

LEXICAL LAYER IN LEGAL DISCOURSE

Tursunova Zulifarkhon Iqboljon kizi
Fergana State University, doctoral student
Zilufar.00@gmail.com
ORCID ID 0009-0004-1617-4256

Annotation: This article analyzes theoretical and practical issues related to the lexical layer of legal discourse. It highlights historical, national and international lexical units used in legal texts, their semantic properties, as well as the role of lexical relations such as synonymy, antonymy and homonymy.

Keywords: legal discourse, lexical layer, terminology, synonymy, antonymy, homonymy, formal style

In linguistics, the term “discourse” has been widely used since the second half of the 20th century. The works of the French scientist E. Benveniste, the English scientist Z. Harris, and the Russian linguist M. Bakhtin made a great contribution to the theory of discourse. “Discourse” is often used in a sense close to the concept of “text”, but it refers not only to a written text, but also to a speech process that occurs in a specific communicative situation. Thus, discourse is a unity of speech and text, which is closely related to the social situation, participants in communication, and their goals. The main features of the concept of discourse include text (existing in written or oral form), communicative process (serving a specific situation and goal), social context (dependence on the cultural, political, and legal environment of society). Thus, discourse is one of the broadest concepts in linguistics, and it is used in linguistics, philosophy, sociology, psychology, and law.

One of the specific types of discourse is legal discourse. It covers texts and speech processes that are formed within the framework of legal relations. Legal discourse can be broadly defined as follows - legal discourse is a text that defines, explains and regulates legal norms and the process of legal communication. Legal discourse is manifested in such forms as normative and legal documents (constitution, law, decree, decision), speech in court proceedings (speech of a judge, prosecutor, lawyer, witness), contracts and agreements, legal explanations and commentaries, international treaties and documents.

The basis of legal discourse is special legal terminology. Terminology is a set of terms related to a particular field. Legal terms were formed during a long historical process. The roots of the legal lexicon in the Uzbek language go back to ancient Turkic written monuments. For example, the word “törü” (law, order) is one of the ancient legal terms. Later, Arabic and Persian legal terms (“sharia”, “judge”, “fatwa”) were adopted, and during the period of independence, national legal terminology further developed, and international legal terms (“constitution”, “parliament”, “prosecutor”, “judge”) are widely used. Thus, legal terminology is multi-layered and includes historical, national and international elements.

Legal discourse does not consist only of terms. Neutral lexicon is also widely used in it. For example, words such as “citizen”, “person”, “state”, “assembly”, “document” are found in various texts. Although these units are general language elements, they have a specific legal meaning in a legal text. In addition, book-style lexicon is also widely used. Combinations such as “this”, “above”, “also”, “if possible”, “on legal grounds” give a formal tone to a legal text. Their function is to present the text in a clear and formal form.

Regulatory and legal documents have a specific formal stylistic lexicon. For example: “Let it be decided” (in government resolutions); “This law shall enter into force on the date of its publication” (in laws); “The contract is drawn up in duplicate” (in contracts); “The court’s

decision may be appealed” (in court decisions). Such formulas are used repeatedly in legal texts and have become stable formal constructions.

A distinctive feature of the legal lexicon of the Uzbek language is that it combines national legal traditions and international experience. For example: national elements - "mahalla", "hokim", "people's deputy", "civil society"; international elements - "constitution", "parliament", "prosecutor's office", "judiciary". Terms in the national legal system reflect the specific socio-political structure of society, while international elements integrate generally accepted legal concepts into national law.

Many loanwords are also used in legal discourse. For example: of Arabic origin: “right”, “obligation”, “law”, “justice”; of Russian and Latin origin: “constitution”, “prosecutor”, “advokat”, “codex”, “parliament”. Such loanwords are easily understood internationally, as they are used in the legal systems of many countries. At the same time, there is a tendency to use Uzbek equivalents in national terminology whenever possible. For example, the combination “state prosecutor” can be used next to the word “prosecutor”.

The lexical system of legal discourse consists of terms that are in complex semantic relationships with each other. Among these relationships, synonymy, antonymy, and homonymy occupy a special place. Each of them plays an important role in ensuring the clarity and consistency of legal texts.

In the general language system, synonymy is widely used, that is, one concept can be expressed in different words. However, in legal discourse, synonymy is used to a limited extent, since the presence of excessive synonyms allows for different interpretations of the legal text. However, in some cases, synonymous units still occur: “criminal proceedings” and “criminal proceedings” are concepts similar in content. “Court decision”, “judgment”, “decision” are terms that are close to each other, but differ depending on the procedural context. “Defense” and “lawyering” are close to each other in a general sense, but the latter is used as a more specific legal term. Thus, although synonymy exists in legal discourse, it is used under strict control and in a form with semantic differences.

One of the distinctive features of legal language is the abundance of pairs of opposite meanings in it. Because legal relations themselves are formed on the basis of conflicting situations. For example: “innocence - guilt”; “right - obligation”; “responsibility - freedom”; “honesty - corruption”; “defendant - victim”. These antonymic pairs constitute one of the main fulcrums of the semantic system in legal discourse. They create a meaningful balance by showing the two sides of legal relations.

Although homonyms are common in common language, their use in legal discourse is almost limited. Because homonyms express different meanings in the same form, which creates confusion in legal interpretation. For example, the word “substance”: in common language - “chemical substance”; in legal discourse - a section of a law or code. In legal documents, such words are used only in one context. If there is a possibility of confusion, an additional explanation is given. Therefore, legal linguistics has a strict approach to homonymy.

When analyzing the practical appearance of lexical relations, examples include the regular opposition of the terms "guilt" and "innocence" in the Criminal Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, the use of the term "responsibility" in court decisions along with "obligation" and the fact that they are semantically related terms, and the use of "rights and freedoms" in the Constitution in semantic balance with "obligations". Thus, synonymy, antonymy and homonymy not only constitute lexical relations in legal discourse, but also ensure the logical and semantic consistency of legal texts.

Conclusion

The lexical layer in legal discourse is multifaceted, consisting of a historical layer (ancient and religious terms), a national layer (neighborhood, government, people's deputy), an international

layer (constitution, parliament, lawyer, prosecutor), neutral and formal-stylistic units. Such a complex lexical layer forms the semantic system of legal discourse and distinguishes it from other types of discourse.

There are specific features of lexical relations in legal discourse. Synonyms - are limited, but used in a specific context. Antonyms - constitute the main semantic support of legal texts. Homonymy - are almost limited, used only in a specific context. Thus, lexical relations serve as an important tool that ensures the clarity, consistency and consistency of legal language.

REFERENCES:

1. Benvenist E. General Linguistics. – Paris, 1971.
2. Harris Z. Discourse Analysis Papers. – Oxford, 1952.
3. Bakhtin M. Aesthetics of Speech Genres. – Moscow, 1979.
4. Shtyrov T. V. Legal Discourse: Lexical and Pragmatic Aspects. – Moscow, 2007.
5. Smirnov A. I. Forensic Linguistics and Analysis of Legal Texts. – Moscow, 2012.
6. Constitution of the Republic of Uzbekistan. – Tashkent, 2023.
7. Criminal Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan. – Tashkent, 2022.