

The effective usage of corpora in legalese studies (on the example of the *fiducie*)

IRINA GVELESIANI, PhD

Faculty of Humanities

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Georgia

Chavchavdze Ave. 1

irina.gvelesiani@tsu.ge

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-9566-1278>

Abstract: If we consider corpus linguistics as the study of a language through its samples, we should give credit to its contribution to the advancement of various sub-fields of linguistics: lexicography, translation studies, applied linguistics, diachronic studies and contrastive linguistics. The latter can be regarded as a special case of a linguistic typology that is distinguished from other types of typological approaches by a small sample size and a high degree of granularity (Gast 2011: 2-3). Nowadays, corpus-based contrastive studies can be treated as a growing research area that focuses on two or more languages. The present paper makes an attempt to discuss the usefulness of the specialized combined parallel-comparable corpus while dealing with legalese. The effectiveness is presented on the example of the legal institution *fiducie*. The methodology of research comprises the comparative analysis as well as the corpus-based analysis of the terms related to the *fiducie*-s presented in three varieties of French: France's, Canadian and Luxembourgish. The carried out research reveals the juridical-semantic differences and the problematics of the verbal realization of the concepts related to three *fiducie*-s. These hinder a proper interpretation and complicate the process of translation. The major solution is found through the specification of meaning by renaming.



Keywords: civil law; corpus; fiducie; translation; trust.

კორპუსების ეფექტური გამოყენება იურიდიული ენის კვლევისას (FIDUCIE-ს მაგალითზე)

თუ კორპუსს ლინგვისტიკას განვიხილავთ, როგორც ენის შესწავლას არსებული ნიმუშების საფუძველზე, მაშინ ნათელი გახდება მისი წვლილი ენათმეცნიერების ისეთი ქვედარგების განვითარებაში, როგორებიც არის ლექსიკოგრაფია, მთარგმნელობითი კვლევები, გამოყენებითი ლინგვისტიკა, დიაქრონული კვლევები და კონტრასტული ლინგვისტიკა. ეს უკანასკნელი შეიძლება მივიჩნიოთ ლინგვისტური ტიპოლოგიის განსაკუთრებულ შემთხვევად, რომელიც გამოირჩევა სხვა ტიპის ტიპოლოგიური მიდგომებისაგან ნიმუშის მცირე ზომითა და გრანულობის მაღალი ხარისხით (Gast 2011: 2-3). დღესდღეობით, კორპუსზე დაფუძნებული კონტრასტული კვლევები შეიძლება განვიხილოთ, როგორც მზარდი სფერო, რომელიც ორიენტირებულია ორ ან მეტ ენაზე. წინამდებარე ნაშრომი განიხილავს სპეციალიზებული კომბინირებული პარალელურ-შედარებითი კორპუსის ეფექტურობას იურიდიული ენის შესწავლისას, რაც წარმოდგენილია fiducie-ს მაგალითზე. კვლევის მეთოდოლოგია მოიცავს სამ fiducie-სთან დაკავშირებული ტერმინების შედარებით ანალიზს კორპუსზე დაფუძნებული მიდგომის საფუძველზე. განსახილველი ტერმინები წარმოდგენილია ფრანგულის სამ ვარიანტში - საფრანგეთის, კანადურსა და ლუქსემბურგულში. ჩატარებული კვლევა გამოყოფს იურიდიულ-სემანტიკურ განსხვავებებსა და სამივე fiducie-სთან დაკავშირებული ცნებების ვერბალური რეალიზაციის პრობლემატიკას. ეს უკანასკნელი აფერხებს სწორ ინტერპრეტაციას და ართულებს თარგმნის პროცესს. აღნიშნული პრობლემების გადაჭრის მთავარ გზად მიჩნეულია მნიშვნელობის დაზუსტება ხელახალი სახელდების საშუალებით.

საკვანძო სიტყვები: სამოქალაქო სამართალი; კორპუსი; ფიდუციარი; თარგმანი; ტრასტი.

Introduction

The advancement of **computer technologies** opened up a bunch of opportunities in different spheres of life. Drastic changes have

appeared in the field of linguistics after the advancement of corpus linguistics, which can be treated as the methodology, comprising a large number of related methods used by scholars of many different theoretical leanings (Kida 2013: 133).

