References:

1. Болдырев Н. Н. Языковые категории как формат знания. Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. 2006. № 2. С. 5–22.

2. Голованова Е. И. Введение в когнитивное терминоведение : учеб. пособие. Москва : Флинта : Наука, 2011. 224 с.

3. Іващенко В. Л. Когнітивне термінознавство: перспективи розвитку. Теромінологічний вісник : зб. наук. пр. Київ : ІУМ НАНУ, 2011. Вип.1. С. 47–54.

4. Стасюк Т. В. Терміносфера новітніх технологій: лінгвосоціокогнітивний аспект : монографія. Дніпро : Журфонд, 2019. 360 с.

5. Temmerman R. Sociocognitive terminology theory Terminologia y cognicion. Barcelona: Institut Universitari de Lingüística Aplicada (Universitat Pompeu Fabra), 2001. P. 75–92.

6. Temmerman R. Towards New Ways of Terminology Description. The sociocognitive approach. Amsterdam : John Benjamins Publishing company, 2000. 258 p.

7. Sustainable Agriculture: Definitions and Terms. Related Terms. https://www.nal.usda.gov/legacy/afsic/sustainable-agriculture-definitions-and-terms-related-terms [дата доступу 2.12.21]

8. Top 5 Newest Technologies In Agriculture https://eos.com/blog/top-5-newest-technologies-in-agriculture/ [дата доступу 2.12.21]

7.2. SOME ASPECTS OF SPECIALISED TEXTS TRANSLATION

Ekaterina Pantileienko,
Teacher, of Philology Department,
Dnipro State University of Agriculture and Economics

Summary. Although it is the most common and frequent type of translation performed nowadays in the world, specialised translation, i.e. the translation of texts produced within or referring to a specialist field of knowledge or activity, has mostly been allotted a second-rate status within the discipline of translation studies. Seen as far less creative, noble, and glamorous than its traditional counterpart, i.e. literary translation, specialised translation has been associated with rather negative features, being directly or indirectly described as an automatic, restricted, and often tedious process.

Keywords: specialised translation, terminology, phraseology; translating texts, specialised texts.

Nowadays transactions between countries and cultures of the world necessitate the translation of the texts and the terms from English, primarily. In this framework, professionals often need to work with translators (and vice versa) in the process of writing, re-writing, translating and editing economic texts. Translation techniques (Vinay and Darbelnet, 1995) can assist by providing some methodological tools; yet, translators often find themselves in ‘unchartered waters’, having to employ all their scientific and even artistic resources to come up with the most appropriate terms and structures in the target language. To paraphrase the traders’ motto ‘cash is king’, in translation 'content is king'; in other words, no technique can substitute for factual knowledge and there can be no translation without understanding of meaning. Similarly, no software can provide a 'camera-ready', edited document; therefore, unless the translator or writer of the target text possesses the necessary expertise or awareness of both content and context, the outcome will be not only disappointing but also potentially dangerous, depending on the information conveyed by the target text. The speed at which 'google translate' can create the illusion of 'transfer' into another language (another world, essentially) creates the false impression that translation is an easy task, available at a click of the mouse. Naturally, every modern 'gadget' that provides speedy solutions is welcomed with enthusiasm, especially nowadays that technology has diminished the dimension of time to such a miraculous extent. However, maturity takes time. In translation, as in every kind of writing that requires thought, creativity, inspiration, innovation, versatility, caution and, above all, thorough investigation, 'sleeping on it' is often the best strategy, as it may prevent errors that would never have had a chance to be 'cured'.

The translator – even if he is simply a 'post-editor' with powerful translation tools at his service – is essentially a significant mediator between two cultures – and not just between two languages. This is a role which requires special skills and knowledge, particularly when it comes to technical translation, such as the translation of economic texts. According to Newmark (1988, 190), a translator's 'craft or skill' is 'the ability to follow or deviate from the appropriate natural usage', depending on what kind of text one is dealing with. This paper presents samples from translations of economic texts, with and without the collaboration of an expert, so as to question the translator's 'omnipotence' on the one hand (for those who insist on being over-confident), while it analyzes the benefits of learning to co-operate and succumb to the impossibility of 'omniscience', on the other. Finally, the critical question, and a vital one for the future of translators, is to what extent they will continue to attain, maintain, and, ultimately, defend a privileged and demanding level of text production amidst an increasingly receding 'reader response' for the sake of expediency. To play the devil's advocate, in several cases it is not even necessary to translate nowadays; for instance, in co-authoring which involves bilingual texts sometimes it is better and easier to 'paraphrase' and adapt information. Yet, it is this process of paraphrasing that requires even more skill and craft, as it is solely based on the translator's art and knowledge, far from machine translation and word counting, which are usually associated with translation per se. On the other hand, this is exactly what makes paraphrasing so attractive: its wider 'affordability' than the demanding process of translating, to the extent that anyone thinks they can 'try it for themselves'.

1. Technical translation: a different need for 'faithfulness'. Translation began to gather momentum as an episteme (science) after the 1960s (Nida, 1964), when academics started to relate it to other scientific fields, such as linguistics, and the first theories were formulated in an attempt to provide a framework illustrating the basic parameters involved in the process of transferring or 'carrying across' (from the Latin translatus) the message (Kasparek, 1983, p.83); in other words, rendering the meaning of a text from the source language (SL) to the target language

(TL). Despite, however, this 'epistemological' approach, and the problematic involved in the dispute between verbatim (faithful, word-for-word) translation and the linguistic alternative favoring the creation of equivalences, the practical aspect of this process verifies that it is primarily an art. This is because of its resemblance to 'a gigantic crossword involving a huge number of tiny decisions' – according to the British playwright and translator Christopher Hampton (Anderman, 1998, 39) – that the translator needs to take every single moment, necessitated by the linguistic and cultural differences between languages. When the moment of 'building' the new text comes, even if translation were an 'exact science' – which it is not, and sometimes it even calls for 'intuitive leaps' (Robinson, 1997, p.92) – scientific principles could not possibly get the job done; yet, they would help the translator by playing the role of a reliable compass that can guide him/her along or across the finite choices (Kentrotis, 1996, 379) of the paradigmatic and syntagmatic axes, respectively.

