1 ESTABLISHING A RESEARCH TRAJECTORY

1.1 Prologue: Monograph Structure & Rationale

The first study of Chapter 2, entitled *EU Discourse as a Textual, Legal and Linguistic Challenge*, sets out the overall conceptual framework for EU discourse by showing how EU translation is conceptualized in the extant typologies of legal translation and analysing what factors mould the language of EU law. It emphasizes that EU translation differs in many respects from traditional legal translation and is affected by a vast array of procedural, political and institutional factors which are conducive to the overall hybridity of EU discourse.

The purpose of the first study is to provide a prolegomenon to EU translation in the overall monograph’s design from such angles as intimated in its title. There is an account of selected legal translation typologies as propounded by Kjaer (2007), de Groot (2002) and Cao (2007) in order to illustrate the truly specific position of EU translation among legal texts. Trosborg’s (1997) and Garzone’s (2000) textual approaches drawing on EU texts’ hybridity are also commented upon.

EU texts challenge the myth of an easy translation, contrary to de Groot’s interpretation; they mingle traits of both international legal instruments and domestic legislation and stand for translation both within as well as between legal systems. Moreover, EU texts are interpreted as hybrid (political) texts which emerge as a result of the mixing of the languages, discourses and communication conventions endemic to globalization and more specifically to ongoing Europeanization. Thus, hybridity may be perceived as a trait of the EU legal system.

In the latter sections, the study sheds some light on the translation of EU law and its preconditions resulting from the constraints of its policy of multilingualism. Lastly, attention is paid to the specificities of EU-English as a product of convergence of legal traditions and interlingual assimilation marked by proclaimed syntactic as well as semantic simplification. EU-English in its de-culturalized and de-territorialized form with its linguistic aberrations is depicted as a controversial means of making multilingual translation into twenty-four official languages possible. From the angle of text linguistics, a new text genre suffused with terminology that is neither typically continental nor English originates at a supranational level, crafting a pan-European discourse where the global meets the local.
An even deeper insight into the nature of EU translation is given in the second study of Chapter 2, entitled *EU Translation as a Language of a Reunited Europe Reconsidered*, which reveals some hidden translatorial complexities. In order to grasp and critically appreciate the translations produced in the institutional habitat, it is necessary to comprehend the dynamics of the institutional language work as well as its constructive and constraining influences.

The focal point is the rationale behind the language policy of the EU as well as difficulties resulting from the actual execution of a language policy which meets the ideals set up by political dignitaries who had little regard for the particular problems they might pose for translators. Above all, the validity of the ‘classic’ concepts of translation studies such as ‘original’, ‘translation’, ‘equivalence’ and ‘intercultural communication’ is challenged as to their applicability in the EU setting.

In contrast to commonplace translation situations, the drafting of EU legislation and its translation take place concurrently and are intertwined. One of the key findings of the study is that EU multilingualism blurs the boundaries between the source text and target text(s) and replaces them with politically correct ‘language versions’. The source text is a collective product, dynamic and mutable, and recycled many times. It is “a fluid and changeable mass of text, composed of recycled translation, new linguistic material from both core or tool languages, as well as national languages incorporated into the core languages” (Dollerup 2004: 197).

Moreover, some theorists cast some doubt on designating EU translation as translation proper and interpret it as a case of ‘interlingual text reproduction’ since its main focus is not on target language conventions, but rather the reproduction of words and phrases that can ensure consistency and coherence within and across twenty-four equally authentic language versions (Kjaer 2007: 87). Therefore, the assertion that the real problem of translation at a supranational level is not translation but the standardization of terminology goes hand in hand with this understanding of EU translation.

Furthermore, the study reveals that EU translation also requires a novel approach to equivalence. This is presumed to exist between all language versions of an institutional-legal document, not only with the source text. As Koskinen (2000: 51) contends, equivalence is not a qualitative requirement, but a default attribute of EU translation; it is ‘existential equivalence’ because the main symbolic function of the language versions is to exist, which overrides their communicative function. As it often does not come easy to determine the source and target culture in the EU setting, the application of ‘culture’ to EU translation
remains very debatable despite recent obsessions with intercultural communication across translation studies. In the last section, the paper draws attention to some specificities and basic tenets of EU translation, making it possible to reach general conclusions about the enormous scale of translating at EU institutions.

After the first two studies, functioning more or less as a theoretical lead-in, Chapter 3 moves on to the actual analysis of selected linguistic phenomena of EU texts. Because it would be virtually impossible, if not hopeless, to give an all-encompassing analysis of all the manifold aspects of EU legislative documents on the linguistic plane due to the limited scope of the monograph, I will refrain from such an approach. For this reason, two language levels, i.e. the morphological and lexical levels, have been singled out in the overall research architecture. In some measure, this might be perceived as a certain limitation due to the overall linguistic complexity of the acquis communautaire genre. However, even the partial results at the stated language levels may still be ample enough to suggest the particularities of the texts under analysis.

A linguistic analysis of translation of English passive constructions in the assembled EU corpus forms the focus of the first case study of Chapter 3, entitled The Problem Area of the Passive and Its Reflection in Translation of Selected EU Texts (An English-Slovak Confrontation Perspective Study). At the morpho-syntactic level, the functional-semantic category of the voice (or diathesis) is interpreted in line with many studies (e.g. Bhatia 1994, Crystal and Davy 1986, Bážlik and Ambrus 2008) as an inherent marker of legalese (along with modal verbs exempt from analysis in the present work but dealt with by Gibová 2010).

A number of studies testify to a high degree of occurrence of the passive in specialized texts, which is connected to their pragmatic function to make an utterance appear as objective as possible. From the morphological angle, deagentization, i.e. the incidence of deagentive verbal linguistic forms with a non-specified doer of the action, seems very symptomatic of EU-ese. This is believed to keep the verbal action general and/or anonymous, thus being in compliance with the foggy language tendencies of EU discourse.

The study aims to delimit the passive voice, using the methods of quantitative corpus analysis, descriptive-contrastive and analytical-deductive methods, on the basis of the analysis of Slovak TL equivalents of English SL passive constructions in the assembled corpus. The texts subjected to analysis were all retrieved from the EUR-Lex database’s website (http://eur-lex.europa.eu/en/index/html), which comprises the whole bulk of EU legislation published simultaneously in all official languages of the EU. The goal of the paper is to ascertain if
Slovak TL equivalents of the English passives are picked by a translator in a systematic manner and to specify the diversity of translational-stylistic operations.

