

IOSUD – „DUNĂREA DE JOS” UNIVERSITY, GALAȚI

Doctoral School of Social Sciences and Humanities



Ph. D. THESIS

A Linguistic Approach to Negotiations in the European Union:

A Comparative Study

Ph. D. Candidate

STĂNESCU Delia Denis

President

Professor Nicoleta IFRIM, Ph. D.

Scientific Advisor

Professor Lillians-Violeta NEGREA, Ph. D.

Scientific Reviewers

Professor Daniel-Codruț DEJICA-CARTIȘ, Ph. D.

Professor Lavinia-Eugenia NĂDRAG, Ph. D.

Professor Mariana NEAGU, Ph. D.

Series U1: Letters - English, no. 22

GALAȚI

2022

SUMMARY

Like any other conceptual system, the European Union (the EU) operates with its own linguistic microclimate populated with metaphors, specific understanding drifting from the regular meaning, customary use bearing a different meaning than the standard.

On the occasion of the current thesis our intention is to offer a manner of facilitating the approach of internationally negotiated documents which have the reputation of using codified and unpalatable language, but also to signal possible traps in translation.

For example, in the case of Romanian, the latest version of the referral dictionary (DOOM3. 2021) does not retain a commonly used Anglicism (intelligence), even though this edition explicitly assumes taking up as such into Romanian many words of English origin. The Regulation EUROSUR translates this item into Romanian by the same generic word used to designate information (*common pre-frontier intelligence picture* is translated by *tabloul comun al informațiilor privind zona prefrontalieră*). Professionals have a long-lasting need for a disambiguation solution in Romanian in respect to this concept, a difference is seen between the generic word *informații* (a. i. including from open sources) and the word *intelligence* designating information obtained via specific methods and sometimes partially or totally analysed and processed by professionals of the intelligence services or similar. We might have to wait for DOOM4 edition in order to see it settled.

The added-value of this research is grounded on its interdisciplinary approach, reuniting more than one point of view on the EU negotiations and its output. Existing studies are usually addressing the EU negotiations as such and as typical expressions of the diplomatic activity or take on focus only the translation activity in the EU.

The key element of novelty resides in its *vademecum* feature of guiding the reader through a maze of information with various degrees of weight and relevance, operating in different contexts with changing shades of possible influence. It aims to guide by offering a toolkit for assessing variables so as to get as close as possible to the real meaning behind the words written in an official paper as a result of a negotiation process.

The substance of the present thesis builds on **three main chapters**:

1. ***Multilingualism as overarching value of the European Union***
2. ***Language traps in negotiations***
3. ***Guidelines for the appropriate use of the Brussels English.***

The first chapter - ***Multilingualism as overarching value of the European Union*** sets the scene by describing the complexity of the legal and institutional framework for the language regime in a super-national and multilingual environment like the European Union. It tackles the legal basis, the dedicated strategic setting (the Multilingualism Strategy), the practical mechanism in place for supporting the objectives enshrined in the strategic documents.

In addition to the general outlook on the available translation tools for official documents, it brings details on the translation work performed by every of the 9 main EU institutions and bodies, along with their common resource (e. g. the Translation Centre for the Bodies of the European Union) and a dedicated outlook for the translation work performed in Romania by the European Institute of Romania.

The second chapter - *Language traps in negotiations* approaches language practicalities encountered in the official documents negotiated at international level and makes a conceptual distinction between the three main layers of language identified by this research as overlapping in a text negotiated at international level: legal, diplomatic, political. It also focuses on linguistic marks indicating the layer of language to which the concept may belong to, in order to support a better estimation of its weight and potential impact.

The analysis carried out by this chapter offers language tools which can support a compromise in a negotiation, and also identifies linguistic marks for indicating various formalities in relation to the birth of a document: applicable procedure for producing a specific document, types of documents, contributing institutions, type of legal competence involved. In this context, our study dwells on aspects such as the political choice of the language and the role of ambiguity as negotiation tools.

