

UNIVERSITY OF VAASA

Faculty of Philosophy  
English Studies

Veera Kortman

Translation Quality Through Error Analysis  
Translation Quality Assessment of the Finnish Translations of Four English  
Environmental Articles in the EU

Master's Thesis  
Vaasa 2017

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES	3
ABSTRACT	4
1 INTRODUCTION	5
1.1 Material	9
1.2 Method	11
2 TRANSLATION INDUSTRY IN THE EU	14
2.1 Toward the quality in EU translation	17
2.2 Typical problems in translating English EU texts into Finnish	18
2.2.1. Skopos theory and translation quality	25
2.3. LSP (Language for special purposes)	29
2.3.1 LSP translation	30
3. ASSESING TRANSLATION QUALITY	35
4 ERROR ANALYSIS OF FOUR ENGLISH EU ARTICLES AND THEIR FINNISH TRANSLATIONS	38
4.1 Text profiles	39
4.2 Wrong translations	41
4.3 Not translated	45
4.4 Deficiencies in translation	46
4.5 Creative translation	48
4.6 Breach of the target language system	49
WORKS CITED	61

## TABLES

Table 1. Finnish translator's work related contacts	24
Table 2. Wrong translation	46
Table 3. Decifiencies in translation	49
Table 4. Creative translation	51
Table 5. Breach of the target language system	59
Table 6. Total of errors identified in each translation	62

**UNIVERSITY OF VAASA****Faculty of Philosophy**

<b>Discipline:</b>	English Studies
<b>Author:</b>	Veera Kortman
<b>Master's Thesis:</b>	Translation Quality Through Error Analysis Translation Quality Assessment of the Finnish Translations of Four English Environmental Articles in the EU
<b>Degree:</b>	Master of Arts in English
<b>Date:</b>	2017
<b>Supervisor:</b>	Anu Heino

---

**ABSTRACT**

Tämän tutkielman kohteena on neljän englanninkielisen EU-artikkelin suomenkieliset käännökset, joiden laatua tutkitaan Julian Housen käännöksen laadun arvioimismenetelmällä. Tutkielman aineiston artikkelit ovat peräisin Euroopan Komission internetsivustolta, ja ne ovat aiheiltaan ympäristökeskeisiä, ja sisällöltään informatiivisia. Artikkeleiden käännöksille on annettu otsikot ”Eläinten hyvinvointi”, ”Tulvat”, ”Kaupunkitutkimus” sekä ”Meritieteet”. Tutkielma tähtää erittelemään käännöksistä löytyvät virheet sekä näiden pohjalta arvioimaan käännösten laatua.

Käännösten laadun arviointi Julian Housen menetelmän mukaan toteutetaan etsimällä mahdollisia virheitä kohdetekstistä vertaamalla kohdetekstiä sen lähtötekstiin, jolloin ensimmäisenä luodaan molemmista teksteistä tekstiprofiilit, jonka jälkeen kohdetekstin virheitä haetaan seuraavien piirteiden perusteella: 1) Väärä käännös (alkuperäinen tarkoitus on muuttunut), 2) Ei käännetty (joitakin lähtötekstin sanoja tai ilmauksia ei ole käännetty johtuen huolimattomuudesta, tai siitä, ettei sopivaa käännöstä ole löydetty), 3) Puutteellinen käännös (ei täysin lähtötekstiä vastaava, mutta alkuperäisen merkityksen muuntuma ei ole erityisen vakava), 4) Luova käännös (vapaasti käännetty sana tai ilmaus, jossa kääntäjä on lisännyt tarpeettomia sanoja), 5) Kohdekielen säännöistä poikkeaminen (kohdekielen kieliopin normien noudattamatta jättäminen).

Hypoteesi koskien tutkimusta oli kaksiosainen. Oletuksena oli, että suurin osa virheistä olisi vääriä käännöksiä. Tämä osoittautui vääräksi, sillä eniten virheitä aiheutui kohdekielen säännöistä poikkeamisen takia. Hypoteesin toinen osa oli, että teksteissä esiintyisi vain vähän virheitä, koska artikkelit ovat tuotettu korkeatasoisen käännösyksikössä Euroopan Komissiossa. Tämä piti osittain paikkansa, sillä esimerkiksi artikkeli ”Meritieteet” sisälsi vain kolme virhettä. Kuitenkin kolme muuta artikkelia sisälsivät kuusi tai useampia virheitä, eli näiden käännösten laatu olisi voinut olla parannettavissa.

---

**KEYWORDS** EU-translation, Institutional Translation, Quality Assessment



## 1 INTRODUCTION

Today, translations are often produced in institutional environments such as the European Union, European Commission or the United Nations. These institutions like many others are multilingual and this affects the way translations are made and, in consequence, any research into them. Multilingualism is linked to the fact that not all aspects or topics of the publications are seen in all parts of the world, yet still they are translated. This should be noticed when researching the translations. As society is also becoming more and more hybridized and multicultural it is important to pay attention to the quality of the translations of, for example, the material from the European Commission. (Koskinen 2008:2) The quality of the translations has an impact on how the readers understand and receive new information coming from the Commission and how they can use it. The translations are made following the guidelines of the translating institution and because of the official nature of the institution the publications carry authority and performative power (Koskinen 2008: 2).

According to Koskinen (2008: 4) theoretical discussion of institutional translating is somewhat rare, even though the translating institutions have a long history and both writing and translating first took place in institutional settings. Even today, growing globalization, co-operation in the area of business and other work related contacts, contacts between cultures in all aspects of life etc. tell us that institutional translating is increasing and the need for it is real. In the late 1980's, Brian Mossop (Koskinen 2008: 4) raised the question of institutional translation and the need for an institutional approach towards it and since then there had been growing interest in translating in different type of institutional context such as the European Union and European Commission. Still, little more than articles and practitioner's own reflections on their work have been available on the subject.

The European Union (EU) is a democratic federation of 27 nations and over 500 million people, and it was founded in 1993. The mission of the EU is to unite the nations of Europe and, at the same time, respect their cultural and linguistic diversity. Since its

inception, Europe has developed fast at various levels. It has integrated national currencies and taxes and has established a common body of law, the *acquis communautaire*. Still, no such ‘integration’ has occurred with respect to language, which is explained by the fact that the founding fathers of the EU, the authors of the Treaties of Rome, recognised right from the beginning the importance of language as the bearer of the cultural identity of a people. On April the 15 in 1958 the EU agreed on a policy of multilingualism. (Sosoni 2011) In other words, the founders adopted Council Regulation which guarantees that the official languages of all member states are both official and working languages of the EU institutions and they are all equal. Thus, the EU currently uses 23 languages, from the official languages of its 27 member states. The reason for that is related to the EU’s nature, the aim for unity in diversity (Sosoni 2011).

The aspect of multilingualism in the EU is important because the decisions and legislation affect directly the lives of its citizens (Koskinen 2008: 44). This is why the decisions and laws must be translated into all the member states’ official languages. The citizens must have the right and the access to read and understand what have been legislated and discussed about in the institution. Not all translated text are laws, but also articles of different subjects are published and translated for everyone to read.