Leaning primarily on the linguistic research by Sokolová (1989, 1993) with regard to reflexive and participial transformates, and Newmark (1988) in terms of so-called ‘pure modulation’, the paper offers an analytical probe into the mentioned sorts of TL equivalents. The outcomes of the study confirm that regardless of the type of modal verb used with the passive (shall, may, should) there is a striking proclivity to translate English passives using their pertinent Slovak passive equivalents, apparently due to keeping the verbal action general and/or anonymous and thus consonant with the ‘fogginess’ of EU discourse. Therefore, the imitation of the language of the English source texts results in its de facto unsolicited consequence, evincing the morphological features of a Eurolect. Moreover, reflexive transformates seem to prevail over the participial ones, which is fully in accord with the Slovak norm to shun the less frequent periphrastic forms of the passive. Even if pure modulation comes second as the most proliferated translation variant of passive forms in all the texts under analysis, some minor translation variant types such as one-member sentences and zero-equivalent or verbal construction coupled by an adjective have also been disclosed at the microstructural level of the qualitative analysis.

The second study of Chapter 3, entitled Nominalization, Critical Stylistics and Translation Studies: A Case Study of EU-ese in Parallel English-Slovak Texts is a pertinent linguistic-translational investigation that reveals how EU translators have limited capacity to influence meaning making in translation, due to the restricted style of the EU’s institutional discourse. Combining critical stylistics insights and translatological analysis, the paper uses nominalization as a symptomatic stylistic marker of legalese, more precisely of EU institutional-legal texts. Cognitively, the paper draws on the textual-conceptual function of naming and describing within Jeffries’ model (2010). Simultaneously, it is responsive to her appeal to compare the ways in which different languages (here English and Slovak) produce textual meaning. The study examines complex noun phrases and discusses the variability of their translations using quantitative measures to contrast English and Slovak EU legal texts. The study suggests that Euro-texts follow different linguistic strategies of nominalization in the two tested languages. While pre-modification of the head noun tends to be used in English multi-word compound nouns, post-modification of the analogous linguistic structures seems to be dominant in Slovak.

Assuming texts can be tools of ideology, nominalization is explored as a means of the ‘institutionalization’ of translation by which EU institutions assert their textual presence by
pre-selection of certain linguistic forms (e.g. with regard to the rendition of –ing and –ed participles). An analysis of the translation of complex noun phrases reveals an uneven distribution of power in the institutional discourse as EU translators are obliged to use pre-selected linguistic forms/structures. In this way, their chances to influence the textual meaning making are significantly diminished. The research outcomes stress the value of further transdisciplinary research anchored in critical stylistics in conjunction with translation studies methodologies.

The third study of Chapter 3 has the somewhat expressive title Don’t Speak Gobbledygook or a Way Out of a Lexical Labyrinth of English Legalese and zeroes in on a lexical analysis of EU texts. Primarily well-known under denigrating labels such as legal ‘jargon’, ‘gibberish’, ‘waffle’, ‘clap-trap’ or even ‘flim-flam’ and many others, the language of law imposes extreme demands on the lexical preparedness of even experienced linguists and lawyers, not to mention non-native English speakers dealing with English legalese for professional reasons. Often one can witness these target groups of recipients whinging about its tortuous terms requiring further explanation by experts if they do not want to end up helplessly entrapped in the textual labyrinth of confusion and/or misinterpretation.

The corpus-based paper aims to pay heed to crucial lexical strands in English legalese along the lines of legal terms, collocations and language clichés with a special focus on EU documents. Employing identification and interpretation methods of research, the paper provides an analytical probe into the most vital lexical elements to be taken into account. At the same time, it provides cues for approaching a lexical analysis of the examined text genre, enhanced in places with minor translatological insights.

Functionally, terms synthesize knowledge and are used for the representation and transfer of specialized knowledge. They are endowed with high information content and have the capacity to project the basic content of texts. Legal terms should share the functional properties of terms, i.e. transparency, consistency, conciseness, appropriateness and derivability, as advocated by the international terminological norm ISO 704. From this it follows that the same concepts should be denominated by the same terms, while different concepts should be named with distinct terms. This explicitly excludes synonymy from the language of EU law and encourages repetition. Although legal language strives to avoid stylistic variation, in practice neither synonymy nor polysemy may be completely omitted. One of the qualitative assessments of EU translation is their compliance with institutional terminological resources, e.g. IATE and the DGT in-house glossary as well as equivalents used in earlier versions of a legal instrument as evidenced in EUR-Lex.
Even if EU legal communication is a complex textual venture, a certain attempt at its lexical stratification is made in the paper. Legal terms in a wider sense and legal terms in a narrower sense (the ‘meta-terminology’ of the EU) are elucidated, drawing on Škrlantová’s (2005a) approach. In addition, foggy lexemes redolent of ‘discoursal nativization’ (Modiano 2001) along with neologisms creating a certain interlingual subscene in the national vocabularies of the Member States are also paid attention to. It should be added that in EU-ese a neologism in a broad sense involves not only coining a new (English) expression but in principle any expression which is not a TL term, *i.e.* a functional equivalent, which has a limited potential to activate relevant knowledge structures: “terms that do not belong to the selected target-language legal system must be qualified as neologisms” (de Groot 2002: 234, translation by author).

Shedding some light on collocations, a perhaps most tantalizing finding is that collocations made up of coordinating constituents (so-called doublets), so symptomatic of legalese, are largely backgrounded in the analysed EU texts. This modern trait of EU-ese is also enhanced by the negligible presence of archaisms. Contrary to expectations, the unique taste of legalese has not been whetted by archaisms but rather by recurrent language clichés.

The fourth paper, *A Terminological Analysis of EU-ese Based on the IATE Database*, is a follow-up to the previous lexicologically-oriented study. The specialized language of EU documents forms a natural habitat for an analysis of terminology, which has always been a vexing issue in legalese, to say the least. The paper offers an insight into EU terms as units of legal knowledge with a precise meaning firstly through the conceptual treatment of some of their theoretical properties and secondly through a comparative terminological analysis in IATE. The set goal in this paper is to verify the reliability of terms used in the selected EU institutional-legal document from the financial domain by means of the IATE terminological database. The paper works on a central hypothesis that all the terms used, whether in a wider or narrower sense, are very reliable. In addition, the paper focuses on the relationship of terms to everyday language, juxtaposing the general and legal meaning of lexemes and their terminological (in-)congruence.

Recently, research in terminology has undergone substantial changes following fundamental developments connected with the advent of corpora. The objectivist approach to terminology, as represented by Wüster’s General Theory of Terminology (GTT), has treated concepts as the main object of study, positing the onomasiological perspective (*i.e.* working from a concept to a term), the clear-cut nature of concepts, univocity (the one-to-one permanent assignment of a term to a concept) and synchrony (Biel 2014a: 33). Nonetheless,
later on, the GTT came under fierce critique under various methodological frameworks, especially cognitive and communication sciences, which argued that concepts are not discrete; terms are context-dependent, polysemous, ambiguous and subject to variation, and onomasiology should be replaced by semasiology, *i.e.* working from a term to a concept by analysing corpus data to arrive at the meaning of extracted terms (Cabré Castellví 1999: 107-111). Lately, further improvements in several alternative approaches to terminology have been proposed, including textual terminology, Cabré Castellví’s communicative theory of terminology and sociocognitive terminology.

