ROMANIAN JOURNAL OF ENGLISH STUDIES
RJES 18 /2021

sciendo

DOI: 10.1515/RJES-2021-0017

DEGREES OF LINGUISTIC AND CULTURAL MEDIATION IN LEGAL TRANSLATION

TITELA VÎLCEANU, MARIA GEORGIANA STOENICĂ (TANCIU)
University of Craiova

Abstract:*The interconnection between language, culture and ethics is a commonplace within the field of translation studies, more particularly, when discussing legal translation. The role of the translator as a communicator and cultural mediator has long been established. However, the question arises how far the legal translator of EU texts can and is entitled to mediate between legal systems and cultures.*
Keywords: *culture; language; legal translation; mediation;*

1. Introduction

Legal translation, as pertaining to the broader of category specialized translation, deals with the complexity of legal texts and legal systems: "translation of texts for legal purposes and in legal settings, i.e., a functionally and - situationally - defined translation type" (Engberg 2002: 375).

Monjean-Decaudin and Popineau-Lauvray (2019) use the term *juritraductology* (*traductologie juridique* in French) instead of *legal translation* to emphasize the complex scientific nature of the field (i.e., the science of legal translation, perhaps, drawing on the term *jurilinguistics* (*jurilinguistique* - originating in Canada, coined by Gémar, 1982, taken over by Cornu, 1990 in France, with reference to the status of translators within the European Union), i.e., translation as supported by the language sciences and industries. Although *juritraductology* may be considered a case of parallel terminology, referring to *Legal Translation Studies* (a denomination preferred by Cao, 2014; Prieto Ramos, 2014, 2018; Vlasenko, 2014; Šarcevic, 2015, Biel, 2018; Engberg, 2018; etc.)*,* according to the authors, *juritraductology* means more, involving both legal linguistics (*jurilinguistics*) and translation studies. We think that the terms overlap significantly and that the authors' simply show preference for one of them to the detriment of the other. We agree that *juritraductology* "offers a new crossdisciplinarity, building bridges between translation studies and law, but rooted in both fields" that are thus enabled "to interact with each other without any disciplinary frontiers" (Monjean-Decaudin and Popineau-Lauvray 2019: 116).

In *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies,* Gamal (2009: 65), the *cultural translation* entry indicates its equivocal meaning. In its broad sense, it "radically questions translation's traditional parameters". The narrow sense is associated with literary translation theory and practices "that mediate cultural difference, or try to convey extensive cultural background, or set out to represent another culture via translation" as opposed to *linguistic* or *grammatical* translation "that is limited in scope to the sentences on the page" and dealing with "complex technical issues" "further reaching differences in the assumed contextual knowledge that surrounds the text and gives it meaning".

Based on these assumptions, we shall try to determine the specificities of the legal translation and of cultural translation as well as their productive areas and interference.

2. Contexts of legal translation

Martin Ruano (2014: 15) discusses the context(s) of legal translation laying emphasis on the "intervening" role of the translator and his/her awareness of the readership's expectations, or, better said, client- and target legal culture-orientation. In the same spirit, Bestué (2019: 131) draws attention to the variables involved: the "diatopic variety of legal terms", "the function of the target text and applicable law", and "the importance of the legal context". In this respect, legal translation becomes intersystemic, operating between two languages and two legal systems – this is the case of the EU and of bilingual jurisdictions such as Belgium, Switzerland, Canada, Hong Kong, etc.

In an attempt to bridge the gap between comparative law and legal translation, the translator should know how to deal with ambiguity, vagueness and asymmetries or a high degree of anisomorphism in which "we do not seek identicalness but, rather equivalence" (Alcaraz Varo 2004: 202, quoted in Biel et al., 2019: 135), or the *equivalent effect* in a communicative situation (i.e., the same or a similar impact on the target readership, in Newmark's definition). Acting as a comparatist, the translator has to determine the similarities and/or differences of the meaning of the legal term in the two legal systems

involved in order to make the best decision regarding the optimal equivalent; a legal practitioner is more likely to search for such information in order to acquire knowledge or to import models for domestic legislation. Admittedly, comparative law supports the legal translator as securing mediation between the legal systems in question; the process should be identified with profiling legal concepts in a dynamic way, and with reflective practice(s) rather than with a search for translation universals (Engberg 2013: 20ff.).

