



Title

At any time after any proceedings ...: Why is any so frequent in legal texts?

Authors

Martin Warren and Maggie Leung

This paper explores phraseologies specific to legislative legal texts, but, unusually, it does this by examining phraseologies consisting of grammatical words as well as those which are lexically richer. The general determiner *any* is much more frequent in legislative legal texts than in general English. This was discovered in a corpus linguistics project examining the phraseologies specific to legislative legal texts in engineering- and financial services-related corpora. Many of the most frequent phraseologies associated with these legal texts were found to include this general determiner. Examples of these phraseologies are described and discussed in order to better understand why phraseologies containing *any* are so frequent, and so necessary, in legislative legal texts. The paper also explores the implications of its methodology for future studies seeking to uncover the linguistic representations of linguistic reality.

Keywords: phraseology, legislative legal texts, genre analysis, corpus linguistics, phraseological variation

1. Introduction

This paper is based on a larger-scale project which aims to identify the phraseologies specific to two specialised corpora: the Hong Kong Engineering Corpus (9.2 million words) and the Hong Kong Financial Services Corpus (7.3 million words), representing two professional registers. In this study, the approach adopted in the identification of the phraseologies is corpus-driven in that the phraseologies are identified fully automatically rather than being nominated by the researcher (Cheng, Greaves, & Warren, 2006; Cheng, Greaves, Sinclair, & Warren, 2009). This was achieved by using *ConcGram 1.0* (Greaves, 2009), software designed to find all of the co-occurring words in a corpus without the nomination of search items and irrespective of constituency and positional variation. Constituency variation is when other words are found between the co-occurring words, and positional variation is when the co-occurring words occur in different sequences relative to one another. The inclusion of variation when searching for co-occurring words means that the phraseologies in a corpus, termed 'congrams' (Cheng, Greaves, & Warren, 2006; Cheng, *et al.*, 2009), can be accounted for more fully, compared to studies confined to fixed contiguous sequences of words (i.e. n-grams, also known as 'bundles', 'chunks', and 'clusters').

Part of the on-going larger scale project investigating the phraseologies specific to engineering

and financial services registers involved studying the individual genres which make up these two registers. It was while studying the sub-corpora of Ordinances¹⁷ that we became interested in a particular set of phraseologies that consisted of the determiner *any* co-selected with another word. The two sub-corpora of Ordinances were subsequently merged into one genre-specific corpus: the Hong Kong Ordinances Corpus (HKOC).

When studying the raw data of two-word co-occurrences (i.e., two-word concgrams) derived from the HKOC, we had observed that a number of the most frequent two-word concgrams contained the word *any*. This led us to check whether *any* is more frequent in the HKOC than in a corpus of general English. In the HKOC, it ranks eighth in the single word frequency list with 6,786 instances, which is approximately 1.36% of the entire corpus. In the British National Corpus (BNC), a 100 million-word reference corpus representing a cross-section of general English, *any* occurs 120,629 times, approximately 0.13% of the entire BNC. This means that *any* is ten times more frequent in the ordinances than in general English. An extract chosen to highlight this relatively higher frequency is given below. In this extract, *any* occurs three times.

*... whether in relation to all or **any**, or **any** part of all or **any**, of the regulated activities ...*

¹⁷ These are the laws relating to the engineering and financial services sectors in Hong Kong, many of which are derived from their UK equivalents, and all of which are drafted in English and take legal precedence over their Chinese translations in Hong Kong's courts.

(HKOC)

Another determiner, *all*, is used twice in the phrase *all or any* and this might lead one to think that *all* is also more frequent in ordinances. However, the determiner *all* is actually more frequent in general English. The BNC has 273,000 instances (0.29%) whereas the HKOC has 956 (0.18%). This finding regarding the determiner *all* makes it even more interesting to compare *any* in the two corpora.

2. Previous studies of *any*

While this is the first study to examine the functions of *any*-related phraseologies in legislative legal texts, and the first to focus on why *any* is more frequently used in the legal register, it is by no means the first to study *any*. There is a substantial literature and an overview is presented here.

A review of some of the most widely used grammar reference works shows that *any* is described in a variety of ways, but with basically similar conclusions reached. In grammar by Sinclair, *et al.* (1990: 52), *any* is listed among the "general determiners" which are used to talk "about people or things in a general or indefinite way", and it is also noted that *any* can be a pronoun. In an earlier grammar of spoken English (Sinclair, 1972: 154-155), when covering "nominal group structure", *any* is described as a "general deictic" as opposed to a "specific deictic" which relates to "the type of reference made by the deictic to the noun", and it is pointed out that *any* is often found in "negative clauses, where it alternates with

the positive *some*". Halliday and Matthiessen (2004: 315) also use the term 'deictic' and describe "non-specific deictics" which are "total or partial determiners" and include *any* in this category. This type of deictic is said to "convey the meaning of all, or none, or some unspecified sub-set" (*ibid*: 315).