It is stressed in the study that the specificity of EU terminology lies in the constant interaction between the Member States’ national terminologies and the supranational terminology. Hence, EU terms are peculiar both to the national legal system as well as the EU legal system, having multiple references, resulting in “a conceptual osmosis” in EU legal terminology (Biel 2014a: 66). The one-to-one permanent assignment of a term to a concept constitutes a strict terminological requirement in EU-ese, coupled with the avoidance of “culturally-embedded” legal terms which could be questionable in translation.

The issue of reliability of terms is frequently a bone of contention in new EU Member States in particular. The paper fully subscribes to the idea that the formation of terminological databases in the EU strengthens the terminological unity of pan-European EU discourse. Strikingly, the analysis reveals that the reliability of terms, whether in a wider or narrower sense, is not the same in the two examined language versions. Whereas the tested English terms turned out to be reliable or very reliable according to IATE, the Slovak terms showed some instances without checked reliability. This hint could be connected to the fact that even after more than ten years since Slovakia’s accession to the EU, there are still underdeveloped databases for new EU languages compared to English. Last but not least, the paper also called into attention the contrast between the general and legal meaning of particular lexemes using Macmillan and Black’s Law Dictionary. This has confirmed the theory by Šarcevic (1997) that legal terms may develop from general lexemes based on ordinary language as long as they take on a special legal meaning.

Moving onwards, Chapter 4 constitutes the translatological completion of the monograph. Being predominantly empirical in its character, it centres on the presentation of research outcomes with regard to an analysis of translation procedures firstly in EU texts only and secondly, in comparison with a selected literary text. The first study, *Some Thoughts on Translation Procedures as Employed in Acquis Communautaire Documents*, gives a textual analysis of major translation procedures employed in EU texts in a nutshell. The aim of the
paper is to present my own synthesizing model of translation procedures that I drew up specifically for the examined text genre. Drawing on Vinay and Darbelnet’s (1958/1995), Newmark’s (1981, 1988) and Schreiber’s (1993, 1998) earlier models, the paper mingles quantitative and qualitative methods of research, highlighting the broader implications of the manipulating power of EU language policy.

The proposed model consists of transposition (word-class and sentence-member), modulation (pure modulation in syntax and modulation of expression in lexis), permutation (minimum, median, maximum), expansion, reduction, calque (semantic and word-formation) and borrowing (transference and transcription). Statistically, the corpus analysis draws on a database of 2,663 excerpted unis. The analyses were performed partly by concordancers of the Wordsmith Tools software and partly manually because they are the outcome of mental-cognitive processes.

Even if the topic of translation procedures appears of considerable relevance within translation studies at present, at the time there were actually very few academic publications dealing with this issue. The only exception was perhaps the pioneer treatise *Stylistique comparée du français et de l’anglais*, written by Paris-born Canadians Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet as early as 1958 but not translated into English until 1995, which was the first treatment of translation techniques with a clear methodological purpose. With regard to English scholars, Newmark’s contribution to the topic in terms of his rather sketchy 1981 model (see Newmark 1981: 30-32), later updated in his seminal publication *A Textbook of Translation*, lacked a deeper framework structure and was rather humble. Based on the sociobiological notion of memes – ideas that spread, develop and replicate like genes – Chesterman (1997: 87-116) mapped his “meme pool” with a chapter on translation strategies, proposing mainly syntactic/grammatical (coded as G), semantic (S) and pragmatic (Pr) strategies. In his own words, the classification proposed is a “heuristic one” and “uses accessible terminology; seems to differentiate enough, but does not get bogged down in ‘unportable’ detail” (ibid: 93). However, in comparison to Newmark’s approach, there are too many subcategories, some of which are based on concepts by Vinay and Darbelnet (e.g. most semantic strategies) and Catford (e.g. unit shift and level shift), which makes Chesterman’s approach far too complex and contrary to his own painstakingly detailed characteristics. In the context of European publications, a distinguishing treatise shedding fresh light on the structural comparison of the English, German and French language pairs with regard to translation procedures was written by the German scholar Schreiber in 1993. Marked by a transparent organization, in sharp contrast to the models mentioned above, Schreiber (1998:
151-154) plainly splits his translation procedures into lexical, grammatical, semantic and auxiliary categories.

A niche in the research into translation procedures was only overcome by the little more than sporadic papers by some scholars which were published in a variety of translation journals, testifying to the importance and topicality of this issue. Among the papers worth mentioning, there is the work by Salkie (2001), offering a new look at modulation, and Sewell’s (2001) and Garnier’s (2009) work analysing calques in comparable corpora. Additionally, Klaudy and Károly (2005) delve into the implicitations in translation, and a number of recent researchers have started to pay attention to explicitation, putting its hitherto commonly accepted interpretation as a translation universal to the test (Englund-Dimitrova 2003; Pym 2005; Kamenická 2007; Baumgarten, Meyer and Özcetin 2008 and Becher 2010). Seen from a complex perspective, broad-brush pictures of translation procedures have been painted only by Molina and Hurtado Albir (2002), who called for a dynamic and functional approach to translation procedures, and more recently by Ordudari (2007) and Zakhir (2008).

In Slovakia, readings on translation procedures have been almost completely absent, being restricted to less than a dozen papers, ranging from somewhat dated essays by Bareš (1974) and Dokulil (1982), to Hájiková’s short paper (2005) on translation procedures in legal documents intermingled with a detour into legal terminology. In this respect, the most comprehensive treatment of translation procedures endemic to legal texts has been provided by Gibová (2010) in her monograph.

The first study of Chapter 4 also sheds some light on the terminological and conceptual confusions between translation method, translation procedure (or technique) and translation strategy. Translation procedure is understood, in line with Molina and Hurtado Albir’s seminal paper (2002: 498) as “an instrument of textual analysis that, in combination with other instruments, allows us to study how translation equivalence works in relation to the original text.” Translation method, which is part of the translation process and a global option for a translator affecting the whole text, should be singled out from translation procedure (or technique), which affects smaller sections of translations and describes the outcome. Translation strategies are related to the mechanisms employed by translators throughout the whole translation process to find an adequate translation solution. Since translation procedures enable us to analyse and classify how translation equivalence works, the following quintessential characteristics may be ascribed to them: they affect the results of translation,
they are classified in comparison with the original, they affect micro-units of texts, they are by nature discursive and contextual, and they are functional (ibid.: 509).