Biel (2017: 321) enlarges upon the "communicative dimension" of translation, as indicated by the fact that the expert legal translator pays utmost attention to morpho-syntactic and textual patterns / patterning, "convergent to target recipients' expectations". Bestué (2019: 133) estimates that in many cases, the legal translator will opt for a borrowing (transfer) – we think that this mainly the case when translating international law. Futhermore, Bestué (2019: 134) dismisses functional equivalents on the grounds that they provide "superficial" information about the term in the source legal culture, therefore, stressing the importance of a comparative look.

Biel et al. (2019: 1) acknowledge that it is not only the legal translation practice that has expanded, but also the academic and research interest. On a more persuasive note, figures speak volumes of the number of translated legal texts within European or international organizations (EU, UNO, NATO, etc.), public institutions and in the private sector. For instance, in the *Annual Activity Report* highlights for 2020 of the Directorate General for Translation (DGT), European Commission, "as the service responsible for the translation of Commission autonomous acts and proposals for legislative acts" takes pride in the fact that the "total production reached 2 346 000 translated pages (+18.7% compared to 2019) and 33 000 edited pages (+7.8%)" with a customer satisfaction rate of 93%. The share of the DGT translation and language services provision is the following: 47% EU law making (i.e., legal translation); 23% - external communication, web content; 23% - communication with EU institutions, national parliaments; 8% - other official documents; 8% - incoming correspondence; 2% - consulting the public on EU policy (https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/default/files/annual-activity-report-2020-translation_en.pdf). The 24 official languages in the European portfolio and the 552 language combinations / pairs make the Directorate-General for Translation (DGT) one of the world's largest translation services, and translation "the language of Europe" (Eco 1993).

Nevertheless, we think that despite this proportional growth of the translation market and research, there is still need to bridge the gap between the ivory tower and the wordface as pointed out by Chesterman and Wagner (2002) in their cross-fertilizing dialogue "Can theory help translators?" almost two decades before. For instance, Graham Cross, a British translator (quoted in Arrojo 2012: 124), labels *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2012) "a remarkable storehouse of interesting information", adopting a dismissive attitude. The question remains to what extent theory inform practice and to what extent practice documents empirical and exploratory research.

3. Contexts of cultural translation

Cultural translation, a relatively new addition to translation types, is rooted in Bhabha's (1994) metaphorical conceptualization of translation and culture: translation means, above all, a process of alienation, revealing the instability of cultural norms and cultural differences: the act of cultural translation is performed "through that apprehension of difference" (Bhabha 1994: 164). Therefore, this concept seems to be, for many scholars (notably, Bery 2007; Buden and Nowotny 2009), linked to postcolonial translation theories as expressing "power differentials between nations, languages and cultures" (Bery, 2007: 7).

In fact, the notion of *cultural translation* is reported to have been originally used in British social anthropology "to describe what happens in cultural encounters when each side tries to make sense of the actions of the other" – therefore, cultural translation is given an ethnographic account (Carbonell Cortés and Harding 2018: 9), and was thereafter discussed in relation to the translatability of literary texts, in connection with visual images and everyday life.

In an attempt to systematize the various perspectives on cultural translation, we think that two lines of action should be followed:

- a language-focused definition of *cultural translation,* based on the idea that the source text comprehension represents in itself a kind of translation, which renders people's ideas, beliefs and social practices (Carbonell Cortés and Harding 2018).

- a socio-cultural definition of *cultural translation* as involving both decontextualization and recontextualization, "first reaching out to appropriate something alien and then domesticating it" (Carbonell Cortés and Harding 2018: 10). In this sense, from the receiver's point of view, translation is a form of gain, of enriching the host culture due to artful adaptation. From the donor's viewpoint, translation is a form of loss, bringing about misunderstanding of the source text in an aggressive manner (Carbonell Cortés and Harding 2018: 10).

The *Cultural Turn* in Translation Studies is initiated by Snell-Hornby (1988), which she considers to stem from various sources such as descriptive translation studies, skopos theory and deconstructionism. The author rejects *equivalence*, one of the key and overarching notions in the linguistic approach to translation, which she considers unsuitable, promoting "an illusion of symmetry between languages which hardly exists beyond the level of vague approximations and which distorts the basic problems of translation" (Snell-Hornby 1988: 22) – language is not placed in a social vacuum, it is an integral part of culture, which imposes further requirements on the translator: "If language is an integral part of culture, the translator needs not only proficiency in two languages, he must also be at home in two cultures. In other words, he must be bilingual and bicultural" (Snell-Hornby 1988: 42). Snell-Hornby (1988: 43-44) equates translation to an act of communication (beyond linguistic transcoding), to a cross-cultural transfer, and encourages orientation towards the function of the target text as *prospective translation* to the detriment of source text-orientation in *retrospective translation.*

