

## СЕКЦІЯ 3 МІЖКУЛЬТУРНА КОМУНІКАЦІЯ

УДК 81'255:81'373.612.2:[341.231.14:341.645.5]  
DOI <https://doi.org/10.32999/ksu2663-3426/2026-1-5>

### JUDICIAL METAPHORS FROM SEMANTIC, CONCEPTUAL AND TRANSLATION PERSPECTIVES

**Pavliuk Nataliia Veniaminivna,**  
PhD, Associate Professor,  
Associate Professor at the Department of Theory and Practice of Translation from English  
*Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv,*  
Visiting Fellow at the School of Languages, Cultures and Societies  
*University of Leeds (Leeds, United Kingdom)*  
[pavliuk.natalia@gmail.com](mailto:pavliuk.natalia@gmail.com)  
[orcid.org/0000-0003-3451-1063](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3451-1063)

*This paper examines the use and translation of metaphors in the argumentative sections of judgments issued by the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR). Metaphor plays a fundamental cognitive and rhetorical role in legal discourse, enabling judges and litigants to articulate abstract legal principles, structure factual narratives, and frame persuasive arguments. The study analyses conventional metaphors, in particular those embedded in descriptions of police conduct, prison practices, and the actions of domestic courts that contribute to a broader conceptualization of the state as rights violator. For the purposes of this research a corpus of ECtHR judgments was created and the metaphor identification procedure was applied. The study distinguishes between transcultural and monocultural legal metaphors and evaluates the translation strategies applied, including image transfer, image substitution, reduction to sense, and omission. The findings demonstrate that metaphors are central to constructing persuasive narratives of rights violations and that their translation affects the transmission of conceptual and evaluative meaning across legal systems.*

**Key words:** legal metaphor, judicial metaphor, legal translation, specialised translation, conceptual metaphor, lexical metaphor, argumentative function.

### МЕТАФОРА В СУДОВОМУ ДИСКУРСІ: СЕМАНТИЧНІ, КОНЦЕПТУАЛЬНІ І ПЕРЕКЛАДАЦЬКІ АСПЕКТИ

**Павлюк Наталія Веніамінівна,**  
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент,  
доцент кафедри теорії і практики перекладу з англійської мови  
*Київський національний університету імені Тараса Шевченка,*  
*гостьова дослідниця школи мов, культур і суспільств*  
*Університету Лідса (Велика Британія)*  
[pavliuk.natalia@gmail.com](mailto:pavliuk.natalia@gmail.com)  
[orcid.org/0000-0003-3451-1063](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3451-1063)

*Робота присвячена ролі юридичної метафори у рішеннях Європейського суду з прав людини та їх перекладу на українську мову. Метафора відіграє важливу когнітивну та риторичну роль у юридичному дискурсі, спонукаючи учасників судового процесу чітко формулювати абстрактні юридичні поняття і принципи, надавати структуроване викладення фактів справи і формувати переконливу аргументацію. У цій статті наведено результати аналізу загальноновживаних метафор, що використані в описі поведінки представників поліції, умов утримання ув'язнених, а також в оцінюванні рішень національних судів, таким чином представляючи державу як порушника прав людини. Для отримання емпіричного матеріалу дослідження було складено корпус з рішень Європейського суду з прав людини, застосовано метод ідентифікації метафор у юридичному тексті.*



У дослідженні розрізнено міжкультурні і монокультурні юридичні метафори, проаналізовано перекладацькі методи, включно з такими, що застосовують перенесення образу, заміну образу, скорочення змісту й опущення. Завдяки цьому дослідженню можна стверджувати, що метафори є центральним інструментом у створенні переконливого наративу щодо порушення прав людини, а їхній переклад впливає на відтворення концептуального і оцінювального значення метафор у юридичній системі мови перекладу.

**Key words:** legal metaphor, judicial metaphor, legal translation, specialised translation, conceptual metaphor, lexical metaphor, argumentative function.

**Introduction.** Metaphor is an important feature of legal discourse used to conceptualise abstract principles, structure argumentation, and justify judicial decision, they perform essential cognitive and rhetorical functions by rendering complex legal notions in a clear way, guiding legal interpretations and decisions, and influencing the perception of the facts, norms, and arguments. *Judicial metaphors* are those used in court discourse, i.e. judicial documents, trial proceedings, etc. This paper focuses on the use of judicial metaphors in the judgments of the the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR) that present a special interest for examining metaphor use. Within ECtHR judgments, metaphors appear most frequently in the argumentative sections of the text, where applicants and judges articulate the circumstances of the case, assess evidence, and determine whether the actions of state authorities breached the European Convention on Human Rights (Convention).

