TRANSLATION PROBLEMS WITHIN THE EU CONTEXT

Indra Grietēna

Department of Translation Studies
Ventspils University College
Latvia
indrag@venta.lv

The paper reviews publications by Latvian linguists looking at the main translation problems within the context of the EU between 2005 and 2010. The author analyses the publications from three aspects: general aspects of translation problems and practices within the EU context, particular translation problems, and methodological publications providing guidelines for translators working within the EU context. The author reveals discussions on the ways translation influences language in general, the role of the source language for the development of the target language, and the role and responsibility of a translator at the 'historical crossroads'. The article discusses a number of EU-specific translation problems, including source language interference, problems of the translator's visibility and a translation's transparency, 'false friends', and linguistic and contextual untranslatability. The author briefly summarizes the contents of guidelines and manuals for translators working within the EU context, highlighting the main differences between English and Latvian written language practices, literal (word-for-word) translation and the translator's relationship with the source text. The publications selected and analysed have been published either in conference proceedings or in academic journals from the leading Latvian institutions in the field of translation: Ventspils University College, the University of Latvia, the State Language Commission of Latvia and Translation and Terminology Centre of Latvia.

INTRODUCTION

The Latvian language, as the language of Latvian ethnos and the official language of the Republic of Latvia, belongs to the Baltic group of Indoeuropean languages and was consolidated in the 10th–12th centuries. Today, Latvian is the native language for 1.5 million people; another half a million know it as their second language (Druviete 2010b, 156). From 2004 the Latvian language acquired a completely new legal status when it became one of the official languages of the European Union (EU). However, Latvian ranks only 20th among the 27 EU languages in terms of the number of people speaking the language (Druviete 2010a, 172).

It has generally been aknowledged that Latvia's accession to the European Union has significantly influenced the development of the Latvian language in the 21st century. The new legal status of Latvian required a mass of translation work on an unprecedented scale. Within a considerably short period of time, about a hundred thousand pages of EU legal documents had to be translated into Latvian (Veisbergs 2005a, 12). The huge amount of translations, on the one hand, have left an impact on the Latvian language itself and, on the other hand, developed new translation practices in Latvia. Furthermore, this flurry of linguistic activity has given rise to new areas of research, language policy, terminology and translation.

The aim of the present paper is to review the publications on the main areas of translation and problems within the EU context in Latvia between 2005 and 2010 and summarize the main problems revealed in them. The study covers articles by nine authors and and the role of a number of institutions involved in the terminology and translation fields. The study does not cover online publications. The author acknowledges the limited nature of her study, as the sources reviewed do not represent a complete list of publications on the theme.

Having studied the publications, the author of the paper summarises and analyses the translation problems within the EU context from three aspects: firstly, general aspects of translation problems and practices, secondly, particular translation problems in EU-related texts, and, thirdly, methodological publications providing guidelines for translators working within the EU context.

The articles selected and analysed in the paper have mostly been published either in conference proceedings or in academic journals from the leading Latvian institutions in the field of translation: Ventspils University College, University of Latvia, the State Language Commission of Latvia and Translation and Terminology Centre of Latvia.

GENERAL ASPECTS OF TRANSLATION PROBLEMS AND PRACTICES

The EU background and context presents an important factor for both language policy and translation practices that cannot be ignored. However, the relation between Latvian and the EU can be described as '*two sides of one medal*' ('*medaļas divas puses*') (Veisbergs 2005a). Latvian (consequently, translation) and the EU can be viewed from two aspects: the position of Latvian in the EU and its institutions, and the EU influence on Latvian (*ibid.*). The former has been legally ensured by the EU; the latter reveals itself through translations of various types and quality, and has raised a number of disputes in the linguistic community.

Therefore, taking into account the specific EU context characterized by a big

number of translations and the single dominant source language (SL)—English, the following general issues can be described and analysed: the ways translation influences a language, the role of the SL for the development of the target language (TL), and the role of a translator at the historical crossroads.