Carter and McCarthy's (2006) grammar of spoken and written English describes *any* as a determiner which has a "strong form" and a "weak form" (*ibid*.: 353). Whether *any* takes its strong or weak form is determined by whether or not it is stressed and a different meaning is produced as a result of this choice (*ibid*: 365). In its strong form, *any* can be "used with any type of head noun, whether singular, count or non-count" (*ibid*.: 354). An example of its strong form is "*Why doesn't he have **any scissors?***" (*ibid*.: 355). The weak form of *any* can "only be used with a non-count noun or a plural count noun" (*ibid*.: 356). The weak form "indicates an indefinite quantity of something" while the strong form means "it doesn't matter which" (*ibid*.: 365-366). An example of the former is: "*Are there **any messages** on the answerphone?*"; and of the latter: "**Any fruit juice** will make you sick if you drink enough of it" (*ibid*.: 365-366). They also describe how weak forms of *any* typically occur in negative declarative clauses (*ibid*.: 366-367), and in interrogative clauses, where *any* is "more open-ended and does not necessarily project an answer the speaker expects" (*ibid*.: 367). In another grammar of spoken and written English, Biber, *et al.* (1999: 176) describe *any* as a "non-assertive determiner/pronoun" (*ibid*.: 176), and say that it is used in negative clauses after the negative form, and also in

positive interrogative, conditional and temporal clauses (*ibid.*: 176). *Any* is described as combining with countable and uncountable nouns, referring to "an arbitrary member of a group or amount of a mass" (*ibid.*: 276). In their grammar, Biber, *et al.* (1999) also study the distribution of quantifiers, across the four corpora upon which the grammar is based - conversation, fiction, newspapers and academic writing - and they find a uniform distribution of between 800 and 1,000 instances of *any* per million words (*ibid.*: 278). It is interesting to note here that if one converts the frequencies of *any* in the BNC into instances per million words, it is 1,255, which is higher than that found by Biber, *et al.* (1999). However, in the HKOC, it is much higher at 12,947 per million, confirming the fact that *any* is ten times more frequent in legislative legal texts. The relatively higher frequency found in the BNC compared to the corpora examined by Biber *et al.* is probably accounted for by the fact that the BNC includes a small number of legal texts, unlike Biber *et al.*'s four corpora.

Quirk *et al.* (1985: 377) list *any* as one of the "major indefinite pronouns and determiners". They also state that *any* is a "nonassertive form" in that it does not "claim the truth of the corresponding positive form" (*ibid.*: 83). In other words, in the example, "No, I haven't found *any* yet" (*ibid.*: 83), the speaker is not saying that there are some to be found. They note that "generic use of the indefinite article" which identifies "any representative member of the class" as in "the best way to learn *a language* is to live among its speakers" can be substituted by *any* (*ibid.*: 281). *Any* is further described as a "nonspecific determiner" which usually conveys

"only restrictive modification" (*ibid.*: 1241) and this "modification at its 'most restrictive' tends to come after the head", as in "Any person *who wishes to see me* must make an appointment" (*ibid.*: 1242).

An English usage reference work (Sinclair, *et al.*, 1992: 57) advises that *any* is used "to say something is true about each thing or person of a particular type, about each member of a group, or about each part of something". This particular interpretation of the meaning of *any* is particularly pertinent to the current study. In addition, *any* is also used "as part of the object of a negative sentence", as in "*I don't have any money*" (*ibid.*: 641).

Among linguistic researchers, *any* is sometimes more specifically described as a quantifier (see, for example, Aloni, 2007; Jacobsson, 2002; Kadmon and Landman, 1993 Yasutake, 2008) rather than as a determiner (see, for example, Quer, 2000; Yasutake, 2008). A number of these studies (see, for example, Aloni, 2007; Jacobsson, 2002; Kadmon and Landman, 1993; Duffley and Larrivé, 2010; Quer, 1999; Tovená and Jayez, 1999; Yasutake, 2008) have looked at the difference in meaning, if there is indeed a difference in meaning, between what is often termed "free choice" *any* and "polarity sensitive" *any*. The former is said to be when *any* is chosen by a speaker or writer as a "universal quantifier" from a range of possible determiners/quantifiers, whereas the latter is when *any* is "is a sort of indefinite and is often represented by an existential quantifier" (Tovená and Jayez, 1999: 1). The consensus in more recent studies (e.g., Jacobsson, 2002) seems to be in line with the position of Kadmon and

Landman (1993) who make the case for *any* having one meaning; and that is, conveying the sense of "widening" and "strengthening".

An important point to note regarding all of the above studies is that the examples of *any* used by the researchers, if they use real world example at all, they all come from general English and not from legislative legal texts, where *any* is much more commonly used,. A relatively small number of studies have investigated the distinctive language use found in legal texts (e.g. Bhatia, 2004, Kurzon, 1997). A study of speech acts in English contract law, for example, uncovered the important role of modal verbs in such texts (Trosborg, 1995). In another study, Bhatia (2004: 138) examined a variety of legal genres and described some of the characteristics of legal language, such as its longer and more complex structure and the use of arcane terms, all of which makes legal texts more difficult for the layperson to interpret, despite the fact that we are all subject to abide by such texts. Others (see, for example, Lin and Hsieh, 2010; Jablonkai, 2010) studied the words and phrases used in legal language. Jablonkai (2010), for instance, studied the most frequent four-word n-grams in a 1.2-million-word corpus of official European Union policy documents, of which approximately 63% are legal texts (*ibid.*: 256). However, this means that the findings, while useful, inevitably exclude all instances of phraseological variation and all phraseologies consisting of less than four words; in other words, the overwhelming majority. In a natural language processing-based study using a 1-million-word corpus of Australian contract language, Curtotti and McCreath (2011) automatically extracted "a

domain ontology for contracts" (*ibid.*: 1). Their study is of particular interest because they identified single words which had a higher occurrence than that found in a two 1-million-word reference corpora, the Brown and Reuters corpora (*ibid.*: 4). One of the words they identified as being a "key term in a contract" (*ibid.*: 4) is *any*, but they did not closely examine its functions, or its co-selections, beyond stating that *any*, along with other key words such as *that*, *or*, *may*, *must*, and *will*, typically marks "the occurrence of rules" (*ibid.*: 4). This finding supports the high frequency of *any* found in the HKOC, and ordinances are, of course, basically sets of rules.

