

Vilnius University
Faculty of Philology
Department of English Philology

Greta Pažereckaitė

Who is More Guilty? Collocational Resonance of the Nouns "kaltinamasis",
"accused" and "defendant"

Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of requirements for the degree of MA in Language for
Specific (Legal) Purposes

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Rita Juknevičienė

2022

Acknowledgements

I sincerely thank my research supervisor Dr. Rita Juknevičienė for leading and guiding me during my academic journey in Vilnius University. I will forever be indebted to her for helping me in every step of the way, providing invaluable advice and patiently answering what now seems as millions of questions. I also want to express my gratitude to the academic staff from the Faculty of Philology and the Faculty of Law for introducing me to the world of law and making it as accessible as possible. Lastly, I would like to thank my family and friends for their encouragement and continual support in the course of writing this research.

Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| List of Tables | 4 |
| List of Abbreviations | 5 |
| Abstract..... | 6 |
| 1. Introduction | 6 |
| 2. Literature Review | 8 |
| 2.1. Linguistic features of legal discourse | 8 |
| 2.2. Formulaicity of legal discourse..... | 9 |
| 2.3. Study of collocations..... | 10 |
| 2.3.1. Approaches to and classifications of collocations..... | 10 |
| 2.3.2. Research on collocations in legal discourse | 11 |
| 2.3.3. The collocational resonance approach..... | 12 |
| 2.4. The perception and treatment of culprits | 13 |
| 3. Data and Methods..... | 15 |
| 4. Results and Discussion | 17 |
| 4.1. Nouns <i>kaltinamasis</i> , <i>accused</i> and <i>defendant</i> in legal language | 17 |
| 4.1.1. Noun collocates of <i>kaltinamasis</i> , <i>accused</i> and <i>defendant</i> in the Code _{LT} , Code _{CAN} and Code _{US} | 17 |
| 4.1.2. Major semantic groups of the noun collocates of <i>kaltinamasis</i> , <i>accused</i> and <i>defendant</i> in the Code _{LT} , Code _{CAN} and Code _{US} | 21 |
| 4.1.3. Verb collocates of <i>kaltinamasis</i> , <i>accused</i> and <i>defendant</i> in the Code _{LT} , Code _{CAN} and Code _{US} | 29 |
| 4.1.4. Major semantic groups of the verb collocates of <i>kaltinamasis</i> , <i>accused</i> and <i>defendant</i> in the Code _{LT} , Code _{CAN} and Code _{US} | 33 |
| 4.2. Nouns <i>kaltinamasis</i> , <i>accused</i> and <i>defendant</i> in general language | 41 |
| 4.2.1. Noun collocates of <i>kaltinamasis</i> , <i>accused</i> and <i>defendant</i> in the Corpus _{LT} , Corpus _{CAN} and Corpus _{US} | 41 |
| 4.2.2. Major semantic groups of the noun collocates of <i>kaltinamasis</i> , <i>accused</i> and <i>defendant</i> in the Corpus _{LT} , Corpus _{CAN} and Corpus _{US} | 44 |
| 4.2.3. Verb collocates of <i>kaltinamasis</i> , <i>accused</i> and <i>defendant</i> in the Corpus _{LT} , Corpus _{CAN} and Corpus _{US} | 48 |
| 4.2.4. Major semantic groups of the verb collocates of <i>kaltinamasis</i> , <i>accused</i> and <i>defendant</i> in the Corpus _{LT} , Corpus _{CAN} and Corpus _{US} | 51 |
| 5. Conclusions | 54 |
| Summary in Lithuanian | 57 |
| References | 59 |
| Appendices | 63 |

List of Tables

Table 1. Noun collocates of *kaltinamasis* in the Code_{LT}, p. 17–18

Table 2. Noun collocates of *accused* in the Code_{CAN}, p. 18–19

Table 3. Noun collocates of *defendant* in the Code_{US}, p. 19

Table 4. Shared noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, p. 20

Table 5. Semantic classification of the noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, p. 22–23

Table 6. Verb collocates of *kaltinamasis* in the Code_{LT}, p. 30

Table 7. Verb collocates of *accused* in the Code_{CAN}, p. 31

Table 8. Verb collocates of *defendant* in the Code_{US}, p. 31

Table 9. Shared verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, p. 32

Table 10. Semantic classification of the verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, p. 33–34

Table 11. Noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in the Corpus_{LT}, Corpus_{CAN} and Corpus_{US}, p. 42

Table 12. Shared noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, p. 43

Table 13. Semantic classification of the noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, p. 44

Table 14. Verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in the Corpus_{LT}, Corpus_{CAN} and Corpus_{US}, p. 49–50

Table 15. Shared verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, p. 50

Table 16. Semantic classification of the verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, p. 51

List of Abbreviations

Code of Criminal Procedure of the Republic of Lithuania – Code_{LT}

Criminal Code of Canada – Code_{CAN}

Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure of the United States – Code_{US}

Lithuanian Web 2014 – Corpus_{LT}

Canadian domain of English Web 2020 – Corpus_{CAN}

US domain of English Web 2020 – Corpus_{US}

Abstract

This research paper focuses on the semantic analysis of the closely related lexemes: Lithuanian *kaltinamasis* 'the accused' and two English terms, i.e. *accused* and *defendant*, across different registers. The purpose of the study is to examine the collocational resonance of references to the presumably guilty parties *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in legal and general discourses as evidenced through their strongest noun and verb collocates. In order to analyse the data, a contrastive analysis of collocational profiles was performed by adopting the collocational resonance approach proposed by Williams and Millon (2009). The results of the study indicate that the strongest verb and noun collocates of the semantically more similar lexemes *kaltinamasis* and *accused* for the most part carry rather negative connotations in both legal and general discourses, whereas the collocational environment of the lexeme *defendant*, as its semantics suggests, is connoted more positively in legal as well as general discourses.

1. Introduction

The object of the research. Sinclair (1996) in the course of his quest for meaning claimed that the word is usually taken as the point of departure. Indeed, many dictionaries follow this approach and regard the word as the main unit of meaning (Sinclair 1996). However, definitions of single words are often too vague and do not account for the multiplicity of the shades of meaning a particular word may have. Thus, it emerges that meaning is not concentrated in an individual word, but rather in its environment on the whole (Sinclair 1996). Following such an understanding of meaning, Williams & Millon (2009) developed the collocational resonance approach, which helps to establish the shades of meaning of a single word through its collocational environment, in this way revealing the complexity of its meaning.

In this study, an attempt will be made to adopt the collocational resonance approach for the analysis of legal language in order to determine whether there are any differences in meaning of the closely related nouns Lith. *kaltinamasis* 'the accused', *accused* and *defendant*, all of which refer to the allegedly guilty party during criminal proceedings, but are evidently different both in their morphological features and meaning. The base word of *defendant* is the verb *defend*, therefore, *defendant* can be understood as somebody who is/has to be defended or somebody who defends/has to defend himself/herself. On the other hand, the base word of the noun *kaltinamasis* is the verb *kaltinti* 'accuse' and the base word of the noun *accused* is the verb *accuse*, therefore, these two nouns refer to somebody who is perceived to be guilty. This study will be dedicated to the in-depth analysis of the similarities and differences in the conceptualisations of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in legal and general language as it is evidenced through the collocational profiles of these lexemes.

The aim of the study is to analyse the collocational resonance of references to the presumably guilty parties *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in legal and general discourses as evidenced through their strongest noun and verb collocates. The following **research questions** were raised:

1. What are the similarities and differences in the strongest noun and verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in legal and general discourses?
2. What meanings can be attributed to the investigated lexemes through their strongest noun and verb collocates in legal and general discourses?
3. What undertones do the legal terms *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* carry in legal and general discourses?

To answer the questions raised in this study, the following **research tasks** were undertaken:

1. Compilation of corpora representing legal and general language.
2. Extraction of statistically significant noun and verb collocates.
3. Contrastive analysis of collocational profiles and description of collocational resonance on the basis of empirical corpus evidence.

The novelty and relevance of the research. The formulaic nature of legal discourse has been recognised as one of its most prominent features (Kopaczyk 2013), yet only one type of formulaic sequences, i.e. lexical bundles, are usually chosen for the analysis of legal language, whereas collocations are left beyond the scope of current studies. What is more, the collocational resonance approach has been adopted for the analysis of both general and specialised discourses, i.e. biblical, literary and medical (Williams (2008), Williams & Millon (2009)), however, to the best of the author's knowledge, no studies have used the collocational resonance approach for the examination of legal language. Thus, the present study will be dedicated solely to collocations in legal language and it will attempt to adopt the collocational resonance approach in order to find out if there are any differences in the conceptualisations of seemingly similar lexemes.

Organisation of the paper. The study consists of eight major sections, namely, this Introduction, Literature Review, Data and Methods, Results and Discussion, Conclusions, Summary in Lithuanian, References and Appendices.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Linguistic features of legal discourse

The relationship between language and law has been a major area of interest in linguistic and legal studies. The importance of the language used in various fields of law has been recognised by Kopaczyk (2013), who noted that “language is a vehicle for law” as language is a means to create and codify a great variety of rules and regulations (Kopaczyk 2013: 13–14). A valid interpretation of those rules and regulations depends largely on the context in which language is used and whether the ordinary or legal meaning of certain words should be applied in order to properly comprehend what is conveyed in a legal document (McGinnis & Rappaport 2017: 1340, Trklja 2018: 89). This is one of the reasons why legal language is notorious for its obscurity and difficulty to understand for non-lawyers (Alcaraz & Huges 2014: 4). All of these aspects gave rise to a closer examination of the language of the law, which is commonly referred to as “language for special purposes” (Kopaczyk 2013: 21), “technical language” (McGinnis & Rappaport 2017: 1336) and “legalese” (McGinnis & Rappaport 2017: 1339).

Many scholars have attempted to distinguish the prevailing linguistic features of legal discourse. It is argued that the most prominent characteristic of the language of the law is the use of specialised vocabulary (Kopaczyk 2013: 27, McGinnis & Rappaport 2017: 1338), however, this could be said about any other discourse, i.e. political, philosophical, theological, etc. Thus, what truly differentiates legal discourse from other discourses is the fact that a great part of legal discourse is principally based on ordinary language, which is afterwards modified and supplemented (Kopaczyk 2013, McGinnis & Rappaport 2017). Although certain words and phrases comprising legal discourse are mostly used only in legal contexts, for instance, *a bill of attainder* (McGinnis & Rappaport 2017: 1339), other words and phrases have both common and specialised meanings, such as *property* (McGinnis & Rappaport 2017: 1340) or *negligence* (Kopaczyk 2013: 27). Moreover, many Latinisms, such as *bona fide*, *prima facie*, *res judicata*, words of French and Norman origin, for example, *feme sole* and *demurrage*, as well as archaic adverbs, i.e. *hereinafter*, *thereunto*, *whereby* and the like, are often used in legal documents, which can be explained by the conservatism of the language of the law and the wish to preserve long-established traditions (Alcaraz & Huges 2014: 5–9). Apart from lexis, legal discourse also stands out in terms of grammatical and syntactic patterns: the language of the law often makes use of numerous passive constructions, long and complex sentences as well as various repetitive devices, such as anaphora, syntactic parallelism and formulaicity (Kopaczyk 2013: 24–29). Taking all of the abovementioned features into account, it seems that the formulaic nature of legal discourse has been analysed the most thoroughly in academia over the years.

2.2. Formulaicity of legal discourse

Formulaicity can be regarded as an umbrella term for a variety of word combinations: phrasal and prepositional verbs, lexical bundles, collocations and idioms (Vilkaitė 2016, Berūkštienė 2017, Juknevičienė 2017). What all of these different word combinations have in common is that they are retrieved as one unit from memory rather than produced spontaneously word-by-word while speaking or writing (Pawley and Syder 1983). The notion of formulaicity can be best explained with reference to the two principles of language production, namely, the open-choice principle and the idiom principle, proposed by Sinclair (1991). The open-choice principle establishes that an infinite number of word combinations can be created and the only limitation to that is grammaticality, whereas the idiom principle accounts for the existing meaning constraints since certain word combinations might be grammatically correct, but very unusual or unnatural semantically (Sinclair 1991: 109–110). Thus, it is argued that words rarely occur together randomly, which suggests that the idiom principle dominates in language production (*ibid.*). The findings of the study by Vilkaitė (2016) support these observations as it has been found that formulaic word combinations comprise up to an average of 41% of the English language in the four analysed registers, namely, academic prose, fiction, newspaper language and spoken conversation.

The exact percentage of formulaic sequences comprising legal discourse is yet to be determined, however, it has been already established that formulaicity serves several essential functions in legal discourse. To start with, formulaicity helps to memorise or remember the text better, it contributes to the overall clarity and explicitness of the text as well as provides textual stability (Kopaczyk 2013: 24). Moreover, “the interpretation of a legal text and its application to the social context relies on the meaning of individual lexical items, phrases, and collocations, as well as larger formulae” (Kopaczyk 2013: 27), which means that the examination of formulaic sequences might shed light not only on the construction of legal discourse, but also on the ways the meaning is created. Out of all formulaic sequences in legal discourse, lexical bundles have been analysed the most extensively as the lexical bundles’ approach allows for a thorough analysis of both structural and functional levels of the language used in legal documents (Breeze 2013, Kopaczyk 2013, Mazzi 2018) as well as helps to reveal translation patterns (Berūkštienė 2017, Biel 2018, Noreika & Šeškauskienė 2017). On the other hand, research evidence is still lacking in regards to another common type of formulaic sequences, i.e. collocations, despite the fact that they can also give valuable insights into production and processing of legal discourse.

2.3. Study of collocations

2.3.1. Approaches to and classifications of collocations

Theoretical foundations for the examination of collocations have been laid in the second half of the 20th century (Sinclair 1991, Howarth 1996, Cowie 1998), followed by numerous studies on various aspects of collocations across different genres. Generally, two main approaches to the concept of collocations are distinguished: phraseological (Nesselhauf 2005) and frequency-based (Sinclair 1996) or, in other words, statistically-oriented (Siepmann 2008). Starting with the phraseological approach to collocations, Nesselhauf (2005) described these formulaic sequences as “arbitrarily restricted lexical combinations” (Nesselhauf 2005: 1), emphasizing the bond between the constituents of a collocation. Meanwhile, Sinclair (1996) defined a collocation as “a frequent co-occurrence of words” and focused on those word combinations which appeared regularly in the corpora (Sinclair 1996: 79). Nowadays, many studies approach collocations from a statistical point of view due to the rise of corpus linguistics (Handl 2008: 53).

Moreover, many attempts have been made to provide a comprehensive classification of collocations. The most straightforward is a syntactic classification, which is based on the word classes of the constituents of a collocation (Nesselhauf 2005: 21, Juknevičienė 2017: 40), such as:

1. verb + noun combinations (e.g. *file a claim*)
2. adjective + noun combinations (e.g. *legal right*)
3. noun + noun combinations (e.g. *child custody*)
4. noun + preposition combinations (e.g. *crime against*), etc.

Collocations can also be classified according to the substitutability or commutability of their elements (Howarth 1996: 34, Nesselhauf 2005: 14, Juknevičienė 2017: 41). Two major groups of collocations can be distinguished: free collocations, where all constituents of a collocation can be freely changed, for instance, *carry out/conduct a test/a survey*, and restricted collocations, where only one word in a collocation can be freely changed, for instance, *adopt/assume/take on a role* (Howarth 1996: 43–47). As regards the former example, both a verb and a noun in a collocation can be substituted with other synonymous words without significant changes in meaning, however, in the latter case, it would be more challenging to find a direct replacement for *role*.

Lastly, collocations are commonly classified on the basis of semantic transparency (Howarth 1996: 34) or literalness (Juknevičienė 2017: 40) of their elements and are also referred to as free collocations and restricted collocations (Howarth 1996, Nesselhauf 2005). When it comes to free collocations, all words of a free collocation are used “in a primary literal sense”, for instance, *cut cheese*, whereas in restricted collocations, one word is used in “some kind of specialised way” and

the other is literal, such as in *blind alley* (Howarth 1996: 38–39). Taking into account the first example, the meaning of the collocation is very straightforward, whereas in the second example, the adjective *blind* is not to be understood as ‘incapable of seeing’, but rather as ‘being closed’, although this phrase is now commonly used metaphorically to refer to a hopeless situation.

