

# Analysis Of The Lexico-Semantic, Grammatical And Pragmatic Characteristics Of English Legal Texts From The Linguocultural Point Of View

 Nosirova Shoirakhan Ulugbek qizi

Doctoral student of Fergana State University, Uzbekistan

**Received:** 26 September 2025; **Accepted:** 16 October 2025; **Published:** 21 November 2025

**Abstract:** This article analyzes the lexical-semantic and grammatical features of the English legal texts, which today are considered the most prestigious and widespread legal means of communication internationally, in connection with culture, and touches on scientists and their works who have conducted research in this field. In the course of the study, the level of formality, the expression and cultural meaning of the language of English legal texts are studied based on the analysis of a systematic-functional grammatical, linguocultural and discursive approach.

**Keywords:** Linguoculturology, language of English legal texts, legalese, lexical-semantic analysis, grammatical features.

**Introduction:** Today, along with the high attention to language learning, great conditions are being created for becoming a mature specialist in various professions. We can see that the people of different professions have certain characteristics in different languages due to the influence of the nationality, culture and traditions, social views of the person in which he lives. The language of English legal texts is not only a means of communication, but also a set of strategic knowledge necessary for international legal communication, negotiation, contract formation, judicial protection and understanding of legislation. Studying the language of English legal texts requires studying the national mentality, worldview and culture of this nation, which goes hand in hand with language and professional knowledge.

## METHODS

The English scientist K. Amadi conducted in-depth research on the English legal language (Legal English) and revealed its unique lexical-syntactic features and the pedagogical importance of its teaching and learning [1,25]. A number of scientists conducted scientific research on the peculiarities of the language of English legal texts and considered the language of legal texts as

a separate section in the teaching process of English for Specific Purposes as an object of research such as V.Batia, D.Kristal, D.Devy, K.Goddard, J.Northcott, J.Rumsfield, S.Susanto, M.Tiersma, I.Veretina. Particularly, D. Melinkoff made a significant contribution to the development of this field with his work "The Language of the Law" [7] which reveals the unique features of the field of jurisprudence in many ways. The historical invasions and their effects on the legal system, as well as the changes and peculiarities of the English language by Latin and French during the development, some characteristics in Old, Middle and Modern English periods, areal variations of English used in legal purposes and special mannerisms of the language are described in detail. This research paper studies the specific lexical-semantic, grammatical and pragmatic features of English legal texts by using the methods of systematic-functional grammar, linguocultural and discourse approach, connecting them with the influence of culture.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The language of legal texts is the spoken and written language used by professionals in formal legal discourse, appearing in laws, legal codes, regulations, contracts and agreements, court decisions, reports,

wills, and legal textbooks. It is natural that not only experts use this type of language, but also ordinary people are interested in better understanding of legislation. Legal English (LE) is taught according to three approaches and they are EALP (English for Academic Legal Purposes), EOLP (English for Occupational Legal Purposes), EGLP (English for General Legal Purposes). They differ from one another in accordance with what purpose is needed in learning legal language of English.

It can be said that English legal texts are complicated and difficult to understand as the first feature of the language. This is caused by complex syntactic structures, use of special terms and jargon, ambiguous words and words from different languages. Under the influence of historical development, many words in the field of jurisprudence go back to the Anglo-Saxon, Latin and French languages. Through the work of D. Melinkoff, it is possible to know that the terms of advocacy, taken from the old French and Latin languages, are related to the historical and legal relations between England and France [2,13]. For example: special terms such as habeas corpus, sub justice, prima facie, mens rea, pro bono, ex parte, de facto, ipso facto are taken from the Latin, whereas the terms force majeure, droit acquis, raison d'état, voir dire, tort, plaintiff, bailiff, liaison manifest the influences of the French language.

It can be stated that the use of words and vocabulary, which can be traced back to Latin and French in origin, is due in legislation to the types of legislation system (Common law and Civil law), in which geographic location, Customs and historical-legal traditions are differentiated, that is, influenced by the socio-cultural phenomenon. Etymologically, due to the different stages of historical development, Civil law is more French in the system, while in Common Law, in many cases, Latin words and phrases are actively used in legislative practice.

