

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.46991/AFA/2026.SI-2.57>

LEGAL ENGLISH: LEXICAL COMPETENCE AND CURRICULUM DESIGN

Anahit Voskanyan**Yerevan State University*ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-7323-1271>

This paper examines both linguistic and pedagogical aspects of legal vocabulary instruction in English for Law courses. The research examines legal language through its formal, precise, and culturally specific nature by studying vocabulary classification, polysemy, synonymy, and lexical field structure in legal discourse. The study aims to develop an effective teaching method for legal lexis to improve students' subject-specific fluency, legal reasoning abilities, and English communicative competence. The research applies theoretical models from applied linguistics, legal semiotics, and ESP curriculum design to achieve its objectives. The research employs descriptive and comparative methods to study authentic legal texts, analyze legal genre terminology and lexical patterns, and develop practical teaching methods for Armenian higher education. The paper examines content-based instruction and conceptual field mapping as recommended instructional methods. The research demonstrates that successful legal vocabulary instruction requires cognitive, contextual, and functional methods that move beyond memorization to develop semantic understanding and cultural awareness. The interdisciplinary approach leads to legal English curriculum innovation through recommendations for developing vocabulary-intensive ESP syllabi.

Keywords: *Legal English, ESP, lexical competence, curriculum design, legal discourse, vocabulary teaching strategies, cross-cultural awareness.*

Introduction

Law school students and legal professionals are challenged to develop oral and written communication fluency in legal English to operate in domestic and foreign legal environments successfully. Therefore, the English for Specific Purposes (ESP) curriculum at law faculties is critical for training students for their academic

* anahit_voskanyan@ysu.am

Received: 25.08.2025

Revised: 20.02.2026

Accepted: 23.02.2026



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

© The Author(s) 2026

and professional work in international legal domains. The growing interdependence of legal systems and increasing frequency of cross-border legal practices make the competence of strong legal English skills an absolute necessity. Legal English is an established professional language that maintains its distinct linguistic characteristics through its unique vocabulary and sentence patterns and its deep integration into particular legal traditions and professional practices. The language exhibits complex structures combined with exact terminology and standardized rhetorical rules. So, legal English instruction requires more than just vocabulary teaching because it encompasses the entire language system. The teaching method needs to focus on the semiotic aspects as well as the functional and cognitive elements of the language. This paper examines the linguistic and educational principles needed to teach legal vocabulary in ESP programs while focusing on developing curricula for Armenian university students. The research uses theoretical models from applied linguistics, legal discourse analysis, and ESP pedagogy to advocate for teaching methods beyond memorization toward functional learning approaches.

This research aims to investigate and analyze the linguistic and educational bases for teaching legal terminology with emphasis on lexical development, develop a pedagogically sound framework highlighting the selection, presentation, and teaching of legal English vocabulary in the English for Law course to improve students' academic progress and their professional legal communicative skills, enabling them to correctly understand and interpret legal terminology across various professional contexts.

Within the ranges of the stated aim, the research establishes the following objectives: 1. the classification of legal English vocabulary in terms of its semantic, functional, and stylistic characteristics; 2. the examination of linguistic theories focusing on lexical semantics and lexical field theories; 3. the identification of effective pedagogical strategies with due attention to the Armenian legal education context; 4. the analysis of the effect of polysemous and synonymous words in interpreting legal terms; 5. the recommendation of curriculum covering content, frame, and cognitive-based instruction.

Legal linguistic approaches aligned with ESP pedagogical methods form the interdisciplinary framework to improve legal English teaching in the English for Law course. The drive to acquire legal lexical competence minimizes the traditionally accepted strategy of memorizing terminology.

The study presents a culturally adapted vocabulary classification system that targets Armenian legal education while maintaining global teaching applicability.

Theoretical foundations and methodology

The study implements a multi-disciplinary theoretical structure that combines findings from lexicology, legal discourse analysis, ESP pedagogy, and cognitive linguistics. The fundamental research principle views legal English as a specialized language system that derives its form from functional, semiotic, and cultural elements.

