



*Vladislav Hrežo*

University of Prešov (Slovakia)

ORCID: 0000-0003-0090-3931

## Linguistic Insights into Eurolect of Institutional Documents Based on the System of Logico-Semantic Relations

Wgląd lingwistyczny w język dokumentów unijnych  
wyrosły z systemu związków logiczno-semantycznych

### Abstract

The present article draws primarily on a text-based approach while aiming attention at researching one genre of EU legal language – the judgement in its English language version by employing quantitative and qualitative research methods and serves as a pilot analysis. The analysis is focused on the occurrence of textual Themes used for signalling organization of information and their functioning in the selected text of CJEU judgement based on the Halliday's (1985) theory of information distribution in a text and the system of logico-semantic relations between clauses later adapted by Trklja (2017). On the basis of the data obtained, it follows that the textual Themes denoting different logico-semantic relation types are distributed in the analysed text of EU Judgement unevenly, whereas the most frequent and prevailing type of relation between clauses is represented by lexical items of enhancement denoting causal-conditional relations. The article also provides an overview of previous research of contemporary scholars regarding various aspects of institutional-legal discourse.

**Key words:** *EU legal language, formulaicity, hybridity, information organization, lexical item, logico-semantic relations, multilingualism, textual Themes.*

### Abstrakt

Niniejszy artykuł omawia głównie podejście do analizy tekstu, kierując uwagę na badanie języka prawniczego UE; do celów badań wariantów języka angielskiego, autor angażuje ilościowe i jakościowe metody, służące analizie pilotażowej. Analiza skupiona jest na częstotliwości występowania Tematów tekstowych, służących do zasygnalizowania układu informacji i ich funkcjonowania w wybranych tekstach Trybunału UE (CURIA), do czego wykorzystano teorię Hallidaya (1985), dotyczącą rozkładu informacji w tekście, a także system logiczno-semantycznych związków pomiędzy zdaniami, opracowany przez Trklja (2017). Na podstawie uzyskanych danych, okazuje się, że Tematy tekstowe wykazujące odmienne typy związków logiczno-semantycznych są rozmieszczone w analizowanych wyrokach Trybunału UE w sposób nierównomierny, podczas gdy najczęściej występujący typ związków międzyzdaniowych jest reprezentowany przez jednostki leksykalne o tendencji wzrostowej występowania, co wskazuje na związki uwarunkowane przypadkowością. Artykuł odnosi się również do wcześniejszych badań obejmujących różnorodne aspekty dyskursu prawniczego.

**Słowa kluczowe:** *język prawniczy UE, formalizm, hybrydowość, układ informacji, jednostek leksykalna, związki logiczno-semantyczne, wielojęzyczność.*

### Introduction

Institutional legal discourse represents a highly specialized discourse whose idiosyncratic linguistic-translational features have been explored by a number of researchers. (e.g. Bajčić, 2018; Bednárová-Gibová, 2016, 2017, 2020; Biel, 2014; Gibová, 2010; Klbal, 2019; Mori, 2018; Godź-Roszkowski, 2011; Godź-Roszkowski and Pontrandolfo, 2018; Seracini, 2020; Sosoni, 2012; Sosoni and Biel 2018; Trklja, 2017) As suggested by Seracini (2020, p. 36), legal languages are created “within the legal order and culture of a certain country”. However, the process of evolution of EU legal language differs from any other cases. The uniqueness of EU legal discourse consists in its emergence from fusion of various different cultures, as explained by Seracini:

The case of EU legal language is unique, since it originates from EU culture, which is not the culture of one single country, but rather the result of the encounter of the cultures of all the Member States. (Seracini, 2020, p. 136)

There have been formed several designations of the language used in EU institutional environment, however, the present paper employs the label pro-

vided by Koskinen (2000) and Mori (2018) who refer to that legal language variety as 'Eurolect'.

The specificity of EU legal discourse consists in its various features, among them multilingualism, hybridity, textuality, and formulaicity. At the beginning of the present article, EU legal discourse and translation are being approached from different perspectives so as to provide a potential reader with the most crucial linguistic insights into this variety of legal language. However, the quintessential objective of the article is to investigate formulaic nature of the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) from the viewpoint of textual Themes that are used for the indication of information organization in the selected text and study their character from the logico-semantic perspective. At the same time, the frequency of their occurrence was observed based on the analysis which consequently should provide us with the answers to the proposed research questions.