Meanwhile, D. Melinkoff emphasized that the use of synonymous words from the old French and English versions in pairs gives a unique dramatic tone to the legal language in terms of style and formality [7,15]: cease and desist, null and void, aid and abet, goods and chattels, wills and testament, land and tenement. Both parts of these doublets have the same meaning semantically but originally taken from two varying languages. They have become accepted to be used in this set form and is considered to be one of the significant characteristics of LE.

In addition to double words used in the language of legal texts, three-part expressions are also noteworthy in terms of use: arbitrary, capricious and unreasonable;

rest, residue and remainder; right, title and interest; signed, sealed and delivered; give, devise and bequeath; grant, bargain and sell; acts, defaults and gross negligence; order, adjudicate and decree; remise, release and forever quit claim. It can be observed that such doublets and triplet expressions are also deliberately used in the language of legal texts to maintain clarity and formality.

Even now, in the language of legal texts, the use of mixed English, Latin and French words is in practice to a significant extent, which helps lawyers not only to avoid abstraction, but also to convince their opinions and at the same time to show the characteristic of legal luxury. For this reason, legal texts are often compared to language museums [8, 215].

Another of the peculiarities of the language of its legal texts is seen in its incomprehensibility and active use of archaisms. Many occurrences of words and phrases that were used in old and Middle English and are difficult to understand in modern English prove that it is described as an incomprehensible language: hereof, thereof, hereinafter, hereunder, heretofore, aforesaid, arraignment, feoff [1,28] The active use of polysemic words also reveals the need to know exactly what meaning they represent in what context. For example, the word consideration, which represents the meanings of thinking, paying attention, considering, when used in a legal context, carries the meanings of compensation, exchange value (money, service, goods or promise that one of the parties in the contract gives to the other) and it is a necessary component to indicate that the contract has legal force. The word hold, which has the meaning of holding, is also used with the meaning of making a formal decision when used in court proceedings. The word said, with this grammatical form, also appears in many places, representing the meanings mentioned above in the legislation. Some other examples of similar polysemic words are action, attachment, execute, hand, party, prefer, redemption, furnish, construction, find, tender.

Dwelling on the grammatical analysis of the language of legal texts, it is possible to first notice the long and complex structure of sentences. This is mainly due to the multiple use of words, doublets, triplets, punctuation in sparse positions, characteristic word order, repetitions, noun conjugations with a large number of adjectives, prepositional phrases, adjectives, adverbs, complex sentences, which come from the various languages considered above. The use of punctuation marks in very small quantities is a product of the old-fashioned concepts in jurisprudence that the meaning conveyed in legislative documents should be only in words, while the use of punctuation marks creates uncertainty, confusion [3].

Nominalization is considered one of the distinguishing features of the legal language. When the meaning is conveyed not directly by verbs, but by the use of vocabulary involving nouns made of verbs, it is felt that it is not about action, but the emphasis is put on the process that represents the meaning which adds to its legal significance. For example, the meaning, even if expressed with the verb to agree, is used in the form of the noun conjugation to be in agreement [1,34]. Some other examples are to be in consideration=consider, to be in opposition=oppose, to be in contravention=contravene, to make a decision=decide, violation of contract=violate, to make assignment=assign, to give consent=consent.

Due to the fact that one of the main goals of experts in the field of law is to make an opinion while maintaining objectivity, the productive use of the passive voice demonstrates that there is an emphasis on the action itself rather than the performer. Pronouns that show no clear orientation to a particular person (impersonality, non-personality) are also used more efficiently (e.g. anyone, any person, each person, whoever, the party, the person, it...). Instead of will, which is widely used in colloquial speech, shall is more often used in LE. The will and final words also do not directly refer to the second person(you). The reason is that inheritors are not directly commanded, warned, or charged with responsibility, and therefore an opinion is stated using the first person. It is noteworthy that even in the speech of witnesses in the trial, no direct reference is made to the 2nd or 3rd person, instead of which the combinations of nouns and nominal phrases are used [1,35]. In legal texts, pronouns such as everyone, everybody, every person serve to represent that the law is equal to everyone, while no one, nobody serves to represent a complete ban.

