THE ETHNOLINGUISTIC ASPECT OF THE CONCEPTUAL SYSTEM

INTRODUCTION.

Ethnolinguistics is the study of language as an aspect or part of culture, especially the study of the influence of language on culture and of culture on language. It’s a part of anthropological linguistics concerned with the study of the interrelation between a language and the cultural behaviour of those who speak it [12]. The notion that the structure of a language conditions the way in which a speaker of that language thinks is known as the Whorfian hypothesis, and there is much controversy over its validity. Ethnolinguists study the way perception and conceptualization influences language, and show how this is linked to different cultures and societies [9]. The principle of linguistic relativity holds that the structure of a language affects the ways in which its respective speakers conceptualize their world, i.e. their worldview, or otherwise influences their cognitive processes. Popularly known as the Sapir–Whorf hypothesis the principle is often defined to include two versions: Strong version: that language determines thought and that linguistic categories limit and determine cognitive categories. Weak version: that linguistic categories and usage influence thought and certain kinds of non-linguistic behaviour. The relationship between language and culture has been debated by philosophers, linguists and social scientists alike. Western philosophy has been addressing this question at least since the Ancient Greek debate between those who thought that the relationship is natural and those who considered it to be subjective and conventional.

The conceptual system is a set of all concepts entering into mental fund of language, the relations which were in different types among themselves [10, p. 1–25]. Vyvyan Evans treats the conceptual system as a structured and organized repository of concepts available to a human being that catagorizes and conceptualization [5, p. 38]. Then the concept is a fundamental unit of knowledge central to categorization and conceptualization [5, p. 31]. The concepts are realized in the form of ‘representant’ via language. It is possible to call conceptual system a mental framework of a language picture of the world. Human beings are motivated from within to find answers to the ‘why, whence, and whither’ questions of life. Worldviews are generated by the mind’s quest for a framework to orient people to the world around them and to the ultimate issues of life. Immanuel Kant first used the word weltanschauung from which we derive ‘worldview’ in English. Worldviews are shaped by linguistic patterns and are built by individuals.

In the Conceptual System of Jurisprudence (Law science) we will focus on the ‘Legal profession Concept’ in our case this is ‘lawyer’ which can be called a lexical concept: attorney, solicitor, barrister, jurist consult, barrister at law, legal adviser, King’s or Queen’s counsel (K.C.), advocate (noun. person who recommends, teaches, or otherwise helps), authority, buttinski, clubhouse lawyer, judge, advocate (person supporting an idea or cause publicly), pleader, consul (representative), jurist (jurisprudent), defender, justice, legal adviser, legal expert, legal scholar, representative (a person who acts in the stead of another), council person, Dutch uncle, adviser, authority, petitfogger, confidant, consultant, counselor, expert, judge, shyster, counsel, solicitor [4; 8].

DISCUSSION.

All these units constitute the conceptual system of ‘Lawyer’ structured and organized inventory facilitating categorization and conceptualization, in semantics it is represented by the Lexical Semantic field of ‘Lawyer’ sharing a common component in their lexical meaning: a person whose profession is to represent clients in a court of law or to advise or act for clients in other legal matters. We link two types of analysis – lexical and semantic: the lexical field studies the morphology of words, or their shape, form, and construction; the semantic field is the study of the meanings of words. Consequently we limit the constituent of the field by belonging to one part of speech, namely, noun, and by the common semantic component in its lexical meaning. A lexical semantic field is more specifically defined as a set of lexemes which cover a certain conceptual domain (field) and which bear certain specific relations to one another (Adrienne Lehrer, 1985). A lexical field is a set of lexemes that are used to talk about a defined area of experience (Adrienne Lehrer, 1974). A lexical field analysis will attempt to establish the lexemes that are available in the vocabulary for talking about the area under investigation and then propose how they differ from each other in meaning and use. Such an analysis begins to show how the vocabulary as a whole is structured, and more so when individual lexical fields are brought into relationship with each other. When analyzing a set of lexical items, Anna Wierzbicka (2006) does not just examine semantic information. She also pays attention to the syntactic patterns displayed by the linguistic items, and furthermore orders the semantic information in more encompassing scripts or frames, which may in turn be linked to more general cultural
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scripts which have to do with norms of behavior. She therefore offers an explicit and systematic version of the qualitative method of analysis for finding a close equivalent of the conceptual field.