Since EU texts are treated as LSP (language for special purposes) texts, translating them requires special knowledge about LSP translation, EU texts and the EU. At first, LSP research dealt with lexicological items because subject specialists and LSP experts agreed with each other that it is the terminology which is very characteristic of LSP. The notions ‘LSP’ and ‘Terminology of LSP’ have been used as synonyms for a certain time. Later, investigations in the field have showed that the essence of LSP could not be explained only by lexical means. LSP research started shifting more and more to syntax. Syntactical features of LSP were dealt with on three levels: syntagmas, phrases and sentences. It soon became evident that a more comprehensive description of all those language means could only be realised sufficient on the *text* level. As a result, the main interest moved from the structural view of language system to a complex view of all levels of communication. The integration of the language system into the analysis of the

communicative process and the social interaction has made it possible to notice and study various number of aspects of the complexity of communication processes. (Brekke, Andersen, Dahl & Myking 1994: 2)

In science and technology, as well as in most areas in translation, target texts are expected to sound natural and idiomatic so that they seem originals to the reader. On closer inspection, the assessment of how natural an LSP translation sounds is often linked with the quality of translation and especially the terminology. The terminology consists of compound terms, technical vocabulary and specialised phraseology. Still, corpus analysis has shown that in these texts, too, the most frequent words are mainly general-language words. The naturalness of LSP translations derives from a blend of different elements, as well as lexical and syntactic, but also stylistic conventions. (Lauren & Nordman 1987: 265)

As stated in the previous paragraph, one key notion which is closely tied to the translation of EU texts and which contributes to its idiosyncrasy is quality. The European Commission as well as The European Parliament claims that ensuring quality is not only its main concern but also its duty as part of the European Public Service (European Commission 2009).

In this thesis I will study the translation quality of four English EU article's Finnish translations from the European Commission webpage using the model of Translation quality assessment by Juliane House. The main concern of Translation quality assessment (henceforth TQA) approaches and the current study is whether the translation is good or poor. This is examined by identifying the dimensional mismatches and non-dimensional mismatches. The latter consists of both mismatches of the denotative meaning of source text and target text elements and breaches of the target language system. (House 1997: 2) These two types of non-dimensional mismatches are in five different categories: 1. wrong translation, 2. not translated, 3. deficiencies in translation, 4. creative translation and 5. breach of the target language system. The dimensional mismatches are examined by source text and target text profiles. According to House (1977: 1) the textual profile characterizes the function of the text. The Error

categories and text profile details will be explained more closely in the method part, following the material. Target text and source text as terms will be referred as ST and TT in study, especially in the analysis part (chapter 4). As pointed out earlier, language for special purposes include specialized terminology and vocabulary, but, still, the most frequent words are of general language. It is interesting to study what type of words or phrases will be the ones that have not been translated successfully from English into Finnish in my material. This can be treated as useful information, so that translators could pay special attention to these aspects in the future.

House (1977: 11) presents ways how translation quality was previously tested and measured. She mentions Nida and Taber (cited in House 1977: 11) who have suggested a practical test in which “the degree of comprehensibility of a text is related to its degree of predictability.” In this type of test the reader is provided with a translation text in which, for example, every fifth word is deleted. The more the reader can fill in the gaps the easier the text is to comprehend because its predictability is high. This test is criticized because it provides only a relative yardstick. No such thing as a ‘norm of comprehension’ exists. Another practical test from Nida and Taber mentioned by House (1977: 12) suggest the elicitation of respondents’ reactions to several translation alternatives. Sentences are presented to respondents in two or more different forms and questions such as “Which is plainer?” and so on are asked. This type of test compares several translations but does not evaluate the translation against its source text, nor does the previous one. One may present respondents with several “inadequate” translations and never establish true criteria for their quality because of the non-inclusion of the original as a yardstick for quality. House, in turn, has taken the original text into account in her model of translation quality assessment. This is the main reason why her model is suitable for evaluating the quality of translation. For House (1977: 31) translating is a linguistic procedure aiming to produce a replacement of a text in the source language by a semantically and pragmatically equivalent text in the target language, that is, at functional equivalence on the text level. Functional equivalence can be treated as a measurement for good translation (House 1977: 32).

Oittinen and Mäkinen (2004: 123) state that the quality of EU translations were broadly criticised especially during the first years of Finland's EU membership and such 'Eurospeak' has even been seen as a threat for Finnish language in the fields of law and administration. In 1996 The Finnish Ministry of Education made a wide report concerning the EU translation in Finland and its problems. Many different issues were considered to be causing problems. For example too strict faithfulness to the source texts syntax caused sentences which did not sound like fluent and natural Finnish. This is something which the present study aims to examine as well, as pointed out earlier by mentioning the interest in House's model for the denotative mismatches. Suomen kielen lautakunta (Board of the Finnish language) (Kotus 2015) has stated that in order to produce understandable translations the source texts should also be easier to understand. When voting about the constitution of European Union, understandability rose up in the discussion.

The material and the method will be presented in detail in the following part of the introduction. The second chapter concentrates on the industry of EU translation, LSP and LSP translation. In chapter three I will discuss translation quality assessment. Chapter four consists of the analysis and the conclusions will be discussed in chapter five.

## 1.1 Material

As my primary material I have used four environmental English EU articles and their Finnish translations. The articles can be found in the official website of the European Commission (Ec.europa.eu) from the section called 'Research'. In that section there are articles with eight different themes; 'Research policy', 'Environment', 'Medicine and health', 'Energy', 'Research and society', 'Transport', 'Industrial technology' and 'Marie Curie'. Each of these themes consists of several articles. The articles chosen for the current study are from the theme 'Environment', and I have chosen to study the four latest of them and their Finnish translations; 'Animal Welfare – Eläinten hyvinvointi', 'Floods - Tulvat', 'Marine Sciences - Meritieteeet' and 'Urban research - Kaupunkitutkimus'. All of the articles are available in all EU languages as well. I

choose to study four articles because I assumed that it is an appropriate number to do comparing between the errors found in each article.

These articles aim to provide information on the members, duties and organizations of the European Commission, information on the coverage of EU affairs and access to public policy consultations. The articles on the webpage contain information about issues of the current interest in the field of environment. The members of the European Commission form a large group and it includes people from various fields of profession. In consequence, the language in the articles should be intelligible to a common reader, but it should still maintain the professional aspect which includes, for example, the use of specialized terminology. This is the case both with the source texts and the translations. The language in the articles is formal, yet understandable but there are numerous terms and phrases which may cause difficulties for some readers and, maybe for the translator. Another problem-causing aspect in the source texts is long and complex sentences, which can be difficult to translate into Finnish because of the different syntax between the two languages.

It is useful for the translator to think about the nature of a text so that the translation would meet the expectations of the reader. House (1977: 56) divides translation into overt and covert translation. An overt translation would be for example a political speech or a literary text because these text types are usually linked to the source language. Covert translations are for example commercial texts, scientific texts and such text types which usually exist only or primarily as target language texts. House calls this type of translation covert because 'it is not marked pragmatically as a translated text of a source text but may, conceivably, have been created in its own right'. (House 1977: 193) The translations studied in this thesis are covert translations because my material, the EU articles, are scientific texts and they obey this rule by House in which covert translations should read like an original text.

