

A Review of Research on Correspondence and Processing of Legal Terminology in Legal Translation

Xiyu Zhou, Caixia Hu*

School of foreign languages, China University of Petroleum (East China), Shandong 266000, China

* Corresponding author Email: hucaixia@upc.edu.cn

Abstract: This paper undertakes a comprehensive review of both domestic and international research on the correspondence and handling of legal terminology in legal translation. It critically examines the current state of research, highlighting key achievements, ongoing challenges, and potential future directions, while also incorporating the author's perspectives and recommendations. The paper is structured into four main sections: The first section introduces the fundamental concepts of legal terminology and legal term correspondence, as well as their pivotal roles in the field of legal translation. It provides an in-depth analysis of the definitions and characteristics of legal terminology, alongside the definitions and classifications of legal term correspondence, underscoring their significance in the translation process. The second section delves into the principles and methodologies governing legal term correspondence. It synthesizes four primary principles identified by scholars both domestically and internationally. Furthermore, it outlines three commonly employed methods. The third section presents a case analysis focused on the correspondence between Chinese and English legal terminology, emphasizing the disparities between the two legal systems and their implications for legal term correspondence. The fourth section reviews the current landscape of research on legal term correspondence and handling, identifying prevalent issues. It concludes with suggestions for enhancing research quality and standards.

Keywords: Legal Translation; Legal Terminology; Legal Terminology Correspondence.

1. Introduction

Legal translation is a specialized form of cross-cultural communication that involves the intricate process of converting legal concepts between distinct legal systems, cultures, and languages[1]. Within this domain, legal terminology serves as the most fundamental unit of expression and simultaneously represents one of the most professionally demanding aspects. The accurate correspondence and handling of legal terms across languages constitute a core issue in both the theoretical and practical realms of legal translation[2]. Given that legal translation is intrinsically linked to international cooperation, the protection of legal rights, and the advancement of the rule of law, the precision and professionalism required in this field are of utmost importance[3].

A pertinent example can be seen within the context of the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), recognized as the most stringent data protection legislation to date, designed to safeguard personal information and regulate data processing activities[4]. Translating this regulation into Chinese necessitates a careful consideration of the differences between the EU and Chinese legal systems and cultural contexts, particularly in relation to key terms such as "personal data", "data subject", "data controller", and "data processor". This underscores the requirement for legal translators operating in this field to possess a high degree of professional competence.

In light of these challenges, a thorough review of domestic and international research on the correspondence and handling of legal terminology in legal translation is both theoretically and practically valuable. Furthermore, in contrast to earlier reviews of legal translation, this study focuses on the topic of legal terminology correspondence and processing, diversifying the relevant research perspectives.

This paper aims to provide a comprehensive review of existing research on the correspondence and handling of legal terminology in legal translation, and to explore the current status and problems of research on the theme.

2. Legal Terminology and Legal Terminology Correspondence

2.1. Definition and Characteristics of Legal Terminology

Legal terminology refers to words and phrases that carry specific legal meanings. It is a crucial component of legal language, employed to express, record, and convey legal concepts and information [5]. The origins of legal terminology are diverse, including terms derived from everyday language, those preserved from ancient legal systems, terms borrowed from foreign legal systems, and others created through legal practice [6].

Legal terminology possesses several distinct characteristics. First, it is specialized, used exclusively within the legal domain and distinct from terms in other fields or everyday language. Examples include "legal person", "incapacitated person" and "defendant". Second, it is exclusive, designed to express a single, precise legal concept while avoiding polysemy or ambiguity to prevent misunderstandings and misinterpretations [7]. For instance, "party" refers specifically to individuals directly involved in a legal matter or litigation. Third, legal terminology is conservative and authoritative, meaning it resists change and often retains older legal expressions, reflecting the stability and solemnity of the law. Finally, it is systematic and precise, typically forming word families or phrases around a core term to express related or derivative concepts, while adhering to the conventions and norms of the target language.

These characteristics enable legal terminology to play a

vital role in the legal profession by facilitating communication, regulating behavior, protecting rights and resolving disputes [1].

