

DOI: 10.7596/taksad.v9i2.2689

Citation: Bobrova, N. E., Lebedev, A. V., & Pinkovetskaia, I. S. (2020). Peculiarities of the English Legal Text Discourse: The Issues of Interpretation and Translatability. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 9(2), 318-328. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v9i2.2689>

Peculiarities of the English Legal Text Discourse: The Issues of Interpretation and Translatability

Natalia E. Bobrova¹

Anton V. Lebedev²

Iuliia S. Pinkovetskaia³

Abstract

The growth of international cooperation, trade, tourism and emigration arouses the interest of both linguists and legal experts in the theory and practice of legal translation. The existing difference in the laws of countries, basic features typical of Russian and English legal discourse should be taken into account when dealing with juridical texts. The issue of adequate transfer of the content of legal documents is of importance when translating from one language to another. To identify the basic features typical of the English juridical vocabulary and to offer a methodology for solving the problems occurring when translating juridical texts, the authors implement the methods of syntactic, vocabulary, comparative and comparative translation analysis. The studied material is certain lexemes (commonly used words, terminology, professionalisms, Latinisms, abbreviations and idioms), legal texts (court rulings, legal contracts, official business documents) taken from the authentic British and American legal sources as well as examples from the authors' translation and teaching practices. The authors believe that a retrospective analysis of conditions contributing to Legal English historic development will facilitate sufficient comprehension of subject areas constituting legal discourse. The findings indicate that the difference between the Russian and English juridical lexemes is conditioned by both linguistic and extra-linguistic factors.

Keywords: Juridical texts, English legal discourse, Peculiarities of translation, Translatability problem, Comparative translation analysis.

¹ PhD, Associate Professor, National Research Ogarev Mordovia State University, Saransk, Russia. E-mail: bo-ne@yandex.ru

² PhD, Associate Professor, National Research Ogarev Mordovia State University, Saransk, Russia. E-mail: toshaleb@mail.ru

³ PhD, Associate Professor, Ulyanovsk State University, Ulyanovsk, Russia. E-mail: pinkovetskaia@gmail.com

Introduction

Currently, one cannot overstate the importance of the theory and practice of translation, specialized legal documentation, legislative acts and literature in particular. The relevance of the research is associated with the rapid growth of international contacts at the individual and public levels both in the professional environment (business communication, negotiations, lawsuits and cases involving foreign individuals or legal entities), and in the domestic sphere (tourism, emigration, etc). Accordingly, the legal translation problems constantly require an in-depth study and systematization due to its complexity consisting in the discrepancy between the Anglo-Saxon and post-Soviet systems of law, and consequently, in the formation of gaps and neologisms in translation. The novelty of the study is the categorizing of the English legal vocabulary sources as well as English legal vocabulary characteristics classification based on both linguistic and extra-linguistic criteria.

The study aims to identify and classify the specific features of English juridical lexemes as well as to suggest ways to solve the problems occurring in legal texts translation. To achieve this goal the following tasks are set:

- to identify the main features of legal documents in English and Russian;
- to define the peculiarities of lexical, grammatical and semantic system of English juridical vocabulary;
- to specify the main linguistic and extra-linguistic sources of English juridical texts;
- to offer strategies ensuring adequacy of legal texts translation. In the research process authors implement the methods of vocabulary, syntactic, comparative and comparative translation analysis.

Certain lexemes and legal texts taken from authentic British and American legal sources: legal contracts, court rulings, reference books and media reports related to legal topics (Consultancy agreement, 2020), as well as examples from the authors' translation and teaching practices are examined in the article.

Literature Review and Methodology

The issue of legal translation and its multilateral aspects are in focus of many researchers' interests as this problem has been significant for centuries due to the demand in knowledge of diverse legal systems and their interpenetration. Over history, the interpreters and translators in this field have been facing numerous difficulties and challenges in conveying legal texts and expressing certain realia not peculiar to various cultures.

