

OVIDIUS UNIVERSITY CONSTANTA  
Doctoral School of Humanities

**DOCTORAL THESIS**

**DIFFICULTIES IN TRANSLATING THE  
JURIDICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE LANGUAGE.  
THE LAW OF THE EUROPEAN UNION**

Scientific coordinator:

Prof. univ. Dr. Domnița Tomescu

Candidate:

Iancu (Matei) Adela Cornelia

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
1.1. Objectives of the paper.....	4
1.2. The state of the research.....	5
1.3. Corpus and sources.....	11
1.4. Terminology of the paper.....	12
1.5. Structure and Contribution of the paper.....	14
CHAPTER II.....	17
JURIDICAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE LANGUAGE. COMMUNITY LANGUAGE. THEORETICAL PREMISES.....	18
2.1. Juridical-administrative language in all specialized languages.....	18
2.2. Particularities of the legal-administrative language.....	30
2.2.1. Legal-administrative terminology.....	32
2.2.2. Clarification of legal-administrative language.....	39
2.3. The language of the community <i>acquis</i> , a component of the legal-administrative language.....	41
CHAPTER III.....	44
PROBLEMS IN TRANSLATING THE JURIDICAL-ADMINISTRATIVE LANGUAGE.....	44
3.1. The abilities of the legal translator.....	44
3.2. Particularities of legal language in the source language .....	49
3.3. Translation techniques of the legal-administrative language from English into Romanian.....	55
3.4. Special issues in translating community texts.....	59
3.5. Difficulties in translating legal and administrative texts .....	63
3.6. Measuring the difficulties of translating legal and administrative texts .....	66
CHAPTER IV.....	73
CORPUS OF LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE LANGUAGE.....	73
4.1. Methodology of corpus analysis .....	74
4.2. Glossary of legal-administrative Language .....	77
4.3. Corpus analysis. Semantics and difficulties .....	79
4.4. Corpus analysis: results .....	113
CHAPTER V	

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF THE DIFFERENCES OF THE TRANSLATION OF COMMUNITY LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE TEXTS.....	116
5.1. Methodology .....	116
5.2. The peculiarities of community legal-administrative texts: statistical perspective .....	117
5.3. Difficulties in translating community legal and administrative texts: statistical analysis .....	128
CONCLUSIONS.....	137
Bibliography.....	142
FIGURE CONTENTS.....	153
CONTENTS OF TABLES.....	154
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	155
ANNEX I CORPUS 1.....	156
ANNEX II. SUMMARY OF CORPUS ANALYSIS.....	164
ANNEX III. CLASSIFICATION OF TRANSLATION DIFFICULTIES IN LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE TEXTS.....	167
ANNEX IV. CORPUS 2.....	169

## Introduction

### 1.1. Objectives of the paper

The study of translating legal-administrative texts is becoming more relevant as the demand for such texts has increased, particularly in the form of contracts, legal rules and administrative texts. The European Union, whose administrative legal texts will be analyzed in this research, requires the drafting of documents in the 24 official languages.

In this paper, we focus on researching the peculiarities and translation difficulties of administrative legal texts. We want to add to the existing research in the field, according to which the administrative legal texts are characterized by long, complex phrases and the use of specialized terms. The research questions on which the methodological design was carried out were: "What are the particularities of the legal-administrative texts" and "What translation difficulties arise in the case of legal-administrative texts?"

The two main objectives of the paper are:

1. To identify the particularities of legal and administrative texts
2. To identify and analyze the difficulties of translating legal and administrative texts

The secondary objectives of the paper are:

1. Establishing the particularities of legal and administrative texts in the European legislation;
2. To identify and analyze the difficulties of translating legal and administrative texts;

### 1.2. Stage of research

In the literature, there is consensus that legal-administrative texts are more difficult to translate than those in everyday language. There is a small number of works on the topic of legal language, but their number is growing. Among the authors we have consulted in the theoretical foundations of the present paper are: Mellinkoff (1963), Zidan (2015), Sarcevic (2000), Stoichițioiu-Ichim (2006), Tomescu (2011), Deborah (2007), Di Carlo (2015), Irinescu (2003), Levy (2011), Kischel (2009), Topală (2004), Dănișor (2015), Badea (2014), Pitiriciu (2008, 2009) etc.

The peculiarities of the legal texts are, according to the studied studies: predictability and the presence of fixed formulas and the almost mathematical structure. There are two types of legal translations: those of informative value and those of legal value, and they differ in the rigor of translation, the ones with legal value being more complex. In the literature, there is a distinction between the meanings and legal effects of translating administrative legal acts, emphasizing the need for legal effects not to be changed by

translation.

An important concept in this field is that of translatability. Because of the differences between legal systems, situations where a term has no equivalent in the target language appear. Some authors (Sarcevic, 2000) therefore, consider that the basic unit of legal translation is not the word, but the text.

### **1.3. The corpus analyzed**

The corpus analyzed is the Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union (Maastricht Treaty). It was signed in 1992 by the European Council, and it established the European Union. The corpus chosen on the basis of the objectives of the paper was analyzed to identify the peculiarities and difficulties of translating administrative legal texts from English into Romanian.

### **1.4. The terminology of the paper**

In the terminology of the paper we have defined and explained the terms: legal language, administrative language, legal discourse, legal English, normative language, judicial language, lexical ambiguity, structural ambiguity, false friends, fidelity of translation, translation transparency, tokenization and stemming.

### **1.5. The structure and the contribution of the paper**

The paper is structured in two parts, the theoretical and the research, respectively in five chapters.

The second and third chapters, after the introduction, represent the theoretical part. Among the subjects, there are the particularities of the Romanian and English legal and administrative language, the translation of legal and administrative texts and the difficulties of translation; we also discuss issues related to the competences of translators of legal-administrative texts, highlight the particularities of the legal-administrative language in the source language, as well as the difficulties of translating it from source language to target language.

The fourth chapter, “Corpus of Legal-Administrative Language”, contains the corpus presentation, the glossary of terms and expressions and their analysis. We identified a type of translation difficulty for each term, and we made a list of the translation difficulties.

The fifth chapter, called “Statistical Analysis of the Difficulties of Translation of Community Legal-Administrative Texts”, has three main subchapters. The first of these is the methodology, which is followed by the particularities of legal-administrative texts from a statistical perspective and by the difficulties in translating legal and administrative texts:

statistical analysis. In this chapter we will investigate with quantitative tools the difficulty of translating legal and administrative texts.

### ***Our own contributions***

Through this paper, we want to contribute to the current knowledge of the peculiarities and difficulties of administrative legal translations. The research reveals useful theoretical and practical information about the work and skills required for translators. Following the analysis of the “Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union”, we identified translation difficulties: lexical ambiguity, structural ambiguity, false friends, lexical mismatches, translational difficulties, pragmatic issues (lack of context), text specific problems, balance between the fidelity of translation and its transparency. We also identified the most common difficulties: lexical ambiguity, structural ambiguity, and the translation difficulties of the collocations.

At the same time, we found out from the statistical analysis in Chapter V details of the peculiarities and difficulties of translation of legal and administrative texts.

We used translation factors as the length of the sentences, the degree of polysemy and the structural complexity, according to some studies in the field (Mishra, 2013). The length of the sentences proved to be an important factor of complexity for the legal-administrative texts. The degree of polysemy did not have the same level because of the precision of the administrative legal texts, for which ambiguity is a defect. The level of structural complexity registered is higher for legal-administrative texts.