As a consequence, a translator's creativity plays a catalytic role in relation to the quality of the text produced in the target language, as he often has to 'invent' equivalences and make the right choice of both word and word order. Byrne (2010, 26) argues that instead of translation we should nowadays use the term 'interlingual technical communication', and not simply 'technical writing' but even text 're-engineering', depending on the skopos of the target text, as this is often the best approach in the process of creating a new document of technical nature rather than staying close to the source text (as is the case with literary works, in which style, paralinguistic and extralinguistic features have also to be considered). Furthermore, it is important to maintain consistency when translating technical texts, using the same term in order to avoid misunderstandings (cf. Sim and Pop, 2012, 156). In contrast, the 'signifier' (Saussure, 1983) can vary in the case of literary texts, and the translator has the flexibility to use synonyms in order to avoid repetition, given the significance of 'fluidity' and the aesthetic parameters characterizing literary texts. Although, therefore, it is possible to use different words (synonyms) to render the concept (or 'signified') 'beautiful' (e.g. when describing a sunset: wonderful, exquisite, unforgettable, majestic, etc.), the need to be exact when translating economic, legal and, generally, technical texts necessitates the use of the same term in a consistent way. In other words, adopting a 'literary' approach in technical texts can only create confusion, instead of adding flavor and innovation to the target text. It would be annoying to start a presentation about 'start-ups', then start using the term 'newly-born businesses' (either interlingually or intralingually), and after that, erroneously perceiving 'variety of style' as a requirement that calls for summoning up one's 'innovative' powers, turn to a term such as 'recently-launched business ventures' or even 'new endeavors in the entrepreneurial field', and so on. On the other hand, it would be unacceptable to use the word 'nice' repeatedly in a literary target text (unless the author of the source text intentionally meant to do so). Non-fiction requires uniform and clearly comprehensible terms and equivalences in the target language. Therefore, although it is not a critical error to use the terms 'Euro-area' and 'Eurozone' interchangeably (cf. Gikas and Tagkas, 2010), it would be completely wrong to translate 'DTL' as 'postponed' or 'put off' 'obligations', ignoring the need for consistency while, in the meantime, 'drowning' in the sea of synonymous signifiers. It is for that reason that quality control should involve the co-operation of a translator with an expert in the relative field (i.e. economist, accountant, lawyer, etc.) before the final 'product' is submitted to the client. In other words, if the translator aims to act as a reliable 'target-language writer', he/she sometimes has to 'ask experts' – or the client, the author, and anyone who can play the role of an experienced 'sourcelanguage reader' (Robinson, 1997,164), whenever the translator encounters difficulties in acting out both roles.

In several cases, the foreign term is used within parentheses, so as to ensure that the term or equivalence used in the target text is recognized, as it may be a neologism that has unsuccessfully been introduced in the target language. For instance, 'backwards tracing' was given in brackets in the process of writing a research paper, as a 'guarantee' that the (unavailable) 'equivalent' in Ukrainian (an explanation or definition, actually) is identified, taking into account that less spoken languages do not always have a widely recognized translation of all current terminology that is constantly created in and around Wall Street.

2. Case study: translation of economic and accounting texts from English into Ukraininan and vice versa. Undoubtedly, 'faithfulness' should rather be viewed as the consistent use of terminology than a process of word-for-word translation paying allegiance to the source text. It is therefore necessary to use the same term, both when technically rewriting (or post-editing), and in the initial process of translating an economic text. At the paradigmatic level, instead of editing the technical text in order to 'embellish' it (as would be the case with a literary text, trying to eliminate repetition of similar words), post-editing a technical text requires the reverse process, as the translator needs to make sure that the same sets of words or expressions – 'terms', which have a different meaning in specific contexts than in normal, everyday usage – are used consistently (albeit repeatedly) in the target text. Although this is a task that an experienced translator can easily accomplish in his/her own, it is during the actual process of selecting the appropriate terms or 'engineering' new equivalences – or even modifying and adapting parts of the source text – that collaboration with an expert proves to be valuable. As the knowledge of content is a prerequisite for the creation of a target text that 'makes sense', an economist's contribution can guarantee and confirm the comprehensibility (and 'validity') of the target text. The following examples, ranging from blatant errors to minor mistakes, have been gleaned from three different categories: a) papers co-authored by an economist and a translator with experience in economic texts, b) translated, edited and even re-written papers, first from English into Ukrainian and vice versa, and c) a student's graduation thesis, tutored by a supervisor experienced in economic terminology:

a) Translating 'book-tax gap' as 'gap of a tax-book' when the studenttranslator chooses to be 'loyal' to machine-translation, baffled by unusual word combinations. In that case, the supervisor's feedback is essential in explaining the difference (gap) between a company's 'taxable' income and its 'financial' (pre-tax or 'book') counterpart. Similarly, the kind of problems polysemy can create is reflected in ‘record’ (in ‘Greenspan’s record’) that has erroneously been translated as a ‘process of recording’ (verb), rather than ‘breaking a limit’ (noun), while ‘associates’ (a noun referring to associated firms) has often been translated as a verb, thus creating problems at the syntagmatic level, too, and leading to further errors in the process of translation. Ironically, though, one of the characteristics of economic terminology is actually its lack of ambiguity, as connotations do not play an important role (as in literary translation, for instance) and an experienced translator should not encounter insurmountable problems in that respect. This, however, does not mean that we do not have economic terms with more than a single meaning (in a general vs. a technical context), and this can create problems, especially when certain new terms and processes may be unknown in the target economic system and, hence, in the target language, as well.

b) Another common error is related to mistaking a term for its normal, every-day meaning. For instance, words like ‘supply’, ‘share’, ‘security’, ‘notes’, ‘interest’, ‘subsidiary’, ’branches’, ‘constitutional’, etc. can sometimes be misinterpreted, while they have a special meaning in an economic context.

c) The expression ‘golden parachute’ (signifying the money or other benefits an executive is going to receive if his/her contract is terminated) is literally translated into Greek, but although it is neither necessary nor helpful to use the English term, the latter is often used in quotation marks (to emphasize its metaphorical meaning) and may also be accompanied by some explanatory remarks (Ayers et al., 2011,18). In contrast, the expression ‘golden boys’, which has become popular during the economic crisis, is used as a loan (in English) and has derogatory connotations that both newspaper readers and TV viewers have become familiar with. On the other hand, ‘lobbying’ describes a strategy that cannot be rendered verbatim, while providing the English term can certainly illustrate the kind of ‘pressure’ or ‘diplomacy’ it signifies.