3. The present study

This study focuses on a cross-section of the more frequent phraseologies in which *any* is co-selected with other words in the HKOC. To understand why *any* is so frequent in these legal texts, examples of these frequent phraseologies are described and discussed based on their different functions. Also, the possible reasons for their genre-specificity are discussed. Finally, the methodology used and the focus on phraseological variation adopted in the study are discussed in terms of their potential for wider applications in future studies which seek to gain a better understanding of linguistic representations of linguistic reality in legal texts.

In this study, we adopt the notion set out by Kadmon and Landman (1993: 374) that *any* has one basic meaning which conveys a sense of "widening" and "strengthening". Also adopted is the definition offered by Jacobsson (2002: 9) that *any* is "one or more, no

matter who/what/which/of what kind', connoting arbitrariness, random selection, lack of limitation". This definition is, perhaps, more simply captured by Sinclair et al. (op cit.: 57), who state that *any* is used "to say something is true about each thing or person of a particular type, about each member of a group, or about each part of something". It will be seen that these characteristics of *any* help to explain both its high frequency, and the necessity for *any*-based phraseologies, in legislative legal texts.

4. Data and methodology

The data used are three specialised corpora and a corpus of general English (BNC). The specialised corpora were the Hong Kong Engineering Ordinances Corpus (HKEOC, 139,176 words), the Hong Kong Financial Services Ordinances Corpus (HKFSOC, 384,950 words) Hong Kong Ordinances Corpus (HKOC) which is comprised of the HKEOC and the HKFSOC. The HKEOC and the HKFSOC were used to examine whether or not the phraseologies are specific to a particular register rather than to ordinances generally. The British National Corpus (BNC), comprising 100 million words of written and spoken texts of general English, was used as a reference corpus.

Before the phraseologies were identified, *ConcGram 1.0* (Greaves, 2009) was used to generate the list of two-word concgrams from the HKOC. This list was fully automatically generated by the software without any prior intervention. Then, the concgrams containing the word *any* were identified. As the two-

word concgram list only provides the frequencies of co-occurrence, and not all of the concgrams are necessarily meaningfully associated, the next step was to generate the concordance lines to determine whether the two words simply co-occur or are meaningfully associated. The parameters of ‘associatedness’ in this study are whether the two words combine to form a meaningful unit (for example, *any* + *person* as in ‘*any specified person*’) and whether they frame lexical items in between them to form a larger unit(s) (for example, *any* + *under* as in ‘*any revision under this subsection*’).

After frequent phraseologies containing *any* in the HKOC had been identified, the frequencies of the words comprising the phraseologies were examined. Whether they are frequent or not as single words may have implications for their co-selection with *any*. The same phraseologies were then searched for in the BNC. By comparing the relative frequencies of the phraseologies in the HKOC and the BNC, the specificity of the phraseologies with regard to legislative legal texts was determined. The same procedure was then applied to the HKEOC and the HKFSOC to determine whether certain phraseologies are more specifically associated with ordinances dealing with the financial services or the engineering sector.

5. Findings and discussion

Examination of the two-word concgram list of the HKOC shows that phraseologies consisting of the general determiner *any* are commonly found. In the list, five phraseologies containing *any* were among the top 50

congrams: *any/the*, *any/of*, *any/or*, *any/to*, and *any/in*. Comparison of the HKEOC and HKFSOC was then carried out. Table 1 shows the top ten two-word congrams containing *any* in the two sub-corpora.

Table 1: Top 10 two-word congrams containing *any* in the HKEOC and the HKFSOC

Hong Kong Engineering Ordinances Corpus	Frequency (%)	Hong Kong Financial Services Ordinances Corpus	Frequency (%)
<i>any/the</i> ¹⁸	1,307 (0.94%)	<i>any/the</i>	5,329 (1.38%)
<i>any/of</i>	1,173 (0.84%)	<i>any/of</i>	5,255 (1.37%)
<i>any/or</i>	956 (0.69%)	<i>any/or</i>	4,519 (1.17%)
<i>any/to</i>	750 (0.54%)	<i>any/to</i>	3,085 (0.80%)
<i>any/in</i>	636 (0.46%)	<i>any/in</i>	2,837 (0.74%)
<i>any/a</i>	551 (0.40%)	<i>any/a</i>	1,646 (0.43%)
<i>any/and</i>	385 (0.28%)	<i>any/and</i>	1,218 (0.32%)
<i>any/person</i>	309 (0.22%)	<i>any/by</i>	1,168 (0.30%)
<i>any/shall</i>	271	<i>any/under</i>	991

¹⁸ Congrams are written alphabetically with a forward slash to denote that they exhibit variation.

	(0.19%)		(0.26%)
any/gas	267 (0.19%)	any/person	982 (0.26%)

Table 1 shows that the two sub-corpora of legislative legal texts share eight of the top ten two-word concgrams with *any*. Of the two which are not shared, only *any/gas* is register-specific in the sense that it is found only in the HKEOC. From these top ten and others in the list, we have tried to classify the phraseologies in terms of the associated words and their grammatical classes as well as the functions the *any*-related phraseologies perform in the ordinances. As a result, the study has identified five colligational patterns of *any*: *any* + noun, *any* + preposition, *any* + conjunction, self-collocation *any* + *any*, and *any* + modal verb.