The rationale of the analysis of translation procedures in the examined text type (under the English-Slovak interlingual comparison) is that it may be instrumental in clarifying how Euro-texts have become what they are. Notably, translation procedures imply certain choices and an analysis of the procedures can thus be aligned with the interpretation of texts as “networks of systems of options which are selected amongst in the production of texts” (Fairclough, qtd. in Koskinen 2008: 122). If each semantic choice has its own meaning potential, each translation procedure may also result in shifting the meaning potential. An analysis of the translation procedures may thus disclose significant processes of emphasizing particular meanings and subduing or hiding others.

The performed corpus analysis has revealed that direct translation procedures are prevalent over oblique ones: calques and borrowings make up 43.07% whereas transpositions and modulations comprise 31.24% of all undertaken translation procedures. This can be explained by the source text and its status in a supranational discourse community, which is influenced by EU language policy. In the EU setting, the structure of a source text has a bearing on the choice of a translation method on the basis of which the EU translator goes about translation. EU documents embody an independent supra-national textual unit. Therefore, it is not the translator’s task to tailor these documents to national legislation texts, but to keep them in the unaltered form, striving for the most faithful expressions for the source text and thus ensuring the European legislation approximation process. As a result, an overall exoticizing veneer of the analysed EU documents has been corroborated.

The second study in Chapter 4, Non-Literary and Literary Text in Translation Juxtaposed, focuses on a comparative analysis of translation procedures in two typologically dissimilar text types which are in general apprehended as hardly commensurable. To this end, an EU institutional-legal text entitled Council Directive 2004/114/EC and a novel excerpt from The Shack by William P. Young are analysed against an English-Slovak contrastive background. Even if the comparative aspect of the study with a partial focus on a literary text might at first sight seem to subvert the streamlined research scheme with regard to EU texts, such a methodological procedure has been taken on purpose in order to contrast the studied non-literary EU text with a very ‘dissimilar’ text type. Such an experiment is to accentuate and help understand both the linguistic and translatological otherness of EU texts.

The focal point of the empirical case study revolves around the concept of ‘translation procedure’, i.e. a tool of textual analysis originating from comparing the source and target text
affecting sentences and smaller units of language. To a large extent, the paper leans on translation procedure models by Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/1995), Newmark (1981, 1988) and Schreiber (1993, 1998) as crucial theoretical underpinnings. That is not to say, of course, that other authors’ ideas are strictly incompatible (e.g. Hardin and Picot qtd. in Zakhir 2008; Pápai qtd. in Becher 2010; Klaudy and Károly qtd. in Pym 2005): they are used whenever it is felt useful, necessary or perhaps just intriguing to do so. In addition, the empirical study stresses the need to enhance the author’s proposed construct with some further translation procedures (e.g. recasting sentences, naturalization, adaptation and paraphrase) so as to comply with the multifaceted nature of the literary text, which is so different from the non-literary text.

By merging the methods of contrastive textual analysis, corpus analysis and analytical-deductive methods enhanced by a comparative dimension, the identification facet of research takes turns with the interpretation layer throughout the whole study layout. Research outcomes, gained by the application of the said methods, will answer the key research question, i.e. whether dissimilar textual genres produce different translation procedures and what striking differences (if any) between examined translation procedures occurring in the two textual genres under scrutiny can be observed. Additionally, the study also deals with a battery of minor research questions (see subsection 4.2.3) which will be resolved in the unfolding analysis. Overall, the analysis results contribute to solving partial translation problems encountered in both text types.

Being fully aware of the limited research sample, the results gained offer only approximate data (especially with regard to the literary text whose rendering is much more contingent on the individual author’s poetics and translator’s performance, to say the least) and thus do not purport to offer sweeping generalizations. Both quantitative and qualitative findings concerning the translation procedures in the literary text could be altered by the inclusion of a more culture-specific source text or a greater genre multifariousness of literary texts. The comparative case study, however, draws on the author’s long-term research conducted within her 2012 monograph, and from this point of view the research outcomes surpass those of a shallow analytical probe. As already implied, the partial focus on the literary text was to add up to the specificity of translation procedures endemic to an EU text. Indeed, a deeper delving into the translation of the literary text fell outside this monograph’s scope. The merit of the study is that it draws attention to translation procedures as a possible tool for the systematization of translation theory. Moreover, in this study, by dint of selection
of formally and semantically different text genres, the applicability of my proposed translation procedures construct has been put to the test.

Finally, the third study in Chapter 4, entitled *Hybridity in EU-ese: a Pan-European Harmonization and/or National Disharmony in Translation?* aims to explore the complexities of hybridity, determine its sources and outline how it is manifested in EU text-formation, terminology, stylistics and syntax. The concept of hybridity is part of ‘cultural translation’ and localization trends in translation studies and is relevant in situations where there is no traditional source/start text and usually no target/fixed text. Conceptually, the paper draws on Simon’s (2011) interpretation of hybridity, redolent of Adab and Schäffner’s (1997, 2001) earlier approaches. The springboard for the analysis is a premise that hybrid texts result from a pan-European convergence of cultures and languages as a result of which they reflect specific macro- and microtextual features which may clash with TL conventions. The study examines hybridity as a linguistic-cultural effect of pan-Europeanization and as a creator of transculture. Its cross-sectional design suggests that hybridity in EU-ese is multi-layered, affects EU translators’ institutional patterns of behaviour and has a bearing on the interpretation of EU translation. With hybrid source text and target text, hybrid deterritorialized and acultural terminology, lexical interferences and dissonances, hypnotic target text production colonising the integrity of national legislation, the study outcomes do not sit easily with the view of EU translations as “agents of dehybridisation” (Pym 1996).

Fusing macrotextual and microtextual insights, the final study shows how EU discourse accomplishes its practices, why hybridity has its place in it, by what means hybridity comes to expression in EU-ese and how it affects EU translation. The implications of the qualitative analysis are that the hybridity of EU discourse is reflected in the interplay between supranational and national elements in translation. Besides, hybridity acts as a multiplier of mutation with lexical interferences and dissonances and last but not least, it may lead to broken expectancy norms on the part of TT recipients owing to the hypnotic character of EU texts.
1.2 Delimitation of the Research Area

1.2.1 The translation of EU law as institutional translation

EU translation epitomizes an illuminating example of institutional translation which has with its megalithic proportions, grown into a translational culture of its own. The concept of institutional translation refers to those cases when an official body (in our case supranational multicultural organization) uses translation as a means of addressing a particular audience (i.e. the Member States) by stipulating their rights and obligations.