It is generally believed that corpus linguistics is a heterogeneous field. It is not a monolithic, consensually agreed set of methods and procedures for the exploration of a language (Mcenery and Hardie 2011: 1). More precisely, corpus linguistics provides large quantities of empirical language databases accumulated systematically from various fields of an actual language use following some statistical methods and techniques of data sampling (Dash 2009: 476).

If we consider corpus linguistics as the study of a language through its samples, we should give credit to its contribution to the advancement of different sub-fields of linguistics, for instance, lexicography, translation studies, applied linguistics, diachronic studies and contrastive linguistics. The latter can be regarded as a branch of comparative linguistics that is concerned with pairs of languages, which are 'socio-culturally linked'. More broadly defined, contrastive linguistics is a special case of a linguistic typology and is distinguished from other types of typological approaches by a small sample size and a high degree of granularity (Gast 2011: 2-3).

It is noteworthy that nowadays corpus-based contrastive studies are treated as a growing research area that focuses on two or more languages. The paper makes an attempt to present the importance of the specialized combined parallel-comparable corpus while dealing with legalese. The effectiveness is presented on the example of the legal institution *fiducie*, which exists in the juridical systems of some European countries, for instance, France, Canada and Luxembourg. The methodology of research comprises the comparative analysis as well as the corpus-based analysis of the terms related to the *fiducie*-s presented in three varieties of French: France's, Canadian and Luxembourgish. The carried-out research reveals the juridical-semantic differences and the problematics of the verbal realization of the concepts related to three *fiducie*-s. These hinder a proper interpretation and complicate the process of translation. The major solution is found through the specification of meaning by renaming.

1.1. Different types of corpora

Initially, let us discuss different types of corpora and contrastive analysis. According to Kirk and Čermáková, the latter relies on two types of data: translation (parallel) corpora and comparable corpora. A translation corpus contains original (source) texts with their aligned translations, while a comparable corpus consists of original texts in two or more languages that have been selected on comparable criteria for text categories and quantities for each category (Kirk and Čermáková 2017: 9).

Similarly to Kirk and Čermáková, Biel makes the distinction between a parallel corpus and a comparable corpus. The former is bilingual or multilingual and bi-directional, while the latter is a set of at least two monolingual corpora that may involve one language or at least, two languages. Accordingly, monolingual and bilingual/multilingual comparable corpora can be singled out. The former contains a corpus of translations and a corpus of texts created spontaneously in the same language (non-translated language). The latter does not contain a translated language. They comprise spontaneously created texts in two different languages and are used for cross-linguistic analysis (Biel 2010: 3). Moreover, a comparable corpus may present similar texts in more than one variety of a language (Lahaussois 2014: 21) and contain components that are collected using the same sampling frame and similar balance and representativeness i.e. with “the *same proportions* of the texts of the *same genres* in the *same domains* in a range of *different language* in the *same sampling period*” (McEnery and Xiao 2007: 20).

While discussing various types of corpora, two different contexts – corpus linguistics (CL) and translation studies (TS) – should be considered.

In the standard CL terminology, comparable corpora are usually multilingual (comparable original texts in different languages), while in TS terminology they are usually monolingual (original and translated texts in the same language). Within the TS framework the term parallel corpus usually refers to ‘corpora that contain a series of source texts aligned with their corresponding translations’ (Malmkjaer 1998: 539), in other words what contrastive linguists usually refer to as translation corpora (Granger 2010: 15).

Moreover, parallel corpora can be subdivided into general and specialized ones, stressing that specialized parallel corpora (including, for instance, contract law texts) are particularly useful in domain-specific translation research (McEnery and Xiao 2007: 20).

In this paper, a comparable corpus is considered as a corpus, which selects similar texts in more than one variety of a language, while a parallel corpus is treated as a corpus, which presents original (source) texts with their aligned translations. Moreover, the paper illustrates the importance of specialized combined parallel-comparable corpora in legalese studies.

