

**Hioarã N.,**  
*university lecturer Academy of Economic Studies*  
**Bacinschi S.,**  
*university lecturer Academy of Economic Studies*  
**Grozav P.,**  
*senior lecturer Academy of Economic Studies*  
**Ruga E.,**  
*Phd Academy of Economic Studies*

## **TRANSLATION NOT BE TAKEN AS SUPERFLUOUS ORNAMENTS IN COMMUNICATION**

Translations have accelerated cultural progress by shortening the accumulation time necessary for the outcropping and mellowing of each culture. Since early times scientists, philosophers had noticed that translations were absolutely necessary and was not at all deprived of significance when one tried to demonstrate their high importance for the development of exchange of cultural values.

The first traces of antiquity of civilizations made extensive use of translations and their importance may be proved with the authority of historical documents.

This is also substantiated and authenticated by the work **Translators through History** edited by Jean Delise and Gudith Woodsworth (1995) where it provides full justice to the “translators “and interpreters” remarkable efforts, throughout the centuries, to promote cultural and scientific exchanges worldwide.

The first vestiges and aftermath dated from the year 3000 B. C. stretching from the Egyptian old Kingdom, being continued by the European translator Livius Andronicus, a Greek slave who in 240 B.C. translated the Odyssey into Latin verse. The translated works were taken over by the Romans in 300 B. C. who speed up and hit the road paved by the Greeks were acquainted with the oriental texts developed by the flourishing period of the great civilization. Both the Greek and the Latin authors appraised the worthiness of the artifact or memorabilia of humanity's olden days and the intense translating activities widespread during the golden age of Latin literature. Many elements of translation norms of Greek culture as well as the Greek religions apparatus emerged.

The famous Cicero (**De oratore**) favoured free translation approach, believing and foreseeing the artistic potential of his language (Latin), synchronizing and accompanying the translators's creative capacity and aptitude. Quintilian (**De Institutio Oratorio**), on the other hand, comprehended and distinguished an element of “challenge” or “contention” between the target text version and the original, so-called-source text. Religions translations were among the first important texts with the authors like King Arthur the Great in the ninth century. He translated from Latin into English having an important impact in the development of languages and literatures, followed by the translation of Luther's Bible (1522) and King James's Bible (1611) being of great use for languages and literatures both, for Germany and English.

All these variants of translation, for many centuries gave rise to certain translation theory approaches, which lately were structured as a series of dichotomis

closely related to each other: 1. faithful/unfaithful translations; 2. literal/free translations; 3. possibilities / impossibilities of translating; 4. source language (and culture) / target language (and culture) oriented translations, etc. [Dumitru, Rodics, p.106]. The main concerns of professional translators and scholars alike gravitated round such indispensable and key proceedings as the possibilities and fidelity of translation. The matters were explained from the religious, philosophical and linguistic point of view.

The beginning of translations was interpreted as a warning that Biblical text (translation) is doomed to failure, and the Word of God is untranslatable and should therefore, be read in the original. Humboldt's conception of language as a linguistically separated universe imposes its own values and distinctions **on thought** and **on the non-linguistic world**. Hjelmslev, Whorf Sapir also adopted the idea of a universe that is linguistically determined. Each language proceeds thought and the future generations is offered a ready-made interpretation of reality.

The interpretation is peculiar to each language having its own way of structuring world leading to impossibility of connecting these different cut-outs of the surrounding world. Usually these impossibilities (or difficulties) of translation pertain to the lexical level of language. For example, the northern languages retain a dozen of different terms for **sledge**, while the languages spread, in our geographical zone retain one term (Ro., sanie; Ru. санки )

In the Romanian field of temperature there are six divisions that comes under the category of “untranslatable terms ”. They are related to a specific geographical, historical, socio-cultural experience, which have always been touchstones for the translator. Words such as (**frig cumplit** – *a very low temperature*) **rece**, **răcoare** (*cool*), **caniculă** (*very high temperature in the atmosphere*), **fierbinte** (*very high temperature for objects*), **cald** (*moderate temperature*). In English there are four divisions in temperature as cold, cool, hot and warm. [ Bantaş, Andrei et al., p. 144]. In Arabic there is one word for *cool* and *cold* – baarid, but two words for *hotness* as haar and saakhin (for weather and for objects, respectively) and a single lexical unit for *warm* – daafi. (In English “hot” can’t be always used even metaphorically: if “hot temper” but one should never use “hot feelings”. [Leviţchi, Leon, p.126].

