
of Foreign Languages for Engineering,
Lviv Polytechnic National University
12, Stepana Bandery str., Lviv, 79013, Ukraine