The ways translation influences a language

Today '*we live in a translated world*' ('*mēs dzīvojam tulkotā pasaulē*') (Veisbergs 2005b, 189). The large scale of translation practices within the EU context have added new concepts to the world of linguistics—translation product, translation language, etc. Therefore, next to the many definitions and characteristics of translation one more can be added, highlighting the specific EU context and its diversity—translation is '*the enrichment of the target language*' ('*mērķvalodas papildināšana*') (Veisbergs 2005b, 187).

As a result, no language today can escape being influenced by translation and translation pratices, including Latvian. Also, translation and terminology processes play an important role in Latvian language-policy making, since 80 per cent of the new words added to Latvian come from translations either of fiction or official EU texts (Druviete 2010a, 173). It cannot be denied that translation has brought about considerable changes in Latvian via various types of text and different types of translations ranging from the technical to the literary, from the official to the unofficial, and from open to hidden translations, or '*hybrid translations*' ('*hibrīdtulkojumi*') (Veisbergs 2005b, 188).

Furthermore, it is translation that carries both the positive and negative aspects of the EU context. It has brought a range of benefits for the development of modern Latvian: first and foremost, it has enriched the word stock of modern Latvian, it has helped to stabilize the lexical system, and facilitated the standardisation of terminology, as 35,000 new terms have been created and added within a decade (Veisbergs 2005a, 14). As Zauberga has rightly emphasized:

> Translation of EU documents, undoubtedly, has a positive effect on the development of Latvian, as (…) it facilitates linguistic creativity and makes one look into language for ways and means of expressing new notions and stylistically new language structures.
>
> ('*ES dokumentu tulkošana neapšaubāmi atstāj pozitīvu ietekmi uz latviešu valodas attīstību, jo (...) rosina valodniecisko jaunradi un liek valodā meklēt veidus un līdzekļus vēl nebijušujēdzienu un stilistiski strukturālo konstrukciju atveidei.*')

> (Zauberga as quoted in Druviete 2010a, 174).

However, translation within the EU context also has its 'dark side': it indirectly influences the use of Latvian exercised by translators. As Veisbergs (2005a, 15) maintains, the language of translations deeply penetrates the daily use of language in

various ways, for instance, Latvian legislative acts can be characterised as direct copies of EU regulations and directives, unfortunately, also copying their language, and thus making formal Latvian bureaucratic, heavy, vague, complicated by the use of unclear euphemisms, typical 'Eurojargon' and hybridization (the EU regulations prepared by non-native speakers of English or French). Secondly, the structure of Latvian legal texts tends to become complex with far too many subordinate clauses; they '*reproduce the structures of the original documents*' ('*atražotas iepriekšējo dokumentu struktūras*') (Veisbergs (2005a, 15) thus becoming vague and ambigious, creating the '*language mist*' ('*valodas migla*') (*ibid.*). As a result, the produced Latvian text has "*a taste' of poor translation*' ('*nekvalitatīva tulkojuma 'piegarša*') (Veisbergs 2005a, 15), carrying just a formal equivalence to the source text (ST) and language.

This leads Veisbergs to the conclusion that the '*translation language (like language in general) is not a homogeneous entity but a fluid, changing and overlapping variety of a set of innumerable idiolects which is impossible to decree or organize in a democratic society*' (1999, 73). And as the greater part of the vocabulary in Latvian was received through translation, the influence of the SL is omnipresent in all its varieties, the EU context being the most significant source of borrowing.

The role of the source language for the development of the target language

The influence and, consequently, the role of any source language on the development of any target language can be explained by the so called '*Columbus's complex*' ('*Kolumba komplekss*') (Veisbergs 2005b, 189)—a natural human curiosity about unknown and strange phenomena that can be satisfied via translations. In the modern world, English has become the main intermediary language of this natural human quest. The dominance of English in human contact and communication, as well as in linguistic borrowing, is unavoidable (Veisbergs 2006, 31). Consequently, it is English as the main source language that has been playing a major role in the development of modern Latvian as a target language.