The third chapter - *Guidelines for the appropriate use of the Brussels English* focuses on peculiarities of English used in the European Affairs, as main negotiation language in the European Union. It brings details about the distinction between the Standard English and the English used “for Brussels purposes”.

Under this chapter the analysis proposes a disambiguation exercise based on common inappropriate use of idioms, accompanied by explanations as for their political and legal implications. It also highlights, by virtue of exemplification and analysis, the semantic shift in relation with the change of the context. With the help of two case studies (BREXIT and Ukraine), the research develops on aspects of creativity of the language and its adaptability resources to new realities which force the reaction of the international environment (which is stable by definition), including by the language means.

The conclusions of our thesis offer details about the method we suggest as outcome of the current study in support of decrypting the actual meaning of an internationally negotiated text – including in the terms of meta-language.

The practical utility of our suggested reader assistant could prove a useful tool for the analytical work which takes into consideration such documents, but also a convenient assistant for a large palette of professionals who might be interested by the in depths of the work performed by the international fora.

Our approach reunites and explains inter-operability of applicable principles and constraints in an EU negotiation, be it of legal, diplomatic or political nature and by consequent offering a more accurate identification of the real message meant by the issuer. By distinguishing among the three main layers of language present in a document (legal, diplomatic or political), any impact analysis taking into consideration this type of documents can benefit in precision and soundness.

Albeit insisting on pragmatic, semantic and discourse analysis with focus on the EU-related documents, procedural and institutional architecture peculiarities, the suggested method, as reader-assistant, goes beyond the EU specificities and can prove its utility in decoding documents

negotiated in other international formats if adapted to their particular statutory profile (e.g. United Nations/UN and subordinated institutions and bodies, Council of Europe/CoE, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/OECD, African Union/AU, North Atlantic Treaty Organisation/NATO).

The outcome also suggests support for disambiguation in case of dilemma resulted from the relation between globalisation and localization. The EU-related language is treated in more detail by support explanations in respect to the procedurally and institutionally-specific features throughout the whole lifespan of a document, including the final stage of implementation and interpretation by the European Court of Justice.

One of the important assets of the present research derives from the successful passing the reality test as it is based on documents in force, many of which having been negotiated with the participation of the author. In comparison with other researches, the current one brings explanations for the reasons having grounded the decision to choose specific concepts for featuring the EU legislation in force, thus offering a significant historical insight on their actual meaning.

The European Union identifies itself with high values, such as rule of law, and assumes developing evidence-based policies, therefore its written output is looking for its outmost relevance. The current study connects information in multiple fields which concur in the process of producing the EU legislative and political texts such as EU and international law, legal drafting, political science, language, translation studies, semantics, cultural studies, negotiation strategies and tactics, public communication, psycho-sociology. Seen from the perspective of its ultimate goal, it is also an essential tool for sound strategic analysis which takes into consideration any EU document by facilitating understanding of its true meaning and weight.

The pragmatic approach of the thesis consists in a qualitative and quantitative analysis of official documents produced by the European Union considering their value in justice. Formal and official sources, like press communiqués, transcripts or oral interventions/declarations/interviews, press materials etc., are referred to mainly for contrastive or explanatory purposes.

The main corpus of resources is trilingual: English, Romanian, French and so are the key-concepts analysed – the original English pairing with the Romanian and French options for translation. From a subjective perspective, these three languages are the main three mastered by the author by virtue of professional experience in EU matters, with Romanian as mother tongue. From an objective perspective, when in doubt, the interpretation of a negotiated document refers to the language version of its negotiation. For the EU documents, this refers to English for the bulk of the output and to French for the Treaty currently in force (Lisbon Treaty) and some other documents.

Resources were tested to support knowledge fields, such as media and public communication, which tend to share the opinion that public communication is a mirrors game, in line with Charaudeau's subtitle its volume of 2011: "L'impossible transparence du discours/The impossible transparency of the discourse/Imposibila transparență a discursului".