Significantly, in institutional translation, the institution is typically the author of both the source text and its translation(s), which is not a quotidian situation in translation practice. Therefore, institutional translation is ‘self-translation’ (Koskinen 2008: 24). In institutional translation it is often vital, symbolically or on practical grounds, to preserve the different versions of a particular legal document, ensuring they are equally equivalent and authentic. Here, the skopos of the source text and its translation remains a constant: although the different language versions of an EU institutional-legal document are levelled at manifold subgroups of the recipients (i.e. Member States), the authorial intention of the law-maker remains the same. Hence the need for keeping up the mirage or ‘legal fiction’ that multilingual legislation is concurrently drafted in all the official languages. Although EU texts may be held as translations in a genetic sense, they no longer function as such, and in this regard ‘authenticated’ translations are akin to self-translations or auto-translations.

In the institutional community, the translator becomes part of a “situated institutional practice that has become routinized and habituated over time” (Kang 2011: 144). The institutional approach assumes that translators make conscious choices to adjust their translations in the sense of making the translation serve the purpose of the translating institution, acting as its agents. Therefore, institutionality in this respect is a function of EU texts, not of the institutional setting per se. In order to rationalize EU translation, EU legal documents are subject to extensive formulaicity and standardization, and adherence to predetermined conventions makes for one of the primal translation quality criteria. For instance, Slovak EU translators are required to comply with a number of guidelines and style guides (e.g. Joint Practical Guide, Manual of Precedents for Acts established within the Council of the European Union, English Style Guide etc.), the IATE terminological database and EU glossaries, and the EUR-Lex law database. These resources and institutional norms as set
down in the guidelines are designed to ensure terminological consistency, uniform institutional style and textual patterns with a minimum degree of variation. Hence, the EU institutions regulate and control the language and format of the source texts and target texts, resulting in their mirror-image-like nature comparable to the translation of language matrices filled with particular language content.

In this light, it may be presupposed that the EU institutions’ goals and translation policy significantly affect translators’ choice of strategies and leave a mark on the language employed in their documents. The policy of the EU multilingualism is linked with literal translation strategies, both at the terminological and syntactic levels, to ensure uniform interpretation of the legal intent. Based on my research, I argue that EU law requires the source-oriented rather than receiver-oriented approach. Even though this translation strategy is not identical with word-for-word translation, it intimates an avoidance of cultural adaptation, which is common in intercultural translation. In the multicultural discourse community, literal equivalents are interpreted as a guarantee of ensuring the same message to all text recipients: “there is a clear, albeit unwritten, preference for surface-level similarity, which is assumed to guarantee that readers of the various translations get the same message” (Koskinen 2000: 54). At the terminological level, literal translation is backed up by supranational terms that reflect efforts to find a common ground in the supranational setting; thus they are “reasonably transparent and can be easily translated” (Šarcevic 1997: 261). At the syntactic level, literal translation may be supported by a more straight-forward language of hybrid texts (Garzone 2000:6). All the above shape and mould the institutional translation and norms.

1.2.2 Critical reception of EU translation

According to Toury’s well-known definition, translation is a norm-governed activity (qtd. in Koskinen 2008: 147). Norms also bridge the micro-world of individual translators and the institutional framework. That said, translations should fulfil communication norms by optimising communication between the ST author(s) and TT recipients. Moreover, the communication norms are subordinate to expectancy norms which comprise the TT recipients’ expectations as to translations and corresponding native texts. Expectancy norms are decisive for a degree of divergence that TT recipients are capable of tolerating (Chesterman 1993: 8-10).
An influx of euro-rhetoric manifested in new buzzwords (e.g. additionality, creeping competence, Europe ‘a la carte’, hard core, ‘multi-speed’ Europe), tortuous syntactic structures leading to sentences stretching over several lines, stylistic deficiencies marked by text redundancies and features unnatural for national languages, increase the foreignness of EU texts and the distance between the TL version and its recipients. In this light, Glanert (2008: 163) observes that the new EU terminology triggers off “a semantic earthquake” in the national languages of the Member States. In this manner, national legal traditions are bound to vanish in the process of the harmonization of EU law. On these grounds, it does not come as a surprise that these negative linguistic tendencies resulted into campaigns such as KISS (Keep It Short and Simple), Fight the FOG (also being an acronym for “frequency of gobbledygook” or “full of garbage”) and more recently the Clear Writing Campaign, commenced by EU translators who were concerned that the European Union’s message was not getting across to the general public because it was obscured by foggy language (Wagner, Bech and Martínez 2002: 74).

It is thus evident that EU translations have failed to meet the expectancy norms of many national recipients, including Slovak ones. With multilingual Eurospeak, “each national language is forced into an unnatural format” (Koskinen 2000: 55). There is a chasm between expectancy norms and constraints that EU translators are tied up with when translating EU multilingual law. Considering multilingualism-related restrictions and the complex conceptual network of supranational law, the animadversion directed at translators, except for critical errors made, is not always justified. It is more often than not forgotten that EU translators form part of a gigantic machinery, where their language is not individual but is heavily controlled, and consequently their translation is not a personal act but a collective expression with a limited responsibility. The attempts to castigate EU translators mirror one’s insufficient knowledge about the specificities of EU translation. As aptly noted by Dollerup (2001: 285), “EU translations are sometimes accused of being poor and [...] the texts are assessed by criteria which do not really apply.” Moreover, he duly emphasizes that “it is not translation alone that makes the product” (ibid.: 290), but rather a whole spectrum of procedural, ideological and political factors.

Some theorists tend to ascribe the poor quality of EU translations to a low quality of drafting (Caliendo 2004: 161; Šarcevic 2013: 22). This may also be enhanced by non-native speakers of English and French who draft the majority of documents, as well as native speakers who work in the institutional setting and face “some erosion of their ability to write their mother tongue” (Wagner, Bech and Martínez 2002: 76). In some quarters, the lower
quality of EU translations is attributed to the choice of translation procedures rather than the deficiency of translators’ skills (Tosi 2002: 188). In my view, the mediocre quality of EU translations has also been caused, apart from the above factors, by no established equivalents of EU terms, underdeveloped quality assurance in their initial stage, time constraints and the overall specificity of EU language. The linguistic peculiarity of EU texts is a consequence of their hybridity, since they fuse many national legal systems, languages and cultures. The hybridity of EU language results in a perpetual interplay between national and supranational elements in translation. To reconcile these forces, EU language ought to be conceived of as a “multilingual legal language realised in distinct legal varieties of the national languages with an interdependent conceptual system” (Biel 2014b). EU-English has been referred to as “a continental variety of English” (Dollerup 2001: 287) and its language has been perceived as devoid “of pretentious juridical style” (Tosi 2002: 171). In this vein, some scholars (Salmi-Tolonen 2004: 1187) regard EU-English as a novel legal variant of the official languages. According to Wagner et al. (2002: 48), the principal difficulty of EU translation is said to lie, apart from its linguistic aspects, in the “tortuous progress” by which EU documents are drafted, amended and sent for translation.