5.1 *any* + noun

A frequent phraseology containing *any* is the combination of *any* + *noun*. Table 2 lists the top ten *any* + *noun* phraseologies in the HKEOC and the HKFSOC to help to determine the extent to which this pattern is register-specific.

Table 2: Top 10 instances of *any + noun* in the HKEOC and the HKFSOC

Hong Kong Engineering Ordinances Corpus	Frequency (%)	Hong Kong Financial Services Ordinances Corpus	Frequency (%)
any/person	309 (0.22%)	any/person	982 (0.26%)
any/gas	267 (0.19%)	any/section	607 (0.16%)
any/premises	171 (0.12%)	any/corporation	577 (0.15%)
any/part	156 (0.11%)	any/ordinance	431 (0.11%)
any/authority	121 (0.09%)	any/securities	413 (0.11%)
any/water	95 (0.07%)	any/subsection	410 (0.11%)
any/service	87 (0.06%)	any/commission	384 (0.10%)
any/pipe	78 (0.06%)	any/respect	308 (0.08%)
any/work	67 (0.05%)	any/part	306 (0.08%)
any/time	65 (0.05%)	any/time	286 (0.07%)

Some of the phraseologies containing *any + noun* are evenly distributed across the sub-corpora, while others are more specific to one register. In both corpora, *any/person* is the most frequent phraseology of this type. It occurs 309 (0.22%) and 982 (0.26%) times respectively in the HKEOC and the HKFSOC, and so is

proportionately the same regardless of register. This suggests that *any/person* is commonly used in ordinances generally, and so are *any/time* and *any/part*. The rest are more register-specific. We find, for example, *any/gas*, *any/water*, and *any/pipe* are specific to the HKEOC; whereas *any/corporation*, *any/securities*, and *any/commission* are specific to the HKFSOC.

Figure 1 shows sample concordance lines of *any/person*, taken from the HKOC.

1 any purpose other than a domestic purpose. (3) **Any**
 2 **person** who contravenes subsection (2) shall be
 3 of their being subject to those restrictions **any**
 4 **person** whom he does not know to be aware of th
 5 Subject to sections 38A(2) and 38B(5), where **any**
 6 **person** becomes or ceases to be a director or
 7 corporation or the other corporation, and **any**
 8 such **person** referred to in subsection (2), with
 9 issued share capital of- an intermediary, or **any**
 10 other **person** carrying on the business of the
 11 effect to a specified extent, in relation to **any**
 12 specified **person** or to members of a specified
 13 with section 33. The arbitrator may appoint **any**
 14 legally qualified **person** to advise him on any
 15 990) (1) The Authority may exempt in writing **any**
 16 **person** from any of the provisions of these regu
 17 iness or identity, or the trading particulars, of **any**
 18 such **person** being ascertained from it; (b) wit
 19 y or season ticket of which he is the holder to **any**
 20 other **person**. (iii) All monthly and season

Figure 1: Sample concordance lines of *any/person* from the HKOC

Across both corpora, *any +person* is the most frequent phraseology of this type. This is probably due to the fact that these ordinances ultimately regulate the behaviour of people and their organisations. In lines 1-3, *any +person* occurs as the n-gram *any person* and in lines 4-7 constituency variation is observed. In these

two variations, *any* functions as an all-encompassing determiner, by which the writer intends to include all of the items following it, in this case, *person*, without exception. The intervening words in the instances with constituency variation serve to further modify the word *person*, such as '*specified*' and '*legally qualified*' (lines 6 and 7). Thus, in most of these instances, the intervening words together with *person* form the noun phrase. The phraseology *any/person*, which can be an n-gram but can have constituency variation, expresses the meaning of including at least one or every person, or a particular person when *person* co-selects other words to form a noun phrase. Since one of the major functions of legal texts is to act as a written record to regulate the behaviour of people and entities, the drafters of the texts intend to be as inclusive as possible. In the case of *any + person*, the ordinances set out to regulate the rights or behaviour of seemingly *any person*, and it can be seen from the concordance lines that *any + person* is always used with the all-encompassing meaning of *any*. In the contexts of ordinances, the requirement to be seen to treat all of the persons in a society equally obviously requires this meaning to remain intact.

Another example of *any + noun* is *any/premises* which also has a similar pattern and function when the two words occur in the positional variation *any + premises*. As shown in Figure 2, the two words *any* and *premises* form an n-gram in lines 1-3, with *any* acting as an all-encompassing determiner widening and emphasising *premises*. In lines 4-5, the two words are not contiguous, with intervening words that are adjectives. Together with *premises*, they form a noun

phrase. In these instances, whether *any* is directly modifying *premises* (n-gram) or is part of a noun phrase with *premises* as the head noun (constituency variation), the concgram *any/premises* expresses the meaning of encompassing one, no matter which one, or all premises or particular premises. Here we see how the legislative legal texts set out to regulate activities with regard to premises, with the use of *any* underscoring the extent to which a particular ordinance applies to premises.