Previous research has examined metaphor in legal communication, but studies focusing specifically on the argumentative functions of metaphor in ECtHR judgments remain limited. This paper addresses that gap by analysing the metaphors used in the parts of judgments that substantiate complaints and establish the admissibility of alleged violations. The practical part of the paper focuses on the lexical metaphors used in the argumentative function as one of the means of persuasion, where wrongful actions of the police officers, prison staff and domestic courts allegedly caused the violation of the Applicant's human rights. Given the multilingual application of ECtHR case law, the study also considers the translation of these metaphors. Identifying whether metaphors are transcultural or monocultural enables a more accurate understanding of how metaphorical meaning is transferred, adapted, or reduced in translation from English into Ukrainian.

**Methods and tools.** This paper is an interdisciplinary study that employs the methods of corpus linguistics, translation studies, discourse analysis, and cognitive linguistics, i.e. corpus-based analysis to identify the collocations of words with high metaphorical

potential, metaphor identification procedures embedded in the method of attentive reading, qualitative discourse analysis to interpret the functions of metaphors within judicial reasoning, taking into account genre conventions and rhetorical effects, cognitive linguistic analysis to trace the creation of mental representation of legal concepts through metaphor, comparative translation analysis to identify the semantic and conceptual changes of metaphorical expressions caused by translation.

To study the metaphor for human rights and translation-related semantic and conceptual changes it involves, the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights were chosen as the Court was created to ensure the observance of the European Convention of Human Rights by the member states of the Council of Europe. The Court has jurisdiction to decide complaints ("applications") submitted by individuals, organisations and States concerning violations of the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (commonly referred to as the "European Convention on Human Rights"), i.e. the violation of civil and political rights.

For these purposes, a parallel corpus was compiled that includes 51 ECtHR judgments in English translated into Ukrainian: English 506,644 words, Ukrainian (translations) 536,124 words. The software SketchEngine was employed in this study for qualitative and quantitative analysis of judicial metaphors and their translations into Ukrainian.

#### 1. Metaphor in legal discourse

Metaphor in legal discourse occupies a central place in how legal actors conceptualize, justify, and communicate the law. It means metaphors are used to express legal concepts, substantiate the decisions by giving arguments and quoting legislative acts. Most of metaphors used in legal settings are conventional, however, the choice of metaphors instead of neutral vocabulary in persuasive argumentation, makes the language more emotive.

Metaphor functions as a cognitive and rhetorical instrument through which abstract legal principles are rendered in a more understandable way. Speaking about the purpose

of using metaphor, Newmark stressed that, “its referential purpose is to describe a mental process or state, a concept, a person, an object, a quality or an action more comprehensively and concisely than is possible in literal or physical language; its pragmatic purpose, which is simultaneous, is to appeal to the senses, to interest, to clarify 'graphically', to please, to delight, to surprise. The first purpose is cognitive, the second aesthetic.” (Newmark, 1988:104). These two main purposes of metaphor are actualised in legal domain.

As Battistella (1994) pointed out, “By incorporating figurative language into legal reasoning, judges make what is abstract or obscure more concrete and accessible. Through personification, for example, inanimate legal constructs acquire human traits and become easier to grasp.” (Battistella, 1994:47).

Metaphors in argumentative legal texts play a strategic role in shaping how claims are framed, how evidence is interpreted, and how persuasion is achieved. “Metaphor is evidently the most efficient means of text expressiveness that softly draws the recipient’s attention to important matters” “While translating, it is important to keep the pragmatic function of metaphor evoking the same effect in the reader’s subconsciousness. If the metaphor’s use is successful, its purpose is achieved and it will stay in the minds of the readership for long” (Donii, 2023: 213)

Judicial metaphors in argumentative clauses shape causal inferences: a “chain,” for example, suggests linearity and necessity, whereas a “web” might imply complexity and mutual dependence. The choice of metaphor thus predisposes the reader toward particular conclusions presenting the evidence of the violation of the Convention using metaphorical expressions, legal texts address the reader’s emotive perception as means of persuasion. “Besides shaping our understanding of reality, metaphors convey emotional connotations, evoke and carry feelings and attitudes against the thing, phenomenon or person metaphorically referred to” (Jumanca, 2012: 368).