d) Very technical terms (e.g. ‘mark-to-market’, which means ‘valuing assets at their current price’) often remain untranslated, ‘borrowing’ the foreign term, while in other instances a tentative translation (more like an explanation, or definition) is followed by the original term, as already explained. The same happened with the term ‘revaluation effect’, which refers to the expected impact of asset revaluation on net income (due to a tax rate increase); here, the English term also follows the translation.

e) While in English-Ukrainian translation collaboration with an expert can help to delineate whether there is an identical comprehension of meaning, it is the process of reverse translation (from Ukrainian into English) that requires a ‘verification’ process so as to technically rewrite the original text in the target language, especially when, as in the process of writing a research paper, ‘faithfulness’ to the text in the source language is by no means necessary or recommended. The flexibility, therefore, to deviate from the original wording (excluding the relevant terminology) allows for ‘maneuvering’ in order to ‘fine tune’ the meaning that the economics (or accounting) expert intends to communicate to the target reader.

f) During co-authoring, as is the case when translating with the collaboration of an economist or accountant, instant feedback is provided with terms like ‘optimum currency area’ (Gikas, Hyz and Tagkas, 2013,10). And even when the translator’s knowledge of the equivalent term does not entail comprehension of its meaning as a concept or its economic connotations, a definition or explanation can be readily available: ‘an area characterized by flexibility of prices and wages, labor mobility, and a system of financial transfers from a federal budget’.

3. ‘Rewriting’ as the next phase of translating. The translator is traditionally viewed as the person who faithfully and obediently undertakes the role of an intermediary. What happens, however, when he/she is required to collaborate with the ‘client’ (who, in this particular case is an expert) and do so repeatedly, until the final text is engineered in the foreign language. In the case of a research paper, translation is not actually the issue and a ‘faithful’ translation is of no use if ‘technically rewriting’ the original text produces significantly better results. Taking into account the above-mentioned options, a translation of an article from Greek has been reduced to a much smaller number of words, as other issues, related to clarity and structural balance (coherence and cohesion) need also to be considered when writing a brand-new text in the target language – rather than awkwardly and meaninglessly having to translate a text from the source language (something that can certainly hold true for the first draft, though, before embarking on the challenge of ‘interlingual technical writing’). The following examples illustrate the modifications that preceded the formation of the final texts in a series of translation and subsequent collaboration sessions between a translator and an expert in accounting and finance.

a) Abstract writing: What if the article is submitted to a journal and reviewers suggest a different approach or minor corrections? This is an instance when extension of the collaboration with the translator is necessary. In other words, the initial aim of the translator – not because of his own lack of skills or knowledge – has not been achieved yet. In this case, the translator needs to adapt the text to the new requirements while at the same time helping the author of the source text to cope with the difficulty of understanding and taking into account the reviewer’s comments and suggestions. Even worse, this continuous process may involve translating (or, simply, explaining or even summarizing) into the ‘client’s’ language in order to determine whether it would be possible to continue working with the target text or should focus again on the source text (or even go back and forth, as proves to be the case when the client has not even a limited knowledge of the target language).

b) Content writing: Even in the case of collaborating with an expert with a limited knowledge of English, co-operation was constantly required on the translator’s side, as well, when difficult terms had to be discussed and sentence modifications had to be made in order to engineer a scholarly paper with the appropriate terms but also the necessary coherence and cohesion. This corroborates the argument that even an explanation in the source language can be quite helpful, as it provides the necessary context (and content) for the translator, who can proceed to render in the target language the meaning that he has now grasped, using of course the appropriate term and incorporating it into the text he obviously has the ability and skill to create as a language expert. For instance, terms like ‘revaluation effect’, 'intraperiod tax allocation' or 'CDS' (Credit Default Swaps), 'options', 'hedge funds' (which some Ukrainian dictionaries translate as 'mutual funds' – a more general category – failing to explain that their purpose is to 'offset risk') often need some sort of 'intralingual' translation, as stock market jargon is difficult to decipher without comprehending the processes it describes.

c) Terminology: The expert's knowledge of content proved to be valuable in helping the translator with pragmatic elements and explaining complex issues related to accounting processes that the translator would find it difficult to render otherwise. For example, the transition from Greek GAAP (Generally Accepted Accounting Principles) to IFRS (International Financial Reporting Standards) was followed by the introduction of new terms, as was definitely the case with the recent Memorandum and the subsequent PSI (Private Sector Involvement); a term which has been literally translated into Ukrainian but is much more clearly known – and comprehended – as 'haircut'. Pragmatically speaking, it refers to the write-down of 53.5% of the amounts owed to private creditors holding Greek government bonds (GGB). In the same vein, differences between synonyms like 'devaluation' (official lowering of the value of a country's currency) and 'depreciation' (decrease in a country's currency due to market forces) are sometimes baffling dilemmas for a translator, in contrast to an economist.

d) The translator's research: A last but equally important point that has to be made is that the translator is 'the final incumbent', so to speak, and is therefore obliged to carry out his/her own 'investigation' into 'facts and figures', despite the assistance that he may be receiving during the process of translating and writing. This is because, firstly, even experts can make mistakes with terminology but, worse, pragmatic elements may be incorrectly reported. In that case, the translator is responsible for tracking down such possible inconsistencies and fixing them, as in the end he/she will definitely be held responsible for not doing so. For example, what if the author of the source text misreports the name of a major organization (or a bank, or an official)? If the translator takes that for granted and incorporates it in the target text without having first conducted his/her own research, that is certainly a 'cardinal flaw' in the required quality control that should precede the final draft of every (and not just technical or economic) translation.