Since information is about language and language, in its turn, is anything but transparent, it becomes a matter of "ideological show off" and of "making the invisible visible". Image is a high

stake for the political, diplomatic, communication side of the work in international relations, therefore it is a challenging task to discern the real shape of the reflected object in a hall of mirrors.

Specifically for the Romanian language, several sound resources may be resorted to: dictionaries on confusables as translation traps with disambiguation annotations and explanatory notes on advisable usage for confusing words, terminological data base managed by the European Institute of Romania or methods for specialised language acquisition like *English for European Affairs*.

In the early days of Romania's membership to the European Union a stylistic guide was issued in a concerted institutional manner by the European institutions (*Ghid stilistic* 2008), similar to the other EU official languages. In time, its practical value is kept updated by means of the online version of the terminological data base fed by the European Institute of Romania which is the official Romanian institution in charge of supporting the policies developed by the Romanian Government by virtue of the country's EU membership.

For the practicalities, many valuable resources may come at hand: from the well-known generic dictionaries to online resources which are regularly updated by the very EU institutions involved in the official translation work in the European Union. The IATE data base¹ is the referral, as it hosts more than 8 million entries which are constantly revised and enriched. Initially IATE was used by the EU institutions for the collection, dissemination and management of EU-specific terminology and currently it provides the infrastructure for all EU terminology resources, as a tool in support of the availability and standardisation of the information.

In almost 70 years of existence, the European Union has developed its own language and codes, like any other ecosystem. Sometimes they are accessible, sometimes they are rather not. An indicator for the need to translate the English developed under the logic of the institutional environment of the European Union is the publication by the European Commission of an official institutional guide for the editorial, legal, technical, visual and contractual aspects, called *Europa Web Guide*. Its importance resides in the fact that the European Commission is at step one of the legal process in the European Union, thereby assuming an important role as for the linguistic aspect of the EU's output.

Recent articles, like Robertson's Legal-Linguistic Profiling in Institutional Contexts: *The Case of EU Staff Representation Bodies* (2020), started to go into the depth of the legal-linguistic profiling approach to EU "staff representation bodies" as a way to access domains that lie behind the public face of EU institutions and their texts concerning translation, language and terminology. However, it mainly focuses on a legal-linguistic analysis of EU texts for references to *staff*, *staff representation* and *employment* in order to identify specific texts and bodies of relevance to the study. This approach analyses the translation and language arrangements of the staff committees and trade unions, including their websites available to the general public as part of the legal-linguistic profiling approach.

In early 2000' the General Secretariat of the EU Council produced several multilingual thematic guides suggesting validated corresponding terms in all the EU official languages for core

¹The *Interactive Terminology for Europe* which is the EU's terminology database, available at <https://iate.europa.eu/home>

terminology in certain policy area (such as migration or foreign policy), basic EU terminology for a specific target language (e.g. Finnish) or a guide to transliteration and alternative geographical name forms (e.g. foreign names in Swedish). Designed with the IATE help, such linguistic tools supporting the implementation of the multilingualism principle require today some update both in conceptual and linguistic terms.

From **methodological point of view**, the doctoral thesis relies mainly on the analysis of EU texts, which are investigated both qualitatively and quantitatively.

It aimed at answering the following research questions:

1. Is the multilingualism principle evenly implemented in the European Union in respect of all the EU official languages and by all EU institutions?
2. Does English, as main negotiation language in the European Union, feature any peculiarities as compared to Standard English?
3. Is there a method to ease the access of the reader to the real meaning of a document negotiated at international level so as to weight its real value?

While trying to answer these questions, the qualitative type of research carried out by our thesis aims at raising awareness on linguistic questions in terms of negotiation in European Union leading to textured data and *thick description* needed to trace specific meaning values able to induce theoretical support. The strength of the qualitative exploratory work is given by the particular experiences developed when searching formal and official documents issued by various European bodies. The research of specific language meanings and nuances is made more effective through the numerical measurements of compared variables, producing causal hypotheses empowered by the questionnaires instrument applied.