2.2. Definition and Types of Legal Terminology Correspondence

Legal term correspondence refers to the process of comparing and matching legal terms that convey the same or similar legal concepts across different legal systems or languages [8]. Its primary purpose is to facilitate the accurate transmission and exchange of legal information, thereby enhancing understanding and communication between different legal jurisdictions or cultures. Legal term correspondence can be categorized into several types based on the relationship between two legal terms.

One type is cognate correspondence, which occurs when two legal terms share the same historical origin and cultural background, expressing the same legal concept. An example is “contract” in common law and “contrat” in civil law [9]. Another type is non-cognate correspondence, where the two legal terms do not share a common origin or background but have gradually converged in modern legal development to express similar legal concepts. For instance, “trust” in common law and the concept of trust in civil law illustrate this type of correspondence [10]. A third type is non-correspondence, where there is no commonality or similarity between the two legal terms, and they represent entirely different legal concepts. An example is “equity” in common law versus the principle of fairness in civil law. The final type is false correspondence, which involves legal terms that appear similar or identical in form but differ fundamentally in content, expressing different legal concepts. For example, “tort” in common law and “tortious act” in civil law fall under this category.

These types of legal term correspondence reflect both the differences and connections between various legal systems or languages, playing a crucial role in effective legal translation and comparative law studies.

2.3. Importance of Legal Terminology and Legal Terminology Correspondence in Translation

Legal terminology and its correspondence are fundamental to ensuring accuracy in legal translation. Accuracy is the primary principle of legal translation and the most important criterion for evaluating its quality [2:115-119]. It demands that the translation faithfully reproduces all legal information contained in the original text, without omissions, additions, or ambiguities, and that it objectively prevents the reader from experiencing misunderstandings or confusion while preserving the linguistic characteristics of the original text. To achieve this, each legal term in the original text must be accurately, appropriately, and consistently matched, avoiding misinterpretations or ambiguities caused by differences in legal systems, cultural backgrounds, or linguistic conventions [7:92-98]. For instance, Article 48 of the Copyright Law of the People’s Republic of China states: “Whoever infringes upon copyright or rights related to copyright, causing damages, shall bear civil liability in accordance with this Law.” Here, the term “民事责任” should not be simply translated as “civil responsibility,” but rather as “civil liability,” in line with the corresponding concept and customary expression in common law jurisdictions [11].

In addition to ensuring accuracy, legal terminology and its correspondence play a crucial role in reflecting legal cultural differences and fostering cross-cultural understanding. Different countries or regions possess distinct historical, political, economic, social, and religious characteristics, which give rise to diverse legal systems, concepts, values, and styles-collectively referred to as “legal culture”. These differences are further reflected in the languages used, particularly in the legal terminology crafted to express and convey legal information [2:13-19]. By conducting a comparative analysis of legal terminology across languages and their corresponding relationships, it is possible to uncover similarities and differences in cognitive approaches, thought patterns, and value orientations between two or more cultures. Through the careful selection of appropriate translation strategies, these differences can be bridged or minimized, enabling target readers to better comprehend the information conveyed in the original text.

For example, the term “判决” in common law jurisdictions can be translated into several corresponding expressions, such as “judgment,” “verdict,” “decision,” or “ruling,” each with subtle yet significant distinctions. “Judgment” refers to “a court’s final determination of the rights and obligations of the parties in a case”; “verdict” refers to “the jury’s finding or decision on the factual issues of a case”; “decision” refers to “a court’s ruling on a matter of law or an issue not requiring a factual determination”; and “ruling” refers to “a court’s or a judge’s decision on some matter or point of law” [12]. Therefore, in translation, these terms should not be used interchangeably; the most appropriate corresponding term must be chosen based on the context of the original text and the conventions of the target language.

3. Principles and Methods of Legal Terminology Correspondence

3.1. Principles of Legal Terminology Correspondence

The principles of legal terminology correspondence refer to the fundamental norms and standards that should be adhered to when translating legal terms between different legal systems or languages. These principles aim to ensure the accuracy, professionalism, and standardization of the translated text. Scholars, both domestically and internationally, have proposed various categorizations and definitions for these principles, which can be broadly summarized into four main categories.