The (technical) translation of economic texts is a demanding process, requiring accuracy – and even exactitude. Therefore, consistency is a prerequisite, as the uniform use of terminology eliminates misunderstanding, but there is also scope for creativity and flexibility in the process of 'building' the target text. Finding or creating the proper equivalences, employing the appropriate syntactic or grammatical structures, and collaborating with an expert that has knowledge of the field can lead to a professionally written and edited text in the target language that ideally would not 'reveal' its identity as a translated text from the source language. Given the vast heterogeneity in the field of 'economic translation', translators cannot pretend to be the know-it-all experts, in the same way that experts cannot become linguists, translators and language engineers. The former possess the art and craft (the skills and 'tools', in other words), while the latter can provide perspective and help with difficult ‘spots’ at the paradigmatic level, mainly. Although translation is often a ‘misinterpreted’ science (or/and art), it is vain to defend against a potential usurpation of its field by non-professional practitioners who possess a sound knowledge of terminology (or even the ‘special’ language of economics) – but who, nevertheless, cannot guarantee that they will be able to integrate it in a seamless way with the ‘general’ language that is the greatest part of even technical texts. The special language cannot exist without the normal, everyday language (Arnzt and Picht, 1982, 24), which is the vehicle that can convey meaning by forming comprehensible sentences.

As a relay team can run 400 meters faster than an individual athlete, we need to think as teams, too, and learn to ask for feedback, find out pragmatic elements that are essential in attributing the correct meaning to a term or an utterance, and collaborate both during translating (or, simply, ‘re-writing’ in the target language) and during the phase of post-editing (especially if machine translation has been used) in order to be able to achieve the best possible results and create a target text of ‘publishable’ quality. As Robinson puts it, an experienced translator ‘has a better sense of when it is all right to admit ignorance’; and doing so ‘is not only acceptable without loss of face, but a sign of professionalism’. Finally, both translating and paraphrasing require the scientific analysis that sets limits even to a professional translator’s ‘galloping craftsmanship’ in a concrete and universally acceptable way. That knowledge, paired with skill and experience, is and will remain irreplaceable, because it is not the product of a momentary fascination with the source text and subsequent inspiration; it is the outcome of a long and serious process of ‘toil’ (Kasparek, 1983), coupled with sensitivity and accountability.

Although in recent years the literature on specialised translation has grown significantly and non-literary translating seems to have reduced some of the distance that separates it from its traditionally upper placed rival, some researchers are still noticing the slight disdain with which specialised translating is treated within the discipline. In one of the few books dealing specifically with non-literary translation, Byrne notes that technical translation “has long been regarded as the ugly duckling of translation, especially in academic circles. Not particularly exciting or attractive and definitely lacking in the glamour and cachet of other types of translation, technical translation is often relegated to the bottom division of translation activity and regarded as little more than an exercise in specialised terminology and subject knowledge (2006, 1). The appeal of literary translation among translator trainees is motivated, at least in part, by the second-rate status that seems to have been allotted to specialised translation within the discipline of translation studies itself. It is common knowledge that most of the early reflections about translation have focused mainly on the translation of literary works (understood here as including religious, philosophical or rhetorical writings): Cicero’s and Horace’s thoughts on translation, the views of various Bible translators (St. Jerome, John Wycliffe, William Tyndale, etc.), Etienne Dolet’s or George Chapman’s ideas on the translation of the Greek masters or John Dryden’s preface to Ovid’s *Epistles*, to give but some examples. As shown by Bassnett in her chapter on the *History of translation theory* (1992, 39-75), the sharp focus on literature continued in the centuries that followed, with other writers and translators – *e.g*. Alexander Fraser Tytler, August Wilhelm Schlegel, Friedrich Schleiermacher, etc. – sharing their thoughts on translation within a literary context. For a very long time, translation reflection behaved as if non-literary translation did not even exist. In 1972, when translation studies had just began to develop into a scientific branch of knowledge, Holmes noted that "there had been longstanding efforts to produce theories for the translation of literary or sacred texts, but that attempts to develop theories for the translation of scientific texts were relatively new" (qtd. in Olohan, 2009, 249).

The lack of genuine interest in the non-literary aspects of translation fostered the rise of a biased and stereotypical view of specialised translation. Whereas the translation of literature has always been associated with high levels of creativity and certain liberties taken from the source text, specialised translation was allotted an inherently lower status and deemed to be "easier", "restricted", "machine-like" and even "humdrum". In the early 20th century, in his famous essay *The Misery and the Splendour of Translation*, Ortega y Gasset mentions scientific writings and argues that due to their terminology "(...) *these books are easier to translate* from one language to another. Actually, in every country these are written almost entirely in the same language" (2004, 51). Moreover, the Spanish philosopher clearly associates non literary production – and thus non-literary translation – with inherently negative or, rather, non-positive features when he says that he has based "the utopianism of translation on the fact that an author of a book – not of mathematics, physics,

or even biology – is a writer in a positive sense of the word" (2004, 51).

Byrne also tackles some of the common misconceptions about technical translation (a type of specialised translation, in my view), among which he lists: that it presumably includes law, economics, business; that it is all about terminology; that style does not matter in technical translation; that it is not creative, but simply a reproductive transfer process; that you need to be an expert in a highly specialised field in order to perform it, or that it is all about conveying specialised information (2006, 2-7). Some of these misconceptions will also be discussed further on in this paper.

The Scope of Specialised Translation.

Technical translation is often taken to include translations performed in such diverse fields as law, business, religion, politics, etc. In fact, in the literature, technical translation and specialised translation are sometimes treated as synonymous. Aguado de Cea & Álvarez de Mon y Rego provide the following definition to the former concept: "technical translation refers to the process of translating those texts belonging to what are called specialized languages and is usually classified along with other varieties such as legal translation, scientific translation or the translation of medical texts" (2004, 289). More than taking technical and specialised as synonymous concepts, this definition seems to enhance confusion, since, apparently, it implies that legal, scientific, and medical translations do not deal with specialised languages and are not "technical". In the following definition, the word "technical" refers to virtually any field: "Technical translation

(…) covers the translation of any material belonging to a particular area of knowledge, technical field or technology (e.g. mechanical engineering, hydraulics, electrical engineering, business management, etc.), providing the materials require special knowledge of the area involved" (Gouadec, 2007, 30). According to another view, technical translation is a sub-species of specialised translation. As Hann explains, "to avoid confusion the expression specialised translation is reserved for the superordinate concept. In turn, Byrne stresses that "simply because a field or subject area has unique or specialised terminology does not make it technical technical translation deals with technological texts, or, more specifically, technical translation deals with texts on subjects based on applied knowledge from the natural sciences" (2006, 3). It should be noted that the word "technical" does not mean exactly the same thing in these authors' views. Moreover, the exact nature and extent of specialised translation remains unspecified in these two definitions. So, what is the scope of specialised translation?

