

## The semantics of repetitive constructions in Renaissance legal English and Scots

Joanna Bugaj (Adam Mickiewicz University)

Repetition as a discourse-specific feature has long been recognised as one of the typical traits of legal language (Mellinkoff 1963, Koskeniemi 1968, Goodrich 1990, Hiltunen 1990, Bhatia 1993, Gibbons 1994, Rissanen 1999, Tiersma 1999). This phenomenon can be observed on two levels of linguistic structure: semantic, when a particular meaning is repeated, reiterated or relexicalised (see Wang 2005 for details of this distinction), and syntactic, when one considers structural parallelism in relative clauses. In the present paper, I would like to concentrate on the semantics of lexical repetition in legal texts.

Repetitive lexical constructions are usually discussed on the basis of the so-called binomials, that is word pairs exhibiting a specific semantic relationship, coordinated with *and* or *or*, as in *verified and proven*. Attention has been paid to the etymology of pair members, the traditional argument being that one lexical item “interprets” or “translates” the other, which goes back to Mellinkoff’s seminal study on legal language (1963). In recent studies based on a corpus of renaissance English and Scots legal texts (Bugaj 2006 and in press, Bugaj and Włodarczyk 2006), I have shown that etymology does not provide a satisfactory explanation for the extensive use of binomials. There are also other aspects, such as the phonological properties of the pair members and, indeed, their semantic properties, which have been considered influential in the formation of binomials also by other scholars (e.g. Koskeniemi 1968, Gustafsson 1974, 1976, Hiltunen 1990, Danet and Bogoch 1992). For instance, the Me-First criterion was postulated as a factor influencing the choice and ordering of elements in a binomial pair. No study, however, has checked these predictions by means of a systematic corpus research.

In this presentation, I am going to discuss the semantic relations between the members of repetitive lexical constructions, on the basis of the Helsinki corpora of two national, and genetically related, standardising languages in the British Isles: English (HC) and Scots (HCOS). The scope of my investigation is going to include coordinated nouns and coordinated verbs. The tendencies in vocabulary patterns will be grouped according to particular aspects of meaning, such as synonymy, contiguity or complementation. Additionally, the paper is going to build on the aforementioned earlier research and test the factors potentially influencing the semantic structure of a binomial pair. Thus, I am hoping to discover the semantic purpose of repetition in legal discourse and establish its generality on comparative grounds.

### References

- HCOS = *The Helsinki Corpus of Older Scots*. Ed. by A. Meurman-Solin, 1993. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- HC = *The Helsinki Corpus of English Texts*. Ed. by Rissanen, Matti et al.. 1994. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Bhatia, Vijay. 1993. *Analysing genre. Language use in professional settings*. London – New York: Longman.
- Bugaj, Joanna. 2006. “Sources of discourse-specific vocabulary in Middle Scots administrative records: An etymological study of binomials”, in: Marina Dossena - Irma Taavitsainen (eds.) *Diachronic Perspectives on Domain-specific English*. Bern: Peter Lang. 109-132.
- Bugaj, Joanna. in press. “The language of legal writings in 16th-century Scots and English: an etymological study of binomials”, *English for Special Purposes across Cultures* 3.
- Bugaj Joanna / Włodarczyk, Matylda. 2006. At ‘the wylle and plesur’ of ‘kyng and soueraine’: In Search of Motivations for Binomials as Markers of Legal Discourse. In Katarzyna Dziubalska-Kołaczyk (ed.) *Ifatuation. A Festschrift for prof. Jacek Fisiak on his 70<sup>th</sup> birthday*. 85-98.

- Danet, Brenda / Bogoch, Bryna. 1992. "Whoever alters this may God turn his face from him on the day of judgement". Curses in Anglo-Saxon Legal Documents. *Journal of American Folklore* 105, 132-165.
- Goodrich, Peter. 1990. *Legal Discourse: Studies in Linguistics, Rhetoric and Legal Analysis*. London: Macmillan.
- Gustaffson, Marike. 1974. The Phonetic Length of the Members in Present-Day English Binominals. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 75/4, 663-677.
- Gustaffson, Marike. 1976. The Frequency and 'Frozensness' of some English Binominals. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 77/4, 623-637.
- Hiltunen, Risto. 1990. *Chapters on Legal English. Aspects Past and Present of the Language of the Law*. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedakatemia.
- Koskeniemi, Inna. 1968. *Repetitive Word-pairs in Old and Early Middle English Prose*. Turku: Turun Yliopisto.
- Mellinkoff, David. 1963. *The Language of the Law*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- Rissanen, Matti. 1999. Language of Law and the Development of Standard English. In Irma Taavitsainen *et al.* (eds.). *Writing in Nonstandard English*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 189-203.
- Tiersma, Peter M. 1999. *Legal Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wang, S.-P. 2005. Corpus-based Approaches and Discourse-analysis in Relation to Reduplication and Repetition. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37, 505-540.