## **Chapter II. Juridical and administrative language. Community language. Theoretical premises**

### **2.1. Legal and administrative language in all specialized languages.**

The legal-administrative language is included in the extended classification (Cornu, 1990), which includes:

- legal language: the language in which laws are formulated;
- jurisprudential legal language: the language used in the case law, in other words, the judgments themselves, but also the totality of the solutions of the courts of law and other authorities responsible for jurisdiction;
- scientific legal language: the language used in legal science;
- common legal language: the language used in other speeches within law, by professionals

such as lawyers, notaries; it is also the language used in the social context to discuss aspects of law - for example, when a journalist discusses the effects and mode of applying a law; • legal-administrative language: the language used in writing documents or administrative contexts.

Like other functional languages, the legal-administrative language falls within the category of the communication function determined by the field of activity (Buşmachi, 2012: 127). After the communication situation, the legal-administrative language can be either official or professional, and the channel of communication either oral or written.

## **2.2. Particularities of legal-administrative language**

The individuality of the legal-administrative style among the other functional styles of the language is given by a series of features, including:

- the presence of specialized terminology that includes exclusive terms;
- frequent cliching of expression through redundancy of terms;
- specific introductory and closing phrases;
- the compositional structure of the text, with a determined sequence of the parts;
- the insertion of precise instructions on the necessary or mandatory character of some provisions;
- the neutral character of the message;
- respecting the property of the terms (Buşmachi, 2012: 131).

The legal-administrative language, like any specialized language, is, almost without exception, a descriptive one. The descriptive language follows the classical rules of discursivity (the bivalence of the relation of signification and the referentiality, the truth). The main function of this type of language is referential, denotative or informative.

The legal-administrative texts are predominantly normative, being expressed in an appropriate language, whose requirements are clarity, precision, concision and accessibility (Stoichiōiu-Ichim, 2006:44).

The clarity of language is ensured by the ownership of the terms and their unitary use, the unequivocal formulation of the usual statements, which contributes to a good understanding of the text.

Precision is achieved by using a specialized lexicon that tends to monosemy and monoreferency (Irinescu, 2003: 38), and their syntactic level through the correct use of grammar construction rules, by observing the natural theme. (Stoichiōiu-Ichim, 2006: 45).

Concision is a requirement of the legal-administrative language, which consists in

eliminating unnecessary redundancies, outdated protocols, as well as in a systematic organization of the text.

Accessibility of the legal-administrative language requires the text to be appropriate at the level of the recipients, by using uniform terms with the usual frequencies, avoiding technical terms, explaining the lesser-known terms or unusual logos.

#### 2.2.1. Terminology of legal-administrative language

The vocabulary specialization consists in creating and using a domain specific terminology, different from the terminologies of other functional languages.

The legal-administrative terms can be classified according to their degree of specialization:

- legal-administrative terms used exclusively in this type of language, constituting the internal terminology of the domain: *notice, authorization*;
- legal and administrative terms that belong simultaneously to the common language: *actuality* etc ;
- legal-administrative terms that belong to other specialized languages.

#### 2.2.2. Clarification of the legal-administrative language

One of the most prominent features of the legal-administrative discourse is cliching, represented by the presence of formulas or template constructions. From the socio-linguistic point of view, they ensure the social prestige of this type of language, although their presence often makes it difficult for the non-specialists to understand the legal text.

Cliching is an important element, its use being justified, on the one hand, by the need for concise expression, and on the other, by the need to ensure the applicability of the rule by formulating general or abstract rules.

Thus, we observe the presence of maximum formulas (represented by the expression of norms and legal provisions, and of minimal ones (specialized phrases).

### **2.3. The language of the community *acquis*, part of the legal-administrative language**

The legal and administrative language of the European Union, also called the language of the community *acquis*, reflects the complete system of European Union law, independent and autonomous regarding the national legal rules of each Member State.

The phrase "community *acquis*" refers to the legal norms of the functioning of the European institutions, the treaties issued by it, the structure and functioning of the Community institutions, the acts adopted on the common security and politics, the cooperation in various fields.

The legal-administrative texts contained in the representative Community Acquis are: the Treaties (establishing the European Communities, accession of certain states to the European Union, etc.); directives, regulations, decisions, binding acts for the implementation of the Treaties; international agreements concluded by the European Union and those concluded by EU Member States; recommendations and opinions adopted by the institutions of the European Union; declarations, resolutions, framework decisions; the signed conventions, the resolutions, the declarations adopted on the Common Foreign and Security Policy, Justice and Home Affairs etc.

The unitary character of the language in which they are written, the precision of the notions are important for the transmission of documents to the citizens of all states.

All administrative legal documents are drafted in the working languages and then translated into all the official languages of the Union countries. That is why bilingual and, above all, multilingual translations are a very important area of community activity, very well organized, with numerous translation offices, specialized translators, polygraphed dictionaries (Bărbulescu, Repan 2009) or encyclopedic (Ghica 2007) translation for each language.

### **III. Translation of the legal-administrative language and its difficulties**

#### **3.1. The competences of the translator**

The level of linguistic competence is the volume of knowledge of a native speaker. The skills that the translator needs are both theoretical and procedural. A translator needs to know: the target language, the source language, the type of text, the field of the subject of the translation (knowledge from outside linguistics) and contrastive analysis.

Translators can be classified based on the level of competence: novice translator, intermediate translator, competent translator, experienced translator and expert translator. In the development of its competences, the translator faces two types of problems: basic concepts, strategies or conscious procedures, oriented towards objectives or norms or values.

The competences of the translator of the European Union are interdependent with one another. The central competence is that of providing the translation service and includes the interpersonal dimension (planning ability, self-evaluation, teamwork, customer communication) and production size (making context-based translation and customer guidance). Translators also need intercultural competences: sociolinguistic and textual

(identifying and comparing cultural elements, solving the problems by understanding the text).

### **3.2. The particularities of the legal language in the source language**

Some of the features of English legal language have a historical explanation. The typical format of legal documents was a few centuries ago a text without spaces and paragraphs between its component parts. Currently, page layout of legal-administrative texts focuses on the ease of identifying information. A characteristic feature of the legal English language is monoreferency: in one context, only one meaning is allowed. One of the most common situations of this type is that of pronouns, which are avoided in legal English for the text to be lacking in unintended interpretations.

English law is characterized by: the use of common words with different meanings, exclusively belonging to the legal field, Latin words and expressions, archaisms, binomials (five types: imperfect, complementary, antonyms, subdivision and consequence synonyms) the use of *shall* for expressing an obligation, the deictic elements together with the sentences, the verbs followed by the prepositions, and the increased proportion of the suffixes. The legal language is rich in attributes. The legal English vocabulary contains French and Latin archaisms and a significant proportion of technical words. Not all legal texts intend to be as clear and unequivocal as the vague nature of a term can bring benefits when used in an informed manner.

### **3.3. Translation of legal-administrative language from English to Romanian**

The number of theoretical studies on translations is limited, and most of the papers are articles and monographs that are limited to empirical observations. The translation and interpretation of legal and administrative texts encounters certain difficulties, some more in law than linguistics. In international law, there is a need to borrow legal terminology from one language to another. A new legal concept can be imported along with the term itself, but imports are changing over time, and the meaning becomes another.