Oral legal discourses, which differ significantly from written speech, are somewhat easier for the language to be understood even for those who are interested in the discourse of the judicial process, but whose profession is not in the field of law. The speech in the courtroom is divided into introductory, middle and concluding parts, similar to the language of the story, and sentences are made accordingly.

Nouns formed using \_-er, -or, -ee by the affixation method are also actively used in legal speech: as lessor – lessee, appointor – appointee, donor – donee, assigner – assignee, feoffor - feoffee. By making a word like this, the suffixes \_-er,- or are understood as the person giving the property, and-ee as the person receiving the benefit. In the case of single mortgagor and mortgagee, the opposite is implied [1,31].

Through the study of the several works including

P.Brown, C.Fillmore, G.Yule, F.Palmer, H.Grice, R.Stalnaker and others, examples of the use of pragmatic tools in the speech of lawyers can be as in the following:

1. "The incident occupied on that day", " As I mentioned early, the defender's actions were awful.

This example shows the places of use of diexis tools in lawyers' speech, with a reference to a certain fixed date through the first example, and a reference to the previous stressed statement in the second. These tools provide clarity and effectiveness of communication, and through them lawyers are able to clearly point to individuals, places, times, and social relationships.

2. The witness must testify under oath, The contact may be considered void

A clear example of the above is the speech of representatives of the field of law, who used modal means in expressing a degree of confidence in reality, probability or necessity.

3. It appeals that the agreement was breached, Arguably, the law supports this interpretation.

It is also important to use mitigation tools in communication, in the softening of formal statements, in careful expression, and this is especially evident in the speech of lawyers.

4. Clearly, the defender's actions were unlawful, Undoubtedly, this sets a precedent.

Examples in which evaluative units are used when making an assessment of a particular opinion or case, when making a point of view, are also considered necessary parts of the speech of lawyers.

5. Since the contact was signed, bonds arise, Given the prior agreement, terms are binding.

The above examples can be an example to presupposition, and they consider a particular case or information to be presupposed. Examples also have pragmatic significance, depicting the meaning of the signing of a contract as the conclusion of a previous agreement.

6. The defender has a history of similar offenses, The evidence speaks for itself

Even in the speech of people of this profession, the pragmatic tool is used effectively (meaning a certain meaning without directly saying it).

7. With all due respect, the opposing counsel's argument lacks merit, I would like to suggest an alternative interpretation.

From the above examples, it can be seen that within the framework of the law, the speech of workers also appropriately follows politeness strategies, such as

compromising in controversial cases and maintaining respect in communication.

8. First, we will examine the facts, Secondly, we will consider the legal implications.

The tools that make up discourse also play a role in lawyers' speech in managing the flow of ideas and the consistent continuation of speech in a logical way.

### **CONCLUSION**

Summarizing the above comments, we can say that legal texts also embody the features of the connection of the language with its specially used lexical-semantic units and grammatical structure with English culture, national mentality, political values and historical events. It seems that the correct use of pragmatic tools will improve the effectiveness of communication, as well as ensure the accuracy of legal documents and make the audience convinced about the provided data.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Amadi, C. Lexical and Syntactic Features of Legal English: Implications for Use of English Teaching in Nigeria. *Icheke Journal of the Faculty of Humanities*. Vol.18. No1 March, 2020 pp. 23-42 [www.ichekejournal.com](http://www.ichekejournal.com)
2. Bhatia, V.K. (2014). *Analyzing Genre: Language use in professional settings*. London: Routledge, - P 20.
3. Crystal, D. & Davy, D. (2016). *Investigating English style*. London: Routledge
4. Goddard, C. (2010). Didactic aspects of Legal English. *Dynamics of course preparation. Legal English Across Cultures. Special Issue. ESP Across Cultures*, 7.
5. Halliday, M.A.K., & Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. *Halliday's Introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
6. Mattila, H.E.S. (2006). *Comparative Legal Linguistics: Language of Law, Latin and modern lingua francas*.
7. Melinkoff, D. *The Language of the Law*. Little, Brown and company – Boston: Toronto, 1963. Pp 552.
8. Northcott, J. (2013). *Legal English*. In B.Paltridge and S.Starfield (Eds). *The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes*. Pp. 213-226 West Sussex: John Willey & Sons.
9. Tiersma, P.M. (1999). *Legal Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.