2. Judicial metaphors in the judgments of the European Court of Human Rights

A court judgment is a specific genre of legal writing which is characterised by its own structure, vocabulary, grammatical and syntactic features, and the structure of the ECtHR judgment is set forth in the Court’s Rules of Procedures that “specifies the constituent parts of the judgment and supplementary materials, the Court can use its discretion to structure the judgment as it deems appropriate.” (Šarčević, 1993: 125).

The compulsory parts of a court judgment are singled out by Gotti (2012) as judgment genre characteristics as follows: (1) Identifying the case – for the case to be referred to consistently; (2) Establishing facts of the case – the main circumstances of the case legally relevant for the trial; (3) Arguing the case – The main steps of arguing the case are the following: a) Giving a history of the case – Previous judgments and opinions related to the case; b) Presenting arguments – The arguments put forward by the present judge are illustrated here; c) Deriving “ratio decidendi” – This step presents the principles of law derived by the judge cases; (4) Pronouncing judgment – a highly standardized formulaic statement reporting the judgment pronounced. (Gotti, 2012: 65-66).

It is worth mentioning that the metaphors found in ECtHR judgments are conventional, i.e. widely used and easily understood within a speech community, not felt novel. However, there are two types of conventional metaphors that need to be distinguished: *dead metaphor* – a metaphor that has become so conventionalised that speakers no longer perceive it as metaphorical, e. g. “to hold a position,” “to grasp an idea”; and *stock metaphor* – a highly conventional metaphor that is common in a specific discourse community, law in particular, and is recognised as figurative but familiar, e.g. “balancing interests”, “the scales of justice” (terminology used by Newmark). (Newmark, 1988).

Despite the fact that conventional metaphors are not so expressive and emotive as novel ones, they are important for argumentation where they can implicitly influence the perception of the facts by listeners and readers, making them more memorable and significant. “These metaphors are of central interest because of the dialogical work they engage in; they can be situated within an implicit argumentative structure in which the speaker/writer attempts to persuade the hearer/reader that their view is correct and should therefore be adopted.” (Ponton, 2023: 291).

Smith (2007) classified legal metaphors into four categories by their field of application: 1) metaphors used in the judicial principles; 2) used in the process of legal reasoning in specific legal issues; 3) applied by legal authors; 4) metaphors existing inherent to the language.” (Božović, 2024: 406). All these categories are found in the ECtHR judgments and will be discussed here according to the sub-domains of legal discourse, in particular, police, prison and court settings.

This paper focuses on the metaphors used in the parts of judgments devoted to the alleged



violation of human rights by the police and prison officers and domestic courts, which shape thematic fields where metaphors play an important role. See examples in Table 1.

### Part 3. Translating judicial metaphors

The use of techniques to translate metaphors in legal discourse is greatly determined by the metaphors themselves. Being conventional, judicial metaphors are clearly understood and accepted by the speakers of the source text, and to have the same legal effect, they should be clearly understood and accepted by the target audience. It is only possible if the metaphor is transcultural, i.e. “conceptualised in both languages and used similarly in both legal and language systems.” (Pedersen, 2015: 106), “so they can be translated literally via image transfer” (Božović, 2024: 407). Monocultural metaphors, on the other hand, specific to the source language and law, require other techniques that will be discussed in the paper.

Translator’s choice is also influenced by the language itself, where lexical and grammatical allomorphy of two languages affects the translation of metaphors, in particular, the rules of collocation, morphological divergences, for example, the use of verbal nouns in English and Ukrainian. “In Ukrainian, preference is given

to nouns and noun phrases to express complex ideas, as they convey more information about the context, status, and relationships than verbs or adjectives... In contrast, English, being more verb-centric, with its array of finite and non-finite verb forms, often uses a more balanced mix of nouns, verbs, and other parts of speech.” (Bajcic, Robertson, Slavova, 2024:15).

Among taxonomies of translation techniques, the translation of metaphors is best presented in the studies of Toury’s (1995), Lindqvist (2005), and applied by Božović (2022, 2024) in his study of translation of judicial metaphor. The main parameter for this taxonomy is the preservation of the original image, which can be transferred without changes, substituted by another image or reduced to a non-metaphoric expression. Developing this taxonomy, I found out that *image transfer* can be full or partial, in the *image substitution*, three types can be found: 1) the metaphor type may be changed or kept as it is (e.g. ontological to orientational), its 2) sub-type too (e.g. personalisation to topic as entity), and 3) the type and sub-type are the same, the image is different. The following examples illustrate the translation techniques applied by Ukrainian translators working on the judgments of the ECtHR.