The first group of scholars analyze the theoretical and philosophical issues of legal translation. Specifically, Faber & Reimerink (2019) from Granada University, Spain deal with categorizing terminology in legal translation "from the perspective of Frame-Based Terminology (FBT), which directly links specialized knowledge representation to cognitive linguistics and cognitive semantics". The authors use the case study of international agreements in the context of environmental law. In the article by Mathiasen (2018) the researcher raises the question: *can a legal dictionary go from sexist to inclusive?* and theorizes on how dictionaries treat gender roles both currently and over the history; the author determines how implicit the sexist language is and the means to avoid it. Scavuzzo (2018) studies the legal discourse, specifically, functions of language and legal sentences. The author proposes to consider two main distinctions – between descriptive and prescriptive uses of language, as well as sorting out internal and external interpretations of legal sentences. Anesa (2019) provides an attempt to consider the conceptualization of Legal English as a Lingua Franca as it

is widely used by non-native legal professionals (and sometimes regular citizens) around the world in various settings. The study also discusses if Lingua Franca as a notion can be applied to legal language or it is inapplicable both from conceptual and pragmatic perspectives. Macagno et al. (2018) offer their analysis on interrelation between linguistic pragmatics and legal interpretation within the framework of debate on translation mechanics using the Gricean maxims to justify interpretation and various approaches to legal translation.

Some researchers concentrate on legal translation as a study discipline. For instance, Jones & Ellison (2020) analyze “the dissonance between the intended message of written feedback on written assessments provided by law academics and the understanding of the recipient” by conducting a survey and identifying common words and phrases misinterpreted or correctly understood by those giving their feedback and provide qualitative data to encounter “some unexpected misinterpretations and some surprising synergy”. Chiknaverova (2019) from MGIMO University, Moscow, Russia raises the issue of “semantization” as a means of preventing and correcting learner’s mistakes while teaching legal English in higher education institutions context. The study results feature the practical application of synonyms, homonyms, lacunas, partial equivalents, collocations, stylistic, socio- and ethno-cultural peculiarities of word use, as well as identification of false cognates and connotative meanings of words. Perez-Perdomo (2019) studies the issues of Latin American Law Students entering United States Law Schools and discusses changes in globalization, comparison of American and Latin American legal education, aspects of culture shock and required changes in national education systems. Giampieri (2019) studies the concept of the Web as a resource for legal language. The article features how Google advanced search and the WebCorp Web concordancer provide the recurrent patterns and categorize legal language queries using search syntax, the extraction of frequent collocations, the high recurrences, etc. Another study and research tool is the one described in the paper by Szeminska and Wiech (2019) on *A prototype electronic dictionary application for legal translators*, i.e. software designed for specific need of legal translators offering a set of parameters for the final product, classification of equivalents and headwords etc.

The other group of scholars focuses on professional and practical perception of the given issue. Specifically, in the study *Plain writing in the legal field: An approach from the discourse of specialists* by Meza et al. (2020) plain writing among 18 legal practitioners was surveyed, eight plain language categories were identified to provide clear legal services to citizens and the definition of “plain writing” was formulated. Another work by Skoczen (2019) *Implications within Legal Language* proposes an innovative approach to legal proceedings interpretation by linking judicial court decisions and “linguistic mechanisms behind them”, criticizing classic approaches to legal language (including the translation aspect) and also helps to understand the logic behind the legal procedure verdicts which will be of great interest to philosophers of law, philosophers of language, linguists and non-experts. The work by Wallace & Monzo (2019) deals with legal translation and interpreting in public services and gives a detailed overview of multilingual policies, practices and protocols, situating public service interpreting and translation, as well as reimagining interpreting and translation for the public services. The comprehensive study by Kredens & Drugan (2018) from the English Centre for Forensic Linguistics (CFL) analyzes the peculiarities of translation in superdiverse legal contexts (i.e. courts and legal debates) touching upon the discourse which affects the four important areas: “the logistics of translation in legal contexts, translation quality, translation ethics and policy issues” and drawing on direct hands-on experience from translation practice and its effects. Monzo (2018) considers the issues of translation and culture in legal settings and institutions. Sammut (2018) deals with the translation of EU trademarks as a special type of intellectual property translation by classifying and analyzing specific texts (patents, trademarks, contracts, invoices etc.)