The study of legal vocabulary requires analysis through lexical field theory alongside frame semantics and polysemy analysis within linguistic theory. According to Léon (1997) and Cruse (1986), lexical field theory demonstrates that words acquire meaning based on their relationship to other terms within conceptual domains. Vocabulary items group into semantic clusters or fields that link through functional and conceptual relationships. Legal English terminology, including jurisdiction, statute, precedent, and liability, exists in close semantic relationships that form a cohesive semantic network.

Analyzing legal terms through frame semantics, the Cognitive Frame Semantics Theory, developed by Fillmore (1982), expands our understanding of legal thought and concepts. It establishes that meanings emerge by activating conceptual structures known as frames, which relate to specific situations. For example, the mental framework of a contract includes essential elements such as offer, acceptance, consideration, breach, and remedies. The instructional approach of frame theory enables students to learn vocabulary through its relationships with complete conceptual frameworks.

Sheigal's (2000) *Semiotic Theory of Legal Language* defines legal discourse as a complete sign system that generates meaning through lexical content and the legal-cultural framework where these terms exist—legal terminology functions as symbolic units within an organized institutional framework of discourse according to this semiotic approach.

Legal discourse analysis requires the interpretation of legal English through genre conventions, pragmatic functions, and communicative goals according to Bhatia (1993). Legal texts function as performance tools because they create new realities instead of merely depicting existing ones. The fundamental legal communication requirement includes precise language and complete control over writing style. Students need to understand the different legal writing genres, including contracts, statutes, judgments, and pleadings, as well as their distinctive lexical characteristics.

The instructional approach based on ESP methodology serves as a method to connect theoretical knowledge with practical applications. The ESP teaching approach delivers content-focused instruction that matches students' academic and

professional requirements according to Hutchinson and Waters (1987). The instruction for legal English vocabulary should include content-based instruction (CBI), task-based language teaching (TBLT), and cognitive-linguistic approaches, which help students learn vocabulary beyond memorization, focusing on semantic understanding, contextual awareness, and professional competence. The teaching models require a needs analysis followed by learner-specific approaches and content-focused education as fundamental elements for legal English instruction of law students and legal professionals. According to their framework, ESP instruction needs to mirror both linguistic requirements and professional needs of the target domain. Thus, the theoretical combination of linguistic, legal, and pedagogical knowledge is a basis for developing innovative curricula. Instructors who link their curriculum design to linguistic theory and legal discourse analysis can establish ESP programs that provide students with legal reasoning and English language communication tools.

The research employs a descriptive and comparative methodology, analyzing educational practices in the English for Law course. Data collection included: The study evaluated legal terminology recognition and usage through pre- and post-course lexical assessments. A classroom study was conducted among 34 second-year law students to apply a descriptive method. The research evaluated the impact of theoretical models, including vocabulary classification, frame-based learning, and lexical field instruction, on students' legal vocabulary development, contextual competence, and legal English communication confidence. To exercise the comparative method, the students were given translation assignments of authentic texts such as legal documents, cases, etc, to find out how they selected the vocabulary and understood the context and conceptual meanings of the terms. Learners' reflection was asked.

The students explained how their understanding of legal English as a system improved through performing translation assignments, analyzing actual legal documents, and targeted vocabulary instruction. Students ranked frame-based and lexical field exercises as the most effective methods to build their confidence while improving their understanding of the subject matter.

“I learned legal terms through memorization before this period. Legal terms now have meaning for their use in different legal documents. I can explain the legal terms to my Armenian peers,” a 2nd-year student reflected.

Key outcomes and implications for curriculum design

Students demonstrated substantial growth in their legal vocabulary comprehension and interpretive skills. The students enhanced their ability to recall and apply legal

terminology correctly by 42% through their work on ambiguous and polysemous terms. Students improved their skills in organizing legal terms by functional categories (e.g., torts, contract law, civil procedure), which is fundamental for handling legal professional discourse. In the translation analysis, students reduced their literal translations and legal term misuses by 38%. Students selected functionally equivalent or paraphrased alternatives instead of literal translations when encountering legal-cultural differences. The students achieved situational expression context recognition at a rate of 76% through frame-based exercises that improved their understanding of procedural logic, such as offer and acceptance, and judgment vs. sentencing. Students demonstrated correct understanding of polysemous terms, including *case*, *appeal*, *party*, and *sentence*, by using legal definitions instead of everyday language definitions in 64% of their responses.