Table 1

### Judicial metaphors by sub-domains

|                 |  |   |
|-----------------|--|---|
| Police          | Investigation process                                  | The investigator could not explain how suspicion had fallen on the applicant (orientational and (down) and ontological (entity) metaphor)   |
|                 | Police officers’ actions                               | The circumstances in which the evidence was obtained cast doubt on its reliability or accuracy. (ontological (entity) metaphor)<br>The practice of police ill-treatment (1) aiming at extracting confessions (2) (1) ontological (personalisation); (2) ontological (substance) metaphors)  |
|                 | Offense details  | nor the exact mechanism of M’s injury (ontological (entity) metaphor)<br>..whom Sa. had handed over to the police (ontological (entity) metaphor)<br>Sa. submitted that he had pointed at the applicant as he had been “driven by his emotions” (ontological (entity) metaphor)   |
| Prison          | Applying force   | The manner of force-feeding (1) shall not trespass the threshold (2) of minimum level of severity. ((1) ontological (personalisation); (2) ontological (entity) metaphor)   |
|                 | Restricting freedom                                    | This kind of detention falls within the scope of the restriction permitted by Article 5 § 1 (a) of the Convention (ontological (entity/personalisation) and orientational (within) metaphor)<br>The authorities decide to place and maintain in detention a person who is seriously ill... (ontological (entity) metaphor)  |
| Domestic courts | Elements of court proceedings                          | On 25 March 2010 the Kharkiv Regional Court of Appeal (...) quashed the above mentioned ruling concluding that all the issues it raised could be clarified in the course of the trial ... (orientational (up) and ontological (entity) metaphor)  |
|                 | Failure of the domestic courts to provide a fair trial | By doing so the trial court had substantially aggravated his situation... (ontological (entity) metaphor)<br>On 13 August 2010 the District Court delivered (1) a new judgment (2), finding the applicants guilty of a number of counts of torture, extortion, knowingly unlawful searches, and abuse of power (3). ((1) ontological (personalisation); (2) ontological (entity); (3) ontological (personalisation) metaphor) |

1. *Image transfer*: this includes the translation of the source text metaphor with the same metaphor in the target text by using the same vehicle.

1.1. *Full image transfer* is observed when in translation vehicle of the metaphor evokes similar mental representations as that of the source metaphor. Most of them are dead metaphors of transcultural character, which makes the full image transfer possible, as these conceptual representations are typical of the source and the target audience and may affect similarly the recipients of the legal text.

| Source  | Target  |
|---|---|
| Nor the exact mechanism of M's injury   | Також не було встановлено конкретний механізм завдання М. тілесного ушкодження  |
| The manner of force-feeding shall not trespass the threshold of minimum level of severity | Спосіб, в який до заявника застосовується примусове годування ... не повинен перевищувати порогу мінімального рівня суворості |

1.2. *Partial image transfer* means the mental representation of translation partially coincides with the source image but close enough to be considered to be image transfer. In the following example the metaphorically used verb "falls within" – "підпадає" and the topic "restrictions" – "обмеження" are translated by means of image transfer. However, there are differences in other parts of the metaphoric expression: direction "within" – to "under", "scope" – to "action".

| Source  | Target  |
|---|---|
| This kind of detention falls within the scope of the restriction permitted by Article 5 § 1 (a) of the Convention | Зазвичай такий вид тримання під вартою підпадає під дію обмежень, дозволених підпунктом «а» пункту 1 статті 5 Конвенції |

2. *Image substitution*: the translation of the source text metaphor with a different target language metaphor by using a different vehicle that shares the same or similar underlying conceptual domain.