Equivalence Principle. This principle dictates that translators should strive to find and select terms that express the same or similar legal concepts as closely as possible. It aims to ensure that the translated text aligns with the original in terms of content, form, and function. As the fundamental principle of legal terminology correspondence, equivalence also serves as a key standard for evaluating the quality of legal translations. The equivalence principle requires translators to consider not only linguistic similarities but also legal and cultural parallels, to avoid misunderstandings or ambiguities arising from differences between legal systems or cultures. Additionally, this principle necessitates that translators distinguish between different types of legal terminology correspondences-such as homological correspondence, heterological correspondence, non-correspondence, and false correspondence-and apply appropriate translation strategies for each type.

In relation to the equivalence principle, numerous studies have been conducted by scholars both domestically and internationally. Zhao Gen, building on Koller's equivalence theory, explored the issue of equivalence in Chinese-English legal terminology translation. He argues that Koller's theory provides an effective theoretical framework and operational methodology for such translations [13]. Zhao emphasizes that Koller's theory highlights cultural and functional differences in translation, proposing five levels of equivalence: literal equivalence, formal equivalence, situational equivalence, conceptual equivalence, and cultural equivalence. He suggests that the appropriate level of equivalence should be selected based on the specific context, while balancing the differences and commonalities between the two languages [13]. Similarly, Li Ru analyzed the equivalence issue in Chinese-English legal terminology translation from a functional perspective, suggesting that a functional approach offers a more flexible and practical guiding principle for such translations [14]. In the context of translating legal terms with Chinese characteristics into English, Zhang Falian and other scholars have applied Conceptual Integration Theory to the translation of terms such as "the people's court" and "real right" in the Civil Code of the People's Republic of China. Their research demonstrates that this theory can effectively reduce misunderstandings arising from conceptual discrepancies in legal terminology [15].

Functional Equivalence Principle. This principle asserts that in legal terminology correspondence, the selected terms should achieve the same or similar communicative effects and functions as those in the original text, considering the purpose and audience of the translation. It emphasizes the importance of flexibility and practicality in legal translation.

Scholars have conducted extensive research on functional equivalence, which can be summarized in several key areas. Some scholars explore the issue of functional equivalence in legal terminology translation from a functional perspective. Wen Zhuguang and Li Xiaohong proposed three levels of functional equivalence: efficacy equivalence, communicative equivalence, and cultural equivalence [16]. Some scholars investigate the theoretical basis and implementation of efficacy equivalence in legal translation from the perspective of functional equivalence theory. Wu Peng argues that efficacy equivalence refers to producing the same or similar legal effect in the target language as in the source language [17]. Other scholars focus on translation strategies and techniques within the framework of functional equivalence in specific fields. Long Jie analyzed functional equivalence issues and solutions in cross-border e-commerce translation [18], while Cheng Xinliang examined methods and outcomes of applying translation techniques under the functional equivalence perspective [19].

Cultural Adaptation Principle. This principle stipulates that when translating legal terminology, translators must consider the differing cultural backgrounds and values inherent in the languages and legal systems involved. The goal is to maintain consistency in both the connotations and denotations of the source and target languages while avoiding cultural conflicts and misunderstandings [20]. To achieve this, legal translators must possess a high level of cross-cultural awareness and sensitivity, enabling them to accurately interpret the cultural information embedded in various legal terms, including historical context, religion, customs, habits, and thinking patterns. In addition, they should carefully choose the appropriate translation methods—such as literal translation,

free translation, annotation, borrowing, or coinage—based on the target audience's comprehension abilities and linguistic norms. This ensures that the translation remains faithful to the original text while conforming to the conventions of the target language. The cultural adaptation principle plays a crucial role in guiding legal terminology translation, helping to achieve both accuracy and effectiveness, while facilitating communication and understanding between different legal systems and fostering cooperation and goodwill among nations.