## 1.2 Method

Juliane House's method 'Translation quality assessment' will be applied in the present study to examine the translation quality of four English EU articles' Finnish translations. House's method reflects the more target-audience-oriented notion of translation appropriateness as fundamentally misguided, and for this reason, she bases her model on comparative ST-TT analysis, leading to the assessment of the quality of the translation, highlighting 'mismatches' or 'errors'. According to House (1977), "If a TT, in order to be adequate, have to fulfill the requirement of a dimensional, and as a result of this, a functional match, then any mismatch along the dimensions is an error".

The main interest of this study has been to find out about the quality of the translations by examining the possible errors in them. Koskinen states that there are no strict rules for translation strategies in The European Commission but some issues are still considered to be important when translating. This was determined by a survey among the Finnish translators in the Commission. (Koskinen 2008: 102—103) The seven most important factors, regarded as important in choosing the translation strategy consisted of "1) producing a fluent and readable text, 2) making sure that the content is equivalent to that of the source text, 3) keeping to the schedule, 4) adapting the text for the Finnish readers, 5) using correct language following established formulas and 6) renewing the textual practices used in the Commission". The factors are presented in the order of importance. According to Koskinen (Koskinen 2008: 103), the first two items of the list illustrate the double tie present in all translation: there is a need *to reach towards the target text readers* (readability) and *to remain faithful to the source text*. If this is the aim in EU translation, one can but wonder why there have been so many complaints, for example, in the media of poor quality and unintelligibility of the translations.

According to House (1977: 29), the essence of translation is the preservation of meaning across the language and that there are three aspects to it; semantic, pragmatic and textual. House states that translation is a replacement of a text in the source language by a semantically and pragmatically equivalent text in the target language. In translation quality assessment the aim is to find two types of mismatches between the

source text and the target text; overtly erroneous errors and covertly erroneous errors. Covertly erroneous errors are the ones concerning the non-dimensional mismatches and overtly erroneous errors both mismatches of the denotative meaning of ST and TT elements and breaches from the target language system. The former is divided into five different categories: 1. wrong translation (mistakes which influence total distortion of meaning) 2. not translated (words or expression which are not translated either because of translator's negligence or incompetence) 3. deficiencies of translation (partial transference of meaning, or not completely faithful to the source text) 4. creative translation (the translator has added information) 5. breach of the target language system (the translator is deviating from the target language norms). Covertly erroneous errors can be discovered by first drawing up and then comparing the source and the target text profiles. It is made by identifying the genre and register which are supposed to capture the linguistic and situational features of both the source and target text. Register is further divided into field, tenor and mode which correlate with lexical syntactical and textual features. Field refers to the subject matter and social action. Tenor covers the addresser's personal viewpoint (intellectual, affective or social) and temporal and social provenance. Social attitude refers to formal, neutral or informal style. Mode relates to the channel; simple (written to be read) or complex (written to be spoken). Participation can be simple (no addressee built into the text) or complex (various addressees). These profiles as well as the errors in five different groups are to be seen in chapter four. (House 1977: 39–42)

This study was conducted by following House's model of translation quality assessment. First, the profiles of the source text and the target text were drawn and the possible mismatches in them were examined. Then the four English EU articles and their Finnish translations were read and the ST and the TT were compared and examined to find out whether there were any mismatches. After this the errors found in the target text were categorized into five groups of 1) wrong translation, 2) not translated, 3) deficiencies of translation, 4) creative translation and 5) breach of target language system. Finally the errors were listed in tables and some conclusions could be made.

By examining the mismatches between the source text and the target text it is possible to define the quality of a translation, according to House's model. If not many errors are found, the quality is regarded as good and vice versa. Conducting a study by using the method devised by Juliane House is very straightforward because the researcher is only looking at the end product and the conclusions are drawn from that. This is an advantage because the researcher cannot know about the reasons behind the translator's choices without interviewing the person. However I have introduced some speculation on the reasons based on Kaisa Koskinen's information previously in this study.

The purpose of this thesis has been to analyse the quality of four environmental EU articles translations by using House's model of translation quality assessment. My assumptive hypothesis is that only minor mistakes will be found in the translations because translating the material used in this study requires professionalism in the field of LSP and so does EU translation in general. Most errors are found in translating terminology because as mentioned previously translating terms often cause problems in translations. Because this study does not have a specific category just for errors in terminology, the researcher must notice him/herself when a terminological aspect is in question. Considering the current study, if there is a single term which is found translated unsuccessfully/wrong it will fall into the category of 'Wrong translations'. This is because the translation quality assessment by House uses this categorization and does not have a specific category only for terms.

## 2 TRANSLATION INDUSTRY IN THE EU

According to Wagner et al. (2002: 12) the need for certainty as to the law is the first reason why translation plays such a large part in the activities of the European institutions. The translators working for the EU are translating various different types of documents and articles, but not everything is translated to all official languages. However all laws and many outgoing documents have to be translated into all languages, because they are of general application and have to be published.

Translating for the European Commission requires professionalism and knowledge about the topic of the translation. In translation studies, it is commonly known that the working conditions play a large role in the case of how good or bad the translation quality is or is going to be. The European Commission is located in Brussels and Luxemburg as well as in several other locations throughout Europe. It has approximately 1300 in-house translators, two thirds in Brussels and one third in Luxembourg. The Commission's Translation Service has small field offices (two translators) in most European capitals, attached to the Commission's Representation there. In addition, the translation service sends about 20% of its translation work to freelance translators and agencies. Freelancers must complete the formalities of preparing formal tenders and collecting the necessary documentation to work for the EU. The EU staff translators take part in the open competitive examinations before becoming translators. (Wagner, Bech & Martinez 2002: 17)

The Finnish translation unit is situated in Luxembourg and there are 28 Finnish employees. While Finnish is a small language in the context of the EU institutions, EU translators are not a small issue in the Finnish context. Since the European Union was founded, it has had a great impact on the job markets of Finnish translators and interpreters, not only for in-house translators and interpreters but also for numerous freelancers. (Koskinen 2008: 5) The translation scholar Kaisa Koskinen has worked in the EU Commission as a translator and describes the atmosphere in the Finnish unit as almost totally silent, and although the pace of work is slow, people do not gather in hallways or in the library room to chat. "Everyone pops in [the library] to read the

newspaper and tiptoes back to their room.” Translation is often considered as a feminine profession. Against this, the gender distribution in the Finnish unit in 2008 was fairly even. Of the 23 translators, 16 plus the head of unit and all the assistant staff were women, while 7 were men. (Koskinen 2008: 74)

Translating for The EU can be considered as ‘institutional translation’ and there have been many definitions for that over the years. Brian Mossop (quoted in Koskinen 2008: 26) claims that translating institutions include companies, governments, newspaper, churches, literary publishers and what he calls for is an ‘institutional’ understanding of the translation process. This approach assumes that translators make conscious choices to adapt their translations in the sense of making the translation serve the purpose of the translating institution, not as individuals. Kaisa Koskinen (2008: 28) makes some additional amendments. She states that the translators’ choices are not always conscious and points out that while it is rare to find translations that are produced outside any institution, the level and degree of institutionalization differs. Koskinen’s definition thus is that institutional translation is concerned when translating is dealing with an official body such as multilingual organization, government agency, etc. which uses the translation as a means of ‘speaking’ to a particular audience. Thus, in institutional translation, the voice is to be heard is of the translating institution.