Because of the need for legal multilingualism, difficulties arise not only in translation but also in the implementation of legislative acts in several languages in parallel. In this case, the version of the document in each language is the original one, and the term "translation" is not legally accepted. The use of the word "translation" implies the idea that one variant is the source of the other and would undermine the idea of equality between multilingual legal texts. Due to the principle of equal authenticity, these versions have equal authority.

Mixed drafting techniques include: co-drafting, parallel drafting, alternative drafting, shared editing, double editing, and joint editing. Translator's work takes place in three stages:

understanding the source text, interpreting the source, and reshaping it. The translator needs an overview of the text to be translated so that individual phrases and replicas make a coherent part of the whole. In the absence of an understanding of the overall picture and context, the translator will commit translation errors.

### **3.4. Special issues in translating community texts**

The European Union has 24 official languages: Bulgarian, Czech, Croatian, Danish, English, Estonian, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Irish, Italian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Slovenian, Spanish and Swedish (EU, fd). All 24 versions of the legal-administrative documents must be precise and respect the highest rigor in the field. Personnel with dual professional training, linguists and lawyers were recruited to ensure the quality of the administrative legal texts.

Unlike other areas, the EU's translators benefit from databases such as EUR-Lex (2016) that make the translation process simpler, but also from guides such as the styling by the Publications Office. Thus, archived documents can be accessed in all the official languages of the Union and rules on translations in a short time.(Cook et al., Wisniewski, Richard and Schmidt), or in LSP, language for specific purposes (Hoffman et al., Swales), are not united in the classification of European Union texts as belonging to applied linguistics.

The high degree of specialization and multilingualism of the European Union generated the concept called "eurospeak" or "euroslang". It can be defined as a variant of the English language that has appeared in Brussels in the Union institutions in written form.

### **3.5. Difficulties in translating legal and administrative texts**

The importance of correctly translating legal-administrative texts should not be underestimated: in a contract, a translation error may result in a process, and in a legislative text, legislative ambiguities and legislative goals.

Difficulties in translating legal-administrative language can be: general (difficulties that occur in other cases) and specific. One of the main ones is the inconsistency between the legal systems of the source language and the target language. Another problem is linguistic differences. The increased frequency of Latin expressions could pose problems in translation, as it may not all be used in Latin in the target language. A further difficulty is represented by the multitude of partial synonyms in the English legal lexicon. The translator needs to know all the nuances of these terms, to know which one is suitable for translation (for example, *jail* and *prison*).

Some authors classify the translation difficulties of legal-administrative texts in four: system difficulties, terminology difficulties, syntax difficulties, and general tone difficulties.

The translator must pay special attention to the order of words. The difficulty of translating phrases decreases if the subject and the predicate are close to one another; many times, however, they become complex because of the multitude of complements and attributes.

### **3.6. Measuring the difficulty of translating the legal text**

Some authors consider that the difficulty of translating is made of two elements: text translation problems and intellectual tasks. To measure the translation difficulty, the difficulty of the source text is measured. This process results in an index, which is then correlated with the difficulty of translation. Measuring the readability of a text is being researched in the 1920s.

In the literature, there are formulas that use measurable features of the text. They can be based on the length of the sentences, the length of the words, the percentage of difficult words (words with more than 2-3 syllables or less common words). It is estimated that only until 1980 were published 200 formulas that calculate the difficulty of reading a text. The most popular formulas are: Flesch Reading Ease Formula; Dale-Chall formula; Gunning Fog Index; SMOG formula; Flesch-Kincaid Readability test; Fry Readability formula.

There are two approaches to giving a score for difficulty: the holistic and the analytical one. The holistic score method is based on the idea that gathering all the difficulty factors of a translation would not adequately reflect the real degree of difficulty of the translation. For more objective assessments, criteria were proposed, one being structured on four levels of correct translations: strength, acceptable level, deficient level and minimum level. The analytical score method is to award a score for each translation difficulty component to get a total score.

Analyzing verbal protocols is another way of assessing the translation difficulty, according to which translators should analyze the translation process while doing it. Thus, information about the translators' thinking process appears while translating. Recording and analyzing translators' behavior is another way of measuring the difficulty of translating. Actions such as keystrokes are measured, translators' activity on the screen, and its eye movements, as well as the pauses, are an important clue to the identification of difficult passages. Measurement of eye movements is assessed by: the duration of ocular fixations, their number, when and how often the translators' attention changes, how often they turn their eyes over a particular passage, phrase or expression.

However, the verbal and non-verbal behavior of the translator reflects in an imperfect way his mental activities. There are tools to measure the difficulty of translating that focus on assessing the mental burden of the translator. One of the most used instruments for subjective

measurement is the scale questionnaire. The most commonly used NASA task load index has 6 items, structured by categories: mental effort (thinking, making decisions, memories, searches), physical effort (pushed, raised, carried), temporal effort (the pressure to do things with high speed), overall effort, execution and frustration.

After analyzing all these techniques and tools to measure the difficulty of a text, there is a need for automatic measurement of the text.

## **Chapter IV. Corpus of legal-administrative language**

### **4.1. Methodology of corpus analysis**

The aim of the paper is to identify and analyze the translation difficulties from English into Romanian, in the legal and administrative contexts. Within this subchapter, we will examine each term and phrase in the glossary, explaining the difficulties encountered by translators. In the analysis of the difficulty of the terms, we will present the term in its context in the Consolidated Version of the Treaty on European Union, we will present alternative meanings and variants of translation.

### **4.2 Glossary of legal-administrative Language**

In the glossary, we have included terms and expressions in the "Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union". The terms include: accession, accountable, agenda, binding, breach, chair, Charter, compliance, concert, convene, currency, determination, heritage, mandate, national, provision, remedy, second, guideline, subsidiarity. Some of the phrases and phrases defined and analyzed in this chapter are: blocking minority, draft legislative act, equal rotation, extraordinary meeting, fair trade, free movement, head of state, institutional framework, internal market, policy-making, qualified majority, rule of law, self-government, serious misconduct, sustainable development, term of office, territorial scope, lay down and without prejudice etc.

### **4.3. Corpus analysis. Semantics and difficulties**

The purpose of this study is to identify the translation difficulties specific to the legal-administrative language by analyzing the "Consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union" (Official Journal, 2012).

We have identified eight types of difficulties encountered by translators in the case of legal and administrative texts:

1. Lexical ambiguity

2. Structural ambiguity
3. False Friends
4. Lexical incompatibilities
5. Difficulties in translating phrases
6. Pragmatic issues (lack of context)
7. Text specific issues
8. Balance between translation fidelity and transparency

Lexical ambiguity occurs when a word has more than one meaning. Structural ambiguity occurs when a sentence or a sentence has more than one meaning. The difficulties identified are not only related to the terms themselves, but also to the structure they belong to. The frequency of the difficulties has been analyzed in order to make recommendations for translators of administrative and legal texts. The most common translation and translation difficulties for administrative and legal texts are: lexical ambiguity (1), the balance between translation fidelity and transparency (2), but also the translation of collocations (3).

The results are consistent with the characteristics of the legal and administrative language, as it appears from the literature. The terms used often have more than a meaning, and the sentences are long and complex.