1.2. Legalese

Let us discuss legalese (i.e. legal language). It is believed that legalese “encompasses lexical terms, phraseology and syntactic structures that make it incomprehensible to the layperson” (Giampieri 2016: 424). The branch which copes with the study of the language of jurisprudence is called legal linguistics. It studies law with linguistic methods and the outcome of the studies can help legal scientists and practitioners do and understand their work better through an increased understanding of how a language works in general and in a legal domain in particular (Salmi-Tolonen 2013: 275).

From the first sight, linguistics and juridical studies taken at face value are different disciplines. However, both work with a language, differing merely in their respective focus: linguists describe texts and model linguistic phenomena, while lawyers use a language to negotiate legal norms. They seem to employ texts – statutes, opinions, etc. – only as a “vehicle” for juridical norms (Vogel, Hamann, and Gauer 2017: 1340).

It is noteworthy that at the current stage, legal linguistics has to cope with the challenges and demands of the modern world that strives to integration, uniformity and simplification. Moreover, simplification of the legal language has become one of the most fashionable topics that has gained attention throughout the last forty years (Pontrandolfo 2019: 61). However, it cannot be easily achieved. Simplification as well as uniformity of legalese may lead to unpredictable coincidences and misunderstandings (for example, the

emergence of similarly named transplants, the lack of coinage of new terminological units, etc.). Aspiration towards both of them requires well-measured and well-considered strategies of maneuvering. The above-mentioned can be discussed on the example of the legal terms denoting the European *trust-like devices* that were created in accordance with the pattern of the common law *trust*.

1.3. Trust and three *Fiducie*-s

The *trust* is a legal device, which usually considers “the settlor’s transfer of title to property to another person, intending that person to be a trustee-manager of it for the benefit of beneficiaries or for a charitable or other permitted purpose” (Hayton 2005: 1). Accordingly, in case of the entrusting relationships, the law deals with the bifurcation of ownership of property between a trustee (a receiver of a legal title) and a beneficiary (a receiver of an equitable title). The duality of ownership as well as the flexible character makes the *trust* useful and popular throughout the world. Its popularity has raised during the last decades. Many civil law countries made attempts to implement the *trust* in their juridical systems. Despite this fact, it seems almost impossible to find a direct conceptual equivalent of the *trust* in civil law, because the cultural environments of civil and common laws differ. This fact is stipulated by several reasons. On the one hand, common law system is characterized with a self-contained evolvement. It developed separately from the rest of Europe. On the other hand, English law is primarily case law or judge-made law in which statutes are only of a secondary importance (Bugg 2009: 174). Moreover, the duality of ownership can only be found in the common law context. It is untransferable into the continental legal systems.

Despite the above mentioned, the *trust-like devices* can be found in the law of continental Europe. The best example in this respect is the *fiducie*, which is presented in France, Canada, Luxembourg. Accordingly, the legal term *fiducie* can be found in three varieties of French: Canadian/Quebec, Luxembourgish and French of France.

Let us describe the juridical mechanisms of three *fiducie*-s and afterwards, focus on the correctness of the identical naming of these devices.

Canada was the first European country, which introduced the *fiducie* in its juridical system under the form of the *patrimoine d'affectation*. Article 1261 of Civil Code of Quebec presents a precise description of the entrusting relationships:

Le patrimoine fiduciaire ... constitue un patrimoine d'affectation autonome et distinct de celui du constituant, du fiduciaire ou du bénéficiaire, sur lequel aucun d'entre eux n'a de droit réel^{7/} The trust patrimony, consisting of the property transferred in trust, constitutes a patrimony by appropriation, autonomous and distinct from that of a settlor, trustee or beneficiary and in which none of them has any real right (Civil Code of Quebec)

This passage reveals that the Quebecoise *fiducie* was established as a juridical device paralleling a tripartite relationship of the common law *trust* sitting quite comfortably within the major principles of civil law. Moreover, the term *patrimoine d'affectation* denotes an ownerless patrimony dedicated to a particular purpose, where a trustee is an administrator of property of another person, in a position not much different from that of a director of a company with a legal personality (Vicari 2012: 4).

