

Research Article

Mihaela Cozma*

Source and target factors affecting the translation of the EU law: Implications for translator training

<https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2022-0266>

received June 30, 2023; accepted November 17, 2023

Abstract: By virtue of its very nature, the process of translating European legislation presents certain particularities that any translator working in this domain must be aware of. These particularities are mainly related to the manner in which the EU law is drafted, to the categories of people representing its intended audience, and to what is understood by the concept of equivalence. All these aspects determine an interesting interplay between the source and the target factors influencing the process of translating the EU law. Which are the source factors, on the one hand, and the target factors, on the other, that facilitate the creation of a good translation in this field? Which are the implications that the particularities of the process of translating EU legal texts have for the process of translator training? The article will offer some answers in this respect, relying on both theoretical information and qualitative research data relevant for the translation from English into Romanian.

Keywords: European legislation, source text, target audience, translator training

1 Introduction

Multilingualism, which is regarded as “a powerful symbol of the European Union’s (EU) aspiration to be united in diversity” (European Education Area, n.d.), represents one of the policies that ensure the good functioning of this entity. In fact, the multilingual character of the EU and its institutions is supported legally by Regulation 1 determining the languages to be used by the European Economic Community and by the amendments made whenever a new state joins the Union. According to this Regulation, the languages of all the Member States are official languages, and the documents of general application must be drafted in all the Union’s official languages. This means that the attainment of the EU’s goals depends to a large extent on the activity of translating a wide range of documents from one of the Union’s procedural languages (English, French, and German) into the languages of all the Member States. A report published by the European Commission at the beginning of 2023 is relevant for the volume of work carried out by the Directorate-General for Translation (DGT), a translation service with a staff of around 2,000, 70% of which is represented by translators, language technology experts, quality experts, terminologists, and revisers. DGT ensures the translation of more than 2.5 million pages a year, 2,355,021 of these pages having English as a source language. It is also worth noting that more than half of DGT’s work (54%) is represented by legislative documents (European Commission 2023).

Given the considerable volume of translation activity involving EU legal texts, as well as the essential role played by this category of texts for the good functioning of the Union as a whole, it is obvious that the familiarization of the students with the specific features and the difficulties presented by the translation of

* **Corresponding author: Mihaela Cozma**, Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, West University of Timișoara, Timisoara, 300223, Romania, e-mail: mihaela.cozma@e-uvt.ro

the EU legislation is a useful component of any academic programme devoted to training future translators. I have dealt with this specialized domain in my activity as a translator trainer over the last decade as part of a course addressed to the first-year students in the MA of Theory and Practice of Translation organized by the West University of Timișoara. Before providing my students with any training in this respect, I usually confront them with an EU legislative text in its bilingual (English and Romanian) variant, and I ask them to identify, in a relatively spontaneous manner, the potential problems that such texts may pose to the translator working in this field. Most frequently, the answers they offer make reference to possible comprehension problems related to the particular structure of these texts, to the fact that they are full of repetitions, that they contain numerous words and word combinations which do not occur in the normal language use, or that the Romanian variants of the texts sometimes display solutions whose justification they do not understand. My students' reactions after the initial contact with the EU law are justifiable, because the texts in this category do present a range of structural and linguistic particularities, and the process of rendering them into another language is influenced by an interesting interplay between a series of source and target factors that any translator working in this field must be aware of. It can be rightly assumed that, if translation students are familiarized with these factors, they will be likely to produce good translations in this field; however, in practice, things are more complicated, because, in the case of the EU legislation, translation theory challenges basic concepts like source text (ST) or target text (TT). In what follows, I will discuss the particularities of the process of translating EU legal texts, pointing to the implications that these particularities have for the process of translator training.

