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Abstract: The paper will show how translations played a considerable role to the maintaining of the German minority’s language and identity in Greater Romania, ensured the law’s application until new legislation was introduced, and contributed to a cultural dialogue, in which a modern legal thinking found a fruitful ground. Not only the history of translations and translators are part of this study, but also the translational peculiarities of such texts speak for an intellectual activity which aimed at the development of an interwar modern society, be it of Romanian or German nationality, which can be defined as purely European in nature.
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1. Introduction

The article offers an overview on which legal texts were translated from German into Romanian and from Romanian into German during the Weimar Republic (1918-1933) and for which purposes. After the end of World War I, Greater Romania was created by the incorporation – officially achieved by 1920 – by the Old Kingdom (Moldovia and Wallachia) of territories in which a large German-speaking population lived: Transylvania, Bukovina and a part of Banat, which were formerly part of the Habsburg Empire, and Bessarabia, formerly under Russian rule. The year 1933 is relevant in Germany’s history, but also in regard to German-Romanian cultural relations, marking the end of the Weimar Republic and the seizure of power in Germany by the national-socialists. In terms of translation analysis, the texts after 1933 could also be regarded from an ideology or propaganda point of view and will constitute the object of further research.

2. Translations from Romanian into German

Most legal texts translated during the interwar period consist of Romanian legislation, which was made accessible by Romanian-Germans for the German minority. In Greater Romania, after the unification of the Romanian-speaking territories rectified by the Treaty of Trianon in 1920, the German minority was the
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2 Lecturer, PhD, Faculty of Law, “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University of Iași, email: iulia.zup@uaic.ro.
second largest (approximately 750,000 Germans, around 4% of the total population) after the Hungarian one (around 8%).  

The Germans of Romania were:

- Transylvanian Saxons, who had settled here beginning with the 12th century and constituted around 8% of the total local population;
- Swabians living in Banat and Satu Mare, who constituted 24% of the total local population – the largest national group after the Romanians, who had settled in the 18th century;
- Zipser of Maramureș, who had settled here in the 13th century;
- Bukovina Germans (approximately 75,000), who had been encouraged to immigrate here in the 18th century, after Bukovina had been annexed in 1775 by the Habsburg Empire;
- Bessarabia Germans (around 80,000), who had immigrated from Germany in the 19th century;
- Old Kingdom Germans, who lived in Wallachia and Moldovia (around 30,000), and Dobruja (around 16,000) and had settled here at the end of the 19th century; in the Old Kingdom lived also a quite large community of Swiss people.

Apart from the Germans of Romania, also the Jews, especially those living in Bukovina, spoke German.

The skopus^4 of such translations was to help the German speaking population have access to and understand the Romanian legislation and to assist Romanian-German lawyers to make use of it, especially if we take into consideration that in Bukovina German had been before 1918 the official language used in the courts of law and by all jurists. Most of the translations were published in bilingual editions in Chernivtsi (the capital of Bukovina) and Sibiu (Transylvania), only a few in Bucharest (Wallachia) and Timișoara (Banat). For some laws two versions were published – usually one in Bukovina and one in Transylvania or Banat. Between these versions there are linguistic differences because the communities, with different origins, religions (catholic or evangelic) and even historical paths, used regional variants of German.

Fragments of codes of law, such as the criminal code, were published in German newspapers (Czernowitz Allgemeine Zeitung^5) and even entire laws on a

---


4 According to the German linguist Hans Josef Vermeer, not only the source text plays a role in the culture it emerged from, but also translation strategies are determined by certain purposes, a certain intentionality of the translational action (‘Skopostheorie’), so that the text plays certain roles in the receiving culture. Depending on the reader and the context of the reception, purposes of the text are maintained, altered or introduced by producing the translation. H. J. Vermeer, *Ein Rahmen für eine allgemeine Translationstheorie*, in Lebende Sprachen, no. 23/1978, pp. 99-102.