The research demonstrates that systematic legal vocabulary instruction based on theory enhances lexical competence through activities involving frame-based translation, cultural comparison, and terminology classification models. Integrating legal vocabulary within conceptual fields allows students to understand legal English analytically and functionally. The research evidence supports the development of ESP syllabi that incorporate linguistic principles and contextual awareness for Armenian legal education.

Teaching English for Law students requires a specific instructional plan to handle the characteristics of legal language that experts call legalese. The specific language used in law features unique patterns of words as well as grammatical and stylistic characteristics that make it distinguishable from regular English usage. Legal language requires comprehensive educational methods because its complexity requires a complex teaching approach for translation and instruction.

E. I. Sheigal (2000) explains that legal language functions as an entire semiotic system, demonstrating organized and sign-based characteristics of legal discourse. English legal sublanguage demands analysis through semantic, semiotic, cognitive, and cultural perspectives.

Semantic Function is responsible for the use of legal terms in interpretation and communication, which requires absolute precision and clear definition. The precise definition of legal terminology and contextual knowledge proves essential for legal communication and translation needs.

Semiotic Function stands for the use of legal discourse that operates as both a tool for communication and a collection of symbolic elements. To achieve accurate translation and legal interpretation, one must first master legal *frames* and their rhetorical structures, including cause-and-effect reasoning, conditionals, and procedural sequences.

Cognitive Framing helps students understand and duplicate legal concepts by learning the legal meaning through frame semantics, together with cognitive-semantic frameworks. This method allows learners to develop stronger comprehension abilities and learn to translate with context awareness.

Cultural Sensitivity is expressing legal concepts through language, which depends on specific cultural approaches to legal thought and reasoning methods. Legal terms contain cultural elements that translators should understand for effective cultural and systemic adaptation. To achieve precise and meaningful legal translation, one should know all external elements, including historical and institutional aspects.

Classification of legal vocabulary: polysemy and precision

The legal vocabulary exists in separate categories that distinguish its usage patterns and complexity levels.

1. General legal vocabulary: Terms used in both legal and general contexts (e.g., *right* - աջ, ճիշտ, իրավունք, *motion* - շարժում, միջնորդություն, sentence - նախադասություն, դատավճիռ, դատապարտել, *bill* - հաշիվ, օրինագիծ, *will* - կամք, կտակ, *fine* - հիանալի, տուգանք, տուգանել, *party* - խնջույք, կուսակցություն, իրավական վեճի կողմ)։

2. Legally borrowed terms: Terms imported directly or partially from other languages (e.g., *precedent* - նախադեպ, *barrister* - դատական փաստաբան, *solicitor* - խորհրդատու փաստաբան)։

3. Non-borrowed legal phrases: Multi-word expressions that convey legal concepts (e.g., *peremptory challenge* – առարկություն առանց պատճառաբանության՝ առարկություն երդվյալ ատենակալին ընդգրկելու տվյալ խմբում, *challenge for cause* – ըստ պատճառի առարկություն՝ առարկություն երդվյալ ատենակալին ընդգրկելու տվյալ խմբում, *common sense* – առողջ դատողություն)։

4. Technical legal terms: Words specific to the legal domain, often without direct equivalents in general English (e.g., *tor* – քաղաքացիական իրավախախտում, *indictment* – մեղադրական ակտ)

5. Archaisms and Latinisms: Traditional or Latin-derived terms that remain functional in legal settings (e.g., *herein* – այս փաստաթղթում, *hereby* – սույնով, այս փաստաթղթով, *vice versa* – ընդհակառակը, *burden of proof* – ապացույցի բեռ, *beyond a reasonable doubt* - ողջամիտ կասկածից դուրս)