2 What is special about the translation of the EU legislation?

In spite of the fact that it deals with legislative texts, the translation of the EU legislation occupies a distinct position in the context of the legal translation in general, and this happens for various reasons. First of all, it is the very nature of the EU law, which clearly differentiates it from the national legislation: European legislation represents a legal system which, in 1963, was described as “a new legal order of international law for the benefit of which the states have limited their sovereign rights, albeit within limited fields, and the subjects of which comprise not only the Member States but also their nationals” (Judgment of the Court of 5 February 1963, paragraph 3). Moreover, being at the confluence of a variety of languages and national legal systems, European law is regarded as a mixed jurisdiction (Cao 2007, 25) or as a hybrid legal system (Biel 2014, 337, Čavoški 2017, 59). The specific nature of the EU legislation, in conjunction with the multilingualism characteristic of its context of use, will obviously influence the EU language, which can also be described as being hybrid, since it presents “a constant interplay between the supranational and national elements in translation” (Biel 2014, 337).

In close connection to these particularities, the translation of European legislation can be defined as “a category in its own right” (Biel 2014, 335), as it questions some concepts of central importance in translation studies, such as ST, TT, or equivalence. As Biel explains, this type of legislation is drafted in one of the procedural languages, it undergoes several negotiations and revisions, and it is possible that the process of its translation into the other official languages may have to start even before it reaches its final variant. In this context, the concepts of ST and TT are frequently replaced by that of the language version, and the idea of equivalence is presumed to exist not in relation to a single ST, but between all the language versions of a certain legal document (Biel 2014, 336). These arguments are in line with Article 55 of the Treaty on EU, which stipulates that the texts in each of the languages spoken in the Union's member states are equally authentic and, thus, excludes the source–target dichotomy. Referring to this aspect, Seracini (2020, 19) explains that the avoidance of the word ‘translation’ is meant to prevent “any possible suggestion that the ST is predominant compared to the TTs, thus reinforcing the concept that the texts in the different languages have equal legal force”.

I do not fully agree with the idea that some of the terms that lie at the very heart of the theory of translation are not valid when it comes to the translation of the EU legislative texts. It is true that the process

of rendering EU legal documents from the language in which they are drafted to all the other official languages does have some distinctive characteristics, but it still is a process of translation. This fact is acknowledged by various documents available on the official sites of the EU, such as the Interinstitutional Style Guide (Publications Office of the European Union 2022) or the English Style Guide (European Commission 2023), in which we encounter the terms ‘translation’, ‘translator’, ‘source text’, and ‘target text’. Moreover, Translation Quality Guidelines, a document published in 2015 by the European Commission (2015, 2), emphasizes the essential role played by translation for the functioning of the Union and states that, since all the official language versions of the EU law have the same formal status, “the existing Commission drafting guidelines are not only relevant for the drafters of the original texts but also for the translators and revisers”.

In view of all these aspects, I consider that, for practical purposes, such as translation research or translator training, the process of translating EU law should be approached in terms of the traditional source–target distinction, even if the syntagm ‘linguistic variant’ can also be used. In spite of the fact that any of the three procedural languages of the EU can represent the source, translator training can focus on one of them as the language of the ST and then proceed to an analysis of the linguistic features presented by this type of text, with a view to highlighting the potential problems with which the translators of such texts might be faced. The following section will offer an illustration of the manner in which the process of translating EU legislative texts from English into Romanian can be approached for training purposes.

3 EU law in the context of translator training

The manner of dealing with the EU legislation in the context of translator training is influenced by the fact acknowledged earlier, namely that the texts in this category – both as originals and as translated variants – present some special features that should be taken into account by the translators of this field, no matter at which stage of the drafting process they join in. Consequently, in order to familiarize students with the process of translating EU legislation from English into Romanian, the translator trainer is supposed to guide them towards a thorough understanding of the features displayed by the original texts and the source context and, then, to help them become aware of the criteria that they must take into account in order to appropriately transfer these texts in the context of the target culture. A very useful method in this respect is that of genre analysis for translation purposes, because, by becoming aware of the norms governing the EU legal texts written in English, on the one hand, and the norms that should govern the Romanian translations of these texts, on the other, the students are likely to produce TTs that are not only correct, but also functional.