Sosoni states (2011) in her article that high standards are seen important in the translation of EU texts by in-house members of staff but by external contractors as well. The translators can be asked to translate texts which can vary from legal texts to almost any sort of internal information or limited topics for the general public. Some of the texts can have political, legal or financial aims, so the translations should be as accurate as possible. Other texts aim at explaining the European project to the general public in the EU's 27 member states.

As was mentioned many of the texts EU translators are translating are ‘quasi-legal’, which means that they refer to EU legislation, or they use the same terminology. Still, large number of translations are also intended for general readership, and the texts written in an attempt to promote European integration and the work of the EU

institutions. Moreover, these documents can include demanding terminology. Often the translations are produced by outside contractors, because it is generally assumed that the staff translators are too busy. According to the staff translators, these translations are not always successful. (Wagner et al. 2002: 64)

An issue which causes problems for EU translators is often the incompetent information about the purpose of the translation. The translators understand the need to translate differently for different types of reader, but they also need the information about the purpose of the translation and the target readers. According to the EU staff translators the translation requesters often do not understand this, because they are not familiar with the document. For this reason, the translators do not always know who the reader will be. Also the poor quality and excessive length of some of the texts complicates translators work. Often the texts are produced by authors with varying writing skills, but in most cases the authors are unidentifiable: the texts are collectively produced with disparate input from various sources, in the process of consensus formation and political compromise. (Wagner et al. 2002: 69)

Riitta Oittinen and Pirjo Mäkinen have written about translation in general and in their book 'Alussa oli käännös' they deal also with EU translation. They state that during the years that Finland has been a member of the EU, there has been discussion about the fact that people think that the translation does not meet the requirements of the target language and the target culture. (Oittinen & Mäkinen 2004: 109) EU translation differs from other translation in the way that the source culture is a hybrid culture, a mixture of many cultures. EU translation can be either intercultural or intracultural depending on the situation and to whom the texts are targeted. They can be targeted to be read inside the union or in the member states. They can also be targeted to either officials of the EU or to the citizens of EU. Jyrki Lappi Seppälä from the Finnish translation service in the European Commission has said that the translations cannot be adapted to the target cultures because juridically documents are not translations but 'side versions' of the originals. This is why equivalence plays such a major role in EU translation. (Oittinen & Mäkinen 2004: 113)

An organization like the EU uses its own terminology and its own way of expressing things. (Oittinen&Mäkinen 2004: 114) Thus translating the terminology requires knowledge about the structure and history of EU. It is also expected that the readers of EU texts know about the terminology. Usually the terms are not explained in the articles or in the translations.

## 2.1 Toward the quality in EU translation

Vilelmina Sosoni (2011) has studied the quality of EU translation. She states that a clear definition to quality has not been provided but points out that the Commission's DGT has published a *Guide for External Translators* which comments on the quality requirements. The guide includes following requirements; "all specific instructions from the requesting department are followed, the delivered target text is followed (no omissions nor additions are permitted), the target text is faithful, accurate and consistent translation of the source text, references to documents already published have been checked and quoted correctly, the terminology and lexis used throughout the text, sufficient attention has been paid to the clarity and register of the text, the target text contains no syntactical, spelling, punctuation, typographical or other grammatical errors, the formatting of the original has been maintained and the agreed deadline is met". (Sosoni 2011)

According to Koskinen (2008: 24) the language in translation is heavily controlled in The European Commission. Translation is not a personal act but a collective process and the translated text belongs to the institution, not to the translator. In this sense, institutional translation differs from, for example, from literary contexts, when authors self-translate their own work, the translated text is not considered less authentic. In institutional translation it is often important to notice that the different versions of a particular document are equivalent and equally authentic.

Sosoni (2011) states that it is natural that the client demands that the translation is carried out in accordance with the instructions, that it is delivered on time and that it does not contain any type of grammatical errors. According to her, some of the other

requirements are not straight-forward and need to be discussed separately. Sosoni claims that the requirements by the DGT which specify that the delivered translation, that is, the target text is complete, without any omissions or additions, and is faithful to the source text set particular restrictions to translators. That is because the target language and culture deviate from the source language and culture. Translators need to produce texts which are ‘appropriate’ for a particular communicative situation even if it does not obey the target language and culture norms and rules. (Sosoni 2011) Still, it is in contradiction with House’s Translation Quality Assessment; every breach of the target language system is a mismatch.

## 2.2 Typical problems in translating English EU texts into Finnish

There can be number of various kinds of mistranslations in translations of EU texts. Some of which might be visible in all translation but some distinctive in specifically EU translation. According to Kaisa Koskinen (Koskinen 2008: 132), some of them are pure slips, perhaps caused by lack of time. Others were misunderstandings which could have been caused by unfamiliarity with the field. The repeated translation of ‘community’ as ‘kunta’, for example, caused unintelligibility to one translation. Koskinen (2008: 132) states that the mistake caused a significant change on the meaning of the source text. This is what I am also trying to study in this thesis and see if this is the case in my material as well.

Koskinen (2008: 133) points out issues which are causing problems to EU translators. These issues may have an impact on the quality of translation. She states that source texts are not usually easy. They contain for example long noun phrases, with long chains of genitive modifiers and these reduce readability. The next example shows this type of sentence in one of the source texts in the material of this study, in article ‘Floods’.

- (1) **ST** As was demonstrated so clearly in the summer of 2002, floods wreak havoc – they are a menace to public safety, disrupt people’s daily lives, threaten our cultural heritage, and inflict enormous economic and environmental losses.

This is an example of a long noun phrase. It demands the translator to pay certain attention to the fact of which word is defining which.

Often English source texts have different types of modifiers in the sentences. But whereas the English text alternates between pre- and post-modifiers, and adds rhythm and emphasis to the text with the help of sentential adverb and commas ('in principle'), the Finnish opts exclusively for pre-modifiers and has a tendency towards nominalized head nouns. These long chains of modifiers have been identified as typical feature of Finnish translations of EU texts. (Koskinen 2008: 134) Koskinen states that noun phrases are seen as a means of standardizing the ideational contents and as a result, speculations, presuppositions and contested views all appear to be naturalized. Other common features in both EU texts and the Finnish translations are the extensive use of passive voice, neologisms, fixed phrases and terms. (Koskinen 2008: 134)

EU texts are often LSP (language for special purposes) text and when translating LSP terminological accuracy is of utmost importance, which naturally is one of the DGT's quality requirements as well. According to Koskinen (Koskinen 2008) it is very common to have 'document chains' in the sense that each document is anticipated for (or regulated) in previous documents, and it in turn paves the way to new documents taking the issue further. Also Sosoni (Sosoni 2011) states that terminology is linked with intertextuality. When a source text (text A) makes a reference to another already translated text (text B), the terminology to be used in the target text (text C) should be the one used in text B. This can be demanding for translators as the whole process must be started with doing a research of the texts connecting to each other.