> *The text cannot be considered as a static specimen of language (an idea still dominant in practical translation classes), but essentially as the verbalized expression of an author's intention as understood by the translator as reader, who then recreates this whole for another readership in another culture. This dynamic process explains why … the perfect translation does not exist.* (Snell-Hornby 1988: 1-2)

Naturally, the turn is furthered by other milestone works authored by Lefevere and Bassnett (1990), Lefevere (1992, 2004), Toury (1995), Venuti (1995), Shuttleworth and Cowie (1997), Bassnett and Lefevere (1998), Bassnett (2003), etc. underpinning the idea that Translation Studies should re-centre on translation as a *cross-cultural event*, on its status in the context of the receiver culture and on the cultural effects of translations. Accordingly, Snell-Hornby (1988), even changes the nature of the "translation unit" from a linguistic one (textual) to a cultural one.

Translation is no longer defined as being primarily about language or as a form of more or less mechanical conversion of lexical units between languages, it is dynamic, and in the transfer process language is an expression of the cultures involved (Lefevere 2004). Therefore, the cultural turn in translation moves away from prescriptivist and descriptivist stances, paying attention the wider constraints and demands on translation. The theoretical underpinnings state how a text can be shaped by external forces during the transition from the source language and culture to the target environment - in Lefevere's (1992) terms, translation is a form of *manipulation*, i.e., texts are adapted with a view to influencing the target readership's reading and interpretation.

Lefevere (1992: 81) frees the translation from being evaluated in terms of fidelity or deviation from the original – translation is context embedded and the translator should show context sensitivity: "what social, literary, ideological considerations led translators to translate as they did, what they hoped to achieve by translating as they did, whether they can be said to have achieved their goals or not, and why". *Manipulation* develops into *rewriting* in the name of the prevailing ideology and to secure that translation fulfills the intended social; rewriting strengthens the translator's presence by placing them at the centre of the cultural and social mediation:

> *Translation is, of course, a rewriting of an original text. All rewritings, whatever their intention, reflect a certain ideology and a poetics and as such manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way. Rewriting is manipulation, undertaken in the service of power, and in its positive aspect can help in the evolution of a literature and a society. Rewritings can introduce new concepts, new genres, new devices, and the history of translation is the history also of literary innovation, of the shaping power of one culture upon another. But rewriting can also repress innovation, distort and contain, and in an age of ever increasing manipulation of all kinds, the study of the manipulative processes of literature as exemplified by translation can help us towards a greater awareness of the world in which we live.* (Lefevere 1992: vii)

Acting as a cultural theorist, Venuti (1995), imposes the dichotomy *domestication* vs. *foreignization*, while suggesting that culture does not impede on the linguistic transfer, on the contrary, culture should be regarded as an all-inclusive framework within which translation effectively operates. The translator's choices are important – in this sense, Venuti (1995) describes *resistant translation* in conjunction with a strategy of *foreignization,* intended to mask the translation. Venuti (1995) contends that *foreignization* could have a positive influence on the target culture serving an ethno-deviant agenda, whereas *domestication* (serving an ethnocentric agenda) might not only inhibit innovation in the target language and culture, but also lead to cultural misrepresentations. Venuti agrees that translations undergo domestication to some extent, but highlights that foreignization "promises a greater openness to cultural differences" (Venuti 1995: 23). The translator's choice of either strategy is dictated by the intended *skopos*.

In the same spirit, House (1997: 69) proposes *covert translation* in which the target text that "enjoys the status of an original source text in the target culture" (1997: 69) while it reproduces the function of the source text, but losing connection with the source culture. Hence, from a generalizing perspective, *cultural translation* needs to be regarded as "any translation which is sensitive to cultural as well as linguistic factors" (Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997: 35), to "broader issues of context, history and convention" (Bassnett 1998: 123).