1 (2) Where a gas fitting has been installed in **any**
premises before the commencement of these
2 subregulation (1), no person shall install in **any**
premises a gas pipe which is- (a) made of
3 unsatisfactorily or restricting the supply to **any**
premises the consumer shall, if so
4 no authorized officer shall enter or search **any**
domestic **premises** except- (a) by virtue
5 persons as may be necessary, and on leaving **any**
unoccupied **premises** which he has entered
6 that purpose; (iv) place his feet on a seat in **any** part
of the **premises** including the
7 for the management of the **premises** or **any** part
thereof; and (c) gives an
8 to admit **any** person onto the **premises** or **any** part
thereof at **any** time, and shall not be
9 ground for entry into the **premises** for **any**
purpose specified in subsection (1); and
10 means the pipes and fittings in **premises**, and **any**
pipes and fittings between the **premises**

Figure 2: Sample of concordance lines of *any/premises* from the HKOC

These examples of phraseologies of *any/person* and *any/premises* were also searched for in the two profession-specific ordinances sub-corpora, HKEOC and HKFSOC, to examine whether some of these phraseologies containing *any* are specific to the engineering or financial services register. The occurrence

6 of such corporation or business; engaged **in any**
 judicial or other proceedings; a party to a
 7 point. 3. No bend or curve shall be made **in any**
 pipe so as to diminish the waterway or alter t
 8 apply to the reinstallation of a gas fitting **in any**
 premises as they apply to the installation of a
 9 of the Ordinance; closing date **in** relation to **any**
 relevant securities, means- the date specified
 10 for the purposes of issue- **in** the case of **any**
 advertisement, invitation or document made in

Figure 3: Sample concordance lines of *any/in* from the HKOC

The major pattern of the positional variation *any/in* is in the form of *any + noun phrase + prepositional phrase with in*, for example, ‘*any error in a previous return or remittance*’ in line 2, and *any + noun phrase + verb in past participle + prepositional phrase with in*, such as ‘*any power mentioned in subsection (1)*’ in line 4. In these instances, *any* performs its all-encompassing function in relation to the noun or a noun phrase. This is similar to the phraseology *any + a noun or a noun phrase*, however, the inclusive meaning is delimited by the prepositional phrase which is the modifier of the noun phrase. For example, in line 2 ‘*any error in a previous return or remittance*’, the regulated item is no longer every error as denoted by ‘*any error*’. Instead, it is delimited by means of the use of the prepositional phrase to one or every error that occurred in a previous return or remittance. Similarly, the regulated item in line 4 is no longer ‘any power’ but is delimited by the prepositional phrase to only those powers ‘*mentioned in subsection (1)*’.

Phraseologies containing *any/under* (Figure 4) are also similar to those of *any/in*.

1 subsection (2). (4) The Authority may exercise **any**
 power **under** this Ordinance that an inspector m
 2 apply in relation to the approval of **any**
 revision **under** this subsection as they apply i
 3 the reasons for making the determination; and **any**
 order made **under** section 223 in relation to th
 4 not affect such refusal so far as it is based on **any**
 additional ground **under** section 8(1)(b).
 5 as the Insurance Authority may determine. (6) **Any**
 proceedings commenced **under** an Ordinance repea
 6 or as a member of a tribunal appointed **under any**
 of the provisions referred to in paragraphs (a)
 7 a claim to be made which is barred **under any**
 enactment or rule of law. Unified Exchange
 8 nce of a corporation is revoked or suspended **under any**
 provision of this Ordinance; and the Commissio
 9 any other condition imposed **under** or pursuant to **any**
 provision of this Ordinance. Subject to
 10 liabilities **under** subsection (1) in respect of **any**
 outstanding non- collateralized warrants issue

Figure 4: Sample concordance lines of *any/under* from the HKOC

The positional variation of the collocational framework *any/under* also exhibits two main patterns: *any + noun phrase + prepositional phrase with under*, and *any + noun phrase + verb in past participle + prepositional phrase with under*. In line 1, ‘*any power*’ seems to suggest that the authority can exercise whatever power(s) it cares to invoke; however, it can be seen that this is not the intended meaning. The co-selection of *any* with *under* in this collocational framework necessarily qualifies the extent of the powers of the authority embodied in the ordinance, by expressing the meaning that only the powers detailed ‘*under this Ordinance*’ can be exercised. This qualification with respect to *any* is invariably found in the other instances of *any/under* (lines 2-4). Interestingly, when the positional sequence is reversed, i.e., *under/any*, the same qualifying function is

observed. In lines 6-10, we see that *under*, again, refers the reader to an ordinance, or provisions of an ordinance, and *any* is thereby limited in its scope.

These two examples of *any/in* and *any/under* demonstrate that this type of phraseology in the sequence of *any* + *preposition* typically expresses a meaning which delimits the all-encompassing property of *any*. This, again, reflects the nature of legislative legal texts which need to make explicit who or what is being regulated (or is responsible for the regulating) in order to encompass all of the persons and entities involved and, at the same time, set out the parameters where applicable.

5.3 *any* + *conjunction*

Instances of this type of phraseology, *any* + *conjunction*, share the same function which is for the conjunction to provide the link to extend or expand upon the persons or entity co-selected with *any*. The first example is *any/or* in Figure 5.