and identifying specific common approaches to their interpretation and translation. *The Role of Legal Translation in the Interpretation of International Law Documents* by Farrokhi (2019) studies legal translation in light of both Anglo-Saxon and Asian legal systems, states the importance of legal translation within the framework of international law documentation and provides valuable application experience from International Court of Justice, World Trade Organization and European Union Institutions. The article by Khizhnyak & Zaraiskiy (2020) deals with the issue of coining terminology and nomenclature signs, the intersection of Russian and English linguistic areas of terminology and onomastics. The authors come to the conclusion that “the meanings of nomenclature signs with proper names specify those of the terms in the hierarchical structure of the terminological system and in particular legal situations”.

Some national features of legal translation are described in the article *Bilingualism and law in Hong Kong: Translatophobia and Translatophilia* (Lee, 2020) that discusses potential discrepancies in the translation within the framework of Hong Kong’s bilingual jurisdiction and “the paper proposes the terms Translatophobia and Translatophilia to highlight the double bind that entraps translation in institutional discourses on legal bilingualism”. The historical and pragmatic aspects of legal translation are described by the article on Belgium experience by van Gerwen (2019) which states how Flemish equivalents of the legal text, included additional notes, comments and explanations offering access to international legislation and enabling citizens to comprehend the law and more validly participate in legal and political life. The study by Landqvist & Rogstrom (2018) features two Swedish 17th-century approaches to the legal vocabulary in a Latin context. The publication *Legal and LSP Linguistics and Translation: Asian Languages’ Perspectives* by Matulewska (2019) provides “theoretical semiotic perspectives which shape legal languages, legal translation and public discourse over languages spoken in Asia” dealing with legal interpretation issues of Hong Kong, China, Arab countries and other states. Sanchez (Lasaballett, 2018) studies the case of legal translation within the framework of the Brazilian contract law (from Portuguese into English) and claims that specific functional equivalents should be identified to accommodate the source concepts to English language structure, frequently departing from the English linguistic instruments that fall short of crossing the inter-cultural divide. Alwazna (2019) deals with the problem of *Techniques for Coping with the Untranslatability of Legal Terms between Arabic and English*, since there exist lacunas of untranslatability of legal terms, particularly between originally unrelated languages, which are derived from different legal cultures and legal systems (conceptual asymmetry). Luo & Wang (2018) present a substantial work studying 35 mainland Chinese legal texts, categorizing legal terminology, analyzing its semantics and usage, putting forward guidelines and approaches for potential translators and interpreters into various languages taking into account the diversity of Chinese legal culture and system.

Translatability Issues

An untrained and inexperienced translator is able to encounter multiple challenges when dealing with legal texts. Moreover, having a completely different meaning in various contexts (for example, everyday use and official settings) the legal aspect of words and combinations translation can cause sufficient difficulty. The knowledge of “ordinary” semantics is insufficient in legal reality. For example, it is not difficult for a translator specializing in the field of law enforcement to interpret in Russian such collocations as: “stop and search” (has nothing to do with literal imperative “stop and seek something” but describes “detention and search of any suspicious person”), “manslaughter” (is not just “homicide”, but “unpremeditated murder”), “killing” (not always “murder” but “causing

death", "death as a result of accidents"), "therapy" (has nothing to do with literal "treatment", but describes "rehabilitation and re-education of a criminal"), "peace officer" (can be confused with the literal "world" and "official" but describes a "policeman", "law enforcement official"), "profiling" (is not a literal "shaping" or "forming" but deals with "psychological testing of prisoners"), "health screening" (is not "healthy study" but "medical examination"), "guardians of the peace" (not "keepers of the world" but colloquial for "law enforcement"), "police powers" (not literal "police forces" but describes "the right granted to police officers"), "correctional institutions" (have no concern with "special educational institutions that provide special needs children with training, education, treatment", but means "places where people sentenced to imprisonment serve their sentence"), "walking the beat" (has nothing to do with literal "battery" but describes "patrolling the streets by police officers"), "challenge a juror" (is not "daring to show your resistance to a juror" but describes "the removal of a jury from a given case if he or she is suspected of personal interest in the outcome of this case due to various reasons") and many others.