#### **4.4. Corpus analysis results**

To avoid difficulties in translating legal and administrative texts, the translator needs a high level of expertise in legal and administrative language in source language and target language. Failure to recognize legal terms in their legal context could lead to an erroneous translation. Furthermore, it is necessary to pay attention to the meanings of the words, especially in cases where the context does not clearly indicate what meaning it is. At the same time, it is necessary to pay extra attention to "false friends", which can compromise a seemingly easy translation. Last but not least, attention is needed to the text message, which should not be altered with the translation. Therefore, the translator of legal and administrative texts must ensure both translation fidelity and transparency. It needs to be vigilant about eight difficulties: lexical ambiguity, structural ambiguity, false friends, lexical mismatches, difficulties in translating collocations, pragmatic issues (lack of context), text-specific problems, and the balance between translation fidelity and transparency.

## **Chapter V. Statistical Analysis of the Differences of the Translation of Community Legal and Administrative Texts**

### **5.1. Methodology**

Using a quantitative research method, we answer the following research questions: What are the particularities of the legal-administrative texts? and What are the translation difficulties for legal-administrative texts? We will analyze the frequency of words and expressions in the corpus and the average length of the sentences. One of the programs used is RapidMiner, with the word processing extension.

### **5.2. The peculiarities of community legal-administrative texts: statistical perspective**

The consolidated version of the Treaty on European Union has been analyzed according to the frequency of its terms. 1885 terms repeated at least once and 1454 terms appeared at least three times in the text. The most used word is the article (1087 repeats). Therefore, there is a high degree of predictability of the content of the document, from a lexical point of view. Analyzing the terms with less than 100 repetitions, one can notice that the lexicon used is a very bureaucratic one. There are many economic terms ("capital", "budget", "labor"), organizational and temporal terms ("March", "annual", "June", "July"), verbs from organizational and managerial spheres : ("Order", "appoint", "prevent") and specific nouns for the administrative lexicon ("servant", "secretaries" - secretary, secretary, "citizen" ).

The most used term is "member states" (512 uses), followed by "European Parliament" (348 repeats). Among the most common categories of two word expressions, we have identified the names of European institutions: "European Parliament", "Central Bank", "Court of Justice", "Council Act", "Parliament Council", etc.

The second step was to perform a comparative analysis of the basic text of the corpus without annexes and a generic text of similar length in British English (composed of short stories, chosen according to the criterion of diversity). Many indices relevant to determining the difficulty of translating a text cannot be interpreted by themselves, so this generic text is needed.

The generic text has 3125 sentences, and the corpus has 1102 sentences, the total number of words being very similar. The average length of the generic text sentence is 6.6 words, and the corpus of 19.2 words. The corpus is structured in 730 paragraphs, unlike in 1797, as is the generic text. The length difference between the longest sentence in the corpus

(135 words) and the longest of the generic text (77) is quite large. The number of words with more than seven characters is almost double in the legal-administrative text (3257 versus 6459). The frequency of difficult words was determined on the basis of a familiar word list (3000 words). There are 7853 difficult words in the corpus and 4568 in the generic text, a difference of 15%.

The difficulty of reading was also analyzed through instruments such as the Dale-Chall, Coleman-Liau, Flesch and Gunning Fog indexes. Dale-Chall Readability level is based on the proportion of difficult words and the proportion of words and sentences, and partial results consist of numbers between 4 and over 10; the final results consist in awarding a level of education. Through this test, we find that TUE can easily be understood by a college graduate, while the generic text is at high school level (9th or 10th grade). The Automated Readability Index refers to the number of characters in a word, and the interpretation of the score is done by age. The difference between the two texts is significant, from 17.2 to 7.6. The results indicate that the generic text can easily be understood by a child aged 12-13 years, but the TEU overcomes 18-22 years of difficulty and is intended for college graduates and above. Coleman-Liau Index. This index is calculated using the average of 100 words and the average number of sentences per 100 words. Corpus had a result of 20.6, and generic text 16.3. Flesch Reading Ease Score, one of the safest and oldest methods of learning the difficulty of a text. The lower the score, the more difficult the text is.

The corpus is distinguished from the generic text by a high number of words with over three syllables (5472 polysyllabic words versus 2193). The legal-administrative texts have fewer sentences, but about three times longer than in an ordinary text (19.2 versus 6.6). These are almost 3 times less (1102 vs. 3125). The structure of legal-administrative texts is more compact, with a small number of paragraphs. A legal-administrative text has 2.5 times fewer paragraphs than a regular text. It is necessary to mention that the longest sentence in the corpus has a dimension of 135 words and 736 characters, about 8.4 times more than a regular text. In legal-administrative texts, there is a high frequency of words of over seven characters, which occur approximately twice as often as in a regular text. They are more complex because they have a higher frequency of high difficulty words (37% versus 22%). The legal-administrative texts have a double number of polysyllabic words and a higher average of syllables per word (1.8 versus 1.5). The words are longer, with a maximum of 18 characters (15 characters for the general text). The estimated reading time is similar for the two texts, with an additional 2-3 minutes for the legal-administrative text.

### **5.3. Difficulties in translating community legal-administrative texts: statistical analysis**

The length of the sentence is a common index for measuring the translation difficulty (Mishra, 2013). According to this index, the legal-administrative texts are much more difficult to translate (the sentences being almost three times longer). This index is not safe enough. In determining the difficulty of translations, lexical and textural properties are also relevant.

Statistical methods for measuring the difficulty of translation are divided into two categories:

1. Difficulty of translation, evaluated only after translation, by: keystrokes, mouse clicks, time of sight on various words, etc. The Translation Difficulty Index is another example; it refers to "the time the brain processes translation activities" (Mishra, 2013, 348). The processing time of the work we need to calculate the translation difficulty index is calculated by adding time to understanding the source text and generating the translated text. The Transition Difficulty Index (IDT) is the translation processing time.
2. Difficulty of translation, assessed before the translation of a text takes place; Mishra et al. (2013) proposed a formula based on three factors: length, polysemy and structural complexity. Thus, without the text being translated, we can estimate the difficulty of translating.

Calculation of sentence length (L) is the number of words in a sentence. The degree of polysemy (GP) is the sum of the meanings of words in a sentence, divided by the length of the sentence. In this study, we used WordNet v.3.1, developed by Princeton University. Structural complexity (CS) represents the total length of dependency linkages in the structure of a sentence (Lin, 1996). The total length of dependency bindings is divided by the number of sentences. Structural complexity was calculated using the Stanford Parser program (developed by The Stanford Natural Language Processing Group) with the extension of the Typed Dependency Viewer.

Thus we analyzed the first fifteen sentences of the corpus in length, the degree of polysemy and the structural complexity. Some of the hypotheses of this research have been denied, and some have been confirmed. The degree of polysemy (GP), with the average of 4.39, is below the average indicated by some researchers in the field for general or non-legal texts. However, the structural complexity is above average, the same for the length of the sentence. The abundance of detail required for legal and administrative language specific precision increases the length of the sentences, complicating the translation process accordingly. Legal-administrative texts therefore present greater translation difficulties than texts in other areas, but the degree of polysemy is not a factor contributing to this complexity.

Generally speaking, the more text is in many words, the more the translator is asked for. In the legal-administrative language, long and complex words are used, and they have a lower degree of polysemy and decrease the average of this index to just 4.36. Even if the ambiguity of the legal-administrative texts is low, the high standards in terms of precision make the translator's job easier.