Traditionally, specialised translation has been defined drawing on the dichotomous pair *general language* vs. *specialised language* or *language for general purposes* vs. *language for special(ised) purposes*. According to this view which is overtly or covertly present in all the definitions quoted above whereas general translation deals with general language, specialised translation tackles a wide array of specialised languages, e.g. the language of computer science, the language of law, the language of medicine, etc. LGP/LSP-based definitions are problematic for at least two reasons. On the one hand, the concept of general language is too large and fuzzy to yield satisfactory applications, making it hard to define "general" translation, as the following definition – which, contrary to generally accepted rules, uses only negative terms – clearly proves it: "general translation refers to the translation of documents and materials that do not belong to any specific type or domain area, do not belong to any particular type, do not entail a specific translation process or the use of equipment beyond an ordinary computer and word processor" (Gouadec, 2007, 27). For instance, should the language used in (and the translation of) a newspaper article on a new technological product be seen as general (medium of publication and intended readership) or as specialised (by the use of a particular terminology)? Should translating a company memo (specialised sender) that announces a new work procedure (general information) be seen as general or specialised? Should the translation of movie subtitles (general topics) be seen as general or as specialised?

In recent years, however, the literature has apparently left aside the LGP/LSP distinction and seems to have embraced *a twofold*, *both text- and field-based view* on specialised translation according to which there are virtually just as many specialised translation types as there are specialist knowledge areas or activities. This seems to be the view put forth by the *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies* (Baker & Saldanha, 2009), where there is no definition of specialised translation per se, but there are several entries on *commercial translation*, *i.e.* a term "intended to cover the translation of all texts used in business contexts, excluding technical and legal texts" (Baker & Saldanha, 2009, 41), *institutional translation*, i.e. "translating *in* or *for* specific organizations" (Baker & Saldanha, 2009, 141), or *scientific and technical* *translation*, *i.e*. "the translation of texts from the domains of science and technology" (Olohan, 2009, 246), etc. It is worth noting that none of these definitions mentions specialised language as a defining factor.

According to the perspective adopted in this paper, *specialised translation deals with any text produced within or referring to a specialist field of knowledge or activity, regardless of its intended readership or purpose*. From this viewpoint, all of the types of translating mentioned in the questions above could be safely seen as specialised, owing to their topic (technology in a newspaper article), their producer (a corporate, specialist producer in the case of a company memo) or the specialist activity within which or whereby they are produced (movie subtitles). Otherwise put, specialised translation may be defined as the translation carried out in a specialised context, *i.e*. a context which involves specialist source-text producers, specialist topics, or a specialist activity.

Dealing with Terminology – a Challenging Task. Coming back to the issue at hand, paradoxically, the most conspicuous aspect of specialised translation – *i.e*., its having to do with specialised terms – is one of the main causes that have seemingly led to its relegation to a status of "low-grade translating". For instance, it is based on terminology that Ortega y Gasset explains why scientific translation is an easier task than literary translation: "if we ask ourselves the reason certain scientific books are easier to translate, we will soon realize that in these the author himself has begun by translating from the authentic tongue in which he 'lives, moves and has his being' into a pseudolanguage formed by technical terms, linguistically artificial words which he himself must define in his book. In short, he translates himself from a language into a terminology" (2004, 50).

Showing that terms in general are not "linguistically artificial words" or that terminology is not a pseudolanguage separated from actual language is not within the scope of this paper. Suffice it to say that Ortega y Gasset's view is not singular. In a more recent paper, Gómez González-Jover stresses that "in translation, it is specialized terms that pose fewer problems to the translator, and, moreover, they are often documented in specialised dictionaries, glossaries or scientific and technical texts, and they can even be standardised". Although many scholars seem to believe that translating specialised terminological units is basically a straightforward, almost automatic process, which requires nothing more than matching the terms in the source text with their dictionary equivalent in the target language, any translator with some practical experience in specialised contexts knows this is far from the truth.

In fact, dealing with terminology in specialised translation is quite often a challenging task and may require much more effort and creativity from the translator's part than meets the eye. To begin with, the belief that a multilingual dictionary or a terminological database is all you need to deal with specialised terminology is questionable for at least two reasons:

Multilingual dictionaries and terminological databases do not cover every possible field of knowledge and activity. Although this may not be immediately apparent in countries with a long lexicographic and terminographic tradition, where both monolingual and multilingual dictionaries/terminological databases for the technical, legal, medical, business, etc. fields are relatively common and easy to find, this reality is particularly challenging in countries where even these well-established domains are not well covered – or not covered at all – by multilingual terminological work. Many niche or lesser developed areas of knowledge do not benefit from terminographic work at all, regardless of the language in which they emerge. In all these cases of terminologically undocumented fields, translators need to embark on a difficult quest and find on their own, through their own research, the conventional translation (if any) of the source terms in their target language.

Dictionaries and terminological databases do not include every possible term. As comprehensive and accurate as they might be (at least in the countries where they are created, maintained, and constantly updated), there is only so much that dictionaries and terminological databases can do. Being limited repertories, they cannot claim to encompass all instances of language in use or everything that happens in actual texts. Moreover, they are by nature unable to keep up with all the innovations made in a particular field of knowledge. In their work, specialised translators may (and often do) come across *neonyms* – terms that are neologisms, new creations in the source language – and may have to try and find the best solution to introduce them into the target language. This is where their linguistic creativity plays a part as well. Besides these misconceptions about the almighty powers of multilingual dictionaries and terminological databases, some confusion surrounds the translation of terms themselves. Despite the common view that a source term and its translation are usually linked by a one-to-one relationship, sometimes there is not just one available translation for a source term. Although, in theory, terms are supposed to be monosemous and cover just one concept in a given field, in practice many terms are polysemous and may require different translations for each of their meanings. To give but an example, the *The Whatis?com Encyclopaedia of Technology Terms* lists no less than four different meanings of "glitch" in this field: 1) a momentary power failure; 2) any temporary loss of service in the network; 3) a bug that is not encountered very often; and 4) a quick temporary noise in a file that sounds like a "snap". What is more, even in the absence of standardisation, the accepted translation of a term may also change in time, due to various reasons, and this is also a phenomenon that dictionaries are not always able to capture. In Romania, when information technology and its devices were just beginning to take hold, the most common translation of the English term (computer) "icon" was "iconiţă" (little icon). Nowadays, this translation is starting to become obsolete and less and less used, being steadily replaced by "pictogramă".