However, an inexperienced translator is likely to use the meaning of individual words leading to wrong translation and a pragmatic function will not be accomplished.

Nevertheless, it is not always possible to find a unique equivalent to a collocation or term in the legal sphere. According to Alimov (2005), "a juridical text translator can face problems because there are no verbal constructions in the target language that could accurately describe the terms of the source language". Literal translation may lead to a distortion of the original meaning inherent in the source language; and even a quite adequate equivalent sometimes requires a descriptive comment or definition revealing the difference between legal systems or power institutions of countries of both languages.

Based on this, the American interpreter and translation studies theorist Eugene Albert Nida states that the translation is not the transfer of individual lexemes meaning, but rather the transfer of cultures Nida (1978), i.e. translation constitutes a dynamically equivalent "transfer" from one culture to another.

Accordingly, common language proficiency is not the only competence required of a translator but it is vital and significant to be familiar with legal realities, as well as their difference and dissimilarity. For instance, some Anglo-Saxon and American legal systems phenomena are absent in the Russian judicial and legal sphere. Thus, "limited divorce" has nothing to do with literal Russian "divorce with limitations" but stands for separation of spouses according to judgement of court; "indeterminate sentence" is "a sentence imposed for a crime that is not given a definite duration"; the American "Department of the Interior" does not correspond to the Russian law enforcement agency "Ministry of Internal Affairs", but is responsible for the conservation and management of most federal lands and natural resources; "Crime Index" – is not a literal "crime rate" but "a list of the most serious crimes" ("felonies") – "murder" (the unlawful premeditated killing of one person by another), "sexual assault" (illegal sexual contact involving force upon a person without consent), "robbery" (the crime of stealing from somewhere or somebody), "aggravated assault" (a serious violent attack on somebody), "burglary" (also "breaking and entering", illegally entering a building and stealing things), "larceny" (taking something which is not yours, stealing), "car theft" (the criminal act of stealing a motor vehicle), "arson" (the crime of setting fire to intentionally damage something), "coroner" (an official who examines the reasons for a person's death, performs an autopsy on and makes investigation; as for the Russian legal system - coroner's responsibilities are performed by several bodies: the investigative committee, court, forensic medical examination, preliminary

investigation). These and many other cases show that the translation inaccuracies caused by different legal systems discrepancy can be compensated by cultural, historical or legal commentary.

Thus, the translator is expected to acquire double qualification – knowledge of English and Russian for adequate conveying the meaning of the text, as well as competence in legal matters. We agree with the I. G. Fedotova's statement: "... the texts of the source and target languages are considered in completely different legal systems; therefore, they must use different wording specific to each language. However, these formulations should be clear to both parties and convey the same meaning. Therefore, the translator should know not only the legal law of his country but also one of the discourses of the source language" (Fedotova, 2016).

Research Results: Features of Legal Vocabulary in English

The so-called "legal English" was developed at the intersection of three layers of cultures - ancient Latin (the roots of modern legal systems in Roman law, the rule of the Roman Catholic Church at a certain historical stage), archaic English (lexical units taken from "the grand style" and ancient linguistic forms), modern (clichéd and connected with other fields of knowledge). The study considers some distinctive features of each of the above-mentioned fields.