## Conclusions

Following the research, we concluded that the translator must know the legal and administrative language of the source language and target language. In the absence of in-depth knowledge, it may encounter problems like translation of certain phrases. The translation difficulties identified by qualitative research were: lexical ambiguity, structural ambiguity, false friends, lexical mismatches, difficulties in translating collocations, pragmatic issues (lack of context), text-specific problems, and the balance between translation fidelity and transparency.

At the same time, we have identified a number of peculiarities of the legal-administrative texts: they have fewer sentences, but they are longer than three times. Long and complex words are more common. Indices to measure the difficulty of reading the text reveal that legal-administrative texts are written for college graduate level.

In the statistical analysis, we used three factors proposed by Mishra et al.: length of phrases, degree of polysemy and degree of structural complexity. The length of sentences is the main index indicating a high degree of difficulty in translation. The degree of polysemy was low, but this does not automatically indicate a reduced translation difficulty, but is due to the need for precision. Structural complexity is an increased one, requiring a higher degree of attention; the translator makes an increased mental effort in their translation because it has to correctly translate the meaning of the source text, to meet all the grammatical requirements - this is more difficult for large stretching phrases.

Given the difficulties of translating legal and administrative texts, translators have to use the specialized resources they have at their disposal. For EU translators, they can use tools such as EUR-Lex or InterActive Terminology for Europe to ensure the uniformity, accuracy and high quality of the EU legal and administrative texts.

## Bibliography

Ang S., Dyne L. (2008). „Conceptualization of Cultural Intelligence. Definition, Distinctiveness, and Nomological Network”, în Ang, S., Dyne, L. (coord.), *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence. Theory, Measurement, and Applications*, New York, England: M.E. Sharpe, pp. 3-340.

Badea, S. (2014). *Legal English. A practical Approach*, Craiova, Editura Universitaria.

Badea, S. (2015). *The Suffixes –or and –ee in Forming Legal Terms*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL)”, VIII, 1-2, pp.130-141.

Badea, S. (2017). *The Prefix Dis- in Legal Language*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL)”, X, 1-2, pp.92-102.

Barborică, E. (1969). *Aspecte ale vocabularului juridic din secolul al XVI-lea*, în „Analele Universității București. Limba și literatura română”, XVIII, 1, pp. 41-46.

Berceanu, B. (1981). *Dreptul și limba. Știința dreptului și lingvistica. Succinte considerații teoretice și aplicative*, în „Revista de Studii și Cercetări Juridice”, XXVI, 3, pp. 247-266.

Bieltz, P., Gheorghiu, D. (1998). *Logică juridică*, București: Ed. Pro Transilvania.

Busuioc, I. (2003) „Dinamica terminologilor românești sub impactul traducerii acquisului comunitar”, în Pană Dindelegan, G. (coord.) (2003). *Aspecte ale dinamicii limbii romane actuale*, București, Editura Universității din București, pp.343-350.

Butoi, T. (2000). *Note de curs*, București: Universitatea Spiru Haret.

Cazan, O. (2013). *Terminologia dreptului internațional penal în documentele românești și franceze (diferențe și corespondențe)*. Lucrare de doctorat. Cluj-Napoca: Universitatea „Babeș-Bolyai”.

Cercel, S., Dumitrescu, L. (2012) *Terms and Symbols in the Juridical Domain. Some Facts Concerning the Figures-Type Identifying of the Individual Person*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL)”, V, 1-2, pp. 99-109.

Cercel, S. (2016) *The Regulation of Dismemberments of the Private Ownership Right in the Romanian Civil Code: the Superficies Right and the Usufruct Right*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL)”, IX, 1-2, pp. 107-117.

Chatillon, S. (2000). *Droit et langues*, în „Revue internationale de droit comparé”, 3, pp. 687-715.

Chiș, D. (2000). „Considerații asupra clasei numelui în vocabularele specializate”, în *Comunicarea*, Timișoara: Augusta, pp. 62-76.

Chodkiewicz, M. (2012). *The EMT framework of reference for competences applied to translation: perceptions by professional and student translators*, în „The Journal of Specialized Translation”, 17, pp. 37-54.

*Convenția de la Viena cu Privire la Dreptul Tratatelor*. Încheiată la Viena la 23 mai 1969 (Publicată în ediția oficială a Monitorului Oficial „Tratate Internaționale”, IV, 53).

Cornu, G. (1990). *Linguistique juridique*, Paris: Montchrestien.

Coteanu, I. (1960). *Stilurile moderne ale limbii române literare*, în „Limba Română”, IX, 2, pp. 58-70.

Coteanu, I (1962) *Structura stilistică a limbii*, în „Limba Română”, XI, 4, pp.211-221.

Coteanu I. (1973) *Stilistica funcțională a limbii române*, București: Editura Academiei RSR.

Dănișor, D. (2012) *Juridical Terms of Exclusive Juridical Pertaining: the Case of the Term “Synallagmatic”*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL)”, V, 1-2, pp. 120-125.

Dănișor, D. (2015) *Legal Terms Of Art – l'accesion in the Lannguage of the New Romanian Civil Code*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL)”, VIII, 1-2, pp. 153-159.

Dănișor, D., Badea, S. (2015). *Polisemie și ambiguitate în limbajul codului civil*, în „Revista de Științe Juridice”, XXVI, 1, pp. 134-143.

Deborah, C. (2007). *Translating Law*. Cleveland, Buffalo, Toronto: Multilingual Matters.

Di Carlo, G.S. (2015). *Diacronic and Syncronic Aspects of Legal English: Past, Present and Possible Future of Legal English*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Doczenkalska, A. (2009). „Drafting or Translation – Production of Multilingual Legal Texts”, în Olsen, Fr., Lorz, A., Stein, D. (coord.), *Translation Issues in Language and Law*, New York: Palgrave, Macmillan, pp.116-135.

Dracsineanu, C. (2011). *Legal English*, Iași: Universitatea „Mihail Kogălniceanu”.

Ericsson, K.A. & Simon, H.A. (1980) *Verbal reports as data. Psychological Review*, Vol. 87, no. 3, pp. 215-251.

European Commission (2010) *Studies on translation and multilingualism: Lawmaking in the EU multilingual environment*. 1/2010. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Ferluc, T. (coord.) (2005), *Ghid stilistic de traducere în limba română pentru uzul traducătorilor acquis-ului comunitar*, ediția a III-a revăzută și adăugită, Institutul European din România, Direcția Coordonare Traduceri.

Gheție, I. (1978). *Istoria limbii române literare*, București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.

Gheție I. (1982). *Introducere în studiul limbii române literare*, București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.

Ghiță, O. (2014) *The Notion of Matrimonial Regime as Provided in the New Civil Code*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL), VII, 1-2, pp. 172-179.

Ghiță, O. (2015) *The Child in Legal Terminology*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL), VIII, 1-2, pp. 179-185.

Ghiță, O. (2016) *Conceptual Scope of the Terms “positive” and “negative” in Matters of Obligations of States under the European Convention of Human Rights – Special Focus on art.8 on “Family Life”*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL), IX, 1-2, pp. 125-134.

Gorea, B. (2009) *Logica juridică*. Târgu-Mureș: Zethus.

Gupta G. (2015). *Text document tokenization for word frequency count using Rapid Miner (Taking resume as an example)*, în „International Journal of Computer Applications. International Conference on Advancements in Engineering and Technology”, pp. 24-26.