### **Previous research**

Sosoni and Biel (2018, p. 2) refer to EU legal translation as “a perfect case in point for the study of the intersection between law and language” and study the way the EU legal culture is affected by such a multilingual translational routine. This intersection within the framework of EU is perceived as being remarkably complex and specific, mainly because of the interaction between national and supranational features.

One of the reasons for this state of affairs is an inevitable presence of TRANSLATION and translators, which involves an extreme degree of mediation and filtering of law through the EU's official languages, as well as national legal cultures linked to them. This extreme multistage mediation and filtering through the official languages and cultures has led to an emergence of a hybrid supranational EU legal culture. (ibid)

As may be inferred from the statement above, the authors examine the relations among culture, law and language and observe interrelation between national and supranational in connection with those three areas. Sosoni and Biel (2018) further discuss several other important topics, among them the influence of “national legal cultures on legal translation” (ibid). This influence is closely related to what Bednárová-Gibová (2017) mentions in her publication:

EU texts are produced by a large number of authors from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, who very often import

their own drafting conventions, syntax and stylistic features into the (English) source text. (Bednárová-Gibová, 2017, p. 149)

Apart from this interrelation between national legal cultures and legal translation, there is another factor affecting the quality of the final EU text translation, and that is deculturalization. Bednárová-Gibová (2017) explains the cause of this phenomenon as follows:

As a result of interactions among drafters (and translators) of different cultures and languages, the translation of EU texts dismisses the traditional concepts of a source text and a target text due to strong elements of deculturalization and the need to ensure uniform legal interpretation of all language versions. (Bednárová-Gibová, 2017, p. 149)

Concerning EU legal culture Sosoni and Biel (2018) propose that a defining feature of EU legal culture is multilingualism. The authors claim that legal culture of EU has developed in the process of interaction between both the supranational and national cultures, which created “a hybrid conceptual and linguistic space”, and as a consequence of multilingual translational routine. To sum it up, in relation to national culture in multilingual translation and reproduction of hybrid texts like those of EU legal texts, it is appropriate to highlight the role of translators who are involved in the making of such texts:

Hence, it is not the translator’s role to adapt EU texts to national legislation texts, but to keep them in the unchanged form. This accounts for why EU translators do not embark on a domesticating journey when they transcreate them into the other languages; why they do not try to get hold of their own language and culture. (Bednárová-Gibová, 2017, p. 149)

The other perspectives discussed by Bednárová-Gibová (2017) and Sosoni and Biel (2018) is exploration of the English language as *a lingua franca*, which is the role English has acquired for many practical reasons. (Sosoni and Biel, 2018) Bednárová-Gibová (2017, p. 148) approaches English from the perspective of “a lingua franca of the supranational translational EU culture” serving as the instrument of ‘the supranational communication’. Furthermore, the author introduces translational particularities which are characteristic of EU institutional-legal texts. These specificities of EU translation to be closely examined, and which have been, according to the author, marginalized many times even in scholarly literature aimed at EU translation are as follows: the problem of equivalence; the problem of terminological

(in-) congruity, and the problem of the nature of a source text and institutionalization of the EU translation.

Koskinen (2000) in reference to the character of the EU source text claims that it is often connected with “a highly complex and unintelligible language of the multilingual Euro-speak which deforms the national languages into an unnatural format”. (Bednárová-Gibová, 2017, p. 154) As a consequence of such a nature of the EU source text we may see the following phenomenon as described by Bednárová-Gibová (2017): “Thus, national traditions of the Member States’ legislation are starting to disappear amidst the ongoing harmonization of European law”. (ibid, p. 154)