EU texts are produced in a multilingual and multicultural environment and among other things aim at expressing new concepts. These are terms which are produced to describe something which has not occurred before, or does not have terms yet. All of these concepts need to be translated in all the official languages of the EU. This is conducted primarily with 'Eurospeak'. Eurospeak is often said to be complicated and hard to understand, especially among non-professionals. (Sosoni 2011) Wagner (Wagner et al. 2002: 28) points out that it is a useful language to describe EU inventions and concepts

which have no exact parallel at the national level. Eurospeak is characterized by neologism and borrowings. Neologism is a newly coined term, word, or phrase that may be in the process of entering common use, but has not yet been accepted into mainstream language. Sosoni (Sosoni 2011) argues that Eurospeak also causes problems to translators, because they are the first ones who should understand the concepts behind the terms. This requires knowledge about the EU history and law. New concepts can appear every day and some of these are difficult to express in different languages because they are so culture-specific and they might not even appear in the target language. Despite of that they must be translated. In these situations is it common for translator to explain terminology in the text. (Sosoni 2011)

EU translations sometimes show added readability. Complex sentences are cut into two, deictic expressions and references to EU events and institutions are made more explicit and acronyms are spelled out. Sometimes, on the contrary, the Finnish translations ‘normalize’ the language of the original towards the style of typical official texts. Wordings that are typical or even colloquial in English tend to become more official in the Finnish translations. (Koskinen 2008: 134) Oittinen & Mäkinen (2003: 124) however mention that even though these aspects mentioned are acknowledged they remain difficult for translators. They continue that especially certain aspects of translations continue to cause problems for readers. These are, for example, abstract and difficult concepts which demand wide understanding of the subject involved, mechanical translation strategies in which a certain expression has been replaced with a similar in the target language, following too strictly to the source language syntax which following with unnatural Finnish, long sentences, rhetorical features in text which often are unreadable in Finnish. Oittinen and Mäkinen (2003: 125) state that these problems are possibly caused by the long history of EU translation. The norms and customs for EU translation in Finnish have been developed along translating and translators find it natural to stick to these customs. (Oittinen and Mäkinen 2003: 125)

Translations can also have high number of additions and omission. The additions often consist of added information and repetition which can help the reader whereas the omissions are sometimes more questionable. Koskinen (2008: 141) Koskinen states

(2008: 141) that for example often some of the omissions are unimportant reductions caused by simplified sentence structures and expressions. For example, if the translator takes out words such as ‘potential’ in *potential benefits*, ‘genuinely’ in *making learning genuinely available for all* and ‘much’ in *much more open*, the reader loses the cues for interpreting the writer’s attitude and degree of engagement towards the proportions. This simplified propositional structure fails to make the text easier and clearer but makes it actually more difficult to understand. (Koskinen 2008: 142) One type of omission was found in the material of this study. As Koskinen has stated, sometimes omission can make the sentence more difficult to understand. An example from my material will be presented next.

(2) **ST** Cities house most of Europe’s population and consume most of its resources.

**TT** Kaupungeissa asuu suurin osa Euroopan väestöstä ja se kuluttaa valtaosan voimavaroista.

As can be seen from the example, the translator has not translated the modifier *its*. Even though this might be seen as more simple to read, it actually makes the sentence harder to understand, because now the reader is not told *which* resources are consumed.

As stated previously in this study it is important that especially institutional translations should read like an original. (House 1977: 7) This requires knowledge on how to write the target language within its norms and rules. This concerns all types of translation but is important also in EU translation. Sometimes translations include unnatural Finnish. Translation Company ‘Translatum Oy’ has published an article which deals with this problem. In ‘Ethän kirjoita epäsuomea’? Vältä nämä yleiset lainarakenteet’- “Are you writing unnatural Finnish? Avoid these common borrowed structures.” (My translation) (Translatum Oy 2013) article a ‘language doctor’ (a guide for writing good Finnish) states that certain types of English language structures and expressions can sometimes be seen in Finnish translations. According to the article, these ‘borrowed structures’ affect the intelligibility of the message and make the translation sound clumsy. It is mentioned in the article that the reader will notice if something is not ‘good Finnish’

even if s/he might not be able to identify exactly what is wrong. This is something which can be seen in this study as well. An example from my material is presented in the following extract.

(3) **ST** Furthermore, EU research has contributed to the emergence of an integrated assessment framework for sustainable decision-making.

**TT** EU-tutkimus on lisäksi vaikuttanut osaltaan siihen, että on muodostettu kestäväälle päätöksenteolle puitteet kokonaisvaltaista arviointia varten.

The translated sentence has become hard to read and understand partly because the word order is clumsy. It can be seen that the translator might have either tried to obey the English sentence structure too strictly or failed to translate the sentence in the way so that this sentence would be more natural and understandable to read in Finnish. It is quite difficult to understand which word is referring to which, especially because the translator has made the decision to put the verb ‘muodostettu’ before the subject ‘kestävälle päätöksenteolle’.

As the previous example shows, it is important to pay attention to the fact that the target language norms are obeyed. Otherwise the meaning of the source text can change. It is important for a translator to have an excellent control of the target language so that the target language norms could be met. A certain amount of data on the source language message can usually be secured from dictionaries, commentaries, and technical treatises, but there is no substitute for thorough mastery of the receptor language. The most numerous and serious errors made by translators arise primarily from their lack of thorough knowledge of the receptor language. (Nida 1964: 150) It is very different to know a language in general than have a special knowledge of a particular subject. In other words, the translator must have a thorough know-how on the subject matter concerned and the needed skills in the receptor language. (Nida 1964: 150) It can be seen in my material that errors in translations were identified concerning the control of the target language and within subject related terminology.

In this study I am looking at errors in five different categories of Wrong translations, Not translated, Deficiencies in translation, Creative translation and Breach of the target language system. In addition the ST and TT profiles are examined. It was noticed that even a small word which may not come across as particularly meaningful in the original is still important to translate. For example, if a translator leaves out a word which is meant to be describing another word, not translating it changes the meaning in the translation. Ernst-August Gutt has written about translating the meaning of the original. In the book *'Translation and Relevance'* Gutt (1991: 66) deals with this aspect. He states that since 1960's there has been a strong trend in translation theory and practice to pay special attention to how well the translation communicates to the target audience and how well the meaning and the dynamics of the source text are transferred. A translation which transfers the meaning and the dynamics of the original text is to be regarded as a faithful translation. The expression 'transfers the meaning' means that the translation conveys to the reader or hearer the information that the original conveyed to its readers or hearers. 'The dynamics' means that the translation makes a natural use of the linguistic structures of the target language and that the readers of the translation understand the message with ease. (Gutt 1991: 68) This is something which is important for the present study because I have examined if the translations have errors and whether they convey the message of the original as it was understood in the source text or not.