Hale, S., Campbell, S. (2002). *The Interaction Between Text Difficulty and Translation Accuracy*, în „Babel”, I, 48, pp. 14-33.

Hickey, L. (1998). „Perlocutionary equivalence: Marking, exegesis and recontextualisation”, în Hickey L. (coord.) *The Pragmatics of Translation*, Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, pp. 217-232.

Hometkovski<sub>1</sub>, L. (2012). „Concepții, abordări și controverse în terminologie”, în *Taxonomia paradigmatică și sintagmatică în terminologia dreptului comunitar*. Chișinău: ULIM, pp.16-45.

Hometkovski<sub>2</sub>, L. (2012). „Limbajul juridic comunitar și terminologia acestuia”, în *Taxonomia paradigmatică și sintagmatică în terminologia dreptului comunitar*. Chișinău: ULIM, pp.46-77.

House, J. (1997). *Translation Quality Assessment: A Model Revisited*. Tübingen, Germany: Gunter Narr.

Irimia, D. (1986). *Structura stilistică a limbii române contemporane*, Bucureşti: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.

Irinescu, T. (2003). *Lingvistica Juridică*, Iași: Casa Editorială Demiurg.

Istrătoie, M. L. (2014) *A Terminologica land Juridical Analysis of the Transaction Contract*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL), VII, 1-2, pp. 192-200.

Istrătoie, M. L. (2015) *Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL), VIII, 1-2, pp. 185-197.

Istrătoie, M. L. (2016) *Particular Aspects of the Commodity*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL), IX, 1-2, pp. 134-141.

Ivănescu, G., (1972) *Stilurile limbii literare*, în „Convergiri literare”, 5, pp.11-57.

Javid, Z. (2013). *English for Specific Purposes: Its Definition, Characteristics, Scope and Purpose*, în „European Journal of Scientific Research”. CXI, 1, pp. 138-151.

Jensen, K. T. (2009). *Indicators of text complexity*, în „Copenhagen Studies in Language”, LXI-LXXX, 37, pp. 61-80.

Kischel, U. (2009). „Legal cultures – Legal languages”, în Olsen, F., Lorz, A., Stein, D. (coord.), *Translation Issues in Language and Law*, New York: Palgrave, Macmillan, pp.7-17.

Kischel, U., Kirhoff P. (2009). „Egalitatea în statul constituțional”, în *Gleichheit im Verfassungsstaat: Symposium aus Anlass des 65. Geburtstages von Paul Kirchhoff*, Publisher: Müller Jur.Vlg.C.F., pp. 7-14.

Klare, G. R. (1984). „Readability”, în Pearson, P.D., Barr, R. (coord.), *Handbook of reading research*, New York: Longman, pp. 681-744.

Kunnerke M. (2013). *Translation in the EU: Language and Law in the EU's Judicial Labyrinth*, în „Maastricht Journal”, 20, pp. 243-260.

Levy, J. (2011). *The art of translation*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Lin (1996). „On the structural complexity of natural language sentences”, în *Proceeding of the 16th International Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING)*, pp. 729-733.

Mateuț, Gh., Mihăilă, A. (1998). *Logica juridică*, Bucureşti: Lumina Lex.

Mattila, H.E.S. (2014). „Foreword. New Challenges for Legal Translation”, în *The Ashgate Handbook of Legal Translation*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Company, pp.18-22.

McAuliffe, K. (2012). „Language and Law in the European Union: The Multilingual Jurisprudence of the ECJ”, în Solan L., Tiersma P. (coord.) *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.200-216.

Mellinkoff, D. (1963). *The Language of the Law*, Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Mishra, A., Bhattacharyya P., Carl, M. (2013). „Automatically Predicting Sentence Translation Difficulty”, în *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, Sofia, pp. 346-351.

Munteanu, Ș., Țăra, V. (1978). *Istoria limbii române literare*, București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.

Nord, C. (1991). „Text Analysis in Translation. Theory. Methodology and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation”, în *Oriented Text Analysis*, Amsterdamer Publikationen zur Sprache & Literatur, Amsterdam/Atlanta, Ga.: Rodopi, pp.184-190.

Petuhov, N. (2003) *Câteva observații pe marginea structurilor frazeologice în terminologia românească a aquis-lui comunitar*, în „Limba română”, LII, 5-6, p. 539-546.

Petuhov, N. (2005) *Structures néologiques dans la terminologie roumaine de l'acquis communautaire* în „Studii și cercetări lingvistice”, LVI, 1-2, pp. 207-214.

Petuhov, N. (2008) „Structures phraséologiques dans la terminologie roumaine de l'acquis communautaire”, în *Frazeologie, lexicologie și lexicografie. Studii în memoria profesoarei Keti Ankova-Niceva*, Sofia, pp. 217-223.

Petuhov, N. (2011) „Influences françaises et anglaises dans la formation de la terminologie roumaine de l'acquis communautaire, în *L'état des recherches et les tendances du développement de la parémiologie et de la phraséologie romanes*, Oficyna Wydawnicza Leksem, Łask, pp. 189-195.

Pitiriciu<sub>1</sub>, S. (2008) *Elements of Eurojargon in Contemporary Romanian*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL), I, 1-2, pp. 217-231.

Pitiriciu<sub>2</sub>, S. (2008). *Compuse cu euro- in limba română actuală*, în „Analele Universității din Craiova”, Seria Științe Filologice. Lingvistică, XXX, 1-2, pp.96-102.

Pitiriciu, S. (2009) *The Concept of Eurojargon*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL), II, 1-2, pp. 184-191.

Pitiriciu, S. (2012) *Terminology of Penal Law: the Offence “Reflected” in Vocabulary and Semantics*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL), V, 1-2, pp. 189-193.

Popescu, S., Ciora, C., Țăndăreanu, V. (2007). *Probleme curente privind folosirea limbajului juridic*, în „Buletin de informare legislativă”, 3, pp. 3-11.

Porter, M.F. (1980) *An algorithm for suffix stripping*, în „Program”, XIV, 3, pp. 130-137.

Preda, M. (2012) *The Polysemy of Jurisdictional Terms*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL), V, 1-2, pp. 193-203.

Pym, A. (2003). *Redefining Translation Competence in an Electronic Age: In Defence of a Minimalist Approach.*, în „Meta”, XXXVIII, 4, pp. 481-497.

Pym, A. (2014). „Translating between languages”, în Allan, K. (coord.) *Routledge Handbook of Linguistics*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 417-430.

Radu-Golea, C. (2012) *Elements of Logical Analysis Referring to Legal Terms, Phrases and Notions in Current Romanian*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL), V, 1-2, pp. 203-207.

Robertson, C. (2014). „EU Legislative Texts and Translation”, în Le Cheng, King Kui Sin, Anne Wagner (coord.), *The Ashgate Handbook of Legal Translation*, Surrey: Ashgate, pp.155-174.

Roibu, M. (2014). „False Friends -

Roland, H. (2002). *Lexique juridique. Expressions latines*, 2ème édition, Paris: Litec.

Sarcevic, (2012). „Challenges to the Legal Translator”, în Solan L., Tiersma P. (coord.) *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.82-101.

Schäffner, C., Beverly A., (2000). *Developing Translation Competence*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Siems M.M. (2007). *The End of Comparative Law*, în „The Journal of Comparative Law”, 3, pp. 133-150.