In connection with one of the most distinctive specificity of EU institutional-legal texts – text hybridity, Bednárová-Gibová (2016) analyses complexities of that feature. Furthermore, she aims to figure out the sources of that hybridity and its manifestations at various linguistic levels. Regarding the cognitive level of research problem analysis, the author makes use of some previous authors’ perception of hybridity. The author also examines hybridity as one of the crucial factors in the process of creating transculture. In order to deal with the research problem, the author employs the cross-sectional arrangement for her study, which according to the author, indicates that hybridity in EU discourse is multi-layered and affects the interpretation of EU translation. Bajčić (2018) with reference to text hybridity, makes references to the authors, such as Koskinen and Mori, who deal with the issue of ‘a hybridization of legal languages in the EU’ which takes place as the consequence of the influence of EU legislation. The author also mentions ‘a new European legal culture’ which according to him emerges as a result of the phenomenon referred to by Graziadei (2015) as ‘the Europeanisation of law’. Furthermore, the author examines the relations among culture, law and language in the EU while pointing out the ongoing development occurring in that particular area and highlighting the function of English in the EU, which is *lingua franca*, the term commonly discussed by many of the authors mentioned above. Besides, Bajčić scrutinizes “the alleged neutrality of English and the importance of neutral terminology in EU legal drafting” and tests such a proposition by putting it in contrast to “the backdrop of autonomous concepts of multilingual EU law”. (Bajčić, 2018, p. 8)

### **Formulaicity and hybridity of CJEU documents**

As far back as 1983, Pawley and Syder conducted one of the first linguistic research of formulaic language. They claim that cognitive lexicon of

language users “consists of holistically stored linguistic sequences” and “refer to these sequences as ‘lexicalized or institutionalized sentence stems’”. (Goźdz-Roszkowski, 2018, p. 90) In addition, Trklja (2017) refers to Biber and Conrad who in 1999 arranged a corpus-driven method as an approach for investigation of formulaic language. “The method, which was further elaborated in subsequent studies (e.g. Biber et al., 2004; Biber, 2009) focuses on the distribution of frequently recurring fixed sequences of words called *lexical bundles*”. Biber and Barbieri (2007, p. 270) refer to lexical bundles as “building blocks in discourse” and “a kind of pragmatic ‘head’ for larger phrases and clauses, where they function as discourse frames for the expression of new information”. From the structural viewpoint, Trklja (2017) presents lexical bundles as sequences usually consisting of three to six words having various discourse functions as it is illustrated in the second part of the article based on the analysis of the particular CJEU judgement. The author further refers to Montolio (2001) and Goźdz-Roszkowski (2011) who demonstrate “how recurrent expressions contribute to the textuality of legal texts”, and to McAuliffe (2009) in order to point out “that drafters of the judgments at the CJEU are constrained by the formulaic style of these documents”. (Trklja, 2017, p. 89)

The phenomenon called ‘hybridity of language’ is often referred to by the authors (Born, 1995; Muhr and Kettemann, 2002; Tirkkonen-Condit, 2001) as a source of strangeness of the language of EU institutions in its diverging from what is considered as being normal as those translations contain such linguistic features that usually do not appear in non-translated texts (Trklja, 2017). “Hybrid expressions are considered as lexical items which are produced through translation into a target language, and the semantics of which depart from the semantics observed in ‘standard’ use”. (Trklja 2017, p. 89) However, in accordance with Neubert (2001), it should be noted that not all translations containing hybrid texts can be labelled as entirely hybrid. With reference to McAuliffe (2011, 2013), he states the two reasons for the CJEU’s legal judgements being hybrid texts: the first one is based on the fact that CJEU’s legal judgements are created in ‘a multilingual context’; the second one consists in the fact that legal judgements are products of translation process, which, however, does not guarantee the total hybridity of the translated text. (Trklja, 2017) Nevertheless, there will not be enough space left in the present analysis for the investigation of hybridity of the chosen CJEU document.

## Halliday's (1985) Theory of Information Distribution in Text and System of Logico-semantic Relations

In order to proceed to the practical analysis of the selected text it is inevitable to introduce the theoretical background and issues based on which the analysis is performed. At first, it should be noted that discourse is structurally organized (Hobbs, 1985) and that “texts consist of discourse units which are semantically organized in terms of various types of relations”. (Trklja, 2017, p. 92) In reference to discourse units, Trklja (2017, p. 92) points out that they “have different discourse values or communication functions” and those values/functions are according to Crombie (1985, p. 2) “determined largely with respect to the interaction between sentence meaning and context”. Trklja (2017, p. 92) further explains that in order to comprehend and recognize ‘information development’ in discourse, it is useful to follow the manner by which “sentences are related to each other”.