Being the language of the Church, rhetoric, education, science and literature for many centuries, the *Latin language* has played a huge role in the development of the English legal language environment. Some Latinisms were included in the Anglo-Saxon system of law: "Actus reus" ("unlawful act"), "Res judicata" ("a matter judged", "claim preclusion"), "ad absurdum" ("reduction to the absurd"), "ad hoc" ("when necessary or needed"), "ad verbum"/"verbatim" ("literally, in exactly the same words as were used originally"), "a priori" ("from the former"), "a posteriori" ("in hindsight"), "Argumentum ad hominem" ("to the person", fallacious arguments attacking not an opponent's beliefs but his character and motives), "Commune bonum" ("common good"), "Consensus omnium" ("common consent"), "Dominium" ("complete power to use, to enjoy, and to dispose of property at will"), "In adversum" ("against the will"), "Modus operandi" ("a particular way or method of doing something"), "Modus vivendi" ("a way of living"), "Ne varietur" ("cannot be changed"), "Pacta sunt servanda" ("an agreement must be kept"), "Per capita" ("for each person; in relation to people taken individually"), "Prima facie" ("based on the first impression"), "Reductio ad absurdum" ("reduction to absurdity"), "Res integra" ("an unprecedented case", "a case which has not been examined"), "Salus populi suprema lex" ("the health, welfare, good of the people should be the supreme law"), "Sic" ("thus"), "Sine die" ("with no appointed date, deadline"), "Sub conditione" ("under the condition"), "Tabula rasa" ("blank slate", "from scratch"), "Tacito consensus" ("an unspoken consensus"), "Ultima ratio" ("the last reason or argument"), "Urbi et orbi" ("to the city (Rome) and the world; to everyone") and many others (Consultancy agreement, 2020). According to Goloshchapova and Dyakonova (2014), "due to extra-linguistic as well as linguistic factors the Latinisms related to the book style (the johnsonese) and limited in their use make up a group of international fund of terms, including legal ones". Indeed, being so common in the legal field, Latin expressions are used not only in legal documents but also in judicial eloquence, in the speeches of representatives' parties, legislators, politicians, in journalism, etc.

Correspondingly, the translator faces the issue of dealing with such lexical units and has to decide how to insert them in the translation text. Three strategies are possible: transliteration, translation, and transfer. Moreover, transliteration of words (less often - phrases) is used if a lexical unit exists in Russian and recorded in dictionaries (de jure, de facto, status quo, non grata person, alibi and others). The translation is used less frequently, and in most cases as an explanation and subsequent

comment. The most common is the method of transferring a Latin phrase into a Russian text with a further explanation (or even without it).

Old English archaisms are the second most important source of legal vocabulary in the English language. Historical, political, legal and religious documents such as the Habeas Corpus Act (1679), Bill of Rights (1689), King James Version Bible (1611) played a great role in lexical borrowings. They remain significant cultural monuments as well as current legislation in some cases. The existence of long legal traditions in the UK allowed legal English to maintain conservatism, formalism, sublimity and continuity. At the same time, general English gives way to some special terminology. In particular, the words “read”, “ask”, “at once” are replaced with “peruse”, “inquire”, “forthwith” respectively. Other examples include: “increase” is used instead of “go up”, “establish” – “set up”, “examine” – “look at”, “delay” – instead of “put off”, “require” – “need to”, “consider” – “deal with”, “commence” – “start”, “authorize” – “let”, “notwithstanding” – instead of “despite”, etc.

Some of the verbs are intentionally used in an archaic form with the suffix “-eth” – “witnesseth”, “secureth” (with the meaning of “testify” and “protect” respectively), which goes back to the original historical documents. As far as bureaucratic language is concerned there are a lot of such archaic forms as “hereto” (“given, indicated here”), “henceforth”, “hereinafter” (“starting from this time; in the future”), “hereon” (“on this basis”), i.e. prepositions are added to the verbs; thus, a new lexeme is created.

Another example of archaization is the use of the verbs “will / shall” in formal, business and legal English settings using their modal semantics – obligation, a duty – rather than auxiliary verbs for future tenses. For instance, the sentence “Whosoever commits an offence from the preceding paragraph shall be subject to the same penalty” is translated into Russian with the help of the Present Simple tense indicating obligation and conveying the following meaning “the perpetrator of the offence from the previous paragraph *receives* (the Present Simple tense) the same punishment”.

However, Old English archaisms definitely have limitations in use. Thus, there is a tendency to reduce their use frequency in the modern legal field (especially the American one). Burukina (2005) points out that “despite the obvious advantage of using archaic words in legal documents their functionality is a matter of debate. Some terms and definitions that are no longer in use are an obstacle to a full understanding of the text. For this reason, for a reader who does not understand the peculiarities of juridical vocabulary, the text will seem difficult to understand”.