6. Proper legal nouns and Institutional names: names that carry jurisdictional meaning (e.g., *Old Bailey* – Կենտրոնական քրեական դատարան, որը գտնվում է *Old Bailey* փողոցում, *Miranda warning* – Միրանդայան Արիզոնայի դեմ՝ գործ, առ այն, որ նրա իրավունքները ոտնահարվել են՝ ձերբակալվածին պետք է ընթերցեն իր սահմանադրական իրավունքները)

This classification helps across domains, sequences vocabulary from accessible to complex, and assesses student understanding. Legal discourse features polysemy as its regular practice rather than an unusual occurrence. Harutyunyan (2011) explains that semantic complexity arises from legal language due to this specific feature. The word *sentence* functions as a linguistic structure and a court verdict based on the textual context. The Latin term *jus civile* demonstrates multiple meanings that developed across historical periods and legal jurisdictions to describe both Roman civil law and state law compared to divine (*jus divinum*) and natural law (*jus naturae*) (Harutyunyan, 2011).

English legal terms such as *government, jurisdiction, and law* demonstrate semantic complexity because they maintain multiple meanings that differ across various legal frameworks and fields (Tiersma, 1999). Legal precision remains essential because it serves as the foundation. The process becomes distorted through procedural misinterpretation because of small mistakes in legal terminology. Common law systems maintain a crucial distinction between *to cite* and *to quote* since their meanings produce different interpretations of legal arguments (Šarčević, 1997; Tiersma, 1999).

Justice represents the U.S. Supreme Court judge position and the abstract legal concept of fairness or legal principle. The legal profession has distinct terms, including *lawyer, attorney, solicitor, and barrister*, which do not translate between jurisdictions. Legal writers should select terminology based on British, American, or other legal systems to prevent meaningful misunderstandings, according to Bhatia (1993).

Students require training from educators to detect these subtleties, especially when they lack knowledge about common law principles. Students who understand polysemy and precision in legal language develop better abilities to analyze legal texts and select appropriate terminology for academic and professional writing. Students in ESP contexts need to learn both specific vocabulary, context understanding, and functional capabilities (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987).

US vs UK Legal English vocabulary: taxonomical distinctions

The comparison between U.S. and U.K. legal terminology requires both cultural and lexical knowledge.

The distinction between American and British legal terminology is a cultural and linguistic necessity for legal English instruction. According to Chirnova (2016), many legal terms cannot be effectively taught through the learner’s native language alone as they require analysis and internalization in their original English-language legal frameworks to expose their complete semantic, functional, and institutional nuances. The United States and the United Kingdom have distinct names and organizational structures for their legal and governmental institutions, even though their names seem identical. The following institutional comparison demonstrates this difference between the two systems:

Concept	United States	United Kingdom
Ministry of Foreign Affairs	State Department	Foreign and Commonwealth Office
Ministry of Finance	Treasury Department	Treasury
Ministry of Justice	Department of Justice	Department for Constitutional Affairs
Ministry of Education	Department of Education	Department for Education and Skills
Attorney General	Justice Minister	Public Prosecutor

Table 1: Institutional comparison of the US and the UK systems

The etymological and terminological levels reveal fundamental distinctions between these concepts. Black’s Law Dictionary (Garner, 2019) demonstrates that equivalent terms in appearance have different meanings because of the common law system in the U.K. and the federal statutory system in the U.S.

The differences between these systems require teachers to use comparative analysis when teaching legal English. Students who study English for Specific Purposes (ESP) or English for Legal Purposes (ELP) benefit from exploring these differences because it improves their legal reasoning while preventing semantic overgeneralization or functional misapplication. Legal English curricula should include side-by-side terminology comparisons to develop students' lexical precision and intercultural legal competence.

The legal terminology used to classify criminal law violations differs between American and British English. Taxonomical distinctions between *crime* and *offence* illustrate these differences. The legal system in America uses the term *crime* as a

term to describe penal code violations, but British legal discourse prefers the term *offence*, which includes minor and severe violations of law (Haigh, 2018).

In American law, the classification of criminal *offences* depends on the nature of criminal acts systematically. This taxonomy includes:

- *Offences against persons (e.g., murder, manslaughter)*
- *Offences against habitation and occupation (e.g., burglary, arson)*
- *Offences against property (e.g., larceny)*
- *Offences against morality and decency (e.g., adultery)*
- *Offences against public order and government (e.g., treason)*

The U.S. legal system uses lettered categories to divide felonies and misdemeanors between different levels of severity, with three categories for each type of crime.