Halliday (1985) in his theory of information distribution in text provides us with the elementary functional units ‘Theme and Rheme’ that have a specific role in ‘information structure’, and that is “[giving] a clause a character of a message”. (Trklja, 2017, p. 92) However, they differ in relation to their assigned position in a clause.

Theme refers to all the elements in a clause that start from a clause boundary and end with a finite verb and Rheme covers the rest of the clause... The content of the message is developed in Rheme, which is typically associated with new information. The elements that occur in the Theme position, therefore, signal how the message will develop and the content of this message is located in Rheme. (Trklja, 2017, p. 93)

Halliday (1985) distinguishes three types of Themes based on their function or message they convey. The first type are ideational/topical Themes that signal “the propositional content of a clause or message” (Trklja, 2017, p. 93) Interpersonal Themes, which are of the second type, indicate the relation between the writer and reader. And lastly, textual Themes suggest the way of how the information distribution is indicated in a text. Trklja (2017, p. 90) refers to textual Themes as to functionally and structurally incomplete units “which are also associated with a specific textual position” and which “are part of information structure in language and signal discourse organization of texts”.

Trklja (2017, p. 93) further makes mentions of the previous studies (Halliday, 1985; Fries, 1995; Martin, 1995) that dealt with the issue of ‘the flow

of information' in relation to the first type of Themes exploring ideational meaning, however, the author points out that not much attention was paid to interpersonal and textual themes.

The last and for the purpose of the present analysis most crucial theoretical issue to deal with is a system of logico-semantic relations introduced by Halliday (1985). Trklja (2017, p. 93) claims that “[this] system provides a sound basis for the study of the functions of textual Themes”. The system consists in the categorization of different relations that exist between clauses. Halliday recognizes three basic types of these logico-semantic relations – Elaboration, Extension and Enhancement, all of them being further divided into several subclasses.

The first major relation is represented by Elaboration items which function as indicators of the situation in which certain clause “elaborates on the meaning of another by further specifying or describing it”. (Halliday, 1985, In: Trklja, 2017, p. 93) Elaboration items provide us with an indication “that the subsequent clause does not contain new information but instead provides further characterization of a previous clause”. (Trklja, 2017, p. 94) Extension items, on the other hand, indicate “that a clause adds new information to a previously introduced message”. (Trklja, 2017, p. 94) Enhancement items indicate distinguishing of “the content of a message by reference to time, place, manner, cause or condition”. (Trklja, 2017, p. 94)

## **Methodology of the Present Analysis**

This article draws essentially on a text-based approach. The approach to the analysis presented in this article was inspired by the methodology incorporated by Goźdz-Roszkowski (2011) and Halliday (1985). The present analysis consists in researching the multilingual EU document in its English language version while applying both quantitative and qualitative method and serves only as a pilot analysis aiming attention at only one genre of EU legal language – judgements and orders. For the purpose of the analysis, a random EU case-law from the EU Court of Justice – Judgment of 28.2.2019 – CASE C-466/16 P was selected from the EUR-Lex database. The focus of the analysis is on the occurrence of textual Themes and their functioning in the text based on the logico-semantic relations proposed by Halliday (1985). The chosen textual Themes consist of two and more words and are supposed to be indicative of legal language occurring in judgements/orders and opinions as both of them fall under EU case-law.

In addition, the objective of the article is as well to illustrate EU legal discourse as a one-of-a-kind instrument of supranational specialized com-



munication. The lexical units – textual Themes that have been chosen for the purpose of the present analysis will be examined in further research with the help of corpus linguistic software tools and online resources providing phraseological information.

The present analysis addresses the following research questions:

- Which textual Themes having specific functions in the text can be identified in an EU judgement?
- Which kind of textual Themes with regard to their function occur in the analysed text most frequently?
- What are the functions of those textual Themes that were identified in the text?
- In what manner are textual Themes involved in organization of information/discourse?
- Do textual themes contribute to the higher level of formulaicity?