The text analysis is supported by contrastive analysis of the key concepts in English, French and Romanian and, insofar available, in other EU languages.

The scientific research is mainly driven by pragmatics principles, as various types of analysis are combined, such as diachronic, semantic, statistical and discursive, contrastive and text analysis. These methodological options are often superposed to the legal analysis specific to the EU and international law.

The diachronic senses analysis proved to be operationally helpful to distinguish between meaning changes as a result of linguistic conservatism or innovation. The research of the latter ones have disclosed the transfer of senses and composite transfer of senses as a result of the attached semantic fields, bringing in new meanings that turned into specific working ones for the official European Union documents and their negotiation.

The semantic analysis of the formal case-study texts was carried out horizontally, aiming at the paradigmatic predictability of the terms meaning and vertically, targeting the syntagmatic meaning relationship which depends on the social, political and linguistic environment and the individuals experience taking part in the act of communication, pointing to the meaning volatility.

The linguistic analysis is extended to the legal genre analysis which takes into account “not only the socio-cultural and psycho-linguistic factors” but also the political and legal ones which are specific to the European Union. The planned aim of such an analysis goes to the understanding

and the development of the professional domain genre by the definition of the communicative goals of the discourse targeted community associated to the individual strategies. The object of this approach is rather a raising awareness and professional development pattern seeking than an imposing one.

The qualitative linguistic research, which was carried out by our thesis, tries to be functional by explaining the complexity of the linguistic changes and developments of the Brussels working language. An explanatory adequacy was aimed at by putting at work the analysis of linguistic structural mechanisms. The causal factors considered were extended to the layers of the official language providing a major contribution to the establishment of new semantic standards that make the specificity of the EU working language.

The research is supported by **two sets of questionnaires** (see Annex): the first questionnaire is in relation with the multilingualism policy in the EU, while the second pertains to the practicalities of the negotiation process. The first questionnaire was addressed to all EU institutions (plus the European Institute of Romania) implementing the multilingualism policy and the second one targeted experienced practitioners in EU affairs with a consistent background in negotiating EU documents.

The questionnaire on multilingualism (*Questionnaire 1*) aimed at completing, bringing nuances and/or clarifying public information usually available on the official websites of the respective institutions, with the final goal of recomposing an outlook of a multi-faceted approach towards ensuring multilingualism in the EU institutions. The questionnaire on multilingualism addressed to the European Institute of Romania was preceded by a meeting with some of its experienced practitioners in the translation work. *Questionnaire 1* was addressed to 10 EU institutions and bodies (plus the European Institute in Romania) and received 5 meaningful answers (45,5% rate of return). The questionnaires contained between a minimum of 10 and a maximum of 22 questions, depending on the available public information so as to aim at completing the overall institutional picture in a comparable manner on key aspects.

The *Questionnaire 1* inputs were capitalised in Chapter 1 – *Multilingualism in the European Union*, aiming at completing missing parts in the public information available during 2020-2021. That was also the reason for it being conceived in a tailor-made manner for each institution and although its questions were formulated with the purpose of ensuring comparability of answers, which is only a partially achieved goal.

The questionnaire on practicalities of the negotiations in the EU (*Questionnaire 2*) aimed at extracting first-hand information from experienced negotiators involved in producing EU documents in the main field of interest of this research: Justice and Home Affairs. It included two sections: 1) open questions addressing the personal negotiation experience of the respondent and 2) closed questions aimed at estimating the personal assessment of the respondent.

The examples provided by the replies in the open questions section were expressly indicated in the footnotes in the various chapters of the thesis and they pertain mainly to Chapters 2 and 3. The rest of the meaningful inputs for our points of interest served as an inspirational starting point for further documentation and development in various parts of our research.