The current state of the English juridical field is characterized by a high level of clichés, contextuality, and even some departure from traditional norms.

The contextuality of English legal terminology is expressed in the situational nature of certain phrases or individual words meanings. For example, the phrase “courts and tribunals” in the legal sphere should not be translated literally, but “judicial institutions”, “judicial authorities”. The adjective-prepositional phrase “subject to” has nothing to do with literal “subjectivity” but expresses a variety of semantics: “undergo”, “serve”, “have the right”, “be dependent on”, “be conditioned by”, “be under the authority”. According to E. S. Maksimenko, “the translation of phrases with “subject to” has some difficulties and is not deduced from those correspondences given in various dictionaries. This phrase acts in two functions: as an adjective as part of a nominal predicate or as a phrase preposition” (Maksimenko, 2003). The author gives the following example when the phrase “subject to” acquires unexpected contextual meanings in legal and economic texts: “subject to any damages which may be due” in a particular contract means “retaining the right to compensation for any possible losses”.

Another example of contextuality is the translation of the lexeme “business” which has a very wide semantic field. In particular, the translator of legal and business texts should distinguish between the following meanings:

- “business” (zero article, singular) as entrepreneurship, commercial and industrial activity, employment in the business sector;
- “a business / businesses” (indefinite or definite article, singular or plural) as an enterprise, business, institution, commercial firm;
- “business” – a transaction;
- “business” – customers, consumers, clients. Thus, for an adequate translation it is necessary to be well-informed about the legal and business spheres, as well as to gain experience in a particular field and consequently to acquire a certain linguistic flair.

Another important characteristic of English legal texts is their *clichéd nature*. It should be noticed that a phrase or sentence is actually an integral lexical unit, therefore, it is unacceptable to change it by omitting some elements – the translator transfers the cliché using unique equivalents. For example, “to adjudicate (not “make decisions”) in disputes”; “at the discretion (not “at the consideration”) of the court”; “formation process” (not “the process of making a contract”), etc. The English commercial and business spheres are also characterized by fixed “subject-object” pairs, where the main semantic distinguisher is not the word root, but the suffix: “drawer” (the person writing a cheque to tell the bank to pay some amount of money to somebody) – “drawee” (the person or company that accepts and pays the amount of money written on a bill of exchange), “endorser” (the person that signs the back of a cheque, bill of exchange, etc. written out to them to give permission for it to be paid to somebody else) – “endorsee” (the person whose name is written on the back of a cheque, bill of exchange, etc. so that they can get the money from it instead of the person it was originally written for), “employer” (a person or organization that employs people) – “employee” (somebody who is paid to work for somebody else).

In some cases, the discrepancy between Russian and English legal clichés is observed both at the lexical and syntactic levels. In particular, the phrase “hereinafter referred as” means “a term that is used to refer to the subject already mentioned in the remaining part of a legal document”; “this agreement is made effective on ...” means “the date of signing the contract”; “with effect from the date hereof” means “go into effect from the current date”. A. A. Zgonnikova notes that “as a language standard, the cliché performs a number of functions – the use of these expressions allows you to save mental energy, contribute to the quick and accurate settling of the document, facilitate communication, and therefore are neutral normative phenomena in business language. In addition, it is believed that pat phrases contribute to the speed of information transfer” (Zgonnikova, 2014).

Finally, another paradoxical peculiarity of English modern legal discourse is its *deformalization* in some contexts. In particular, American legal texts and judicial eloquence are sometimes characterized by switching to emotionally loaded words and even colloquialisms. Kharkova (2014) gives the following examples: “Such terms are offered on ‘take it or leave’ basis” means “conditions are fixed, without the possibility of change or bargaining”; “to confine the role of the court to that of a rubber stamp” – “to reduce the court role to purely formal”; “to avoid the clutches of the penalty clause” – “to avoid punishment”. Common abbreviations are also used – EU (European Union), CM (Current Month), CV (Curriculum Vitae), etc. In some cases, this approach makes it possible to shorten the text, make it more concise, comprehensive and clear, especially for an untrained or

unprofessional audience. This is especially true and relevant as the jury trial has become an inherent element of the English legal sphere.