My research activity has already focused on some of the benefits presented by the use of genre analysis for didactic purposes – both in the case of foreign language teaching (e.g. Cozma 2014) and in that of translator training (e.g. Cozma 2012). Basically, there are two important elements of the genre analysis that can be exploited in the teaching context with a view to familiarizing students with particularities of a different culture: the sociocultural situation which normally imposes the use of the genre texts, and the macro and microstructural conventions which determine the linguistic format of the respective texts. I consider that these aspects also determine the general directions that genre training is supposed to follow if the teacher intends to develop the future translators’ awareness of the specific features of these documents. More exactly, based on the contributions made by Bhatia (2004), on the one hand, and by Borja et al. (2009), on the other, I devised a model of training future translators in the field of the EU law that involves the following stages:

3.1 Sociocultural considerations

The production of an appropriate translation depends on a good understanding of the socio-cultural context in which that genre text is normally used in the source context, as well as on a parallel with the situation in which its translated variant is supposed to function. The situational considerations should regard details about the ST

production, the intended original audience and the extent to which it resembles the addressees of the TT, the purpose of that text as a representative of its genre, as well as existing sub-genres.

When the teaching process is focussed on the translation of the EU legislation from English into Romanian, students must be made aware of the special features presented by the context in which this type of legislative document is produced and is used. Thus, they should understand that the communicative purpose of the EU law is similar to that of any national legislation, in the sense that it is meant to impose obligations and confer rights, but, additionally, it has the function of achieving European unification and of creating a new legal order. The process of creating the STs in this category has also some special characteristics, since the preparation and the adoption of the European legislation involve a wide range of institutions and individuals, and the texts themselves are written by people who are not necessarily native speakers of the Union's procedural languages (English, French, and German). Moreover, the recipients of legislation do not represent a homogeneous category, as they include people of various nationalities, both members of the legal community who use such texts as part of their daily work routine, and ordinary people to whom the texts are basically addressed. It is important to stress that the addressees of the Romanian EU texts do not differ from the addressees of the original texts. All these considerations contribute to a better understanding of the genre texts and account for the linguistic format they display.

3.2 Organizational structure

Since producers of texts in a particular genre tend to be consistent in the way they structure the overall message, the segments making up those texts, as well as the function served by each segment, represent essential aspects of the genre conventions that must be identified and discussed in the translation class. Familiarization with the macrostructural features of the genre in which they are working contributes to the students' logical comprehension of the material to be translated. But the syntagm 'EU law' covers a wide range of documents which present slight differences due to the particular contexts of use, and therefore, translator trainers need to be clear about the sub-genre in focus at a particular moment. For instance, the documents which, according to Article 288 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU, represent 'legal acts' (regulations, directives, decisions, recommendations, and opinions, as well as delegated and implementing acts), are characterized by the following organizational structure: Title, Preamble (Opening text, Citations, Recitals and Enacting formula), Enacting terms, Concluding formulas and Annexes (the Interinstitutional Style Guide 2022, 33–40, the English Style Guide 2016/2023, 86–8). Moreover, as I will explain later, the typology of linguistic features specific to a genre is greatly influenced by the function of the text segment in which these features are used.

3.3 Pragmatic approach to the linguistic features

Before actually dealing with the challenges that the linguistic features specific to a certain category of texts might present in the transfer from a source to a target language, trainee translators should understand the presence of certain linguistic forms (e.g. the repetition of some lexical items, the use of specific verbal constructions, the preference for a certain type of vocabulary, etc.) from a pragmatic point of view. The pragmatic perspective is useful for translators because it goes beyond the study of words or grammatical structures and focuses on higher units of the text, taking into account the context, the intention of the speaker, and various implicit elements that must be accessed by the addressee. In other words, in the context of pragmatics, language is explored in close connection to the uses to which it is put. Awareness of the mechanisms by which speech acts or the cohesive devices structure the discourse specific to this category of documents is essential for the translator both at the stage of ST comprehension and at that of TT production.

3.4 Lexico-grammatical features

All the stages described so far are meant to prepare the ground for the examination of the lexico-grammatical features displayed by the EU texts written in English. In the case of this type of convention, students are familiarized with the following levels of linguistic description: general vocabulary (e.g. neologisms and formal/informal), terminology, word combinations (e.g. collocations, idioms, and specific expressions), sentence structure and complexity, specific features of the nominal and the verbal phrases (e.g. formal or informal neologisms), as well as other semantic and grammatical particularities. Decisions about the manner of dealing with these linguistic features in the process of translation must be based on some research involving, among others, parallel texts (both legal texts originally written in Romanian, and EU legislation already translated into our language), glossaries of terms and other helpful documents available on the official sites of the EU, or even information from specialists of the field.