5 S. Kassner, *Das Ehescheidungsrecht in der Bucovina. Nach der Ausdehnung der Gesetzgebung des Altreiches*, in Czernowitz Allgemeine Zeitung, no. 10055/09.1938; S. Kassner, *Die Delikte an der Ehe. Der Ehebruch im Straf- und Zivilrecht*, in Czernowitz...
specific matter were published in profile magazines, such as employment law (Angestellten-Zeitung) or banking or commercial law. Some of the translations included also commentaries of the jurist-linguist in the paratext – footnotes, foreword or afterword.

While for some translators it is hard to find biographical information, in other cases even the text itself, in the paratext, is a good starting point, since in those times the occupation of the translator was also mentioned. With this useful tool, along with philological research, we could conclude that most translators were not specialised professionals, but translated for an immediate purpose in the field they worked in. Thus, most translators were lawyers, most of whom held a PhD: in Chernivtsi: Dr. Josef Thau, Dr. Siegmund Last, M. Barbasch, Dr. Louis Hausknecht; in Sibiu: Dr. Wilhelm Klein (also court interpreter), Dr. Richard Zintz (also delegate of the county council), Dr. Karl Gündisch, Friedrich Keschmann, Dr. Theodor Fabini, Dr. Hermann Albrich, Wilhelm Klein, Dr. Hans Gutt; in Timișoara: Dr. Hans Mayer, Dr. Fritz Ebner and Dr. Nikolaus Weber. Other professions among the translators were: notary (Dr. Albert Arz, Sibiu), senator (Dr. U. Lebouton, Chernivtsi), school inspector (Friedrich Müller, Sibiu), secretary (Jacob Krell, Chernivski), even military captain (Anton Kremling, Timișoara), and for some there is only mention of the PhD title: Dr. Siegfried Klokner (Sibiu), Dr. Rudolf Kostrakiewicz (Chernivski), Dr. Michael Rausch (Periam). Some translations were commissioned by local institutions or organisations of the Germans of Romania, such as Bund Siebenbürgischer Industriellen [Confederation of the Transylvanian Industrialists], Landeskonsistorium der evangelischen Landeskirche A.B. in Rumänien [National Consistory of the Evangelic Church in Romania], Syndikat der Banater Geldinstitute [Trade Union of the Financial Institutions in Banat]. As it can be seen in the biography of one of these translators, these mediators between the Romanian and German culture ensured through these works the integration of the minority in the new constituted state and the social, economic and cultural development of the German communities by providing access to and use of the state legislation. As an example, we chose the translator Fridrich Müller (1884-1969), who had studied mathematics and physics in Leipzig and Cluj, psychology in Leipzig, history, philosophy and theology in Cluj, Vienna and Berlin. He then worked as a teacher, school principal and newspaper editor. He was the author a history textbook (Lehrbuch der Geschichte Rumäniens, 1921) and of the first treaty about the Germans of Romania (Die Geschichte unseres Volkes, 1926). Between 1933 and 1945 he was the president of Verein für siebenbürgische Landeskunde. He was a pastor from 1928 and became later, in 1945, bishop of the Evangelic Church of Romania. At the time he translated the law Das Gesetz über das nichtstaatliche
Schulwesen Rumäniens, he was a school inspector, so he needed the German text for his daily activities and duties and for the correct application by the institution he was working for.

Finding the equivalents for the specialised terminology, also in view of the regional variant of German, was the main difficulty. In the foreword to the translation of Das Gesetz über das nichtstaatliche Schulwesen Rumäniens, Fridrich Müller states that although the Romanian version was so unclear, he had to keep the same phrasing, in order to avoid potential mistakes in the interpretation, especially of passages with a double meaning. Sometimes, technical terms could not be rendered in German. This is why he used the explanations of the minister of education and also the notes taken during the deliberations on the law, so that the translation contains a lot of footnotes with such explanations and fragments from the ministry’s meetings. Some terms posed difficulties, so they are explained in footnotes, for example: „Regulament [Regulation] for example can mean executive order, school regulations or by-laws, and, because of the fluctuating stylisation, it is not clear at all points what it is meant." 8

In the translation of Regulamentul Monopolului de stat al stupefiantelor, in order to facilitate a better understanding, the translator often used glosses – the mentioning of another version for the translated word, a synonym in brackets:
- glosses in German: Ro. grădiniță – Ge. Kleinkinderschulen (Kindergärten) – p. 14; Ro. gestionar – Ge. Amtsführer (Gestionar) – probably a word used regionally; Ro. Tribunal – Ge. Landesgericht (Tribunal), also used regionally in Romania, tribunal having in Germany, as in the United Kingdom, other competencies than the ones in Romania; Ro. stupefiant – Ge. Betäubungsmittel (Rauschgift);
- glosses in Romanian: Gehaltscharakter (salarii), Hinzukommendes (accesori) – p. 12.