4. Interfaces of legal translation and cultural translation

Without a shadow of doubt, the impact of translation on law (and on the legal and institutional settings) and on the evolution of culture(s) is unquestionable (see Cao 2010). Historically, the first legal translation is reported to be a bilingual peace treaty signed between the Egyptians and the Hittites in 1271 BC (Gémar 2003). However, it is only centuries later that the establishment of international organisations allowed "for a twofold democratisation of interpreting and translation" (Monzó-Nebot 2018*:* 464), resulting in an ever growing demand for professional services and in a wider range of available linguistic combinations (also technology-enhanced). In legal language and across different legal systems, each term can be said to carry a particular tradition, "a cluster of culturally rooted meanings" (Monzó-Nebot 2018*:* 465), which makes legal translation a difficult enterprise.

As far as the legal settings and cultures are concerned, there are countries based on one legal tradition but using two official languages (e.g., Belgium), or countries or international organizations which share the same tradition and which have engaged in harmonisation efforts (for instance, the European Union), raising the question of how this reconciliation is feasible, culturally speaking (see Engberg 2013; Monzó-Nebot 2018). One possible answer lies in aligning the interests of comparatists (lawyers and linguists alike) with that of the translator as far as possible, although on the outset, their needs and interests might be different – experts in comparative law focus on law, and translators on (intercultural) communication. Comparatists aim to contribute to the "cross-cultural harmonisation efforts to adapt a legal culture to an international community or a new social reality or to analyse the cross-fertilisation between different legal systems" (Monzó-Nebot 2018*:* 467). It is important to note that provided the cross-cultural harmonization does not occur naturally through the contact and converging development of the legal systems, a legal concept and term is transferred and it is no longer culture-specific. The evolution and reception of these transplants helps us understand that law and legal translation are situated, that cultural translation is intersystemic (as also highlighted in the previous sections), and that a functional perspective on legal translation as cultural translation is most suitable.

In fact, we do not believe in the untranslatability of legal concepts as culture-bound; on the contrary, we think that, even if there is no perfect counterpart or substitute for the source system, the purpose of translation sets priorities and enhances the translator's decision-making in relation to the optimal equivalent based on textual and contextual information (see also Harvey 2002; Károly 2012; Sin 2013).

Also from a culture-oriented perspective, de Groot (2000) denies the possibility to achieve translation for different legal systems at the same time, especially if we take into consideration the fact that the translator might not be aware of the type or expectations of the readership at all times – in this respect, Šarčevič (2000) recommends the legal translator to use neutral wordings (blanket terms / hyperonyms, loan words, paraphrases), whereas Hickey (1998) prefers to adopt a non-neutral position, thereby, recontextualization and foreignizing strategies as a clear indication of the jurisdictional origin of the term. Venuti (1998) promotes an "ethics of sameness" while advocating foreignizing (understood as "minoritizing", "exoticizing" and "abusive fidelity") relying on the stylistic conventions. Since then

> *the notions of sameness and the translator's invisibility have been increasingly problematized, and partly because of the growing sociological interest in translators and their agency, and issues of ideology, power, manipulation and responsibility*. (Chesterman 2018: 445)

This asymmetrical power relationship between cultures due to globalization phenomena is something to reflect on within legal translation - for example, the make-up of portfolio of EU languages and the status of only a small number of working languages in which legal documents are drafted, etc. (Tosi 2003 – "crossing barriers and bridging cultures") reinforces dominating identities and ideologies while undermining the legal translator's role:

> *[…] law is one of the cultural fields in which terms are more system-bound because legal translators and interpreters are regarded as mere linguistic messengers. From this point of view, the translator's main task in translating legal documents is still, in many institutional domains, to translate a text as "precisely", "faithfully", "accurately" and "neutrally" as possible, trying to find linguistic equivalents. […] and take all reasonable care to be accurate*. (Martin Ruano 2018: 85)

To what extent this is fully achievable in reality is another question – the profile of the legal translators requires for knowledge about the law and about different legal systems (as thematic competence), for bilingual proficiency, intercultural competence and transfer skills (see the EMT framework, 2017, https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/default/files/emt_competence_fwk_2017_en_web.pdf) – it is discouraging to know that some of the European bodies and institutions employ translators who hold legal qualifications but who are not required to provide any proof of formal qualification in translation. In the changing linguascape we would expect non-professional translators - those who do not hold a qualification, *natural translators* in Harris and Sherwood's (1978) terms, i.e., possessing *innate skills*, or *native translators* in Toury's (1980) words, i.e., selected by the market - to operate less and less frequently and visibly (see Martínez-Gómez, 2015). Admittedly, there is need for professional legal translators to collaborate more closely to achieve common goals and "to thrive in current market conditions", and to develop tools for in-group membership (Monzó-Nebot 2018: 470).