**INVESTIGATION.** There is no prescribed or agreed method for determining what constitutes a lexical field; each scholar must draw their own boundaries and establish their own criteria. It is defined as ‘a person learned in the law; as an attorney, counsel, or solicitor; any person who, for fee or reward, prosecutes or defends causes in courts of record or other judicial tribunals’ of the United States, or of any of the states, or whose business it is ‘to give legal advice in relation to any cause or matter whatever’.

In Global English a lawyer is a person who speaks or writes in support or defense of a person, cause, etc.; a person who pleads for or in behalf of another; intercessor; a person who pleads the cause of another in a court of law.

Cf.: in Russian адвокат – (лат. advocatus, от advoco приглашаю) юрист, оказывающий профессиональную правовую помощь физическим и юридическим лицам (посредством консультаций, представительства их интересов в суде), защиту обвиняемого. Адвокат – (лат. advocatus, от advoco приглашаю) юрист, оказывающий профессиональную правовую помощь физическим и юридическим лицам (посредством консультаций, представительства их интересов в суде), защиту обвиняемого [2; 1]. The definition of English ‘lawyer’ and Russian ‘адвокат’ fully coincide and their common origin stress their international and terminological character.

Now let’s compare the LSP адвокат (лат. advocatus, от advoco приглашаю) in Russian with that of English: статейный, защитник, (прайсжиненный, частный) поверенный, ходатай; юрист, законодавец, правовой, авторский, баристер; защитник, сошитор, юрист, поверенный, устар. устар. статейный, присяжный поверенный, правовой, берущий на себя ведение тяжбы и защиту подсудимого; частный ходатай по тяжёбам. Russian ‘доверенное лицо, занимающееся ведением судебных дел, поверенный’ and English litigator have the common nucleus component. The lexeme 'атторней' refers to the American legal system, while баристер, сошитор underline their English origin [2; c.f.: 1].

As for functional characteristics of the English lawyer, for example, they vary from one national law system to another:

In England and Wales, ‘lawyer’ is used loosely to refer to a broad variety of law-trained persons. It includes practitioners such as barristers, solicitors, legal executives and licensed conveyancers; and people who are involved with the law but do not practice it on behalf of individual clients, such as judges, court clerks, and drafters of legislation.

In Scotland, the word ‘lawyer’ refers to a more specific group of legally trained people. It specifically includes advocates and solicitors. In a generic sense, it may also include judges and law-trained support staff.

In the United States, the term generally refers to attorneys who may practice law; it is never used to refer to patent agents or paralegals.

In Canada, the word ‘lawyer’ only refers to individuals who have been called to the bar or have qualified as civil law notaries in the province of Quebec. Common law lawyers in Canada may also be known as barristers and solicitors, but should not be referred to as ‘attorneys’, since that term has a different meaning in Canadian usage. However, in Quebec, civil law advocates (or avocats in French) often call themselves ‘attorneys’ and sometimes ‘barrister and solicitor’.

In Australia and New Zealand the word ‘lawyer’ is used to refer to both barristers and solicitors (whether in private practice or practicing as corporate in-house counsel). There you can come across the term ‘bush lawyer’ – a person claiming legal or other knowledge when s/he is unqualified to do so:

All Australians know what a bush lawyer is – and how they are bores best avoided.

‘I am only a bush lawyer not an industrial lawyer,’ he added. What bush lawyer gave him the advice that if the Privy Council were restored, these people would automatically be lost to the judiciary system, when that is not that is the case?

According to LEGAL PROFESSION ACT 2004 – SECT 4 in New South Wales, Australia: a lawyer is a legal practitioner, or a barrister, or a solicitor, or a barrister and solicitor, or a solicitor and barrister.

Cf.: In India, the term ‘lawyer’ is often colloquially used, but the official term is ‘advocate’ as prescribed under the Advocates Act, 1961 [6, p. 148–52].

In the UK, the USA, and Australia an ‘in-house lawyer’ (house counsel) is used, it is a lawyer drawing a full time salary from a corporation that he or she represents. There is a specification: an in-house counsel is an attorney who is employed full time in any other state or territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia by a non-governmental corporation, partnership, association, or other legal entity, including its subsidiaries and organizational affiliates, that is not itself engaged in the practice of law or the rendering of legal services outside such organization. We believe that its Russian and Ukrainian close correspondence is ‘юрисконсульт’.