Normativity Principle. The normativity principle is one of the foundational principles of legal terminology correspondence, reflecting the essential characteristics and requirements of legal terminology. Legal terms are defined and governed by legal norms, which endow them with authority and stability. These terms function as both the expressions and carriers of legal norms, as well as tools for legal reasoning and communication. Consequently, legal terminology fundamentally differs from general language terminology and cannot be arbitrarily altered or replaced, as doing so could lead to confusion and misunderstandings in the interpretation of legal norms [21]. The principle requires that when translating legal terms across languages, translators must carefully consider the content, form, and function of the legal norms embedded in the terminology. The goal is to maintain normative consistency between the source and target languages, thereby avoiding normative conflicts and deviations. This principle emphasizes the need for professionalism and accuracy in legal terminology translation, as well as respect for and adherence to established legal norms.

3.2. Methods of Legal Terminology Correspondence

The primary methods for establishing legal terminology correspondence are the equivalence method, the approximate equivalence method, and the zero equivalence method.

The equivalence method involves selecting legal terms in the source and target languages that convey identical or closely related legal concepts and forms, thereby achieving functional equivalence. This method is foundational in legal terminology translation and is the most ideal, as it ensures accuracy and professionalism while minimizing ambiguity or misunderstanding. The equivalence method applies in cases of both complete and partial equivalence. Complete equivalence occurs when legal terms in both languages share identical meanings and scopes, allowing for direct translation. Examples include "contract", "tort" and "plaintiff". Partial equivalence arises when the legal terms in both languages have overlapping but not identical meanings and scopes, necessitating careful differentiation during translation. For instance, the term "trust" and its related concepts, such as agency and beneficiary rights, or "equity" and its applications, including equitable principles and supplementary laws, require precise handling.

Scholars have made significant contributions to the study and application of the equivalence method in legal translation across different languages. In the translation of Chinese-English legal terminology, Zhang Yinglun analyzed the challenges in translating the "De" structure in marriage and family law clauses. This structure has multiple functions, such as expressing possession, subordination, and modification, for which no direct English equivalent exists. Therefore, depending on the context, different translation approaches—such as possessive nouns, prepositional phrases, adjectives, or

adverbs-should be employed [22].

The approximate equivalence method is employed when it is impossible to find terms that are completely or nearly equivalent. In such cases, terms expressing similar or related legal concepts are selected to ensure the translated text aligns closely with the content, form, and function of the original. This method highlights the flexibility and practicality required in legal translation, demonstrating the translator's skill and expertise. It requires translators to thoroughly consider the differences and similarities between the source and target texts, striving to preserve the original legal information and intent while adapting to the norms of the target language to avoid misdirection or confusion. Depending on the context, translators may employ strategies such as synonyms, paraphrasing, annotations, borrowing, or coinage.

Scholars have extensively explored and applied the approximate equivalence method in the translation of legal terms across languages. Wang Rui and Gao Xichen analyzed the challenges of translating terms like "People's Assessor", "People's Procuratorate" and "People's Mediation Committee" due to the differences between Chinese and English legal systems and cultures. They proposed translation strategies such as paraphrasing, annotation, and borrowing [23]. However, translators must exercise caution to avoid common mistakes. Liu Guosheng, for example, highlighted the risk of misinterpretations and ambiguities arising from a lack of professional knowledge or cultural sensitivity, such as mistranslating "民事责任" as "civil responsibility" instead of the more accurate "civil liability" [24].

The zero equivalence method is applied when there are no equivalent legal terms in the target language due to differences in legal systems, legal cultures, or language structures. In such cases, specific techniques are employed to convey the meaning of the source legal terms. The zero equivalence method encompasses borrowing, creation and amplification and annotation.