Further investigating translation and culture in professional settings, we are likely to shed more light on the complex relation between culture and translational behaviour, and on their shaping of professional status and codes of practice. Monzó-Nebot (2019) and Monzó-Nebot and Moreno-Rivero (2020) discuss the key cultural issues in jurilinguistics and in legal translation, acknowledging that the understanding of *legal translation* might differ according to the socio-cultural setting in which it takes place, also raising the question of the *jurilinguist* profile and training. Basically, a jurilinguist undertakes that the two legal texts are equivalent in meaning and in terms of culture (Gémar and Kasirer 2005: 281ff.), and that "the "equal effect" across the two versions—which are both considered authentic" is produced: "for the purpose of more insight into the legal culture/system of the source text such that the target text would lead to the same legal effects in practice" (Šarčević 2000: 71). The translator does not have "to adhere to strict parallelism or formal equivalence" (Hsieh 2018: 315). Actually, jurilinguistics is a relatively recent interdisciplinary approaches to the study of language and law in a bijural and bilingual context, and the term is attributed to Gémar (1982) seeking reconcile the two interdisciplinary fields, to create synergies between law, language and translation, and to juxtapose the work and expertise of translators (as communicators and cultural mediators) and legal practitioners: "the interpretation of legal texts does not just involve language but also the values and traditions represented by the text in question, complicating matters for the legal translator" (Hsieh 2018: 319).

Gémar and Kasirer (2005) challenge the myth of legal translation as a mere linguistic transfer for law while and Monzó-Nebot (2019) dispels "the myth of authority" in legal translation, i.e., of the alleged "authorlessness" of translations – the legal translator's status should be reassessed as actively contributing in the legal process. In the internationalized and globalized world of legal translation, the inequalities between individuals, societies and languages become highly relevant to translation and culture.

Within the framework of multiculturalism or "identitarian politics", which definitely shapes the EU, cultural translation values the alleged "uniqueness and originality of cultural formations" "either tolerantly recognizing or violently excluding each other" (Buden and Nowotny 2009: 198).

Nevertheless, multiculturalism has developed its own concept of *cultural translation*, i.e., *inter-cultural translation* to enshrine a tolerant and inclusive approach to translation and culture at the "inter-, supra- or post-national level (a sort of cosmopolitan multiculturalism)" (Burke and Hsia 2007: 201).

Indeed, legal translation has acquired far-reaching implications in the political sphere and in the social arena, thus calling for innovative interdisciplinary perspectives, and insights:

> *In the enlarged European Union, legal translation participates in the construction of new societies, having a social, cultural and political dimension. Owing to its unprecedented multilingualism, institutionality and hybridity, EU translation has challenged some central concepts of Translation Studies with its fluid and non-final source texts, concurrent drafting and translation, collective translation processes, and the replacement of source text and target texts by authentic language versions*. (Biel and Engberg 2013: 6)

Moreover, legal translation is likely to act as a mechanism for cultural preservation or transformation, for bridging gaps through capitalizing on the "solid societal knowledge of both the source and target languages" (Wagner et al. 2014: 37). In other words, legal translation as an institutionalized practice and a comparative exercise is "sensitive to the trap of cultural assimilation" and "values the otherness of foreign law" (Glanert 2014: 3) going beyond ethnocentric views while accepting diversity. Accordingly, it can be "defined and practised as cultural translation" requiring "more, negotiation and compromise" as well as revisiting "models inherited from the past beyond unitary ideologies of languages and cultures" (Martin Ruano 2018: 269).

5. Conclusion

Broadly speaking, legal translation is a specialized type of translation involving the interlingual and cross-cultural transfer of law in well-defined legal settings. The legal translator acts simultaneously as a communicator, comparatist and cultural mediator, ascertaining "the status and communicative purposes of both the original text and the translation "(Cao 2007: 12).

When embarking upon translation, the legal translator may choose between a source text-oriented approach, or a target-oriented approach based on the function of the target text in the target culture. More often than not, the source text acts as a reference point in the translation process, the translator going back and forth to clarify meaning due to the indeterminacy characterizing legal language and to the cultural differences (in relation to the legal systems).