Moreover, the translator felt the need to explain why he had used certain terms, the reason usually being that the word was a regionalism used only or mostly in Romania: „The word Stupefiant – of Latin origin – with the meaning it is used in the concerning laws and regulations, could not be translated better into

7 Dar Gesetz über das nichtstaatliche Schulwesen Rumäniens: mit den bei feiner Verhaltung abgegebenen authentischen Erklärungen des Unterrichtsministers nach dem amtlichen Stenogramm (Legea privind educația non-formală din România cu declarații autentice făcute de ministrul educației după stenograma oficială), translated into German by F. Müller, Honterus, Sibiu, 1926.

8 Translated from German by the author of this article. In the original: „Regulament z.B. kann Durchführungsverordnung, Schulordnung oder Satzungen heißen, wobei es bei der flüchtigen Stilisierung nicht an allen Stellen zuverlässig klar ist, woran gedacht ist.”, Dar Gesetz über das nichtstaatliche Schulwesen Rumäniens, Honterus, Sibiu, 1926, p. 21.

9 Regulamentul Monopolului de stat al stupefiantelor; Legea pentru combaterea abuzului de stupefiant; Tabloul substanțelor și specialităților cu valoarea timbrului aplicat asupra specialităților farmaceutice; Regulamentul pentru autorizarea vânzării produselor cosmetice și parfumuri; Timbrul cosmetic, translated from Romanian into German by A. Weiss, bilingual edition, Universul, Bucharest, 1933.
German other that with Betäubungsmittel [narcotics], an expression we also use in our work. Abroad, the expression Rauschgift [narcotics] is used frequently; for the substances and specialities provided for in our regulation, the expression Betäubungsmittel is more appropriate.”

The translators of legal texts from Romanian into German played an important role in the development of the social, economic and even cultural life of the German-speaking communities in a newly constituted state, whose goal was the centralisation and uniformisation of all life aspects, in order to consolidate its sovereignty, just as Romanian translators of the Austrian legal texts had contributed before 1918 through all their intellectual activities to the maintaining of the Romanian identity and culture during the Habsburg rule.

3. Translations from German into Romanian

There are considerably fewer translations from German into Romanian than from Romanian into German and they basically fall into two categories:

1. a few translations of theory of law, of texts which were well known throughout Europe and translated into other languages as well, such as Hans Kelsen’s General Theory of Law and State\textsuperscript{11} and Rudolf von Ihering’s The Struggle for Law\textsuperscript{12};

2. translations of the legislation still in force in the territories which were part of the Habsburg Empire before 1918: Transylvania, Banat and Bukovina – where German had been the language used in the courts of law and Austrian laws were still applied.

3.1. Translation of German theory of law into Romanian

Hans Kelsen’s General Theory of State was translated into Romanian by Jean H. Vermeulen, member of the Romanian Institute for Administrative Sciences and author of treaties on administrative law\textsuperscript{13}, with the assistance of E. Glaser and under the coordination of Paul Negulescu, professor of law at the University of

\textsuperscript{10} Translated from German by the author of this article. In the original: „Das Wort „Stupefiant“ – lateinischen Ursprungs – wie es in den betreffenden Gesetzen und Reglementen gebraucht wird, könnte nicht gut anders in die deutsche Sprache übersetzt werden als mit „Beträubungsmittel“, welchen Ausdruck wir auch in unserem Werke benützen. In Auslande wird vielfach auch der Ausdruck „Rauschgift“ gebraucht; für die in unserem Reglement vorgesehenen Substanzen und Spezialitäten ist jedoch der Ausdruck „Betäubungsmittel“ zutreffender.” Regulamentul Monopolului de stat al stupefiantelor, Universul, Bucharest, 1933.