The questionnaire was addressed to 36 potential respondents and was returned 11 valid replies (see annexes). The profile of the respondents is determined by an average experience in EU affairs of more than 15 years, knowledge of minimum 2 foreign languages in addition to the mother tongue (maximum 5 additional languages), an average experience in negotiating in English of almost 16 years and an average of 11 years in negotiating EU documents. A profile reuniting all these elements with detailed knowledge in Justice and Home Affairs, covering 11 EU different languages (and a non-EU language) is not the easiest task to achieve primarily from a numerical point of view.

It is worth mentioning that almost 70 % of the bibliographical resources (books, articles, surveys, studies) accessed by this research were published after the year 2010, 40% of which in the last 7 years, therefore supporting its conclusions with the results of the most recent academic activity at international level.

The legal corpus used for this thesis reunites more than 1500 pages of EU legislation, in addition to legal sources issued by other international actors like the United Nations, NATO, Council of Europe.

In terms of language, from a methodological point of view, the examples used in this thesis are always in (British) English, as main language of the study, supported by their Romanian and French correspondents and, insofar available, other EU languages. Exception to this rule are on grounds of referral to other sources. The comparisons always take into account the English, French and Romanian correspondents used in the official EU documents; if the analysed text is of other nature than legal, the Romanian and French correspondents belong to the author.

The approach was chosen to mirror the standard working method of the lawyer-linguists in the European Union and by the linguistic analysis usually adopted by the European Court of Justice. A lawyer-linguist is a lawyer with consolidated linguistic profile, which was built upon with additional layers of knowledge in concurrent knowledge fields, such as diplomacy, EU and international law, politics, public communication.

The analytical part (Chapters 2 and 3) is mainly based on the English, Romanian and French versions, while examples from other EU languages (Bulgarian, Greek) may be invoked occasionally for contrastive or explanatory purposes. Whenever the sources are in other languages than English, the translation used belongs to the author in case of Romanian, French, Italian and Latin or to native speaker referees in case of Bulgarian, Greek or Russian.

The conclusions of the research and its practical results take into account the complexity of the EU institutional setting ensuring translation of the official documents and other outputs of public interest reflects an uneven approach of implementation of the principle of the multilingualism, currently not matching the highest legal value ensured by its mentioning at Treaty level. It ranges from ensuring full translation covering all 24 EU official languages of all outputs to translating only a selected number of (types of) documents or ensuring translation of a limited number of EU languages or translation on request.

The most important challenge for the translation activity in the European Union is to secure coherence of the applied language throughout the documents pertaining to the same policies and, insofar possible, in time – which proves to entail considerable legal and political consequences.

Our thesis has in focus a linguistic perspective on the specific language developed by the European Union in English (as main language for negotiations) as well as the Romanian and French correspondents for the key-concepts. It overlaps a linguistic analysis to a legal analysis, with due consideration to the political and public communication relevance of the language.

As for the public communication, the EU institutions and bodies offer a similar patchy landscape, as they propose various formulas – from a theoretical coverage of all 24 EU official languages (but with a set off availability of translation depending on the target language) to limited translated options.

Under these conditions, the language coherence ambition is even greater, as according to the statistical body of the EU (EUROSTAT), the EU institutions resort to some 180 000 translators and interpreters, equivalent to 0.1% of total EU employment at the lever of year 2018.

Even in such circumstances, the financial effort on behalf of the European Union is considerable, both for the institutional implementation and for the direction supporting language acquisition by the EU citizens as an economic factor for growth.

The principle of multilingualism experienced a peak of visibility after the year 2007, when it benefitted of a dedicated portfolio in the European Commission, which entailed numerous strategic and practical initiatives in the name of the EU. Since then, it continued to be supported as a horizontal concern for all the policies promoted at the level of the European Union.