Translators in the Commission's Finnish department do not always know who their translations are directed to. This can be regarded as one of the explanation concerning the quality or unintelligibility of the translations. The lack of proper feedback is another problem. If the translators do not receive any feedback, they are left under the impression that the translation was of good quality. The third explanation to poor quality is related to the ways in which the translating institution directs the translation process. In the European Commission, institutional guidance and feedback do not support readability. The distant relations between the translator and the requester/writer/reader seem to decrease the quality. Koskinen (2008:94) states that it is common that translators sometimes feel that no-one reads their texts. There are only few opportunities to discuss the on-going projects with the officials who draft documents or

to witness meetings that take place before a new version of the document is drafted because officials are in different locations than the translators. (Koskinen 2008: 94) The following table shows how the respondents answered when asked who they usually come in contact with in their work.

**Table 1.** Finnish translator's work related contacts (Koskinen 2008: 96)

	Daily	Weekly	Sometimes	Never
Finnish colleague translators	11	-	-	-
Other colleague translators	1	3	7	-
Requesters	-	-	11	-
Source text writers	-	-	8	3
Finnish EU officials	-	1	9	1
Other EU officials	1	1	8	1
Experts in Finland	-	1	11	-
Finnish language professionals	-	-	8	3
Users of translations in Commission	-	-	7	4
Users of translations in Finland		-	6	5

The above table is very revealing about the working conditions in the European Commission translation service. If a translator does not know to whom the translation is directed to, it is difficult to produce one that meets the expectations of the reader. It could be argued that if the translators and the source text writers would interact more that could possibly have a positive impact on the quality of the translations.

Koskinen (2008: 66) states that the European Commission has set 'norms' for the translation quality. The institutional structure of the Commission translation services has experienced some radical changes over the past few years. (Koskinen 2008: 70–71) What used to be a *Service de Traduction* (SdT) is currently the *Directorate-General for Translation* (DGT). In 2004, DGT had a mission to further improve the quality of both

internally and externally translated documents and raise productivity as well. Koskinen states that without specification quality represents 'empty words'. Translators did not receive information for example on how quality could be improved or what is the stage of the quality at the moment and how it has been evaluated. In 2006, The DGT mission statement was revised. The aim of improving the quality of translated documents was deleted, and the new mission statement contained no reference to the translation products themselves. The present approach to quality issues seems to be that if there are no complaints from the clients, the quality is assumed to be sufficient. (Koskinen 2008: 71–72)

### 2.2.1. Skopos theory and translation quality

Before one can analyse what is good and what poor quality, there must be some kind of policies which tell the difference between them. In this study the quality is measured by examining the errors in each of the four articles and then comparing them with each other but more was needed before that. Hans J Vermeer's skopos theory can be linked to the quality of translation. According to Vermeer (cited in Venuti 2004: 227) any form of translational action can be conceived as action. Skopos is the Greek word for 'purpose' or 'aim', and it is a technical term for the purpose of a translation and of the action of translating. In Vermeer's theory, the skopos (the purpose) determines the translation strategies that are to be employed in order to produce a functionally adequate result. Before looking for errors, I needed to think the purpose of the articles which I have chosen. As I stated earlier I came to a conclusion that because they are environmental EU articles which tell the reader about the environmental situation in the world and share information, their purpose is to educate and give information to the reader. The purpose can be same in the source text and in the target text but sometimes also a different one. (Venuti 2004: 229) This is because the target text is oriented towards target culture, and this defines its adequacy. In a result, source and target text can diverge from each other in a noticeable way not only in the formulation and distribution of the content but for the goals which are determined. In this study the purpose of source and target texts is the same because the aim of the articles' is to provide information and this information is not intended to change when translating. When

acknowledging this along with House's assessment, it is possible to state that if there are differences with the form or meaning in the translations compared to the source text, they are errors.

The skopos theory is linked to the quality of the articles I am analysing not only because I need to think what is the purpose of the articles translations to analyse them but because is it the translator's task as well. As mentioned previously, in order to translate well one must know the purpose, the skopos, of a certain text. It was also stated that not always the translators in the European Commission know who their target audience is. The purpose of a text is closely linked to the fact of who the readers are. If a translator is not sure who the readers are, it will probably have an effect on the translation quality.

Skopos theory focuses above all on the purpose and the result, which determines the translation methods and strategies that are to be employed in order to produce a functionally adequate result. This result is the target text, which Vermeer calls the *translatum*. (cited in Venuti 2004: 228) Thus is skopos, knowing why a source text is to be translated and what the function of the target text will be, is crucial for the translator.

There are five basic rules of the theory (Reiss and Vermeer quoted in Roinila 1986: 67–68). These rules are important for the current study because violation of the rules can cause errors in the translation.

1. a *translatum* is determined by its skopos,
2. a target text is an offer of information in a target culture and target language concerning an offer of information in a source culture and source language
3. a target text does not initiate an offer of information in a clearly reversible way
4. a target text must be internally coherent
5. a target text must be coherent with the source text
6. The rules will be implied in the order they are listed here (Reiss and Vermeer quoted in Roinila 1986: 67–68).

Rule 2 is important because it relates the source text and target text to their function in their respective linguistic and cultural contexts. The translator is the key player in a process of intercultural communication and production of the translatum so s/he has to be aware of the skopos of the text before translating it. The irreversibility in point 3 indicates that the function or the purpose of a translatum in its target culture is not necessarily the same as in the source culture. This is true with some texts, for example, in fiction, but in this study, the source and the target text have the same skopos because their informative aspect does not change even if the source texts were translated in many different languages. The texts produce information about the environmental situation in the world, and despite some aspects are not seen in all the EU countries, for example different climate, it does not mean that the translator should or could adapt the texts because that would change the whole meaning of the texts. In other words the purpose does not change, but the targeted readers may do, especially if they speak different languages. The translator's task is to maintain the purpose in all these languages. Rules 4 and 5 are said to be 'general skopos rules' concerning how the success of the action and information transfer is to be judged: the coherence rule is linked to internal textual coherence and the fidelity rule is linked to coherence with the source text. (Reiss & Vermeer in Roinila 1986: 69–70)

The target text needs to be translated in a way that it is coherent for the target text readers, for whatever their circumstances and knowledge is. This rule is very difficult to apply for my material. The EU articles analysed in this thesis are targeted to all people who are interested in the environmental issues and search for the webpage because they are publicly available at the website, that is, available for anyone to read. The articles include professional language with all its terminology but still it has to be kept in mind that the readers should be able to understand what they are reading. This type of situation may cause the fact that the translator might feel necessary to explain certain terms or difficult concepts. The fidelity rule means that there must be coherence between the source text, the translator and the information that the translator shares to the target text readers. (Reiss and Vermeer in Roinila 1984: 66) The fidelity rule is significant in this study because how the translator has understood the information in the source text affects the errors in the target text. If there have been misunderstandings,

it shows in the translation and the misunderstood information is transferred to the readers of the target text.