The model of genre analysis for translation purposes described in this section is supposed to offer trainees some basic knowledge and skills that are necessary for the production of Romanian EU legal texts which are not only linguistically correct but also functional in the target context. It is important to note that, by acquiring these skills, students also become aware of the source and the target factors influencing the creation of a good translation in this field. Research evidence meant to illustrate these factors is provided in what follows.

4 Source and target factors in the translation of the EU law: research evidence based on the transfer from English to Romanian

The methodological suggestions offered in the previous section will be illustrated with findings generated by the qualitative analysis of a bilingual corpus containing 30 EU ‘legal acts’ (the Treaty on the Functioning of the EU) written in English and their Romanian translations. All these texts, collected from EUR-Lex, were issued in the period 2018–2022 and represent part of the teaching material that I have used in the last 5 years during my course devoted to the translation of the EU legislation. Reference to the EU documents is made by means of the CELEX number (e.g. 32019D1570, 32022R1917), which is a combination of symbols denoting the sector to which the document belongs, the year in which the document was adopted, the type of document (represented by a letter), and the number of the document, represented by the last four figures. The complete list of the documents used in my research study is given at the end of the article. The results of the analysis performed on these texts from pragmatic, lexical, and grammatical perspectives are presented below.

4.1 The pragmatic perspective

The approach of the linguistic features of the EU legal texts from a pragmatic perspective reveals that the functional values assumed by the EU texts written in English have generally been transferred at the level of their Romanian translations, a characteristic that should come as no surprise in the case of a genre which aims at achieving the same communicative purpose, irrespective of the language in which it is realized. In other words, the main features presented by the cohesive devices and the speech acts displayed by the Romanian variants of these documents are greatly influenced by their English sources.

Thus, the Romanian texts illustrating this genre preserve the speech act typology of the original English documents, but the two linguistic variants of the texts differ, of course, with regard to the linguistic devices indicating these acts. The most interesting case in this respect is that of the Romanian commands, whose illocutionary force indicators are represented by verbs in the present tense of the Indicative Mood, the third-person singular, while their English counterparts are signalled by modal constructions built with the help of

mandatory *shall*: e.g. “Contracting Parties *shall decide* on the appropriate time...”/“părțile contractante *decid* cu privire la momentul adecvat” (32020D0143). This aspect will be discussed in more detail in the section devoted to the grammatical features of the EU law (4.3).

Additionally, influenced by their sources, the Romanian EU documents in my corpus show a marked preference for cohesion achieved by means of lexical reiteration, to the detriment of the anaphorical pronouns. In other words, pronouns are avoided as much as possible, and nouns are repeated in order to avoid any ambiguity: e.g. “The competent *Eurosystem central bank* shall provide to the reporting agent the written notification ... after the serious misconduct first became known to that *Eurosystem central bank*. Where there is an alleged infringement of daily reporting requirements, the competent *Eurosystem central bank* shall provide such notice [...]”/“*Banca centrală* competentă din *Eurosistem* transmite agentului raportor notificarea scrisă ... după ce respectiva *bancă centrală din Eurosistem* a luat cunoștință pentru prima dată de abaterea gravă. În cazul în care există o pretinsă încălcare a cerințelor de raportare zilnică, *banca centrală* competentă din *Eurosistem* transmite o astfel de notificare.” (32022R1917). Even in situations when the English original documents use pronouns, the Romanian translator sometimes prefers to resort to the lexical device of reiteration, a strategy which is clearly meant to avoid any ambiguity at the level of the translated text: e.g. “Where *the controller* restricts, wholly or partially, the right of access..., *it* shall ... inform the data subject concerned [...]”/“În cazul în care *operatorul* restricționează, complet sau parțial, dreptul de acces..., *operatorul* informează persoana vizată [...]” (32022D2359).