Despite the legal and political objective of multilingualism, in reality English is positioned in the leading role in the EU negotiations even after the United Kingdom's leaving the European Union (BREXIT) in January 2021, thus consolidating the tendency of overcoming the ambitions of French. This is a counter-intuitive conclusion in a context where after BREXIT English is a native language for only 2% of the EU population and despite the trend of the official institutional communication showing more preference for French or German after January 2021.

The *de facto* leading role of English at the EU level is mirroring a tendency experienced in this forum by the diplomatic activity in itself, in the sense of drifting from the classical line of the traditional diplomacy, often associated with French, towards a more pragmatic line, conveniently supported by means of the English language.

Even though the language issue may be seen through various lenses (legal, political, diplomatic), in fact any text which is a result of a negotiation process reunites all these registers in various proportions. Since all the texts produced by the EU come to life in an environment representing a mixture of political, legal and diplomatic factors, it is only natural that these layers are present to some extent in the final output.

The proportion in which they are reflected in the final result can hardly be predicted according to a strict formula, since they are the result of a negotiation process, but if identified, it is a good indicator for any strategic analysis. The only foreseeable feature is that while – for reasons of legal certainty – in the legal texts it is desirable that ambiguity approach zero level, in a political text ambiguity tends to cover more space.

As revealed by our research, in general, the legal layer is about obligation and permission, the diplomatic layer is about suggestions and recommendations, while the political layer is about declaration of intention.

The legal layer is to be considered the one more strict, technical and conditional, while creativity of language is more specific to the political and diplomatic layers.

As highlighted by our study, conditionality and rigour (strict syntax, linguistic templates, definitions, pre-determined concepts) are also features derived from procedural constraints, such as the type of applicable procedure, the type of the act in question, the actors involved in the negotiation process, the type of policy on the territory of which the act was negotiated.

Conversely, the political layer is more prone to boldness, but in the same time is affected by *linguistic political fashion* considering its sensitivity to the *political correctness* factor which leads to preferences or stigma in terms of political language.

The trends that may be set in terms of politically preferred language or, vice versa, politically stigmatised language is in close connection with the lifespan of the political ideas. As proved by our analysis, over time, politically preferred language may end up in the politically stigmatised category, usually following the general perception about the political ruling it was associated with. Such a process has a lot to do with the political symbolism connected with a specific concept.

Similarly, when seen through the lenses of the political correctness, a simple concept such as “normal” may acquire connotations which are not obvious when reading its definition in a dictionary. The political correctness factor therefore impacts in the most epistemic manner by highlighting the increased context-sensitivity of the meaning, sometimes to the detriment of its basic understanding.

It is to be noticed that the current tendency is a feature of the language to anticipate or to correlate with changes in the society so as to adjust to the changes in the reality. This is to mirror the theory of anthropologists like Boas or Malinowski stating that language has the capacity of encapsulating information regarding the place and the direction of events in the history of the people speaking it.

On the contrary, the current trend appears to water down the validity of the theory supported by Bourdieu affirming that any human dialogue is predetermined by community, gender, social class, religious beliefs-related relationships. The current line goes into the direction of levelling any sharp connotation indicating a difference, including those considered (so far) factual or purely biological. The Ochs’ remark in early `90 of the last century on the expansion of the liberty to widely use features of a specific gender is now being reversed by the idea of *neutralising* any gender-specific feature.

Our study could not register examples indicating tendencies affecting the languages, featuring the use of the pronoun for indicating a social distinction, therefore lacking indication about the impact on the social categories such equity/inequity, solidarity/power, but the phenomenon brings a particular challenge for the gender-sensitive languages, forcing them to explore their resources of creativity. This is a fundamental change in approach, as gender is the most stable feature among the almost 200 grammatical features classified by linguists in *The World Atlas of Language Structures*.

Anticipating the impact of such a shift in the language use in relation to gender would be also interesting to follow up, especially on whether the new neutralising line would bring any change to the feminist movement and to the idea of gender quotas as promoted so far.