Overall, the quality of EU translations has significantly improved over the course of time. In the Slovak context, this was apparent after Slovakia’s accession to the EU in 2004, when the translation process was taken over by the DGT, which translates most legislative documents in-house, making use of terminological databases and consultations with national experts. It should be stressed, though, that this was not the case with translating the pre-accession acquis into Slovak, which took place predominantly outside the institutional setting. With a view to the analysed EU documents, after the conducted linguistic-translatological analysis, it may be claimed that no critical errors in the sense of legal violation of any rights and obligations have been uncovered. The ascertained deficiencies were mostly connected with stylistic and grammatical errors (see Bednárová-Gibová 2012 for more detail) or terminological inconsistency. Although these infelicities may not be judged as critical, they decrease the quality of translated law to a considerable degree and may be seen as an obstacle to the uniform application of the legal intent. However, an intriguing consequence of errors, resulting in divergences between language versions of an EU institutional-legal document, has been called to attention by Šarcevic (2013: 6), who contends that such linguistic discrepancies have an adverse impact on the requirement of legal certainty in institutional translation, and the right to access legislation in one’s native tongue. Hence, in order to prevent a threat to legal certainty, EU legislation should be sufficiently intelligible and error-free.
1.3 The Current State of Research into EU Texts

The ongoing globalization, growing co-operation and contacts between cultures have increased the need for institutional translation both at national and supranational levels. Over the years, the European Union with its special political and social basis has turned into a gargantuan institution with its own laws and regulations having a bearing on its translation policy. Due to its intricacies and qualitative differences from other sorts of legal translation, EU translation justifiably calls for a unique approach. This has also been confirmed by a number of scholars who argue that the translation of EU law should become an independent research field with its own theoretical framework (see Kjaer 2007; Koskinen 2008; Šarcevic 2006, 2012 and Biel 2014a). Lately, some progressive attempts have been made to establish European Legal Linguistics as a separate branch of study with its own journal Zeitschrift für Europäische Rechtslinguistik at the university of Cologne in Germany (Burr and Kempen 2007).

Tracing the inception of the theoretical reflections on EU translation, already in the late 1980’s, Brian Mossop called for an institutional approach to translation. Accordingly, he defined translating institutions as “a missing factor in translation theory” (Koskinen 2008: 4). However, EU translation became the object of scientific enquiry as late as the second half of the 1990’s and it still represents a rich reservoir of theoretical reflections as well as analyses of practical translation-oriented issues. Among the chief motivating factors of the increased interest in theory and practice of EU translation, there was an enlargement of the EU back in 1995 when the number of official languages increased to eleven, as well as the European integration efforts in-progress which heralded the accession of many other Central and Eastern European countries. Thus, the number of official languages of the EU increased and put EU language policy to the test more than ever. Besides, the overall paradigm shift in the theory of translation from linguistic and text-oriented approaches after the so-called communicative-pragmatic turn to the analysis of broader intercultural interconnections in translation also left its mark on the avenues of interest in EU translation.

Making up for the previous decade, the research into EU translation has been carried out in a rather intense manner since the 2000s, by more or less the same personalities, ranging from the experts directly involved in the EU institutions (Brian McCluskey, Emma Wagner, Colin Robertson), via translation studies scholars (Anna Trosborg, Christina Schäffner, Radegundis Stolze, Cay Dollerup, Giuditta Caliendo, Kaisa Koskinen, Peter Sandrini and Lucja Biel), up to legal experts (Gerard-René de Groot, Susan Šarcevic and Anne Lise Kjaer).
In their publications, all of them are striving to elucidate EU translation by means of translation theory concepts, or offer radically new theoretical points of reference. However, they all seem to be consonant in the idea that EU translation is a specific sort of translation taking place under highly specific conditions.

In compliance with the direction of translation studies after the 1990’s following a predominantly linguistics-based phase, a good many papers attending to cultural, social and ideological conditions and consequences of EU translation started off a new line of enquiry. In this light, the publication of Koskinen’s ground-breaking paper *Institutional Illusions. Translating in the EU Commission* (2000), followed by *How to Research EU Translation?* (2001), bringing a whole lot of inspirational incentives in terms of methodological considerations, had a tremendous impact. Her observations regarding the role of the source text, translation as intercultural communication, visibility versus anonymity of translator and equivalence as a (pre)historic concept indicate that there is a gap between what is being said in translation theory and what is being done in the everyday work of EU translators.

Among the most thought-provoking papers and/or book chapters on EU translation, first of their kind, rank those penned by Wagner (2001a), Schäffner (2001), Stolze (2001), Šarcevic (2000, 2001b, 2006), Kjaer (2007) and Biel (2007). Both Wagner (2001a) and Schäffner (2001) must be credited with their somewhat intuitive observations at the time when theoretical developments and approaches to the subject were still in their infancy, that elucidating EU translation both as a process and product in their relevance for translation studies (in the widest sense) poses a challenge to the discipline. On the one hand, the German scholar Stolze (2001) acutely identifies a major guideline of EU translation to keep it as abstract as possible and never introduce legal concepts into the conceptual horizon of the target legal system. On the other hand, the Croatian legal expert Šarcevic (2000, 2001b, 2006) stresses in her numerous papers that developing sound translation strategies which safeguard both legal certainty and linguistic purity is key to the success of translations in the future of the multilingualism of the EU. The goal of the translators of the *acquis* ought not to be fidelity to one source text, but fidelity to the single instrument, to Community law and to their own language, which only serves to highlight a special role of EU translation. Thus, it can be said that the ultimate goal of EU translation is to produce parallel texts that will be interpreted and applied uniformly in all the Member States, having the same meaning, legal effect, and intent (Šarcevic 2000: 5).

Next, Biel (2007) proposes to treat the translation of EU legislation as a distinct subgenre of legal translation, thus concurring with Kjaer (2007). Biel also argues that owing
to constraints of multilingualism, the language of EU legislation is distinct from that of national legislation, thus opening new possible avenues of research. The merits of Kjaer’s pre-eminent book chapter lie in her urgent appeals to emphasize a most specific nature of EU translation induced by the special character of the legal system and translational situation. Above all, Kjaer (2007: 90) stresses that if one wishes to grasp the way legal translation functions in the EU, it is not sufficient to apply translation theory, comparative law and legal theory. One also has to take into account integration theories which can explain the dynamics of European legal integration and the ways that interlingual communication of national and international interpretive communities contribute to that process.