4.2 Lexical choice

Under the influence of their sources, the Romanian EU texts are characterized by a high proportion of lexical items with a formal character, mostly neologisms which have a rather abstract meaning and which may sometimes create difficulties of comprehension on the part of the non-specialist audience. These lexical items are not problematic in translation, since the Romanian translators have at their disposal equivalents that produce a similar effect and that sometimes even have the same Romance etymons as the English ones: e.g. *applicable/aplicabil*, *to confer/a conferi*, *to consolidate/a consolida*, *discretionary/discreționar*, *dissemination/diseminare*, *institution/instituție*, *to notify/a notifica*, *onerous/oneros*, *procedure/procedură*, *proportionate/proportional*, *to validate/a valida*, etc.

Another category of general lexical items which is very well represented both in the English EU texts and in their Romanian counterparts is that of the function words, among which a special place is occupied by the linking devices. There is a tendency among the Romanian translators of such texts to render the English simple prepositions and conjunctions by means of Romanian preposition and conjunction phrases, thus increasing the level of explicitness in the TT: e.g. “*where* the supplier has been authorised for this purpose”/“*în cazul în care* furnizorul deține o autorizație în acest sens” (32018L1028); “*under* Article 5(1) and (2) of Regulation (EU) No 1163/2014 (ECB/2014/41)”/“*în conformitate cu* articolul 5 alineatele (1) și (2) din Regulamentul (UE) nr. 1163/2014 (BCE/2014/41)” (32022D0514). This is clearly an influence from the target context, where the same tendency was noticed by the researchers of the Romanian legal discourse (e.g. Stoichițoiu-Ichim 2001) and was put in relation to the necessity of making the legal provision clear and unambiguous.

EU texts, just like texts from any other specialized field, include a wide range of terms and collocations denoting realities specific to the Union. Since, before the accession process, our country had not had any previous experience with such realities, it is obvious that the EU – specific terms and collocations – started being used in our language as a result of the translation process, under the influence of the STs. However, it must be stressed that, once they have been accepted as official equivalents for the ST ones, these terms and phrases have to be used consistently by all the Romanian translators working in this field: e.g. *the Council of the European Union/Consiliul Uniunii Europene*, *Treaty on European Union/Tratatul privind Uniunea Europeană*, *third country/țară terță*, *Community rules/norme comunitare*, etc.

The presence of a series of standardized expressions is also a general feature of the legal discourse. In most of the cases, the TT solutions for these expressions are determined by the normative documents

originally written in Romanian: e.g. *fără a aduce atingere* (for the English *without prejudice to*), *a intra în vigoare* (for the English *to entry into force*), *(care) intră sub incidența* (for the English *within the scope or covered by*), etc. A special position among the standardized expressions displayed by the Romanian texts that I analysed is occupied by the constructions based on inversion at the level of the noun phrase, a feature that, as Stoichițoiu-Ichim (2001) notes, was identified in the Romanian legal texts as early as in the eighteenth century and that represents a proof of the stereotypical and conservative character of the legal discourse: e.g. *bună credință* (for the English *good faith*), *depline puteri* (for the English *full powers*), *prezentul regulament* (for the English *this Regulation*), etc.

4.3 Grammatical features

The Romanian documents in my corpus have taken over many of the grammatical features presented by their English originals, but, at the same time, they reveal certain particularities that can be explained by other types of influences, such as the differences between the two language systems involved in the process of translation, or the influence exerted by the norms of the legal-administrative documents originally written in Romanian.

Syntactic complexity is clearly a feature displayed by both the English texts in my corpus and their Romanian translations. However, in the English EU documents, this complexity is manifested mainly at the levels of the clause and of the phrase, while in their Romanian translations, it is also quite richly present at the level of the sentence. This happens because, quite often, the Romanian translator renders various types of English non-finite structures by means of finite clauses which have the status of sentence constituents: e.g. “Most Council Decisions *establishing* the Union’s position within RFMOs [...]”/“Majoritatea deciziilor Consiliului, *care stabilesc* poziția Uniunii în cadrul ORGP-urilor [...]” (32019D1570); “The existential threat *posed by* climate change requires enhanced ambition [...]”/“Amenințarea existențială *pe care o prezintă* schimbările climatice impune un nivel de ambiție mai mare [...]” (32021R1119).