\textsuperscript{11} H. Kelsen, Teoria generală a statului, translated into Romanian by J. H. Vermeulen, Bucharest, Oltenia, 1928.

\textsuperscript{12} R. von Ihering, Lupta pentru Drept, translated from German by C. Turtureanu, Iași, Presa Bună, 1930.

\textsuperscript{13} The Commercialisation of the Romanian Public Services (1929), Dreptul administrativ jurisprudential român (Bucharest 1932), Statutul funcţionarilor publici (Bucharest 1933), Evoluţia dreptului administrativ român (Bucharest 1943).
Bucharest. Hans Kelsen himself, Austrian jurist and author of the 1920 Austrian Constitution, writes a foreword to this translation, in which he stated his belief that the Romanian culture played an important role to the development of the science of law, for example by the foundation of the Institute for Administrative Sciences in 1925. Again, the translational strategies at hand were the introduction of neologisms (most of them through calques), in order to compensate for the lack of some equivalents in Romanian, and the use of glosses in brackets: in German: validitate (Geltung) p. 6, a fi (senin) [sic!], și a trebui să fie (sallen) [sic!] p. 16, Statul central (Oberstaat) p. 40, abolițiune (abolitzon) [sic!]; and very few in Romanian: revoluțiunea victorioasă (sau lovitura de Stat reușită) p. 34.

The translator of Rudolf von Ihering’s *The Struggle for Law* was Constantin Turtureanu, whose interest in the study of law is evident not only from this translation (which appeared in 1000 copies), but also from other published works. In the foreword, Turtureanu motivates the translation and publication of this work, although more than half a century passed since its first edition (1872), by the fact that it was still of current interest and the Romanian theory of law needed more than ever such a model. The importance of the work was demonstrated also by the large number of translations, including those into Romanian from 1874 and 1898, which enhanced the reception of Ihering’s theory in Romania, as exemplified by the translator. On the other hand, the translation was motivated by some personal unfortunate experiences of the translator, which convinced him that one has to struggle for law against injustice, against all odds, even by translating such a work which could have an impact on the juridical thinking. In the afterword, the translator emphasises the cultural relations between Romania and Vienna and the influence of Ihering, a German jurist, professor of law at the University of Vienna and the founder of the modern sociological and historical school of law, on the most acclaimed Romanian poet, Mihai Eminescu, and the politician and historian Simion Bărnuțiu, who had been involved in the 1848 revolution in Transylvania.

### 3.2. Translations of the Austrian legislation in force in Greater Romania

The legal situation in the provinces newly acquired by Greater Romania was quite different after the unification: in Bukovina, the extension of the legislation was achieved at a slow pace, until 1938, while in Bessarabia, for example, it was

---

14 *Die Vereinigung der Fürstentümer und die Entwicklung des Staatsgedankens in Rumänien* (Iași, 1929).
15 As mentioned by the translator: English, French, Japanese, Russian, Swedish, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Polish, Czech, Dutch, Danish, Serbian, Greek, Hungarian.
applied right away after the annexation. In 1919, the Romanian legislator had three options with regard to the extension of the legislation\(^\text{17}\):  
1. the immediate unification through the extension of the Old Kingdom’s legislation in the new territories, as other European countries had done (France, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Belgium, Denmark, The State of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs);  
2. the fast passing of new codes of law, applicable in all Romanian territories;  
3. the application of the regional legislation, until new codes of law could be drafted, by creating a synthesis of the provinces’ legislation which was in accordance with the Greater Romania’s legislative vision and which would comprise new elements from the modern world’s thinking.

The solution was a mixture of the three options: regional laws were still in force, while others were replaced with the ones from the Old Kingdom. Meanwhile, new codes of laws were drafted, passed and implemented.

Greater Romania meant not only other or new legislation, but also a new balance of power, a process of Romanisation, which corresponded to a utopia of population homogeneity, and manifested itself also through introducing Romanian as the official language, used in administration, courts of law, university and schools. For jurists of a different nationality, who practiced law in German, the obligation to pass a Romanian language exam was introduced in 1919. In Bukovina, Romanian textbooks were published and even the most important foreign language publications, like Czernowitz Allgemeine Zeitung, contained Romanian lessons in supplements, and articles which explained special terms, even legal ones.