Stanciu, C. (2013) *Evolution of the Juridical Regulations in the Matter of Contract Promises and their Terminology in the Romanian Law System*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL), VI, 1-2, pp. 221-232.

Stanciu, C. (2014) *The Influences of the New Romanian Civil Code on the Terminology and Notions of the Transport Contract*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL), VII, 1-2, pp. 280-289.

Stanciu, C. (2016) *An Analysis of the Legal Features and Legal Language in Relation to the Contract of Shipment of Goods*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL), IX, 1-2, pp. 166-176.

Stoichițoiu-Ichim, A., (2006). *Semiotica discursului juridic*, București: Editura Universității din București.

Strechie, M. (2012) *Terms of Juridical Value in Latin*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie (SCOL), V, 1-2, pp. 255-262.

Sun S. (2012). „Measuring difficulty in English-Chinese translation: towards a general model of translation difficulty”, în *A dissertation submitted to Kent State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy*, pp.1-158.

Tiersma P., Solan L. (2012). *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tomescu, D.(2011). „Le roumain, langue de l’Union Européenne: problèmes de la traduction des documents officiels.”, în HERRERAS José Carlos (dir.), *L’Europe des 27 et ses langues*, Valenciennes, Presses Universitaires de Valenciennes, pp. 701-709.

Topală, D. (2004). *Sintaxa propozițiilor subordonate din codurile juridice de la 1863-1865*, Craiova : Editura Universitaria.

Topală, D. (2010). *An Interdisciplinary Perspective on EU Terminology*, în „Studii și cercetări de onomastică și lexicologie” (SCOL), III, 1-2, pp.230-247.

Topală, D. (2012), „The Terminology of the Legal System in Romanian – Norm and Usage”, în *Ezikăt i kulturata v sâvremennia svăt*, Burgas, Velico Târnovo, pp. 469-473.

Wagner, E. (2001). *Translating for the European Union Institutions*, Publisher: Routledge; 1st edition.

Way, C. (2016). *The Challenges and Opportunities of Legal Translation and Translator Training in the 21st century*, în “International Journal of Communication”,10, pp. 1009-1029.

Warburton N. (1999) *Cum să gândim corect și eficient*, București: Editura Trei.

Wroblewski, J. (1985). *Legal Language and Legal Interpretation*, în „Law and Philosophy”, IV, 2, pp. 239-255.

Zidan, A.A.Y.M. (2015). *A Linguistic Analysis of Some Problems of Arabic-English Translation of Legal Texts, with Special Reference to Contracts*, Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Zafiu, R, (2001) *Diversitate stilistică în româna actuală*, București: Editura Universității din București.

Zlătescu, V., D., (1996) – *Introducere în legistica formală. Tehnica legislativă*, București: Editura Oscar Print.

### *Source bibliography*

#### *a) Dictionaries*

Academia Română (Institutul de lingvistică „Iorgu Iordan – Al. Rosetti”), (2016), *Dicționarul Explicativ al Limbii Române*, Editura: Univers Enciclopedic, București.

Bara, M., Georgescu, A.M., Ionescu, M.C. (2011) *Glosar juridic*. Ediția a II-a. București: Institutul European din România.

Bărbulescu, I. Ghe., Răpan D. (2009) *Dicționar Explicativ Trilingv al Uniunii Europene*, Colecția Collegium, Ed. Polirom, București.

Bidu-Vrânceanu, A., Călărașu, C., Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, L., Mancaș, M, Pană Dindelegan, C. (2001) *Dicționar de Științe ale Limbii*, București, Editura Nemira.

Blackwell, A. H. (2008). *The Essential Law Dictionary*, Sphinx Dictionary. Canada: Sphinx Publishing.

Brudascu, D. (2009) *Dicționar englez-român pentru juriști*. București: Editura Sedan.

Bușmachi, V. (2012) „Stilurile funcționale ale limbii române”, în *Philologia*. LIV, pp.127-134.

Cambridge University Press (2008) *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. 3rd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cambridge University Press (2011) *Cambridge Business English Dictionary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chiriacescu R., Stănciulescu A., Nicolescu N.C. (coord.) (1993, 1999, 2001, 2004, 2006, 2009) *Dicționar Enciclopedic Român*, ediție cu șapte volume, Editura Enciclopedica, București.

Collin, P.H. (2004). *Dictionary of Politics and Government. Third Edition*, Cambridge: Bloomsbury.

Gaffiot, F. (1934). *Dictionnaire latin-français*, Paris: Hachette.

Gardner, B. (2004). *Black's Law Dictionary. Eighth Edition*, St. Paul: Thomson West.

Ghica, L.-A. (coord.) (2007), *Enciclopedia Uniunii Europene*, București, Editura Meronia.

Gifis, S. (2008) *Dictionary of legal terms*. New York: Barron's.

Gifis, S. (2010) *Law dictionary*. New York: Barron's.

Guțu, Gh. (1983). *Dicționar latin-român*, București: EȘE.

Levițchi, L. (2004). *Dicționar englez-român. Ediția a II-a.*, București: Univers Enciclopedic. (2015). *Oxford Dictionary of English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reboul, A., Moeschler, J. (1999) *Dicționar enciclopedic de pragmatică*. Cluj: Editura Echinocțiu.

Ştef, F. (1995). *Dicționar de expresii juridice latinești*, București: Editura Oscar.

**b) Electronical sources**

Biri A. (f.d.). „The Challenges of Eurospeak in ESP”, SZE, accesat online în decembrie 2016.  
URL: [www.sze.hu/.../The%20challenges%20of%20Eurospeak.doc](http://www.sze.hu/.../The%20challenges%20of%20Eurospeak.doc)

Carl, M., Lacruz, I., Yamada, M., Aizawa, A. (2016). „Measuring the Translation Process”, *The Association for Natural Language Processing*, accesat online în noiembrie 2016.  
URL: [http://www.anlp.jp/proceedings/annual\\_meeting/2016/pdf\\_dir/E6-2.pdf](http://www.anlp.jp/proceedings/annual_meeting/2016/pdf_dir/E6-2.pdf)

Chelaru, I. (2016). *Claritatea, precizia și previzibilitatea actelor normative – condiții de constituționalitate a acestora*, Revista „Universul Juridic”, accesat online în martie 2017. URL: <http://revista.universuljuridic.ro/claritatea-precizia-si-previzibilitatea-actelor-normative-conditii-de-constitutionalitate-a-acestora>.

Chirilă, C. (2015). „Errors and Difficulties in Translating Legal Texts”, *Strategii Manageriale*, accesat online în decembrie 2016. URL: [http://www.strategiimanageriale.ro/images/images\\_site/articole/article\\_e13dfe43988afb3140cb2030ee16eb8e.pdf](http://www.strategiimanageriale.ro/images/images_site/articole/article_e13dfe43988afb3140cb2030ee16eb8e.pdf).

Consiliul Uniunii Europene (f.d.). *Majoritate calificată*, accesat online în septembrie 2016.  
URL: <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/ro/council-eu/voting-system/qualified-majority/>

Costin, A. F. (2015). „Aspecte ale însușirii limbajului juridic prin tehnica traducerii”, accesat online în august 2016. URL: <http://oaji.net/articles/2015/2064-1432807668.pdf>.