There come then other categories of “untranslatable terms”, relating to a specific geographical, historical, socio-cultural experience; which have always been touchstones for the translator; this interpretation is peculiar to each language, as each language has its own way of structuring reality, hence the difficulties of connecting nuances, dissensions, divergences of the surrounding world. Words such as *espri*, *charme* (French), understatement establishment (English), *spaţiu mioritic*, *dar*, *tulburel*, *vărzari* (Romanian), [Leviţchi, 53], *pilmeni*, *blăn*, *masleniţa* (Russian) belong to this category. Aspects of this kind (with lots of examples) have led Friederick Schleiermacher to the conclusion that there is not a single word in one language to have an exact correspondent in another. Gasset (1937) states that translation as an utopian task, as differences concern both the denotational (purely descriptive) and connotational (subjectiv) meaning of words. It makes an ample use of the latter (connotations) frequently used in poetic discourse advocating untranslatability. In this case Mary Snell-Hornby appeals to inner and outer forms of

languages, furthermore, she promotes at the opposite side the translatability. According to the second promoters of translatability, as Rene Descartes, they reverse the relationship between reality and thought in favour of the former considering that language represents the most important means of communication in society entirely covers the total field of human knowledge and remains (expresses) the principle instrument for representing reality. Neo-Humboldtian theorists didn't take into consideration five (at least) issues reflecting the specificities of languages: 1) the evolution of any language under the pressure of everyday experience; 2) the ignorance of objective historical causes that are responsible for the differences (the best known example is the English adjective „genial” with two plural (geniuses, genii) hasn't got the expected equivalent in Romanian, which is translated as *plăcut, agreabil, favorabil, binevoitor, vesel, social, jucăuş, simpatic, drăguţ, blând (depsre climă), dulce, cald, înăscut congenital*. The English equivalent for the Romanian „genial” will be a man of genius (Ru. гениальный); 3) the similarities between various languages (see the „cognate pairs” (related languages) and „distance pairs” (non-related languages) as in Russian «близко-родственные языки» и «дально-родственные языки»; 4) a more detailed analysis operated by a language over a particular semantic field that obviously reveals its importance for the respective culture. 5) The existence of specialized professional sub-codes (languages, jargon, etc;) (here the authors will operate with terms of export and import and their quantitative indices in different (18) semantic fields of economy pertaining to a single Harmonized System of Trade terms accepted as Standard Terms in EU. The research is based on the materials of the Association Agreement between EU and the European Atomic Energy Community and their Member States, on the one part, and RM on the other part. Title IV. Economic and other sector Cooperation.

Back to our flock, i.e. to the translatability; some scholars adopted the notion of relative equivalence (the third approach) between the source language (SL) and the target language (TL) by explaining their midway position that the general meaning can be reproduced in any language. Though the degree of translatability is historically determined and never thoroughly achieved Steiner shows that „not everything can be translated at any time”, and „an argument against translatability is (...) often no more than an argument based on local temporary myopia”. There is the strongest argument for the translation based on the existence of universals in languages, thought and culture. Due to this particular case of a „lingua universalis” human reason can be expressed in all language systems (as to R.Descartes's and G.W.Leibniz theories).

This is the case, as to Nida (1982), when the semantic criteria are adopted being aware that all languages have common classes of references: activities, states, entities, processes, characteristics, relationals on the other hand and solidarity (power) relations, religion, cultural community, and the other. All kinds of asymmetries can be solved through the expressive resources of each language by operating within the Saussurian concept of parole (language in use) rather than of langue (language as an abstract system). Each time the translator is choosing which of these two alternatives to support, which is valid for a concrete case. The degree of translatability varies with the distance of ST and TT (or target audience) in terms of

time and place. The texts embedded in a culture of the **distant past**, tend to be less easily translatable than those texts dealing with the „universals” of modern sciences.

The analyses of translation using the similarity between various languages (Romanian, English and Russian) identified two types of approaches in making the translators’ job much easier in providing the quantitative data of import and export terms useful within different semantic fields of economy. All in all, 18 categories of goods pertain to such fields such as: animal and vegetable products; foodstuffs, mineral and chemical products, [lastics, raw skins, pulp of wood, textiles, footwear, articles of stone, pearls, base metals, machinery, aircraft, surgical instruments, etc.

Analysing 412 terms determining different goods, the teaching process (in terminology) became fruitful and workable when there was applied similarity (and disimilarity) approach through cognate pairs (related words) and distance pairs (unrelated words), CP and DP – respectively. [Ruga E. .... p.106]. Here are some examples taken from the 15th (in our research) semantic field entitled „Base metals and articles of base metal”. The articles are traded between the Republic of Moldova and 5 more European countries as: Ukraine, Romania, Russia, Germany, Belarus. The goods classified according to the Harmonized System of Goods within the EU are translated and described starting with the Romanian terms versus English and English terms versus Russian variants identifying „close pairs” and „distance pairs”