When systematically rendering this '*English tsunami*' (Veisbergs 2008, 148) into Latvian, Andrejs Veisbergs classifies it into a direct influence on a surface level and a deeper impact of English upon the morphological structure of Latvian. According to Veisbergs, the direct influence of English is seen in a variety of English borrowings:

a) colloquial loans—these are mostly short Anglo-Saxon words, partially assimilated grammatically, e.g., *chat*—'*čats*', *fan*—'*fans*', etc.;

b) creation of many new synonyms—when a borrowed word with a narrower specialized meaning is adopted as Latvian synonym, e.g., '*līdzjutējs*'—*fans* (from Engl. 'fan-fanatic'), and *vice versa* when a new Latvian synonym is created for a borrowed word,

e.g., '*hobijs*' (Engl. 'hobby')—'*vaļasprieks*', '*brends*' (Engl. 'brand')—'*zīmols*', etc.;

c) neoclassical borrowings—these are mostly neoclassical internationalisms, e.g., *logistics*—'*loģistika*', *presentation*—'*prezentācija*', *innovation*—'*inovācija*', etc.;

d) loan translations—these are semi-calques, e.g., '*eksvīrs*'—*ex-husband*, '*ziepju opera*'—*soap opera*, '*viedkarte*'—*smart card*, etc.;

e) semantic borrowings—these are old Latvian words or previously borrowed internationalisms that have acquired new meanings because of the polysemy of their English counterparts, e.g., '*zvaigzne*'—*star*, '*pele*'—*mouse*, etc.;

f) replacement of the contact language—when a former borrowing is replaced by another borrowing with the same semantic meaning, e.g., '*želeja*' *vs.* '*gels*', etc.

On a deeper level the influence of English on Latvian is seen in the following:

a) conversion of adjectives into nouns—a rare word-formation pattern in Latvian, e.g., *collective* (adj.)—'*kolektīvs*' (n.), *analogue* (adj.)—'*analogs*' (n.), *potential* (adj.)—'*potenciāls*' (n.), etc.;

b) hidden borrowings—nouns with a negative prefix, e.g., *non-resident* (adj.)—'*nerezidentu*' (n.), *non-governmental* (adj.)—'*nevaldības*', etc.;

c) use of occasional hyphenated compounds, e.g., '*ne-politiskais*'—'*pusžurnālists*', etc.;

d) tendency of borrowings to form derivatives, even a complete paradigm, e.g., '*globalizēt*'—'*globalizācija*'—'*globāls*'—'*globālists*', or to form analogue structures, e.g., '*nostaļģija*'—'*nostaļģēt*'—'*nostaļģis*'—'*nostaļģisks*', etc.;

e) compounding in word formation, e.g., '*darbaholiķis*'—*workaholic*, etc., also original Latvian compounds and blends, e.g., '*bandokrātija*' *vs.* '*birokrātija*', '*varastrīce*' *vs.* '*zemestrīce*', '*eiroremonts*' *vs.* '*natoremonts*', etc.;

f) blends: former blends, e.g., '*smogs*'—*smog* ('smoke+ fog'), '*motelis*'—*motel* ('motorist +hotel'), new blends, e.g., '*cūkmens*' *vs.* '*biznesmenis*' ('business+ man'), '*mēstule*' from '*mēslu vēstule*', etc.;

g) compound phrases, e.g., '*e-pasts*'—*e-mail*, '*e-pārvalde*', '*i-banka*' from '*interneta banka*', etc.;

h) contextual use of idioms (Veisbergs 2008, 148).

The above exemplified cases of the influence of English upon Latvian present a short list of the great variety of influences on both the morphology and syntax of Latvian.