Moreover, specialised texts are not mere lists of specialised terminology. As far as terms are concerned, specialised texts often encompass (near) synonym series, paraphrases, definition-like contexts, and vast lexical and terminological networks. In addition, due to the highly interdisciplinary nature of today's knowledge landscape, the texts that are strictly confined to a single terminological field are the exception, not the rule. For instance, most medical texts include terms from statistics, pharmacology, or physics, most texts that deal with musical theory rely on the terminology of mathematics, whereas technical user manuals encompass legal and business terms. It seems pointless to stress that a translator dealing with this kind of texts needs to take into account and account for all these variables.

Reducing the translation of the texts produced within or referring to a specialist field of knowledge or activity to the translation of their terminology is a gross simplification. Newmark (qtd. in Byrne, 2006, 3) estimated that terminology represents at most 5-10% of the total content of technical texts. Of course, this estimate should be taken *cum grano salis*, since the ratio of terms in a text depends on numerous factors. However, from a lexical viewpoint, the bulk tissue of specialised texts is made up of words that belong to everyday vocabulary or words that may be seen as semi-specialised (commonly used in several fields). As an illustration, here are some examples taken at random from a medical article (1), a business textbook (2), and a user manual (3) – terms are highlighted in italics:

During CC treatment, levels of both *luteinizing hormone (LH)* and *follicle-stimulating hormone (FSH)* rise, falling again after the typical 5-day course of therapy is completed (7). In successful treatment cycles, one or more *dominant follicles* emerge and mature. [1] Look again at the basic rule presented in the first paragraph of this chapter, the rule we said all price searchers try to follow if their goal is to maximize *net revenue*: Set the price or prices that will enable you to sell all those units and only those units for which *marginal revenue* is expected to be greater than *marginal cost*. [2] Press the left (2) and right (3) buttons located beneath the *touchpad* to perform selection and execution functions. These two buttons are similar to the left and right buttons on a *mouse*. Tapping on the *touchpad* is the same as *clicking* the left button. [3] While showing that terms are only a relatively small part of the vocabulary used in specialised texts, the examples above also reveal another challenging aspect of specialised translation: dealing with phrasemes and register. Besides finding the right terms, the translators who work with specialised texts need to identify the various kinds of phrasemes present in the source text, understand their meaning and intended perlocutionary effects, and make informed decisions relative to their translation. Although set phrases carry a lighter weight as far as informational content is concerned, their mistranslation may hinder the overall readability and undermine the intended communicative functions of the target text. For Mel'čuk, a *set phrase* or *phraseme* is simply a phrase which is not free; this means that in its construction either the selection of its constituent members or their combination, or both, are not made freely, but are restricted to a more or less limited number of choices (1998, 24-30). Although it is relatively untapped in translation studies, the field of phraseology seems to be of utmost importance in specialised translation. In order to streamline communication, each field of knowledge has its specific set phrases and hallmark word combinations. For instance, "to browse the Internet / the Web / through files / data", "to read / write a disc / data", "editing tools", "image processing", "unauthorized use/access" are some phrasemes and word combinations very common in the field of information technology.

When dealing with the phraseology of specialised texts, choosing the right words to go with each term in the translation is key, not only in order to preserve the field-specific register/style, but also to maintain and support the communicative function that the translated text is supposed to fulfil in the target context of reception. A Romanian physician once told me that she had been very bothered by a translated medical text she had read. In it, among other things, a Romanian translator felt that such English verbs as “to die” or “to flatline” were too rough, so s/he decided to “sugar the pill” in translation. As a result, in the Romanian version of the English article, patients “passed away”, “perished” or “parted”. As the physician explained, the unwanted effect of such associations had a negative impact on her reception of the article at hand.

Apart from field-specific collocations, specialised texts may include many other types of textual and referential set phrases. In the parallel corpus of general use ICT texts that I built for my doctoral research I was able to identify several types of frequent non ICT-specific referential phrasemes: lexical collocations (“high quality,“next generation, “user experience”), irreversible binomials (“incoming and outgoing, “quick and easy”), compounds (“highspeed”, “user-friendly”), and phrasal verbs (“to turn on/off”, “to set up”, “to swipe down”). Textual phrasemes, field-specific and non-field specific phrasemes are sometimes accompanied in specialised texts by what Granger and Paquot (2008) name communicative phrasemes. Depending on the overall purpose pursued by a specialised text, the latter may take the form of speech act formulae (used mainly in advertising or in texts that address the readers directly), attitudinal formulae (e.g. “I/we think that”, “I/we are of the opinion that” – used mainly in argumentative, scientific texts), commonplaces (sometimes used in educational contexts), proverbs (or clever paraphrases), and slogans (advertisements, corporate communication, etc.). Below there are some examples of such communicative phrasemes, taken from a reference book in economics, *The Economic Way of Thinking*: Let's go back now to a question that we asked but deferred answering. We are not denying the possibility of predatory pricing in business. Simple cases are best for illuminating basic principles. There's the catch. It is in fact efficient (from his point of view) for Ed to. An old proverb wisely asserts that the wolf should not be sent to guard the sheep. Should the government be relied on to preserve competition in the economy? The way in which all the types of phrasemes mentioned so far are dealt with in translation is of great importance since, along with terms, they participate in the building up of the field-specific register and of the general, communicative register (or style) of both the source and the target texts. As Byrne noted, “in many cases, the importance or even existence of style in technical texts goes completely unacknowledged, due largely to the belief that because technical language is functional, it must be “plain” and stripped of any form of style or linguistic identity” (2006, 5). The few examples discussed so far are an indication that style neutrality or the lack of linguistic creativity in specialised texts is not universal.