Exploring credits in EU translation further, Trosborg (1997) introduces an influential, if somewhat contentious concept of hybridity of EU political texts, later on also elaborated by Schäffner and Adab (2001a, 2001b). Moreover, a certain resurgence of interest in this research topic is observable in Tirkonnen-Condit (2001) and in McAuliffe (2011) who also focused on hybridity with special attention to EU translation.

The issue of the complexities of EU language work, its pitfalls and dangers in the enlarged Europe reverberated throughout the papers by Weir (1995), Dollerup (1996, 2001), Cunningham (2001), McCluskey (2001), Šarcevic (2001b), van Els (2001), Berteloot (2004) and Fischer (2010). An overview of the knotty relationship between language policy, translation and political power, in a way rarely seen in translation studies, is given by Nordland (2002). More recently, a conflict of interest between the smaller and larger language communities in having only one or several institutional working languages for the EU, sketching a plausible solution which would serve both political and communicative demands, has been presented by Ammon (2006).

Furthermore, discourse features of EU institutional-legal texts have been fleshed out by Caliendo (2004); Caliendo, Di Martino and Venuti (2005); Wodak and Weiss (2005) and Krzyzanowski (2010) in his treatise analysing discourses as diverse as those of the EU politicians, of Europe’s national media as well as of migrants living in Europe. The problems of multilingual translation from a legal angle have been expatiated upon by Garzone (2000), Sandrini (2004a, 2004b, 2009) and Gémar (2001, 2013), and more recently by Felici (2010), Arntz (2012), Pommer (2012), and Šarcevic (2013). Euro-English as a particular linguistic reality of EU texts marked by strange bureaucratic parlance, text redundancies and a deluge of new terminology shrouded in ‘Euro-fog’ has been dealt with in the works by Wagner (2001b), Kjaer (2002), Fenyö (2006), Mollin (2006), Jesenská (2007), and more recently by Pozzo (2012a) and Robertson (2012).
Except for the papers given above, published mostly in prominent translation journals such as *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology, The Translator* or *Across Languages and Cultures*, it was not until the crucial publications by Šarcevic (2001a) and Wagner, Bech and Martinez (2002) came out as first ‘large-scale’ treatments of EU translation that a way was paved for a more scientific treatment of the given research subject. A certain innovation in the sense of a valuable contribution to the sociology of EU translation, after a long-lasting wave of terminological research into legal translation, came only with Koskinen (2008). Her monograph *Translating Institutions. An Ethnographic Study of EU Translation* outlines a framework for research on translation in the institutional habitat, using the Finnish translation unit at the European Commission as a case study. Due to their foundational multilingualism, the European institutions stand for both translating and translated institutions. Koskinen sets out to explore the organizational role and professional identity of the Finnish translation unit as cultural mediators, and uses the analysis of this data to elaborate broader methodological and theoretical issues. Using a three-level research design, she devotes herself to the study of the *institutional framework*, its rules and norms; the study of *translators* working in specific institutional settings including their views on their roles and status, and sociologically oriented *textual analysis* of translated unofficial documents and their source texts focusing on shifts. The most important findings of the analytical book section concern the ascertained attempts on the part of translators to enhance readability of case documents, which is, however, thwarted by the second tendency, that of the institution pushing itself to the forefront by the choice of certain bureaucratic expressions and buzz words.

Moving onwards, a fairly novel avenue of research in EU translation over the past years seems to be the impact of EU legal translation on national legal languages. The studies by Catenaccio (2008), Mori (2011), Piehl (2013) and Biel (2014a), respectively offer insights into UK English, Maltese, Finnish and Polish, based on thorough empirical research. Catenaccio (2008) compares the language of UK statutes on unfair terms in consumer contracts before and after the transposition of EU directives. Although she finds very little similarity between the pre-transposition UK national legal documents and the EU legal instruments in terms of text layout, terminology, standardized formulae or syntactic issues, quite the contrary is true of the post-transposition statutes. The latter bear close textual resemblance to EU directives, adopt even their terminology and also showcase some semantic and syntactic simplification. In a similar vein, Mori (2011) explores EU Maltese and its impact on the language of national law. Intriguingly enough, she sees EU Maltese as a source of linguistic regeneration rather than degeneration, contrary to the commonplace
interpretation of EU-ese as a hybrid linguistic form inviting critical comments and/or defamatory attributes. Lastly, Piehl (2013) delves into her corpus-based study of translated EU directives and Finnish national legal instruments, with syntactic issues in mind. Even if she corroborates the incidence of longer sentences with more clauses, an increased number of certain participial modifiers superseding relative clauses, a large number of relative clauses and striking proclivities to subordination in EU directives, her conclusion is that EU law has not affected the syntax of Finnish law in large measure. However, she concedes that the influence is likely to be traced in syntactic properties such as “an atypical frequency of certain forms” (Piehl 2013: 179), which were not covered by her study. In this sense, the ‘atypical’ syntactic forms observable in the national legal documents have been confirmed by Matulewska (2013: 110) noting that “there are so many Anglicisms and so much transfer of English syntax into Polish texts” and Bednárová-Gibová (2012) in the English-Slovak language dimension, resulting into ‘Europeanization’ of individual legal languages.

Moreover, a few studies were conducted from a comparative legal perspective to verify the impact of EU terminology on national legal terminology. They were elaborated in a special issue of European Review of Private Law (2012), edited by Barbara Pozzo. While Álvaraz Lata (qtd. in Pozzo 2012b: 1321) reports the introduction of new legal concepts which replace synonymous more traditional concepts of Spanish law, Caufmann (qtd. in Pozzo 2012b: 1354) focuses on changing definitions of Belgian legal concepts, arguing that the implementation of EU directives “distorts the Belgian legal terminology”.

To date, however, one of the most in-depth investigations into the nature of EU translation abroad has been provided by Biel (2014a). The author is concerned with the overriding question to what extent the Polish of the EU law as a hybrid variant deviates from the language conventions of the national law both at the microstructural and macrostructural level. In her book, Biel reactivates Chesterman’s concept of textual fit1 and extends it to EU translation, approaching it as a measure of how translated EU legislation departs from the TL conventions of national legislation, which is in her case exemplified by Polish law. Drawing on the potential of corpus-based methods to research legal translation, her major findings in the empirical section suggest that translated EU law employs lower terminological rigour, atypical collocations, more lexical variation and synonymy, a reduced level of formulaicity due to increased variation in the text genre, as well as greater terminological inconsistency in comparison to national law. At the theoretical level, Biel’s ideas about textual fit are of

---

1 Textual fit is a linguistic distance between translations and nontranslations of a comparable genre (Biel 2014a: 118).
paramount importance for general translation theory. Textual fit is subordinated and inversely proportional to equivalence: the higher the equivalence requirement, the lower the focus on the textual fit. Overall, the findings of Biel’s study amply demonstrate that the textual fit of EU law is divergent. Translated EU law markedly departs from the generic conventions of Polish law, invading its integrity and colonising the genre. As a consequence, translated law creates a distinct, foreignising European variety of Polish (a Eurolect), which apart from being a product of efforts to ensure a uniform interpretation and application of multilingual law, seems to be also a by-product of the unequal interaction between a majority and minority culture (Biel 2014a: 16).