It is noteworthy that the French legislator was inspired by Articles 2,011-2,030 of Civil Code of Quebec and created the rules regulating the *fiducie*. However, the French *fiducie* was not enacted as an ownerless patrimony (as in Canada), but as a segregated patrimony owned by a transferee (Vicari 2012: 4). This fact was stipulated by the following rule "no person has one way of holding moveables and another for holding immoveables" (Gray 2004: 267).

Therefore, nowadays, France's *fiducie* can be treated as a triangular relationship that deals with a transfer of rights on assets for the fulfillment of a particular purpose. This transference implies the following:

the settlor (constituant) entrusts existing or future assets, rights or security to the trustee (fiduciaire), who manages these for the benefit of one or more beneficiaries. French law does not classify the legal status of the trustee; he is deemed to be either an agent or an administrator, only the manager (*agissant, actor*) of the trust property (*patrimoine fiduciaire*) (Sandor 2015: 313).

Sometimes, a protector (*protecteur*) is appointed. He/she controls the *fiduciaire*'s activities.

It is important that on 19 July of 1983 Luxembourg adopted the Grand-Ducal decree related to *fiducie agreements* of credit institutions. In 2003 it was replaced by the Law related to Trusts and Fiduciary Contracts. Article 5 of this law was dedicated to the concept of *fiducie*, which was defined in the following way:

The Luxembourgish *fiducie* is a contract whereby a person, the principle (or *fiduciant*) agrees with another person, the *fiducie* (the agent or *fiduciaire*), that, subject to the obligations set forth by the parties, the *fiducie* becomes the owner of assets which shall form a *fiducie* estate (Parsch and Houet 2012: 56).

According to this passage, at present day Luxembourg possesses a contractual fiduciary concept that mirrors in part what common law jurisdiction would accomplish with the *trust* (Graziadei, Mattei and Smith 2005: 91) – a settlor agrees with the *fiduciaire* that he/she will become an owner of the property forming the so-called *fiducie* estate (Cera 2014: 64-65). As a result,

fiducie property constitutes a patrimony (*le patrimoine fiduciaire*) distinct from the *fiduciaire*'s personal patrimony and the *fiduciaire* becomes the owner of this patrimony (*propriétaire de biens formant un patrimoine fiduciaire*) (Graziadei, Mattei and Smith 2005: 91).

Accordingly, it is obvious that the above-described juridical mechanisms of three *fiducie*-s differ. All of them consider a transfer of property, which is managed for the benefit of a beneficiary or beneficiaries as well as for a specific purpose. However, the Quebecoise law deals with an ownerless patrimony, while Frances's legal system presents the *patrimoine d'affectation* – a segregated patrimony separated from a transferee's personal property but owned by him/her. In the Luxembourgish legal system, the *fiducie* property constitutes a patrimony (*le patrimoine fiduciaire*) distinct from the *fiduciaire*'s personal patrimony and the *fiduciaire* becomes its owner. Therefore, property transferred by means of entrusting relationships may form:

1. An ownerless patrimony (in Canada);
2. A segregated patrimony (in France);
3. A distinct patrimony (in Luxembourg).

1.4 The corpus for *Fiducie*-s

The above discussion of three *fiducie*-s and different types of corpora, motivates us to build the specialized combined parallel-comparable corpus consisting of the smaller parts, namely, three subcorpora: Canadian French-English parallel corpus, France's French-English parallel corpus, Luxembourg's French-English parallel corpus. The specialized combined parallel-comparable corpus has the following functions:

1. presentation of the similar texts in three varieties of French;
2. presentation of the English translations of the texts written in three varieties of French;
3. specialization in the field of law, namely, the law of *fiducie*.

Accordingly, if in case of an ordinary parallel corpus, source and translated texts present how the same content is expressed in two languages (Aijmer and Altenberg, 1996: 13) i.e. how the same idea is conveyed, our corpus presents how the same idea is expressed in two languages as well as in three varieties of one of these languages.

While building the corpus, we focus on four major attributes: form, size, representativeness and open-endedness (Fernandes 2006: 88). Accordingly, the corpus has the following characteristics:

1. form – the corpus is the collection of the texts presented in an electronic form;
2. size – due to its specificity, the corpus is small-scale;
3. representativeness – the corpus covers the topic *fiducie*;
4. open-endedness – by means of the corpus, scholars may select and use the texts for various types of comparisons.