References

Alcaraz Varo, Enrique. 2004. 'Anisomorfismo y lexicografia tecnica' in *El espanol lengua de traduccion*, no. 2, pp. 201-219 [Online]. Available: https://cvc.cervantes.es/lengua/esletra/pdf/02/021_alcaraz.pdf [accessed 2021, March 23]

Arrojo, Rosemary. 2012. 'The Relevance of Theory in Translation Studies' in Carmen Millán and Francesca Bartrina (eds.). The *Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 117-128.

Baker, Mona and Gabriela Saldanha (eds.). 2009. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. 2nd edition. London and New York: Routledge.

Bassnett, Susan and André Lefevere. 1990. *Translation, History and Culture. London*: Printer Publishers.

Bassnett, Susan. 1998. 'The Translation Turn in Cultural Studies' in Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere (eds.). *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary* Translation. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 123-140.

Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere (eds.). *Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary* Translation. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bassnett, Susan (ed.). 2003. *Studying British Cultures*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bery, Ashok. 2007. *Cultural Translation and Postcolonial Poetry*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Bestué, Carmen. 2019. 'A matter of justice: integrating comparative law methods into the decision making process in legal translation' in Lucja Biel, Jan Engberg, Rosario Martin Ruano and Vilelmini Sosoni (eds.). *Research Methods in Legal Translation and Interpreting: Crossing Methodological Boundaries*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 130-147.

Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.

Biel, Łucja and Jan Engberg. 2013. 'Research Models and Methods in Legal Translation' in *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series – Themes in Translation Studies*, no. 12, pp. 1-11.

Biel, Łucja. 2017. 'Enhancing the Communicative Dimension of Legal Translation: Comparable Corpora in the Research-Informed Classroom' in *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1750399X.2017.1359761[accessed 2021, April 23]

Biel, Łucja. 2018. 'Corpora in institutional legal translation: Small steps and the big picture' in Fernando Prieto Ramos (ed.). *Institutional Translation for International Governance. Enhancing Quality in Multilingual Legal Communication*. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 25–36.

Biel, Łucja, Engberg, Jan, Martin Ruano, M. Rosario and Vilelmini Sosoni (eds.). 2019. *Research Methods in Legal Translation and Interpreting*. London and New York: Routledge.

Borja Albi, Anabel and Fernando Prieto-Ramos (eds.). 2013. *Legal translation in context: Professional issues and prospects*. Oxford: Peter Lang.

Buden, Boris and Stefan Nowotny. 2009. 'Cultural Translation. An Introduction to the Problem' in *Translation Studies*, no. 2(2), pp. 196-219.

Burke, Peter and Ronnie Po-chia Hsia (eds.). 2007. *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cao, Deborah. 2007. *Translating Law*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Cao, Deborah. 2010. 'Legal Translation' in Gambier, Yves and Luc van Doorslaer. *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 191-195.

Cao, Deborah. 2014. 'The Trials and Tribulations of Legal Translation' in Le Cheng, King Kui Sin and Anne Wagner (eds.). *The Ashgate Handbook of Legal Translation*. Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 313-315.

Cornu, Gérard. 1990. *Linguistique juridique*. Paris : Montchrestien.

Cheng, Le, Sin. King Kui and Anne Wagner (eds.). 2014. *The Ashgate Handbook of Legal Translation*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Chesterman, Andrew and Emma Wagner. 2002. *Can Theory Help Translators? A Dialogue Between the Ivory Tower and the Wordface*. Manchester: St. Jeome Publishing.

Chesterman, Andrew. 2018. 'Translation Ethics' in Lieven D'hulst and Yves Gambier (eds.). *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge. Sources, Concepts, Effects*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 443–448.

Eco, Umberto. 1993. 'The language of Europe is translation'. Lecture given at the conference of ATLAS *Assises de la traduction littéraire* in Arles, 14 November 1993. [Online]. Available: http://www.eutrio.be/language-europe-translation [accessed 2021, April 23].

Engberg, Jan. 2002. 'Legal Meaning Assumptions – What are the Consequences for Legal Interpretation and Legal Translation?' in *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue internationale de Sémiotique*