### **An Analysis of the CJEU Case Based on the System of Logico-Semantic relations by Halliday (1985)**

On the basis of the data obtained from the empirical approach towards the text investigation, the present analysis is supposed to answer the first three research questions. The two remaining ones are to be answered particularly on the basis of hypothesising about the data analysis provided by Trklja (2017). As can be inferred from the tables below, textual Themes denoting different logico-semantic relation types are distributed in the analysed text of EU Judgement unevenly. The most frequent and by far the prevailing type of relation between clauses is represented by lexical items of enhancement denoting causal-conditional relations, whereas the lexical items of elaboration and extension were identified in the analysed text far too rarely. Some of the subcategories of elaboration (exposition and exemplification) and of extension (addition and variation) items even did not occur in the text.

Table 2: Overview of subcategories of 'Elaboration items' identified in the analysis

Categories of Elaboration items	Exposition	Exemplification	Clarification
Items found	–	–	in that regard, in particular, in essence

Table 3: Overview of subcategories of 'Extension items' identified in the analysis

Categories of Extension items	Addition	Alternation	Variation
Items found	–	in the alternative	–

Table 4: Overview of subcategories of 'Enhancement items' identified in the analysis

Categories of Enhancement items	Temporal relations	Spatial relations	Manner relations	Causal – conditional relations
Items found	in the first place, in the second place	in the present case, in this case	in accordance with, in so doing	on the ground that, on the basis of, so that, in order to, conditions under which, it follows that

### Distribution of lexical items/textual themes across different categories and subcategories of logico-semantic relations

The following categorization of the lexical items/textual Themes indicating different logico-semantic relations is adapted from Trklja (2017).

#### *Elaboration items*

The first major category of logico-semantic relations is realized by the agency of the following three types of lexical items.

- Exposition signals rephrasing of a statement
- Exemplification signals introduction of instances
- Clarification signals further explanation or interpretation of information

Textual Themes denoting clarification found in the analysed text: *in particular, in essence, in that regard*.

In the example, there are two lexical items of clarification. The structure of **in that regard** – preposition *in* + determiner *that* + *regard* indicates the clarification type of lexical item.

Example: *It found in particular in that regard, in paragraph 76 of that judgment, that even supposing that the traders/blenders bore the anti-dumping duty... (Judgement (EU) of 28.2.2019 – CASE C-466/16 P; ECLI: EU:C:2019:156- EN version, Art. 22)*

### ***Extension items***

The second major category of logico-semantic relations is realized by means of the following three types of lexical items:

- Addition signals adding new content to already existing information
- Alternation signals alternative to the content of previously stated information

Textual Themes denoting alternation found in the analysed text: *in the alternative*.

Example: *In the alternative, the Commission claims that the Court should: (Judgement (EU) of 28.2.2019 – CASE C-466/16 P; ECLI:EU:C:2019:156- EN version, Art. 26)*

- Variation signals substitution of the content of prior information

### ***Enhancement items***

The third and last major category of logico-semantic relations is realized through the four types of lexical items as follows:

- Temporal relations signal a time order in which some actions happened, either successively or simultaneously

Textual Themes denoting temporal relations found in the analysed text: *in the first place, in the second place*.

Example: *Secondly, the General Court found, **in the first place**, in paragraphs 56 to 67 of the judgment under appeal... (Judgement (EU) of 28.2.2019 – CASE C-466/16 P; ECLI:EU:C:2019:156- EN version, Art. 16)*

- Spatial relations signal a frame in which an action took place

Textual Themes denoting spatial relations found in the analysed text: *in the present case, in this case*.

Example: ***In the present case**, by its first ground of appeal, the Council submits that the General Court made two errors of law in its interpretation of the fourth paragraph of Article 263 TFEU... (Judgement (EU) of 28.2.2019 – CASE C-466/16 P; ECLI:EU:C:2019:156- EN version, Art. 36)*

- Manner relations signal a way in which an action occurred

Textual Themes denoting manner relations found in the analysed text: *in accordance with, in so doing*.

Example: ***In accordance with** the settled case-law of the Court of Justice, referred to by the General Court in paragraph 44 of the judgment under appeal... (Judgement (EU) of 28.2.2019 – CASE C-466/16 P; ECLI:EU:C:2019:156- EN version, Art.44)*

- Causal-conditional relations signal the purpose or cause of an action

Textual Themes denoting causal-conditional relations found in the analysed text: *on the ground that, on the basis of, in order to, so that, conditions under which, it follows that.*

As can be seen in the following example, both lexical items *so that* and *conditions under which* are subordinating conjunctions functioning as textual Themes indicating casual-conditional relation.