2.1. Image substitution preserving the same metaphor type (ontological) but with different sub-type (e.g. entity – person), e.g. statement had value – показання мала сила (ontological metaphor, but entity to person).

| Source   | Target   |
|--|--|
| However, his <b>statement</b> was of little evidential value, given that he had left the scene prior to the beginning of the fight and had not seen any of it. | Проте його <b>показання</b> мали невелику доказову <b>силу</b> , оскільки він покинув місце злочину до початку бійки та не бачив її. |

2.2. Image substitution with the change of metaphor type (e. g. ontological to orientational: entity to direction "down")

| Source   | Target  |
|--|---|
| Sa. submitted that he had pointed at the applicant as he had been "driven by his emotions" | Пізніше під час досудового слідства Са. знову змінив свої показання та заявив, що вказав на заявника, оскільки «був на емоціях» і насправді не бачив, хто поранив їхнього друга |

2.3. Image substitution preserving the same metaphor type (e. g. ontological), same sub-type (entity), different image, same topic

| Source   | Target  |
|--|---|
| The circumstances in which it [the evidence] was obtained cast doubt on its reliability or accuracy. | ... чи не ставлять обставини, за яких він був отриманий, під сумнів їхню достовірність або точність |

2.4. Image substitution with different metaphor type (orientational – ontological), same topic (force – сила)

| Source   | Target  |
|--|---|
| The judgment of 13 August 2010 did not enter into force and it was being challenged by the prosecutor... | вирок від 13 серпня 2010 року не набрав законної сили та що він був оскаржений прокурором та двома заявниками |

The above sub-types of image substitute are not exhaustive and more combinations of changes made by translators can be found. A common feature of these techniques that the conventional metaphors of the source legal text are replaced by other conventional metaphors in the target legal text, which means both languages use metaphoric means to express legal concepts in similar contexts. It may be a sign of universal character of legal metaphor as a concept and requires further research by comparative translation studies.

3. *Reduction of sense*: this includes a translation of the source text metaphor with a non-metaphor, typically via a paraphrase.



| Source   | Target   |
|--|--|
| Any deficiency in the investigation which undermines its ability to establish the cause of injuries.. will risk falling foul of this standard. | Будь-який недолік розслідування, що стає на заваді встановленню походження тілесних ушкоджень та винних осіб, є загрозою недотримання цього стандарту. |

Transcultural metaphors, which rely on imagery shared across cultures, are typically rendered through *full image transfer* so the original figurative impact remains intact. In contrast, monocultural metaphors depend on culture-specific references that may not be perceived in the same way by the source and the target audience, so translators often use image substitution to find a comparable concept or apply image reduction to convey only the core meaning. These strategies help maintain clarity while preserving essential interpretive effects in translation.

**Conclusions.** This study has demonstrated that metaphor is an important linguistic feature of judgments that functions as cognitive and persuasive mechanism through which violation of human rights is conceptualised. The analysis of conventional metaphors, particularly those recurrent in descriptions of police actions, prison conditions, and domestic court proceedings, reveals that these linguistic choices collectively contribute to conceptual frame of the state as rights violator. Within this frame, metaphors shape how facts are interpreted, how causal relationships are perceived, and how arguments are evaluated, thereby contributing significantly to the Court's reasoning process.

The investigation of Ukrainian translations further highlights the importance of distinguishing between transcultural and monocultural legal metaphors. Translation strategies such as image transfer, image substitution, and reduction to sense influence not only the linguistic form but also the conceptual content conveyed to the target legal audience. Where metaphors are transcultural, literal transfer tends to preserve argumentative effects; where they are monocultural, translators must navigate conceptual gaps and select strategies that maintain as much of the metaphor's persuasive potential as possible.

Overall, the study illustrates that judicial metaphors function as tools of legal reasoning and persuasion, and that their translation is an essential component of multilingual legal communication within the Council of Europe. A deeper awareness of metaphor's cognitive

and rhetorical properties can enhance both judicial interpretation and translation practice, contributing to more transparent, coherent, and accessible human rights adjudication.