2.3.2. Research on collocations in legal discourse

As it has been already established, there are not many studies on collocations in legal discourse. A study by Huertas Barros & Buendía Castro (2018) focused on the mistakes translation students make when translating such legal collocations as *local adoption agency*, *health and criminal record* and *home study report*, to name a few, from English into Spanish. It was concluded that students struggle to translate many collocations and commit transfer errors, which are related to accuracy and completeness, together with language errors, such as smoothness and tailoring to the genre (Huertas Barros & Buendía Castro 2018: 53–54).

Another study by Szczyrbak (2018) analysed the collocations with four speech verbs, i.e. *say*, *talk*, *tell* as well as *speak*, which were used in courtroom interactions, and defined their pragmatic functions. It was found that the verbs *saying* and *telling* had negative connotations in such phrases as *you are saying that*, *what you are saying* and *you are telling me*, because they were used to challenge the narrative of the opposing party (Szczyrbak 2018: 253). On the other hand, the verbs *talking* and *speaking* in such phrases as *we are talking (about)* and *I am speaking* did not express the stance of the speaker and referred solely to the activity of reporting information (ibid.).

Lastly, Hadryan (2016) examined and compared verb collocates of the noun *bailiff* in legal Polish and legal Swedish. The reason the author of the study chose this particular noun for the analysis was because in Poland, bailiffs are not properly supervised by the court, which enables them to quickly impose the seizure of property and sell the property cheaper, but there is no such problem in Sweden (Hadryan 2016: 144). The collocational analysis showed that verbs with which the noun *bailiff* appears in the two corpora can be categorised into three semantic groups: denoting the actions of bailiffs (e.g. *seize*, *knock*), describing communication (e.g. *say*, *state*) and expressing modality (e.g. *must*, *can*) (Hadryan 2016: 148–149). Although the verb collocates were similar in the analysed corpora, there was one significant difference: in legal Polish, the collocation *bailiff earns*, which emphasizes the wrongdoings of bailiffs, was common, whereas no similar collocations appeared in the Swedish corpus (Hadryan 2016: 165).

The latter two studies, i.e. Szczyrbak’s (2018) and Hadryan’s (2016), clearly illustrate the importance of the context in legal language. Interestingly, their investigation of collocations and

collocates strongly resembles the collocational resonance approach, which was proposed by Williams & Millon (2009).

2.3.3. The collocational resonance approach

The collocational resonance approach was elaborated upon in the study by Williams & Millon (2009). Williams & Millon (2009) claimed that the majority of words are polysemous, therefore, their meaning depends on the context: a particular word may carry certain aspects of meaning in general contexts, such as everyday language, and other shades of meaning in specific contexts, such as specialised language. The transfer of meaning from one context to the other is exactly what the collocational resonance accounts for (Williams & Millon 2009). Williams & Millon (2009) noted that the changes of meaning can be discovered through the examination of collocates of the word, i.e. its collocational environment, which helps to distinguish what connotations that word carries in different contexts.

The collocational resonance approach has been adopted for the analysis of verbs and nouns. Starting with verbs, Williams & Millon (2009) examined the verb *probe* in the British National Corpus (BNC) as the source of everyday language and in the English BioMed Corpus (BMC) as the source of specialised language. The analysis revealed that in the BNC, a judicial sense of the word prevailed as it was frequently used to denote an active process of investigation, for example, *police probing* and *to probe the nature of* (Williams & Millon 2009). Meanwhile, in the BMC, the prototypical meaning of *probe* was “to use a probe” or, in other words, to examine something with a medical tool (Williams & Millon 2009). The two uses of the same word are clearly very different, but the element of inspection remains in both contexts.

To show how the collocational resonance approach can be adopted for the examination of nouns, Williams (2008) analysed the meanings *God* acquires in three distinct sources, namely, the New Testament, Shakespeare’s works and the BNC, using this approach. It was found that in the New Testament, God is portrayed as an active agent in human life: he gives gifts (e.g. *God’s love*), establishes relationships with others (e.g. *God’s children*), etc., in Shakespeare’s works, God is an outsider who intervenes, i.e. *forbids*, *blesses*, *saves*, etc., and in the BNC, the word *God* has little to do with religion and is mostly used to express surprise (e.g. *my God*, *good God*) and relief (e.g. *thank God*) (Williams 2008). It is evident that the collocational resonance approach might help to distinguish the differences in meaning of the word based on the context it appears in, which is particularly important for legal English as one term might be commonly used not only in different fields of law, but also discourses, for example, *defendant*.

2.4. The perception and treatment of culprits

Various studies have been conducted in the field of psychology regarding the perception and treatment of culprits. In one such study, an overview of legal and extralegal factors, which affect the treatment of the defendant and the crime committed, was given (Crawley, Ramos & Leyva 2017). The main legal factors include gender, age, race and socioeconomic status (Crawley, Ramos & Leyva 2017: 308). As regards gender and age, there is a tendency to treat female defendants and older defendants more leniently than male defendants and younger defendants (ibid.). When it comes to the race of defendants, it has been found that in many cases, more severe punishments are imposed on black defendants than white defendants, meanwhile the research on the socioeconomic status of defendants revealed that the representation of defendants of lower socioeconomic status in legal proceedings is less effective in comparison to the representation of defendants of higher socioeconomic status (ibid.). Furthermore, it has been observed that such extralegal factors as the physical appearance of defendants, their demonstration of emotions, religious beliefs and publicity may also have an impact on the outcomes of the criminal case (ibid.). All of this suggests that the differences in the treatment of defendants are often determined by various prejudices as opposed to facts.

The perception of defendants has also been analysed from the linguistic point of view. Cotterill (2014) investigated the portrayal of defendants and their offenses in the sentencing statements of judges. The analysis revealed that the sentencing statements of judges contained a great variety of highly subjective and mainly negative evaluative descriptors, which usually denoted the immorality and social unacceptability of the actions of defendants (Cotterill 2014: 56). The committed crimes of the guilty defendants were often found to be *extremely violent, unprovoked* and *serious, brazen* as well as *shameless*, which in turn presupposes that defendants themselves are violent and shameless (Cotterill 2014: 66, 68). Moreover, the judges frequently emphasized the carefree attitude of defendants, for example, that they *showed no hint of remorse*, and, if the defendant was not a first-time offender, the judges never failed to mention that, as in *you have three convictions for <...>, you have been convicted <...> no fewer than three times*, etc. (Cotterill 2014: 65, 67). It could be concluded that although the judges have to strive for a highest degree of objectivity, they sometimes cannot refrain from showing their stance.

Finally, the treatment of defendants has been examined from legal perspective. Cemnolonskis (2012) aimed to answer the question whether Lithuanian laws ensure the equality of arms between the victim and the accused. It has been established that the central participants to criminal proceedings, i.e. the victim and the accused, are not granted equal rights as the accused has more rights of defence in comparison to the victim's rights to legal remedies (Cemnolonskis 2012: 4).

One of the instances of such a discrepancy is the moment from which the victim and the accused can exercise the procedural rights granted to them: a person becomes an accused party and starts to exercise the procedural rights granted to him/her when, for example, he/she is sent the summons to the interrogation, meanwhile a person can be declared to be a victim only upon the decision of the court and only after that he/she can exercise the procedural rights granted to him/her (Cemnolonskis 2012: 43). Moreover, it has been established that the accused has the right to testify, but he/she may not exercise this right, whereas the victim must give testimony, otherwise coercive measures can be taken against him/her (Cemnolonskis 2012: 44). Lastly, the victim together with his/her counsel cannot participate during the pre-trial interrogation of the accused and the witness, meanwhile the accused has the right to ask the witness questions during the pre-trial interrogation and, by doing so, he/she may gain considerable advantage over the victim (ibid.). Taking everything into consideration, it seems that the equality of arms between the victim and the accused is not always ensured.

The three lexemes chosen for the present analysis, namely, *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, are evidently of great importance in the criminal proceedings, therefore, it is worth examining what collocational resonance they “bring” to the courtroom.

3. Data and Methods

The data of the study was obtained from five sources. In order to examine the Lithuanian noun *kaltinamasis* and its two English correspondences *accused* and *defendant* in legal language, three legal codes were chosen: the noun *kaltinamasis* was analysed in the Code of Criminal Procedure of the Republic of Lithuania (henceforth referred to as the Code_{LT}), the noun *accused* was investigated in the Criminal Code of Canada (henceforth referred to as the Code_{CAN}) and the noun *defendant* was examined in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure of the United States (henceforth referred to as the Code_{US}). The Code_{LT} was obtained from <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt>, whereas the Code_{CAN} and the Code_{US} were accessed via <https://www.legislationline.org>. The Code_{LT} consists of 78,423 words, the Code_{CAN} – of 797,829 words, the Code_{US} – of 208,767 words.

For the analysis of the nouns *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in general language, two corpora from *SketchEngine* were chosen: Lithuanian Web 2014 (ltTenTen14), the only available version in Lithuanian which was compiled in 2014, and English Web 2020 (enTenTen20), the newest available version in English which was compiled in 2020. The two corpora are made up of texts collected from the internet and belong to the so called “TenTen corpus family”, meaning that they were built based on the same criteria and can be compared. The noun *kaltinamasis* was analysed in Lithuanian Web 2014 (henceforth referred to as the Corpus_{LT}), which consists of 778,151,979 words, the noun *accused* was investigated in the Canadian domain of English Web 2020 (henceforth referred to as the Corpus_{CAN}), which consists of 860,572,101 words, and the noun *defendant* was examined in the US domain of English Web 2020 (henceforth referred to as the Corpus_{US}), which consists of 415,624,566 words.

In order to determine the collocational resonance of the closely related nouns *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, their collocational environment was analysed through the strongest noun and verb collocates, which were obtained using the *SketchEngine* software program (Kilgarriff et al. (2004), Kilgarriff et al. (2014)). With the help of its advanced search option, the nouns *accused* and *defendant* were examined as lemmas, however, this function was not available for Lithuanian, therefore, each case-inflected form of the lemma *kaltinamasis*, i.e. *kaltinamasis* for Nominative Case Sg, *kaltinamojo* for Genitive Case Sg, *kaltinamuju* for Genitive Case Pl, etc., was investigated separately. The lemma *kaltinamasis* occurred 349 times in the Code_{LT} and 20,614 times in the Corpus_{LT} (excluding the locative cases *kaltinamajame* and *kaltinamuosiuose*), the lemma *accused* occurred 939 times in the Code_{CAN} and 3,291 times in the Corpus_{CAN}, while the lemma *defendant* occurred 2,087 times in the Code_{US} and 22,554 times in the Corpus_{US}.

The collocational resonance can be determined more accurately by taking a wider context into account, therefore, the collocational span chosen for the analysis was 4 to the left and 4 to the right.

The collocates of the nouns *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* were obtained on the basis of a logDice score, which is a statistic measure that shows “the tendency of two words to co-occur relative to the frequency of these words in the corpus”, the maximum value of logDice being 14 (Gablasova et al. 2017: 164). A decision was made to extract the noun and verb collocates with the highest logDice scores up to the integer 7 to maintain a more even number of the collocates throughout all the codes and corpora and obtain comparable data samples. The only exception was the Corpus_{CAN}, where the highest logDice score was 7,78, therefore, the collocates of *accused* with the values up to the integer 5 had to be included in the analysis. As regards the Code_{LT}, a few noun and verb collocates of *kaltinamasis* that occurred at least 3 times per 100,000 words were extracted manually, for example, *kaltinamojo paskutinis žodis* 'the last word of the accused' and *kaltinamojo paskutinio žodžio* 'of the last word of the accused' because they were not identified by the *SketchEngine* due to the differences in cases. Such collocates were presented separately at the bottom of the list.

It is important to mention that because the collocates of *kaltinamasis* had to be extracted by every case from the Code_{LT} and the Corpus_{LT}, certain collocates repeated multiple times, for example, *gynėjas* 'counsel' in such cases as *kaltinamojo ar jo gynėjo* 'of the accused or his counsel', *kaltinamąjį ir jo gynėją* 'the accused and his counsel', therefore, both *gynėjo* and *gynėją* were regarded as the same collocate and presented as the lemma *gynėjas*. In such cases, the highest logDice score from the collocates of the same type was attributed to the lemma. Moreover, a few instances were eliminated from the data samples, namely, the various forms of *kaltinamasis aktas* 'indictment', where the word in question, i.e. *kaltinamasis*, functions as an adjective, and the actions related to it (*surašyti* 'draw up', *siųsti* 'send', etc.), also proper nouns and those collocates that are a part of another clause, for example, *see, e.g., 18 U.S.C.*

In this study, Sinclair's (1996) statistical approach to collocations was applied. The obtained data was analysed using the collocational resonance approach proposed by Williams and Millon (2009), which involves the examination of the transfer of meaning from one context to the other as well as the establishment of the prototypical meanings in a particular context.

Lastly, some clarification regarding the term *defendant* is due to make sure that it can refer to *kaltinamasis* in Lithuanian. For this purpose, the lecturer of the course in criminal law Ramunė Žiedė was contacted and through personal correspondence she assured that *defendant* can refer to *kaltinamasis*. Moreover, in the dictionary of English and Lithuanian legal terms, it is also indicated that one meaning of *defendant* is *kaltinamasis (baudžiamąjoje byloje)* '(in a criminal case)' (Bitinaitė 2002).

4. Results and Discussion

In this section, the major results of the study will be presented. Section 4.1. will focus on the collocates of the nouns *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in legal language. Section 4.2. will explore the collocates of the nouns *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in general language.

4.1. Nouns *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in legal language

The first objective of the study was to analyse the noun and verb collocates, i.e. those with the highest logDice scores, of the nouns *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in legal language, namely, in the Code_{LT}, Code_{CAN} and Code_{US}. In this subsection, the noun and verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* will be presented, compared and categorised into major semantic groups in order to establish the prototypical meanings and connotations of these three nouns in a legal context.

4.1.1. Noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in the Code_{LT}, Code_{CAN} and Code_{US}

To start with, the noun collocates of *kaltinamasis* in the Code_{LT} will be taken into consideration. The findings are presented in Table 1. The total number of the distinct noun collocates of *kaltinamasis* in the Code_{LT} was 44, 38 of which met the established criterion of the logDice score, whereas the other 6 collocates were extracted manually. Among the noun collocates of *kaltinamasis* with the highest logDice scores were *įtariamasis*¹, *nuteistasis*, *sprendimas*, *pavardė*, *gynėjas*, *dalyvis* and *byla*, meaning that in the Code_{LT}, *kaltinamasis* most typically co-occurred together with other participants to the proceedings, namely, *įtariamasis*, *nuteistasis*, *gynėjas* and *dalyvis*. As it has been previously indicated, the maximum value of logDice is 14 (Gablasova et al. 2017: 164), therefore, it could be claimed that the other two “villains”, i.e. *įtariamasis* and *nuteistasis*, are the prototypical noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*. The rest of the noun collocates mainly fell into the groups with slightly lower logDice scores, i.e. 10–9, which are nonetheless considered to be high.

Table 1. Noun collocates of *kaltinamasis* in the Code_{LT}

| Lemma | Code | logDice score ² | Collocates as lemmas |
|---------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|---|
| KALTINAMASIS | Code _{LT} | 13 | Įtariamasis 'suspect' |
| | | 12 | Nuteistasis 'convict' |
| | | 11 | Sprendimas 'decision', pavardė 'surname', gynėjas 'counsel', dalyvis 'participant', byla 'case' |

¹ The translations of the collocates from this point forwards are given once in the tables.

² The scores from this point forwards are rounded to the nearest whole number.

| | | | |
|--|--|--------------------|--|
| | | 10 | Vardas 'name', nukentėjusysis 'victim', nepilnametis 'underage', iniciatyva 'initiative', reikalavimas 'claim, request', asmenybė 'personality', atstovas 'representative', teisė 'right', straipsnis 'article', neatvykimas 'absence', sutikimas 'consent', vaizdo įrašas 'video record', išteisintasis 'acquitted', liudytojas 'witness' |
| | | 9 | Nagrinėjimas 'examination', apklausa 'interrogation', prokuroras 'prosecutor', atvejis 'case', įstatymas 'law', padėtis 'situation', posėdis 'hearing', procesas 'trial', dalyvavimas 'appearance', teismas 'court', nusikaltimas 'offence', veika 'act', metas 'time', bausmė 'punishment', nuosprendis 'sentence' |
| | | 8 | Tvarka 'procedure' |
| | | 7 | Respublika 'Republic' |
| | | Manually extracted | Gimimo data 'date of birth', prašymas 'request', parodymai 'testimony', nuomonė 'opinion', paskutinis žodis 'last word', interesas 'interest' |

Furthermore, the noun collocates of *accused* in the Code_{CAN} will be examined. Looking at Table 2 it is clear that there were fewer noun collocates of *accused* in the Code_{CAN} compared to the noun collocates of *kaltinamasis* in the Code_{LT}, i.e. 29 in total. Another significant difference was that in the Code_{LT}, there were 7 noun collocates of *kaltinamasis* with the logDice scores ranging from 13 to 11, whereas no collocates of such strength were found in the Code_{CAN}. In fact, the majority of the noun collocates of *accused* fell into the groups with the lowest investigated logDice scores, i.e. 8 and 7. Nevertheless, the prototypical noun collocate of *accused* in the Code_{CAN} was *custody*, the only noun collocate with the logDice score higher than the integer 10 (the precise value being 10,37588), which in most cases referred to *accused being in custody*, *being taken in custody* or *being detained in custody*, with only a few instances of *being released from custody*. The fact that the phrase *in custody*, which has highly negative connotations, was far more common than *from custody* only strengthens the impression of the guilt of *accused*. Moreover, as with *kaltinamasis* in the Code_{LT}, *accused* also most typically co-occurred together with another allegedly guilty participant to the proceedings, namely, *defendant*.

Table 2. Noun collocates of *accused* in the Code_{CAN}

| Lemma | Code | logDice score | Collocates as lemmas |
|----------------|---------------------|---------------|---|
| ACCUSED | Code _{CAN} | 10 | Custody, defendant |
| | | 9 | Counsel, prosecutor, treatment, trial, place |
| | | 8 | Province, justice, right, arrest, conduct, finding, appearance, court, plea, time, jury |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | 7 | Name, testimony, belief, offence, proof, detention, judge, disposition, consent, hospital, promise |
|--|--|---|--|

Lastly, the noun collocates of *defendant* in the Code_{US} will be observed (Table 3). In total, there were 60 noun collocates of *defendant*, which was the highest number out of all legal codes. Despite the abundance of the noun collocates of *defendant* in the Code_{US}, none of them clearly stood out from the rest as *itariamasis* together with *nuteistasis* did in the Code_{LT}. Just as in the Code_{CAN}, the majority of the noun collocates of *defendant* in the Code_{US} appeared in the last two rows of the table, while at the top of the table were only a few collocates with the logDice score of 10. However, a completely different pattern emerged in the Code_{US} regarding the strongest collocates. While *kaltinamasis* and *accused* most typically co-occurred with the words that carry rather negative undertones, the three strongest collocates of *defendant*, i.e. *right*, *counsel* and *attorney*, carry no such undertones. On the contrary, these collocates seem to reinforce the conceptualisation of *defendant* as an innocent person who is wrongfully suspected of violating a law, which allows *defendant* to enjoy the protection of the counsel and attorney as well as to exercise the rights granted to him/her. Thus, on the basis of a few strongest collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, it could be claimed that the collocational resonance of *defendant* is the most positive out of the three.

Table 3. Noun collocates of *defendant* in the Code_{US}

| Lemma | Code | logDice score | Collocates as lemmas |
|------------------|--------------------|---------------|--|
| DEFENDANT | Code _{US} | 10 | Right, counsel, attorney, court, government |
| | | 9 | Interest, notice, statement, plea, information, request, custody, order, evidence, consent, case, condition |
| | | 8 | Expert, judge, examination, presence, probation, motion, district, opportunity, testimony, witness, sentence, discovery, time, trial, rule, appearance, appeal, defense, need, property, offense, copy, record, address, absence, report |
| | | 7 | Assistance, agreement, officer, warrant, disclosure, failure, requirement, jury, ability, prosecutor, advice, amendment, extent, circumstance, reason, conviction, situation |

Having introduced the strongest noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* separately, their shared collocates can now be established. As presented in Table 4, 11 groups of collocates that are similar or identical in meaning occurred with all three investigated lexemes. Evidently, among the collocates shared by *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* more than one collocate referred to

(1) the persons who are responsible for defending the presumably guilty party during the trial, i.e. *gynėjas, atstovas, counsel* and *attorney*, (2) an illegal activity, namely, *veika, nusikaltimas* and *offense/offence*, (3) case hearing, that is *procesas, posėdis, nagrinėjimas* and *trial* as well as (4) the outcome of the case with such collocates as *bausmė, nuosprendis, sentence, conviction* and *disposition*, all of which are arguably the key elements during the investigation of a criminal case.

Table 4. Shared noun collocates of *kaltinamasis, accused* and *defendant*

| | | KALTINAMASIS | ACCUSED | DEFENDANT |
|--|-----|---------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|
| Among all | 1. | Gynėjas, atstovas | Counsel | Counsel, attorney |
| | 2. | Teisė | Right | Right |
| | 3. | Sutikimas | Consent | Consent |
| | 4. | Prokuroras | Prosecutor | Prosecutor |
| | 5. | Teismas | Court | Court |
| | 6. | Parodymai | Testimony | Testimony |
| | 7. | Veika, nusikaltimas | Offence | Offense |
| | 8. | Procesas, posėdis, nagrinėjimas | Trial | Trial |
| | 9. | Metas | Time | Time |
| | 10. | Dalyvavimas | Appearance | Presence, appearance |
| | 11. | Bausmė, nuosprendis | Sentence, conviction | Disposition |
| Only between kaltinamasis and accused | 1. | Pavardė, vardas | Name | |
| Only between kaltinamasis and defendant | 1. | Byla/atvejis | | Case |
| | 2. | Liudytojas | | Witness |
| | 3. | Interesas | | Interest |
| | 4. | Neatvykimas | | Absence |
| | 5. | Prašymas | | Request, motion |
| | 6. | Padėtis | | Condition |
| Only between accused and defendant | 1. | | Plea | Plea |
| | 2. | | Custody, arrest, detention | Custody |
| | 3. | | Jury | Jury |
| | 4. | | Proof | Evidence |
| | 5. | | Judge, justice | Judge |

Moreover, only three collocates were shared solely between conceptually more similar nouns *kaltinamasis* and *accused*, i.e. *pavardė, vardas* and *name*, which referred to the identity of the presumably guilty party, whereas conceptually more different nouns *kaltinamasis* and *defendant* had even 14 collocates in common exclusively between them. This finding was surprising because it was hypothesised to be the other way around. However, such results might have been influenced by the fact that *accused* had the fewest noun collocates out of the three examined words, thus

lessening the possibility of the co-occurrence of the noun collocates between *kaltinamasis* and *accused*. Lastly, 13 noun collocates were shared only between *accused* and *defendant*, which might be explained by the closeness of the Canadian and American legal systems, for example, when it comes to *jury*, as there is no such tradition in Lithuania.

4.1.2. Major semantic groups of the noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in the Code_{LT}, Code_{CAN} and Code_{US}

Another objective of the study was to categorise the noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* into major semantic groups in order to establish the prototypical meanings and connotations of these three lexemes in a legal context. A possible semantic classification is presented in Table 5. Various grammar books and books on semantics have been consulted to find a fitting semantic classification of nouns, however, all of the proposed categorisations were too abstract for the purposes of this study, therefore, only a few ideas of how to classify nouns were taken from Dixon (2011). An attempt was made to group as many noun collocates as possible, yet a few of them were left out because they were too abstract (e.g. *atvejis*, *extent*) or did not really fit under any other categories (e.g. *reason*, *byla/case*). In addition, certain collocates seemed to be ambiguous and it was not clear whether, for example, a reference was made to a written document or an oral expression of one's will (1), if it was not stated directly (2):

- (1) <...> *allows a judge, with the defendant's consent, to inspect* <...> (Code_{US})
- (2) <...> *report with the written consent of the defendant* <...> (Code_{US})

Thus, due to the lack of legal competence, an assumption was made that both scenarios are plausible regarding such cases as in (1) and *consent* together with a few other collocates (*request*, *statement*) were ascribed to the broadest category of 'actions' following the logic that actions had to be taken to produce a formal document as well. In total, 10 major semantic groups of the noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* were distinguished: references to (I) agents, including both people and institutions, (II) places, (III) time, (IV) legislation and rules, (V) sources of knowledge, (VI) processes, (VII) various actions (or lack of them) and their results, (VIII) personal information of *kaltinamasis*, *accused*, *defendant*, (IX) their mental state and (X) possessions (or lack thereof).

Table 5. Semantic classification of the noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*

| | | | KALTINAMASIS | ACCUSED | DEFENDANT |
|------|---|------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| I | Agents | People | Įtariamasis, nuteistasis, išteisintasis, dalyvis, nukentėjusysis, gynėjas, atstovas, nepilnametis, liudytojas, prokuroras | Defendant, counsel, jury, prosecutor, justice, judge | Counsel, attorney, jury, witness, expert, judge, officer, prosecutor |
| | | Institutions | Teismas | Court, hospital | Court, government |
| | | | | | |
| II | Places | | Respublika | Place, province | District |
| | | | | | |
| III | Time | | Metas | Time | Time |
| | | | | | |
| IV | Legislation, rules | | Straipsnis, įstatymas, tvarka | – | Rule, amendment, requirement |
| | | | | | |
| V | Sources of knowledge | | Parodymai, vaizdo įrašas | Testimony, proof | Testimony, evidence, advice, information |
| | | | | | |
| VI | Processes | | Procesas, posėdis, nagrinėjimas | Trial | Trial |
| | | | | | |
| VII | Actions (or lack of them) and their results | Institutions | Apklausa, iniciatyva, sprendimas, baudmė, nuosprendis | Arrest, detention, custody, treatment, finding, disposition | Warrant, order, report, custody, examination, notice, motion, failure, probation, sentence, conviction |
| | | The three allegedly guilty parties | Nusikaltimas, veika, dalyvavimas, neatvykimas, prašymas, reikalavimas, sutikimas, paskutinis žodis | Offence, conduct, appearance, plea, consent, promise | Offense, absence, appearance, presence, disclosure, discovery, plea, statement, notice, request, failure, consent, motion, assistance, defense, appeal |
| | | | | | |
| VIII | Personal information of <i>kaltinamasis</i> , <i>accused</i> , <i>defendant</i> | | Pavardė, vardas, asmenybė, gimimo data, padėtis | Name | Address, condition, (criminal) record |
| | | | | | |
| IX | Mental state of <i>kaltinamasis</i> , <i>accused</i> | | Nuomonė | Belief | – |
| | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|-------|-----------------------|
| X | Possessions (or lack thereof) of <i>kaltinamasis, accused, defendant</i> | Teisė, interesas | Right | Right, interest, need |
|---|---|------------------|-------|-----------------------|

Starting with agents (I), *kaltinamasis, accused* and *defendant* regularly co-occurred with other participants to the proceedings. As it has been already established, *kaltinamasis* was most frequently surrounded by other guilty or allegedly guilty parties, namely, *nuteistasis* and *įtariamasis* (3), (4), whereas *accused* most commonly appeared together with a potentially guilty *defendant* (5), (6):

- (3) <...> *atsižvelgiant į įtariamąjį, kaltinamąjį ar nuteistąjį turtinę padėtį* <...> (Code_{LT})
 'having regard to the financial situation of the suspect, accused or convict'
- (4) *Įtariamajam, kaltinamajam ar nuteistajam apie paskirtą gynėją pranešama* <...> (Code_{LT})
 'The suspect, accused or convict shall be notified of the appointed counsel'
- (5) <...> *an accused or defendant pleads not guilty* <...> (Code_{CAN})
- (6) <...> *the accused or defendant was so convicted* <...> (Code_{CAN})

It seems that *įtariamasis, kaltinamasis ar nuteistasis* as well as *accused or defendant* become set phrases and form formulaic sequences in the Code_{LT} and Code_{CAN}. Despite the fact that the relationship between these participants to the proceedings is not direct, it seems that they are all treated in the same way and regarded as one in many cases. On the other hand, the collocational environment of *defendant* shows that *defendant* does not commonly co-occur with any other culprits and mostly keeps a direct relationship with his/her counsel and attorney:

- (7) <...> *signed by the defendant and the defendant's attorney* <...> (Code_{US})
- (8) <...> *in the presence of defendant and counsel* <...> (Code_{US})

Such findings suggest that in terms of relations with other people, the collocational resonance of *defendant* is more positive in comparison to *kaltinamasis* and *accused*.

Another important agent was the court, which in all three legal codes referred either to the court as the building (9) or the court as the officials (judges, justices, etc.) who investigate the case (10):

- (9) <...> *to ensure the accused's attendance in court* <...> (Code_{CAN})
- (10) <...> *teismas praneša kaltinamajam ir jo gynėjui* <...> (Code_{LT})
 'the court shall inform the accused and his counsel'

However, the latter sense of the word was the dominant one in all examined legal codes and the court in the majority of the cases was the authoritative figure who, for example, had the power to

find *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* guilty or not guilty, whereas *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* were the ones who had to submit to the decision of the court. The collocates referring to the court as an active agent will be explored in more detail later on. As regards institutions, it is also worth mentioning that the noun collocate *hospital*, which was found in the Code_{CAN}, functions as a place where *accused* is detained or treated in order to determine whether *accused* is fit to stand trial. This collocate signifies the potential reason for committing a crime, namely, the inability to comprehend one's actions, and denotes the poor mental condition of *accused*.

The last collocate in this semantic group which needs to be singled out is *nepilnametis* 'underage' as it is the only one that refers not to other people or institutions involved in the proceedings, but to the allegedly guilty party, namely, *kaltinamasis*. This collocate alludes to the age of *kaltinamasis* and embodies the issue of juvenile delinquency in Lithuania. Thus, it seems that references to particular types of allegedly guilty parties are prominent in the Code_{CAN} and Code_{LT}: those with mental health problems and those under the legal age of adulthood, respectively.

Moving on to the other major semantic groups, it has been found that the collocates denoting places (II) usually refer to the *district*, *place* or *province* in which *accused* and *defendant* are found, arrested or to which they are transferred, whereas when it comes to *kaltinamasis*, the collocate *Respublika* is used in such a context as to refer to *kaltinamasis* being outside of the territory of the Republic of Lithuania. Therefore, it seems that the noun collocates referring to places could be described in terms of the presence or absence of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in a specific location. The noun collocates denoting time (III) have multiple meanings and refer to various periods of time (*time to file an appeal*, the Code_{US}), processes (*nagrinėjimo teisme metu* 'at the court hearing', the Code_{LT}), a precise time (*time of the alleged offense*, the Code_{US}), to name but a few, therefore, this category can hardly be generalised. All in all, it can be concluded that these two meaning categories provide a general situational context.

Furthermore, references to various rules and legislation (IV) are often made to indicate what procedures are being followed for the treatment of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, which again suggests an aspect of submissiveness on the part of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* and an aspect of authoritativeness on the part of the court as the latter is completely in control. Under the group named as 'sources of knowledge' (V) were included those collocates which could be deciding factors in the outcome of the case and, in turn, determine the destiny of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, i.e. whether they would be found guilty and doomed or found innocent and redeemed, which again falls out of their control. A few collocates referred specifically to case hearing (VI), when the destiny of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* is actually being determined.

The semantic group named ‘various actions (or lack of them) and their results’ (VII) requires more elaboration as the majority of the noun collocates fall under this category. To start with, it has been found that in all three legal codes, institutions, in most cases the court, are active agents who participate in various stages of the investigation, from issuing a warrant for arrest to conviction. In the case of *kaltinamasis*, even three collocates, namely, *bausmė*, *nuosprendis* and *sprendimas*, signify the court’s last word in the investigation and the willful or unwilful subordination of *kaltinamasis*. The collocate *bausmė* clearly indicates the guilt of *kaltinamasis*, however, the collocate *nuosprendis* not always entails conviction – in a few cases it refers to acquittal, i.e. *išteisinamasis nuosprendis*. Moreover, the court in the Code_{LT} can also be regarded as an initiator due to a common collocation *teismo iniciatyva* ‘on the initiative of the court’. For example, the court has the initiative to bring a psychologist to the questioning of the accused who is a minor, which is yet another expression of the court’s authority that is prominent examining the noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*.

When it comes to *accused*, there are three collocates which denote the restriction of liberty and, in some cases, the imposition of force: *arrest*, *detention* and *custody*. Such collocates suggest the complete submission of *accused*, which can be either voluntary or involuntary, and the absolute power granted to the court. Another interesting case regards the collocate *finding*, which commonly appears in a phrase:

(11) <...> a finding that an accused is a high-risk accused <...> (Code_{CAN})

Considering the fact that *accused* can be given a title of *high-risk*, which is the strongest adjective collocate of *accused*, and that among the strongest noun collocates are those which refer to the court’s physical restriction of accused, it can be claimed that the negative conceptualisation of *accused* prevails.

Lastly, the actions concerning *defendant* will be taken into account. Looking at the strongest collocates of *defendant*, the court, just as with *kaltinamasis* and *accused*, commonly has the authority: keeps *defendant* in custody, issues a warrant of arrest, enters an order requiring *defendant* to do something and so on. However, there are quite a few cases when the court is actually put under an obligation to do something for *defendant* (12), (13) or when *defendant* is given an opportunity of a better outcome (14):

(12) <...> the court must provide notice to the defendant <...> (Code_{US})

(13) <...> a defendant's conviction must be reversed <...> (Code_{US})

(14) <...> government's motion to reduce a defendant's sentence <...> (Code_{US})

Although similar instances can be found in other legal codes as well, they seem to be less frequent, which yet again supports the more positive resonance of *defendant*. So far, it seems that *accused* carries the most negative undertones out of the three words, *defendant* has revealed the most positive aspects, whereas *kaltinamasis* falls somewhere in between the two.

Another major semantic group denotes the actions of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* and the outcomes of their actions. Starting with *kaltinamasis*, there are three collocates which seem to suggest the authority of *kaltinamasis*, namely, *neatvykimas*, *reikalavimas* and *paskutinis žodis*. As regards *neatvykimas*, it can be understood that *kaltinamasis* may choose not to participate in a certain stage of the investigation and, by doing so, disobey the authorities. However, such a decision will have repercussions because in the Code_{LT}, there is an article named *kaltinamojo neatvykimo pasekmės* 'the consequences of the absence of the accused', therefore, the authority of *kaltinamasis* is only partial. In the case of *reikalavimas*, *kaltinamasis* enjoys the right to lodge claims:

- (15) <...> *bylos nagrinėjimas buvo surengtas kaltinamojo reikalavimu* <...> (Code_{LT})
'the hearing was held at the request of the accused'

However, only a few such instances were found, which indicates that *kaltinamasis* is not the one to dictate his/her own terms. Also, a very interesting case regarding this collocate was observed:

- (16) <...> *gavęs kaltinamojo prašymą su reikalavimu* <...> (Code_{LT})
'upon receipt of the accused's request with the claim'

This example shows that a demand can be a part of a request, which are two completely opposite and seemingly incompatible notions. Therefore, even the collocate *reikalavimas* cannot be seen as denoting the sole authority of *kaltinamasis* because it may be embedded in a request. In addition, it is important to mention that *request* is a more frequent collocate of *kaltinamasis* and it indicates the dependence of *kaltinamasis* on the court as the court has the power to grant the request or reject it. The last collocate alluding to the power of *kaltinamasis* is *paskutinis žodis*. *Kaltinamasis* can use an opportunity to defend himself/herself for the very last time as long as he/she needs with no rebuttals, which is the only noun collocate that denotes the exclusive authority of *kaltinamasis*. Another two collocates, i.e. *sutikimas* together with *dalyvavimas*, seem to suggest the willingness of *kaltinamasis* to be cooperative during the proceedings. Interestingly, *dalyvavimas* was a more common collocate than *neatvykimas*, which once again strengthens the impression of cooperativeness on the part of *kaltinamasis*.

A few of the aforementioned noun collocates of *kaltinamasis* also occurred with *accused* as well as *defendant*, namely, *appearance*, *presence* and *consent*. Their meaning was also that of cooperation,

but the difference lied in their frequencies. For instance, *consent* was a very frequent collocate of *defendant* in the Code_{US}, contrary to the Code_{LT} and Code_{CAN}. Thus, in the case of *defendant*, not only an aspect of cooperation on the part of *defendant* can be observed, but also that of co-dependence on the part of some authoritative figure (17), (18), which was not the case in the Code_{LT} (19) and Code_{CAN} (20):

- (17) <...> *allows a judge, with the defendant's consent, to inspect* <...> (Code_{US})
- (18) <...> *permit the judge, after obtaining defendant's consent, to see* <...> (Code_{US})
- (19) *Kaltinamojo akto nuorašas kaltinamojo sutikimu gali* <...> (Code_{LT})
'A copy of the indictment, with the consent of the accused, may'
- (20) <...> *does not depend on the consent of the accused* <...> (Code_{CAN})

The examples in (17) and (18) highlight the importance of the role of *defendant* as he/she seems to be the central figure, whose agreement or disagreement directs the course of actions of the authorities. As regards (19) and (20), no authoritative figure appears in the immediate context and *kaltinamasis* with *accused* seem to be left on their own.

Furthermore, another noun collocate which occurred both with *accused* and *defendant* was *plea*, but its use was different. In the Code_{CAN}, *plea* mostly occurred on its own, for example, *accused enters a plea*, whereas in the Code_{US}, the type of *plea* was often indicated, as in:

- (21) <...> *defendant tenders a plea of guilty* <...> (Code_{US})

There was only one case of *not guilty plea*, which seems to be yet another indication of the willingness to cooperate on the part of *defendant* by admitting to the committed offense at once.

The last collocate of *accused* that needs to be mentioned is *conduct*, which signifies the interaction between *accused* and the victim. In the Code_{CAN}, the form of Victim Impact Statement is included, in which the victim can describe what emotional, physical and financial impact the conduct of *accused* who has been found not criminally responsible due to a mental disorder had on the victim. Yet another noun collocate of *accused*, the other being the aforementioned *hospital*, refers to the poor mental condition of *accused* and adds another shade of meaning, namely, that *accused* may not always comprehend his/her actions and their long-term effects on the victims.

Lastly, a few other collocates of the actions of *defendant* should be discussed. In the Code_{US}, an English equivalent of the Lithuanian noun *neatvykimas*, i.e. *absence*, was also among the strongest collocates, yet a different shade of meaning is observed in the Code_{US}. There, the absence of *defendant* is not necessarily an act of insubordination because oftentimes the absence of *defendant* is clearly authorised:

- (22) <...> *conducted in the defendant's absence with the defendant's written consent* <...>
(Code_{US})

Thus, the implication is that *defendant* follows the procedures and does not disobey. Another collocate related to that is *assistance*, which signifies the willingness of *defendant* to be cooperative and helpful:

- (23) <...> *defendant has provided substantial assistance* <...> (Code_{US})

Moreover, it seems that *defendant* exercises his/her will the most frequently, compared to *kaltinamasis* and *accused*, judging by the abundance of such collocates as *motion*, *notice*, *appeal*, *request* as well as *defense* and the lack of them in the other legal codes, for example:

- (24) <...> *defendant's motion to suppress evidence* <...> (Code_{US})
(25) <...> *defendant has provided notice of an intent to* <...> (Code_{US})
(26) <...> *in the event of an appeal by the defendant* <...> (Code_{US})
(27) *At the defendant's request, the government must* <...> (Code_{US})
(28) <...> *defendant raises an alibi defense at trial* <...> (Code_{US})

All of these examples show that *defendant* in particular is the most active participant to the proceedings who makes his/her presence felt by exercising the rights granted to him/her, sometimes even dictating the terms to the authority (27) or opposing it (26). Interestingly, *defendant* could be described by the variety of his/her actions, whereas *accused* could be characterised by the lack thereof.

The last three semantic groups are dedicated solely to *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, namely, their personal information (VIII), mental state (IX) and possessions or lack thereof (X). It seems that the identity of *kaltinamasis* is of particular importance in the Code_{LT} as the greatest number of collocates referred to the identification of *kaltinamasis*. Moreover, only two collocates were ascribed to the semantic group named 'mental state', however, they reveal interesting results. In the Code_{LT}, the collocate *nuomonė* seems to indicate the importance of the stance of *kaltinamasis* and the fact that he/she may influence the decision of the authority:

- (29) <...> *teismas, atsiklausęs kaltinamųjų ir jų gynėjų nuomonės* <...> (Code_{LT})
'the court, having considered the opinions of the accused and their counsel'

As regards the *belief* of *accused*, it seems that there is an element of deceit. This collocate is mostly used to refer to what *accused* thinks is true or what he/she tries to present as truth when it comes to the consent of the victim to be involved in some activity:

- (30) <...> *determination of the honesty of the accused's belief* <...> (Code_{CAN})

In the Code_{CAN}, it is specified that the belief of *accused* can arise from his/her intoxication, recklessness or wilful blindness, all of which further contribute to the negative collocational resonance of *accused*. Finally, the last semantic group was named as ‘possessions or lack thereof’ quite literally because the collocates under this category denote what *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* have or what they lack and thus need. In all three legal codes, a great variety of rights are granted to *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* under the law and their interests are taken into consideration as well. Interestingly, in the Code_{US}, *defendant* can not only exercise the rights granted to him/her, but also ask for more favours:

(31) <...> *defendant establishes a need for this information* <...> (Code_{US})

To sum up, a few patterns have emerged having analysed the noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*. *Kaltinamasis* is surrounded by other guilty or allegedly guilty parties, can be under the legal age of adulthood and absent from Lithuania, for the most part seems to be cooperative, has complete authority only during his/her last word, whereas in the other cases he/she submits to the authorities or highly depends on them. Meanwhile, *accused* commonly appears together with another allegedly guilty party, has seemingly little freedom to act, is cooperative, completely submits to the authorities, can have mental health problems, deceptive beliefs and can be deemed to be high-risk. Lastly, *defendant* mainly keeps a direct relationship with his/her counsel and attorney, has the most opportunities to act, submits to the authorities and is cooperative, but is also an important figure on whom the authoritative figures sometimes depend or have to act in his/her favour.

4.1.3. Verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in the Code_{LT}, Code_{CAN} and Code_{US}

Firstly, the verb collocates of *kaltinamasis* in the Code_{LT} will be examined. In total, 11 verb collocates of *kaltinamasis* with the established logDice score were obtained, whereas the rest were extracted manually, the total number being 21 (Table 6). Evidently, there were far fewer verb collocates in comparison to the noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, which might be indicative of the dominance of nominal structures in the Code_{LT} or the lack of references to the actions of *kaltinamasis*. The latter assumption will be tested by means of semantic analysis of the verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*. Getting back to Table 6, two out of three verb collocates with the highest logDice scores seem to carry mainly negative undertones, just as the two strongest noun collocates *įtariamasis* and *nuteistasis*, therefore, it can be claimed that a similar pattern emerges regarding the prototypical noun and verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*. In the case of *(ne)dalyvauti*, the most frequent collocation was *kaltinamajam nedalyvaujant* 'in the absence of the accused', which might

indicate the unwillingness of *kaltinamasis* to participate in the proceedings. Although it has been already established that *dalyvavimas* is a common noun collocate of *kaltinamasis*, it is not as strong as *nedalyvaujant*, which becomes a set phrase in the Code_{LT}. The second verb collocate, i.e. *pripažinti*, refers to the outcome of the case and whether *kaltinamasis* will be found guilty or not guilty. Based on the context in which this collocate appears in, *kaltinamasis* is almost always found guilty. The rest of the verb collocates mainly had the logDice value of 10 or were extracted manually.

Table 6. Verb collocates of *kaltinamasis* in the Code_{LT}

| Lemma | Code | logDice score | Collocates as lemmas |
|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---|
| KALTINAMASIS | Code _{LT} | 12 | (Ne)dalyvauti '(not to) appear' |
| | | 11 | Pripažinti 'find', nagrinėti 'examine' |
| | | 10 | Kaltinti 'charge', (ne)būti '(not to) be', tęsti 'continue', nurodyti 'indicate', paskirti 'appoint, impose', privalėti 'must' |
| | | 9 | Turėti 'must, have' |
| | | 8 | (Ne)galėti 'may (not)' |
| | | Manually extracted | Reikalauti 'require', (pa)duoti 'file, give', (ne)atvykti '(not to) appear', išteisinti 'acquit', išaiškinti 'explain', įteikti 'serve', apklausti 'interrogate', pranešti 'inform', suteikti 'give', atleisti 'release from' |

Taking into account the verb collocates of *accused*, 54 of them were obtained from the Code_{CAN} (Table 7). Interestingly, only a few noun collocates denoting the actions of *accused* were found, but the abundance of the verb collocates challenges the initial finding, therefore, a thorough semantic analysis is essential for more accurate results. Moreover, contrary to the noun collocates, there were three verb collocates of *accused* with the logDice score higher than 10, namely, *charge*, *be* and *have*. Evidently, the strongest verb collocate of *accused* in the Code_{CAN} was *charge*, which refers to the accusation of having committed an offence, thus presupposing that there is evidence to make such a statement. This verb is highly negative in itself and, by co-occurring with the allegedly guilty party *accused*, reinforces the impression that the allegations might actually be true and that *accused* is likely guilty. Lastly, just as with the noun collocates of *accused*, the majority of its verb collocates fell into the groups with the lowest investigated logDice scores, i.e. 8 and 7.

Table 7. Verb collocates of *accused* in the Code_{CAN}

| Lemma | Code | logDice score | Collocates as lemmas |
|----------------|---------------------|---------------|---|
| ACCUSED | Code _{CAN} | 11 | Charge, be, have |
| | | 10 | Try, stand, detain, shall/should |
| | | 9 | Transfer, find, order, may, discharge, believe, convict |
| | | 8 | Call, plead, represent, contravene, intend, (re)elect, serve, require, give, release, take, direct, entitle, instruct, allege, arrest, appear, must, deem, understand, will, enter, pay, determine, can |
| | | 7 | Mislead, fail, sentence, attend, comply, consent, seek, acquit, abscond, commit, promise, know, put, carry |

The last investigated lexeme, namely, *defendant*, had 52 verb collocates which met the established logDice score. It can be observed that only in the Code_{US} almost the same number of noun and verb collocates co-occurred with *defendant*, whereas in the Code_{LT} and Code_{CAN}, one or the other word class was clearly dominant. As indicated in Table 8, the highest logDice score was 10 and there were no verb collocates that clearly stood out from the rest as in the Code_{LT} and Code_{CAN}. The strongest verb collocates of *defendant* were mainly primary verbs, i.e. *be* and *have*, or modal verbs, namely, *must*, *may/might*, *should/shall*, *will/would* and *can/could*, therefore, not much can be said about their meaning without examining them beforehand. However, what can be noted is that none of the strongest verb collocates of *defendant* carry clearly negative undertones, contrary to *kaltinamasis* and *accused*, which yet again seems to indicate a more positive or at least neutral conceptualisation of *defendant* and rather negative conceptualisations of *kaltinamasis* and *accused*.

Table 8. Verb collocates of *defendant* in the Code_{US}

| Lemma | Code | logDice score | Collocates as lemmas |
|------------------|--------------------|---------------|---|
| DEFENDANT | Code _{US} | 10 | Be, must, have, may/might |
| | | 9 | Should/shall, will/would, can/could, advise, require, appear, arrest, give, inform, make, order, entitle, permit, provide, consent, fail |
| | | 8 | Intend, do, charge, represent, determine, plead, waive, appeal, disclose, need, hold, release, bind, obtain, commit, sentence, address, use |
| | | 7 | Withdraw, convict, notify, bring, show, allow, move, know, understand, file |

Just as with the strongest noun collocates, the mutual verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* will now be analysed. Table 9 demonstrates that 8 groups of similar or identical collocates combined with *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, among which many were various modal verbs (3 and 4). Considering the polysemy of modal verbs, their detailed semantic analysis in some cases might reveal even more than lexical verbs as modal expressions can convey everything from possibility and permission to necessity and obligation. The other shared verb collocates referred to the state of existence (1), participation during the proceedings (2), state of possessing (5), some sort of benefit (6), accusation of committing an offence (7) and expression of one's will (8), out of which only two, i.e. *kaltinti* and *charge*, have clearly negative implications.

Table 9. Shared verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*

| | | KAL TINAMASIS | ACCUSED | DEFENDANT |
|--|-----|-------------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Among all | 1. | (Ne)būti | Be | Be |
| | 2. | (Ne)dalyvauti, (ne)atvykti | Appear, attend | Appear |
| | 3. | (Ne)galėti | May, can, will | May, might, can, could, will, would |
| | 4. | Turėti, privalėti | Must, shall, should | Must, shall, should |
| | 5. | Turėti | Have | Have |
| | 6. | Suteikti | Entitle, give | Entitle, give, provide |
| | 7. | Kaltinti | Charge | Charge |
| | 8. | Reikalauti | Require | Require |
| Only between <i>kaltinamasis</i> and <i>accused</i> | 1. | Pripažinti | Find | |
| | 2. | Išteisinti | Acquit | |
| Only between <i>kaltinamasis</i> and <i>defendant</i> | 1. | Pranešti | | Inform, notify |
| Only between <i>accused</i> and <i>defendant</i> | 1. | | Arrest, detain | Arrest, hold |
| | 2. | | Intend | Intend |
| | 3. | | Represent | Represent |
| | 4. | | Consent | Consent |
| | 5. | | Know | Know |
| | 6. | | Plead | Plead |
| | 7. | | Release, discharge | Release |
| | 8. | | Sentence, convict | Sentence, convict |
| | 9. | | Understand | Understand |
| | 10. | | Determine | Determine |
| | 11. | | Order, direct | Order |
| | 12. | | Commit | Commit |
| | 13. | | Take | Bring |
| | 14. | | Fail | Fail |

Furthermore, only a few verb collocates in total were shared solely between *kaltinamasis* and *accused* as well as between *kaltinamasis* and *defendant*, which was not surprising given the fact that half of the verb collocates of *kaltinamasis* were already shared among all three examined lexemes. Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning that the shared verb collocates of *kaltinamasis* and *accused* denote completely opposite phenomena: in the case of *pripažinti* and *find*, these verbs were usually followed by *kaltu* or *guilty*, respectively, thus indicating that the offence has been committed, whereas the other two collocates, namely, *išteisinti* and *acquit*, signify that no illegal activity has taken place. Judging by these collocates, it seems that in the Code_{LT} and Code_{CAN}, the notions of doom and redemption are prominent. Finally, even 14 groups of verb collocates were shared between *accused* and *defendant*, which referred to various activities at different stages of the investigation. This finding was also expected knowing that almost the same number of verb collocates co-occurred with *accused* and *defendant*.

4.1.4. Major semantic groups of the verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in the Code_{LT}, Code_{CAN} and Code_{US}

Analogically to the noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, their verb collocates were categorised into major semantic groups, which are presented in Table 10. The verbs were grouped semantically on the basis of a classification proposed by Biber et al. (2002), however, the current classification is much broader. Biber et al. (2002) distinguishes 7 distinct semantic categories of lexical verbs, namely, activity verbs, communication verbs, mental verbs, causative verbs, verbs of occurrence, verbs of existence and verbs of aspect, but some of these categories overlap (e.g. causative verbs are also activity verbs), which makes it difficult to determine to which group a certain verb should be better ascribed. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, a decision was made to distinguish and examine the two broadest categories of lexical verbs – actions (including mental actions) and mental states (II) – as well as modal verbs (I). It should also be noted that primary verbs were not included in the analysis.

Table 10. Semantic classification of the verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*

| | | | KAL TINAMASIS | ACCUSED | DEFENDANT |
|----|---------|-------------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| I | Modal | Permission, possibility | (Ne)galėti | May, can | May, might, can, could |
| | | Prediction | – | Will | Will, would |
| | | Obligation | Turėti, privalėti | Must, shall, should | Must, shall, should, need |
| II | Lexical | Actions of the | Nagrinėti, kaltinti, pripažinti, atleisti, | Sentence, convict, charge, acquit, | Advise, sentence, convict, charge, |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | institutions or other parties | išteisinti, išaiškinti, apklausti, pranešti, įteikti, suteikti, paskirti, tęsti, nurodyti | arrest, detain, release, discharge, transfer, find, order, call, deem, direct, entitle, allege, take, give, require, put, represent, try, carry, mislead, determine | arrest, release, use, entitle, require, give, inform, make, hold, order, permit, provide, represent, determine, allow, disclose, obtain, notify, bind, bring, show, address |
| | | Mental states of the institutions | – | Believe | – |
| | | Actions (or lack thereof) of the allegedly guilty parties | (Ne)dalyvauti, (ne)atvykti, reikalauti, (pa)duoti | Appear, attend, call, abscond, (re)elect, instruct, give, serve, intend, contravene, plead, stand, comply, fail, pay, consent, seek, commit, enter | Appear, give, inform, make, permit, provide, consent, fail, plead, file, intend, move, waive, appeal, notify, disclose, obtain, commit, withdraw |
| | | Mental states of the allegedly guilty parties | – | Believe, understand, know | Understand, know |

The need to examine modal verbs that co-occurred with *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* has already been established due to their polysemous nature. Starting with *galėti*, *may/might* and *can/could*, they have three main meanings: permission, possibility and ability (Biber et al. 2002). In the Code_{LT}, Code_{CAN} and Code_{US}, the prototypical meanings were:

1. The right of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* to do something, possibility/permission:
 - *kaltinamasis gali apskųsti* 'may appeal', *pareikšti* 'may declare', *pakeisti* 'may change' (Code_{LT})
 - *accused may apply, appear, challenge* (Code_{CAN})
 - *defendant can waive, show; may challenge, be entitled* (Code_{US})

2. The right of the authorities to do something, possibility/permission:
 - *kaltinamasis gali būti nubaustas* 'may be punished', *pripažintas* 'may be found', *pašalintas* 'may be removed' (Code_{LT})
 - *accused may be tried, convicted, charged* (Code_{CAN})

- *defendant may be kept, required; can be returned* (Code_{US})

Considering the first sense of modal verbs, it could be claimed that the authority, power and freedom belong solely to *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, whereas in the second sense, the roles are reversed and the authorities regain complete authority, power and freedom. In the Code_{LT} and Code_{US}, both senses are equally common, however, certain differences in the frequency of these two senses can be observed regarding *accused*. In the Code_{CAN}, among the most common collocations were *accused may be tried*, *may be charged* and *may be convicted*, which suggests that the rights of the authorities and not those of *accused* are dominant. Moreover, modal verbs were followed by a great variety of lexical verbs in the Code_{LT} and Code_{US}, whereas in the Code_{CAN}, *may be tried*, *charged* and *convicted* seem to be the three most prominent phrases. Such findings yet again contribute to the most negative conceptualisation of *accused* in comparison to *kaltinamasis* and *defendant*.

In the case of *will* and *would*, they usually denote volition, intention and prediction (Biber et al. 2002), however, in the Code_{CAN} and Code_{US}, the most common meaning was that of prediction or likelihood of something to happen:

(32) <...> *believe that the accused is or will be present* <...> (Code_{CAN})

(33) <...> *likelihood that the accused will use violence* <...> (Code_{CAN})

(34) <...> *defendant will normally not know* <...> (Code_{US})

(35) <...> *it is possible that the defendant will submit* <...> (Code_{US})

These examples seem to suggest the uncertainty of the authorities when it comes to determining the course of actions or state of *accused* and *defendant*, which in turn reveals the lack of control over them and adds an element of unpredictability to *accused* and *defendant*.

The rest of the modal verbs commonly express obligation and necessity (Biber et al. 2002), but in all three legal codes, the dominant meaning was that of an obligation on the part of the authorities to do something for *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*:

(36) <...> *prokuroras privalo įteikti kaltinamajam* <...> (Code_{LT})

'the prosecutor shall serve on the accused'

(37) <...> *the judge must inform the defendant* <...> (Code_{US})

(38) <...> *defendant shall be notified of* <...> (Code_{US})

(39) <...> *accused shall be provided with* <...> (Code_{CAN})

This finding was surprising because it was hypothesised that *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* would be the ones upon whom the majority of obligations are imposed. Moreover, it seems that in

the Code_{LT} and Code_{US}, something good or beneficial is done for *kaltinamasis* and *defendant* by different authoritative figures in many cases, for example:

- (40) <...> *pareigūnas privalo užtikrinti galimybę įtariamajam, kaltinamajam* <...> (Code_{LT})
'the officer shall ensure the possibility for the suspect, accused'
- (41) <...> *teismas privalo išaiškinti įtariamajam ir kaltinamajam* <...> (Code_{LT})
'the court shall explain to the suspect and accused'
- (42) <...> *the court must advise the defendant* <...> (Code_{US})
- (43) <...> *magistrate should inform the defendant* <...> (Code_{US})

On the other hand, *accused* once again clearly stood out from the rest allegedly guilty parties. It has been observed that in many cases, the relationship between the authoritative figures and *accused* is rather hostile:

- (44) <...> *justice shall order that the accused be detained* <...> (Code_{CAN})
- (45) <...> *the accused shall be tried on the information that* <...> (Code_{CAN})
- (46) <...> *the accused shall be taken before a justice* <...> (Code_{CAN})

Thus, it almost seems that *accused* does not deserve anything good done on his/her behalf and the element of guilt permeates more and more collocates of *accused*.

Having examined the main meanings of modal verbs, the lexical verbs of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* can now be overviewed. It should be noted that quite a few verb collocates have noun equivalents which have been previously investigated, such as *requirement/to require*, *arrest/to arrest*, *detention/to detain*, etc., therefore, such collocates will not be analysed again if they occurred in the same legal code. To begin with, in all three legal codes, the notion of the court as the all-powerful body persists because the court is the one that restricts freedom (*arrest*, *detain*, *hold*) or gives it back (*release*, *discharge*), punishes (*paskirta kardomoji priemonė* 'a remand measure was imposed'), presses charges (*kaltinti*, *charge*), determines the outcome of the case and in turn the destiny of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* (*pripažinti*, *sentence*, *convict*, *find*, *išteisinti*, *acquit*), etc. Also, in all three legal codes, a greater number of verb collocates referred to the various actions of the institutions as opposed to the actions of the allegedly guilty parties, which shows that the authoritative figures remain active agents from beginning to end. This is particularly prominent in the Code_{LT}, where even 13 verb collocates denoted the various actions of the institutions and only 4 indicated the activity (or lack thereof) of *kaltinamasis*.

Furthermore, new insights can be offered in the case of *kaltinamasis*. Although a few collocates denoting the actions of the institutions yet again indicated the guilt of *kaltinamasis* and his/her

wrongdoings (*paskirti, kaltinti, pripažinti*), this time the court also established interpersonal communication with *kaltinamasis* (47), (48) and even acted in his/her favour (49), (50), (51):

- (47) <...> *išaiškina kaltinamajam to kaltinimo esmę* <...> (Code_{LT})
'shall explain to the accused the essence of that charge'
- (48) <...> *teismas praneša kaltinamajam* <...> (Code_{LT})
'the court shall inform the accused'
- (49) <...> *atleisti kaltinamąjį nuo baudžiamosios atsakomybės* <...> (Code_{LT})
'shall release the accused from criminal liability'
- (50) <...> *kaltinamajam gynėją paskiria teismas* <...> (Code_{LT})
'a counsel for the accused shall be appointed by the court'
- (51) <...> *pirmininkas suteikia kaltinamajam paskutinį žodį* <...> (Code_{LT})
'the chairman shall give the accused the last word'

Such shades of meaning were not observed analysing the noun collocates of *kaltinamasis* which referred to the actions of the institutions, therefore, it can be claimed that the verb collocates more clearly illustrate the co-existence of both negative and positive aspects of *kaltinamasis*.

In the case of *accused*, the majority of the verb collocates, just as the noun collocates, also denoted the absolute power granted to the court and the need for *accused* to submit, for example, *order, direct, require, deem, determine, try, take*, etc. Interestingly, even three verb collocates referred to the process of judging *accused*:

- (52) <...> *accused is tried or is to be tried* <...> (Code_{CAN})
- (53) <...> *accused is ordered to stand trial* <...> (Code_{CAN})
- (54) <...> *accused is taken before a justice* <...> (Code_{CAN})

One such collocate, namely, *bring*, which was used in the same sense as *take* in (54), also appeared in the Code_{US}, however, it was not as strong as *take, try* and *stand*. The collocates *try* and *stand* were among the strongest ones in the Code_{CAN}, which seems to add even more negative undertones to *accused* and suggests that the accusations directed to him/her are not unjust. Moreover, only in the Code_{CAN} there was one verb collocate that referred to the mental state of the officials, usually to their belief that *accused* has done something wrong:

- (55) <...> *officer has reasonable grounds to believe that an accused has contravened* <...>
(Code_{CAN})
- (56) <...> *there are reasonable grounds to believe that the accused has committed an indictable offence* <...> (Code_{CAN})

The more positive collocates, apart from *release* and *discharge*, seem to be only *give* and *entitle*, but even they sometimes referred to depriving *accused* of something:

(57) <...> *accused has not been given the opportunity* <...> (Code_{CAN})

(58) <...> *accused is not entitled to be acquitted* <...> (Code_{CAN})

Considering *defendant*, a few actions of the institutions in the Code_{US} were similar to the ones in the Code_{CAN} and denoted their authority, namely, *order*, *determine*, *require*. The other collocates expressing the volition of the court were *permit* and *allow*, which in many cases referred to the act of giving freedom to *defendant* to do something:

(59) <...> *allow the defendant to file the notice late* <...> (Code_{US})

(60) <...> *permit the defendant to participate in voir dire* <...> (Code_{US})

What is more, it has been found that the authoritative figures may not only give freedom to act, but also advise *defendant* of the possibilities to act (61) or share some knowledge (62), (63):

(61) <...> *court must advise the defendant of any right to appeal* <...> (Code_{US})

(62) <...> *government may notify the defendant of its intent to* <...> (Code_{US})

(63) <...> *government must disclose to the defendant any statement described in* <...> (Code_{US})

Thus, it is clear that the authoritative figures in the Code_{US} are not only the ones who direct the course of actions of *defendant*. In many cases they also seem to provide help for *defendant* to defend himself/herself, which, judging from the strongest collocates, is not that frequent in the other legal codes.

Having examined the actions of the institutions, the actions of the allegedly guilty parties can now be observed. When it comes to the actions of *kaltinamasis*, three out of four verb collocates have noun equivalents that have been just discussed, namely, *(ne)dalyvauti/dalyvavimas*, *(ne)atvykti/neatvykimas* as well as *reikalauti/reikalavimas*, and their meaning is the same, whereas the last verb collocate, i.e. *(pa)duoti*, refers either to the act of giving testimony or filing a certain document, however, no broader generalisations can be made because this collocate was infrequent. In general, the lack of the verb collocates denoting the actions of *kaltinamasis* suggests that *kaltinamasis* is usually a recipient or sufferer of action, not an active agent or doer.

Moving on to the Code_{CAN}, almost the same number of verb collocates denoted the actions of the institutions and the actions of *accused*, which suggests that *accused* is not a passive agent after all. To start with, it has been already established that the collocates denoting one's presence or absence during the proceedings are found in all legal codes both as nouns and as verbs, however, only in the Code_{CAN} a possible reason for the non-attendance was indicated:

(64) <...> *Where an accused has absconded during the course of his trial <...>* (Code_{CAN})

The verb *abscond* typically denotes a sudden and secret escape, which strongly implies that *accused* is actually guilty of committing an offence and in turn wishes to avoid prosecution. Another collocate related to that was *contravene*, which commonly appeared in a phrase *contravene summons* and yet again indicates the unwillingness of *accused* to go to court. These collocates clearly show the refusal of *accused* to obey the authorities and portray him/her as a rebel. Also, the collocate *re-elect*, which was usually preceded by *intend*, is not negative in itself, but it seems to suggest the inability of *accused* to decide and, in this way, cause more inconveniences to the authorities:

(65) <...> *accused re-elects any other mode of trial <...> <...>* (Code_{CAN})

Moreover, it has been found that the guilt of *accused* is often presumed (66) or evident (67):

(66) <...> *offence that the accused is alleged to have committed <...>* (Code_{CAN})

(67) <...> *the accused instructs to carry out the terrorist activity <...>* (Code_{CAN})

The verb *instruct* was only used in the context of terrorist activities and indicates that *accused* may be the mastermind behind a horrible crime. It can be claimed that all of the verb collocates that have just been singled out add many more negative shades to *accused* and create his/her sinister image. Although a few verb collocates, such as *comply* and *consent*, in many cases signified the willingness of *accused* to cooperate, they were not as strong as *contravene*. Lastly, the rest of the verb collocates of *accused* mainly denoted an imposed obligation to do something, for example, *accused shall serve*, *accused is ordered to stand trial*, *accused shall give notice* and the like, all of which alluded to the power of the authorities and the submission of *accused*.

It is also important to mention a few verb collocates that denoted the mental state of *accused*, namely, *believe*, *understand* and *know*. Just as with the noun *belief*, it seems that there is an element of deceit when it comes to the verb *believe*. This collocate in the majority of the cases referred to the presumption of *accused* regarding the age of a minor to whom sexually explicit material was made available. Meanwhile, the verb *know* occurred in the context of terrorist activities and it signifies that *accused* is aware of the nature of those activities and the person who carried them out. Thus, these two collocates disclose the involvement of *accused* in such criminal activities as terrorism and the distribution of material harmful to minors. Only *understand* is neutral as it appeared in a form template that has to be signed by *accused*, i.e. that *accused* understands the conditions, his/her responsibilities and so on. All in all, the majority of the verb collocates of *accused* allow to claim that the collocational resonance of *accused* is the most negative out of the three examined words.

Finally, the verb collocates denoting the actions of *defendant* will be examined. More than one verb collocate of *defendant* have noun equivalents that have been previously examined, for instance, *consent/to consent*, *appeal/to appeal*, *appearance/to appear*, etc., and all of these pairs carry the same meanings, therefore, there are only a few verb collocates left to observe. The majority of the verb collocates of *defendant* referred either to the obligations which are imposed by the authorities, for example, *defendant is required to give notice*, *defendant must then inform the government*, *defendant shall disclose the results*, or to the permission of the authoritative figures to do something, as in *allow the defendant to withdraw his plea*, *a defendant may waive his right* and so on. With the exception of *commit* and *fail*, no other verb collocates were negative in meaning and seemed to be neutral for the most part, contrary to the verb collocates of *accused*.

In the Code_{US}, there were also two verb collocates which referred to the mental state of *defendant*, i.e. *understand* and *know*. Both of these collocates mostly denoted the obligation of the court to make everything clear and known for *defendant* during the proceedings:

- (68) <...> *the court must take particular care to ensure that the defendant understands <...>*
 (Code_{US})
- (69) <...> *the court must insure that the defendant understands <...>* (Code_{US})
- (70) <...> *The objective is to insure that a defendant knows <...>* (Code_{US})

Thus, these examples suggest that the court could play an important role in helping *defendant* and even act as a guiding figure. Clearly, these verb collocates appear in more positive contexts compared to the same collocates of *accused*, which widens the gap between *defendant* and *accused* even more.

To sum up, in all three legal codes there are modal verbs which denote the authority, power and freedom of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, however, in the Code_{CAN}, the rights of the authorities and not those of *accused* seem to be dominant. Moreover, in the Code_{LT} and Code_{US}, there are quite a few cases where something good is done for *kaltinamasis* and *defendant* by the authoritative figures, whereas in the Code_{CAN}, this shade of meaning is lacking. It is also worth mentioning that in the Code_{LT}, the court establishes interpersonal communication with *kaltinamasis* and even acts in his/her favour, thus bringing more positive aspects to *kaltinamasis*. On the other hand, the undertones of *accused* continue to remain rather negative as only in the Code_{CAN} even three verb collocates referred to the process of judging *accused*, the rebellious nature of *accused* was revealed and the fact that he/she can be involved in such criminal activities as terrorism and the distribution of material harmful to minors. All in all, the majority of the verb collocates allow to

claim that the collocational resonance of *accused* is the most negative out of the three examined words.

4.2. Nouns *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in general language

The second objective of the study was to examine the noun and verb collocates of the nouns *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in general language, namely, in the Corpus_{LT}, Corpus_{CAN} and Corpus_{US}. In this subsection, the noun and verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* will be presented, compared and categorised into major semantic groups in order to establish the prototypical meanings and connotations of these three nouns in a general context.

4.2.1. Noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in the Corpus_{LT}, Corpus_{CAN} and Corpus_{US}

Due to the smaller number of collocates in the Corpus_{LT}, Corpus_{CAN} and Corpus_{US}, the noun collocates (and the verb collocates later on) will be examined all at once. In total, there were 20 noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, 17 noun collocates of *accused* and 13 noun collocates of *defendant* (Table 11). Interestingly, two collocates of *kaltinamasis*, namely, *įtariamasis* and *suolas*, once again share the highest logDice score among the corpora and therefore can be deemed the strongest out of all. It has been found that *kaltinamasis* either co-occurs together with *įtariamasis* or is identified as one, for example, *įtariamasis (kaltinamasis)* 'suspect (the accused)'. In the Code_{LT}, one of the prototypical collocates of *kaltinamasis* was also *įtariamasis*, however, *kaltinamasis* was never identified as *įtariamasis* in brackets. As regards *suolas*, the most frequent collocation was *sėstis į kaltinamųjų suolą* 'sit on the bench of the accused', which refers to the process of being judged during the trial. This phrase is particularly popular in the media because it is very vivid and adds a touch of drama, which evokes interest in many readers. Another very strong collocate of *kaltinamasis* was *nukentėjusysis* and it clearly denotes the guilt of *kaltinamasis*, therefore, it can be claimed that the prototypical noun collocates of *kaltinamasis* in the Corpus_{LT} have mainly negative undertones, just as in the Code_{LT}.

Moving on to the noun collocates of *accused*, none of them had logDice scores higher than 7, which is indicative of the lack of strong noun collocates in the Corpus_{CAN}. Despite that, it has been found that a couple of noun collocates which are the highest on the list in the Corpus_{CAN} are the same as the prototypical noun collocates in the Code_{CAN}. One of them is *custody* and the other is *counsel*, yet the order in which they appear is different: *custody* is the prototypical noun collocate of *accused* in the Code_{CAN}, but in the Corpus_{CAN}, *custody* is preceded by *counsel*, which seems to suggest that the defence of *accused* is more prominent than imprisonment. The strongest noun collocate of *accused* in the Corpus_{CAN}, namely, *bail*, would confirm this interpretation as the phrase 'release/get

out on bail' is quite frequent in the Corpus_{CAN}. Thus, it seems that the two strongest noun collocates of *accused* in the Corpus_{CAN} are less negative in comparison to the prototypical noun collocates of *accused* in the Code_{CAN}.

When it comes to the noun collocates of *defendant*, it is important to mention that *defendant* is used in both civil and criminal law, which made it more difficult to determine in which context the noun collocates are actually used. For example, the two strongest collocates of *defendant* in the Corpus_{US} were *plaintiff* and *motion*, but only the former is used exclusively in civil law, whereas *motion* can appear in both civil and criminal law contexts. Nevertheless, *plaintiff* was the strongest collocate of *defendant* in the Corpus_{US}, which suggests that the meaning of *defendant* as a party to a civil case is very frequent. Another noun collocate, i.e. *motion*, also commonly appeared in the Code_{US} and it seems to be neutral in meaning. Thus, based on a few strongest noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in general language, it could be said that the collocational resonance of *kaltinamasis* so far is the most negative out of the three.

Table 11. Noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* the Corpus_{LT}, Corpus_{CAN} and Corpus_{US}

| logDice | Corpus _{LT} | Corpus _{CAN} | Corpus _{US} |
|---------|---|-----------------------|--|
| 10 | Įtariamasis 'suspect', suolas 'bench' | | |
| 9 | Nukentėjusysis 'victim' | | Plaintiff, motion |
| 8 | Nuteistasis 'convict', veika 'act', baismė 'punishment', kaltė 'guilt', liudytojas 'witness', advokatas 'attorney', prisipažinimas 'confession, admission', parodymai 'testimony' | | Trial, judgement, court, plea, counsel |
| 7 | Pedofilija 'pedophilia', gynėjas and gynyba 'counsel', asmenybė 'personality', nuosprendis 'sentence', prokuroras 'prosecutor', bendrininkas 'accomplice', kaltinimas 'allegation', naudai 'in favour of' | | Appeal, contention, jury, conduct, argument, claim |
| 6,9–5 | | | Bail, counsel, plea, custody, guilt, victim, accuser, innocence, trial, lawyer, surety, offence, intoxication, indictment, offender, psychiatrist, complainant |

Furthermore, as indicated in Table 12, not many noun collocates were shared among *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*. Common to all were those collocates which referred to (1) the legal team of the allegedly guilty parties, i.e. *gynyba*, *gynėjas*, *advokatas*, *counsel*, *lawyer* as well as (2) the statement of acknowledging guilt, namely, *prisipažinimas* and *plea*. Collectively, *kaltinamasis* and *accused* shared the highest number of collocates, which referred to the illegal actions (*veika*, *offence*), their impact on others (*nukentėjusysis*, *victim*) and their consequences (*kaltė*, *guilt*, *kaltinimas*, *indictment*). These collocates presuppose the violation of the law and add more negative undertones to *kaltinamasis* and *accused*.

Table 12. Shared noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*

| | | KALTINAMASIS | ACCUSED | DEFENDANT |
|--|----|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| Among all | 1. | Gynyba, gynėjas, advokatas | Counsel, lawyer | Counsel |
| | 2. | Prisipažinimas | Plea | Plea |
| Only between <i>kaltinamasis</i> and <i>accused</i> | 1. | Nukentėjusysis | Victim | |
| | 2. | Kaltė | Guilt | |
| | 3. | Veika | Offence | |
| | 4. | Kaltinimas | Indictment | |
| Only between <i>kaltinamasis</i> and <i>defendant</i> | | – | | – |
| Only between <i>accused</i> and <i>defendant</i> | 1. | | Trial | Trial |
| | 2. | | Accuser, complainant | Plaintiff |

Moreover, no noun collocates were found solely in the Corpus_{LT} and Corpus_{US}, but there were two groups of noun collocates with similar or identical meanings that were shared only between *accused* and *defendant*, namely, *trial* and *accuser*, *complainant*, *plaintiff*. The collocate *trial* was also common in the Code_{CAN} and Code_{US}, however, the person who accuses another of illegal activity, such as *accuser* or *complainant*, were not prominent there. This might indicate that in the media discourse, which is one of the biggest sources of general language, the dispute between the two parties to the proceedings, i.e. *defendant/accused* vs *plaintiff/complainant/accuser*, are emphasized and explored in greater detail.

4.2.2. Major semantic groups of the noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in the Corpus_{LT}, Corpus_{CAN} and Corpus_{US}

The next step was to distinguish major semantic groups of the noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in order to establish the prototypical meanings and connotations of these three nouns in general language. Evidently, there are fewer semantic groups in comparison to the legal codes due to the smaller number of noun collocates in all three corpora (Table 13). Those groups are: (I) agents, (II) actions and their results, (III) processes and (IV) the state of *kaltinamasis* and *accused*. In all three corpora, there were no collocates referring to legislation, rules and possessions, such as rights and interests, which clearly indicates that specific legal information is not that important in general language.

Table 13. Semantic classification of the noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*

| | | | KAL TINAMASIS | ACCUSED | DEFENDANT |
|-----|---|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
| I | Agents | People | Įtariamasis, nuteistasis, bendrininkas, gynėjas, gynyba, nukentėjusysis, liudytojas, advokatas, prokuroras | Counsel, offender, accuser, lawyer, victim, psychiatrist, surety, complainant | Plaintiff, counsel, jury |
| | | Institutions | Suolas | – | Court |
| II | Actions and their results | Institutions and other parties | Bausmė, nuosprendis, kaltinimas | Indictment, custody, bail | Judgement, claim |
| | | Allegedly guilty parties | Veika, prisipažinimas, pedofilija | Plea, offence | Plea, appeal, claim, contention, argument, conduct, motion |
| III | Processes | – | – | Trial | Trial |
| IV | State of <i>kaltinamasis</i> and <i>accused</i> | – | Kaltė | Guilt, innocence, intoxication | – |

Many noun collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* fell under the first group, i.e. ‘agents’, and all three allegedly guilty parties commonly co-occurred with the same people as in the legal codes, with the exception of *accused*. However, there are a few significant differences that are worth examining. In the Corpus_{LT}, a common collocate of *kaltinamasis* was *bendrininkas*, which was not found in the Code_{LT}. This suggests that an offence is frequently committed by a group of people and it clearly gets media coverage. A prototypical example in the Corpus_{LT} was this:

(71) <...> *kaltinamieji veikė bendrininkų grupėje* <...> (Corpus_{LT})

'the accused persons acted as accomplices'

It could thus be said that the dependency of *kaltinamasis* on others is very prominent as *kaltinamasis* is not only at the mercy of the court, but is also directly affected by the actions of the fellow culprits. Also, it was surprising to find that *nepilnametis* was not among the strongest noun collocates of *kaltinamasis* in the Corpus_{LT} because the offences of the underage youths are commonly reported by the media and sometimes even made greater than they actually are. Other than that, no new shades of meaning of *kaltinamasis* were observed.

It has been already hinted that the collocates of *accused* referring to agents greatly differ in the Corpus_{CAN} and in the Code_{CAN}. In the Corpus_{CAN}, *accused* was commonly used synonymously with the collocate *offender*:

(72) <...> *the accused / offender has addictions* <...> (Corpus_{CAN})

(73) <...> *accused is a dangerous offender* <...> (Corpus_{CAN})

As these examples demonstrate, when *offender* appears together with *accused*, the context is usually highly negative because various references are made to the committed offences, reasons for committing them, criminal dangerousness, etc. In addition, even three noun collocates in the Corpus_{CAN}, i.e. *victim*, *complainant* and *accuser*, denote the relationship of *accused* with the opposing parties and signify their conflict, but none of them appeared in the Code_{CAN}. It is worth mentioning that one noun collocate of *accused*, i.e. *surety*, was completely different in meaning from the ones that have just been mentioned as it referred to a person who is willing to take responsibility for *accused* and in a way act as his/her guardian. There seems to be two extremes with hostility at one end and amity at the other. Lastly, just as in the Code_{CAN}, the mental state of *accused* was commonly brought up in the Corpus_{CAN}, which is indicated by the presence of the collocate *psychiatrist*. All in all, it seems that a rather negative conceptualisation of *accused* prevails in the Corpus_{CAN} as well.

Not much could be said about *defendant* in the Corpus_{US} as only four of its collocates referred to 'agents', two of which, namely, *counsel* and *jury*, were also found in the Code_{US}. One noun collocate of *defendant*, i.e. *plaintiff*, embodies the hostile relationship between these two parties, however, as it has been already mentioned, 'plaintiff' is usually used in civil law, not criminal law. On the other hand, what can be said is that in the Corpus_{US}, none of the abovementioned collocates are clearly negative in meaning. Thus, in the Corpus_{US}, a more positive conceptualisation of *defendant* seems to be prevalent, similarly to the Code_{US}.

Lastly, only two noun collocates referred to the institutions and in both cases that institution was the court. The collocate of *kaltinamasis*, i.e. *suolas*, does not make it obvious, but *suolas* can be regarded as a metonymy for the court. However, the fact that only a specific location in the court was indicated in the Corpus_{LT} and that no references to the court were made in the Corpus_{CAN} indicate that the court seems to be less important in general language.

Furthermore, there was one semantic group with only a few noun collocates ascribed to it, namely, ‘state of the allegedly guilty parties’, however, it provides some interesting results. Two collocates under this group, i.e. *kaltė* and *guilt*, co-occurred only with *kaltinamasis* and *accused*, conceptually the guiltiest parties, therefore, the presence of these collocates further contribute to the impression that something wrong has been done and that the parties are called *kaltinamasis* and *accused* not without reason:

(74) <...> *įrodymais, kurie neabejotinai patvirtina kaltinamojo kaltę* <...> (Corpus_{LT})
'evidence which unequivocally confirms the guilt of the accused'

(75) <...> *exhibits, which prove an accused's guilt beyond a reasonable doubt* <...>
(Corpus_{CAN})

In the Corpus_{CAN}, a completely opposite collocate of *guilt* was also found, namely, *innocence*, but it commonly occurred together with *guilt* and referred to the stage of deliberation (76) or denial of having committed an offence (77):

(76) <...> *establish the guilt or innocence of the accused* <...> (Corpus_{CAN})

(77) <...> *accused continues to assert innocence* <...> (Corpus_{CAN})

The last collocate in this semantic group, i.e. *intoxication*, is slightly different from the rest, but nonetheless refers to the state – the state of being affected by certain substances and having limited control of your actions. An interesting pattern emerges: in the Code_{CAN}, *accused* is sometimes portrayed as being unable to control himself/herself due to a mental disorder, whereas in the Corpus_{CAN}, *accused* loses control due to the consumption of alcohol or drugs.

The last semantic group that will be discussed is the actions of the institutions, other parties as well as those of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*. To start with, although *court* was a common collocate of only *defendant*, it is obvious that its presence is strong in all three corpora even if it is not mentioned explicitly. Many collocates referred to the actions of the court and thus symbolise its power in determining the destiny of the allegedly guilty parties, which was also the case in the three legal codes. In all three corpora, there was only one collocate which denoted the actions of other parties than the court, namely, *kaltinimas*, and it usually appeared in the context where *kaltinamasis* denied his/her guilt:

(78) *Dėl visų kaltinimų kaltinamasis savo kalte neigė* <...> (Corpus_{LT})

'the accused denied his guilt for all allegations'

(79) <...> *šiuos kaltinimus kaltinamasis kategoriškai neigė* <...> (Corpus_{LT})

'the accused categorically denied these allegations'

It is also worth mentioning one collocate of *kaltinamasis* which was not ascribed to any of the semantic groups, but which is connected to the actions of the court, i.e. *nauda*. A very common collocation in the Corpus_{LT} was *kaltinamojo naudai*:

(80) <...> *aiškinti visas abejones kaltinamojo naudai* <...> (Corpus_{LT})

'resolve any doubts in favor of the accused'

Essentially, this collocation means that the court disregards all assumptions or conjectures and is guided only by facts, thus acting in favor of *kaltinamasis*. In this case, it can be understood that the court is protecting *kaltinamasis* from questionable allegations, however, this shade of meaning is clearly not prototypical taking into account all other noun collocates.

Moving on to the noun collocates referring to the actions of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, many of them appeared in the legal codes as well: *veika*, *offence*, *plea*, *appeal* and *motion*, their meaning being the same. The rest of the noun collocates were found only in the corpora and a few of them seem to be important in determining the collocational resonance. Starting with *kaltinamasis*, its collocate *prisipažinimas* indicates that *kaltinamasis* admits to having done something wrong. In many cases this collocate was preceded by the adverb *visiškai*, which signifies the unconditional acceptance of the charges brought against him/her:

(81) *Be kaltinamojo visiško prisipažinimo kaltu* <...> (Corpus_{LT})

'In addition to the accused's full admission of guilt'

(82) <...> *sprendimą šioje byloje rėmė visišku kaltinamojo prisipažinimu* <...> (Corpus_{LT})

'the decision in this case was based on the full confession of the accused'

Previously it has been found that *kaltinamasis* commonly denies his/her guilt, however, the noun collocate *prisipažinimas* was stronger than the verb *deny*, which suggests that *kaltinamasis* is more often than not cooperative. Following this logic, it could be said that *kaltinamasis* is more often than not actually guilty of having committed an offence. Having brought up illegal activities, another noun collocate of *kaltinamasis*, i.e. *pedofilija*, denotes a very serious crime. It refers to the infamous criminal case in Lithuania, which dates back to 2008 and involves allegations of sexual molestation of a young girl and a double homicide. Out of all possible illegal activities of the allegedly guilty parties, even two collocates highlight sexual offences: pedophilia in the Corpus_{LT} and the distribution of obscene material to minors in the Code_{CAN}. On the other hand, no collocates

referring to specific crimes were found in the Code_{US} or the Corpus_{US}, which time again seems to suggest a more positive conceptualisation of *defendant*.

Before considering the actions of *defendant* in the Corpus_{US}, a few clear differences from the actions of *kaltinamasis* and *accused* can be pointed out. Firstly, none of the noun collocates of *defendant* are clearly negative as *veika/offence* or *pedofilija* in the Corpus_{LT} and Corpus_{CAN}. Also, *defendant* had the fewest noun collocates among the corpora, yet the highest number of collocates denoting the actions of *defendant* were found. The same tendency has been observed upon the examination of the legal codes, therefore, it could be concluded that *defendant* remains the most active agent. In addition, the presence of such noun collocates as *claim*, *argument* and *contention* illustrate that *defendant* exercises his/her will with great confidence and often challenges the authorities:

(83) <...> defendant's claim that the prosecutor impermissibly <...> (Corpus_{US})

(84) Defendant's argument that the verdict should not be rendered <...> (Corpus_{US})

(85) Defendant's contention that the evidence is legally insufficient <...> (Corpus_{US})

These examples indicate the efforts of *defendant* to do everything in his/her power to defend himself/herself. Of course, it is impossible to determine how valid these statements are and who is in the wrong, but it cannot be denied that the volition of *defendant* is the most obvious out of all allegedly guilty parties.

To sum up, it has been found that a frequent collocate of *kaltinamasis* in general language is *bendrininkas*, which suggests that an offence is frequently committed by a group of people, whereas *accused* is commonly used synonymously with another highly negative collocate *offender*. In addition, the collocates *kaltė* and *guilt* co-occurred only with *kaltinamasis* and *accused*, conceptually the guiltiest parties, which contributes to the more negative undertones of *kaltinamasis* and *accused*. To that also contributes the collocate *intoxication*, which indicates that *accused* often loses control of his/her actions, and the collocate *pedofilija*, which denotes a very serious crime of *kaltinamasis*. As regards *defendant*, none of its noun collocates are clearly negative in meaning and all of them mainly denote the great efforts at defence, which further contributes to a more positive conceptualisation of *defendant*.

4.2.3. Verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in the Corpus_{LT}, Corpus_{CAN} and Corpus_{US}

The number of the verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* is similar to the number of just examined noun collocates (Table 14). In total, there were 20 verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, 10 verb collocates of *accused* and 12 verb collocates of *defendant*. As usual, the collocates with the

highest logDice score among the corpora were found in the Corpus_{LT}. The prototypical verb collocate of *kaltinamasis*, namely, *skirti*, refers to the imposition of punishment and shows that the outcome of the criminal case is usually finding *kaltinamasis* guilty. Another collocate, namely, *patraukti*, alludes to the very beginning of the investigation and refers to the process of becoming a potentially guilty party, as in *patrauktas kaltinamuoju* 'was identified as the accused'. Thus, it could be claimed that the two prototypical collocates in the Corpus_{LT} show the transition from being accused to being found guilty.

Taking into account the verb collocates of *accused*, a few of them had logDice scores higher than 7, contrary to the noun collocates. Paradoxically, the strongest verb collocate of *accused* in the Corpus_{CAN} is *acquit*, i.e. finding that a person is not guilty, whereas its third strongest verb collocate is *convict*, i.e. finding that a person is guilty. The two completely opposite phenomena, namely, *acquittal* and *conviction*, go hand in hand in the Corpus_{CAN} and bring more confusion in the interpretation of the resonance of this term as a result. Based on this finding alone, it could be presupposed that *accused* in the Corpus_{CAN} is convicted just as many times as he/she is acquitted, which would neutralise the collocational resonance of *accused*.

The verb collocates of *defendant* have distributed equally based on the logDice score: 6 verb collocates have a logDice value of 8 and the other 6 verb collocates have a logDice value of 7. The prototypical collocate of *defendant* is *argue*, which is a verb form of the previously examined noun *argument* and it similarly denotes a determined attempt at defense against the conviction, charges, allegations, etc. In fact, many verb collocates of *defendant* illustrate that, for example, *appeal*, *contend* and *claim*, none of which appeared in the Corpus_{CAN} and Corpus_{LT}. This finding seems to further support the conceptualisation of *defendant* as somebody who vigorously defends himself/herself.

Table 14. Verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in the Corpus_{LT}, Corpus_{CAN} and Corpus_{SUS}

| logDice | Corpus _{LT} | Corpus _{CAN} | Corpus _{SUS} |
|---------|---|-----------------------|---|
| 9 | Skirti 'impose', patraukti 'identify as', apklausti 'interrogate' | | |
| 8 | (Ne)pri(si)pažinti '(not to) confess, admit', (ne)dalyvauti '(not to) appear', išteisinti 'acquit', inkriminuoti 'incriminate, charge', veikti 'act', suimti 'arrest', aiškinti 'resolve', teisti 'convict', padaryti 'commit', | | Argue, convict, charge, dismiss, allege, sentence |

| | | | |
|-------|---|---|---|
| | (ne)susitaikyti '(not to) reconcile' | | |
| 7 | Suvaržyti 'restrict', neigti 'deny', kaltinti 'charge', pažinoti 'know', garantuoti 'guarantee', atsižvelgti 'have regard to', nepriteisti 'not to order' | Acquit, plead, convict | Appeal, deny, contend, fail, grant, claim |
| 6,9–5 | | Detain, testify, charge, discharge, arrest, presume, sentence | |

Having presented the verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, their shared verb collocates can be discussed. As seen in Table 15, the verb collocates found in all three corpora referred to (1) the accusations of having committed an offence, namely, *kaltinti*, *inkriminuoti* and *charge*, as well as (2) the imposition of punishment, i.e. *teisti*, *convict* and *sentence*, which have negative implications and clearly denote the guilt of all three parties with no exceptions. Similar or identical collocates were also found in all three legal codes, thus, it could be claimed that certain shades of meaning are transferred from a legal to a general context.

Table 15. Shared verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*

| | | KAL TINAMASIS | ACCUSED | DEFENDANT |
|--|----|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Among all | 1. | Kaltinti, inkriminuoti | Charge | Charge |
| | 2. | Teisti | Convict, sentence | Convict, sentence |
| Only between <i>kaltinamasis</i> and <i>accused</i> | 1. | Išteisinti | Acquit | |
| | 2. | (Ne)pri(si)pažinti | Plead | |
| | 3. | Suimti | Arrest, detain | |
| Only between <i>kaltinamasis</i> and <i>defendant</i> | 1. | Neigti | | Deny |
| Only between <i>accused</i> and <i>defendant</i> | | | – | – |

Moreover, it has been found that *kaltinamasis* and *accused* share not only the highest number of noun collocates, but also verb collocates in the corpora. In total, three groups of verb collocates with similar or identical meanings were shared solely between *kaltinamasis* and *accused*, which are *išteisinti/acquit*, *(ne)pri(si)pažinti/plead* and *suimti/arrest, detain*. The majority of them signify the authority of the court and only *(ne)pri(si)pažinti* together with *plead* denote the actions of *kaltinamasis* and *accused*. However, it seems that no clear pattern can be established because the collocates are quite different in meaning. In addition, only one verb collocate co-occurred solely

between *kaltinamasis* and *defendant* and no verb collocates were found exclusively in the CorpusCAN and CorpusUS, which suggests that the lexemes *kaltinamasis* and *accused* are the most similar in general language.

4.2.4. Major semantic groups of the verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in the CorpusLT, CorpusCAN and CorpusUS

The verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* were categorised into two major semantic groups, which are presented in Table 16. The verb collocates in the three corpora mainly denoted various actions of different performers and there was only one collocate which referred to a mental state, however, such collocates were also infrequent in the legal codes. Also, in all three corpora, no modal verbs were found among the strongest collocates, which was expected as the use of modal verbs is a more prominent feature of legal discourse. On the other hand, this finding might indicate that the rights of the institutions and the allegedly guilty parties are not commonly referenced in general language.

Table 16. Semantic classification of the verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*

| | | KALTINAMASIS | ACCUSED | DEFENDANT |
|----------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Lexical verbs | Actions of the institutions or other parties | Skirti, patraukti, atsižvelgti, suimti, nepriteisti, apklausti, išteisinti, kaltinti, inkriminuoti, aiškinti, suvaržyti, teisti, (ne)susitaikyti | Acquit, convict, detain, charge, discharge, arrest, presume, sentence | Argue, convict, charge, sentence, deny, contend, fail, grant, allege |
| | Mental states of other parties | Pažinoti | – | – |
| | Actions of the allegedly guilty parties | (Ne)pri(si)pažinti, (ne)dalyvauti, veikti, padaryti, neigti | Plead, testify | Argue, appeal, dismiss, contend, claim, fail, allege |

To start with, in the CorpusLT, the highest number of verb collocates of *kaltinamasis* expressed the actions of the institutions and other parties. The majority of them were not positively connoted in reference to *kaltinamasis* and denoted the acts of bringing accusations against *kaltinamasis* (86), mentioning his/her criminal record (87), which was also frequently brought up in the sentencing statements of judges (Cotterill 2014), imposing certain limitations (88) and punishing (89):

(86) *Kaltinamiesiems inkriminuoti sunkūs ir labai sunkūs nusikaltimai* <...> (CorpusLT)

- 'The accused persons were charged with serious and very serious crimes'
- (87) *Kaltinamasis A. M. teistas 2 kartus* <...> (CorpusLT)
 'The accused A.M. was convicted twice'
- (88) <...> *suvaržytos įstatymo garantuojamos kaltinamojo teisės* <...> (CorpusLT)
 'the rights of the accused guaranteed by law were restricted'
- (89) <...> *kaltinamajam skirtina laisvės atėmimo bausmė* <...> (CorpusLT)
 'a custodial sentence shall be imposed on the accused'

In comparison, only two verb collocates of *kaltinamasis* showed the mercy of the court:

- (90) <...> *teismas gali šių išlaidų kaltinamajam ir nepriteisti* <...> (CorpusLT)
 'the court may not order the accused to pay these costs'
- (91) *Kaltinamasis buvo išteisintas* <...> (CorpusLT)
 'The accused was acquitted'

Thus, it seems that the mainly negative nature of *kaltinamasis* prevails not only in the CodeLT, but also in the CorpusLT. In addition, it could be observed that two verb collocates referred to the relationship between the accuser and the accused, i.e. *pažinoti* and *(ne)susitaikyti*, which signify that the two parties commonly are not strangers. Finally, the verb collocates which denoted the actions of *kaltinamasis* and which were important to the collocational resonance had already been discussed while examining other examples.

As regards the actions of the institutions, other parties and *accused* in the CorpusCAN, all the verb collocates, with the exception of *presume* and *testify*, were also found in the CodeCAN. Therefore, it can be claimed that the collocational resonance of *accused* is the same in both legal and general languages and for the most part remains highly negative throughout.

Looking at the verb collocates which denote the actions of the institutions and other parties in the CorpusUS, it can be claimed that they are quite diverse. A few of them, just as in the other corpora, carry highly negative undertones and refer to the act of bringing accusations against *defendant* (*charge*) and imposing punishment (*sentence*, *convict*). However, it is more challenging to categorise the other collocates because a couple of them embody contradictory notions (92–93), one of them denotes the fault of the authoritative figures (94), another two refer to their attempts to prove a point (95–96):

- (92) *City Court granted defendant's motion* <...> (CorpusUS)
- (93) *Supreme Court denied defendants' motion* <...> (CorpusUS)
- (94) <...> *attorney failed to advise defendant* <...> (CorpusUS)
- (95) *The State argues that the defendant's constitutional claim was waived* <...> (CorpusUS)

(96) *The State contends that the defendant did not object* <...> (Corpus_{US})

What can be said is that such collocates as *argue* and *contend* also commonly express the stance of *defendant*, which evens the power dynamic out. It has been observed that more than one collocate denotes the actions of both *defendant* and the authoritative figures, which was not that common in the other legal codes and corpora. Taking into account all the verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant*, it could be claimed that *defendant* tries to prove that she/he is in the right the most ardently and does so in many different ways, whereas *kaltinamasis* and *accused* only deny or admit their guilt and seemingly do not take as many actions to defend themselves.

5. Conclusions

The purpose of the study was to analyse the collocational resonance of references to the presumably guilty parties *kaltinamasis* 'accused', *accused* and *defendant* in legal discourse represented by the penal codes of Lithuania, Canada and the US (Code_{LT}, Code_{CAN} and Code_{US}) and general discourse represented by the general corpora of Lithuanian and English, namely, Lithuanian Web 2014, Canadian domain of English Web 2020 and US domain of English Web 2020 (Corpus_{LT}, Corpus_{CAN} and Corpus_{US}), as evidenced through the strongest noun and verb collocates of these three lexemes. In order to achieve that, the first objective of the study was to explore the similarities and differences in the strongest noun and verb collocates of *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* in legal and general discourses.

It has been found that in legal discourse, the prototypical noun collocates of *kaltinamasis* and *accused* were other allegedly guilty parties, whereas *defendant* prototypically co-occurred with his/her legal team. What is more, the noun collocate of *accused* with the highest logDice score was *custody*, which further strengthened the impression of the wrongdoings of *accused*, whereas the statistically strongest noun collocate of *defendant* was *right*, which suggests that *defendant* is or should be effectively protected not only by counsel, but by law as well. Moving on to the strongest verb collocates in legal discourse, the prototypical collocations in the Code_{LT} were *kaltinamajam nedalyvaujant* 'in the absence of the accused' and *pripažinti kaltu* 'find guilty', whereas in the Code_{CAN}, the prototypical verb collocate was *charge*, all of which have clearly negative implications as the first denotes the unwillingness to participate in the proceedings and the other two allude to the hardly deniable guilt. On the other hand, the prototypical verb collocates of *defendant* were not lexical verbs, but primary and modal verbs, which are not explicitly connoted, therefore, it could be claimed that they are neutral in meaning. Lastly, it has been observed that in general discourse, the prototypical collocational environment of *kaltinamasis* remained highly negative with such collocates as *įtariamasis*, *suolas* 'bench (of the accused)', *skirti* 'impose (some punishment)' and *patraukti* 'identify (as the accused)', whereas the prototypical collocates of *defendant* (i.e. *motion*, *argue*) remained more positive or at least neutral. However, as regards *accused* in the Corpus_{CAN}, the three prototypical collocates, i.e. *counsel*, *bail* and *acquit*, were completely opposite from those found in the Code_{CAN}, thus, it seems that less negative undertones of *accused* dominate in general language.

Another objective of the study was to determine what meanings can be attributed to the investigated lexemes through their strongest noun and verb collocates in legal and general discourses. The results of the study indicated that in each legal code, the two most prominent agents were the allegedly guilty party and the court, therefore, the majority of the verb and noun collocates denoted

their actions and results thereof. The same tendency was also observed in general discourse, the only difference was that the court was a common collocate of only *defendant*, but its presence was nonetheless strong in all three corpora, even if the court was not mentioned explicitly. Thus, the relationship between the three allegedly guilty parties and the court could seemingly be described in terms of power and submission. In the majority of the cases the court was an active agent who participated in various stages of the criminal investigation and had the power to find *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* guilty or not guilty and in turn determine their destiny, whereas *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* were the ones who had to submit to the decisions of the court. However, the examination of the strongest collocates showed that the actions of the three allegedly guilty parties were far from being the same. *Defendant* stood out from the rest in this regard in both legal and general discourses as the most active participant to the proceedings who makes his/her presence felt by exercising the rights granted to him/her and trying to do everything to defend himself/herself. On the other hand, *kaltinamasis* and *accused* mainly deny or admit their guilt and seemingly do not put that much effort to defend themselves, which may lead to believe that they are actually guilty of committing an offence. In fact, the highest number of collocates alluding to that commonly co-occurred with *accused*, namely, *abscond*, *contravene*, *intoxication* and those which referred to the involvement in such criminal activities as terrorism and the distribution of material harmful to minors.

The last objective of the study was to establish what undertones the legal terms *kaltinamasis*, *accused* and *defendant* carry in legal and general discourses. The major findings of this study suggest that the morphological and semantic features of the three lexemes accurately reflect their collocational environment. The conceptualisation of *defendant* as someone who needs defending seems to be true because the collocational resonance of *defendant* is the most positive out of the three examined lexemes in both legal and general discourses. Moreover, the perception of *kaltinamasis* and *accused* as the wrongdoers is also supported by the fact that their collocational resonance for the most part is rather negative in legal discourse and remains so in general discourse. The research data shows how a legal term which acquires a certain resonance affects the attitude of both other participants to the proceedings and external observers of the proceedings towards the accused party.

It should be noted that the study has its limitations. The present research focused only on lexical collocates, therefore, the analysis of functional collocates is needed to support the findings. In addition, the study explored the use of legal terms exclusively in criminal law, therefore, further research could be dedicated to the examination of the similarities and differences in the use of the lexemes *defendant* and *atsakovas* 'defendant' in civil law. Nevertheless, the study continues the

research on collocational profiles and might prove useful to terminologists and other scholars working in this field.

Summary in Lithuanian

Kas kaltesnis? Kolokacinis daiktavardžių „kaltinamasis“, „accused“ ir „defendant“ rezonansas

Daugelis mokslininkų pagrindiniu reikšmės vienetu laiko pavienius žodžius, tačiau jų apibrėžtys neretai būna pernelyg abstrakčios ir neapėmia visos reikšmės atspalvių įvairovės – iš tikrųjų reikšmė tiksliausiai nustatoma tada, kai atsižvelgiama į konkrečią aplinką, t. y. kontekstą, kuriame vartojamas individualus žodis (Sinclair 1996). Taigi, šio tyrimo tikslas yra išanalizuoti galimai kaltų baudžiamosios bylos šalių, įvardijamų lietuvišku terminu *kaltinamasis* ir dviem angliškais terminais – *accused* ir *defendant*, – kolokacinį rezonansą teisiniame ir bendriniame diskursuose atsižvelgiant į jų statistiškai stipriausius daiktavardinius ir veiksmažodinius kolokatus.

Tyrimo medžiagą sudaro trys teisiniai šaltiniai, t. y. LR baudžiamojo proceso kodeksas, Kanados baudžiamasis kodeksas ir JAV federalinės baudžiamojo proceso taisyklės, bei trys bendrinės kalbos tekstynai iš „SketchEngine“, t. y. „Lithuanian Web 2014“ bei „English Web 2020“ Kanados ir JAV domenų patekstyniai. *Kaltinamasis* buvo analizuojamas lietuviškuose šaltiniuose, *accused* – kanadietiškuose, *defendant* – amerikietiškuose. Duomenims analizuoti buvo pasitelkta „SketchEngine“ programinė įranga ir pritaikytas kolokacinio rezonanso metodas (angl. *collocational resonance approach*, Williams ir Millon 2009), apimantis gretinamąją (kontrastyvinę) kolokacinių profilių analizę.

Tyrimo rezultatai parodė, kad trijų analizuotų leksemų – *kaltinamasis*, *accused* ir *defendant* – morfologinės bei semantinės savybės tiksliai atspindi jų kolokacinę aplinką. *Defendant* samprata kaip asmens, kuris turi gintis arba kurį reikia ginti, pasitvirtino, mat jo kolokacinis rezonansas buvo pats pozityviausias iš trijų nagrinėtų leksemų tiek teiniame, tiek bendriniame diskursuose. Nustatyta, kad *defendant* aktyviai gina ne tik jo gynėjai ir įstatymai – jis aršiai ginasi ir pats. *Defendant* išsiskyrė kaip aktyviausias proceso dalyvis, kuris išnaudoja visas savo teises ir stengiasi daryti viską, kas įmanoma, kad apsigintų. Kita vertus, likusių dviejų leksemų, kurios yra žymiai artimesnės semantiškai, kolokacinis rezonansas buvo visiškai priešingas. Tyrimo rezultatai atskleidė *kaltinamasis* ir *accused* kaip įstatymo pažeidėjų sampratą, nes jų stipriausi veiksmažodiniai bei daiktavardiniai kolokatai turėjo daugiausia neigiamų konotacijų tiek teiniame, tiek bendriniame diskursuose. Nustatyta, kad *kaltinamasis* ir *accused* dažnai neigia arba, priešingai, pripažįsta savo kaltę ir, atrodo, nededa daug aktyvių pastangų gintis, todėl tai tik dar labiau sustiprina įtarimą, kad jie iš tiesų galėjo padaryti nusikaltimą.

Tyrimas tam tikru mastu leidžia paaiškinti kai kurias visuomenėje įsigalėjusias nuostatas kaltinamojo kaip proceso dalyvio atžvilgiu. Tyrimo duomenys rodo, kaip vienokį ar kitokį rezonansą įgyjantis teisinis terminas veikia tiek kitų proceso dalyvių, tiek išorinių proceso stebėtojų

požiūrį į kaltinamąjį asmenį. Tokios įžvalgos gali būti svarbios tolesniam terminologiniam darbui, teisės specialistų rengimui. Akivaizdu, kad dažnas neigiamą ar teigiamą rezonansą turinčio termino vartojimas, pavyzdžiui, įvairiuose proceso dalyvių pasisakymuose ar žiniasklaidoje, nejučiomis prisideda ir prie nuostatų įtvirtinimo. Ateityje šis tyrimas galėtų būti plečiamas tiek apimant daugiau teisinių tekstų, tiek plečiant kolokatų imtis, į kurias būtų galima įtraukti ir funkcinius kolokatus.

References

I. Corpora

Code of Criminal Procedure of the Republic of Lithuania – available at: <https://e-seimas.lrs.lt/portal/legalAct/lt/TAD/TAIS.163482/asr> [Accessed 26 April 2022].

Criminal Code of Canada – available at:

https://www.legislationline.org/download/id/9922/file/CAN_CC_1985_as%20of%202021.pdf [Accessed 26 April 2022].

English Web 2020 (enTenTen20). Online description at: <https://www.sketchengine.eu/ententen-english-corpus/>.

Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure of the United States – available at:

https://www.legislationline.org/download/id/9000/file/US_FEDERAL%20RULES%20OF%20CRIMINAL%20PROCEDURE%20as%20of%202020-12-01.pdf [Accessed 26 April 2022].

Lithuanian Web 2014 (ltTenTen14). Online description at: <https://www.sketchengine.eu/lttenten-lithuanian-corpus/#toggle-id-2>.

II. Software

Kilgarriff, A., Baisa, V., Bušta, J., Jakubiček, M., Kovář, V., Michelfeit, J., Rychlý, P. & V. Suchomel. 2014. The Sketch Engine: ten years on. *Lexicography* 1, 7–36.

Kilgarriff, A., Rychlý, P., Smrž, P. & D. Tugwell. 2004. Itri-04-08 the sketch engine. *Information Technology*.

Available at: <http://www.sketchengine.eu>, accessed on 26/04/2022.

III. Literature

Alcaraz, E. & B. Huges. 2014. *Legal Translation Explained*. New York: Routledge.

Berūkštienė, D. 2017. A corpus-driven analysis of structural types of lexical bundles in court judgments in English and their translation into Lithuanian. *Kalbotyra* 70: 7–31.

Biber, D., Conrad, S. & G. Leech. 2002. *Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Longman.

Biel, L. 2018. Lexical bundles in EU law: the impact of translation process on the patterning of legal language, in: Goźdz-Roszkowski, S. & G. Pontrandolfo (eds) *Phraseology in Legal and*

- Institutional Settings. A Corpus-Based Interdisciplinary Perspective*. London, New York: Routledge, 11–26.
- Bitinaitė, V. 2002. *Mokomasis anglų-lietuvių kalbų teisės terminų žodynas*. Vilnius: „Eugrimas“.
- Breeze, R. 2013. Lexical bundles across four legal genres. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 18(2): 229–253.
- Cemnolonskis, M. 2012. Ar Lietuvoje teisės aktais užtikrinamas nukentėjusiojo ir įtariamojo (kaltinamojo, nuteistojo) lygiateisiškumas baudžiamajame procese? *Master thesis*. Kaunas: Vytautas Magnus University.
- Cotterill, J. 2014. The construction of identities in the criminal courtroom: criminals, victims and crimes as construed in Scottish judges' sentencing statements. *International Journal of Law, Language and Discourse* 4(2): 46–74.
- Cowie, A. P. (Eds.). 1998. *Phraseology: Theory, Analysis, and Applications*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crawley, D., Ramos, C. & J. Leyva. 2017. Perceptions of criminal defendants scale: development and validation. *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research* 22(4): 307–319.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 2011. *A Semantic Approach to English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gablasova, D., Brezina, V. & T. McEnery. 2017. Collocations in corpus-based language learning research: identifying, comparing, and interpreting the evidence. *Language Learning: A Journal of Research in Language Studies* 67(S1): 155–179.
- Hadryan, M. 2016. Bailiff enforcement in Poland – standards of practice, Polish and Swedish legal terms and collocations in the area of debt enforcement. *International Journal of Legal Discourse* 1(1): 133–167.
- Handl, S. 2008. Essential collocations for learners of English: The role of collocational direction and weight, in: Meunier, F. & S. Granger (eds) *Phraseology in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 43–66.
- Howarth, P. A. 1996. *Phraseology in English Academic Writing: Some Implications for Language Learning and Dictionary Making*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Huertas Barros, E. & M. Buendía Castro. 2018. Analysing phraseological units in legal translation: evaluation of translation errors for the English-Spanish language pair, in: Goźdz-Roszkowski, S.

- & G. Pontrandolfo (eds) *Phraseology in Legal and Institutional Settings. A Corpus-Based Interdisciplinary Perspective*. London, New York: Routledge, 41–60.
- Juknevičienė, R. 2017. *English Phraseology and Corpora. An Introductory Course in Corpus-Based and Corpus-Driven Phraseology*. Vilnius: Vilnius University Press.
- Kopaczyk, J. 2013. *The Legal Language of Scottish Burghs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mazzi, D. 2018. “By partially renouncing their sovereignty...”: on the discourse function(s) of lexical bundles in EU-related Irish judicial discourse, in: Goźdz-Roszkowski, S. & G. Pontrandolfo (eds) *Phraseology in Legal and Institutional Settings. A Corpus-Based Interdisciplinary Perspective*. London, New York: Routledge, 189–202.
- McGinnis, J. & M. B. Rappaport. 2017. The constitution and the language of the law. *San Diego Legal Studies Paper* 59: 1321–1411.
- Nesselhauf, N. 2005. *Collocations in a Learner Corpus*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Noreika, M. & I. Šeškauskienė. 2017. EU regulations: Tendencies in translating lexical bundles from English into Lithuanian. *Vertimo studijos* 10: 156–174.
- Pawley, A. & F. H. Syder. 1983. Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Nativelike selection and nativelike fluency, in: Richards, J. C. and R. W. Schmidt (eds) *Language and Communication*. London and New York: Longman, 191–226.
- Siepmann, D. 2008. Phraseology in learners’ dictionaries: What, where and how?, in: Meunier, F. & S. Granger (eds) *Phraseology in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 185–202.
- Sinclair, J. 1991. *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J. 1996. The search for units of meaning. *Textus* 9: 75–106.
- Szczyrbak, M. 2018. *Verba dicendi* in courtroom interaction: patterns with the progressive, in: Goźdz-Roszkowski, S. & G. Pontrandolfo (eds) *Phraseology in Legal and Institutional Settings. A Corpus-Based Interdisciplinary Perspective*. London, New York: Routledge, 240–257.
- Trklja, A. 2018. A corpus investigation of formulaicity and hybridity in legal language, in: Goźdz-Roszkowski, S. & G. Pontrandolfo (eds) *Phraseology in Legal and Institutional Settings. A Corpus-Based Interdisciplinary Perspective*. London, New York: Routledge, 89–108.

- Vilkaitė, L. 2016. Formulaic language is not all the same: comparing the frequency of idiomatic phrases, collocations, lexical bundles, and phrasal verbs. *Taikomoji kalbotyra* 8: 28–54.
- Williams, G. 2008. The good Lord and his works: a corpus-driven study of collocational resonance, in: F. Meunier & S. Granger (eds) *Phraseology: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 159–173.
- Williams, G. & C. Millon. 2009. The general and the specific collocational resonance of scientific language. *Corpus Linguistics 2009 Conference paper*, available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/230692095_The_General_and_the_Specific_Collocational_resonance_of_scientific_language [Accessed 14 October 2021].

Appendices

Appendices are provided in a separate file.