Example: *...but the traders/blenders who were the exporters of the product concerned to the European Union, **so that, in order to** complete the dumping investigation, the Council had relied on the data of the two traders/blenders that had agreed to cooperate. (Judgement (EU) of 28.2.2019 – CASE C-466/16 P; ECLI:EU:C:2019:156- EN version, Art. 9)*

### **Limitation of the Analysis**

To the greatest extent, the limitations of the given analysis consist primarily in not employing corpus linguistic software tools constructed for efficient text analysis which would provide identification and precise quantification of the occurrence of different lexical items. Biber and Jones (2009) argue that a text analysis performed by incorporating corpus linguistic software tools provides its users with a high level of reliability and consistency being less error-prone in contrast to human being. Moreover, because of not incorporating corpus linguistic software tools for the exploration of the judgement of the EU Court, the analysis was limited to only one EU case of judgement since the detailed analysis carried out manually is a time-consuming task. In connection with a conventional routine in researching legal texts, Biel and Engberg (2013 In: Klbal, 2019, p. 166) claim that “[the] research into legal translation has been predominantly qualitative, product-oriented and descriptive and very often involved a manual analysis of small samples”. However, that changed with the development of corpus linguistic tools allowing for extensive corpora analysis by using quantitative methods. Beaugrande (1996) points out the advancement in corpus linguistics that corpus linguistic tools brought by its development and particularly highlights a suitability of using software tools to handle and process extensive quantity of data while also taking into account their distribution. As Tognini-Bonelli (2001) argues, corpus linguistic tools are constructed to search for formal patterns of language and events occurring repeatedly, as those tools read the text vertically as contrasted to conventional horizontal reading.

## Discussion and Conclusion

For the purpose of the present analysis also the formulaic nature of the selected text of CJEU judgement was examined from the viewpoint of organization of information while observing the frequency of occurrence of the different lexical items – textual Themes denoting relations between clauses based on logico-semantic system of relations proposed by Halliday (1985). The present study incorporates quantitative and qualitative approach towards discourse organization analysis which is based on the study of semantic character of particular lexical items analysed in the text.

Despite the fact that this analysis is not intended to serve as a comparative one, but rather a mixed method approach study, it would be useful to put it in contrast with those analyses accomplished by Trklja (2017) and Trklja, McAuliffe (2018) in order to discuss the answers to the proposed research questions.

Trklja and McAuliffe (2018) in their recent study demonstrate “that paragraph initial multi-word units signal the discourse organization of the entire texts of CJEU judgments”. (Trklja, 2017, p. 105) As it results from their study, the principal pattern they observed semantically corresponds to the causal-conditional types of logico-semantic relations which were signalled by the respective lexical items “occurring with high frequency in the position of textual Themes”. (Trklja, 2017, p. 105) This result of their analysis corresponds to the findings resulting from the present one, as the causal-conditional type of relations between clauses, indicated by the lexical items of enhancement, turned out to be the most frequent one. From the research by Trklja and McAuliffe (2018) another observation emerges that “the same kind of devices [(textual Themes)] are used as discourse organizers both at the macro level of entire texts of judgments and at the paragraph level”. (Trklja, 2017, p. 105) These findings resulting from both analyses provide the answer to the inquiry included in the fourth research question which examined in which manner textual Themes are involved in organization of information/discourse. The conclusion that can be drawn from both the present analysis and the study by Trklja (2017) and Trklja and McAuliffe (2018) is that causal-conditional relations “serve as the primary principle of argumentation in CJEU judgments”. (Trklja, 2017, p. 105)

The last research question may be answered by looking at the findings provided by the above-mentioned author based on his more complex analysis of textual Themes. Due to the already stated limitations of my analysis, it would not serve the purpose to either confirm or disprove contribution of

textual themes to the higher level of formulaicity based just on my analysis which was not aimed at researching frequencies of particular lexical items in relation to their length. Based on Biber (1995) there is some correlation between length of 'linguistic units' (lexical bundles) and frequency of their occurrence. Nevertheless, Trklja (2017, pp. 99-100) argues the following:

In contrast, in the present data the most numerous items are not the shortest linguistic units. This might suggest that structurally and functionally complete formulaic expressions have preferences regarding length. [The analysis] also shows that the number of items corresponds to their frequency, which means that once their length is established the frequency of lexical items can be predicted.