Future research could extend the present study in several directions. First, a larger multilingual corpus drawing on translations of ECtHR judgments into several member-state languages would allow for systematic comparative work on metaphor retention, loss, and transformation across languages and legal cultures. Interdisciplinary approaches combining corpus linguistics, cognitive semantics, and legal theory could examine how metaphor interacts with other persuasive devices in judicial argumentation.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Bajcic, Martina & Robertson, Colin & Slavova, Liudmyla. (2024). Manual on EU Legal Translation into Ukrainian Part B.
2. Battistella, Edwin. (1994). Metaphor and reason in judicial opinions By Haig Bosmajian. *Language*. 70. 598-599. 10.1353/lan.1994.0043.
3. Božović, Petar (2022). How are metaphors rendered in legal translation? A corpus-based study of the European Court of Human Rights judgments. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 38, 277-297. <https://doi.org/10.26034/cm.jostrans.2022.092>
4. Božović, Petar. (2024). Metaphors we judge by: a corpus-based study of metaphor use in English legal discourse. *Revista Signos. Estudios de Lingüística*. 57. 402-425. 10.4151/S0718-0934202401150905
5. Donii, Tetyana (2023) Metaphorization of political text: challenges for a translator and methods of problem solution in *Aktualni pytannia humanitarnykh nauk*. 70 (1), pp. 211-216. 2023DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/70-1-31>
6. Gotti, Maurizio, 'Text And Genre', in Lawrence M. Solan, and Peter M. Tiersma (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Law* (2012; online edn, Oxford Academic, 21 Nov. 2012), <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199572120.013.0005>, accessed 27 Nov. 2025.
7. Jumanca, Romanita (2012). Types of Metaphors in The English Legal Discourse. *Romanian Journal of English Studies*. 9. pp. 366-372. DOI:10.2478/v10319-012-0032-9.
8. Lindqvist, Yvonne (2005). Högt och lågt i skönlitterär översättning till svenska. Uppsala: Hallgren och Fallgren.
9. Newmark, Peter (1988) *A textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall. 292 p.
10. Pedersen, Jan (2015). "On the Subtitling of Visualised Metaphors." *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 23, 162-180.
11. Ponton Douglas (2023). Narrower or Broader Ground? The Role and Function of Metaphors in Legal Discourse. In: Douthwaite J, Tabbert U, eds. *The Linguistics of Crime*. Cambridge University Press; 2023:282-300. DOI 10.1017/9781108581332.013.
12. Šarčević, Susan. (1997). *New Approach to Legal Translation*. London: Kluwer Law International
13. Smith, M. R. (2007). Levels of Metaphor in Persuasive Legal Writing. *Mercer Law Review*, 58, 919-946.

14. Toury, Gideon (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Bajcic, Martina & Robertson, Colin & Slavova, Liudmyla. (2024). Manual on EU Legal Translation into Ukrainian Part B.
2. Battistella, Edwin. (1994). Metaphor and reason in judicial opinions By Haig Bosmajian. *Language*. 70. 598-599. 10.1353/lan.1994.0043.
3. Božović, Petar (2022). How are metaphors rendered in legal translation? A corpus-based study of the European Court of Human Rights judgments. *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 38, 277-297. <https://doi.org/10.26034/cm.jostrans.2022.092>
4. Božović, Petar. (2024). Metaphors we judge by: a corpus-based study of metaphor use in English legal discourse. *Revista Signos. Estudios de Lingüística*. 57. 402-425. 10.4151/S0718-0934202401150905
5. Donii, Tetyana (2023) *Metaphorization of political text: challenges for a translator and methods of problem solution* in *Aktualni pytannia humanitarnykh nauk*. 70 (1), pp. 211-216. 2023DOI <https://doi.org/10.24919/2308-4863/70-1-31>
6. Gotti, Maurizio, 'Text And Genre', in Lawrence M. Solan, and Peter M. Tiersma (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Law* (2012; online edn, Oxford Academic, 21 Nov. 2012), <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199572120.013.0005>, accessed 27 Nov. 2025.
7. Jumanca, Romanita (2012). Types of Metaphors in The English Legal Discourse. *Romanian Journal of English Studies*. 9. pp. 366-372. DOI:10.2478/v10319-012-0032-9.
8. Lindqvist, Yvonne (2005). *Högt och lågt i skönlitterär översättning till svenska*. Uppsala: Hallgren och Fallgren.
9. Newmark, Peter (1988) *A textbook of translation*. Prentice Hall. 292 p.
10. Pedersen, Jan (2015). "On the Subtitling of Visualised Metaphors." *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 23, 162-180.
11. Ponton Douglas (2023). Narrower or Broader Ground? The Role and Function of Metaphors in Legal Discourse. In: Douthwaite J, Tabbert U, eds. *The Linguistics of Crime*. Cambridge University Press; 2023:282-300. DOI 10.1017/9781108581332.013.
12. Šarčević, Susan. (1997). *New Approach to Legal Translation*. London: Kluwer Law International
13. Smith, M. R. (2007). Levels of Metaphor in Persuasive Legal Writing. *Mercer Law Review*, 58, 919-946.
14. Toury, Gideon (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 30.04.2026  
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 22.05.2026  
Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 29.05.2026