*Dictionary.com*, accesat online în august 2016. URL: <http://www.dictionary.com/>

Dicționar juridic (f.d.) „Dicționar juridic”, Rubinian, accesat online în august 2017. URL: <https://www.rubinian.com/dictionar.php>

Dicționar juridic (f.d.). „Dicționar juridic online”, accesat online în martie 2017. URL: <http://legeaz.net/dictionar-juridic>

Dosca, A. (2006). *Competențele traducătorului de terminologie juridică (abordări și concepții)*, „Limba română”, accesat online în martie 2017. URL: <http://limbaromana.md/index.php?go=articole&n=1532>

Duhaime (f.d.) „Estoppel Definition”, *Duhaime's Law Dictionary*, accesat online în noiembrie 2016. URL: <http://www.duhaime.org/LegalDictionary/E/Estoppel.aspx>

European Commission Directorate-General for Translation (2016) *English Style Guide. A handbook for authors and translators in the European Commission*. accesat online în

septembrie 2016. URL: [http://ec.europa.eu/translation/english/guidelines/documents/styleguide\\_english\\_dgt\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/translation/english/guidelines/documents/styleguide_english_dgt_en.pdf)

EUR-Lex (f.d.) „Conferral”, *Access to the European Union Law*, accesat online în ianuarie 2018. URL: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/summary/glossary/conferral.html>

Gardner, J. (2016) „Misused English words and expressions in EU publications”, *European Court of Auditors*. accesat online în Decembrie 2016. URL: [http://www.eca.europa.eu/Other%20publications/EN\\_TERMINOLOGY\\_PUBLICATION/EN\\_TERMINOLOGY\\_PUBLICATION.pdf](http://www.eca.europa.eu/Other%20publications/EN_TERMINOLOGY_PUBLICATION/EN_TERMINOLOGY_PUBLICATION.pdf)

Janan, D., Wray, D. (2012) „Readability: the limitations of an approach through formulae”, *British Educational Research Association Annual Conference*, accesat online în ianuarie 2017. URL: <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/213296.pdf>

Legea AZ (2016) *Formele vinovăției și gradele culpei*, accesat online în septembrie 2016. URL: <http://legeaz.net/dictionar-juridic/formele-vinovatiei-si-gradele-culpei>

Regulamentul (CE) nr. 920/2005 al Consiliului din 13 iunie 2005, accesat online în decembrie 2016. URL: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/RO/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32005R0920>

Princeton University (2010) „WordNet”, *WordNet*. Princeton University, accesat online în noiembrie 2016. URL: <http://wordnet.princeton.edu>

Sakareva, I. (n.d.) *Difficulties and some problems in translating legal documents*, accesat online în decembrie 2016. URL: [https://www.google.ro/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&act=8&ved=0ahUKEwiqvq6o6LQAhUIXiwKHXD0BFkQFggcMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.law.swu.bg%2Fip%2Fpluginfile.php%2F31%2Fmod\\_data%2Fcontent%2F203%2FVanya-Sakareva.pdf&usg=AFQjCNEkDN8YdOGxBSNm-V8LmtqNn3Dugg&sig2=UHVOcl0IT-IPE2ejuZb-Tg](https://www.google.ro/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&act=8&ved=0ahUKEwiqvq6o6LQAhUIXiwKHXD0BFkQFggcMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.law.swu.bg%2Fip%2Fpluginfile.php%2F31%2Fmod_data%2Fcontent%2F203%2FVanya-Sakareva.pdf&usg=AFQjCNEkDN8YdOGxBSNm-V8LmtqNn3Dugg&sig2=UHVOcl0IT-IPE2ejuZb-Tg)

Sarcevic, S. (2000) *Legal Translation and Translation Theory: a Receiver-oriented Approach*, accesat online în martie 2017. URL: <http://www.tradulex.com/Actes2000/sarcevic.pdf>

Sferle, A. (2005) *Limbajul juridic și limba comună*, Facultatea de Litere., accesat online în februarie 2017. URL: [https://litere.uvt.ro/litere-old/vechi/documente\\_pdf/aticole/uniterm/uniterm3\\_2005/asferle.pdf](https://litere.uvt.ro/litere-old/vechi/documente_pdf/aticole/uniterm/uniterm3_2005/asferle.pdf).

Sferle A. (2006) *Studiul limbajului juridic: considerații metodologice și teoretice*, Litere, accesat online în martie 2017. URL: [https://litere.uvt.ro/litere-old/vechi/documente\\_pdf/aticole/uniterm/uniterm4\\_2006/adriana\\_sferle.pdf](https://litere.uvt.ro/litere-old/vechi/documente_pdf/aticole/uniterm/uniterm4_2006/adriana_sferle.pdf)

UE (f.d.) „Ce înseamnă o carieră în instituțiile UE?”, *Careers with the European Union by the European Personnel Selection Office*, accesat online în Decembrie 2016. URL: [http://europa.eu/epso/discover/why\\_eu\\_career/index\\_ro.htm](http://europa.eu/epso/discover/why_eu_career/index_ro.htm)

UE (f.d.) *Administrația UE – personal, limbi și locații*, accesat online în decembrie 2016. URL: [https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/figures/administration\\_ro](https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/figures/administration_ro)

UE (f.d.) „Glosarul sintezelor”, *EUR-Lex*, accesat online în decembrie 2016. URL: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/summary/glossary/glossary.html?locale=ro>

UE (f.d.) „Coeziune economică, socială și teritorială”. EUR-Lex. Acces la dreptul Uniunii Europene, accesat online în martie 2017. URL: [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/summary/glossary/economic\\_social\\_cohesion.html](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/summary/glossary/economic_social_cohesion.html)

UE (f.d.) „Cooperarea polițienească și judiciară în materie penală”. EUR-Lex. Acces la dreptul Uniunii Europene, accesat online în martie 2017. URL: [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/summary/glossary/police\\_judicial\\_cooperation.html](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/summary/glossary/police_judicial_cooperation.html)

UE (2010) „Study in Lawmaking in the EU Multilingual Environment”, accesat online în noiembrie 2016. <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail-/publication/7db404b5-48e5-4c2b-aabd-82db6a034eab/language-en>

Sfetcu, N. (2014) *Traducere și traducători. Include Ghidul Comisiei Europene pentru traducătorii din Uniunea Europeană*, accesat online în martie 2017. URL: <https://books.google.ro>

Tydevi (2012) „Typed Dependency Viewer”, *Sourceforge*, accesat online în noiembrie 2016. URL: [https://sourceforge.net/projects/tydevi/?source=typ\\_redirect](https://sourceforge.net/projects/tydevi/?source=typ_redirect)

[www.nicestories.com](http://www.nicestories.com), accesat online în septembrie 2016

\*\*\* (1652) *Îndreptarea Legii. Pravila cea mare*, accesat online în septembrie 2016. URL: [https://archive.org/stream/IndreptareaLegii.PravilaCeaMare1652/IndreptareaLegii.PravilaCeaMare1652\\_djvu.txt](https://archive.org/stream/IndreptareaLegii.PravilaCeaMare1652/IndreptareaLegii.PravilaCeaMare1652_djvu.txt)

\*\*\* (f.d.) „The use of phrasal verbs in legal documents”, *Lex Vision International*, accesat online în noiembrie 2016. URL: <http://www.lexvisioninternational.com/blog/THE%20USE%20OF%20PHRASAL%20VERBS%20IN%20LEGAL%20DOCUMENTS.pdf>

\*\*\* (1993-2009) *Dicționar Enciclopedic Român*, ediție cu șapte volume.

