CONSIDERATIONS ON THE TRANSLATION OF
COMMUNITY TERMINOLOGY INTO ROMANIAN

Sebastian CHIRIMBU
Spiru Haret University
Adina BARBU-CHIRIMBU
Spiru Haret University

Abstract: The increasing number of official translations by the European institutions has been determined lately by specific communication requirements between Member States and third parties, the European area being characterized by a spectacular information exchange within the European Community policies (in economic, monetary, financial, social, environmental, or research areas). Translating texts and Community documentation represents a job that requires special skills, training, experience, and a sense of language; also, translating such texts implies familiarity with the legal system and the historical and cultural background of a country.

Keywords: translation, terminology, equivalence, skills

1. Community Terminology

The evolution of the European Union from a dream to an economic and then political solid reality generated numerous official meetings, official documents and legislation which together gave birth to a specific terminology. Within the Romanian vocabulary the community (EU) terminology covers a new conceptual field which appeared after 1989.

Two core characteristics of the community terminology to be noted are the fact that it is a multilingual terminology, without being based on translations (as the Acts are usually drafted in parallel in all the EU languages) and the fact that the main sources of the community terminology are the common language and the legal terminology (Chirimbu, Murariu, Barbu, Dorînga 2011:239).

Regarding the nature of the community terminology we believe that we cannot talk about the existence of such a terminology in the absolute meaning. The community terminology consists of different groups of terms covering community issues but basically included in another terminology. For example, we can talk about a community political terminology, a community economic terminology, and also about community terminology included in the fields of environment, education, etc. Each such large group of terms can be subdivided into more specialized sub-groups. The community legal terminology can be divided into sub-terminologies referring to the basic Union's legislation, labour legislation, customs legislation, civil legislation, etc. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to talk about a core community terminology of a political nature and of numerous satellite terminologies expressing the realities of all the domains of life affected by European membership.

2. Translation landmarks

A lot has been written about translations, especially by translators themselves, ever since the 1st century B.C., but what was said until recently had a speculative character. The theories of translation started to acquire shape only much later, in the 20th century and were based on linguistic foundations.

The method to be used by the translation is imposed by the type of text. Thus, for an informative text, the purpose of the translation will be steadiness at the informative level, for an expressive text the aim of the translation is to obtain an analogue effect of the artistic level while a translation of an operative text will focus on the identity of the textual immanent message. This perspective shifted the focus on certain key features of text construction such as coherence and structure. By means of these concepts one can explain practical problems of the translation process and describe the characteristics of each type of text, in a contrastive comparison.

Like any form of communication, translation is a complex activity that takes into account inter-subjectivity and intercultural exchanges by creating open and dynamic systems of equivalence.

Language is generally evaluated according to the translator's position in the translation scheme (Richet, 1993: 199), and the relationship between the translation and its assessor. According to some experts, the meaning can be transferred through translation easier than the form. Since they are inseparable, it would be ideal to be found in the translation together: „l'indissociabilité du sens et de la forme n'est pas un postulat, mais une fonction de la nature du texte" (Dancette, 1998: 60). Any translation is possible under certain limits and conditions. This linguistic «handicap» can be overcome in various ways, as languages are distinguished less by what they can say (all can say everything, with more or fewer words) and more by what and how they say.

Differences between linguistic structures of languages placed in a translation relatioship are caused by varied and diverse realities, but they should not be mistaken for linguistic non-concordances.

Intentionality, as a factor of translatability, is blocked by the limits of the translator's intention, his horizon of expectation, but also the purpose of the text, and the extent to which relations with other texts are perceived. Being self-consistent, the translator will meet the strategy chosen (interpretive, open, communicative, cultural, etc.) « dans bien des cas, [le choix du traducteur] dépendra en grande mesure du public auquel il destine sa traduction » (Romney 1984: 267). Translators conceive their translation both as amount of technical issues relative to syntactic, semantic, prosodic, morphological, phonic components of a text (Pageaux, 2000: 68) and a combination of elements of various natures. For this purpose, the reality of translation including all data is examined, among which extralinguistic as well as linguistic factors which have their role.

Nowadays, the meaning of the term *translation* has become a multiple one. R. Bell (2002: 26) identifies three such meanings: *an abstract concept* (the translation

process and translation as a product), *a product* of the translation process (the text which is translated) or *a process* (the activity performed by the translator). Another theory (Seleskovitch, Lederer) used by A. Bantaş and E. Croitoru, namely *the interpretative theory of translation*, which, in addition to studying translation as product and process, focuses on the process of interpretation, including the fields of linguistics, psycholinguistics, semantics, pragmatics, cultural context, communicative competence in the *translation oriented text analysis – TOTA* (1999: 23).