- *Felonies: A felony, B felony, C felony*
- *Misdemeanors: A misdemeanor, B misdemeanor, C misdemeanor* (Garner, 2019)

British criminal law uses different procedures to categorize crimes. Instead, offences are divided procedurally into:

- *Summary offences (tried in Magistrates' Courts)*
- *Either-way offences (can be tried in either the Magistrates' or the Crown Court)*
- *Indictable offences (tried in the Crown Court)*

The British system's procedure-based classification method contrasts with the American system's sentence-based orientation (Bhatia, Candlin, & Gotti, 2008); therefore, legal English learners and translators should identify these terminological differences since incorrect interpretation occurs when dealing with legal terms across jurisdictions.

Practical guidelines for teaching and translating legal texts

The practical instruction of legal English vocabulary and translation requires pedagogically grounded methods promoting linguistic competence and legal reasoning. These instructional methods help learners learn to read legal texts and identify classifications while translating legal terminology in actual legal settings.

1. Textual Analysis for Legal Literacy and Translation Practice: Teaching methods should present students with authentic legal documents, including contracts, statutes, case law, and judicial opinions, to develop their analysis abilities. Students study legal terms alongside their syntax and discourse patterns to understand how these components affect translation choices. The method produces

both precise linguistic output and better comprehension of legal genres, as well as an improved understanding of legal interpretation.

2. Frame-Based Learning Tasks: The design of translation activities should use legal frames representing thematic modules such as contract formation, criminal proceedings, and tort liability. The teaching approach utilizes Frame Semantics (Fillmore, 1985) to help students understand legal concepts and their associated actors and procedures, defining key legal ideas. The method allows students to achieve deeper semantic comprehension while improving their ability to translate functions correctly between languages.

3. Terminology Classification and Contextual Practice: Through the taxonomy developed by Miloslavskaya (2000), students learn to classify legal terms into general-use, context-specific, core legal, and technical vocabulary. Through this exercise, students develop their ability to recognize and identify different term uses across different legal contexts. Students conduct Armenian translations of these terms while maintaining semantic accuracy and choosing appropriate functional equivalents and register-sensitive options.

4. Consistency and Precision Development Workshops: Instructors design learning activities to help students evaluate translation consistency, semantic stability, and terminological precision according to Khizhniak's (1997) criteria for legal terminology. Workshops provide essential assistance for working with system-bound terms and culturally embedded expressions when target language equivalents do not exist.

5. Cross-Cultural Legal Reflection and Comparative Analysis: Students should participate in classroom discussions that explore how legal definitions differ between jurisdictions. The classroom activity enables students to compare English and Armenian legal terminology while identifying cultural differences that necessitate translation methods such as annotation, paraphrasing, or adaptation. Through intercultural education, students develop better capabilities to interpret and think critically.

6. Strategy-Oriented Practice and Metacognitive Awareness: Students need systematic training to select suitable translation methods for legal objectives and linguistic elements. Students will learn through exercises that involve identifying similarities between the English and Armenian legal systems before applying translation methods, including functional equivalence, borrowing, calque, transcreation, and descriptive translation. Teachers should help students develop metacognitive skills through questioning to understand their selection process and assess their results.

Including these educational approaches in English for Law programs helps students build legal knowledge and translation abilities. The dual-method approach enables students to develop precise language and cultural competence for legal communication while creating translations that match professional standards and maintain contextually accurate meanings. This instructional approach fulfills law students' language requirements and builds their capacity for legal communication in multicultural and multilingual professional environments.

The structure of lexical fields in legal discourse

Legal discourse includes lexical fields, also known as semantic or conceptual fields, that combine related terms from specific legal domains such as constitutional law, contract law, and criminal procedure. These terms are interconnected through their meanings, legal functions, and usage within legal texts and institutions. In criminal law, the English terms *crime*, *felony*, *misdemeanor*, *offender*, and *prosecution* correspond to Armenian words հանցագործություն, ծանր հանցագործություն, թեթև հանցագործություն, հանցագործ, and մեղադրող. Each term functions as part of a semantic network that mirrors the legal system's organization while maintaining relationships between words that represent legal concepts and procedural positions.