While building the specialized combined parallel-comparable corpus, we pay a special attention to the alignment of the texts, which may be performed at several levels of granularity. Generally, the process itself shares some common steps, namely, gathering a corpus, input, document alignment (a paragraph/sentence boundary detection, a sentence alignment, a tokenizer, a word alignment) (Santos 2011: 122-126). Accordingly, we work in the following major directions:

- a) collection of the raw parallel texts;
- b) input
- c) alignment of the texts.

In case of the *fiducie*-s, the best way of collecting raw parallel texts is the usage of the online sources, namely, juridical documents as

well as civil codes. Some codes are presented in two languages (French and English), while in certain cases, the official English translations are available. In addition to codes, scientific papers published in the bilingual journals may be chosen.

After collecting raw parallel texts, the process of alignment becomes crucial. Generally, this process is carried out automatically or manually. An automatic alignment can be performed via using the hunalign algorithm.

This algorithm does not require any linguistic resources to perform the alignment. It operates in two phases: In the first pass, the source and target files are analyzed, and a rudimentary bilingual dictionary is created. Then, in the second pass, the dictionary is used to calculate the best sentence matches between the source and target sentences (Jaworski, Seljan and Dunder 2023: 11-12).

In case of our corpus, the criterion of alignment is the same topic of text units, while a text unit is a sentence itself. The format of the documents to align is a plain text format. Accordingly, we convert PDF files to some kind of a plain text. Afterwards, we use the automatic alignment.

Generally, we may use *SDL Trados Studio 2014* or *Xue-Ren CAT*. The former takes the series of stages (creating a translation memory (TM); introducing two separate parallel text files into Studio; correcting the alignment carried out by the aligner; importing segment pairs into the TM), while the latter does a much better job, namely, in case of *Xue-Ren CAT*, it is easier to split and merge translation and source segments. Moreover, editing of source segments is possible (Guo 2016: 88). The usage of *Xue-Ren CAT* seems more beneficial for us. When the aligner does its job, we interfere for ensuring that each and every segment is correctly matched. In case of the codes, the alignment is done on an article-by-article basis. Every article is segmented into sentences. This becomes a precondition of a sentence-level alignment. In case of the scientific papers, an ordinary sentence-level alignment is done.

Accordingly, the meta-design of our specialized combined parallel-comparable corpus comprises three major components (sources, varieties and translations), which reflect its different aspects. The sources include civil codes and scientific papers published in the bilingual journals.

Figure 1. Meta-design of the corpus.

1.5. Discussion

Let us look through some passages taken from the sub-corpora of the specialized combined parallel-comparable corpus:

The aligned sentences from Canadian French-English Parallel Sub-corpus¹:

La fiducie résulte d'un acte par lequel une personne, le constituant, transfère de son patrimoine à un autre patrimoine qu'il constitue, des biens qu'il affecte à une fin particulière et qu'un fiduciaire s'oblige, par le fait de son	A trust results from an act whereby a person, the settlor, transfers property from his patrimony to another patrimony constituted by him which he appropriates to a particular purpose and which a trustee undertakes, by his acceptance, to hold and administer.
--	---

¹ The sentences of *Canadian French-English Parallel Subcorpus* are extracted from the French and English versions of Civil Code of Quebec (Article 1258 | Code civil du Québec annoté | (lexum.com)).

acceptation, à détenir et à administrer.	
Le patrimoine fiduciaire, formé des biens transférés en fiducie, constitue un patrimoine d'affectation autonome et distinct de celui du constituant, du fiduciaire ou du bénéficiaire, sur lequel aucun d'entre eux n'a de droit réel.	The trust patrimony, consisting of the property transferred in trust, constitutes a patrimony by appropriation, autonomous and distinct from that of the settlor, trustee or beneficiary and in which none of them has any real right.