The author cannot but mention the countereffect of such an influence, i.e. the fear of certain Latvian linguistic circles leading to language purism and the search for isolation (Veisbergs 2005b). In their publications some Latvian linguists (e.g. Andrejs

Veisbergs) qualify language purism, on the one hand, as '*a normal phase on the way of language standardisation*' ('*normāla attīstības fāze ceļā uz valodas standartizāciju*') (Veisbergs 2006, 26), on the other hand, purism tends to '*limit the variety of language means*' ('*ierobežot valodas līdzekļu daudzveidību*') (*ibid.*, 27) and therefore it can '*seriously hinder its* (Latvian—I. G.) *development*' ('*var nopietni kavēt tās attīstību*') (*ibid.*).

The so called 'purists' of the Latvian language criticize users of Latvian for their inability to separate both languages (Latvian *vs.* English), and for their inability to find Latvian equivalents to English words (Baldunčiks 2005). As a result, in their opinion, unnecessary lexical and semantic borrowings, word formation patterns and sentence structures are being introduced in Latvian which is leading to a decrease in the use of Latvian words, and to rapid changes in the traditional borders of semantic fields: '*the copies of frequently used English words and expressions start oppressing traditional Latvian equivalents*' ('*angļu valodā bieži lietoto vārdu un izteicienu kopijas sāk nomākt tradicionālos latviskos ekvivalentus*') (Baldunčiks 2005, 57).

The role of a translator at the historical crossroads

Never have translators played such a crucial role in the history of the whole continent as the EU translators from all its member states. Having started their work at the EU's institutions in 2003, Latvian translators, undoubtedly, have gained a unique professional experience. Translation practice within the EU context was '*the first serious challenge for Latvian translators in the field of legal translation*' ('*pirmais nopietnais izaicinājums juridiskās tulkošanas jomā*') (Lejasisaka, Vancāne 2008). Thus, it is understandable that while translating *acquis communautaire* Latvian translators faced a lot of problems highlighted by Māra Graustiņa (1999):

a) there was no coordination of translations, no database of translations had been made;

b) there was no coordination of translated terminology;

c) there was no coordination of work done in different fields;

d) there was no readily accessible information (glossaries, manuals) necessary for translators, no mechanism of spreading useful knowledge, etc.

As the knowledge and competence of translators differed greatly, their performance in many instances resulted in poor translations that were severely attacked and criticized not only by linguists but also by the general public. Researchers, in their turn, tried to define the role of a translator and set standards of translation as guiding principles in their work. It was agreed that the basic task of a translator was to produce '*a precise, clearly understandable and harmonious translation*' ('*lai tulkojums būtu precīzs, skaidri*

saprotams un labskanīgs') (Lejasisaka, Vancāne 2008).

In order to achieve the above goal '*no translator should rely on approximate knowledge*' (Graustiņa 1999, 108). First, Graustiņa (*ibid.*) recommends checking everything a translator is not sure about. Secondly, knowledge of existing Latvian terms is of paramount importance. Thirdly, if there is a wish or necessity to coin a new term, the phonetic and word-building rules of Latvian should be taken into consideration. In short, the authors emphasize that excellent knowledge of Latvian is of first and foremost importance ('*language students must become language-conscious professionals. Indifference will not bring good results*' (Graustiņa 1999, 110)). In the case of translators life-long learning is of particular relevance because all the changes in life find a reflection in the language.

PARTICULAR TRANSLATION PROBLEMS IN EU-RELATED TEXTS

In addition to the above-mentioned considerations, translation within the EU has caused a range of terminological problems. For instance, translation of 'Euroterms' was and still remains a major translation problem. A great number of studies, papers and articles have been published on this issue. Since terminology-related issues are not the object of the present paper, it suffices to say that the diversity of views and opinions on EU-related terminology in Latvia can be summarised in the words of Valija Broka who raises a rhetorical question whether we should '*really supply a translation for every conceivable term used at an international level, in this particular case, in the 'Brussels vocabulary'. Won`t such an objective be an aim in itself?*' (Broka 1999, 105) and proposes an answer to it by stating that '*we should not cudgel our brains trying to think up translations for every new term coming into Latvian from other languages*' (*ibid.*). Particular problems concern source language interference, 'false friends', and cases of untranslatability, briefly discussed below.