The vocabulary of contract law includes English terms such as *offer*, *acceptance*, *consideration*, and *breach*, which maintain conceptual connections and functional relationships between them. The Armenian equivalents of these terms consist of առաջարկ, ընդունում, հակառակ կողմի տրամադրած վճարը՝ փոխհատուցում and խախտում. Legal translators and learners should acknowledge that the Armenian legal doctrine lacks direct translations for concepts, including the term *consideration*. Functional explanations combined with annotations are essential tools when dealing with such instances.

The lexical domains contain terminology specific to particular systems and cultural contexts. The legal concepts of *Common Law* and *Miranda Rights* need translation or adaptation, often accompanied by explanatory notes, because Armenia does not follow civil law traditions (e.g., *Common Law* → Ընդհանուր իրավունքի համակարգ, *Miranda Rights* → Միրանդայի իրավունքներ). The Armenian legal terms քաղաքացիական պահանջ (*civil claim*) and օրենսդրական նախաձեռնություն (*legislative initiative*) need precise translation to equivalent English terms, which should match the legal framework of the target audience.

These lexical fields provide learners with a better ability to detect semantic connections between legal concepts and grasp legal reasoning methods and precise term usage in specific contexts. The method supports critical thinking skills in cross-system legal education since students evaluate how Armenian and Anglo-American legal terminology relate to their conceptual bases.

Legal vocabulary requires knowledge of lexical fields, representing thematic semantic networks within legal language.

Examples:

- The *judicial field* contains three distinct procedural concepts: opinion, decision, and judgment.
- *The Criminal law field* establishes legal severity through its use of felony, misdemeanor, indictment, and arrest.
- *The Administrative law* includes regulations, directives, statutes, and ordinances, which function within separate governance systems.

Learning about lexical fields enables students to recognize term relationships and create thematic vocabulary collections. Students develop better writing and speaking abilities in law because this approach helps them demonstrate fluency and precise analytical skills.

The legal discourse about judicial procedures utilizes a distinct lexical field that contains the vocabulary of decision, opinion, and judgment. Legal specialists recognize distinct meanings for these words that appear similar to general audiences yet hold particular legal definitions. A legal proceeding produces a decision that represents its final result. Judges provide written explanations for their decisions through their opinions. A judicial ruling can have dual functions because it serves as both a court declaration and a legal effect. According to Harutyunyan (2011, p. 229), these functional legal procedures maintain separate divisions. Students learning law English need training to achieve accurate translation skills when identifying legal terminology differences.

The structure and complexity of English legal terminology require students and professionals who study legal English to understand its components. A high level of lexical awareness is necessary because English legal terminology uses Latin and contains multiple meanings in the same word and meanings of multiple words that depend on context. Legal English syllabi must include these features to help students develop their precision, comprehension, and legal reasoning skills in English, which are essential for practical work in international legal contexts.

A sample syllabus for a university-level English for Law (ESP) course is provided below to help students learn legal vocabulary, reading comprehension, and translation skills, and develop oral and written communication in legal

contexts. The curriculum can be used to teach B2–C1 level learners who study law at universities in Armenia and comparable legal institutions.

Course Title: English for Law (ESP)

Duration: 15 weeks | 2×40-minute sessions/week

Course Aim: The program aims to help the students develop legal English vocabulary acquisition and translation skills.

Learning Objectives: The program aims to achieve the following goals by its conclusion:

1. Classify core legal vocabulary.
2. Explain legal concepts in English and Armenian.
3. Translate legal texts (e.g., contracts, statutes, case briefs).
4. Distinguish UK–US legal terminology.
5. Apply translation and writing strategies.
6. Engage in legal discussions and simulations.