The aligned sentences from France's French-English Parallel Subcorpus²:

La fiducie est l'opération par laquelle un ou plusieurs constituants transfèrent des biens, des droits ou des sûretés, ou un ensemble de biens, de droits ou de sûretés, présents ou futurs, à un ou plusieurs fiduciaires qui, les tenant séparés de leur patrimoine propre, agissent dans un but déterminé au profit d'un ou plusieurs bénéficiaires.	A fiducia is the operation by which one or more grantors transfer assets, rights, or security rights, or a set of assets, rights, or security rights, present or future, to one or more fiduciaries who, keeping them separate from their own patrimonies, act to achieve a specified goal for the benefit of one or more beneficiaries.
Lorsque le fiduciaire agit pour le compte de la fiducie, il doit en faire expressément mention.	When the fiduciary acts for the account of the fiducia, he must so state expressly.
De même, lorsque le patrimoine fiduciaire comprend des biens ou des droits dont la mutation est soumise à publicité, celle-ci doit	Likewise, when the fiduciary patrimony includes assets or rights whose transfer is subject to publicity, the transfer must make

² The sentences of *France's French-English Parallel Subcorpus* are extracted from the French and English versions of Code civil Titre XIV : De la fiducie (Articles 2011 à 2031) - Légifrance (legifrance.gouv.fr)

mentionner le nom du fiduciaire ès qualités.	an express reference to the name of the fiduciary in that capacity.
---	--

The aligned sentences from Luxembourgish French-English Parallel Sub-corpus³:

Un contrat fiduciaire au sens du présent titre est un contrat par lequel une personne, le fiduciaire, convient avec une autre personne, le fiduciaire, que celui-ci, sous les obligations déterminées par les parties, devient propriétaire de biens formant un patrimoine fiduciaire.	A fiduciary contract within the meaning of the present title is a contract by which a person, the fiduciant, agrees with another person, the fiduciary, that, subject to the obligations determined by the parties, the fiduciary becomes the owner of assets which shall form a fiduciary property.
Le patrimoine fiduciaire est distinct du patrimoine personnel du fiduciaire, comme de tout autre patrimoine fiduciaire. Les biens qui le composent ne peuvent être saisis que par les créanciers dont les droits sont nés à l'occasion du patrimoine fiduciaire. Ils ne font pas partie du patrimoine personnel du fiduciaire en cas de liquidation ou de faillite de celui-ci ou de toute autre situation de concours entre ses créanciers personnels.	The fiduciary property is segregated from the personal property of the fiduciary as well as from any other fiduciary property. The assets which make up such fiduciary property can only be attached by those creditors whose rights have arisen in connection with the fiduciary property. They do not form part of the personal property of the fiduciary in case of the fiduciary's liquidation or bankruptcy or in any other situation of the fiduciary generally affecting the rights of its creditors.

³ The sentences of *Luxembourgish French-English Parallel Subcorpus* are extracted from the French Journal officiel du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg (public.lu) and English Translation of fiduciary law of 27th July, 2003 | Elvinger Hoss versions of fiduciary law of 27th July, 2003.

The above passages reveal the essence of three *fiducie*-s and their major subjects as well as objects. They enable users of the corpus to understand the difference between the juridical mechanisms of France's, Canada's and Luxembourg's *fiducie*-s and identify some terminological units related to them.

The advantage of the specialized combined parallel-comparable corpus lies in the fact that it can be used for translating the terms related to three *fiducie*-s with a high degree of precision. It is more helpful than a bilingual dictionary. The latter enables readers to find equivalents of particular terms as well as some examples of their usage. However, a single bilingual dictionary may not provide translations of the lexical units, which are presented in different varieties of French. The specialized combined parallel-comparable corpus offers the English counterparts and in addition, deals with non-equivalency i.e. with the lack of full equivalency of particular terms and phrases. It presents a systematic translation strategy for such lexical units and provides the experience of other translators, which dealt with the lack of counterparts at a word level.

Moreover, the specialized combined parallel-comparable corpus reveals the juridical-semantic differences and the problematics of the verbal realization of the concepts related to three *fiducie*-s. If we consider the peculiarities of the juridical mechanisms of France's, Canada's and Luxembourg's *fiducie*-s, how can we deal with the identical naming of the major subjects and objects of these fiduciary relationships? We propose to rename the existing concepts.