Syntactic discontinuities represent a phenomenon that researchers have often associated with the legal discourse (for instance, Crystal and Davy 1969 for the English legal discourse or Stoichițoiu-Ichim 2001 for the Romanian one). In most cases, the Romanian translators of EU law preserve the discontinuities presented by the English sources of these texts. However, sometimes, the target variant displays a slightly different syntactic makeup, either because of the differences between the ST and the TT structures (e.g. “this Eurosystem central bank *shall promptly notify* the authorised ECB personnel”/“această bancă centrală din Eurosistem *informează prompt* personalul autorizat al BCE” – 32018O0014) or for the sake of greater clarity and naturalness of the Romanian translation (e.g. “*The Paris Agreement, inter alia, sets out a long-term goal* [...]”/“*Printre altele, Acordul de la Paris stabilește un obiectiv pe termen lung* [...]” – 32018R0841).

The highly nominal character generally displayed by the language of the legislative writing (Crystal and Davy 1969, Bhatia 1993, Stoichițoiu-Ichim 2001) is also one of the features revealed by the English and the Romanian EU texts. Thus, the texts in my corpus present complex nominal phrases with many of the modifiers being expressed by nouns: e.g. “the conditions for the application of the relevant provisions of the Schengen acquis in Ireland in that area”/“condițiile de aplicare a dispozițiilor relevante din acquis-ul Schengen în Irlanda în domeniul respectiv” (32020D1745); “the data collection for the use of information and communication technologies domain”/“colectarea de date pentru domeniul utilizării tehnologiilor informației și comunicațiilor se realizează” (32021R1223). The Romanian variants of the EU documents make use of even more nouns than their English counterparts, because the translator resorts to this type of solution not only for ST elements with the same morphological status but also for some non-finite forms of the verbs: e.g. “Such mechanisms should allow disputes *to be settled* impartially”/“Astfel de mecanisme ar trebui să permită *soluționarea* litigiilor în mod imparțial” (32019L0790); “Decision (EU) 2022/2522 ... *amending* Decision (EU) 2021/2255 on the approval of the volume of coin issuance in 2022”/“Decizia (UE) 2022/2522 ... *de modificare* a Deciziei (UE) 2021/2255 privind aprobarea volumului emisiunii de monede metalice în 2022” (32022D2522). This feature represents an influence from the target side, since, in the Romanian legal discourse, the phenomenon of nominalization is characterized by “a variety of forms and high productivity” (Stoichițoiu-Ichim 2001, 174, my translation).

The syntactic patterns used in order to render the obligatory character of the law in the English EU documents, on the one hand, and in their Romanian translations, on the other, represent an important point of difference between the two linguistic variants under analysis. As already pointed out in Section 4.1, the English modal constructions built with the help of mandatory *shall* are paralleled by Romanian verbs in the Present Tense of the Indicative mood: e.g. “The relevant NCB *shall remunerate* holdings of minimum reserves [...]”/“BCN relevantă *remunerează* rezervele minime obligatorii [...]” (32022R2419), “the provisions of that Article *shall apply* only until 31 December 2019/“dispozițiile articolului respectiv *se aplică* numai până la 31 decembrie 2019” (32019R1692). The presence of the verbs in the Indicative mood in the translated variants is clearly an influence of the target factor, since this is the form traditionally used in the legal documents originally written in Romanian.

The differences between the grammatical norms of the original EU texts and those of their translations represent some of the reasons why, overall, the English documents are characterized by a more condensed and synthetic type of expression, while their Romanian counterparts are more elaborate and more explicit.

4.4 Discussion of findings

The results of the analysis regarding the English and the Romanian EU legal texts in my corpus support the idea expressed at the beginning of this article, namely that the process of rendering EU legislation into another language is influenced by an interesting interplay between a variety of source and target factors that the (future) translators of the field must know and understand. The most important factors revealed by my research study are briefly discussed below.