Theoretical Framework:

- ESP Methodology (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987)
- Frame Semantics (Fillmore, 1985)
- Legal Discourse Analysis (Šarčević, 1997; Bhatia, 1993)
- Lexical Field Theory (Léon, 1997; Cruse, 1986)

Week	Topic	Focus	Activities
1	Intro to Legal English	Reading	Diagnostic test, glossary
2	Legal Systems	Speaking	Mapping, discussion
3	Courts & Professions	Reading	Diagramming, role cards
4	Vocabulary Types	Lexis	Semantic grouping
5	Polysemy & Homonymy	Translation	Word studies
6	Legal Style	Writing	Clause revision
7	Contracts	Vocabulary	Clause analysis
8	Criminal Law	Translation	Code comparison
9	Tort Law	Translation	Armenian-English matching
10	Phraseology & Latin Terms	Listening	Phrase banks
11	Translation Strategies	Translation	Peer review
12	Culture in Legal Terms	Discussion	Legal lacunae
13	Case Law & Precedent	Reading	Case briefing
14	Legal Writing	Writing	Memo drafting
15	Review + Presentations	Speaking	Simulations

Table 2: Course Syllabus: Weekly Overview

Component	%
Vocabulary Quizzes (3)	15%
Midterm Translation Task	20%
Legal Writing Assignment	15%
Oral Presentation	10%
Participation & Peer Review	10%
Final Evaluation (reading/writing/translation)	30%

Table 3: Assessment Breakdown

Key Materials:

- Šarčević, S. (1997). *New Approach to Legal Translation*.
- Bhatia, V. (1993). *Analysing Genre*.
- Glendinning, E., & Glendinning, J. (2001). *English for Legal Professionals*.
- Armenian Civil & Criminal Codes (bilingual format)
- Black’s Law Dictionary (for reference)

Teaching Methods:

- Task- and project-based learning
- Comparative legal analysis
- Peer collaboration and review
- Glossary development
- Mini-lectures with authentic texts

Conclusion

Teaching legal English requires more than term memorization because students should learn vocabulary that relates to concepts and functions in real-world contexts. The learning process enables students to handle legal texts by identifying functional and specific vocabulary through understanding polysemic terms and their place within discourse and lexical fields.

The research demonstrates the need for curricular development that combines frame-based learning with ESP principles and intercultural legal reasoning. Through this educational method, students learn precise legal language, develop critical thinking abilities, translational skills, and comparative legal understanding. Legal vocabulary needs to be presented as an interconnected system that relates to institutional settings, cultural standards, and communicative practices instead of being presented as individual terms.

A curriculum of legal English that incorporates lexical theory and semiotics and best teaching practices will better equip law students and translators to handle

the complexities of global legal communication. Legal education's increasing multilingual and multicultural nature requires students to learn legal discourse interpretation and production with confidence as a fundamental professional skill.

Conflict of interests

The authors declare no ethical issues or conflict of interests in this research.

Ethical standards

The authors affirm that this research does not involve human subjects.

References

- Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analyzing genre: Language use in professional settings*. Longman.
- Bhatia, V. K., Candlin, C. N., & Gotti, M. (2008). *Legal discourse across cultures and systems*. Hong Kong University Press.
- Carter, R. (1998). *Vocabulary: Applied linguistic perspectives*. Routledge.
- Chirnova, I. I. (2016). *Teaching legal English in higher education: A comparative perspective*. Yurait Publishing.
- Garner, B. A. (2019). *Black's Law Dictionary*. Thomson Reuters.
- Haigh, R. (2018). *Legal English*. Routledge.
- Harutyunyan, A. A. (2011). *English for law students: A lexical approach*. YSU Press.
- Harutyunyan, A. A. (2011). The specifics of legal terminology and its use in translation. *Yerevan State University Legal Review*, 3, 229-240.
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learning-centred approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Khizhnyak, S. P. (1997). *Yuridicheskaya terminologiya: Formirovanie i sostav [Legal terminology: Formation and structure]*. Izdatel'stvo Saratovskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta. (in Russian)
- Miloslavskaya, D. I. (2000). Typical difficulties in the semantic interpretation of a legal text. *Legal Linguistics*, Altai State University, 104-116.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (1976). The role of vocabulary teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10(1), 77-89. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3585941>
- Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Šarčević, S. (1997). *New approach to legal translation*. Kluwer Law International.

