

LIMBI ȘI LITERATURI STRĂINE

STRUCTURAL, SEMANTIC AND GRAMMATICAL PECULIARITIES IN RENDERING ATTRIBUTIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN THE ASSOCIATION AGREEMENT

Anastasia GADJA, Facultatea de Limbi și Literaturi Străine

Acest articol are ca scop analiza multiaspectuală a unui subiect actual al teoriei și practicii traducerii – cel al construcțiilor atributive. Obiectivul lucrării este analiza particularităților structurale, semantice și gramaticale ale construcțiilor atributive din limba engleză, și identificarea metodelor, strategiilor și tehnicilor de traducere a acestora în limba română. Corpusul de exemple analizate este extras din Acordul de Asociere dintre Republica Moldova și Uniunea Europeană.

One of the unique features of the twenty-first century is rapidness. Quick developments are not displayed only in the world of gadgets, but also in the development of countries. An illustrative example is the signing of various agreements, which enable a country to access the world market and integrate the EU and global policies.

The Association Agreement (AA) between the European Union (EU) and the Republic of Moldova is a comprehensive treaty establishing the relations between the parties and includes long-term reforms to be implemented by Moldova. The content aims to establish a Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area (DCFTA) and is one of the most important parts of the overall Agreement. The political purpose is to deepen relations with the EU and to set Moldova for a European path. This means to promote the European values, namely democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights, and norms of the European security order.

Besides the economic and political advantages of this document, it is also a valuable field of exploration for linguists. The AA abounds in economical and compact constructions such as the attributive constructions. These are words joined together grammatically and logically without forming a full sentence. Attributive constructions are mainly created to save space and time, to be as informative as possible by being as short as possible. However, rendering attributive

constructions can be rather difficult. Moreover, the way words are organised in the attributive constructions in the source language will not necessarily correspond to the way they are organised in the target language. In this case, the role of the translator is to ensure that the meaning will correspond. There are three elements to which the translator shall pay attention while translating attributive constructions: structure, semantics and grammatical peculiarities.

First of all, the structure of the construction is made up of a head noun and modifiers. Usually the modifiers, the dependents added to the head element, are in preposition, which means that the construction is regressive i.e. it develops to the left, with the headword being the final element. The Romanian attributive construction is progressive, it develops mostly to the right, with the attributes used in postposition [4, p.21]. For example: *consumer protection – protecția consumatorului, member states – state membre*. The head word in the English construction is at the right, whereas in Romanian the head word is at the beginning, i.e. at the left. However, this rule cannot always be applied. We have cases when the construction unfolds from the left to the right as in *inviolability of borders* which is translated as *inviolabilitatea frontierelor*. In the following example the order is not from the left to the right, but first comes the element in the left, then the first one and then the middle one: *world disarmament conference – conferința mondială de dezarmare*. It means that there are cases when the correct order of words shall be decided by the translator. Consequently, the first rule in translating attributive constructions is to identify the head word and then logical order of modifiers [2, p.136].

The second aspect is linked to semantics. The translator shall be able to establish correctly the semantic relationship between the words. Hence the second rule in the process of translation is to identify the semantic units. Semantic analysis implies the process of examining the meaning of the constituents within attributive constructions. Semantic analysis is at the level of meaning rather than vocabulary. It is needed because language has a very generic representation and words can express anything, but we need to grasp the exact meaning of the constructions. Semantic aspects such as polysemy or homonymy may usually lead to serious misunderstandings, ambiguity and consequently to severe translation mistakes. One word can have various meanings in different contexts,

hence the homonymy of words. In the following examples we can observe this phenomenon: *light weapons* and *fixed light source*. In the first case light is an adjective meaning having little weight, whereas in the second it is a noun with the meaning of a source of light. Ambiguity of the constituents can hinder the process of translation, for instance *date of deposit* [1, p.79] should not be translated as *data depozitării*, but *data depunerii* in comparison to *acceptance of deposits* [1, p. 81] which is translated as *acceptarea depozitelor* but not *acceptarea depunerii*.

Finally, sometimes due to the complexity of the structures, there is a need for establishing the semantic units, in order to render them correctly. For instance:

1	2
[<i>United Nations Convention</i>]	against [<i>transnational organised</i>
	<i>crime</i>].

We have in this case two semantic units. Thus, the translator has to render them separately and afterwards merge them. So that the final result is:

[*Convenția Organizației Națiunilor Unite*] împotriva [*criminalității transnaționale organizate*].

English language is unique due to its way of compressing words and being concise. Attributive constructions are rather transparent from the semantic point of view. It implies that the meaning of the construction is understood from its components. For instance: *border security* is the security of borders. However, in English, sometimes shortness takes priority over clearness, which can lead to ambiguity. There are cases when it is hard to understand the construction, due to the fact that it is rather compact as in: *tourism training*, which is not the training of tourism. In such cases, attentiveness to context is mandatory.

The final aspect is linked to the grammatical peculiarities and changes that occur in the process of translation of attributive constructions. Differences in the grammatical structures of the source and target languages change the structure of the construction, but do not alter its message. This can happen when the target language has a grammatical category which the source language lacks [5]. English does not have the grammatical category of gender and does not distinguish between feminine and masculine nouns, in comparison to

Romanian which is an inflected language, meaning that words change the form to show their grammatical relations. Usually constructions are translated by adding a suffix to the head (the process of adding a suffix or prefix is called declension). In the following examples *territorial integrity* is translated as *integritate teritorială* and *cross-border cooperation* is rendered as *cooperare transfrontalieră*. In English both nouns are masculine, whereas in Romanian, the head nouns are feminine, therefore the modifier shall be subject to the process of declension and also be feminine.

To sum up, rendering attributive constructions is not purely a mechanical task, but it comprises structural, semantic and grammatical aspects to which a translator shall pay attention. By observing closely these peculiarities, the process of translation shall not be a rocket science. This topic is undeniably important due to the fact that it is a subject that is still explored by linguists and translators. Moreover, by understanding such a complex process of construction formation enables translators, in the future, to grasp without any difficulty the contents of any economic, political and scientific text. Thus, explaining how these constructions are made up, understood and translated is of a paramount importance.

References:

1. Association Agreement between the Republic of Moldova and European Union, 2014, 735 p., available at <http://dcfta.md/uploads/0/images/large/eu-md-aa-dcfta-en.pdf>, consulted on May 24.
2. CROITORU, E. Interepration and Translation. Galati, 1996. 256 p.
3. GUSATU, I. *Aplicatii ale Lexiconului Generativ. Grupul Nominal*. Bucuresti, 2015. 216 p.
4. GUTMAN, A. *Attributive Constructions in North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic: Areal, Typological and Historical Perspectives*. Konstanz, 2016, available at https://kops.uni-konstanz.de/bitstream/handle/123456789/36118/Gutman_0-352520.pdf?sequence=6, consulted on April 15, 2017.
5. Romanian Grammar, available at http://www.seelrc.org:8080/grammar/pdf/stand_alone_romanian.pdf, consulted on April 20, 2017.