Keeping Up with Genre Conventions and Communicative Functions. Along with terms, phrasemes, and register, another crucial thing to take into account in specialised translation is the fact that it usually deals with texts, *i.e.* fully-fledged discourse entities, which are not written at random, just for the sake of writing. They are the product of an author or of authors who belong to a particular discourse community, and they are meant to serve a given purpose, because “individuals either produce, or produce interpretations of, texts according to the norms of the discourse community and the functions which the text is intended to serve within that discourse community” (Bex, 2001, 66). Both the “tradition” of a text and the communicative goals it pursues crystallise in the notions of genre and genre conventions. As Bhatia shows, the concept of genre “extends the analysis beyond the textual product to incorporate context in a broader sense to account for not only the way text is constructed, but also for the way it is often interpreted, used and exploited in specific institutional or more narrowly professional contexts to achieve specific disciplinary goals” (2004, 20). Specialised discourse is a realm where genres have been known to prosper, as each field of knowledge and/or activity has developed – or, sometimes, borrowed – its own conventionalised ways of packaging informational content. The legal field, for instance, encompasses a very wide range of textual genres, from judgements, subpoenas, summons, injunctions, to statutes, wills, powers of attorney, or various types of contracts. Discharge summaries, case reports, or consultation letters are some well-known genres in the medical field, whereas bank statements, financial statements, general ledger reports, or closing binders are common genres in the field of business/accounting. Of course, many genres cut across several fields. An example in this respect is the scientific article, which may come up as a conventionalised way of organising information in virtually any field of knowledge – even though textual conventions may be slightly different in each case. One of the challenges that specialised translators need to face is learning how to deal with all the various genres they may come across in their work. On the one hand, they need to be aware of the “culture” and purposes that led to the use of particular genre conventions in the source language and, on the other hand, decide how these conventions should be dealt with in the target culture, in agreement with the possible expectations of the target recipients (that they also need to envisage). As Neubert and Shreve emphasised, “the impression that a translation ‘sounds wrong’ comes from violations of a reader's textual expectations. The reader has in mind a set of tacit expectations about what the text ‘should be like’” (1992, 117). Keeping up with genre conventions may sometimes imply radical decisions, such as deleting, adding, or reorganising information in the target text. A study I carried out for my doctoral research revealed that the Romanian translations of English ICT news articles were consistently shorter than their sources (the average size of the target texts was of 373 words, as opposed to 500 for the source texts) and encompassed a smaller number of intra-textual divisions, like subheads or paragraphs (1793 in the source-corpus as opposed to only 1354 in the target corpus). This showed that the translators made an effort to adapt the target texts to the generic conventions of the target culture, which require that ICT news be more condensed in Romania. An even greater effort of adaptation may be needed in cross-genre translations, in which the source and the target genres are different (*e.g.* translating a source press release as a news article in the target culture). As far as communicative functions are concerned, in spite of the traditional assumption, translation practice seems to suggest that specialised texts which serve a purely informative purpose are not that frequent, not even in the technical fields.

With the exception of technical descriptions (*e.g*. the description of the parts that make up a particular machine or its functioning), which may be seen as only informative, most specialised texts are meant to perform several communicative functions. So, although their primary goal may be that of conveying information, most specialised texts are also meant to persuade (*e.g*. through argumentation, in scientific articles; in product advertisements), to instruct (*e.g*. user manuals; legal provisions), or even to express "personal" viewpoints (*e.g*. in scientific articles, in corporate reports), etc. In the past, examination to exclude any significant residual ovarian enlargement has been recommended before each new treatment cycle but it is no longer recommended. Although it is prudent to postpone further treatment when symptoms lead to discovery of a large cyst or grossly enlarged ovaries, clinical research and accumulated clinical experience suggest that routine 'baseline' physical or ultrasound examinations are unnecessary. When using the touchpad, keep it - and your fingers - dry and clean. The touchpad is sensitive to finger movement; hence, the lighter the touch, the better the response. Tapping harder will not increase the touchpad's responsiveness. What is the cost below which prices should not be set? Does anyone actually sell below cost? Consider the case of Ms. Profetta Seeker, proprietor of the Thrifty Supermarket, who orders 1,000 pounds of ripe bananas. As the examples above show, a wide array of linguistic and rhetorical means is put to use in order to achieve all these functions in the source texts, and some of them may prove to be particularly challenging to translators.

Challenges, Responsibilities, and Risks. As this brief overview has shown, from the level of terms, to phraseology, register, genre conventions, and communicative functions, the translators who work with specialised texts have to deal with many challenges, which require not only extra-linguistic knowledge of the field(s) at hand, but also problem-solving skills and linguistic creativity. In many respects, in the knowledge-based society – where information spreads at a breathtaking pace, the boundaries that separate the disciplines have faded, and the advancements of science and technology develop at a scale never reached before – specialised translation has become at least just as demanding as literary translation. In any case, it is definitely not "easier", "restricted", "machine-like", or "humdrum", as in some traditional views. In many respects, specialised translation and literary translation are similar. In fact, taking the concept of specialisation to the extreme, to the extent that the literary art might be seen as a specialist activity, which is only practiced by a small group of experts, literary translation may also be seen as (a type of) specialised translation. However, in spite of their apparent similarity, the attempt to make the two trades compete and the effort to assign them labels based on value judgements are just as useful as pouring water into a sieve.

Specialised translators have a shared responsibility towards both the source text and its producer(s) and the target text and its future recipients. The status of the literary source text may be higher than with most other text types, as Snell-Hornby claimed, but this does not mean that specialised source texts are authorless or that those who commission specialised translations expect less than a job well done, *i.e*. a translation that manages to keep the accuracy of the informational content conveyed by the source text while succeeding in fulfilling its intended communicative effects in the target context. In its constant juggling between precision and accuracy in the translation of terms/ informational content and resourcefulness in the rendering of the numerous other linguistic and pragmatic phenomena present in its source texts, specialised translation is not a risk-free activity. It is not by chance that, according to some views, the notion of deviation in translation (of the target text with respect to the source text) is acceptable only when one talks about "scientific" documents "where facts are set out and presented in unqualifiedly objective terms for the reader of SL and TL text alike, but with literary texts the position is different" (Bassnett, 1992, 79). In fields of knowledge where accuracy is a prerequisite, the mistranslation of terms may have disastrous results, with consequences that may go far beyond the flawing of a literary author's style. Moreover, the mistreatment of phraseology and inappropriate register choices may undermine completely both the way in which the information in specialised texts is understood and received and the intended communicative effect that the translation is supposed to produce in the target context. Finally, it is worth noting that, especially when their target language is lesser known and terminologically standardised, specialised translators, just like journalists or authors, are creators of language too. As Montgomery stressed, "translation (...) has time and again resulted in the creation of new vocabularies in languages previously foreign to the relevant knowledge" (2000, 18). When the source texts are highly influential or benefit from wide circulation, some of the choices made in their translation will tend to stick in the collective mind and be taken as the norm, and thus become the "conventional" translations of new terms or new field-specific phraseology. It is thus that formal or semantic loans are usually introduced into a language, enriching its vocabulary and helping it keep up with the advances of science and technology. From this perspective, specialised translators have responsibilities towards the target language too and they should be wary of the risk of introducing loose translations and poor style into the target context. "The translator, it was stated, must be more than a mere device, clicking out word for word, phrase for phrase; he must be actively involved in the choice of language, dancing the border between imitation and innovation" (Montgomery, 2000, 34).