1 a claim to be made which is barred under **any**
enactment **or** rule of law. Unified Exchange
2 other misconduct in connection with- dealing in **any**
securities **or** futures contract **or** trading in **an**
3 the circumstances in which records compiled in **any**
specified form **or** manner, **or** documents **or**
4 in relation to a registered institution, means **any**
money- received **or** held by **or** on behalf of the
5 of a supply PART VI MISCELLANEOUS **Any**
person who wastes **or** misuses, **or** causes **or**
6 relation to the contravention)- the person **or** **any**
of his associated persons shall not exercise **an**
7 as it considers appropriate. A notice **or** **any**
other matter published under subsection (7) is
8 may require a copy of **any** such register, **or** **any**
9 part of it, on payment of \$2, **or** such less sum
other person; and (c) shall not suffer **or** permit **any**
other person to have access to **any** record **or**
10 of a review; threatens, insults **or** causes **any**
loss to be suffered by **any** person who has

Figure 5: Sample concordance lines of *any/or* from the HKOC

In Figure 5, lines 1-5 show that the two words *any* and *or* are typically non-contiguous in the positional variant *any/or*. The intervening words in these instances include nouns or noun phrases (lines 1-3), *noun + verb* (line 4), and *noun + relativiser + verb* (line 5). In lines 1-3, *or* is followed by another noun or noun phrase. The same pattern is found in lines 2-3 where *or* is followed by a noun or noun phrase, and then another *or* which is also followed by a noun. This *or + noun* pattern can be repeated more than once in some instances (see, for example, line 3). The verb ‘*received*’ in line 4 is a modifier to the head noun ‘*money*’ following *any*. In this instance, *or* is not followed by other nouns but by modifiers to the head noun ‘*money*’. In line 5, ‘*Any person who wastes*’ is followed by *or* and the verb *misuses*, and this *or + verb* pattern is found elsewhere.

The co-selection of *any + or* is mostly used when a number of items or actions needed to be listed in the ordinances. This indicates that *any + or* has the function of expanding and extending the all-encompassing sense of *any* to the other items listed in order to include all the conceivable possibilities and alternatives that might be covered by the ordinance.

Another example of this type of phraseology is *any/and* (Figure 6).

1 transfer contract. (iv) The property is not subject
to **any** mortgage **and** any other encumbrances. (v)
2 Gazette on September 21, 2001. To the extent
that **any** Property **and** Liabilities of the Merging
3 the Company who has any interests or short positions
in **any** shares **and** underlying shares in, and deb

4 may authorize in writing any public officer to
 exercise **any** powers **and** perform any duties conferred
 5 o support voice recording interface for connection
 of **any** extension line circuits to analogue **and**
 6 mption; "premises" means any building or structure
 or **any** part thereof **and** any place- (a) in which
 7 the recognized investor compensation company by which
any financial statements **and** other documents
 8 event communication means any communication,
 including **any** announcement, disclosure **and** statement,
 9 stion is a corporation incorporated in Hong Kong
 but **any** of the information, particulars **and** docu
 10 Added 29 of 2002 s. 2) "premises"
 includes **any** place **and** a part of premises or a place;

Figure 6: Sample concordance lines of *any* + *and* from the HKOC

Again, we see patterns and functions similar to those found with *any/or*. It seems that the writers of ordinances must make sure that every eventuality and every possible interpretation is covered. An example of this is found in line 10: "*premises*" includes **any** place **and** a part of premises **or** a place. Here the ordinance defines what is meant by 'premises' and it is clearly not deemed sufficient simply to say "'premises" includes **any** place" in a legislative legal text. The writers co-select both *and* and *or* to extend the definition to "*a part of premises*" and "*a part of a place*", and so avoid future legal disputes.

5.4 Self-collocation *any* + *any*

Another example is when *any* self-collocates; in other words, the writers co-select *any* + *any*. The concordance in Figure 7 shows a cross-section of instances from the HKOC.

1 note, statement of account or receipt (or **any**
 copy of **any** such document) required to be

2 of the chairman of the appeal board, take **any**
 part in **any** deliberation or determination of
 3 the conference as he considers appropriate. At **any**
 time after **any** proceedings have been institut
 4 the Commission if, in the course of performing **any**
 function under **any** such provisions, he is
 5 by whatever name called; document includes **any**
 register and books, **any** tape recording and **an**
 6 for which it is licensed and to **any** business of **any** of
 its associated entities, in which case **any**
 7 amends or revokes **any** condition or imposes **any** new
 condition under subsection (7), the
 8 to regulation 38, **any** person who contravenes **any**
 provisions of regulation 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
 9 (b)- where there is **any** requirement in this or **any**
 other Ordinance for notice in writing in res
 10 action in respect of **any** relevant securities in **any**
 case where- it or an associate of its has, i

Figure 7: Sample concordance lines of *any* + *any* from the HKOC

In the sample lines in Figure 7, four patterns are identified: (1) *any* + *noun* + *preposition* + *any* + *noun* (seven instances, lines 1-4, 6, 9-10), for example, ‘*any function under any such provisions*’ (line 4), (2) *any* + *noun phrases* + *any* + *noun* (line 5), (3) *verb* + *any* + *noun* + *conjunction* + *verb* + *any* + *noun* (line 7), and (4) *any* + *noun* + *relativiser* + *verb* + *any* + *noun* (line 8). In pattern (1) and pattern (4), the first instance of *any* modifies the head noun; the second *any* is embedded in the modifying element. While the modifying phrase (prepositional phrase in pattern (1) and relative clause in pattern (4)) seem to delimit the possibilities of the items being regulated, the use of *any* opens up the possibilities. Thus the instance of *any* in line 4, for example, expresses the meaning of every function that is applicable to every such provision. Patterns (2) and (3) are used to list the alternatives and possibilities and so function to extend or expand.