After having divided the identified 'linguistic units' into three types of textual Themes based on Halliday's logico-semantic system, Trklja (2017, p. 100) made an assumption that "the least frequent items do not contribute to the formulaicity of judgments". The author validated the assumption by providing the following results: "items occurring five times, or more frequently, make up 67% of the frequency of all items identified. These more frequent items, therefore, reflect the typical use of thematic items" (ibid). Nevertheless, based on Trklja's (2017) investigation it can be concluded that those textual Themes that occur frequently in judgements may be marked as contributors to the overall formulaicity of judgements while serving as discourse organization indicators.

From the conducted research follows that the selected type of EU texts still offers a number of both theoretical and practical issues to reflect on, among them the inquiry whether there are some specific textual Themes that are exclusively characteristic of EU institutional legal texts. It should be noted as well that over the last few years EU legal language has experienced considerable progress, also as a result of the development of specialised corpus linguistic tools that allow for extensive explorations of sizeable legal text corpora.

## Bibliography

- Bajčić, M. (2018). "The Role of EU Legal English in Shaping EU Legal Culture". In: *International Journal of Language & Law*, no 7.
- Beaugrande, R. de. (1996). 'The "Pragmatics" of Doing Language Science: The "Warrant" for Large-Corpus Linguistics'. In: *Journal of Pragmatics*, no 25.

- Bednárová-Gibová, K. (2016). Hybridity in EU-ese: A Pan-European Harmonization and/or National Disharmony in Translation? In: A. Hučková – M. Djovčoš (eds.). *Preklad a Tlmočenie XII: Hybridita a kreolizácia v preklade a translatológii*. Banská Bystrica: Belianum.
- Bednárová-Gibová, K. (2017). “Translating from a lingua franca in the setting of EU translation”. In: *RUDN Journal of Language Studies. Semiotics and Semantics*, no 8(1).
- Bednárová-Gibová, K. (2020). *Towards an Understanding of EU Translation*. 2nd revised edition. Prešov: Prešovská univerzita.
- Biber, D. (1995). *Dimensions of Register Variation: A Cross-Linguistic Comparison*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, D. (2009). “A corpus-driven approach to formulaic language in English: Multi- word patterns in speech and writing”. In: *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, no 14(3).
- Biber, D., Barbieri, F. (2007). “Lexical bundles in university spoken and written registers”. In: *English for Specific Purpose*, no 26(3).
- Biber, D., Conrad, S. (1999). “Lexical bundles in conversation and academic prose”. In: *Language and Computers*, no 26.
- Biber, D., Jones, J. K. (2009). Quantitative methods in corpus linguistics. In: A. Lüdeling, M. Kytö (eds.), *Corpus linguistics: An international handbook*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., Cortes, V. (2004). “If you look at...: Lexical bundles in university teaching and textbooks”. In: *Applied Linguistics*, no 25(3).
- Biel, Ł. (2014). *Lost in the Eurofog: The Textual Fit of Translated Law*. Frankfurt am Mein: Peter Lang.
- Born, J. S. W. (1995). *Eurotexte: Textarbeit in einer Institution der EG*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.
- Catenaccio, P. (2008). Aspetti linguistici e discorsivi del recepimento nel diritto inglese della Direttiva 1993/13/CE del Consiglio concernente le clausole abusive nei contratti stipulati con i consumatori. In: G. Garzone – F. Santulli (eds.), *Il linguaggio giuridico*. Milano: Giuffrè.
- Crombie, W. (1985). *Process and Relation in Discourse and Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fries, P.H. (1995). A personal view of theme. In: M. Ghadessy (ed.), *Thematic Development in English Texts*. London: Pinter.
- Gibová, K. (2010). *O preklade anglických právnych textov EÚ*. Lingvisticko-translatologická analýza. Prešov: Vydavateľstvo Prešovskej univerzity.
- Gozdz-Roszkowski, S. (2011). *Patterns of Linguistic Variation in American Legal English: A Corpus-based Study*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