1. Ro. articole din fontă fier și oțel	1-CP 5-DP	Engl. articles of cast iron and steel	0-CP 6-DP	Ru. Изделия из железа чугуна и стали
2. Ro. construcții și părți de construcții din fontă	3-CP 4-DP	Structures and parts of structure of cast iron	0-CP 8-DP	Металлоконструкции и части металлоконструкций из черных металлов
3. Ro. Bare din oțeluri nealiate	2-SP 2-DP	Bars of non-alloy steel	0-CP 4-DP	Прутки из железа или нелегированной стали

There were identified 6 cognate pairs (1+3+2) in the translation of terms from Romanian into English and not a single cognate pair is the translation from English into Russian. There predominates „distance pairs” 11 (5+4+2) and 18 (6+8+4) in the first two columns i.e.Ro-Engl. and in the second Engl-Ru.

Besides, the similarity approach, where word-for word translation predominates out of 412 terms of export and import 157 of them stand for one-member or mon-valent terms, i.e. 38.1 per cent of the total amount. [Dee Gardner and Mark davies, p.305]. The rest 255 terms signalize poly-valent members, out of which 126 terms are two and four member terms with the indices of 46 (11.1%) and 40(97%); the third category of terms pose the five-member and six member terms with the data of 12 both covering 2.9 percent respectively and the last category of terms lay the eight-, nine-, ten-, eleven-, member terms disclosing the lowest distribution in the whole system of standardized terms with the quantitative indices of 6,9, 2,2 making up 1,4 percent; 2,1; 0,4; 0,4 within the endorsed and certified picture. It means that 255 terms make up produce 61.8 percent of the total picture. The more detailed analysis operated by this research over particular semantic fields or categories of activities (they are eighteen) which cover 137 divisions (or subcategories) reveals the entire portfolio and information ensuring the potential degree of acquiring the capacity of

handling the techniques of translation. Here is the data each field of knowledge detains in terms of vocabulary: mon-or poly- member terms. Category I holds 8 monovalent terms and 20 polyvalents; C. II – 10 monovalent terms and 19 polyvalents; C. III – 2 monovalent and 6 polyvalent terms; C. IV – 8 monovalent and 8 polyvalent; C. V – 9 monovalent and 12 polyvalent terms; C. VI – 21 and 15; C. VII – 3 and 7; category VIII – 5 and 4; C. IX – 1 and 9; C. X- 5 and 11; C. XI – 20 and 22; C.XII- 5 and 3; C. XIII- 17 and 14; C. XIV-2 and 5; C. XV-13 and 21; C. XVI – 17 and 55; C. XVII – 4 and 7; C. XVIII – 7 and 17 summing up literally 157 monosemants making up 38.1 per cent and 255 polysemants bringing about 61.8 per cent (out of the total amount of 412 terms of export and import, representing the EU Harmonized System of Goods).

### **CONCLUSION:**

1. Promoters of translation theories representing different schools identified lots of approaches

making translation possible affirming that: a) language as an active principle imposes its own values and distinctions on thought and on non-linguistic world; b) each language has its own way of structuring reality; c) the differences among languages (historic, cultural, etc) cannot create exact correspondence in other languages; d) the adoption of relative equivalence referring to the capacity of adjustment of languages is used as an argument of translatability based on universals in languages where semantic criteria reflects the human common classes of referents embedded in rich expressive resources of each language.

2. Similarity and dissimilarity in translation can be applied and trained while considering the close related or distance related languages. Although Romanian and English belong to different groups (Romance and Germanic groups) they possess a great number of common terms, in export and import, due to various historical contacts common in commerce and not only. There also was attested lack of similarity between languages in terms of synonymic series within semantic fields.

3. Teaching terminology the instructor should pay attention to language „universals” especially when the texts amounts discrepancies both in vocabulary and grammar and to the number of monosemants and polysemants (the latter predominates twice).

### **Literature:**

1. Dimitriu, Rodica, „Theories and Practice of Translation”, Institutul European, Timpul, Iasi, 2002, 106 p.

2. Bantas, Andrei and Croitoru Elena. Didactica traducerii, Bucuresti:Teora, 1998 144p.

3. Levitchi, Leon, Manualul traducatorului de limba engleza. Teora, Bucuresti, 1993. 126p.

4. Ruga, Ecaterina, Hioară Natalia, Demcenco Corina, Grozav Parascovia, Teaching Terminology is not New. It exists since Adam was a boy. In new approaches in Foreign Language Teacher Training. National Conference Materials. Sept 28, 2013, Balti, pp.106-113. Section of the US Embassy in Moldova Balti.

5. Gardner, Dee and Davies Mark. A New Academic Vocanulary List. Applied Linguistics, Vol. 35 Number 3, July 2014. Portland State University , Portland USA, p.305-328.