Until recently it was considered that female/male distinctions in language are related to gender political quotas, one of the main determinant of female political participation today and that quotas are needed to increase female political participation, therefore a highlighting language use for gender was in the interest of promoting such a policy. In our opinion, a language avoiding the gender distinction rather goes against the objective of the feminist move and of the equal footing of men and women. If until present the *gender equality* was in fact associated with the idea of placing women on equal footing with men, it appears that the implicit understanding of the notion might suffer slight nuances in the future, not necessarily in the interest of the feminist movement as we used to know.

On the other hand, the neutralising language in respect to gender issues may be understood in the logic of avoiding offending the feelings of the persons who rejects the neat distinction between men and women and therefore making room for other types of expression of gender-identity (virtually the LGBTQI+ community).

According to the results of our study, the most interesting feature of the current tendency in politically correct language is that not only guidance is being provided in an institutional and formal manner, but the private sector assumes a behaviour invoking these principles in order to convey a social message.

From a legal point of view, the new conduct is not associated with sanctions, however a consolidated tendency in this direction can result into a social pressure for the change of the language use. In such a context, we may experience yet another era of dying morphemes and rising meanings.

What appears to play a common role in the analysed examples is the tendency of shifting places between the referral and the object to be defined: if the referral used to be the majority conduct/feature/characteristic/behaviour, the new tendency is to reverse its relevance so as to soften the comparison between majority and minority.

The political and the diplomatic layers are strongly connected with the public communication objectives, are more fluid, dynamic, lax and creative. Under these registers, terminological referrals and semantics may suffer (sometimes dramatic) change in time under the pressure of shifting interests in the society. While the legal layer is perceived more conditional, the latter two may be perceived like pressure factors in the negotiation of a text.

The three layers are usually inter-connected in a text by various degrees of ambiguity which may be a tool of negotiation. What is at stake in distinguishing among the layers and determining the coverage of the ambiguity is related to the interest of implementing evenly throughout the Member States of the European Union the output of the negotiating process.

The English used in the European Union for negotiation purposes is often referred to as a distinct form commonly called *Brussels English*, *Euro-English* or even *Eurospeak*. Our analysis identifies the peculiarities of the English used for EU purposes and the prospects of its further development

after the United Kingdom's leaving the European Union (BREXIT) considering its severe under-representativeness of native speakers in the EU.

By means of merged linguistic and legal analysis, arguments were brought forward for the correct/recommended use of common vocabulary items, with due explanations about semantics and legal consequences. We conclude that creativity of language must always be put in relation with its political and legal impact, especially in the case of the legal instruments, as while a creative vocabulary can be a saviour of the negotiation process, it can also be the gravedigger of the implementation for the result of the negotiation.

In the case of the English used *for Brussels purposes* (in fact for international purposes in any other super-national format where it plays the role of language of negotiation) it plays a particular role of vehicle for levelling up conceptual differences in legal terms. In other words, English serves as a tool for bridging between two fundamentally different legal systems co-existing under the umbrella of the European Union (the Roman law system and the Common law system), gradually interconnecting them and designating new legal institutions understood by both systems. Its merit in this respect is even greater when considering that English is naturally associated only to the Common law system.

From this point of view, whenever English plays the levelling role chances are it is in the interest of the accurate translation in other languages, as it presupposes that most of the translation hurdles – especially “adequate content transfer and lack of ambiguity” – were already foreseen and taken into account during the negotiation process.

As for the **glossary** component, many of such instruments are available. The EU institutions and other private initiative are abundant in this respect. However, almost all are in need of updates so as to keep the pace with the rhythm of the evolving EU legislation and political concepts.

For example, *selected/targeted immigration* [*immigration sélective/imigrație selectivă*] is an obsolete and politically downgraded concept in the EU migration policy. It was associated with the political line promoted by the French President Nicolas Sarkozy ever since accomplishing his mandate of Minister of Interior in France. In French the concept was designated by *immigration choisie*, not by *immigration sélective*, as indicated by the *Glossary on migration*.