In the case of the influence exerted by the source factors, it must be mentioned, first of all, that the pragmatic features revealed by the Romanian texts are generally formed under the close influence of the English originals. Since all the linguistic variants of the EU documents are realizations of one and the same genre, and, consequently, are meant to achieve a similar communicative purpose, it is not surprising that the Romanian texts illustrating this genre preserve the speech act typology of their English sources and that, in both these sets of texts, the preferred cohesive device is the lexical reiteration. The English STs are also responsible for the high proportion of neologisms with a rather abstract meaning displayed by the Romanian EU documents, neologisms which, as illustrated earlier, sometimes even have the same Romance etymons as their English sources. The third source influence mentioned here refers to the fact that the process of translating EU legal texts from English (as well as from German and French) enriched the Romanian legal-administrative language with a wide range of terms specific to the EU.

As regards the target factors, a very important role is played by the standardized expressions, which, represented either by constructions with a reversed word order (*prezenta decizie, bune practici, libera circulație*, etc.) or by other phrases with a formulaic character (*a aduce atingere, a intra în vigoare*, etc.), are considered to be one of the stylistic marks of the legal texts originally written in Romanian (Stoichițoiu-Ichim 2001). In the early 2000s, when the European legislation started to be translated into our language, such standardized expressions were used as models by the first Romanian translators of this category of texts and thus contributed to the integration of the Romanian EU legal texts within our national legislation. Another target influence is represented by the tendency of the Romanian translators of EU legislation to use numerous prepositions and conjunction phrases, even when the English sources reveal simple linking devices. The preference for the use of complex structures as linking elements is based on the belief that they render the syntactic relationships between the various grammatical constituents with more precision and that they are also an expression of the elevated style generally associated with the legal texts. The use of more nouns in the Romanian EU texts in comparison to their English counterparts is also determined by the normative documents originally written in Romanian, where, as pointed out earlier, the phenomenon of nominalization is very productive. Finally, the use of verbs in the Present Tense of the Indicative mood in order to render the obligatory character of the law is not at all determined by the formal features revealed by the corresponding

original structures (the English verb phrases built with the modal *shall* followed by a verb in the infinitive), but is determined by the norms that the Romanian legislation has in this respect.

5 Conclusions

The evidence of both theoretical and practical nature provided in this article supports the idea that the translation of the EU law does indeed present some particularities connected, on the one hand, to the specific features of the context in which the STs are produced and, on the other, to the variety of factors influencing the linguistic format of the translated variants. It is these particularities that should represent the focus of the training provided to the future translators of this field, as they are expected to produce texts with a double direction of integration: within the system of the Romanian normative documents, as well as within the multilingual bulk of texts making up the European legislation.

Funding information: The author states no funding is involved.

Conflict of interest: The author states no conflict of interest.

Data availability statement: All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article.