Another problem for jurists of Greater Romania was that of getting acquainted with the legislation: jurists in the Old Kingdom with the Austrian legislation and those in Bukovina with the Romanian legislation. This led also to movements: on the one hand, jurists from the Old Kingdom practiced law in Bukovina, especially as barristers at The Court of Appeals, until the Bukovina lawyers learned the new legislation. On the other hand, specialists in Austrian law were needed in Bucharest, for example every section of the High Court of Cassation and Justice in Bucharest employed a counsellor specialised in Bukovina legislation, who had a consultative vote.\(^\text{18}\)

In this context, the Austrian legislation still in force was translated again into Romanian, because the previous translations dating from the 19\(^{\text{th}}\) century were outdated; so, the terminology was reviewed. The most noticeable translation was that of the civil code, Das allgemeine Bürgerliche Gesetzbuch, which had come into force in 1811 and had been modified in 1853\(^\text{19}\), when it was applied also in

^{19}\) Allgemeines bürgerliches Gesetzbuch kundgemacht mit dem Patente vom 29 Mai 1853 in dem Grossfürstenthume Siebenbürgen, Vienna, 1853.
Transylvania and Banat. After 1918, the code was still in force not only in Austria, but also in some of the former regions of the Empire, until new legislation was adopted. This is one of the oldest codes of law, which, with amendments, is still in force in Europe.

There exist several translations of the code into Romanian\(^{20}\), which correspond to the different administrative developments of Bukovina:

1. Between 1775 and 1849, a period when Bukovina was annexed by the Habsburg Empire, was under military administration (1775-1786), and then part of the Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria, the code was translated after its coming into force by one of the most important Romanian thinkers of those times, Ioan Budai-Deleanu\(^{21}\), who had studied philosophy and law in Vienna, became later a judge, and was a writer and a representative of the cultural movement called “The Transylvanian School”.

2. In the period between 1849, when Bukovina gained its autonomy within the Austrian Empire and became a duchy, and 1918, the new version of the code was translated by Eudoxiu Hurmuzachi on the occasion of the extension of its applicability to Transylvania and Banat. Eudoxiu Hurmuzachi was a member of one of Bukovina’s most important families, had studied in Vienna and played a considerable role in the struggle for obtaining the new status of the province.

3. During the interwar period, because parts of the code were still in force in Bukovina until the Romanian legislation was extended also to the newly acquired territories, the civil code was translated once again by Romanian jurists.

The first interwar text dating from 1921\(^{22}\) was translated by Ioan Corjescu, a judge from Galați, and revised by the lawyer C. Chisseliță. In the foreword, the translator names some auxiliary materials he used for completing the task: the translation into Italian; an older Romanian civil code, Codul Calimach; the Imperial Law Gazette in German and Romanian (Reichsgesetzblatt) – because it contained the three amendments from 1914, 1915 and 1916. The passages applicable only in Bukovina are highlighted in the text. The ones applicable only in Transylvania and Banat were translations of the texts in Hungarian published in the Imperial Law Gazette. The language of the translated text was considered concise, clear and

---

\(^{20}\) To learn more about the translations of the Austrian Civil Law into Romanian, see: I. E. Zup, *Die Übersetzungen des Habsburger Allgemeinen Gesetzbuchs ins Rumänische*, in Germanistische Beiträge, vol. XXXVI/2015, pp. 240-258; and *Traducerile legislației austriece în Bucovina habsburgică (1775-1918)*, Editura Universității „Alexandru Ioan Cuza” Iași, 2015.

\(^{21}\) *Cartea legilor pravilor de obște părgărești, pentru toate Țările moștenitoare Nemțăști a Monarhiei Austriecești*, Chernivski, Ekhard, 1812.