- Sheigal, E. I. (2000). Semiotika politicheskogo diskursa [Semiotics of political discourse]. Peremena. (in Russian)
- Tiersma, P. M. (1999). Legal language. University of Chicago Press.
- Tomakhin, G. D. (1981). *Lingvostranovedcheskaya teoriya stranyevedcheskogo materiala* [Linguo-Cultural theory of cultural material. Russian Language Publishers. (in Russian)
- Voskanyan, A. (2019). The intercultural aspect of teaching the legal English sub-language. Yerevan State University.

**ԻՐԱՎԱԲԱՆԱԿԱՆ ԱՆՊԼԵԲԵՆ.
ԲԱՌԱՊԱՇՇԱՐԱՅԻՆ ԿԱՐՈՂՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐ ԵՎ
ՌԻՍՈՒՄՆԱԿԱՆ ԾՐԱԳՐԻ ՄՇԱԿՈՒՄ**

Անահիտ Ոսկանյան

Սույն հոդվածը քննարկում է իրավաբանական բառապաշարի ուսուցման լեզվաբանական և մանկավարժական հիմքերը «*English for Law*» դասընթացներում: Հաշվի առնելով իրավաբանական լեզվի մասնագիտացված և բազմաչափ բնույթը, որը հաճախ բնութագրվում է ինքնատիպ պաշտոնական ձևով, ճշգրտությամբ և մշակութային յուրահատկությամբ՝ ուսումնասիրությունը վերլուծում է այնպիսի կարևոր խնդիրներ, ինչպիսիք են իրավաբանական բառապաշարի դասակարգումը, բազմիմաստությունը, հոմանշությունը և իրավաբանական դիսկուրսում բառային դաշտերի կառուցվածքը: Հոդվածի նպատակն է առաջարկել իրավաբանական բառապաշարի ուսուցման մանկավարժորեն հիմնավորված և լեզվաբանական տեսանկյունից հստակ կառուցված մոտեցում, որը կնպաստի ուսանողների առարկայահենք հաղորդակցական կարողությունների, իրավական մտածողության և բանավոր-գրավոր հմտությունների զարգացմանը: Այս առումով՝ հոդվածը ելնում է կիրառական լեզվաբանության, իրավաբանական նշանագիտության և ESP ուսումնական ծրագրերի տեսական դրույթներից: Գործադրելով նկարագրական և համեմատական քննության մեթոդները՝ հետազոտությունն անդրադառնում է բնագիր իրավաբանական տեքստերի վերլուծությանը, իրավաբանական ժանրերում տերմինաբանական բառապաշարի յուրահատկությունների բացահայտմանը և ուսուցման գործնական ռազմավարությունների վերլուծությանը՝ հայկական բարձրագույն կրթության փորձի դիտարկմամբ: Հոդվածում քննարկվում և առաջարկվում են այնպիսի ուսուցողական մոտեցումներ, ինչպիսիք են բովանդակության վրա հիմնված ուսուցումը, և հասկա-

ցությամբ դաշտերի քարտեզագրումը: Վերլուծության արդյունքներն արձանագրում են, որ իրավաբանական բառապաշարի արդյունավետ ուսուցումը պետք է ներառի ճանաչողական, համատեքստային և գործառական ռազմավարություններ, որպեսզի խթանի բառապաշարի խորքային իմաստային ընկալումն ու միջմշակութային ըմբռնումը՝ շրջանցելով բառերը անգիր սերտելու և հիշողության մեջ ամրագրելու մոտեցումը: Միջգիտակարգային այս մոտեցումը նպաստում է իրավաբանական անգլերենի ծրագրային լավարկմանը՝ առաջարկելով իրավական բառապաշարով հագեցած Legal English դասընթացների նախագծում և իրականացում:

Հիմնաբառեր՝ *իրավագիտության անգլերեն, անգլերենը հատուկ նպատակների համար, ծրագրի մշակում, իրավական խոսույթ, բառապաշարի ուսուցման ռազմավարություն, միջմշակութային իրազեկություն:*