References

- Bhatia, Vijay Kumar. 2004. *Worlds of written discourse*. London: Continuum.
- Bhatia, Vijay Kumar. 1993. *Analyzing genre: Language use in professional settings*. London: Longman.
- Biel, Lucja. 2014. "The textual fit of translated EU law: A corpus-based study of deontic modality." *The Translator* 20(3), 332–55. doi: 10.1080/13556509.2014.909675 (03.03.2023).
- Borja, Anabel, Isabel García Izquierdo, and Vicent Montalt. 2009. "Research methodology in specialized genres for translation purposes." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 3(1), 57–77. doi: 10.1080/1750399X.2009.10798781 (19.04.2023).
- Cao, Deborah. 2007. *Translating law*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Čavoški, Aleksandra. 2017. "Interaction of law and language in the EU: Challenges of translating in multilingual environment." *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 27, 58–74. https://jostrans.org/issue27/art_cavoski.pdf (03.03.2023).
- Cozma, Mihaela. 2012. "Developing the translator's cultural competence through genre analysis." In *ESSE: English Studies in Albania 2*, edited by Armela Panajoti, p. 81–91. Tirane: Mirgeeralb.
- Cozma, Mihaela. 2014. "The concept of genre in the English language class: implications for the students' intercultural competence." In *Romanian Journal of English Studies 11*, edited by Luminița Frențiu, p. 36–47. Berlin: Versita de Gruyter. <http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/rjes.2014.11.issue-1/issue-files/rjes.2014.11.issue-1.xml>.
- Crystal, David and Derek Davy. 1969. *Investigating English style*. London: Longman.
- EUR-Lex: Access to European Union law. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/homepage.html> (05.05.2023).
- European Education Area. n.d. *About multilingualism policy*. <https://education.ec.europa.eu/focus-topics/improving-quality/multilingualism/about-multilingualism-policy> (19.04.2023).
- European Commission, Directorate-General for Translation. 2023. *Translation in figures 2023*. <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2782/438164> (19.04.2023).
- European Commission. 2016, 2023. *English Style Guide: A handbook for authors and translators in the European Commission*. https://commission.europa.eu/document/download/c45f5b70-2d0e-4da7-b181-b5fe3a16c4bb_en (19.04.2023).
- European Commission, Directorate-General for Translation. 2015. *Translation Quality Guidelines*. https://ec.europa.eu/translation/maltese/guidelines/documents/dgt_translation_quality_guidelines_en.pdf (25.04.2023).
- Judgment of the Court of 5 February 1963 (61962CJ0026). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:61962CJ0026> (10.03.2023).
- Publications Office of the European Union. 2022. *Interinstitutional style guide*. <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2830/215072> (19.04.2023).
- Regulation No 1 determining the languages to be used by the European Economic Community (31958R0001). [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/1958/1\(1\)/oj](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/1958/1(1)/oj) (10.03.2023).

- Seracini, Francesca Luisa. 2020. *The Translation of European Union Legislation: A Corpus-based Study of Norms and Modality*. Milano: LED.
- Stoichițoiu-Ichim, Adriana. 2001. *Semiotica discursului juridic*. București: Editura Universității București.
- The Treaty on European Union – consolidated version (12012M/TXT). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex%3A12012M%2FTXT> (14.03.2023).
- Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union – consolidated version (12012E/TXT). https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/treaty/tfeu_2012/oj (14.03.2023).

Appendix: List of EU texts making up the corpus

1. 2018D0051: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32018D0051&qid=1699379788397>
2. 32018D0402: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32018D0402&qid=1699379839406>
3. 32018L1028: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32018L1028&qid=1699379870136>
4. 32018O0014: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32018O0014&qid=1699379908946>
5. 32018R0841: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32018R0841&qid=1699379944607>
6. 32018R0673: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32018R0673&qid=1699380266924>
7. 32019D0129(03): <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32019D0129%2803%29&qid=1699380308885>
8. 32019D1570: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32019D1570&qid=1699380349303>
9. 32019D1938: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32019D1938&qid=1699380388928>
10. 32019H0429(01): <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32019H0429%2801%29&qid=1699380430905>
11. 32019L0790: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32019L0790&qid=1699380467196>
12. 32019R1692: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32019R1692&qid=1699380672589>
13. 32020D0143: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32020D0143&qid=1699380705615>
14. 32020D1745: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32020D1745&qid=1699380743911>
15. 32020R0776: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32020R0776&qid=1699380786955>
16. 32020R0910: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32020R0910&qid=1699380840793>
17. 32020R1812: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32020R1812&qid=1699380873013>
18. 32021D2243: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32021D2243&qid=1699380904914>
19. 32021L1233: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32021L1233&qid=1699380945543>
20. 32021L1883: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32021L1883&qid=1699380980013>
21. 32021R1119: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32021R1119&qid=1699381016289>
22. 32021R1223: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32021R1223&qid=1699381047941>
23. 32021R2090: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32021R2090&qid=1699380629997>
24. 32022D0514: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32022D0514&qid=1699380588508>

25. 32022D2359: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32022D2359&qid=1699380549041>
26. 32022D2522: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32022D2522&qid=1699380515529>
27. 32022L2464: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32022L2464&qid=1699379558681>
28. 32022R1917: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32022R1917&qid=1699380029075>
29. 32022R2253: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32022R2253&qid=1699379714390>
30. 32022R2419: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN-RO/TXT/?from=EN&uri=CELEX%3A32022R2419&qid=1699379995053>