Accordingly, the term *fiducie* (denoting fiduciary relations of three countries: France, Canada (Quebec) and Luxembourg) should be replaced by *fiducie française*, *fiducie québécoise*, *fiducie luxembourgeoise*. These lexical units may be translated as **French trust**, **Quebec trust**, **Luxembourgish trust**. The same strategy may be used in cases of *constituant*, *fiduciaire*, *patrimoine fiduciaire* and other terms related to three *fiducie*-s.

This solution seems important, because the process of globalization widens the area of utilization of the *fiducie*-s and any semantic as well as conceptual obscurity may cause problems during cross-national linguistic and juridical activities. Moreover, the existence of the *fiducie*-s raises the competitiveness of European countries in the international arena. Accordingly, the terminological landscape should be fully adequate.

2. Conclusions

As Teubert mentioned, “by exploiting corpora, bilingual and multilingual lexicography can reach a new quality level, a level that was just not possible without corpora” (Teubert 1996: 241). We believe that the creation of a specialized combined parallel-comparable corpus is important for legalese. On the one hand, the preparation of a corpus resource provides an empirical evidence in support of comparative studies between varieties of a language. On the other hand, a corpus may be used as an effective tool for researching discourse structures and markers. Moreover, it can be exploited to solve the problem of translation of some lexical units presented in legal terminology, especially, in cases of existence of several varieties of a particular language. Translators may also benefit from a corpus, because aligned segment pairs can be technically converted to a translation memory.

In addition, the contemporary globalizing processes widen the area of utilization of the *fiducie*-s. Any semantic and conceptual generality may cause court proceedings. We suppose that the proposed corpus will be useful, especially, in cases of cross-national juridical activities associated with the *fiducie*-s.

Conflict of interest

I declare that I have no conflicts of interest to disclose related to this manuscript. If any conflicts arise in the future, I will promptly inform the journal.

AI Use statement

I confirm that artificial intelligence (AI) tools were not used in any aspects of my research.

Bibliography

Aijmer, Karin, and Bengt Altenberg. 1996. Introduction. In *Languages in contrast. Papers from a Symposium on Text-Based Cross-Linguistic Studies*, eds. Karin Aijmer, Bengt

- Altenberg and Mats Johansson, 11–16. Lund: Lund University Press.
- Biel, Łucja. 2010. Corpus-based studies of legal language for translation purposes: methodological and practical potential. In *Reconceptualizing LSP. Online proceedings of the XVII European LSP Symposium 2009*, eds. Carmen Heine and Jan Engberg, 1-15. Aarhus: Aarhus School of Business.
- Bugg, Stuart G., Hons. 2009. *Langenscheidt Alpmann Fachwörterbuch Kompakt Recht English*. München: Langenscheidt GmbH&Co.KG.
- Cera, Franck. 2014. The fiducie revival. *STEP journal*. <https://www.step.org/step-journal/step-journal-february-2014/fiducie-revival> (accessed June 4, 2023).
- Civil Code of Quebec (Article 1258 | Code civil du Québec annoté | (lexum.com) (accessed June 2, 2023).
- Code civil Titre XIV: De la fiducie (Articles 2011 à 2031), Légifrance, <https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/codes/id/LEGIARTI000006445348/2007-02-21> (accessed June 2, 2023).
- Dash, Niladri Sekhar. 2007. Corpus linguistics: an introduction. In *Encyclopedia of life support systems*, eds. Vesna Muhvic-Dimanovski and Lelija Sočanac, 110–159. Oxford: EOLSS Publishers.
- Fernandes, Lincoln. 2006. Corpora in translation studies: revisiting Baker's typology. *Fragmentos*, 30: 87–95.
- Fiduciary law of 27th July 2003, Translation of fiduciary law of 27th July, 2003, Elvinger Hoss <https://elvingerhoss.lu/publications/translation-fiduciary-law-27th-july-2003> (accessed June 2, 2023).
- Gast, Volker. 2011. Contrastive analysis: theories and methods. In *Dictionaries of linguistics and communication science: linguistic theory and methodology*, eds. Berndand Kortmann and Johannes Kabatek, 9-119. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Giampieri, Patrizia. 2016. Is the European legal English legalese-free? *Italian Journal of Public Law* 8(2): 424–40.
- Granger, Sylviane. 2010. Comparable and translation corpora in cross-linguistic research. Design, analysis and applications. *Journal of Shanghai Jiaotong University* 2: 14–21.
- Gray, Christopher Berry, ed. 2004. *The philosophy of law: an encyclopedia*. Routledge.