Borrowing involves directly transferring the source legal term into the target language in its original form or as a transliteration, without modification or explanation. This approach is often used for newly emerging, highly specialized, or region-specific legal terms, such as "Brexit" and "GDPR". While borrowing preserves the originality of the source term, it may also pose comprehension challenges for target readers [25, 26]. Creation entails creating a new legal term in the target language based on the meaning and scope of the source term, in accordance with the norms of the target language. This strategy is useful for legal terms without existing equivalents, such as "People's Juror", "public interest litigation" and "administrative reconsideration". Although coinage can fill gaps in the target legal terminology, it may also raise concerns among target readers regarding the legitimacy or clarity of the newly coined terms [27, 28]. Amplification and annotation involve supplementing borrowed or coined legal terms with explanations to enhance the target reader's understanding of the source term's meaning. This method is particularly suitable for legal terms that originate from different legal systems or cultural backgrounds, such as "habeas corpus", "common law" and "state compensation". While expansion can help reduce or eliminate ambiguity, it may also lead to increased length or repetition in the target text [29, 30, 31].

These strategies are not mutually exclusive and can be combined or adapted as needed to achieve the best translation

outcomes. When employing the zero equivalence method, translators should carefully consider the differences and connections between the source and target languages, as well as the legal systems, cultures, styles, and other relevant factors, to strike a balance between respecting the source language and meeting the needs of the target language.

4. Case Study of Legal Terminology Correspondence

4.1. Differences in Legal Systems between China and the British

The differences between the legal systems of China and the United Kingdom are a primary factor contributing to the challenges in achieving equivalence in legal terminology translation between the two languages.

The United Kingdom's legal system is grounded in the common law tradition, which has developed over centuries through judicial decisions. This system is characterized by its reliance on judicial precedents, where past court rulings (case law) significantly influence future judgments. Common law is inherently flexible, allowing the law to evolve over time through judicial interpretation. The historical evolution of common law has placed great emphasis on the role of judges in shaping and modifying legal principles, resulting in British legal terms often carrying nuanced meanings that have been refined through judicial interpretation [32].

In contrast, China's legal system is based on the civil law tradition, influenced by Confucian philosophy and more recently by European civil law models. The civil law system in China is codified, with legal rules primarily derived from written statutes, codes, and regulations. In this system, the interpretation and application of law are largely determined by the text of legal codes, with judges expected to apply the law as written rather than interpret it expansively. Consequently, Chinese legal terms tend to be more straightforward, reflecting the codified nature of the legal system [33].

Therefore, when translating legal terms between Chinese and English, relying solely on literal equivalence is insufficient. It is essential to consider the underlying legal systems and cultural differences of both languages and seek the most appropriate method of achieving equivalence.

4.2. Examples and Analysis of Chinese-English Legal Terminology Equivalence

To illustrate the differences in legal systems and legal culture between China and the UK, as well as their impact on the equivalence of legal terminology, this paper provides examples and analysis from the fields of criminal procedure, civil procedure, and contract law.

In criminal procedure, China follows a tripartite system with distinct roles for investigative agencies, procuratorates, and courts. Public security agencies handle investigations, procuratorates oversee prosecutions, and courts conduct adjudications. In contrast, the UK employs an adversarial system where the prosecution and defense present their cases in court, with a jury or judge delivering the verdict. Consequently, translating criminal procedure terms between Chinese and English requires more than simply matching agency names or functions; it necessitates a deep understanding of the distinct roles and positions within each system. For instance, "检察院" should not be translated

directly as “prosecutor” but rather as “public prosecutor” or “prosecuting authority,” depending on the context. Similarly, “辩护人” should be translated as “defense counsel” or “defense lawyer,” rather than the literal “defender” [7:245-246, 34].

In civil procedure, China follows the principle of free evaluation of evidence, whereas the United Kingdom adheres to strict rules of evidence. These differing approaches lead to variations in the form, admissibility, and exclusion of evidence in each country. Translators must carefully consider these differences and select terms that align with the conventions and norms of the target language. For example, “书证” and “非法证据” cannot be directly translated as “documentary evidence” and “illegal evidence.” Instead, they should be rendered as “written evidence” or “documentary proof” and “inadmissible evidence” or “excluded evidence,” depending on the legal context [7:267-268, 34].