B. Han (2007:144) assumes that translation theory should resort to descriptive linguistics classes and considers that *the act of translation can be strictly scientific based on a linguistic analysis model.* E Nida (1964) does not agree with the fact that stylistic-literary factors are emphasized, creating the impression that the translation process is an art and not an exact science.

Translation has long been regarded as a text conversion from a source language into a target language so that the surface meaning of both texts should remain roughly similar and the initial text structures should be preserved. The idea that translation simply terns a source language text into a target language text, while keeping the surface meaning close or similar is a narrow idea. Translation is not a mechanical activity, of secondary importance but a creative process. In his work *La Machine à traduire* (1964) Mounin considers the translation act as a science-based art, the problems raised by the process of translation, with all its possibilities and impossibilities, can only be solved within the framework of a linguistic science system "*The translator will not simply convert the idea of the original work but he will choose a new aesthetic formula to materialize it.*" In this regard, the translation is the result of the junction between two spheres of language and, therefore, it becomes an intermediary art.

3. Transfer of textual content in the translation of Community documentation

G. Lungu-Badea (2004:4-7) identifies three stages, the research steps necessary to relieve the transfer features according to the nature of source texts, their intentions and authors:

a. *identification of the translation strategy*, according to purpose (*skopos*) of the translation and its alleged receiver. To this end, the translator precedes the classic stages of the translation process (un-verbalization, understanding, reverbalization), a full reading, followed by an evaluation reading, in fact an analysis of the translation difficulties and problems.

b. *linguistic and translation competence*. Linguistic competence is the overall ability of a speaker to express himself in one language (unilingual or monolingual), two languages (bilingual) or in multiple languages (multilingual). (Ducrot, Schaeffer, 1996: 192-194, Moeschler, Reboule, 1999: 25-28). Communicative competence and performance, elements of linguistic competence, define a speaker's ability to understand the source language and quality to express himself into the target language.

    c. *evaluation of the translation process result* is based on the translation strategy chosen, types of equivalences and correspondences established, aspects of analyzing discourse and criteria of textual correctness (coherence, cohesion, receiver, message, level of language, speech register, type of text, etc.).

The translator which performs translations of European Community legislation and legal documentation must use different techniques to convert the text content from the source language into the target language starting with the equivalents obtained by translating word-for- word (Fr. mot-à-mot), lexical substitutions or structural changes. The documents resulting from the translation will preserve the clarity and precision so as to be transparent and easy to understand (the terminology used will be consistent regarding both the initial act and regulations in effect).

Since January 2007, all EU documents issued by the European Parliament have been also issued in Romanian. The Council, the Court of Justice, the Court of Auditors and the Economic and Social Committee have their own translation services. Other EU agencies send their documents to be translated by the *Translation Centre for the Bodies of the European Union* (TCB UE).

The European institutions have made various steps in their efforts to advance multilingualism as a key element of the European unity in diversity but also in its general context, where community (EU) terminology has emerged and developed/enriched with new terms.

References

1. Bantaş, A., Croitoru E., 1999. *Didactica traducerii,* Editura Teora, Bucureşti.
2. Bell, R., 2002. *Teoria şi practica traducerii*, Editura Polirom, Bucureşti.
3. Chirimbu, S., Murariu, I., Barbu, A., Dorînga, C., *Incursiune în… Uniunea Europeană (De la instituţii şi politici- la fonduri, afaceri şi terminologie specializată*), Editura Stef, Iaşi.
4. Dancette, J., 1998. *Parcours de traduction.Etudes expérimentales du processus de traduction,* Presses Universitaires de Lille.
5. Han, B., 2007. *Traducere şi globalizare* (Conferinţă- situl Integrare Europeană), Universitatea Petru Maior (upm.ro), Tg.Mureş.
6. Lungu-Badea,G.,2004. *Traducerea ştiinţifică. Repere*, online source: http://www.litere. uvt.ro/vechi/documente_pdf/aticole/uniterm/uniterm1_2004/glungu.pdf (accesed May 2011), pp. 4-7
7. Nida, E. *Toward a Science of Translating (1st edition)* , Adler's Foreign Books Inc, 1964
8. Pageux D.H., *Literatură generală şi comparată,* Editura Polirom, Iaşi.
9. Richet, B., 1993. *Quelques réflexions sur la traduction des références culturelles* în *Traduction à l'université,* Editions M.Ballard.
10. Romney, Cl., 1984. « Problèmes culturels de la traduction d'Alice in Wonderland en français » in *Meta* vol. 29, no.3/septembre 1984.