juridique, no.15(4), pp. 375-388 [Online]. Available: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023%2FA%3A1021255513221 [accessed 2021, March 23].
Engberg, Jan. 2013. 'Comparative law for translation: The key to successful mediation between legal systems in legal translation in context' in Anabel Borja Albi and Fernando Prieto-Ramos (eds.). *Legal translation in context: Professional issues and prospects*. Oxford: Peter Lang, pp. 9–25.
Engberg, Jan. 2018. 'Comparative Law and Legal Translation as Partners in Knowledge Communication: Frames as a Descriptive Instrument' in Fernando Prieto Ramos (ed.) 2018. *Institutional Translation for International Governance*. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, pp. 37-48.
Gamal, Muhamad Y. 2009. 'Cultural translation' in Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha (eds.). *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. 2nd edition. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 67-70.
Gambier, Yves and Luc van Doorslaer. 2010. *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Gémar, Jean-Claude (dir.). 1982. *Langage du droit et traduction. Essais de jurilinguistique*, Montréal: Conseil de la langue française.
Gémar, Jean-Claude. 2003. 'Le traducteur juridique et l''asymétrie culturelle'. Langue, droit et culture' in Elena De la Fuente (ed.). *La traduction certifiée et l'interprétation judiciaire*. Paris: Fédération internationale des traducteurs, pp. 231-243.
Gémar, Jean-Claude et Nicholas Kasirer (dir.). 2005. *La jurilinguistique: entre langues et droits. Jurilinguistics: between Law and Langage*. Montréal: Thémis.
Gerver, David and H. Wallace Sinaiko (eds.). 1978. *Language, Interpretation and Communication.* Oxford: Plenum Press.
de Groot, Gerard-René. 2000. 'Translating Legal Informations' in *Jahrbuch für Juristische Hermeneutik. Übersetzung im Recht. Journal of Legal Hermeneutics. Translation in Law*. Münster, Hamburg and London: LIT, pp. 131–147.
Harding, Sue-Ann and Ovidi Carbonell Cortés (eds.). 2018. *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.
Harris, Brian and Bianca Sherwood. 1978. 'Translating as an Innate Skill' in David Gerver and H. Wallace Sinaiko *(*eds.). *Language, Interpretation and Communication.* Oxford: Plenum Press, pp. 155–170.
D'hulst, Lieven and Yves Gambier (eds.). 2018. *A History of Modern Translation Knowledge. Sources, Concepts, Effects*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Glanert, Simone. 2014. *Comparative Law: Engaging Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
Harvey, Malcom. 2002. 'What's So Special About Legal Translation?' in *Meta. Journal des traducteurs. Translators' Journal*, 47(2), pp. 177-185 [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.7202/008007ar [accessed 2021, April 23].
Hickey, Leo. 1998. 'Perlocutionary Equivalence: Marking, Exegesis and Recontextualisation' in Leo Hickey (ed.). *The Pragmatics of Translation*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters, pp. 217–232.
Hickey, Leo (ed.). *The Pragmatics of Translation*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
House, Julian. 1997. *Translation Quality Assessment. A Model Revisited*. Tubingen: Gunther Narr.
Hsieh, Hungpin Pierre. 2018. *Crossing language lines and legal tradition lines - legal translation as an economic phenomenon. PhD Thesis*, University College Cork [Online]. Available: https://cora.ucc.ie/bitstream/handle/10468/7157/HsiehHP_PhD2018.pdf?isAllowed=y&sequence=4 [accessed 2021, February 17].
Károly, Adrienn. 2012. 'Translation competence and translation performance: Lexical, syntactic and textual patterns in student translations of a specialized EU genre' in *English for Specific Purposes*, no. 31, pp. 36–46
Lefevere, André. 1992. *Translation. History*. *Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.
Lefevere, André. 2004. *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
Martín Ruano, Rosario. 2014. 'From Suspicion to Collaboration: Defining New Epistemologies of Reflexive Practice for Legal Translation and Interpreting' in *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, no. 22, pp. 1-15, https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.653.6767&rep=rep1&type=pdf.
Martínez-Gómez, Aída. 2015. 'Bibliometrics as a Tool to Map Uncharted Territory: A Study on Non-Professional Interpreting' in *Perspectives*, no. 23(2), pp. 205–222.
Millán, Carmen and Francesca Bartrina (eds.). The *Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*. London and New York**:** Routledge.
Monjean-Decaudin, Sylvie and Joëlle Popineau-Lauvray. 2019. *How to apply comparative law to legal translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
Monzó-Nebot, Esther. 2018. 'Translation and Culture in Legal Settings and Institutions' in Sue-Ann Harding and Ovidi Carbonell Cortés (eds.). *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Culture*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 463-482.
Monzó-Nebot, Esther. 2019. 'Interviewing legal interpreters and translators. Framing status perceptions and interactional and structural power' in Łucja Biel, Jan Engberg, M. Rosario Martin Ruano and Vilelmini Sosoni (eds.). 2019. *Research Methods in Legal Translation and Interpreting*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 187-211.
Monzó-Nebot, Esther and Javier Moreno-Rivero. 2020. 'Jurilinguistics: Ways Forward beyond Law, Translation, and Discourse' in *Int J Semiot Law*, no. 33, pp. 253-262 [Online]. Available: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs11196-020-09721-w [accessed 2021, March 17].