In contract law, China applies subjective interpretation, while the United Kingdom relies on objective interpretation. These divergent approaches result in different understandings and practices regarding the meaning, validity, and modification of contracts in each country. Thus, when translating contract terms, it is essential to account for these differences and select terms that reflect the conventions of the target language. For example, “合同解除” and “合同变更” should not be directly translated as “contract termination” and “contract change.” Instead, they should be translated as “contract rescission” or “contract discharge,” and “contract variation” or “contract modification,” depending on the specific context [7:120-121, 34].

5. Conclusion

After years of exploration and practice, research in legal translation has developed a substantial theoretical framework and methodology, offering valuable guidance for the field. These achievements include an in-depth analysis of the nature, characteristics, and classification of legal terminology and its equivalence, which highlights the complexity and diversity of legal terminology. Researchers have proposed principles and methods for achieving legal terminology equivalence from various perspectives—such as equivalence, functionality, culture, and norms—thereby providing practical strategies for legal translation. Additionally, numerous examples of legal terminology equivalence across different languages have been presented, with a focus on how distinct legal systems and cultural contexts influence this equivalence. These contributions have significantly improved the quality and standards of legal translation, fostering better communication and understanding between different legal systems.

Despite the progress in both domestic and international research on legal terminology equivalence, certain issues and limitations still require further attention and development. The following suggestions are proposed: First, the scope and perspective of research should be broadened. While much focus has been on traditional language pairs like Chinese-English, there is a need to explore other language combinations, such as Chinese-French, Chinese-German, and Chinese-Russian, as well as multilingual pairs like Chinese-English-French or Chinese-English-Japanese, to meet the demands of globalization and the diversification of legal translation. Second, interdisciplinary approaches should be embraced, integrating theories and methods from linguistics, translation studies, and law, while also leveraging emerging

technologies like computing, artificial intelligence, and big data to enhance the efficiency and quality of legal terminology equivalence. Third, emphasis should be placed on empirical data and case analysis, moving beyond theoretical discussions to validate and evaluate findings from a practical perspective, thereby increasing the credibility and applicability of legal terminology equivalence.

References

- [1] Wenlong, L., & Gonghua, H. (2021). Subjective Thinking in Legal Translation. *International Journal of Language, Culture and Law*, 1(1), 103.
- [2] Xiaobo, D. (2011). *Translation for Legal Texts*. University of International Business and Economics Press.
- [3] Hongjun, M. (2021). Establishment and improvement of China's sports legal system-based on the revision of the sports law of the People's Republic of China. *China Sport Science*, 41(1), 7-20.
- [4] Rui, W. (2018). Analysis of the main contents and impact of The General Data Protection Regulation of the European Union. *Financial Accounting*, (8), 17-26.
- [5] Shuhui, H., Runyu, S., & Falian, Z.. (2021). On the Linguistic Perspective of the International Communication of PRC Civil Code. *International Journal of Language, Culture and Law*, 1(1), 68.
- [6] Boyuan, Z. (2016). *The Verification of the Legal Documents with Annotations*. Social Sciences Academic Press (China).
- [7] Falian, Z. (2021). *A Comparative Study of Chinese and Western Legal Language and Culture (Vol. 4)*. Springer Nature.
- [8] Hanbing, G. (2020). The Traditional Logic and Interpretation Path of the Distinction Between Fact and Law in Criminal Proceedings. *Global Law Review*, 42(4), 61-80.
- [9] Fang, W., & Jingxiang, C. (2023). Explication of Pronouns in C-E Translation of Legal Text—Taking “Qi” in the Civil Code for Example. *Modern Linguistics*, 11, 114.
- [10] Xiaozhou, L. (2023). Independence of Trust Property-Comparison of Trust Property System between China and Britain. *Open Journal of Legal Science*, 11, 469.
- [11] Juan, C., & Qingmei, W. (2011). Lack of Equivalent English-Chinese Legal Words and Subjectivity of Translators. *China Terminology*, 13(4), 27.
- [12] Chabanyuk, V. (2016). JUDGE (JUDGES) REGULATION OF A CLEARLY UNJUST VERDICT, DECISION, DECISIONS AND RULINGS: MODERN PROBLEMS OF INTERPRITATION.
- [13] Gen, Z. (2018). Translation of Legal Terminology from the Perspective of Equivalence Principle. *Language Education*, 6(3), 76-83.
- [14] Ru, L. (2017). *English Translation of Chinese Legal Terms from the Perspective of Legal Equivalence-A Case Study of Food Safety Law of the People's Republic, Jiangnan University, Wuxi*.
- [15] Falian Z., Xiaolan J., & Wenhua T. (2024). Translation of Legal Terms With Chinese Characteristics in the Civil Code Under the Conceptual Integration Theory. *Chinese Translators Journal*, (1), 152-159.
- [16] Zhuguang, W., & Xiaohong, L. (2016). Application of Principle of Functional Equivalence in Legal English Translation. *Journal of North China University of Science and Technology (Social Science Edition)*, 16(2), 100-104.