Results and Discussion

The above examples show the complexity of the problem of English juridical texts translatability. Thus, the following research results can be identified and discussed:

- 1) the specificity of legal terminology can be considered both in the historical aspect (Latinism – English archaisms – the current state of the vocabulary) and in the grammatical-semantic one (contextuality – cliché – deformalization);
- 2) English legal vocabulary is characterized by a different culture from Russian realia; its lexical and grammatical structure is different from the Russian analogue which is explained by both linguistic and extra-linguistic reasons;
- 3) English juridical texts were developed throughout the entire Anglo-Saxon legal system existence, presenting particular difficulties for translation;
- 4) translators often encounter difficulties dealing with legal terms; translation involves a variety of translation transformations – for example, replacement, omission, addition, concretization, transposition, meaning extension, and many others;
- 5) the translator's main task is the adequacy and equivalence of a text translation from one language to another. Moreover, the following requirements are imposed on the translation: accuracy, conciseness and clarity.

Legal language gives an opportunity for further research due to the significant volume of the discourse itself - law enforcement and executive institutions, contracts and accompanying documents in commercial transactions and deliveries. All these areas are subject to a high degree of language mobility, neologization, and at the same time standardization and formality. The research findings can be used to create a lecture and seminar course on the theory and practice of legal translation and could be of interest to non-specialist audiences.

Conclusion

Being a complex and complicated process, legal translation does not constitute only substitution of units between languages. This discourse involves a number of issues, and any translator is to deal with them seeking the most adequate equivalents and the valid context of using them. The translator has to face some problems arising from the comparative study not just of legal texts per se, but also to do the research within diverse legal systems. Constant professional development in the field of foreign language mastering (especially, within the framework of the sublanguage of law), analysis of the nomenclature, the so-called “penetration” and “immersion” into the “spirit” of foreign law discourse, which provides estimation of a different legal norm only in connection with the legal system as a whole – those are the vital elements of the success in legal translation. The studied material (English texts of official business documents - passports, certificates, agreements, protocols, contracts) and their translations into Russian carried out by experts in legal translation allowed to draw a general summarizing conclusion that the main goal of the translation is to achieve adequacy and validity, as well as performing its pragmatic function in any given setting, context and situation. To accomplish this task the authors identified and analyzed the basic techniques and methods of translating the terms of English texts within the framework of legal discourse. They also provided a

retrospective analysis of conditions contributing to Legal English historic development. This will facilitate sufficient comprehension of subject areas constituting legal discourse.

References

- Alimov, V. V. (2005) Legal translation. Moscow: KomKniga.
- Alwazna, R.Y. (2018). Translation and Legal Terminology: Techniques for Coping with the Untranslatability of Legal Terms between Arabic and English. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale de Semiotique Juridique*, 32(1), 75–94.
- Anesa, P. (2019). Towards a Conceptualization of Legal English as a Lingua Franca? *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(6), 14-21.
- Burukina, O. A. (2005). Translation of English legal documents. Moscow: Nauka.
- Chiknaverova, K. G. (2019). Using semantization as a means of propedeutics of learners' lexical errors in the course of teaching legal English at university. *Yazyk i Kul'tura*, 47, 277–300.
- Consultancy agreement. (2020). URL: <http://www.seglegal.com/free-legal-documents/consultancy-agreement/> (accessed: 01.05.2020).
- Faber, P. & Reimerink, A. (2019). Framing terminology in legal translation. *International Journal of Legal Discourse*, 4(1), 15–46.
- Farrokhi, M. (2019). The Role of Legal Translation in the Interpretation of International Law Documents. *Russian Law Journal*, 7(1), 55–86.
- Fedotova, I. G. (2016). Legal concepts and categories in English. Moscow: Statut
- Giampieri, P. (2019). The Web as a legal language resource. *International Journal of Legal Discourse*, 4(1), 109–121.
- Goloshchapova, T. G. & Dyakonova, T. N. (2014). Latinism in the official legal discourse. *Lingua mobilis*, 3 (49), 54-59.
- Jones, D. & Ellison L. (2020). When is a word not just a word? An investigation into the dissonance and synergy between intention and understanding of the language of feedback in legal education. *The Law Teacher*, 1–14.
- Kharkova, E. V. (2014). Peculiarities of legal texts translation. New trends in the development of the humanities: a collection of scientific papers based on the results of the International Scientific and Practical Conference. Rostov-on-Don. <https://clck.ru/F7A9e/>(accessed: 03.05.2020).
- Khizhnyak, S. P. & Zaiskiy, A. A. (2020). Proper Names in the Legal Terminology of the English Language. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale de Sémiotique Juridique*. February 2020, 23-28.
- Kredens, K. J. & Drugan J. (2018). Translation in Superdiverse Legal Contexts. In A. Creese, & A. Blackledge (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Superdiversity*. Routledge, 411-425.
- Landqvist, H. & Rogstrom, L. (2018). Introducing a local legal vocabulary in a Latin context. *Fachsprache*, 50 (3–4), 162–179.
- Lee, T. K. (2020). Bilingualism and law in Hong Kong: Translatophobia and Translatophilia. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–12.