- Gozdz-Roszkowski, S. Pontrandolfo, G. (2018). *Phraseology in Legal and Institutional Settings: A Corpus-Based Interdisciplinary Perspective*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Graziadei, M. (2015). Law, Language and Multilingualism in Europe: The Call for a New Legal Culture. In: S. Šarčević (ed.), *Language and Culture in EU Law. Multidisciplinary Perspectives (17)*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Hobbs, J.R. (1985). *On the coherence and structure of discourse. Technical Report: 85-3*. Center for the Study of Language and Information (CSLI), Stanford, CA.
- Hyland, K. (2008). "As can be seen: Lexical bundles and disciplinary variation". In: *English for Specific Purposes*, vol. 27.
- Klbal, O. (2019). "Corpora in Legal Translation: Overcoming Terminological and Phraseological Assymetries between Czech and English". In: *Clina, Interdisciplinary Journal of Translation, Interpreting and Intercultural Communication*, no 5(2).
- Koskinen, K. (2000). "Institutional Illusions. Translating in the EU Commission". In: *The Translator*, vol. 6. no 1.
- Martin, J. R. (1995). More than what the message is about: English theme. In: M. Ghadessy (ed.). *Thematic Development in English Texts*. London: Pinter.
- McAuliffe, K. (2009). Translation at the Court of Justice of the European Communities. In: F. Oslen, D. Stein (eds.). *Translation Issues in Language and Law*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McAuliffe, K. (2011). "Hybrid texts and uniform law? The multilingual case law of the Court of Justice of the European Union". In: *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, no 24.
- McAuliffe, K. (2013). "The limitations of a multilingual legal system". In: *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, no 26(4).
- Montolio, E. (2001). *Conectores de la Lengua Escrita*. Barcelona: Ariel Practicum.
- Mori, L. (2018). *Observing Eurolects. Corpus analysis of linguistic variation in EU law*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Muhr, R., Kettemann, B. (eds.). (2002). *Eurospeak: der Einfluss des Englischen auf europäische Sprachen zur Jahrtausendwende*. Frankfurt am Mein: Peter Lang.
- Pawlwy, A. Syder, F. H. (1983). Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike selection and nativelike fluency. In: J.C. Richards and R.W. Schmidt (eds.). *Language and Communication*. London: Longman.



- Seracini, F. L. (2020). *The Translation of European Union Legislation. A Corpus-based Study of Norms and Modality*. Milano: LED.
- Sosoni, V., Biel, L. (2018). "EU Legal Culture and Translation". In: *International Journal of Language & Law*, no 7.
- Sosoni, V. (2012). "A Hybrid Translation Theory for EU Texts". In: *Vertimo Studijos*, vol. 5.
- The Council of the European Union. (2019). *Judgement of the Court (EU) 2019/156*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1600878504666&uri=CELEX:62016CJ0466>, 04.05.2022.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (2001). "EU project proposals as hybrid texts: Observations from a Finnish research project". In: *Across Languages and Cultures*, no 2(2).
- Tognini-Bonelli, E. (2001). *Corpus Linguistics at Work*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Trklja, A. (2017). A corpus investigation of formulaicity and hybridity in legal language: a case of EU case law texts. In: S. Goźdz-Roszkowski, G. Pontrandolfo (eds.). *Phraseology in Legal and Institutional Settings A Corpus-Based Interdisciplinary Perspective*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Trklja, A., McAuliffe, K. (2018). The European Union Case Law Corpus (EUCLCORP): A Multilingual Parallel and Comparative Corpus of EU Court Judgments. Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Corpus-Based Research in the Humanities: CRH-2. In: A.U. Frank, C. Ivanovic, F. Mambrini, M. Passarotti, C. Sporleder, C. (eds.). *Gerastree Proceedings*, vol. 1.

*Correspondence concerning this paper should be addressed to Vladislav Hrežo, M.A. in English – research fellow at the Institute of British and American Studies at the University of Prešov (Slovakia).*

*E-mail: v.hrezo@gmail.com*