Source language interference

Veisbergs (2005b, 195) points out that translation theory is based on the assumption that everything expressed in one language can be expressed (translated) into another language. However, when translating from English into Latvian a translator, like any language user, becomes influenced by it as the SL (Baldunčiks 2005, 57); therefore, s-/he either consciously or unconsciously transfers certain elements of English into Latvian, thus causing SL interference—unnatural lexical and semantic borrowings, word-formation patterns and sentence structures. This leads to the translator's visibility, or a translation's transparency. The range of the SL interference is very wide, I will mention but a few problems characteristic of Latvian translations:

1) a literal translation (word-for-word translation) of either a single word or a phrase;

2) word order—words expressing the most important or latest information are placed at the end of a sentence;

3) elliptical sentences—the auxiliary verb '*būt*'—*be* is frequently omitted;

4) in Latvian verbs are often used with participles, which are commonly ignored by translators;

5) long complex sentences with too many subordinate clauses that could better be split into two separate sentences,

and many other cases of SL interference.

Translator's 'false friends'

One of the principles of modern descriptive linguistics claims that language is subject to change and these changes in language are natural (Veisbergs 2006, 34). Proceeding from this assumption, the translator's 'false friends'—another translation problem—is seen as a '*widening of semantic meaning of words*' ('*vārdu nozīmes paplašināšanās*') (*ibid.*, 31).

However, not all Latvian linguists agree with the above argument. Some call it '*uncontrolled invasion*' ('*nekontrolējama anglicismu invāzija*') and '*an issue of linguistic culture of translation language*' ('*tulkojuma valodas kultūra*') (Ūdris 2005). Others use stronger metaphorical expressions, like '*stylistic blindness*' ('*stilistiskais aklums*'), or '*chemical illiteracy*' ('*ķīmiskais analfabētisms*'), or '*linguistic misunderstanding*' ('*lingvistiskie pārpratumi*') (Baldunčiks 2005, 57–58).

The term 'false friends' in translation is used in a narrower sense, meaning words that are used incorrectly, either as undesirable lexico-semantic variants or '*lexical pseudoequivalents*' ('*leksiskie pseidoekvivalenti*') (*ibid.*). Generally, 'false friends' occur via borrowings, or as an interference of the mediatory language; they also appear due to the differences in the course of development of the semantic meanings of words in different languages.

Juris Baldunčiks (*ibid.*, 60) classifies 'false friends' into the following categories:

1) episodically occurring,
2) rarely but regularly occurring,
3) 'false friends' of epidemic character.

The first two types, consequently, may not cause serious damage to language; the third, however, is seen as a serious translation problem and even a threat to language. It is therefore important for a translator to identify any possible 'false friends' by paying attention to the existence of words with an equivalent meaning in the TL (Latvian) or

words carrying a negative connotation which should not be replaced by words with a positive connotation. Otherwise, it may cause misunderstandings (Baldunčiks, 60–61).

To sum up, there is always a choice—also for a language—either to build barriers, to isolate itself from other languages, or to allow the language to change and '*enlarge its borders*' ('*paplašināt robežas*') *(*Veisbergs 2005b, 189).

Linguistic, contextual and cultural untranslatability

To meet the main criterion of translation practice, i.e. to produce a precise translation of a ST, the translator has to fill in lexical and cultural gaps or lacunae (Veisbergs 2005b, 195). The EU context has also created new untranslatable elements. Veisbergs classifies untranslatability into the following types:

1) linguistic untranslatability—a mismatch of grammatical categories between the SL and TL,
2) contextual untranslatability—puns, idioms, neologisms, etc.,
3) cultural untranslatability (Veisbergs 2005b, 193).