References:

1. Aguado de Cea G., Álvarez de Mon y Rego I., (2004), *Cultural Aspects in the Translation of Texts in the Domain of Information Technologies*. In Rogers, A. and Rogers, M. (eds.), Proceedings of the 14th European Symposium on Language for Special Purposes, Khurshid, University of Surrey, Surrey, pp. 289-295.

2. Anderman G., Rogers M., (2008), *The Linguist and the Translator. Incorporating Corpora: The Linguist and the Translator*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, pp. 5-17.

3. Ayers, B., Laplante, S. and Schwab, C. (2011), Does Tax Deferral Enhance Firm Value Proceedings: Symposium on Tax Research XII, University of Illinois. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=1976606

4. Baker M., Saldanha G. (2009), *Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translations Studies* (2nd edition). Routledge, USA, Canada.

5. Bassnett S.,(1992), *Translation Studies*. Routledge, London.
6. Bex T., (2001), *Variety of Written English. Texts in Society: Societies in Text*. Taylor & Francis e-Library, Routledge, London, 2001.
7. Bhatia V.,(2004), *Worlds of Written Discourse. A Genre-Based View*. Continuum, London.
8. Byrne J., (2014), *Scientific and Technical Translation Explained: a Nuts and Bolts Guide for Beginners* (2nd Edition). Routledge, London, New York.
9. Byrne J., (2006), *Technical Translation. Usability Strategies for Translating Technical Documentation*. Springer, Dordrecht.
10. Gómez González-Jover A., *Léxico especializado y traducción*. In Gouadec D., (2007) *Translation as a Profession*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 2007.
11. Granger S., Paquot M., (2008), *Disentangling the Phraseological Web*. In Granger S. and Meunier F. (1982), *Phraseology: an interdisciplinary perspective*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
12. Hann M., (2004), *A Basis for Scientific and Engineering Translation. German–English– German.* John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
13. Mel'čuk I., (1998), *Collocations and Lexical Functions*. In A. P. Cowie (ed.), *Phraseology. Theory, Analysis, and Applications*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
14. Montgomery S.L., (2000), *Science in Translation. Movements of Knowledge through Cultures and Time*. Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago.
15. Neubert A., Shreve G.M., (1992), *Translation as Text*. The Kent State Univ. Press, Kent.
16. Nida E.A., (1982), *Toward a Science of Translating*. E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1964.
17. Newmark, P. (1988), *A Textbook of Translation*. Hertfordshire. Prentice Hall.
18. Nida, E., (1964), *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E.G. Brill.
19. Nord, Ch., (1997), *Translating as a Purposeful Activity*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
20. Olohan M., (2009), *Scientific and Technical Translation*. In Baker M. and Saldahna G. (eds.), *The Routledge Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*, 2nd Edition, Routledge, USA, Canada, pp. 246-149.
21. Ortega y Gasset J., (2004), *The Misery and Splendour of Translation*. In Venuti L. (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, Elizabeth Gambler Miller (Trans.), Taylor & Francis e-Library, Routledge, London, pp. 49-64.
22. Snell-Hornby M., (1995), *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach* (2nd Edition). John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
23. Poterba, J., Nirupama, R., and Seidman, J. (2007), *The Significance and Composition of Deferred Tax Assets and Liabilities*. Working paper/National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., Cambridge, Mass.
24. Robinson, D. (1997), *Becoming a Translator.* New York: Routledge.
25. Saussure, F. de, (1983), *Course in General Linguistics,* trans. London: Duckworth.
26. Sim, M. A. and Pop, A. M. (2012), *Managing Problems When Translating*

Economic Texts. Economic Science Series, 21(2) pp.152-157.

27.Snell-Hornby M., (1995), *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach* (2nd Edition). John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

7.3. FORMATION OF PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION IN THE PROCESS OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING

Olena Stukalo,
Senior Lecturer of Philology Department,
Dnipro State University of Agriculture and Economics, Ukraine

Summary. The work substantiates the structure of pedagogical communication and the structure of psychological readiness for its implementation. The article deals with the peculiarities of professional communication formation of students in a higher education institution. The purpose of the work is to analyse the expediency of teaching a foreign language discipline for students of agricultural specialties. The basic directions of professional communication formation of future specialists are determined. It is established that the quality of teaching a foreign language in higher education institutions to European standards is impossible without implementation of modern methods.

Keywords: pedagogical communication, professional communication, foreign language, training, higher education institution, modern methods of teaching.

Formulation of the problem. In the context of education modernization, the problem of professional training is especially important. The increased interest of scholars and practitioners for professional training is due to a change in the educational paradigm – there is a shift from mass-productive forms and methods of teaching to individual and creative, when a specialist is trained with the emerging need for professional self-education, capable of self-development and full self-realization in the chosen profession [26].

Professional communication is an integral part of the future specialist. The need to improve the level of preparation for professional communication of future professionals in higher education institutions will raise the issue of forming their readiness for communication, professional self-improvement and development. Therefore, there is a need to consider the peculiarities of forming a structure for students' readiness for professional communication.

Humanistic orientation is a priority in the modern educational system. That is what raises a separate personality to the level of the highest social significance and orientates the educational process to create the optimal organizational and pedagogical conditions for the formation of a future specialist as a carrier of high spiritual values, disclosure of his creative potential and self-realization in future professional activities. Humanistic educational trends also embrace the future specialists training in the field of agriculture. It is well-known that in higher education institutions of agricultural profile, attention has always been focused mainly on the general professional component, which led to the degeneration of