- [17] Peng, W., Lin, Z., & Xiaofei, R. (2005). Translation of Legal English in the Perspective of Functional Equivalence. *Journal of Baoshan University*, (6), 83-86.
- [18] Jie, L. (2023). A Study on English Translation of Cross-Border E-Commerce under the Functional Equivalence Theory. *Journal of Jiamusi Vocational Institute*, 39(3), 67-69.
- [19] Xinliang, C. (2023). A Study on the Application of Translation Techniques from the Perspective of Functional Equivalence. *Journal of Jiangxi Vocational and Technical College of Electricity*, 36(1), 148-150.
- [20] Hongying, Z., & Wei, W. (2019). Study of Conceptual Metaphors in English and Chinese Social Discourses and Its Cross-cultural Translation. BEIJING BOOK CO. INC.
- [21] Xin, Z.. (2020). Standardization Process of Legal Terms in Contemporary China. *China Terminology*, 22(4), 5.
- [22] Yinglun, Z. (2022). A Study on the Equivalence in English Translation of the “De” Structure in Legal Texts: A Case Study of Marriage and Family Provisions. *Overseas English*, (24), 38-40.
- [23] Rui, W., & Xichen, G. (2019, March 6). The Dilemmas and Breakthroughs in Legal Term Translation. *Chinese Social Sciences Today*, p. 5.
- [24] Guosheng, L. (2016). On Mistranslation of Legal English Terms. *Journal of Chongqing Jiaotong University (Social Sciences Edition)*, 16(3), 128-133.
- [25] Kashgary, A. D. (2011). The paradox of translating the untranslatable: Equivalence vs. non-equivalence in translating from Arabic into English. *Journal of King Saud University-Languages and Translation*, 23(1), 47-57.
- [26] Hasyim, M., & Kuswarini, P. (2020). Semiotic model for equivalence and non-equivalence in translation. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 8(3), 381-391.
- [27] Jiangyan, L. (2017). Translation Models and Principles of “Zero Equivalence” in ESP from the Perspective of Functional Theory. *Overseas English*, (3), 112-114.
- [28] Chifane, C. (2012). Equivalence versus non-equivalence in economic translation. *Management Strategies Journal*, 18(4), 74-82.
- [29] Jiang, L., & Zhuang, Y. (2019). Non-equivalence in Legal Translation. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 9(12), 1630-1634.
- [30] Rackevičienė, S., & Šliogerienė, J. (2014). Dealing with non-equivalence of legal terminology—a comparative case study of Lithuanian and English legal terms. *English for Specific Purposes World*, 42(15), 1-16.
- [31] Rackevičienė, S., Janulevičienė, V., & Mockienė, L. (2019). Circumnavigating non-equivalence in legal languages: a trilingual case study of generic-specific concepts and terms. *Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 7(1), 1-16.
- [32] Merryman, J., & Pérez-Perdomo, R. (2018). *The civil law tradition: an introduction to the legal systems of Europe and Latin America*. Stanford University Press.
- [33] Chen, J. (Ed.). (1999). *Chinese law: Towards an understanding of Chinese law, its nature and developments (Vol. 3)*. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- [34] Cao, D. (2019). Dilemmas in translating legal terms between Chinese and English. *Legal translation: Current issues and challenges in research, methods and applications*, 301-314.