Any of the above types of untranslatability can cause either a loss of information, or its addition in the translated (target) text (TT). According to Veisbergs (2005b, 193), linguistic lacunae may occur if:

a) there is neither the notion nor the word in the TL,
b) there is the notion in the TL but there is no ready, stable and acceptable word in the TL,
c) there are both a similar, even equivalent notion and the word in the TL, although there is a wish to coin a new word.

Professional translators should be aware of the various linguistic means to fill the above linguistic lacunae. The available linguistic tools as pointed out by Veisbergs (2005b) include the following:

1) to use a borrowing,
2) to use calques,
3) to coin a neologism—either of native, international or semi-international origin,
4) to replace the unfamiliar cultural realia with familiar ones.

To conclude, the development of Latvian (alongside translation) within the EU context has demonstrated its openness. Due to modern information technologies almost every Latvian has the possibility to participate in the creation of a domestic

information space (Baldunčiks 2005, 56). Moreover, Latvian has been provided with both the possibility and mechanisms to develop, the latter being the EU translation system (Veisbergs 2005b).

GUIDELINES FOR TRANSLATORS

Translation in itself is just one stage in a multi-stage system of the translation process within the EU context, which also includes term creation and editing processes (Lejasisaka, Vancāne 2008). To solve initial problems, eliminate drawbacks and improve the quality of translations, a number of guidelines and translators' manuals have been published in Latvia by the Translation and Terminology Centre (TTC) (2000, 2004, 2005, 2006) based on the experience of the EC Translation Service, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Finland, the Canadian Translation Agency, Swedish and Estonian Legal Translation Centres.

These guidelines focus on two main translation issues: the translator's relationship with the ST and compliance of TT to the norms of the Latvian language. However, they are disseminated only among narrower professional circles and thus are not available for wider public, although they would be helpful for all interested in translation, especially for students.

The translator's relationship with the source text

As has been stated above, translators have to be language-conscious. Language-consciousness includes a variety of factors, one of them being the translator's relationship with the ST.

Firstly, translators have to be aware of the variety of source texts—both in language structure and style. However, for many translators the ST has turned into a 'double-edged sword'. On the one hand, the EU context requires a precise, equivalent translation of the ST—neither extending nor narrowing its sense and meaning. On the other hand, no direct equivalence between English and Latvian is possible. Moreover, quite often translators have been unable 'to fight this sword'—they hold too tightly to the ST. As a result, translations become even more imprecise and ambiguous. This is why the authors of the guidelines and manuals from the TTC (2000; 2004; etc.) encourage translators not to be afraid of formal differences between the ST and its translation.

Consistency in translation of both terms and similar language structures is another 'stumbling stone' for translators. Translators are reminded that in order '*to reach unity of the translation process and style, sentences and phrases of similar structure and meaning have to be translated identically*' ('*Lai panāktu tulkošanas procesa un stila vienotību, arī līdzīgas struktūras un nozīmes teikumus un frāzes jācenšas tulkot vienādi*') (TTC 2007, 7). To meet the above requirement, TTC has set forth certain translation standards

and published a number of manuals for translators containing a variety of standardised translations of commonly used phrases and expressions within the EU context.

Compliance with language norms

A combination of new linguistic conditions—SL interference, fear of deviation from the ST resulting in word-for-word translation—has led to a breach of established norms in the Latvian language. '*The uncontrolled invasion of anglicisms*' ('*nekontrolējama anglicismu invāzija*') (Ūdris 2005, 143) seemed set to cause misunderstanding among language users of different generations. To stop the further perpetuation of poor translation practice, guidelines and manuals remind translators of the very basic '*ABC*' (Ūdris 2005, 143) of Latvian—a must for any translator.

The guidelines and manuals include a wide spectrum of Latvian language norms: what should be the attitude towards foreign words, how to translate proper names (both personal and geographical), how to translate English adjectives into Latvian, how to treat numbers and measurements, abbreviations and acronyms in translations, etc. The differences between English and Latvian written practices determine other spelling and punctuation rules. Last but not least, the guidelines and manuals highlight common syntactic translation errors: sentence structure, grammar forms, use of verb tenses, a correct use of the number of nouns, case forms with prepositions, sequence of tenses and the oblique moods and many other language norms.

CONCLUSIONS

It can be argued that, at present, translation within the EU context has grown out of its infancy and has entered the stage of adolescence. However, translation is clearly not only the 'business' of translators. The development and maturity of translation practice is closely intertwined with domestic language policy and terminology.

It has to be admitted that a huge leap has been made since the early days of translation work within the EU context; the processes of both term creation and term standardisation as well as translation itself have made significant advancements. Translators are now supported by a vast range of translation tools: glossaries, dictionaries, databases, translation software, etc. Language policy-makers in Latvia today are not as sceptical about the EU's language processes as they used to be (Druviete 2010a, 170). Indeed, they strongly maintain that translation within the EU and its institutions is a must for further development of the Latvian language (*ibid.*, 173).

To this end, they call upon the government not to permit any stagnation or arbitrariness in the field of translation. Moreover, they demand that more attention should be paid to translators' training and practical work. Furthermore, the level of translators' responsibility should be raised; no 'Brussels variant' of the Latvian language

is admissible. The organization of terminology work should correspond to modern requirements (Druviete 2010a, 174).

Having studied, analysed and described the problem areas of translation within the EU context contained in publications between 2005–2010, the author of the paper draws the following conslusions:

1) translation within the EU context presents a unique experience in translation practices into Latvian;

2) translators have significantly contributed to the enrichment of the Latvian language;

3) translators have accumulated specific knowledge that can be useful and reliable in term creation;

4) a translator's proficiency can never be complete—it requires continuous upgrading;

language/translation students must become language-conscious professionals: indifference will not bring satisfactory results.

Finally, the author is aware of the somewhat patchy character of her paper. Any of the problems analysed herein are perhaps worthy of further, more detailed research. The author would like to express her awareness that, akin to a translator's proficiency, research into translation can never be complete.

References

Baldunčiks J. 2005. Tulkotāja viltusdraugu problēma: no vārdiem pie darbiem. *Vārds un tā lietojums: rakstu krājums*, 56–64.

Brēde M. 2005. Tulkojuma caurspīdīgums. *Latviešu valoda – robežu paplašināšana: raksti, 1. sēj*. Rīga: Valsts valodas komisija, 19–30.

Broka V. 1999. Problems of the Translation of 'Euroterms' into Latvian. *Interpreting and Translation as Intercultural Communication: Theory, Practice, Instruction Methods*: *Proceedings*. Ventspils: Ventspils University College, 102–106.

Druviete I. 2010a. Latvijas valodas politikas pamatnostādnes Eiropas Savienības kontekstā. *Skatījums. Valoda, sabiedrība, politika: rakstu krājums.* Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 167–176.

Druviete I. 2010b. Mūsu valoda – Latvijas vai Eiropas Savienības identitātes daļa? *Skatījums. Valoda, sabiedrība, politika: rakstu krājums.* Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 156–160.

Graustiņa M. 1999. Translation Practices: A Translator's View. *Interpreting and Translation as Intercultural Communication: Theory, Practice, Instruction Methods*: *Proceedings*. Ventspils: Ventspils University College, 107–110.

Lejasisaka I., Vancāne I. 2008. Juridiskā tulkošana Latvijā Eiropas intergrācijas kontekstā: tulkošanas un terminoloģijas centra prakse. *Valoda. Tulkošana. Starpkultūru komunikācija: zinātniski raksti.* Ventspils: VeA, 147–157.