Knowing the skopos, the purpose, and understanding the subject is still not quite enough. Eugene A. Nida (Nida 1964; 145) has also commented the features of a good translator. In *“Toward a Science of Translating”* (1964) he states that if the translator is to succeed in producing an acceptable translation, he/she must have a solid background in the source language and at the same has to master the language into which he/she is translating. In this study I want to emphasize this fact because it can be seen in my material and in the analysis that the translators have made errors. The number of errors tells us that the knowledge of grammar and the rules of the target language could have been better and with that the translations could have been improved. Nida (1964:145) states that the translator simply cannot match words from a dictionary. He must create an equivalent form to carry the concept expressed in the source language. According to Nida (1964: 150) the translator must understand not only the obvious content of the message, but also the subtleties of meaning, the significant emotive values of words, and the stylistic features which determine the “flavour and feel” of the message. The following example from my material shows how the emotive value of certain words is not translated successfully.

(4) **ST** But cities are also incubators for new ideas to combat this **environmental hangover**.

**TT** Kaupungit ovat kuitenkin myös uusien ajatusten hautumoita taistelussa tätä **ympäristöperintöä** vastaan.

The translator has translated “environmental hangover” as “ympäristöperintö”. The impression “ympäristöperintö” does not have any stylistic or emotional aspect which would indicate same type of meaning as the word “environmental hangover”. The translator has not taken into consideration the emotive value of this impression and as a result the meaning of that impression is lost. This has caused a overtly erroneous error in the translation.

### 2.3. LSP (Language for special purposes)

The articles used as a material in this study are considered as LSP (language for special purposes) text so it is necessary to look closely what constitutes a LSP text. In this chapter I will discuss language for special purposes as well as translation of LSP texts.

The changes in the fields of science and technology can be regarded as a substantial revolution which started in most industrialised countries by the middle of the 1950's. This called for a modification of specialised communication; language for special purposes (LSP). It includes text types such as legal, medical, technical, scientific, public service, and possibly political texts. These are texts within reasonable clearly defined interest spheres or discourse communities. (Khursid & Rogers 2003: 86)

LSP has been created to guarantee an effective communication among all people working together in a same profession or industry, and enable the exchange of knowledge (special books, dictionaries, encyclopaedia etc.) It should support intellectual activities by mean of abstractions and generalisations and be analysed according to specific features of specialised subject fields. (Brekke et al.: 1994: 4) As mentioned previously in this study this is the case in EU language and therefore in EU translation. Abstractions and generalisations help the people working inside the EU institution but unfortunately can cause problems people outside organizations; for example for readers of text and translators.

Traditionally, linguistic theory has proceeded on the assumption that a given language should be described in the most general terms. The goal of linguistics has often been stated as the formulation of a theory so abstract as to cover all existing languages or even all conceivable languages. For this reason, conventional linguistic theory has not been suited for providing explicit and well-developed means to define the status of special purposes language (LSP). (Brekke et al. 1994: 6)

One approach is to regard a given LSP as a language or domain on its own. We might obtain varieties such as “scientific English”, “engineering English”, “legal English” and

so on. However, LSP does not meet the requirements for a language in the usual sense. Although it is necessary to regard as LSP as a “complete set of linguistic phenomena” (Lauren & Nordman 1989: 6), no LSP is composed exclusively of its own resources. Instead, every LSP overlaps heavily with at least one LGP (language for general purposes) and is free to use any parts of the latter without express justification. One could not, for example, state the “rules” which determine what parts of the grammar or lexicon of language may or may not appear in the LSP text. LSPs tend to share much of their resources not merely with LGPs, but also with each other. Even LSPs based on different LGPs often have common cognate resources. LSP thus tends to be more international, or indeed universal, than does LGP the more so when English terms are widely borrowed. (Lauren & Nordman 1989: 6)

### 2.3.1 LSP translation

Peter Sandrini’s approach (Gotti & Sarcevic 2006; 107) to LSP translation is that focusing on written texts and a professional translators’ setting, it is appropriate to endorse the functionalist approach and try to use a definition from this specific branch of translation studies, Language for special purposes translation. According to Reiss and Vermeer (Gotti & Sarcevic 2006: 108) any text may be regarded as an ‘offer of information’ as mentioned earlier in this study when dealing with skopos theory. Each receiver chooses the items he/she regards as interesting, useful or adequate for the desired purposes. The translator represents a special type of receiver who chooses the information elements he deems necessary to achieve a given purpose and transfer them, constructing a new text for the target culture. In other words the most important thing is that the purpose is fulfilled. The translator makes decisions based on that desired purpose. Thus the target text should represent the same information offered in the source text. This assumption means that every translation is governed by skopos (the purpose) and it is always part of the global communication effort within a discipline. Thus, it has to take into account the communicative methodology, and they (the experts) package information in ways that conform to a discipline’s norms, values, and ideology. (Gotti & Sarcevic 2006: 108)

A definition of LSP translation must, therefore, build on the concept of specialised communication, which has gone a long way starting with strict linguistic approach and then changing to a more interdisciplinary concept. Newer definitions reflect a more cognitive, knowledge-oriented semiotic approach, with the definition of specialised communication. LSP translation shall be exteriorisation of specialised knowledge systems and cognitive processes and weighed and selected from an information offer with the objective of disseminating them in another linguistic and cultural context governed by *skopos*. (Gotti & Sarcebic 2006: 109)

In LSP translation, text typology is based on the perceived function of texts. In terms of typology, texts created within the framework of science and technical communication, are mainly *informative* and *descriptive*, with their main function being referential and, to a lesser extent, metalinguistic and expressive. (Khursid & Rogers 2003: 359) The EU articles analysed in this thesis can be described as informative because their main function is to offer information about the issues dealt with in each article. The translator must be aware of the content and possible boundaries of a particular LSP, and s/he must also be capable of correlating the special language, that is, the phraseology and terminology of the source language. Then the translator can decide on the strategies and ways to approach the translation.

The quest for equivalence with the source text seemed the overriding criterion for translation success in all translation and it is often still the case, especially in LSP translation. (Khursid & Rogers 2003: 495) The desired purpose is that translations communicate as completely and clearly as possible whatever the source text communicates. Equivalence can reside for example the translator having a good knowledge on specialised terminology in two languages. In this study this aspect has a significant meaning because translating EU text requires knowledge about the terminology, in this case, environmental terms.

Musacchio (quoted in Khursid & Rogers: 2003: 97) states that LSP translations are expected to sound natural and idiomatic. On closer inspection, the assessment of how natural an LSP translation sounds often rests on an evaluation of quality and consistency

of terminology, particularly in compound terms, and specialised phraseology. The next paragraph will discuss how specialist translators research their terminology.

Margaret Rogers (quoted in Gotti & Sarcevic 2006: 329) offers three different methods for solving terminology problems. First of them is teamwork. While the image of a lone translator working with his books may still be an evocative one in the popular imagination, it has increasingly less to do with the modern profession, in which co-operative models of working are seen as a part of translator competence. Many of the large and demanding translation tasks have been conducted through teamwork, such as the Bible translation. Second working method offered by Rogers is consulting experts. That has said to been one of the bases of high-quality terminology work. Third method is consulting documentation. In the modern professional world, documentation plays a key role in terminological research and translators have always looked beyond dictionaries to previous translations and related text in order to solve terminological problems. (Gotti & Sarcevic 2006: 329) Previously in this study I have introduced Kaisa Koskinen's statement about the working habits in the European Commission. We cannot really say that the possibility of teamwork would be practiced very much in all kind of situations in LSP translation because Koskinen stated that is it normal for the translators to work in their own offices in peace and not consulting the text with experts very much.