The cross-cultural analysis of the meaning of ‘lawyer’ reveals the semantic components barristers, solicitors, attorney, advocate, licensed conveyancer who makes it his business to draw deeds of conveyance of lands for others. We must admit that they also can have different responsibilities. In most countries, particularly civil law countries, there has been a tradition of giving many legal tasks to a variety of civil law notaries, clerks, and scriveners [8, p. 1–12]. These countries do not have ‘lawyers’ in the American sense, insofar as that term refers to a single type of ‘general-purpose legal services provider’; rather, their legal professions consist of a large number of different kinds of law-trained persons, known as jurists, of which only some are advocates who are licensed to practice in the courts. It is difficult to formulate accurate generalizations that cover all the countries with multiple legal professions, because each country has traditionally had its own peculiar method of dividing up legal work among all its different types of legal professionals.

Notably, England, the mother of the common law jurisdictions, emerged from the Dark Ages with similar complexity in its legal professions, but then evolved by the 19th century to a single dichotomy between barristers and solicitors. An equivalent dichotomy developed between advocates and procurators in some civil law countries, though these two types did not always monopolize the practice of law as much as barristers and solicitors, in that they always coexisted with civil law notaries.

«Conceptual domain analysis may be compared with a semantic field analysis by scholars such as Kittay (1987, 1992), who proposes a distinction between lexical fields and content domains. As Kittay (1987) underlines that a content domain is identifiable but not exhausted by a lexical field’ [cf.: 3]. In other words, lexical fields can provide an initial point of entry into content domains (or conceptual domains) [11, p. 87–106]. Yet their analysis does not provide a full view of conceptual domains, and this is not what is claimed by Wierzbicka and her associates either. No matter what differences they may have in the denotation their connotation must include the following components:

1. Effectivity: in order for an individual to be an effective lawyer, he/she must have certain traits and attributes in order to excel in this occupation. One important trait which lawyers should have is that of articulation. A lawyer who can articulate effectively is one who will be more likely to succeed, not only against opposition parties in the court but also to impress and put their client at ease as well. An articulate lawyer is one who will see result;
2. Intelligence: a positive attribute will ensure that the person representing the client is one who is smart enough to know what to do, when to do it and how to go about getting the results which are necessary to win the case.

3. Good comprehension: It is another favourable trait which all lawyers should have. Although one who likes to read may be a candidate for the legal profession, this in and of itself means nothing if the person reading does not comprehend that which they just read. Statutes and procedural rules are difficult to understand at times and those who have good comprehension skills may prosper at being a lawyer as they will have to read the pertinent documentation much less than those without good comprehension skills.

4. Willingness to work well with others are two additional positive traits which all lawyers should possess. Some people may think that lawyers have to be tough as nails in order to excel in the legal profession, but this is not entirely true. The saying that one catch more flies with honey than vinegar is relevant with regard to being a lawyer. Negotiations go much better when the lawyers put their best foot forward and are willing to come to an amicable solution.

5. Persuasiveness: it is an additional trait which all lawyers should possess. Since, the legal profession is the based around lawyers persuading individuals to see the point of view, a lawyer must be persuasive in their speech and tactics.

Consequently, the given features will enable the construction of separate conceptual systems in their national world views, which will be naturally interconnected due to their common component in the system of the higher level.

In the conceptual system of «Jurisprudence» all subsystems are interconnected that enables them to change their positions or even to join the neighbouring subsystems, for instance, lawyer and jurist, law and jurisprudence, etc.

CONCLUSION AND PERSPECTIVE. According to Cognitive linguistics there can be no boundary between ‘linguistic meaning’ and general conceptual structure, and therefore no boundary between ‘dictionary’ meaning and ‘encyclopedic information’ [3, p.113]. The typical meaning of a word or a sentence is simply the part of general conceptual structure that is activated in the mind of the speaker and hearer. Words can be analyzed and described in terms of their semantic components, which usually come in pairs called semantic oppositions. The analysis of a set of related linguistic items, especially word meanings, into combinations of features in terms of which each item may be compared with every other. This view of meaning is one of the tenets of cognitive linguistics (including Word Grammar) in contrast with the more ‘classical’ or ‘objectivist’ approaches to semantics that have dominated linguistic semantics. Cognitive linguistics cannot match the massive apparatus of formal logic that these approaches bring to bear on the analysis of meaning, but once again the Cognitive Assumption may be able to guide us towards somewhat more formal analyses than have been possible so far [8, p.1–12; 10, p.1–25]. Semantic structure is also a network, and allows a detailed analysis of the both compositional and lexical meaning.

References: