VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Karolina Papreckytė

Study programme “English and another foreign language (French)”

ON THE USE OF PHRASAL VERBS IN LEGAL ENGLISH

BACHELOR THESIS

Academic Supervisor – Doc. Dr. Aušra Janulienė

Vilnius

2017

ASSESSMENT SHEET

Academic Supervisor’s evaluation:

Reviewer’s evaluation:

Final Mark for the Thesis:

(date of Paper evaluation)

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 5
I. CHARACTERISTICS OF LEGAL DISCOURSE AND PHRASAL VERBS 7
I.1. Legal language 7
1.1. 1. Defining legal language 7
1.2. Legal English 9
1.2.1. Legal English vs plain English 9
1.2.2. Legal English vocabulary 10
1.3. Phrasal verbs 12
1.3.1. Formality 12
1.3.2. Types of phrasal verbs according to the meaning 13
1.3.3. Types of phrasal verbs according to the structure 14
1.3.4. Syntactic types of phrasal verbs 15
II. METHODOLOGY 18
III. THE ANALYSIS OF PHRASAL VERBS IN THE TREATY OF LISBON 20
3.1. Abide by 20
3.2. Accede to 21
3.3. Arise from 22
3.4. Call in 22
3.5. Carry on/out 23
3.6. Change over 25
3.7. Consist in/of 25
3.8. Cover up 26
3.9. Deal in/with 26
3.10. Draw up/upon/on 27
3.11. Engage in 28
3.12. Enter into 28
3.13. Entitle to (to be entitled to) 29
3.14. Limit to 29
3.15. Proceed against/from 29
3.16. Provide against/for 30
3.17. Put across/back/down/forward/in/off 31
3.18. Refer to 32
3.19. Report to 32
3.20. Result in 33

3.21. Rule in/out 34
3.22. Serve upon/on 34
3.23. Set down/forth/up 34
3.24. Settle up 36
3.25. Subject to 36
3.26. Subscribe to 36
3.27. Substitute for 36
3.28. Take over 37
3.29. Weigh up 38
3.30. Work around/out 38
4. Types of phrasal verbs in the Treaty of Lisbon 39
CONCLUSIONS 42
REFERENCES 44
SUMMARY 47
APPENDIX 1 48

INTRODUCTION

Language is seen as an essential component and requirement of the law because language is the element which lets law exist and that cannot be substituted by any other means (Galdia, 2009, as cited in Anesa, 2012). In this way, a particular and specified vocabulary and expressions are chosen in order to distinguish everyday language from legal language.

Legal experts, philosophers, sociologists and applied linguists have studied language in law in order to understand how it is used, concentrating not only on the language alone but also focusing on how it can be accommodated in everyday professional discourse (Bhatia, 2014).

A considerable amount of research has also been done focusing on legal vocabulary, legal terms and definitions. Some recent evidence suggests that a few investigations have been carried out on the language of law mainly trying to explain how the law is associated with language and what linguistic means are used in order to demonstrate that relationship. Anesa (2012) in her recent research focuses on defining the relationship between language and law, and how it differs from everyday language. Another investigator, C. Williams (2007) describes the terminology and expressions associated with the language and the law. K. L. Bhatia (2010) explains how legal language and legal writing should carry the same meaning in all legal documents. However, phrasal verbs in Legal English have not been extensively studied, though R. Haigh (2015) considers them to be an essential part of Legal English.

The aim of the present paper is to analyse phrasal verbs and their usage in Legal English documents.

The importance of the current paper is based on the shortage of analysis of phrasal verbs used in Legal English. The present paper aims to find out whether phrasal verbs are used more often in Legal English documents rather than lexical verbs and, thus, to provide a list of phrasal verbs for students of law or linguists specialising in legal English in order to show the most relevant verbal forms in Legal English documents.

One of the greatest challenges of the research paper is the lack of attention paid to the lexis of Legal English. The investigators mentioned above (Anesa, C. Williams, K. L. Bhatia and R. Haigh) devoted the majority of their works to studying the structure of legal documents, its archaic lexis and frequently used expressions. However, only a relatively small part of their research focuses on vocabulary, leaving out more detailed investigation on the use of phrasal verbs in Legal English.

The objectives of the present study are as follows:

1. To focus on the characteristics of Legal English language concentrating on vocabulary.
2. To discuss phrasal verbs in legal discourse, their meaning, types and style.
3. To determine the most frequently used root verbs in phrasal verb constructions.
4. To determine the structure of the phrasal verb constructions and its impact on the meaning.
5. To identify whether such verbs function as stand-alone verbs or phrasal verbs.

The subject of the current investigation is phrasal verbs used in the Treaty of Lisbon, which is selected as the main Legal English source discussed in the paper.

The structure of the present analysis. The current paper includes the introduction where the importance of the investigation, the aim and the objectives are stated. The following part outlines more detailed background of the subject of the paper: the most careful consideration is given to classification of Legal English documents with a focus on their vocabulary. Accordingly, this part includes a detailed classification of phrasal verbs according to their meaning, structure and usage. The methodology section defines what research methods are used in order to analyse phrasal verbs in the chosen legal document. The next part of this paper (the empirical survey) presents the analysis of phrasal verbs found in the Treaty of Lisbon proposing explanations and possible interpretations of their usage. The paper finishes with conclusions with the findings of the research presented. The paper also includes a reference list, a summary in French and appendixes.

I. CHARACTERISTICS OF LEGAL DISCOURSE AND PHRASAL VERBS

I.1. Legal language

Legal language is based on ordinary language: legal grammar and vocabulary are also based on ordinary language. However, legal language has its own function: it includes a number of legal terms that vary according to different kinds of legal texts, and in different countries it has various characteristics that distinguish them from the ordinary language. For these reasons, legal texts may be incomprehensible to the public and foremost is used by lawyers. Nevertheless, a number of people finding themselves in courts or governmental institutions and who are not lawyers, i.e. lay people, have to know and use legal vocabulary because it is not only a means of internal communication. It should also be understandable to the general public as messages are transmitted to the public together with the language from any other domain (Mattila, 2013, p. 1).

It is also clear that the usage of legal language is different in different countries. The society may choose to use another countries' legal vocabulary and adopt some terminology when forming its own legal language. For instance, in the Middle Ages and at the beginning of Modern Era Latin was the language of legal procedures, actions and writings. In contrast, today the main official legal languages are English and French (Mattila, 2013, p. 2).

1.1.1. Defining legal language

Legal language is usually understood as the language of authority and elite, it has an image of the language of argot[1] and has professionalised power. In this way the term 'technolect' is used, which characterizes a technical language or a language used by a specialist (Goodrich, 1984, p. 187).

Previous studies have established that at first legal language must be understood as a social discourse with specific lexicon, syntax and semantics. Therefore four main features of the legal language as a social discourse are indicated: (1) institutionalisation – language production within specific and restricted institutional settings; (2) lexicon and syntax, which indicate that to study law is to acquire specialized, archaic vocabulary and syntax; (3) semantic appropriation – legal vocabulary and syntax facilitate a number of semantic operations because legal meanings are liable to the syntax; (4) ideology – the feature that the law is a particular sociolinguistic belief system. "As a professionalised stratification of the national language and

[1]Words and that are used by of and that are not by other (Cambridge Dictionary, n. d.).

as a discourse or a set of discursive processes, it functions to legitimate the "evident" or assumed meanings, accents and purposes of legal discipline and the social order upon which it is based“(Goodrich, 1984, p. 187-191).

Knowing the main features of the legal language, four types of legal discourse are indicated: judicial discourse (language of judicial decisions); courtroom discourse (used by judges, counsellors, court officials, and witnesses); the language of legal documents (contracts, regulations, deeds, wills, Acts of Parliament, statutes), and the discourse of legal consultation (between a lawyer and a lawyer or a lawyer and a client) (Maley, 1994, as cited in Williams, 2007, p. 24).

The types of legal discourse mentioned above have two main functions – the regulatory (the prescriptive) and the informative (the descriptive). The prescriptive legal texts are normative texts (laws, regulations, codes, contracts, treaties, conventions), while legal scholars write descriptive legal texts (legal opinions, textbooks or articles). The third group of legal texts, hybrid texts, can contain both the prescriptive and the descriptive features, i.e. petitions, appeals, pleadings, etc. (Šarčevič, 2000, p. 11).

In order to have better understanding of the types of legal language Mattila (2013, p. 87-101) distinguishes its general characteristics:

1. *Precision* in its written form is very important in legal language in order to avoid inaccuracy and ambiguity (that is frequent in oral legal language). Precision includes:
   1.1 Tautology[2] that is employed because of stability in language, which means that a particular term will not change and will not cause any ambiguities;
   1.2 Definitions - terms from legal language, which usually are polysemous and for this reason, they are determined within a particular context in order to avoid inaccuracies;
   1.3 Legislation- the principal term in legal language used in international treaties. The term is needed because legal institutions in each country are different and ‘the interpreters of a treaty form a heterogeneous audience characterised by linguistic pluralism’ (Mattila, 2016, p. 90);
   1.4 Court decisions and private documents that usually are found in judicial and administrative documents;

[2]The and usually use of two words to one (Cambridge Dictionary, n. d.).

1.5 Problems of legal definitions indicate that legal vocabulary has a number of words with multiple meanings, which causes ambiguity;

1.6 Enumerations - lists.

2. *Information load.* Legal language should be accurate and concise in order to avoid laws and regulations to be too long and vague.
3. *Universality and aloofness*. Legal language tends to include semantically open expressions. It also uses the passive voice when the object of the action is in the foreground giving the actor a secondary role.

Having discussed types, functions and characteristics of legal language in general, Legal English will be further focused on.

1.2. Legal English

Legal English can be defined as the language of the law in the English-speaking countries and is used in majority of EU documents. It is now well established that over 88 sovereign states and territories have the English language as an official language. As a result, a number of Legal English words have the same meanings in the countries and states that have a civil law tradition (Gardner, 2016, p. 3). Legal English includes several oral and written forms depending on their communicative purpose, the context in which Legal English is used, the relationship between the participants of the activity and the background knowledge shared by participants (Bhatia, 1987, as cited in Frade, 2007, p. 49). In this way, words 'law' and 'language' "form an indissoluble nexus by their nature" (Anesa, 2012, p. 19).

1.2.1. Legal English vs plain English

In the above-mentioned analysis of Mattila (2013), the language spoken by general public was called *ordinary language*. In contrast, Heyman (2012) uses the term p*lain English*, which is considered as more reader-friendly, shorter and more precise. The term p*lain English* became more widely spread because of the ambiguities and misinterpretations when legal terms are used.

Detailed examination of legal texts is carried out by Williams (2007, p. 23), who states that documents, articles or books written in Legal English may be called those written in *legal language, the language of the law* and in some cases *the language of legal documents.* These expressions appear to be similar, however, the main distinctions between 'the language of the law' and other uses of 'legal language' are outlined. The definition 'the language of the law' refers to the language in legal documents (covered by extent of statute or common law,

legislations, simple contracts and deeds) while 'legal language' is used as an umbrella term to any form of legal discourse (from the language of legal documents to law reports published in newspapers) (Trosborg, 1997, p. 20-21). Despite this, all three expressions can be interpreted as having the same meaning – they define that *legal language* is the language used in legal texts and *Legal English* is a text written in legal language.

As discussed above, the legal language has two main functions: the prescriptive and the descriptive. The best-known Legal English texts are prescriptive and they have the following features: archaic or rarely used words and expressions; insertion of foreign words and expressions (especially Latin); repetition of particular words, expressions and syntactic structures; long and complex coordinate and subordinate sentences; the usage of passive constructions; impersonal style (Maley, 1985, as cited in Williams, 2007, p. 31).

Having listed the general characteristics of legal language, Mattila (2016, p. 314-331) also identifies the characteristics of Legal English:

1. *Multiplicity of linguistic components* that describes the influence of other languages. The basic influence on Legal English is left by Latin and French because modern Legal English has numerous expressions from these languages. Legal English also has French vocabulary and language structure.
2. *Ritual and formalism of language*. The English language has a special feature to preserve some language elements from the middle Ages or early Modern Era: repetition of phrases and expressions in contracts and other documents, the usage of archaic phrases and structures.
3. *Wordiness of English legal language*, which refers to English and American law contracts that tend to be wordy.
4. *Orthography and pronunciation.* For instance, lawyers tend to use specific expressions (usually from Latin) and pronounce certain words in a particular way. In this way, orthography also plays a role, for instance, common-law lawyers always write 'judgment' while 'judgement' is also available.

1.2.2. Legal English vocabulary

Legal vocabulary is a lexicon of legal words and phrases that express the issues of the law. Legal words and phrases cannot be ambiguous and their meaning should be the same no matter what the context is: in statutes, Constitution, various Acts or other documents. Among the distinguishing features of Legal English vocabulary, frequently used formal words can be

indicated, some of them belonging to archaisms of high formality, for instance, ‘duly’, ‘deem’, ‘expiration’ or ‘termination’ (Frade, 2007, p. 49).

French terms are also frequent in legal English vocabulary because a number of current words are from French and Latin. For instance, the words *proposal, effect, society, assurance, sign, policy*, etc. are French words, as well as collocations with coordinated synonyms or near – synonyms: *made and signed, terms and conditions, able and willing*, etc. Two kinds of Latin terms can be distinguished: 1) those which preserved their original form (only the pronunciation has changed in order to make them easier to pronounce), for instance, ab initio – from the beginning, abjuration – a denial on oath, etc.; 2) those adapted to English, for instance, to impugn, to sequester, to prorogue. Medieval English is also found in legal vocabulary, for instance, the words ending with -th, *witnesseth, doth*, or *outwith* are a part of the formal and archaic register of the legal language (Febrero, 2003, p. 28-30).

Legal English vocabulary also contains lexis created and used only by the professionals working in the field of law. Among them, words consisting of an adverbial of place to which a preposition has been added. For instance, the word ‘here’ means ‘this document’ and the word ‘there’ means ‘that document’. For instance, with the word ‘here’: hereafter – (in the future) from the production of this document; hereby – resulting from this document; hereinafter – listed later in this document, thereby – resulting from that document or decision; therefore – for that reason or purpose; theretofore – in the time before that document was produced. Such words are useful for the precise references to the particular document or its part and mainly used in legal writing (Febrero, 2003, p. 26-28).

As it was mentioned above, Legal English includes a number of technical terms of law, various verbal constructions among them. Verbs and verbal constructions in legal prescriptive texts can denote: 1) processes where verbs indicate a change of state or transformation into a state (to thicken, to reduce, etc.); 2) actions which involve person’s attempt to accomplish the action (to draft, to ride, etc.); 3) events, when something happens without any force caused by an agent (to happen, to collapse); 4) states which do not need any energy to make them moving (to own, to contain, etc.). Williams (2007, p. 75).

A considerable part of the verbal constructions in Legal English is the so-called phrasal verbs, which will be analysed in detail in the following parts of the research paper. Haigh (2009, p. 283-292) concentrated on these and created the list of the phrasal verbs that are frequently used in legal English: *abide by, accede to, account for/to, adhere to, amount to, arise from, appertain to, break down/up/off, call in, carry on/out, change over, consist in/of, cover up, deal in/with,*

depart from, dispose of, draw up/upon/on, engage in, enlarge on/upon, enter into, entitle to, factor in, file away, gear to/up, hand down/over, limit to, object to, opt to/for/in/out, pass off/up, pencil in, point out, press for/on, proceed against/from, provide against/for, put across/back/down/forward/in/off, reckon on/up, refer to, report to, resort to, rest on/with, result in, revert to, rough out, rule in/out, serve upon/on, set down/forth/up, settle up, sift through, skim through, speak for/out, strike off/out, subject to, subscribe to, substitute for, sue for, sum up, take over, tamper with, testify to, trade down/in/off, turn down, weigh up, wind down/up, work around/out, wrap up, write off, yield up. All these phrasal verbs, according to Haigh, have a meaning associated with legal language and can be used in Legal English.

1.3. Phrasal verbs

Phrasal verbs are defined as "idiomatic phrases consisting of a verb and another element", which typically is an adverb, preposition or a combination of both (Oxford Dictionaries, n. d.). Even though the term 'phrasal verb' is most commonly used, Gorlach (2004, p. 12) explains that the term 'verb-particle construction' (VPC) is also applied when talking about the verb and particle functioning as a unit.

1.3.1. Formality

Up to now, previous studies have explained the definition of the term *phrasal verbs*. However, data from other studies show that phrasal verbs are not outlined as formal. Formality in English is associated with academic language, where the requirement is to use wide vocabulary (English Language Learners, 2017). In this case, it is suggested using single-word verbs that are assumed to be stronger and more formal than phrasal verbs because single-word verbs enable the writer to be more explicit. Though phrasal verbs are usually considered as an informal part of the English language, there are some acknowledged as academic, for instance, *lead to, result in,* or *followed by.* Phrasal verbs are also used in the cases when no single-word verb can be found (Student Academic Success Center, 2016).

Although some studies attempted to investigate that in some cases single-word verbs can be used informally (or as a slang) and in such cases, phrasal verbs sound more formal. For instance, the phrasal verb *get up* means *get out of bed after waking up* and if there is a need to replace this phrasal verb, the alternatives are quite limited: *rise, arise, stir* and *rouse.* However, these single-word verbs are not more formal than the phrasal verb *get up,* which is neutral. This suggests that phrasal verbs or single-word verbs must be used according to the context (English Language Learners, 2017).

Using this approach, the above-mentioned studies suggest that if phrasal verbs are not considered as a formal part of the English language, they might not be common in legal texts. Therefore, further investigation will be carried out in the empirical part of the paper.

1.3.2. Types of phrasal verbs according to the meaning

The following is a broader description and classification of phrasal verbs. Regarding phrasal verbs, they are also described as multi-word units, which consist of a verb followed by an adverbial particle, for instance, *carry out, find out*, etc. All these adverbial particles have spatial or locative meanings (*out, in, up, down, on, off*), however, they can also be used with extended meanings. Conversely, prepositional verbs consist of a verb + preposition: *look at, talk about*, or *listen to*; and phrasal-prepositional verbs consist of both adverbial particle and a preposition, e.g. *get away with*. This means that phrasal verbs and prepositional verbs represent semantic units that cannot be predicted from the individual meanings of the phrase. These multi-word verb units usually have equivalents in simple lexical verbs, for instance, *carry out* – perform or undertake; *look at* – observe; *talk about* – discuss. All these combinations can occur as free combinations, when each element has independent grammatical and semantic position. Free combinations consist of verb + adverb (that carries its own meaning, e.g. *come down, go back*) or verb + prepositional phrase (which functions as an adverbial, e.g. *live in, sit on*) (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, and Finegan, 2012, p. 403-405).

Talking further about free combinations, each word of such combination has an independent meaning, while the meaning of multi – word verbs cannot be anticipated. This distinction is important when there is a need to differentiate phrasal verbs and free combinations with an adverb. For instance, the intransitive phrasal verbs *come on, get up/out, break down*, and *set in* have meanings beyond the separate meanings of the parts of the phrase, while in intransitive free combinations, such as *come back/down, go back/in*, or *look back*, both the verb and the adverb have separate meanings (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, & Finegan, 2012, p. 404).

Another significant aspect of phrasal verbs is to know the meaning of the verbs and the meaning of prepositions and particles. All verbs that are used with particles are verbs of motion, which can be physical (*wipe, drag, break*) or abstract (*think, sell, buy*). One more problem that can arise is to understand the meaning of the particle or preposition, and why one particle or preposition is used and not another one. In this case, prepositions and particles can have spatial, prototypical or basic meanings. It is easy to understand phrasal verbs if the meaning of the verb is known and the particle is spatial, for instance, 'Do you know there is petrol *leaking out of* your tank?' meaning *coming, flowing out*. It is more difficult to understand phrasal verbs when

particles are used metaphorically, i.e. when literal meanings are broadened to abstract meanings, such as intentions, thoughts, or feelings ('In the Middle Ages epidemics *wiped out* whole cities' meaning *destroyed completely* (Rudzka-Ostyn, 2003, p. 2-3).

In the case of components of phrasal verbs, it is not enough to know its separate meanings. As the example can be taken the verbs *turn, pick* and *put,* which have different meaning from the one they have in a concrete sentence, as in '*pick up* an object from the floor' has a literal meaning while in the sentence 'business is *picking up'* the same phrasal verb has a meaning of 'improving, becoming better'. These examples indicate the fact that phrasal verbs have several different meanings and can be distributed in a number of semantic types (Rudzka-Ostyn, 2003, p. 4-5).

In addition, in order to understand phrasal verbs it is important to recognize its five semantic types: literal, aspectual, reiterative, figurative and non-compositional. The literal meaning of phrasal verb is predicted from individual parts of phrasal verb (the verb and the particle), for instance, *I went away and left him*. Nonetheless, these kind of phrasal verbs are usually entitled as free combinations in distinction from actual phrasal verbs. Aspectual phrasal verbs are formed of a verb and particle, which indicates an action that is completed or ongoing (e.g. *The car just broke up in half*). The third semantic type of phrasal verbs is reiterative, which indicates that a particular phrasal verb is constituted of a verb and a particle that repeats a part of verb semantics (e.g. *He rose up on tiptoe, looking round for James, Allan, and the rest*). Phrasal verbs that have figurative or metaphorical meaning are quite clear and easy to understand but their meaning is eliminated from the literal meaning. For instance, one can literally *throw away* something (like cigarette) or *throw away* a fortune. Phrasal verbs tend to obtain figurative or metaphorical meaning when a verb changes from the physical to the mental domain. The last type is non-compositional phrasal verbs the meaning of which cannot be predicted from the constituents, for instance, *put down – humiliate* or *pass away – die* (Rodríguez-Puente, 2012, p. 72-76).

1.3.3. Types of phrasal verbs according to the structure

As far as the structure is concerned, six types of phrasal verbs can be distinguished (Dixon, 2011, p. 293):

1. Verb + preposition: *set in, come to,* etc.
2. Verb + preposition + Noun: *set about X, come by C,* etc.
3. Verb + Noun + preposition: *put X off, take X on,* etc.

4. Verb + Noun + preposition + Noun: *see X through Y, hold X against Y*, etc.
5. Verb + preposition + preposition + Noun: *take up with X, go in for X*, etc.
6. Verb + Noun + preposition + preposition + Noun: *put X down to Y, let X in for Y*, etc.

Regarding the types discussed above, the difference between second and third types is pointed out because the preposition can be moved to the left over a noun but cannot be moved over an unstressed personal pronoun. For instance, *put the meeting off* (3) - *put off the meeting* (2) and *put it off* (3) but not *put off it* (Dixon, 2011, p. 294).

The syntactic structure of phrasal verbs is more complex because of the restrictions depending on the place of the particle and on passivizing phrasal verbs. Discussing the place of the particle of phrasal verbs, the more figurative meaning a phrasal verb has, the more it forms a tight unit and the less verb and particle can be used separately, for instance, it is not possible to say *make your mind up*, whereas the phrase *make up your mind* is correct. While talking about passivizing phrasal verbs, the phrase *he blew up* is correct, but not *he was blown up by what I said*. The knowledge of these frames is necessary because the restrictions depend on the meaning of the verb, the particle and the meaning of the whole phrasal verb (Rudzka-Ostyn, 2003, p. 1-2).

Structural criteria is also important in recognizing whether the combination has a function as a prepositional verb, phrasal verb, or free combination. The important aspect is the possibility of particle movement (the placement of the particle before or after the object noun phrase). Almost all transitive phrasal verbs allow particle movement (e.g. the direct object can appear between the particle and the verb), while it is not allowed with prepositional verbs and free combinations. (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, and Finegan, 2012, p. 404).

1.3.4. Syntactic types of phrasal verbs

The following is a brief description of two main phrasal verb subcategories: transitive (*bring up, carry out, find out, pick up, point out, take out, turn on*) and intransitive (e.g. *break down, come along/on, hold on, shut up*) (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, and Finegan, 2012, p. 407). Transitive verbs are verbs that take object and intransitive verbs are verbs that do not take object (Cambridge Dictionary, n. d.).

The majority of phrasal verbs are activity verbs and can be divided in following categories: activity transitive (*bring in, build up, fill in, keep up, pull up/down,* etc.); activity intransitive (*get on, look out, move in*, etc.); mental transitive (*make out*); communication transitive (*bring up, call in*); occurrence intransitive (*break down, grow up*); aspectual intransitive (*carry on, go ahead*); aspectual transitive (*keep on, start off*). Prepositional verbs, which also functions as

phrasal verbs, are often used to refer to mental activities (*deal with, get into, look at*, etc.) (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, and Finegan, 2012, p. 409).

As discussed above, phrasal verbs include prepositions that have two uses – within inherent preposition verbs and within phrasal verbs. The main distinction is that the root of an inherent preposition verb cannot be utilized alone, for instance, the verb *refer* can only be used with preposition *to* and noun phrase (NP) (*refer to something*). *Refer to* syntactically can take a meaning *mention*. The root of a phrasal verb can be used alone, however, its meaning is different when used in a phrasal verb from used on its own. For instance, the root verb *take* has a different meaning as a phrasal verb: *take after* (resemble), *take up* (practise), or *take on* (accept). This suggests that the distinction of prepositions and their transitivity are as follows: 1) verbs that consists of a root verb; 2) verbs that consist of a root verb and preposition (where the root cannot stand alone); 3) verbs that consist of a root verb and preposition (where the root can stand alone) (Dixon, 2011, p. 289-297).

Verbs with an inherent preposition can be considered as a part of two-word lexemes and operate as transitive verbs or can be followed by NP and operate as intransitive verbs (in some cases, like *travel* or *float*, they can optionally take or not prepositional NPs). The main difficulty with the second option is that some NPs, which follows an intransitive verb, operate as a transitive object and becomes a passive subject. For instance, it can be said *John's sense of propriety can be relied on* but not *That pool has been floated on*. The examples show that any number of prepositions can follow intransitive verbs such as *float* (*in/on/across the pool*). For this vagueness, it is suggested treating inherent preposition combinations as transitive verbs. Another reason is that these inherent preposition verbs are syntactically and semantically similar to simple transitive verbs, for instance, *approve of* and *like*, *refer to* and *mention*, etc. (Dixon, 2011, p. 289-297).

Phrasal-prepositional verbs consist of a lexical verb combined with an adverbial particle and a preposition and these verbs have two structural patterns: 1) NP + verb + particle + preposition + NP (e. g. No one has been able to *come up with* that problem); 2) NP + verb + NP + particle + preposition + NP (e.g. I could *hand* him *over to* Sadiq). Phrasal-prepositional verbs are considered as a semantic unit and can be replaced by a single transitive verb with a similar meaning, for instance, *put up with* – tolerate; *get out of* – avoid (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, and Finegan, 2012, p. 423).

There are two patterns for prepositional verbs: 1) NP + verb + preposition + NP (e. g. I've never even *thought about* it); 2) NP + verb + NP + preposition + NP (e.g. They like to *accuse* women

of being mechanically inept). Prepositional verbs can be analysed in two ways: one way is to treat them as simple lexical verbs that are followed by a prepositional phrase, which functions as an adverbial. In this way, it is possible to insert another adverbial between the verbs and the prepositional phrase. On the other hand, these verbs can be considered as a single semantic unit. In this case, two-word units can be replaced by a simple transitive verb that has a similar meaning, for instance, *asked for* – requested; *deal with* – handle (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, and Finegan, 2012, p. 413-414).

The fourth type phrasal verbs is multi-word verb constructions and they also have its structural patterns: 1) verb + prepositional phrase combinations that have idiomatic status. They function as one semantic unit and can be replaced by one lexical verb, for instance, *bear in mind* – remember; *take into account* – consider. 2) verb + verb combinations, such as *make do (with)* or *let NP go/be*. 3) verb + NP combinations, when the verbs (*take, make, have, and do*) are combined with noun phrases in order to form verbal expression, for instance, 'it will *take time* to cut costs in the acquisitions' (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, and Finegan, 2012, p. 427 - 428).

In this chapter, it has been explained that phrasal verbs can be divided into six types and they differ according to their meaning and structure. The chapter that follows moves on to consider the methods that are used in order to find out whether phrasal verbs are used in selected legal text.

II. METHODOLOGY

In this paper, phrasal verbs and their usage in legal English are focused on. In order to analyse the usage of phrasal verbs in legal English documents, a prescriptive legal document was chosen – The Treaty of Lisbon (2007).

The Treaty of Lisbon was signed in 13 December 2007 and entered into force in 1 December 2009 (EU Treaties, 2016). The Treaty is a new treaty that amends and updates earlier ones. It was needed because of the changes in the EU and the world: economic crisis, climate change, security, inequalities. Another aspect is that the EU has grown from six states that founded the Union to present 27 states and the changes should be made in order to strengthen the EU and ascertain its efficient work. (Your Guide to Lisbon Treaty, 2009).

The Treaty of Lisbon is chosen for the linguistic analysis because now it is the new document and now one of the main treaties of EU. It is translated into 23 languages, such as French, Latvian, Lithuanian, Italian, etc. In this research paper, consideration is taken to the text of Treaty of Lisbon in English.

In order to achieve the desirable purpose, qualitative (descriptive and analytic methods) and quantitative approaches were used. A quantitative approach was employed in order to indentify whether phrasal verbs from the book *Legal English* by R. Haigh (2009) occur in the text of the treaty and how many of them are found. The list is used as the core source in order to find out which phrasal verbs are used in chosen legal document. The study also uses qualitative analysis in order to gain insights into semantics and structure of the phrasal verbs used.

The terms used in the empirical survey:

- *Multi-word verb* that is used as a synonym to *phrasal verb;*
- *Single-word verb* – a verb that always stands alone, it is concise, stronger and more formal;
- *Root verb* – a base form of a verb listed in a dictionary (Grammar monster, 2017);
- *Lexical verb* – a main verb form in a phrase or a sentence that carries its own meaning (Enotes, 2012);
- *Verb construction* – a construction of a verb and a preposition that is analysed in order to find out whether it can be considered as a phrasal verb.

The appendix at the end of the paper also includes the list of phrasal verbs found in the Treaty of Lisbon. The phrasal verbs are listed with definitions from Haigh's list of phrasal verbs.

The first step in the analysis is to identify what root verbs from the list of phrasal verbs are found in the text of the Treaty of Lisbon. To assess whether and how many times root verbs are used, the corpus AntConc3.4.4w is applied. Then, it is looked upon the meanings of lexical verbs with and without a preposition or adverbial particle. Accordingly, the structure and types of each phrasal verb are analysed according to its components and place in the sentence. Further, the meaning of each phrasal verb is identified and its single-word synonymous replacement matched. In the follow-up phase of the study, the corpus AntConc3.4.4w was used one more time in order to identify whether/how often the single-word verbs occur in the text of the treaty. Finally, the main types of phrasal verbs found in the Treaty of Lisbon are distinguished and single-word verbs that could replace the phrasal verbs identified.

III. THE ANALYSIS OF PHRASAL VERBS IN THE TREATY OF LISBON

As it is discussed in the theoretical part, in order to analyse phrasal verbs in the Treaty of Lisbon, it is necessary to identify which root verbs from the list of the phrasal verbs can be found in the text. For this reason, the corpus AntConc3.4.4w was used. Every root verb from the list of the phrasal verbs, composed by Haigh (2009), was written in the chosen corpus in order to check whether that verb is used in the Treaty of Lisbon and its occurrence.

The findings showed that the root verbs from the list of the phrasal verbs used in the analysed source are as follows: abide, accede, arise, call, carry, change, charge, consist, cover, deal, draw, engage, enter, entitle, limit, proceed, provide, put, refer, report, result, rule, serve, set, settle, subject, subscribe, substitute, take, weigh, and work. The lexical verb *abide* was used once, *accede* – 2 times, *arise* – 2 times, *call*–17 times, *carry* – 27 times, *change* – 3 times, *consist* – 10 times, *cover* – 24 times, *deal* – 4 times, *draw* – 23 times, *engage* – 3 times, *enter* – 21 time, *entitle* – 7 times, *limit* – 2 times, *proceed* – 7 times, *provide* – 101 time, *put* – 4 times, *refer* – 237 times, *report* – 3 times, *result* – 15 times, *rule* – 2 times, *serve* – 8 times, *set* – 110 times, *settle* – 4 times, *subject* – 26 times, *subscribe* – 1 time, *substitute* – 1 time, *take* – 159 times, *weigh* – 2 times, and *work* – 3 times.

It is seen that the text of the Treaty includes 30 root verbs from Haigh's list of 97 phrasal verbs. It is evident that this particular legal prescriptive text includes one third of the phrasal verbs that are said to be those used in legal English documents. The most frequent lexical verbs among them are *refer* (used 237 times), *take* (159 times), *set* (110 times), *provide* (101 time), and *do* (81 time).

However, not all the lexical verbs listed above that include a particle or a preposition function as phrasal verbs. There are verbs that are used only with a particle and/or preposition and function as a phrasal verb, and a number of them function as both, lexical verb and phrasal verb. The following analysis reveals which lexical verbs include a particle or a preposition and function as phrasal verbs and which do not and which phrasal verb has a single-word verb equivalent.

3.1. Abide by

The lexical verb *to abide* has five meanings: *to bear, to tolerate, to wait for, to stay, to remain, to live* (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p.2). When used with the preposition *by*, the verb *to abide* gains the meanings *to be faithful, to obey, to wait for, to accept* (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 2). As the examples show, the same

verb *to abide*, whether used as a single – word verb or with the preposition, can take the same meanings, such as *to wait for*. However, the definition of the verb with preposition indicates that phrasal verb *to abide by* can be used in the wording of laws or agreements with the meaning *to obey*.

The verb construction *to abide by* is used in the Treaty of Lisbon in the following sentence:

- "… any decision adopted by the European Council, at the initiative of the European Parliament and with its consent, establishing the composition of the European Parliament, must *abide by* the principles laid down out in the first subparagraph of Article 9 A(2) (renumbered Article 14)" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 269).

In this sentence, the verb construction *to abide by* takes the meaning and has the equivalent in the single – word verb *to obey*.

The verb construction *to abide by* consists of the verb (*abide*) + preposition (*by*) and takes the noun (*the principles*), which acts as a direct object in the sentence. In this case, the verb construction *to abide by* is a phrasal verb in the text because it is a semantic unit that can be replaced with the transitive verb *to obey*.

3.2. Accede to

The lexical verb *to accede* has the meanings *to give approval, to agree, to take a high post or position after someone has left it, to join a group of people*, etc. (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 5). When used with the preposition *to*, the same verb takes the meanings *to follow someone and take (a position, etc.), to give approval to* (Courtney, 1986, p. 2). The verb, whether used with a preposition or without it, has the same meanings *to succeed* ant *to agree*.

To accede occurs in 2 sentences in the Treaty of Lisbon:

- "The Union shall *accede to* the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 13);
- "…such dialogue could be reinforced when the Union *accedes to* that Convention" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 249).

In both cases, the verb construction *to accede to* has the equivalent in the single-word verb *to agree*.

The verb construction *to accede to* consists of a verb (*accede*) + preposition (*to*) and in both cases take an object (*the European Convention; that Convention*). The implication could be made that the verb *to accede* is an inherent prepositional verb (when, according to the theoretical part, the verb *to accede* cannot be utilized without a preposition in a sentence). However, *to accede*, whether used as a single-word verb or a multi-word verb, has the same meaning and is considered as one semantic unit. In this case, the implication can be made that *accede to* is a phrasal verb in the Treaty of Lisbon.

3.3. Arise from

The lexical verb *to arise* has the meanings *to come into being or to notice, to happen, appear, to move or go upward, to get up, to stand up* (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 44). When used with the preposition *from*, the verb gains the meaning *to result from* (Courtney, 1986, p. 10).

The lexical verb *to arise* is used 2 times in the Treaty of Lisbon:

- "…in particular if severe difficulties *arise in* the supply of certain products, notably in the area of energy" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 72);
- "The latter situation *arises* when the relevant EU institutions decide to repeal a legislative act…" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 257).

In the first case, the verb *to arise* is followed by the preposition *in*, however, it is not considered as a phrasal verb because the preposition is a part of the phrase *in the supply of certain products*. In the second sentence, the verb *to arise* is a single-word verb, i.e. stands without a preposition and does not form phrasal verb.

It is evident that the verb *to arise* is used only as a single-word verb in the Treaty of Lisbon and implication can be made that in both cases the verb has a meaning *to come into being, to appear*.

3.4. Call in

The lexical verb *to call* has up to fourteen meanings: *to shout, to speak or say in a loud clear voice, to make a short visit, to telephone or to radio, to cause to come, to cause to happen, to waken, to consider, to claim, to agree to (an amount or quantity) calculated very exactly; say nasty things about (someone)*, etc. (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 142). When *to call* is used with the preposition *in*, it has two meanings: "to visit (a place) for a short time; call in question to doubt (something)" (Courtney, 1986, p. 64). The verb *to call* can also be used with the preposition *into* in a number of phrasal verbs as follows: *call into* – to

visit (a place) for a short time, *call something into action* – to request that something start working or be active, *call something/someone into being* – to make, create something or someone, *call something into play* – to cause something to be active (Courtney, 1986, p. 64).

The verb *to call* is used 17 times in the Treaty in Lisbon. However, there is only one case found when *to call* is used with the preposition *into* and is considered as a phrasal verb:

- "… without being deprived of its character as Community law and without the legal basis of the Community itself being *called into* question" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 256).

The structure of the verb construction is verb (*called*) + preposition (*in*) + noun (*question*) and in the sentence phrasal verb *called into question* has a meaning *to doubt*. According to the structure, this phrasal verb has idiomatic meaning and functions as one semantic unit.

The Treaty of Lisbon includes 16 more occurrences of the verb *to call*. 4 of them are used with the preposition *on, upon* and *for*. The verb construction *call on* is used once in a sentence:

- "… the words 'and, acting in accordance with the same procedure, may *call on* independent persons to submit within a reasonable time limit a report on the situation … " (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 13).

In this occurrence, the verb construction *to call on* can have an equivalent in the single-word verb *to visit* and is considered as a phrasal verb.

The construction *call upon* is used twice:

- "…that body is *called upon* to adopt acts having legal effects, with the exception of acts supplementing or amending the institutional framework of the agreement." (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 98);
- "In choosing the persons *called upon* to hold the offices of President of the European Council…" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 250).

The preposition *for* occurred once in a sentence "Where such agreements *call for* amendments to this Treaty…) (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 201). When used with the prepositions *on/upon* and *for*, the verb *to call* sustains the same meaning – *to demand*.

The examples above show that when the verb *to call* is used with *on/upon,* it has two structural patters: verb (*call*) + preposition (*on*) + noun (*independent persons*) and verb (*call*) + preposition (*upon*) + infinitive (*to adopt*).

3.5. Carry on/out

The lexical verb *to carry* has 26 meanings that include *to bring, to transport, to convey, to move, to spread, to transmit, to be expecting (a child), to bring or broadcast, to contain, to support, to be approved, to pass, to increase, to enlarge, to continue*, etc. (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 156).

When *to carry* is used with adverbial particle *on*, it has the meanings *to take on, to follow, to continue, to have or organize, to behave wildly, to behave in an excited or anxious manner, to be angry, to have a love affair*. When the verb is used with adverbial particle *out*, it has the meanings *to lift and take it out, to fulfil, to perform* (Courtney, 1986, p. 67).

The verb *to carry* occurs 27 times in the Treaty of Lisbon. 26 of them are used with adverbial particle *out*. For instance,

- "… assist each other in *carrying out* tasks which flow from the Treaties" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 12);
- "The European Commission shall *carry out* broad consultations with parties concerned … " (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 15);
- "It shall *carry out* policy-making and coordinating functions as laid down in the Treaties" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 18).

The occurrences show that the most frequent meaning of verb construction *to carry out* is to *perform* (18 times) and *to fulfil* (8 times). As the findings show, the phrasal verb *to carry out* has the meaning *to perform* when it is used with the nouns *activities/actions* (*carry out activities/actions*). The noun *activities* suggests movement, therefore, the verb *to perform* also implies movement. The same pattern is seen when *to carry out* takes the noun *tasks* (*carry out tasks*). The noun *tasks* also implies movement, accordingly, it suggests that phrasal verb *to carry out* should take the meaning *to perform*.

To carry out takes the meaning *to fulfil* when the phrasal verb takes a noun that indicates or prescribes conditions, responsibilities, etc. For instance, *to carry out responsibilities*, which means *to fulfil responsibilities*.

In the analysed occurrences, the dominating verb construction is verb (*carry*) + adverbial particle (*out*) + noun (*that acts as a direct: tasks, broad consultations, functions, joint assessments, activities, actions, checks, measures, programme; or acts as an indirect object: its responsibilities, his mandate, its tasks, their missions, its policies*). The examples demonstrate that in all occurrences *to carry out* takes object (direct or indirect) and in this way is acknowledged as a transitive verb.

The analysis indicates that in all occurrences carry out can be replaced with the single-word verbs *to fulfil* or *to perform*. It is also evident that these meanings cannot be anticipated from individual component the construction *to carry out* and in this way the conclusion can be made that *to carry out* is a phrasal verb in the Treaty and acts as one semantic unit.

3.6. Change over

The lexical verb *to change* has 14 meanings, which include *to become different, to exchange, to give (money) in exchange of money, to shift,* etc. (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 170).

When change is used with adverbial particle *over*, it has the meaning "to (cause) to exchange places; to (cause to) make a complete change" (Courtney, 1986, p. 73).

The verb *to change* occurs in 3 sentences in the treaty. However, all occurrences of *to change* are used without any preposition or adverbial particle. Accordingly, the implication is made that the Treaty of Lisbon does not include the phrasal verb *to change over*.

3.7. Consist in/of

The lexical verb *to consist* is not used alone in a sentence and always takes the prepositions *in* or *of*. With the preposition *in*, *to consist* gains the meaning "to have as a base; depend on". When used with the preposition *of,* it has the meaning "to be made up of" (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 233). These phrasal verbs can be also considered as inherent prepositional verbs because they always take preposition and can have the single – word verb equivalents: *to compose* (when the lexical verb is followed by *of*) or *to comprise, to contain* (when *consist* is followed by *in*). *To consist in* is regarded as more formal part of the English language and is frequently used in writings (Courtney, 1986, p. 105).

The Treaty of Lisbon has 11 occurrences of the lexical verb *to consist*, 10 of which are used with the preposition *of* and one with the preposition *in*:

- "The European Council shall *consist of* the Heads of State or Government of the Member State …"(Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 17).
- "The ordinary legislative procedure shall *consist in* the joint adoption by the European Parliament and the Council of a regulation ..." (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 113).

The analysis showed that all occurrences of *to consist of* are used together with the modal verb *shall*. In this way, the phrasal verb *consist of* can be replaced with a single-word verb *to compose*. However, in all ten occurrences the verb *to compose* requires a preposition (*of*)

because in all occurrences it is followed by a noun that acts as a direct object, for instance, the Heads of State or Government, one national of each Member State, etc. *To consist in* can be replaced with the single-word verb *to comprise*. In this case, it can be used with the preposition *of* or without it, and the construction is also followed by a noun that acts as a direct object in the sentence.

The research revealed that the verb constructions *consist in* and *consist of* form one semantic unit and have equivalent in single-word verb, which indicate that *consist in* and *consist of* are phrasal verbs in the Treaty of Lisbon.

3.8. Cover up

The lexical verb *to cover* can have 14 meanings, for instance, *to spread, to place, to travel, to watch, insure, to include*, etc. (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 254). When used with the adverbial particle *up*, it gains the meanings: *to put a cover, to hide* (Courtney, 1986, p. 112). It can also have the meanings *to conceal* or *to enfold* (Dictionary, n. d.).

Cover is used 24 times in the Treaty of Lisbon. However, there were no occurrences found with the verb construction *to cover up*. The verb stands only as a lexical verb without any preposition or with the preposition *by*, which indicates passiveness of the sentence.

In this way, the implication is made that the phrasal verb *to cover up* has not occurred in the Treaty of Lisbon at all.

3.9. Deal in/with

The lexical verb *to deal* is indicated to have 3 meanings: "to give as one's share; to give out players in a game; to strike" (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 282). When used with the adverbial particle *in*, it has the meanings *to buy and sell; trade in*. *To deal* with the preposition *with* has the meanings *to handle*; *to be a customer of; to take action about; to be concerned with; to have a relationship with; to have talks with; to punish* (Courtney, 1986, p. 124).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes 3 occurrences of lexical verb *to deal* and in all cases, the verb takes preposition *with*:

- "…promoting measures at international level to *deal with* regional or worldwide environmental problems …" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 87).

- "They shall remain in office and continue to *deal with* current business until they are replaced in accordance with Article 9D ..."(Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 103).
- "…they shall remain in office and continue to *deal with* current business until they have been replaced …" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 106).

In all cases *to deal with* can have an equivalent in the single-word verb *to handle*.

The structure of the verb construction is verb (*deal*) + preposition (*with*) + noun (*regional or worldwide environmental problems; current business*). In all three occurrences, the nouns act as a direct object of the sentence. The findings show that the verb construction *to deal with* act as one semantic unit in the sentences and is a phrasal verb in the Treaty of Lisbon.

3.10. Draw up/upon/on

The lexical verb *to draw* has up to 27 meanings, for instance, *to pull, to attract, to collect, to bend*, etc. (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 334). When used with the prepositions *on/upon* it gains the meaning *to make use of* or *to utilize*. With the adverbial particle *up*, it gains the meaning *to prepare* (Courtney, 1986, p. 149-150).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes 10 occurrences of the lexical verb *to draw*. With the adverbial particle *up* the verb is utilized 6 times and 4 times with the preposition *on*:

- "… the Union shall *draw up* a European space policy" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 86).
- "…each institution shall, before 1 July, *draw up* estimates of its expenditure for the following financial year (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 123).
- "It shall provide the Union with an operational capacity *drawing on* civilian and military assets" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 34).

The analysis revealed that in all occurrences where the verb *to draw* takes the adverbial particle *up*, the verb construction can be replaced by single-word verb *to prepare*. Accordingly, when *to draw* takes the preposition *on*, it can be replaced by the single-word verb *to utilize*.

The prevailing structures of the verb construction in the Treaty of Lisbon are as follows: verb (*draw*) + adverbial particle (*up*) + noun (*a European space policy; estimates*); verb (*draw*) + preposition (*on*) + noun (*civilian and military assets*); verb (*draw*) + adverbial particle (*up*) + preposition (*in*) + noun (*euro; languages*). The findings revealed that in all the occurrences a noun acts as a direct object, which indicates that the verb *to draw* is a transitive verb. Another implication is that all verb constructions act as a single semantic unit and can have equivalents

in the single-word verbs. This indicates that the verb construction *draw up/on/upon* is a phrasal verb in the Treaty of Lisbon.

3.11. Engage in

The lexical verb *to engage* can have up to 7 meanings, for instance, *to hire, to order, to bind*, etc. (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 363). When *to engage* takes the preposition *in*, it has the meaning *to become involved, to be busy with, to take part in* (Courtney, 1986, p. 163).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes 3 occurrences of the lexical verb *to engage*. However, the verb with the preposition *in* occurred once:

- "Specific groups shall be set up within the Agency bringing together Member States *engaged in* joint projects" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2017, p. 37).

The structure of the verb construction in the Treaty of Lisbon is the verb (*engage)* + preposition (*in*) + noun (*joint projects*). The analysis revealed that a noun acts as the direct object of the construction, which indicates that the verb *to engage* is transitive.

In the sentence, *to engaged in* can be replaced with the single-word verb *to involve*, however, according to English Club (n. d.), this phrasal verb is considered to be more formal than the verb *to involve*. The implication can be made that a more formal verb form has been selected.

The structure of the verb construction *to engage in* can be considered as one semantic unit in the sentence, which indicates that it is a phrasal verb in the Treaty of Lisbon text.

3.12. Enter into

The lexical verb *to enter* can have meanings *to come* or *go into* (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 365). When the verb takes the preposition *into*, it has the meaning *to become involved, to begin, to become, to become part* (Courtney, 1986, p. 165).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes 21 occurrence of the lexical verb *to enter* and in all cases the verb takes the preposition *into*:

- "The amendments shall *enter into* force after being ratified by all the Member States …" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 39).
- "These provisions shall *enter into* force following their approval by the Member States …" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 101).

The analysis showed that in all occurrences *to enter into* is used with the noun *force*. In this way, the implication can be made that the verb construction cannot be replaced by a single-word verb *to involve* in any sentences because *to enter into force* is considered as one semantic unit and is not considered as a phrasal verb in the Treaty.

3.13. Entitle to (to be entitled to)

The lexical verb *to entitle* has the meaning "to give (to a book, play, etc.) a title" (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 366). When used with the preposition *to*, it has the meaning *the right to have something or to do something* (Courtney, 1986, p. 166).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes 7 occurrences of the lexical verb *to entitle*, however, it takes the preposition *to* only in two occurrences:

- "The Bank shall be *entitled to* participate in the management of these bodies …" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 179).
- " … it wishes to take part in the adoption and application of any such proposed measure, whereupon Denmark shall be *entitled to* do so" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 189).

The examples demonstrate that *to entitle to* is used with the modal verb *shall* in the construction as follows: modal verb (*shall*) + verb (*entitle*) + preposition (*to*) + verb (*participate, do*). Both occurrences can have the equivalent with the phrase *to have the right to*. Nonetheless, the implication can be made that the verb construction *to entitle to* does not have single-word verb substitution and in the Treaty of Lisbon the construction *to be entitled to* is more formal than *to have the right to* and the form *to be entitled to* is always used in passive voice in Legal English. The research explains that *to entitle to* is regarded as one semantic unit in the occurrences and is a phrasal verb in the Treaty of Lisbon.

3.14. Limit to

The lexical verb *to limit* has the meanings *to restrict, to curtail, to reduce* (Longman New Universal Dictionary, 1982). When used with the preposition to, it has the meanings *to reduce* and *to control* (Courtney, 1986, p. 359).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes two occurrences of the lexical verb *to limit*. However, the verb in the sentence stands without any preposition and is acts a lexical verb in the text.

3.15. Proceed against/from

The lexical verb *to proceed* has the meanings *to begin and continue, to continue, to advance, to move forward* (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 873). When used

with the preposition *against*, it has the meaning "to bring someone to trial" (Courtney, 1986, p. 446). When used with the preposition *from*, it has the meanings *to move forward, to travel, to continue* (Courtney, 1986, p.447).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes 7 occurrences of the lexical verb *to proceed*. However, not a single occurrence includes the verb used with the prepositions *against* or *from*. The analysis indicates that *to proceed* is used with the preposition *with* (6 times):

- "In such a case, the authorisation *to proceed with* enhanced cooperation referred to in Article 10(2) of the Treaty …" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 64).
- "Authorisation *to proceed with* the enhanced cooperation referred to in the first subparagraph …" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 128).

In all seven occurrences, the verb construction *to proceed with* can be interpreted as having a single-word equivalent verb *to continue*, however, the inference can be made that *to proceed with* is more formal construction than the verb *to continue*. Obviously, for this reason *to proceed with* is given preference in the treaty.

The structure of the verb construction in the Treaty of Lisbon is verb (*proceed*) + preposition (*with*) + noun (*ratification, enhanced cooperation*). The analysis showed that in all sentences nouns stand as a direct object and in this way, *to proceed* is a transitive verb.

Despite the fact that the phrasal verb *to proceed with* is not included in Haigh's list of phrasal verbs, the analysis show that it is found in the Treaty of Lisbon.

3.16. Provide against/for

The lexical verb *to provide* has the meaning *to supply* (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 885). When used with the preposition *against*, it has the meanings *to take action, to avoid, to pretend.* When *to provide* takes the preposition *for*, it has the meanings *to supply, to fulfil the needs, to ensure, to make arrangements, to demand the enforcement* (Courtney, 1986, p. 449).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes 101 occurrence of the lexical verb *to provide*, 51 of which take the preposition *for*:

- " …the principle of subsidiarity is respected in accordance with the procedures *provided for* in the Protocol …" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 15).
- "With the exception of the common foreign and security policy, and other cases *provided for* in the Treaties …" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 19).

The analysis show that in all the occurrences the verb construction *to provide for* stands as one semantic unit and can be replaced by the single-word verb *to ensure*.

The structure of the verb construction in the Treaty is verb (*provide*) + preposition (*for*) + preposition (*in*) + noun (*the Protocol, the Treaties*). The examples show that the nouns *the Protocol* and *the Treaties* stand as the direct objects of the sentences and in this way, *to provide* is a transitive verb. The analysis show that in all the occurrences the verb construction *to provide for* stands as one semantic unit and can be replaced by the single-word verb *to ensure*. This concludes that *provide for* is used as a phrasal verb in the Treaty of Lisbon.

3.17. Put across/back/down/forward/in/off

The lexical verb *to put* has up to 12 meanings, for instance, *to move, to set, to place, to lay, to fix, to turn, to guide, to direct*, etc. (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 897). When used with the preposition *across*, the verb has the meanings *to place, to move* (Courtney, 1986, p. 462). With the adverbial particle *back* it has the meanings *to replace* or *to postpone* (English Club, n. d.). The adverbial particle *down* gives the meanings *to lower, to cease, to leave, to record*, etc. When *to put* takes the adverbial particle *forward*, it has the meanings *to offer, to suggest, to make advance* (Courtney, 1986, p.463). With the adverbial particle *in*, the verb has the meanings *to install* or *to devote* (which is considered as a formal form). When *to put* is used with the adverbial particle *off*, it has the formal meaning *to postpone* (English Club, n. d.).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes 4 occurrences of the verb *to put*. 2 occurrences are used with the preposition *in* and another 2 with the preposition *into*:

- " …shall be *put in* the plural and any necessary grammatical changes shall be made …" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 42).
- "The common foreign and security policy shall be *put into* effect by the High Representative and by the Member States …" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 27).

When *to put* is used with the preposition *in*, it gains the meaning *to place*. When used with the preposition *into*, it is used in the phrase *to put into effect*, which can be interpreted as having the single-word verb *to enforce*. The implication is made that the construction *to put into effect* can be considered as an idiomatic phrasal verb.

The structure of the verb construction in the Treaty of Lisbon is verb (*put*) + preposition (*in/into*) + noun (*the plural*, etc.). The nouns stand as direct objects of the sentences and the findings show that *to put* is a transitive verb.

The findings reveal that the verb constructions *to put in* and *to put into (effect)* are one semantic unit in analysed occurrences and can be replaced with a single-word verb, which denotes that it is a phrasal verb in the analysed text.

3.18. Refer to

The lexical verb *to refer* has the meanings *to mention, to speak about, to concern, to attribute to* and usually is used with the preposition *to* (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 926). According to theoretical part, the implication can be made that *to refer to* is inherent preposition verb (the root verb *to refer* and the preposition *to* should be always go together in the sentence).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes 237 occurrences of the verb *to refer to*, for instance,

- " …the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (hereinafter *referred to* as "the Treaties)." (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 10).
- " …the Charter governing its interpretation and application and with due regard to the explanations *referred to* in the Charter …" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 13).

The main structures of the verb construction in the Treaty of Lisbon are verb (*refer*) + preposition (*to*) + noun (*the Treaties, the Commission, the Council*, etc.) and verb (*refer*) + preposition (*to*) + preposition (*in*) + noun (*the Charter*, *this Article*, etc.). The analysis shows that the nouns act as a direct object of the structure, for this reason, *to refer* is considered as a transitive verb.

The analysis revealed that the verb construction *to refer to* is one semantic unit and has the single-word verb equivalent *to mention* (when the sentence continues with the indication of place, for instance, in the Charter, in Article, etc.) or *to attribute* (when the sentence continues with explanation, for instance, explanation of the particular term). This denotes that *to refer* is a phrasal verb used in the Treaty of Lisbon text.

3.19. Report to

The lexical verb *to report* has the meanings *to tell, to make known, to make complaint*, etc. (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 937). When used with the preposition *to*, it has the meanings *to give information, to declare arrival, to be under command*, etc. (Courtney, 1986, p. 502).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes 3 occurrences of the verb *to report*, 2 of which are used with the preposition *to*:

- "The High Representative shall *report to* the Council on the implementation of this remit." (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 33).
- "The Commission shall *report* regularly *to* the special committee and to the European Parliament on the progress of negotiations." (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 92).

The occurrences indicate that in these sentences *report to* can be interpreted as a prepositional verb because the preposition *to* indicates to who something is told (*to the Council* and *to the special committee*). The implication can be made that the preposition *to* the noun phrases of the sentences and is not a phrasal verb in the Treaty of Lisbon.

3.20. Result in

The lexical verb *to result* has the meaning *to happen* (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986). When used with the preposition *in*, it has the meanings *to cause* or *to lead to* (Courtney, 1986, p. 506).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes 15 occurrences of the verb *to result*, 2 of which take the preposition *in*:

- "… the exercise of that competence shall not *result in* Member States being prevented from exercising theirs." (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 47).
- "… the exercise of that competence shall *not result in* Member States being prevented from exercising theirs." (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 48).

The results show that in both occurrences *to result in* is used with the modal verb *shall* in the construction *shall not result in* and takes noun (Member States) that act as the direct object of the sentence.

The analysis also revealed that the verb *to result* is used with the preposition *from* (13 times):

- "…the needs and preferences of users that may *result from* different geographical, social or cultural situations …" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 158).
- "…the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and as they *result from* the constitutional traditions common to the Member States" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 249).

The main structure of the verb construction in the Treaty of Lisbon is verb (*result*) + preposition (*from*) + noun (*situations, the constitutional traditions,* etc.), where noun stands as the direct object of the sentence. In both cases *to result* is considered as a transitive verb.

The analysis revealed that the verb construction *to result in* can be interpreted as one semantic unit and has a single-word verb equivalent in *to lead to* and is considered as a phrasal verb in the text under focus. The verb construction *result from* is interpreted as having an equivalent with the construction *based on*, which is also considered as a phrasal verb. Although *result from* does not have a single-word verb equivalent, it is interpreted as one semantic unit and is acknowledged as a phrasal verb in the Treaty of Lisbon.

3.21. Rule in/out

The lexical verb *to rule* has the synonym and the meaning *to govern*. When used with the preposition *in*, it has the meaning "to or say that something is or will , or that something or someone is " (Cambridge Dictionary, n. d.). With the adverbial particle *out*, the verb gains the meaning *to prevent, to declare impossibility* (Courtney, 1986, p. 520).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes 2 occurrences of *to rule*, however, in both of them the verb is used without any preposition and is not a phrasal verb in the text.

3.22. Serve upon/on

The lexical verb *to serve* can have up to 17 meanings, for instance, *to work for, to do a duty, to suffice*, etc. (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986). When the verb takes the prepositions *on/upon*, it has the meaning *perform duties on* (Courtney, 1986, p. 550).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes 8 occurrences of the verb *to serve*, however, no one occurrence takes the prepositions on or upon, accordingly, it is not considered as a phrasal verb in the text of the treaty.

3.23. Set down/forth/up

The lexical verb *to set* can have up to 19 meanings and it can be used with a number of prepositions or adverbial particles. For instance, if the verb is used with the adverbial particle *down*, it has the meanings *to place, to make, to fix, to land*, etc. When the verb takes *forth*, it has the formal meanings *to explain, to give details, to show clearly*. With *up* it has the meanings *to build, to raise, to start, to prepare, to organize, to establish, to prepare*, etc. (Courtney, 1986, p. 554-555).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes 110 occurrences of the verb *to set*, however, there was no occurrence with the adverbial particle *down*. One occurrence is with the adverbial particle *forth* in the sentence:

- "… the objective of respecting the Union's rich cultural and linguistic diversity as *set forth* in the fourth subparagraph of Article 2(3) (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 256).

The structure of the verb construction is verb (*set*) + adverbial particle (*forth*) + preposition (*in*) + noun (*the fourth subparagraph*), where noun acts as a direct object. In this case, *set forth* can be considered as one semantic unit and can be interpreted as having an equivalent in the single-word verb *to explain*, which indicates that set forth is the phrasal verb in the Treaty of Lisbon.

The verb *to set* takes the adverbial particle *up* in the Treaty and forms the verb construction *to set up* that occurs 12 times, for instance,

- "A standing committee shall be *set up* within the Council in order to ensure that operational cooperation on internal security …" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 58).
- "Specific groups shall be *set up* within the Agency bringing together Member States engaged in joint projects" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 37).

The structure of the verb construction is modal verb (*shall*) + verb (*set*) + adverbial particle (*up*) + preposition (*within, by, in, under*) + noun (*the Council, the Agency*, etc.). The analysis shows that the verb construction *to set up* tend to take one more preposition, which indicates that the construction is interpreted as a phrasal-prepositional verb. The research also reveals that the verb construction acts as one semantic unit in all occurrences and can be interpreted as having a single-word verb equivalent *to establish*, which indicates that the construction is a phrasal verb in the Treaty of Lisbon.

Nonetheless, Haigh's list of Legal English phrasal verbs does not include phrasal verb *set out*, the findings revealed that the majority of occurrences of the verb *to set* take the preposition *out* (84 times):

- "National Parliaments ensure compliance with the principle of subsidiarity in accordance with the procedure *set out* in that Protocol" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 12).
- "… in accordance with the criteria *set out* in paragraph 3, second subparagraph, and paragraph 5, second subparagraph" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 20).

The main structure of the verb construction is verb (*set*) + preposition (*out*) + preposition (*in*) + noun (*paragraph, that Protocol*, etc.) The analysis indicates that a noun can stand both, as a direct and as an indirect object, which indicates that a noun determines verbs' transitivity. In all the occurrences *to set out* is interpreted as one semantic unit and can have an equivalent in the single-word verb *to detail*, which indicates that the construction is a phrasal verb in the text of the treaty.

3.24. Settle up

The lexical verb *to settle* has the meanings *to live, to stay, to rest*, etc. (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986). When used with the adverbial particle *up*, it had the meaning *to pay a debt* (Courtney, 1986, p. 561).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes 4 occurrences of the lexical verb *to settle*, however, none of them included the verb with the adverbial particle *up*. This indicates that the phrasal verb *to settle up* is not used as a phrasal verb in the Treaty of Lisbon.

3.25. Subject to

The lexical verb to subject has the meaning "to cause to be controlled or ruled" (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p.1110). When used with the preposition *to*, it gains the meanings *to bring under control, to allow to receive, to accept, to depend on* (Courtney, 1986, p. 633).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes 26 occurrences of the verb *to subject*, 24 of them takes the preposition *to*:

- "The common foreign and security policy is *subject to* specific rules and procedures" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 25).
- "Compliance with these rules shall be *subject to* the control of independent authorities" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p.32).

The structure of the verb construction is verb (*subject*) + preposition (*to*) + noun (*specific rules, the control*, etc.). The findings reveal that *to subject to* stand as one semantic unit, however, it can be interpreted as having the equivalent with *depend on*, which is also a phrasal verb. Nevertheless, the construction is recognized as a phrasal verb in the Treaty.

3.26. Subscribe to

The lexical verb *to subscribe* has the meanings *to pay money regularly, to give money, to pay regularly in order to receive a magazine, to sign* (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 1111). When used with the preposition *to*, it has the meaning *to make less important* (Courtney, 1986, p. 633).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes one occurrence of the verb *to subscribe*, however, it does not take any preposition or adverbial particle and is not considered as a phrasal verb in the Treaty of Lisbon.

3.27. Substitute for

The lexical verb *to substitute* has the meanings as follows: *to put in a place of another, to displace* (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 1111). When used with the preposition *for*, it has the meaning *to replace* (Courtney, 1986, p. 633).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes one occurrence of the verb *to substitute* and it takes the preposition *for*:

- "The Council will *substitute* itself *for* the Executive Committee established by the Schengen agreements" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 183).

The structure of the verb construction is verb (*substitute*) + noun (*itself*) + preposition (*for*) + noun (*the Executive Committee*), where *itself* stands as an indirect object and *the Executive Committee* is a direct object. In this occurrence *substitute for* is interpreted as one semantic unit and can have an equivalent in the single-word verb *to replace*, which indicates *that substitute for* is regarded as a phrasal verb in the treaty.

3.28. Take over

The lexical verb *to take* has up to 49 meanings and can be used in different contexts. When used with the adverbial particle *over*, it has the meanings *to lead, to carry, to win control, to accept, to become in charge* (Courtney, 1986, p. 654-655).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes 159 occurrences and 13 of them take the adverbial particle *over*:

- "Title IV shall *take over* the heading of Title VII …" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 22).
- "…he Treaty establishing the European Community and Article 61 H shall *take over* Article 60 thereof, as set out in point 62 above …" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 57).

The structure of the verb construction with the adverbial particle over is verb (*take*) + adverbial particle (*over*) + noun (*the heading, Article,* etc.). The implication is made that the verb construction act as one semantic unit in the treaty and can have a single-word verb equivalent with the verb *to carry*, which indicate that *take over* is the phrasal verb in the Treaty of Lisbon.

Despite the fact that Haigh's list of phrasal verbs does not include other phrasal verbs with *to take*, the findings show that the Treaty include the verb *to take* with the prepositions *by, on* and *upon*.

The research also determines that the verb *to take* stands as an idiomatic phrasal verb, for instance, *to take into consideration*, where it is interpreted as having a single-word verb equivalent with *to observe*:

- "He shall ensure that the views of the European Parliament are duly *taken into consideration*" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 31).

There are found 6 more occurrences with the idiomatic phrasal verbs:

- *To take account of* (which has a single-word verb equivalent with *to assess*: "That decision should *take account of* the level of effective participation in the Agency's activities" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 37).
- *To take into account* (which has a single-word verb equivalent with *to include*): "Such rules shall *take into account* the differences between the legal traditions and systems of the Member States" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 64).

3.29. Weigh up

The lexical verb *to weigh* has the meanings *to consider, to compare, to be important* (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 1248). When used with the adverbial particle *up*, it has the meaning *to judge, to consider* (Courtney, 1986, p. 716).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes one occurrence of *to weigh* that is used as the lexical verb without any preposition. In this case, the findings show that *weigh up* is not used in the Treaty of Lisbon.

3.30. Work around/out

The lexical verb *to work* has up to 17 meanings, for instance, *to be active, to do an activity, to make work, to produce,* etc. (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 1986, p. 1269). All the meanings are associated with doing of some kind of activity. When used with the adverbial particle *around*, it usually take the preposition *to* and has the meaning *to reach gradually* (Courtney, 1986, p. 724). When used with the adverbial particle *out*, it has the meanings *to calculate, to invent, to develop, to produce, to reach an answer, to understand, to decide, to result*, etc. (Courtney, 1986, p. 725).

The Treaty of Lisbon includes 5 occurrences of the lexical verb *to work*. The analysis revealed that the lexical verb *work* is used only with the preposition *for* in the construction *shall work for* (2 times):

- "It *shall work for* the sustainable development of Europe based on balanced economic growth and price stability …" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 11).
- "The Union shall define and pursue common policies and actions, and *shall work for* a high degree of cooperation …" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 23).

The construction *to work for* is considered as a phrasal verb that has the meaning *to be employed by* (Courtney, 1986, p. 724). In this case, the meaning of the construction could be *to benefit* or *to boost* because the meaning *to be employed by* can be accommodated when talking about people and labour, however, the examples reveal that the meanings should be associated with benefits and profits.

The analysis shows that the verb *work* occurs with the adverbial particle *in* in the construction *shall work in*:

- "This service *shall work in* cooperation with the diplomatic services of the Member States …" (Treaty of Lisbon, 2007, p. 27).

In this instance, the verb construction *work in* can also be interpreted as having the meanings *to benefit* or *to profit*.

The structure of verb construction is as follows verb (*work*) + preposition (*for, in*) + noun (*a sustainable development, a high degree of cooperation,* etc.). Both occurrences indicate that the verb constructions are interpreted as having single-word verb equivalents, which regard them as phrasal verbs in the treaty.

However, the implication can be made that the verb constructions *to work in/for* are accommodated because they are used with the modal verb *shall* which makes the construction more formal.

4. Types of phrasal verbs in the Treaty of Lisbon

The table below provides 6 structural types of phrasal verbs found in the text of the Treaty:

Type of phrasal verb	Examples
Verb + preposition + noun	*Called into* question; *result from* the constitutional traditions.
Verb + adverbial particle + noun	*Carrying out* tasks; *take over* the heading.
Verb + preposition + preposition + noun	*Referred to* in the Charter; *provided for* in the Protocol.
Verb + adverbial particle + preposition + noun	*Set forth* in the fourth subparagraph; *drawn up* in a single original.
Verb + preposition + verb	Shall be *entitled to* do so.
Verb + adverbial particle + preposition + noun	Shall be *set up* within the Agency;

	shall be *set up* within the Council.

Table No 1 *Types of Phrasal Verbs in the Treaty of Lisbon.*

The table also presents verbs that take a preposition or adverbial particle and are considered as phrasal verbs, whereas a verb taking both an adverbial particle and a preposition can be interpreted as a phrasal-prepositional verb.

It is also seen that all phrasal verbs are followed by a noun, which can act as a direct or as an indirect object of the phrase.

As mentioned in the literature review, six types of phrasal verbs are distinguished. The current study found that six types of phrasal verbs are also identified in the text of the Treaty. The main difference is that the types occurred in the text of the treaty in their structure do not have a noun coming after a verb. Another difference is that in the types identified in the literature review do not include adverbial particle, which was found in the analysed text.

Another important finding is that the types of phrasal verb determine whether they are interpreted as one semantic unit, which specifies whether they can have a single-word verb equivalent. The table below shows phrasal verbs found in the text of the Treaty and what single-word verb equivalent they can be replaced with in the text under focus.

Phrasal verb	Frequency	Single – word verb	Frequency
Abide by	1	to obey	0
Accede to	2	to agree	45
Call into question	1	to doubt	0
Call on	1	to visit	0
Call upon/for	2	to demand	0
Carry out	26	to perform; to fulfil	3; 17
Consist of	10	to compose	6
Consist in	1	to comprise	3
Deal with	3	to handle	0
Draw up	6	to prepare	3
Draw on/upon	4	to utilize	0
Engage in	1	to involve	6
Entitle to	1	to have the right	1
Proceed with	6	to continue	9
Provide for	51	to ensure	80
Put in	2	to place	4

Put into effect	2	to enforce	1
Refer to	237	to mention; to attribute	4; 1
Result in Result from	2 13	to lead Based on	3 25
Set forth Set up Set out	1 12 84	to explain to establish to detail	0 73 0
Subject to	24	Depend on	0
Substitute for	1	to replace	658
Take over Take into consideration Take account of Take into account	13 1 1 1	to carry to observe to assess to include	27 2 1 29
Work for Work in	2 1	to benefit; to profit to benefit; to profit	0 0

Table No. 2 *Single – word verb equivalents*

Table No. 2 shows difference how many times phrasal verbs and their single-word verb equivalents are used in the text of the treaty. The finding was unexpected and suggests that some single-word verbs found in the analysed text are far more frequent than phrasal verbs. This allows to make an implication that Legal English tend to include set expressions, for instance, the text of the treaty includes the verb *to replace* that is used almost 700 times in the same set expression.

It is also evident that three phrasal verbs do not have equivalents with the single-word verbs, for instance, *to subject to* can have the equivalent with *to depend on*, which is also considered as a phrasal verb. The table also indicates that a number of phrasal verbs are interpreted as idiomatic, for instance, *call into question* is the idiomatic phrasal verb, which has a single-word verb equivalent *to doubt*.

CONCLUSIONS

The aim of the present research was to examine whether phrasal verbs are used in Legal English. The results of this investigation show that not all the phrasal verbs from Haigh's list of legal English phrasal verbs are used in the treaty, however, a number of phrasal verbs that are not included in the list were found in the text of the treaty.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the present study:

1. The findings of this research provide insights on characteristics of legal language and legal English, where the main consideration was paid to the vocabulary, i.e. its archaic forms, definitions and etymology.
2. Further, the analysis concentrated on phrasal verbs, their types and semantics. The main interest was to find out how the meaning of phrasal verb depends on its structure. The research defined how phrasal verbs differ from prepositional verbs, which aids later in the empirical part to differentiate whether a verb construction could be considered as a phrasal verb.
3. The quantitative approach of the research revealed that the text of the Treaty of Lisbon includes 30 out of 97 lexical verbs from Haigh's list of legal English phrasal verbs: abide, accede, arise, call, carry, change, consist, cover, deal, draw, engage, enter, entitle, limit, proceed, provide, put, refer, report, result, rule, serve, set, settle, subject, subscribe, substitute, take, weigh, and work. However, the analysis revealed that even though these verbs are used in the text of the Treaty, not all of them are considered as phrasal verbs because they do not take any preposition or adverbial particle and stand as a lexical verb in the sentence.
4. The investigation explains that the Treaty of Lisbon has six types of phrasal verbs. Part of them are interpreted as phrasal prepositional verbs because they include two prepositions or a preposition and an adverbial particle. There were also found idiomatic phrasal verbs. The findings revealed that if a verb and a preposition or an adverbial particle are considered as one semantic unit, they are phrasal verbs and can be interpreted as having a single-word verb equivalent. The principal implication of the study is that identified single-word verbs are more frequent in set expression in the text of the treaty.

The research raises an important question about the usage of phrasal verbs in legal English since they are not considered to belong to formal vocabulary of the English language, although the current study revealed that phrasal verbs are extensively used in the treaty. The implication is

made that some phrasal verbs are more formal and concise than single-word verbs and in this way, they are more common in the text of the Treaty of Lisbon.

The findings of this study have a number of practical implications. It suggests that the usage of phrasal verbs makes legal language clearer and easier to understand, the analysis of the verbs could also be useful to those who study/teach legal English or draft legal documents. However, the scope of this study was limited to one document; further research could also be conducted to finding out the usage of phrasal verbs in other similar sources.

REFERENCES

Argot (n. d.) In *Cambridge Dictionaries online*. Retrieved Avril 10, 2017, from http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/argot?a=british

Anesa, P. (2012). *Jury Trials and the Popularization of Legal Language : A Discourse Analytical Approach*. Bern: Peter Lang AG. Retrieved November 18, 2016 from http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook/bmxlYmtfXzU3Mzc3OF9fQU41?sid=7a775b1a-b8a7-4b8c-a3e2-95879705f00e@sessionmgr106&vid=1&hid=130&format=EB

Bhatia, V. K. L. (2010). Legal Language and Legal Writing. Universal Law Publishing CO. PVT. LTD. Retrieved November 18, 2016 from https://books.google.lt/books?id=wg1dvc2lfcEC&pg=PA61&dq=legal+english+vocabulary&hl=lt&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwilq6T2t_vQAhXKjSwKHfLNCNk4KBDoAQglMAA#v=onepage&q&f=false

Bhatia, V. K. L. (2014). *Language and Law in Professional Discourse : Issues and Perspectives*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. Retrieved November 18, 2016 from http://web.b.ebscohost.com/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook/bmxlYmtfXzcyNjExNV9fQU41?sid=bfac803f-11b1-4580-b490-a52437ce19c3@sessionmgr120&vid=0&format=EB&rid=1

Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., Finegan, E. (2012). Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. England: Pearson.

Conceal (n. d.) In *Dictionary online.* Retrieved Avril 10, 2017, from http://www.dictionary.com/browse/cover?s=t

Consist (n. d.) In *Dictionary online.* Retrieved Avril 10, 2017, from http://www.dictionary.com/browse/consist

Courtney, R. (1986). *Longman Dictionary of Phrasal Verbs*. Russky Yazyk Publishers, Moskow.

Dixon, R. M. W. (2011). *A Semantic Approach to English Grammar*. Oxford University Press, 289-297.

English Language Learners. (2017). Single-word vs. phrasal verbs: When to use the latter, and is the former more formal? Retrieved March 17, 2017 from http://ell.stackexchange.com/questions/39635/single-word-vs-phrasal-verbs-when-to-use-the-latter-and-is-the-former-more-fo

E-notes. (2012, September 12). What are the differences between lexical verbs and auxiliary verbs? Retrieved March 17, 2017 from https://www.enotes.com/homework-help/what-differences-between-lexical-verbs-auxillary-362419

Heyman, S. (2012). Legalese vs. Plain English. *The Business Law Center.* Retrieved May 15, 2017 from http://www.bizlawcenter.com/2012/09/18/the-history-of-legalese/

Febrero, J. L. S. (2003). *Legal English and Translation: Theory and Practise*. *Annotated texts and documents.* Editorial Club Universitario. Retrieved November 18, 2016 from https://books.google.lt/books?id=hoeailQFYT8C&pg=PA26&dq=legal+english+vocabulary&

hl=lt&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwista6Tt_vQAhUG1ywKHenTDcoQ6AEIPzAD#v=onepage&q&f=false

Frade, C. (2007). Power dynamics and legal English. *World Englishes, 26*(1), 48-61. Retrieved from Online Library website.

Gardner, J. (2016). Misused English words and expressions in EU publications. Retrieved May 15, 2017 from http://www.eca.europa.eu/Other%20publications/EN_TERMINOLOGY_PUBLICATION/EN_TERMINOLOGY_PUBLICATION.pdf

Grammar Monster. (2017). What Is the Verb Root of a Verb? (with Examples). Retrieved April 10, 2017 from http://www.grammar-monster.com/glossary/verb_root.htm

Gorlach, M. (2004). Phrasal Constructions and Resultativeness in English : A sign-oriented analysis. Philadelphia, NL: John Benjamins Publishing Company. Retrieved 9 April, 2017 from http://www.ebrary.com

Goodrich, P. (1984). Law and Language: An Historical and Critical Introduction. *Journal of Law and Society*, *11*(2), 173-206. doi:10.2307/1410039. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/1410039.pdf

Haigh, R. (2009). Legal English. London and New York: Routledge – Cavendish.

Intransitive (n. d.) In *Cambridge Dictionaries* online. Retrieved Avril 10, 2017, from http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/intransitive

Your Guide to Lisbon Treaty (2009). Retrieved April 7, 2017 from http://eeas.europa.eu/archives/delegations/belarus/documents/more_info/your_guide_to_the_lisbon_treaty_en.pdf

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English (1986). Great Britain, Avon: The Bath Press.

Longman New Universal Dictionary (1982). England: Jarrold & Sons, Ltd, Norwich.

Mattila, H. E. (2013). Comparative Legal Linguistics. Farnham: Taylor and Francis. Retrieved 18 November, 2016 from https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/viluniv-ebooks/detail.action?docID=1094113

Phrasal verb. (n. d.) In *Oxford Dictionaries online*. Retrieved Avril 10, 2017, from https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/phrasal_verb

Phrasal verbs: Three categories. (n. d.) Retrieved May 18, 2017 from: http://www.englicious.org/lesson/phrasal-verbs/phrasal-verbs-three-categories

Put back (n. d.) In *English Club* online. Retrieved Avril 10, 2017, from https://www.englishclub.com/ref/esl/Phrasal_Verbs/P/put_back_2__2619.htm

Put off (n. d.) In *English Club* online. Retrieved Avril 10, 2017, from https://www.englishclub.com/ref/esl/Phrasal_Verbs/P/put_off_1679.htm

Rodríguez-Puente, P. (2012, January 20). The Development of Non-compositional Meanings in Phrasal Verbs: A Corpus-based Study. *English Studies*. Retrieved December 14, 2016, from http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/citedby/10.1080/0013838X.2011.638453?scroll=top&needAccess=true

Rudzka-Ostyn, B. (2003). Mouton Textbook : Word Power: Phrasal Verbs and Compounds : A Cognitive Approach. Berlin/Boston, DE: De Gruyter Mouton. Retrieved December 14, 2016, from http://www.ebrary.com

Student Academic Success Center. (2016). Single-Word Verbs vs. Phrasal Verbs. Retrieved March 24, 2017 from http://success.ucdavis.edu/academic/grammar/single-phrasal-verbs.html

Šarčevič, S. (2000). *New Approach to Legal Translation*. Kluwe Law International, The Netherlands. Retrieved November 19, 2016, from https://books.google.lt/books?id=i8nZjjo_9ikC&printsec=frontcover&dq=sarcevic+new+approach+to+legal+translation+pdf&hl=lt&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjvj-XMrfvQAhWCXiwKHTx3AwIQ6AEIITAA#v=onepage&q=prescriptive&f=false

Tautology (n. d.) In *Cambridge Dictionary* online. Retrieved May, 10, 2017, from http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/tautology

Transitive (n. d.) In *Cambridge Dictionary* online. Retrieved May, 10, 2017, from http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/transitive

Treaty of Lisbon (2016, November 28). EU treaties. Retrieved from https://europa.eu/european-union/law/treaties_en

Trosborg, A. (1997). *Rhetorical Strategies in Legal Language: Discourse Analysis of Statutes and Contracts.* Tubingen: Narr. Retrieved November 19, 2016, from https://books.google.lt/books?id=EXt7rJdVSTcC&printsec=frontcover&hl=lt#v=onepage&q&f=false

Williams, C. (2007). Tradition and Change in Legal English : Verbal Constructions in Prescriptive Texts. Bern: Peter Lang AG. Retrieved November 19, 2016, from http://web.a.ebscohost.com/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook/bmxlYmtfXzQ4NTM1MF9fQU41?sid=c0be4545-1b9f-4b10-9058-59cf26ac740f@sessionmgr4009&vid=0&format=EB&rid=1

SUMMARY

Dans ce memoire de licence analyse les verbes phrasales dans Le traité de Lisbonne. Dans cette analyse on s'est concentre sur la structure des verbes et comment elle influence la sémantique des verbes phrasales.

Les verbes analysés sont choisis de la liste de Haigh (2015) qui a créé la liste des verbes phrasales utilisées dans l'Anglais juridique. Le but de ce mémoire de licence est trouvé si les verbes phrasales sont utilisés comme une unité sémantique et s'ils peuvent avoir l'equivalent avec les verbes avec un mot unique. Les verbes sont analysés selon leur structure et leur sémantique.

On a choisi le traité de Lisbonne parce que c'est l'un des principaux traités de l'UE qui et c'est signé le plus récent en 2009. Notre analyse effectue nous a permis de tirer les conclusions suivantes : les textes juridiques en anglais ont tendance à inclure un vocabulaire archaïque, il est intéressant de savoir si les verbes phrasales, qui ne sont pas considérés comme une partie formelle ou archaïque de l'anglais, sont appliqués dans le traité de Lisbonne.

L'analyse indique que les verbes phrasales sont utilisés dans Le traité de Lisbonne car parfois les verbes phrasales sont considérés comme plus formels que les verbes avec un mot unique.

APPENDIX 1

The list of phrasal verbs with legal explanations:

Abide by means to accept a decision, a law or an agreement and obey it.

Accede to means to agree to or allow something that someone has asked for, after you have opposed it for a while.

Arise from means to result from something or to become clear due it.

Call in means: (1) to request the return of something. (2) To visit a place or person for a short time. (3) To telephone your office.

Carry out means to do something that you said you would do or that you have been asked to do.

Change over means to stop using one system or thing and start using another.

Consist in means to have something as its main or only feature.

Consist of means to be formed from the people or things mentioned.

Cover up means to try hard to stop people finding out about a mistake, a crime or the true state of affairs.

Deal with means: (1) to do business regularly with a person or organisation. (2) To talk to a person or organisation in order to reach an agreement or settle a dispute. (3) To solve a problem or carry out a task. (4) To be about something. (5) To look after, talk to or control people in an appropriate way. (6) To take appropriate action in a particular situation.

Draw up means: (1) to make or write something that needs careful planning. (2) To bring something nearer to something else. (3) To come to a stop.

Draw upon/on means to use something that you have or that is available to help you do something.

Engage in means to be involved in something, to take part in something or to be busy doing something.

Enter into means: (1) to begin or become involved in a formal agreement. (2) To begin to discuss or deal with something.

Entitle to means to give a right to have or do something.

Limit to means to make something exist or happen only in a particular place, within a particular group or for a particular purpose.

Proceed against means to start a court case against somebody.

Proceed from means to be caused by or be the result of something.

Provide against means to make plans in order to deal with or prevent a bad or unpleasant situation.

Provide for means: (1) to make plans or arrangements to deal with something that may happen in the future. (2) To give somebody the things that they need to live.

Put across means to communicate your ideas, feeling, etc. to somebody clearly and successfully.

Put back means: (1) to return something to its usual place. (2) To move something to a later time or date. (3) To cause something to be delayed.

Put down means: (1) to pay part of the cost of something. (2) To criticise somebody and make them feel stupid, especially in front of other people. (3) To place something on the floor or on a surface. (4) To write something down or make notes about something. (5) To kill an animal because it is old or sick.

Put forward means: (1) to suggest an idea or plan so that it can be discussed. (2) To suggest somebody as a candidate for a job or position. (3) To move something to an earlier time or date.

Put in means: (1) to contribute money to something or pay money into a bank. (2) To contribute time or effort to something. (3) To make an official request or claim. (4) To include something in a letter or document.

Put off means to cancel or delay something.

Refer to means: (1) to mention or talk about somebody or something. (2) To describe or be connected to something. (3) To look at something for information. (4) To send somebody or something to a different place or person to get help, advice or a decision.

Report to: if you report to someone in a company or organisation, that person is responsible for your work and tells you what to do.

Rule in: if somebody rules something in, they decide that it is possible or that it can or should happen or be included.

Set forth means to state something clearly or make something known.

Set up means: (1) to make something ready for use. (2) To provide someone with the money they need to start a business, buy a home, etc. (3) To create something or start a business. (4) To trick someone, especially by making them appear to be guilty of something they have not done. (5) To make someone feel healthier, stronger, more active, etc. (6) To arrange or organise something.

Settle up means to pay the money you owe.

Subject to means: (1) bring a person or group under the power or control of another. (2) To make somebody or something experience or be affected by something, usually something unpleasant.

Take over means: (1) to gain control of a company by buying its shares (hence takeover). (2) To affect so strongly that one is unable to think about or do anything else.

Weigh up means to think carefully about the different factors involved in an issue before making a decision.

Work around means to find a way of doing something in spite of situations, rules, etc. that could prevent you doing it.

Work out means: (1) to happen or develop in a particular way, especially a successful way. (2) To calculate. (3) To understand something. (4) To organise, plan or resolve something in a satisfactory way. (5) To continue to work at your job until the end of the period of time mentioned. (6) To train the body by physical exercise. (Haigh, 2015).