5.5 *any + modal verb*

In our analysis, *any + modal verb* is another frequent phraseology in the HKOC. Such phraseologies include *any + may* and *any + shall* (see Figures 8 and 9).

1 authorities and discretions so delegated, conform to
any regulations that **may** from time to time
2 cation of officers and directors, except to the extent
any such provision **may** be held by the cour
3 granting the listing of, and permission to deal in,
any new Shares which **may** fall to be allott
4 promptly copied to the Company. 2.4 Subject only to
any authorization which **may** be given pursu
5 repayable on demand and which, without prejudice to
any rights the Selling Shareholder **may** hav
6 do under section 35(2). (3) The appeal board **may** make
any order it thinks fit with regard to the
7 d any person authorized by him in writing, **may** enter
any leased land to comply with a requireme
8 Water Authority. (2) The Water Authority **may** specify
any forms required for the purposes of t
9 nd fittings (1) The Water Authority **may** require
any pipe or fitting, before it is instal
10 tions under this Ordinance, the Authority **may** serve on
any registered person, owner of a gas

Figure 8: Sample concordance lines of *any + may* from the HKOC

1 is section the value of any assets and the amount of
any liabilities **shall** be determined in acco
2 is section the value of any assets and the amount of
any liabilities **shall** be determined in acco
3 all make a final report to the Financial Secretary.
Any such report **shall** be made within such t
4 ction (5), the value of any assets and the amount of
any liabilities **shall** be determined in acco
5 on applies the value of any assets and the amount of
any liabilities **shall** be determined in
6 REQUIREMENTS FOR VAPORISERS No person **shall** use
any vaporiser to vaporise liquefied petrole
7 mended 57 of 1999 s. 3) (3) The tribunal **shall** hear
any evidence which the Water Authority or
8 corroded. (Enacted 1990) (1) No person **shall** make
any alteration to any premises which would
9 (3) Except in an emergency, the company **shall** not use
any place other than its stations for the p
10 ed 1990) (1) No person **shall** make any alteration to
any premises which would affect a gas fitti

Figure 9: Sample concordance lines of *any +shall* from the HKOC

In the above concordance lines, we see that *any + modal verb* frames either the action regulated or the regulating source. The positional variations are also found to impact the meanings. In the case of *any/may*, the modal verb *may* tends to express different meanings in different positional variations. In the positional variant *any ... may*, *may* typically denotes epistemic modality, i.e. expressing possibility, in most of the instances; for example, ... *any new Shares which may fall to be allotted ...* When the two words occur in the sequence *may ... any*, *may* mostly conveys a deontic modal meaning which is expressing permission in the majority of the instances; for example, ...*The Water Authority may require any pipe or fitting ...* When *shall* precedes *any*, there is often a colligational pattern consisting of a negative structure which is not often found in the other positional variation; for example, *No person shall make any alteration ...* and ... *the company shall not use any place other than*

5.6 Comparing the HKOC and the BNC

By way of a summary, Table 3 compares the frequencies of the examples discussed in this paper in the HKOC and the BNC. It should be noted that the frequencies include only those of the positional variation *any* followed by the co-selected word. The other positional variations are not discussed because they do not share the same meanings and functions described. Only the cases involving *any/may* and *any/shall* include both positional variations. Table 3: Frequencies of *any*-based phraseologies in the HKOC and the BNC

Phraseology	Frequency (%) in the Hong Kong Ordinances Corpus	Frequency (%) in the British National Corpus	Ratio
any/person	520 (0.0992%)	1,100 (0.0011%)	90:1
any/premises	60 (0.0114%)	120 (0.0001%)	114:1
any/in	680 (0.1297%)	1,760 (0.0018%)	72:1
any/under	480 (0.0916%)	400 (0.0004%)	229:1
any/or	780 (0.1488%)	2,780 (0.0029%)	51:1
any/and	120 (0.0229%)	320 (0.0003%)	76:1
any/may*	460 (0.0878%)	3000 (0.0031%)	28:1
any/shall*	580 (0.1107%)	1,100 (0.0011%)	101:1
any/any	440 (0.0839%)	1,520 (0.0016%)	52:1

* Includes both positional variations for *any/may* and *any/shall*

All of the phraseologies in Table 3 have a far higher frequency in the HKOC than in the BNC. They are between 28 to 229 times more frequent in the HKOC, and so the use of these phraseologies containing *any* is significantly higher in legislative legal texts than in general English. Even those phraseologies which contain common grammatical words, such as *any/in* and

any/under, have more instances in the HKOC than in the BNC. As discussed, these higher frequencies can be explained by the functions they perform which are necessary features of legislative legal texts. It is, therefore, possible to make the case that these phraseologies are ordinance-specific, and thus contribute to the aboutness (Phillips, 1989) of these ordinances and, in some cases to the specific legal register, engineering or financial services, they are related to.

6. Conclusion

The widening and strengthening meaning (Kadmon and Landman, 1993) conveyed by *any*, in combination with the use of *any* to denote "each thing or person of a particular type, about each member of a group, or about each part of something" (Sinclair et al., 1992: 57), is of greater necessity in the ordinances than in general English and other specialised corpora such as those used in Biber et al.'s (1999) grammar. The requirement to cover all possible persons, entities and scenarios makes *any* a much used determiner in legislative legal texts. We have also seen how through the co-selections made with *any* its scope may be elaborated, extended or expanded, or delimited. Again, these functions which set the boundaries and scope of the ordinances are essential features of such texts.