- Graziadei, Michele, Ugo Mattei, and Lionel Smith. 2005. *Commercial trusts in European private law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guo, Xiaotian. 2016. Drawing a route map of making a small domain-specific parallel corpus for translators and beyond. *Proceedings of the 38th conference translating and the computer*: 88–99.
- Hayton, David. 2005. The distinctive characteristics of the trust in Anglo-Saxon law. *Trust et Fiducie: la Convention de La Haye et la Nouvelle Législation Luxembourgeoise*: 1–18.
- Jaworski, Rafal, Sanja Seljan, and Ivan Dunder. 2023. Four million segments and counting: building an English-Croatian parallel corpus through crowdsourcing using a novel gamification-based platform. *Information*, 14(4):226. DOI: <https://www.mdpi.com/2078-2489/14/4/226>.
- Kida, Ireneusz. 2013. Introduction to corpus linguistics. *Linguistica Silesiana* 34: 133–44.
- Kirk, John, and Anna Čermáková. 2017. From ICE to ICC: the new International Comparable Corpus. In *Proceedings of the workshop on challenges in the management of large corpora and big data and natural language processing (CMLC-5+BigNLP) 2017 including the papers from the Web-as-Corpus (WAC-XI) guest section*, eds. Piotr Bański, Marc Kupietz, Harald Lungen, Paul Rayson, Hanno Biber, Evelyn Breiteneder, Simon Clematide, John Mariani, Mark Stevenson and Theresa Sick, 7–12. Mannheim: Institut für Deutsche Sprache.
- Lahaussois, Aimée. 2014. The Kiranti comparable corpus. In *Endangered languages and new technologies*, ed. Mari C. Jones, 17–34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Loi du 27 juillet 2003 Journal officiel du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg, <https://data.legilux.public.lu/filestore/eli/etat/leg/loi/2003/07/27/n4/jo/fr/html/eli-etat-leg-loi-2003-07-27-n4-jo-fr-html.html> (accessed July 1, 2023).
- McEnery, Anthony Mark, and Richard Xiao. 2007. Parallel and comparable corpora: What are they up to? In *Incorporating Corpora: Translation and the Linguist*, eds. Gunilla Anderman and Margaret Rogers, 8-31. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

- McEnery, Tony, and Andrew Hardie. 2011. *Corpus linguistics: method, theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Partsch, Thibaut, and Jeremy Houet. 2012. Country report: Luxembourg. *The Columbia Journal of European Law Online* 18 (2): 55–66, <https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/read/11664055/the-trust-in-continental-europe-a-brief-comment-> (accessed July 1, 2023).
- Pontrandolfo, Gianluca. 2019. Legal linguistics in Italy. In *Legal linguistics beyond borders: language and law in a world of media, globalisation and social conflicts*, ed. Vogel Friedemann, 59–80. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot.
- Salmi-Tolonen, Tarja. 2013. Legal linguistics as a line of study and an academic discipline. In *Language in the negotiation of justice. Contexts, issues and applications*, eds. Christopher Williams and Girolamo Tessuto, 259–78. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Sandor, Istvan. 2015. *Fiduciary property management and the trust, historical and comparative law analysis*. Bucharest: Hvgorac.
- Santos, Andr'e. 2011. A survey on parallel corpora alignment, *MI-STAR*: 117–28.
- Teubert, Wolfgang. 1996. Comparable or parallel corpora? *International Journal of Lexicography* 9: 238–64.
- Vicari, Andrea. 2012. Country reports: San Marino. *The Columbia journal of European law online* 18: 81–92.
- Vogel, Friedemann, Hanjo Hamann, and Isabelle Gauer. 2018. Computer-assisted legal linguistics: corpus analysis as a new tool for legal studies. *Law & Social Inquiry* 43(4): 1340–63.