As the *Glossary on migration* mentions, the *Pact on Asylum and Migration*, while an update would be served by mentioning the *New Pact on Asylum and Migration* published by the European Commission in September 2020.

Conceptually, the starting point of this research is the language which is constantly put in connection with influences generated by other concurrent layers, such as political, legal, diplomatic, public communication, etc.

Starting from the initial research questions, our aim was to establish whether there is a gap between theory and practice in respect to the multilingualism principle promoted by the European Union and whether the negotiation language in the European Union develops any peculiarities compared to Standard English.

Among the main conclusions of our study is that in a document negotiated among numerous actors with such big stakes, imposes the rule according to which the language is intentional and purposeful/meaningful and can be meaningful only by exception.

Conversely, in the European Union the English language develops a specific semantics and, to some extent, a particular use which were under the analytical scope of our research.

The research also tackles translation challenges which are specific to the EU and offers elements of diachronic analysis for the language adaptation following an accession process like the accession to the European Union. In general, adhering to a new conceptual system requires adjustment to the new fundamentals and new language is necessary for reflecting it. In fact, linguistic adjustment and even revision are necessary every from time to time as part of the integration process and for taking stock of the evolving reality regulated by the EU norms.

From an objective point of view, especially the EU legislation which was translated with the occasion of the accession is in need of permanent linguistic/terminological revision because in the initial stage it was produced under an enormous time pressure in conjunction with the limitations resulting from conceptual inadequacy which were not metabolised from the very beginning.

Another reason justifying linguistic revisiting even some time after the adoption of an act is that while the traditional policies are largely regulated already and their linguistic basis is already settled, currently the European Union started to regulate aspects in the daily life which tend to be more and more abstract or conceptual (e. g. artificial intelligence).

The terminological revision can also be of interest on a regular basis given the patchy landscape of the institutionalized translation activity in the European Union, which resorts to more than 4000 translators and freelancers. In this numeric perspective, language coherence is a challenge of tremendous dimensions and a constant subject of revision.

The diachronic exemplifications in our study are meant to offer a basis for a historical semantic and language use perspective as an element for increasing sensitivity to such details in discourse analysis. Our research identifies language indicators for helping the reader to place instantly in time or in the procedure a document which was produced by the European Union.

For practitioners involved in EU affairs, we have identified linguistic marks indicating numerous procedural aspects like the applicable procedure, the issuing institution, diachronic indications, type of the act, type of the competence involved. We have also provided numerous semantic peculiarities to the EU environment for English entries.

Our study approached the both ends of the language potential in a negotiation: ambiguity and creativity, indicating the limits of the two. The aspects of language creativity in international relations was based on two case studies on BREXIT and Ukraine, respectively, which revealed the relation between the birth of new language and its entry into official use.

The theoretical and analytical part of our research amounted to a practical method suggested for guiding the reader of a document grasping its intended meaning can play as a procedural shortcut for the legal practitioners. As the super-national organizations are usually based on a relatively

complicated architecture for their decision-making process, such a tool can save time in finding the correct meaning and relevance of the issuer.

Further on, the findings of this doctoral research could serve as a basis for an annotated guide (English-Romanian-French) on the specific language used in the JHA field whose purpose would be better served if it took the form of an application in order to be kept abreast more easily and be more user-friendly. Its users can be professionals in the international relations working both in the public administration and in the private sector involved in the policies governed by the European Union law, of the students, interpreters and translators, lawyers, political science, media and language professionals, negotiators at international level, with specific focus on peculiarities observed at the EU level.

The narrowest impact of this work is to be assessed by the almost 1000 legal acts currently in force in the field of Justice and Home Affairs which might be subject of interpretation. By extension, its results can serve the whole EU acquis and, leaving aside EU-related peculiarities (semantics, legal architecture, decision making), the principles of interpretation keep their validity in deciphering documents produced by negotiations in any other international format. Such a potential turns it into a valuable tool for of any strategic analysis.