The methodology used in this study has implications for future studies of legal texts. By adopting a more inclusive definition of phraseology with an emphasis on including phraseological variation (Cheng, et al., 2009), and using a corpus-driven approach to finding legal-text-specific phraseology, it is hoped that

such studies could be extended to better uncover the linguistic representations of linguistic reality in legal texts. In addition, the approach, methodology and procedure exemplified in this paper can be extended to other profession- and register- specific corpora to explore the phraseology they contain, thus contributing to our larger project that aims to describe the phraseological patterns specific to genres and specialised corpora (see, for example, Cheng, 2009; Greaves and Warren, 2007).

Acknowledgements

The work described in this paper was substantially supported by a grant from the Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (Project No.: PolyU 5474/09H).

References

- Aloni, M. (2007). Free choice, modals, and imperatives. *Natural Language Semantics*, 15, 65-94.
- Bhatia, V. K. (2004). *Worlds of written discourse: A genre-based view*. London and New York: Continuum.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (2006). *Cambridge grammar of English: A comprehensive guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cheng, W. (2009). *Income/interest/net*: Using internal criteria to determine the aboutness of a text. In K.

- Aijmer (Ed.), *Corpora and language teaching* (pp. 157-177). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Cheng, W., Greaves, C., Sinclair, J. McH., & Warren, M. (2009). Uncovering the extent of the phraseological tendency: Towards a systematic analysis of concgrams. *Applied Linguistics*, 30(2), 236-252.
- Cheng, W., Greaves, C., & Warren, M. (2006). From n-gram to skipgram to concgram. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 11(4), 411-433.
- Curtotti, M., & McCreath, E. C. (2011). A corpus of Australian contract language: Description, profiling and analysis. In K. D. Ashley & T. M. van Engers (Eds.), *The 13th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Law, Proceedings of the Conference* (pp. 199-208). June 6-10, 2011, Pittsburgh, USA. Retrieved from http://http://delivery.acm.org/10.1145/2020000/2018387/p199-curtotti.pdf?ip=175.159.10.220&acc=ACTIVE%20SERVICE&CFID=168943504&CFTOKEN=13096993&acm_=1349421510_4cb0ae5b44f43972fa42cf0b49fa6c37
- Duffley, P. J., & Larrivé, P. (2010). Anyone for non-scalarity. *English Language and Linguistics*, 14(1), 1-17.
- Greaves, C. (2009). *ConcGram 1.0: A phraseological search engine*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Greaves, C., & Warren, M. (2007). Concgramming: A computer-driven approach to learning the phraseology of English. *ReCALL Journal*, 19(3), 287-306.

- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold.
- Jablonkai, R. (2010). English in the context of European integration: A corpus-driven analysis of lexical bundles in English EU documents. *English for Specific Purposes*, 29, 253-267.
- Jacobsson, B. (2002). The indefinites *some* and *any* in linguistic theory and actual usage. *Studia Neophilologica*, 74, 1-14.
- Kadmon, N., & Landman, F. (1993). Any. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 16, 353-422.
- Kurzton, D. (1997). 'Legal language': Varieties, genres, registers, discourses. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 119-139.
- Lin, D. H., & Hsieh, S. C. (2010). The specialized vocabulary of modern patent language: Semantic associations in patent lexis. In R. Ootoguro, K. Ishikawa, H. Umemoto, K. Yoshimoto & Y. Harada (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 24th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*, PACLIC 24, Tohoku University, Japan, 4-7 November 2010
- Phillips, M. (1989). *Lexical structure of text [discourse analysis monographs 12]*. Birmingham: English Language Research, University of Birmingham.
- Quer, J. (2000). Licensing free choice items in hostile environments: The role of aspect and mood. *SKY Journal of Linguistics*, 13, 251-268.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. New York: Longman.

- Renouf, A.J. and Sinclair, J. McH. (1991). Collocational frameworks in English. In K. Ajimer & B. Altenberg (Eds.), *English corpus linguistics* (pp 128-43). London: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J. McH. (1972). *A course in spoken English: Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sinclair, J., et al. (1990). *Collins Cobuild English grammar*. London and Glasgow: Collins.
- Sinclair, J., et al. (1991). *Collins Cobuild student's grammar*. London: HarperCollins.
- Sinclair, J., et al. (1992). *Collins Cobuild English usage*. London: HarperCollins.
- Tovena, L. M., & Jayez, J. (1999). Any: From scalarity to arbitrariness. In F. Corblin, C. Dobrovie-Sorin & J. M. Marandin (Eds.), *Empirical issues in formal syntax and semantics 2* (pp.39-57). The Hague: Thesus.
- Trosborg, A. (1995). Statutes and contracts: An analysis of legal speech acts in the English language of the law. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 23, 31-53.
- Yasutake, T. (2008). On multi-functionality of determiners in grammar and discourse. *Bulletin of Aichi University of Education (Humanities and Social Sciences)*, 57, 27-35. Retrieved from <http://>

Martin Warren is Professor of English Language Studies in the Department of English of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University where he is a member of the Research Centre for Professional Communication in English. He currently teaches and conducts research in the areas of corpus linguistics, discourse analysis, intercultural communication, lexical

semantics, phraseological variation, pragmatics, and professional communication.

Maggie Leung is a PhD candidate in the Department of English of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University. Her current research interest is a corpus-driven study of the genre- and register-specificity of phrasal verbs.