- Luo, H. & Wang. (2018). The Construction and Application of The Legal Corpus. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 448–467.
- Macagno, F., Walton, D. & Sartor, G. (2017). Pragmatic Maxims and Presumptions in Legal Interpretation. *Law and Philosophy*, 37(1), 69–115.
- Maksimenko, E. S. (2003). National-cultural specifics of the nomination of universal legal concepts that create a scientific picture of the world in English and American legal terminology. *Languages of Professional Communication: Materials of the International Scientific Conference: Chelyabinsk*, 313-316.
- Mathiasen, J. (2018). Can a legal dictionary go from sexist to inclusive?: The Dictionary of Legal Terms as a case of point. *Revista de llengua i Dret, Journal of Language and Law*, 70, 117-132.
- Matulewska, A. (2019). Legal and LSP Linguistics and Translation: Asian Languages' Perspectives. *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale de Sémiotique Juridique*, 32(1), 1–11.
- Meza, P., González-Catalán, F., López-Ferrero, C. & Gutiérrez, I. (2020). Plain writing in the legal field: An approach from the discourse of specialists. *Discourse Studies*, 146144562090602.
- Monzo, E. (2018). Translation and Culture in Legal Settings and Institutions. *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Culture*, Chapter: 25, 463-482.
- Nida, Y. (1978). Translation Science. *Questions of Linguistics*, 4, 40-46.
- Perez-Perdomo, R. (2019). Lost in Translation? Latin American Lawyers-Students in American Law Schools: Transplants and Globalization. *Onati Socio-Legal Series*, 9(6), 1078–1096.
- Sammut, I. (2018). The translation of EU trademarks – a special type of Intellectual Property translation. *International Journal of Legal Discourse*, 3(1), 133–158.
- Sanchez Lasaballett, E. (2018). Legal translation as comparative law: the case of the Brazilian contract law. *Uniform Law Review*, 23(3–4), 447–486.
- Scavuzzo, N. (2018). Interpreting the legal discourse: Points of view, functions of language and legal sentences. *Materiali per Una Storia Della Cultura Giuridica, Rivista Fondata Da Giovanni Tarello*, (2), 469–490.
- Skoczen, I. (2019). *Implicatures within Legal Language*. Law and Philosophy Library. Springer.
- Szeminska, W. & Wiech, A. (2019). eLex2. *Terminology*, 25(2), 198–221.
- Van Gerwen, H. (2019). Studying the forms and functions of legal translations in history: the case of 19th - century Belgium. *Translation and Interpreting : The International Journal of Translation and Interpreting Research*, 11(2), 106–118.
- Wallace, M. & Monzo, N. E. (2019). Legal translation and interpreting in public services: defining key issues, re-examining policies, and locating the public in public service interpreting and translation. *Revista de llengua i Dret, Journal of Language and Law*, 71, 1-12.
- Zgonnikova A. A. (2014). Clichéd phrases in business discourse. *Professional communication: topical issues of linguistics and methodology*, 7, 32-41.