\(^{22}\) *Codul civil general austriac cuprinzând textul oficial, legile, novellele și ordonanțele publicate pentru completarea și modificarea acestuia sau la materile cuprinse în el, aplicabile unele în Bucovina, altele în Transilvania*, translated into Romanian by I. Corjescu, Bucharest, Imprimeria Statului, 1921.
simple, and thus the Austrian code was superior to the Romanian or French ones.\textsuperscript{23} In the years 1924-1928, a translation from Hungarian\textsuperscript{24} is published, made by Stefan Laday, Romanian jurist of Hungarian nationality, who translates actually the Hungarian text translated from German by Ioan Popp, a judge in Cluj, because he finds this version to be written in an accessible and up-to-date language. The text was translated again into Romanian in 1937\textsuperscript{25} by three Chernivtsi lawyers (Aurel Tarnavschi, Octavian Pienescu and Anton Iliese) and the law professor George Alexianu. They motivate their work by stating in the foreword that they considered the older versions too indebted to the German text and fully understandable only by making use of the original or Hungarian version.

The translations of the Austrian civil code, undertaken in different historical periods of development of the Romanian society, are a great tool in observing and analysing the evolution of Romanian legal terminology. One of the features of this evolution was the introduction of neologisms, sometimes through calques (words which are formed from the material of the target language and borrow the internal form and/or the meaning of German foreign words), as it can be observed in Table 1.

Table 1: Romanian terminology in the translations of the Austrian civil code

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German term</th>
<th>Romanian term</th>
<th>1812</th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1921</th>
<th>1937</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genugthuung (Ausgleich eines Schadens) (art. 1323)</td>
<td>deplinirea pagubii</td>
<td>satisfacere</td>
<td>indestulare</td>
<td>indestulare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ersatz, Schadenersatz (art. 1295)</td>
<td>deplinirea pagubii</td>
<td>recupirea</td>
<td>restituire, reparațiune</td>
<td>restituire, dar și despăgubire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehe-Pacte (Ehepakt, actual Ehevertrag) (art. 879)</td>
<td>contracte de căsătorie</td>
<td>contracte de nunță</td>
<td>pacte nuțiale</td>
<td>pact nuțial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heirathsgut (art. 1218)</td>
<td>zestre</td>
<td>dote</td>
<td>dotă</td>
<td>dotă</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witwengehalt (art. 1242)</td>
<td>leafa văduvilor</td>
<td>văduatecul</td>
<td>pensiunea pentru văduva (văduvărit)</td>
<td>renta văduvei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ersitzung (art. 1452)</td>
<td>trăgănaire</td>
<td>usucapiunea</td>
<td>usucapiunea</td>
<td>usucapiunea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verjährung (art. 1451)</td>
<td>întârziere</td>
<td>prescripțiune</td>
<td>prescripțiune</td>
<td>prescripția</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Besitz (art. 1460)</td>
<td>stăpânirea</td>
<td>posesiunea</td>
<td>posesiunea</td>
<td>posesiunea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rechtsmaßig (art. 1461)</td>
<td>legii</td>
<td>legal</td>
<td>legitim</td>
<td>legitim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>echt (art. 1464)</td>
<td>adevarată</td>
<td>adevarată</td>
<td>neviciat</td>
<td>neviciat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ausnahme (art. 1481)</td>
<td>osivire</td>
<td>excepțion</td>
<td>excepțion</td>
<td>excepțion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rechtsmittel der Entschädigung (art. 1338)</td>
<td>mișlocire iudecătodească deplinirea pagubii</td>
<td>remezele legale pentru desdamnare</td>
<td>mișcătoarele legale pentru a căpăta despăgubirea</td>
<td>mișcătoarele legale pentru obținerea daunelor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{25} \textit{Codul civil în vigoare în Ardeal și Bucovina. Cu trimiteri la legile și regulamentele speciale}, Bucharest, Librăria Universală, 1937.
In comparison to older translation, the ones dating from the interwar period show a mature, developed legal language, the sentence structure and the terminology being similar to the one in use today. The words borrowed from everyday language were replaced with specialised terminology.

4. Conclusions

During the Weimar Republic, a large number of legal texts was translated from German into Romanian and from Romanian into German for two reasons: the Austrian legislation was still in force in the Romanian territories which were formerly part of the Habsburg Empire, and in Greater Romania lived a large German-speaking population. These translations contributed to the development of the legal thinking of those times and to the development of modern Romanian legal terminology, ensured the integration of the minority in the new constituted state and the social, economic and cultural development of the German communities by providing access to and use of the state legislation.
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