In 2015, a collection of essays entitled Language and Culture in EU Law. Multidisciplinary Perspectives was edited by Šarcevic. Written by distinguished legal experts and linguistic scholars, the contributions provide new multidisciplinary perspectives on the crucial role of language and culture as key forces shaping the dynamics of EU law. The chief focus is on EU multilingual law-making, problems of term formation in the multilingual setting, issues related to the multilingual interpretation of EU legislation and case law by the national courts and an analysis of the pros and cons of translating from a lingua franca.

Turning attention to the research into EU translation in Slovakia, it has been undertaken in a number of studies, first and foremost by Škrlantová (2004, 2005a, 2005b), Hájiková (2005) and Gibová (2010). Some facets of EU translation have also been touched upon in shorter articles by Komínková (2003), Naďová (2006), Plintovičová (2005) and Huťková (2007). In comparison to the EU research abroad, the investigations in Slovakia, of course, do not achieve its immensity in quantitative numbers, but they nevertheless yield some interesting results which may steer the EU research agenda in a new direction. Whereas Hájiková’s and Naďová’s chief object of interest focuses on a linguistic analysis of EU specialized terminology, Komínková centres on translation problems grouped around the most frequent abbreviations in EU institutional-legal documents. Besides, Huťková’s article offers an analytical probe into the individual language levels (stylistic, lexical, syntactic, morphological, phonic and formal) on a sample of text material sourced from EU websites. Aside from these linguistically-oriented papers, Plintovičová (2005) breaks the mould by focusing on the delineation of the overriding motives behind the European language policy, bringing linguistic equality and diversity into a proverbial equilibrium, even if she does not arrive at any radically different conclusions than most foreign authors dealing with the said issues.
As for the book publications on EU translation in Slovakia, Škrlantová’s and Gibová’s credits should not go unmentioned. Škrlantová’s seminal monograph *Preklad textov na národnej a nadnárodnej úrovni* (2005a) analyses in tune with the communicative-pragmatic turn in linguistics the process of legal text translation from the point of view of their position, function and aim in specialized communication. Škrlantová pays heed to the key aspect in EU translation, *i.e.* creation and codification of terminology. At the same time, she sheds light on the issues of interpretation and equivalence in legal translation. Overall, Škrlantová compares the translation specificities of supranational legislation with the legal text translation at the national level. On the basis of an analytical comparison of the characteristic traits of national legal texts of Slovakia, Germany and the Netherlands and by confrontation of their terminological systems, the monograph provides a blueprint for successful solutions to EU translation problems.

As implied throughout this thesis’s section, the research into legal translation had been for the most part terminologically-oriented. Emphasis was laid on how terms in the source legal system could be expressed by equivalent terms in the target legal system, focusing on the delimitation of the areas of semantic correspondence between legal terms. After the sweeping communicative-pragmatic turn, the sociological and ethnographic line of research came to the fore. Despite the current trends, at the time there had been no large-scale study of EU texts from the point of view of a contrastive linguistic-translatological analysis based on the English-Slovak language pair until Gibová’s monograph *O preklade anglických právnych textov EÚ* was published in 2010. By blending the outcomes of a microtextual analysis encompassing a whole gamut of linguistic phenomena at the graphic, grammatical and lexical levels accompanied by a comprehensive analysis of translation procedures, and the macrotextual view of the language policy at the EU institutions, a most up-to-date interpretation of EU translation has been provided. The overriding aim of the work was to analyse constitutive markers of legal language and style at the said levels of language structure, as well as to investigate translation techniques as a consummation of the microtextual analysis in selected EU documents, with the intention of providing a complex view of the outcomes gained. The conducted research, however, was not planted exclusively into the theoretical plane of the systematic contrastive analysis, but it also aspired to signpost the use of the findings for translation practice.

Another significant follow-up monograph zeroing in on the treatment of translation techniques (or procedures) in EU documents, up until then largely marginalised across secondary sources and enhanced by a comparative dimension with a literary text, was written.
by Gibová in 2012. The linguistic approaches to legal translation, having bounced back with renewed vigour (see Šarcevic 2006; Cao 2007), did justice to the overall take of the treatise. Similarly to the trends discernible in the study of non-literary texts, the application of linguistic frameworks seemed to be enjoying a resurgence of interest, thus making the treatise responsive to the current lines of enquiry in the research into dissimilar text types. Whereas the topic at hand invited a good many researchers to deal with its aspects rather marginally by way of their one-off excursions (e.g. Salkie 2001; Klaudy and Károly 2005; Sewell 2001; Garnier 2009; Kamenická 2007; Becher 2010 etc.), this translatological area deserved a more focused treatment.

Lately, the paper by Štefková (2012) seems very inspirational for the future of EU translation, in which she stresses the importance of keeping up intelligible terminology and a more transparent syntax, doing away with oldish archaisms or Latin expressions in EU-ese. In this regard, the *Founding Conference of the Slovak Terminological Network (STS)* taking place under the auspices of the European Commission’s Directorate-General for Translation in October 2007 stood for the peak of the efforts to improve the language culture of Slovak EU translation and its terminological consistency. Moreover, Štefková realizes the potential of a text’s communication quality which should not be confined only to terms and their appropriateness of usage. Instead, what should be paid more attention to in the foreseeable future with respect to EU texts is an emphasis on their intertextuality, cohesion and coherence, *i.e.* their relation to other legislative texts and interconnectedness of the text’s individual parts within one whole. Drawing a certain parallel with Sosoni’s paper (2011), the author calls for the knowledge of not only legal linguistics on the part of translators but also those of stylistics, text-formation, and the role of these texts in a legal context.

To sum up, the adduced secondary sources crucial to research into EU texts testify not only to its continuity and sustained theoretical interest in EU translation but at the same time imply its contents and conceptual structure of its legacy, which may be materialized in many possible avenues of research. On the basis of the previous literature review it may be said that the EU research agenda is by no means finished and it is still thriving. Thus, the beginnings of the noughties when Nordland lamented the surprising dearth of the secondary sources about the language work of the EU, considering that “thousands of academics have been translating for the EU for decades producing little or no theoretical or speculative work” (2002: 35), are long over.