Prieto Ramos, Fernando. 2014. 'Legal Translation Studies as Interdiscipline: Scope and Evolution' in *Meta: Translators' Journal*, no. 59(2), pp. 260-277. doi:10.7202/1027475ar.
Prieto Ramos, Fernando (ed.) 2018. *Institutional Translation for International Governance*. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
Šarčević, Susan. 2000. 'Legal Translation and Translation Theory: a Receiver-oriented Approach' in *Legal translation: History, Theory/Ies and Practice. International Colloquium University of Geneva* [proceedings]. Berne [Online]. Available: https://www.tradulex.com/Actes2000/sarcevic.pdf [accessed 2021, March 23].
Šarčević, Susan (ed.). 2015. *Language and Culture in EU Law*. *Multidisciplinary Perspectives*. Farnham: Ashgate.
Shuttleworth, Mark and Moira Cowie. 1997. *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
Sin, King Kui. 2013. 'Out of the Fly-Bottle: Conceptual Confusions in Multilingual Legislation' in *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law*, no. 26(4), pp. 927–951 [Online]. Available: doi: 10.1007/s11196-013-9313-1 [accessed 2021, April 23].
Snell-Hornby. Mary. 1988. *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Tosi, Arturo (ed.). 2003. *Crossing Barriers and Bridging Cultures: the Challenges of Multilingual Translation for the European Union*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
Toury, Gideon. 1980. 'The Translator as a Nonconformist-to-be, or: How to Train Translators so as to Violate Translational Norms' in *Angewandte Übersetzungswissenschaft: Internationales Übersetzungswissenschaftliches Kolloquium an der Wirtschaftsuniversität Ärhus, Dänemark.* Aarhus: Wirtschaftsuniversität Ärhus, pp. 180–194.
Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
Venuti, Lawrence. 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
Venuti, Lawrence. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London and New York: Routledge.
Vlasenko, Svetlana. 2014. 'Minimal Unit of Legal Translation vs. Minimal Unit of Thought' in Le Cheng, King Kui Sin and Anne Wagner (eds.). *The Ashgate Handbook of Legal Translation*. Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 89-120.
Wagner, Anne, Sin, King Kui and Le Cheng. 2014. 'Cultural Transfer and Conceptualization in Legal Discourse' in Le Chen, King Kui Sin and Anne Wagner (eds.) *The Ashgate Handbook of Legal Translation*. Farnham: Ashgate, pp. 27–42.
Websites
https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/default/files/annual-activity-report-2020-translation_en.pdf [accessed 2021, February 17].
https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/default/files/emt_competence_fwk_2017_en_web.pdf [accessed 2021, February 17].

Notes on the authors

Titela VILCEANU PhD, phil. hab., Director of the *Translatio* Centre for Translation, is Professor at Faculty of Letters, University of Craiova. Her main research interests lie in in translation studies, pragmatics and intercultural communication. She is President of the Romanian Society for English and American Studies (RSEAS) and board member of the European Society for the Study of English (ESSE). She is a member in the editorial board of *The Scientific Bulletin of the Politehnica University of Timişoara – Transactions of Modern Languages*, a reviewer with *Swedish Journal of Romanian Studies*, University of Lund, Sweden, a member of the Scientific Council of Universitaria and Prouniversitaria publishing houses, and head of the *Translation, Terminology and Corpus Analysis (CoTraT)* research laboratory. E-mail: elavilceanu@yahoo.com

Maria Georgiana STOENICĂ, doctoral student, "Alexandru Piru" Doctoral School, University of Craiova. Her main research interests lie in legal English, legal translation, cultural translation and intercultural communication. Her PhD thesis topic is *Legal English and Cultural Translation*, she has authored several papers focusing on legal English, legal translation and interdisciplinary landscapes, and she has participated in national and international conferences. She is affiliated with the Romanian Society for English and American Studies (RSEAS) and with the European Society for the Study of English (ESSE). E-mail: smariageorgiana@hotmail.com