

# Table of contents

 <https://doi.org/10.1075/tlrp.17.toc>

Pages v–viii of

## **New Insights into the Semantics of Legal Concepts and the Legal Dictionary**

**Martina Bajčić**

[Terminology and Lexicography Research and Practice,


17]

2017. xi, 222 pp.

© John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way. For any reuse of this material written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com)).

For further information, please contact [rights@benjamins.nl](mailto:rights@benjamins.nl) or consult our website at [benjamins.com/rights](http://benjamins.com/rights)



# Table of contents

<b>List of figures</b>	<b>IX</b>
<b>List of tables</b>	<b>X</b>
<b>List of abbreviations</b>	<b>XI</b>
 <b>Introduction</b>	 <b>1</b>
 CHAPTER 1	
<b>Terms, concepts and other conundrums</b>	<b>7</b>
1.1 Introduction	7
1.2 From Google to a General Theory of Terminology	8
1.2.1 Wüster's idealized vision of terminology	11
1.2.2 A terminological clarification	12
1.3 Different takes on terminology and terminology work	14
1.4 Logical and ontological relationships vs. legal reasoning	16
1.4.1 Logical relationships	17
1.4.2 Ontological relationships	17
1.5 The concept vs. term quandary	18
1.5.1 Legal vs. linguistic conceptualization	20
1.6 Recent terminology theories	22
1.7 Summary	24
 CHAPTER 2	
<b>Investigating legal concepts, language and the law</b>	<b>27</b>
2.1 Introduction	27
2.2 Researching specialized languages	28
2.2.1 Legal scholars and the study of language	31
2.3 The dichotomy between specialized and general language: The fiction of legal language	32
2.4 What language and the law have in common	36
2.5 Legal concepts	39
2.5.1 Types of legal concepts	40
2.5.2 Determinate and indeterminate legal concepts	44
2.5.3 Coping with indeterminate legal concepts in practice	50

2.6	Polysemous legal terms	52
2.6.1	Implications of the cognitive shift for resolving polysemy	55
2.6.2	Polysemy in the EU context	56
2.7	Summary	58
CHAPTER 3		
	<b>(How) Do courts do things with words?</b>	<b>61</b>
3.1	Introduction	61
3.2	The linguistic importance of case-law reasoning	61
3.3	Interpretation as a perennial source of legal difficulty	62
3.4	General methods of legal interpretation	68
3.4.1	Statutory interpretation methods implemented by U.S. Courts	70
3.4.2	The role of the context in legal interpretation or ‘anything goes’	74
3.5	Summary	78
CHAPTER 4		
	<b>Understanding EU legal concepts</b>	<b>79</b>
4.1	Introduction	79
4.2	Conceptual autonomy	79
4.3	Conceptualization of EU legal concepts	80
4.3.1	Difference in conceptualization	80
4.3.2	The CJEU’s case-to-case approach	81
4.4	Summary	89
CHAPTER 5		
	<b>Multilingualism and EU legal concepts</b>	<b>91</b>
5.1	Introduction	91
5.2	The multilingual character of EU law	91
5.2.1	The Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties	92
5.2.2	Official and working language	93
5.2.3	Problems posed by multilingualism in practice	94
5.2.4	The CJEU’s approaches to reconciling divergent language versions	95
5.3	A summary of findings	104
5.3.1	What will the future bring?	105

## CHAPTER 6

<b>EU legal translation and challenges for the dictionary: Incorporating legal translation into dictionary making</b>	<b>107</b>
6.1 Introduction	107
6.2 Legal translation	108
6.2.1 Legal texts	110
6.2.2 Equivalence: A mission impossible	111
6.2.3 Conceptual analysis as the comparative-law approach to legal translation	112
6.3 Some challenges posed by legal translation to the legal dictionary	115
6.3.1 Analysis of lexicographic treatment of legal terms	119
6.3.2 Coping with different types of equivalence in a legal dictionary	125
6.4 Choosing the right approach to legal translation in the EU context	129
6.4.1 Using functional equivalents when translating EU legal concepts	131
6.5 Practical guidelines for legal translators working in the EU	132
6.6 Summary	134

## CHAPTER 7

<b>Multilingual legal dictionaries: Towards a termonological dictionary of EU law</b>	<b>137</b>
7.1 Introduction	137
7.2 Reinventing the dictionary	137
7.2.1 The future of legal dictionaries: Going digital and cognitive	140
7.3 The role of theory in the making of dictionaries	142
7.3.1 Terminography	142
7.3.2 Domains	143
7.4 The role of definitions in a legal dictionary	145
7.4.1 Redefining the role of legal definitions	148
7.4.2 The problems of defining and categorizing EU legal concepts	150
7.4.3 Subject-field classification: Demarcation of EU law	151
7.5 Filling a gap in legal lexicography	157
7.5.1 Prototype giveth, terminography taketh	157
7.5.2 Teleological definitions	160
7.6 Integrating extralinguistic information into the dictionary	162
7.6.1 Parts of the ontological structure	166
7.7 Summary	167

## CHAPTER 8

<b>Methodology for the making of a termontological dictionary</b>	<b>169</b>
8.1 Introduction	169
8.2 Termontographic methodology	169
8.2.1 Search phase	172
8.2.2 Information-gathering phase	173
8.2.3 Refinement phase	181
8.2.4 Teleological definitions of indeterminate legal concepts	182
8.3 Dictionary display of indeterminate EU law concepts	186
8.3.1 Parent company	186
8.3.2 Subsidiary company	188
8.3.3 Company of a Member State	188
8.3.4 Company of a Member State: Different parts	190
8.3.5 Wholly artificial arrangement	190
8.3.6 Merger	192
8.4 Verification phase	194
8.5 Form of the termontological dictionary: Go digital or perish	195

## CHAPTER 9

<b>Concluding remarks and directions for future research</b>	<b>197</b>
--	------------

9.1 Digitalisation and customized lexicography	198
--	-----

<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>201</b>
---------------------	------------

<b>Appendix 1</b>	<b>215</b>
-------------------	------------

a. Legislative acts:	215
b. Case law:	216
c. Textbooks:	217

<b>Appendix 2</b>	<b>219</b>
-------------------	------------

a. Legislative acts:	219
b. Books and articles:	219

<b>Subject index</b>	<b>221</b>
----------------------	------------