TTC. 2000. *Translation Handbook for Latvian Legislation.* Riga: Translation and Terminology Centre.

TTC. 2004. *Tiesību aktu tulkošanas rokasgrāmata.* Eiropas Savienības tiesību akti, NATO dokumenti. Rīga: Tulkošanas un terminoloģijas centrs.

TTC. 2007. *Vispārēji norādījumi latviešu tulkotājiem* Rīga: TTC, 1–10.

Ūdris P. 2005. Dažu tulkošanas ābeces jautājumu aktualizēšana. *Latviešu valoda – robežu paplašināšana: raksti* 1. sēj. Rīga: Valsts valodas komisija, 143–170.

Veisbergs A. 2008. East Wind, West Wind in Translation (What the English Tsunami Has Brought to Latvian). *Vārds un tā pētīšanas aspekti: Rakstu krājums* 12. Liepāja: LiepU, 148–168.

Veisbergs A. 1999. Language Contacts, Translation, their Impact on Modern Latvian. *Interpreting and Translation as Intercultural Communication: Theory, Practice, Instruction Methods*: *Proceedings.* Ventspils: Ventspils University College, 67–74.

Veisbergs A. 2005a. Latviešu valoda un Eiropas Savienības medaļas divas puses. *Valodas prakse: Vērojumi un ieteikumi: populārzinātnisku rakstu krājums* 1. Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 11–18.

Veisbergs A. 2006. Pūrisms un latviešu valoda. *Valodas prakse: Vērojumi un ieteikumi: populārzinātnisku rakstu krājums* 2. Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 24–36.

Veisbergs A. 2005b. Tulkojumspiediens – guvums vai apdraudējums? *Latviešu valoda – robežu paplašināšana: raksti* 1. sēj. Rīga: Valsts valodas komisija, 187–201.

VERTIMO PROBLEMOS ES KONTEKSTE

Indra Grietēna

Santrauka

Latvių kalbai tapus viena iš oficialiųjų ES kalbų, jos naujasis teisinis statusas ne tik lėmė padidėjusį vertimų kiekį, bet ir paskatino atsirasti gausesnes *mokslines* vertimo studijas, kurių rezultatai skelbiami įvairiuose Latvijos vertimo problemų tyrinėtojų ir vertėjų praktikų straipsniuose. Šiame straipsnyje pateikiama šių tyrimų apžvalga, analizuojamos jų išvados, kuriose vienaip ar kitaip aptariama, kaip latvių kalbą veikia šalies narystė ES ir ES dokumentų vertimuose vartojama kalba. Nagrinėti autoriai sutaria, kad vertimas visada veikia kalbą, į kurią tekstas verčiamas, ir kad būtent per vertimą patiriamas teigiamas ar neigiamas ES konteksto poveikis. Kadangi dažniausiai verčiama iš anglų kalbos, be to, anglų kalba dominuoja ir kitose žmonių bendravimo srityse, latvių kalboje yra daugiausia skolinių iš anglų kalbos. Analizuodami anglų kalbos poveikį latvių kalbai įvairūs autoriai straipsniuose aptaria tiesioginę anglų kalbos įtaką latvių kalbai ir rekomendacijas vertėjams, kaip jos išvengti.

Aptarusi įvairiuose straipsniuose nagrinėjamas temas, autorė daro tokias išvadas: ES kontekstas leidžia latvių kalbai vystytis ir tobulėti įvairiose srityse kaip niekada seniau: vertėjai daug prisidėjo turtindami latvių kalbą, sukaupė didelę patirtį ir įgijo daug žinių, kuriomis galima pasinaudoti kuriant latvišką terminologiją ir vystant administracinę kalbą, tačiau vertėjams reikia nuolatos kelti kvalifikaciją ir tobulėti, o vertėjo profesiją pasirinkusiems studentams reikia skiepyti kalbos profesionalo savivoką.