Although we can discuss what could be the possible solutions to certain problems we still usually cannot know very much about them because the target text displays only the translator's final decisions. Readers perceive an end-product, a result of a decision-making process but not the process itself. (Hatim&Mason 1990: 3) In this thesis I am also looking the translation as end-products. This way I can be able to identify errors in the target texts.

LSP translation is only one name for translation other than literary translation; it can also be called as scientific translation or technical translation. What name to choose can depend on whether we are talking about a scientific article, a manual or something else. In this study where environmental EU articles are analysed I would call the translation

as LSP translation or scientific translation. Isadore Pinchuck (1977) in her book 'Scientific and technical translation' states that scientific translation is in many ways simpler to understand than literary translation because in the latter the emotive elements such as rhythm and assonance are important, whereas they play no part in scientific work'. She distinguishes scientific writing by three main characteristics: subject matter, type of language and purpose. The subject matter is always scientific or technical, the language displays a greater frequency of technical terms than ordinary language and the purpose is always practical one. Scientific texts communicate information and their predominant aim is to present information.

Pinchuck (1977: 205–222) discusses also about judging the quality of a scientific translation. She states that three factors determine the adequacy and that way the quality: accuracy (the translation must convey the information contained in the original with as little distortion as possible), intelligibility and readability (the reader should not have to struggle to work out what it is all about because the translator has expressed it badly) and speed (the client's deadline should be met). Each of these requirements conflicts with the others and each vary according to circumstances. An ideal translation is faithful to the source text, intelligible and produced within a short time. On the other hand, the closer the target text comes to source text the greater the fidelity but it is not necessary more intelligible. Fidelity on the grammatical level may result in obstacles to understanding. (Pinchuck 1977: 222) In this thesis, the articles analysed showed these issues. In some points the terms were translated well but then again the grammar suffered and errors in the sentence structure appeared. This caused serious problems for the reader to understand what was said.

(5) **ST** The Union has introduced strict rules on the use of animals in R&D, and funds research to develop and validate alternative methods.

**TT** Euroopan unioni on hyväksynyt eläinten käyttöä tutkimuksessa ja kehityksessä koskevia tiukkoja sääntöjä, ja se rahoittaa tutkimusta vaihtoehtoisten menetelmien kehittämiseksi ja laillistamiseksi.

This example shows that the sentence structure in the target text does not sound natural and the sentence is not intelligible. It is a clear distortion of the target language system

and it requires special attention for the reader to understand it. In other words fidelity in grammar in LSP translation is something which is produced by making the sentence work grammatically in the target language.

There can be many issues which affect this type of errors. Pinchuck (1977: 206) provides a few of them: for example the time is assumingly a very high factor when it comes to errors. The greater the speed, the more the standard of accuracy and intelligibility will suffer. The translator may aim at readability above all and be less concerned with rendering with accuracy. Alternatively, the translator can be more concerned with rendering the original faithfully than with the readability of the translation. This was shown in few cases in the analysis of this study.

Pinchuck has also dealt with errors in LSP translations. According to her (1977: 207) the most common mistakes are loss of information which means that the text may be inaccurate or false. Inaccuracy may result from too free a translation and too much individuality. Scientific style is generally impersonal and standardized. Also lack of understanding of the source text or carelessness can cause information errors. The translations may even give false information, or it has left an important paragraph or sentence out completely which can change the meaning of the source text. Lack of intelligibility can cause errors in the sense that the content may be transferred but in such way that it requires effort on the part of the reader to understand it properly. Interference between source text and target text means usages peculiar to the source language are transferred into the target language. An example of this involves the blandishments of 'false friends', expressions that look alike in both languages but have different meanings. By incorrect level Pinchuck means replacing as source language utterance with the wrong level of abstraction or the wrong style in target language. Finally she mentions errors in use of target text. These include errors such as incorrect spelling, incorrect capitalization, inadequate punctuation, lexical errors, omission and inaccuracies. (Pinchuck 1977: 207) In this study I have categorized these types of errors in the group 'Breach of the target language system' and these are treated as overtly erroneous errors by House (1977: 7).

### 3. ASSESING TRANSLATION QUALITY

In this study I am aiming to assess the quality of four environmental EU articles with the help of translation quality assessment (TQA) by Juliane House. (1977) House's model is set up "on the basis of pragmatic theories of language use. The model is used for the analysis of the linguistic-situational instances of a given source text and its translation, and a comparison of the two text to identify their mismatches. (House 1977:1)

When the researcher is evaluating the mismatches between the source text and the target text, the distinction is made through dimensional mismatches or covertly erroneous errors and non-dimensional mismatches or overtly erroneous errors. The latter consist of both mismatches of the denotative meaning of the source text and target text elements and breaches from the target language system. (House 1977: 2)

Previous models for examining translation quality have been somewhat insufficient and determining the quality has been very vague. House (1977: 7) lists principles which have been used to describe translation quality previously, or in other words, what means good quality in translation; "a translation must give words of the original, a translation must give the ideas of the original, a translation should read like an original work, a translation should reflect the style of the original, a translation should possess the style of the translator and a translation should read as a contemporary of the original".

There are other views on translation quality assessment compared to House's. Bell (quoted in Hatim & Mason 1990:3) has claimed that the tendency to ignore the process involved in the act of translating lies behind the relative stagnation of translation studies in recent years. According to him, treating texts as a self-contained and self-generating entity instead of a decision-making procedure and an instance of communication between languages and their users, the understanding of the nature of translating will be distorted. It is seen as a problem which encourages evaluating translations by analytic comparison of ST to TT, a product-to-product comparison which does not pay the needed attention to the communication process. Since translation is a process, it

involves the negotiation of meaning between producers and receivers of texts. In other words, the resulting translated text is to be seen as evidence of a transaction, a means of retracing the ways of the translator's decision-making procedures. In the same way, the ST itself is an end-product and, again, should be treated as evidence of a writer's intended meaning rather than as the embodiment of the meaning itself. Texts can be seen as the result of motivated choice: producers of texts have their own communicative aims and they select lexical items and grammatical arrangement to serve those aims.

This would suggest that there is a little point in seeking to match target-language words with those in the ST in isolation from consideration of the writer's whole world-view in this context. This might be true, at least partly, because a researcher cannot know about the decision-making procedures. The only chance to identify the errors is to look at the translations as end-products and closely examine whether one word or sentence in ST is corresponding to the one in the TT. Still, it is erroneous to assume that one-for-one equivalents exist for all lexical items in two languages. However it is translator's job to produce *the best* equivalent that exists. Of course, "equivalent does not mean identical". "A translation cannot be identical to its source text because of different cultural, historical, and situational settings." (House 1977: 9) But if the researcher is not allowed to examine a translation without knowing about the decision-making process, there would not be any point in House's assessment. Translation quality assessment is meant to be used to examine the end-product and in that case the decision-making processes are not as important as they would be in some other way of examining the translation quality. When using House's model, the quality is the researcher's own conclusion because there might be different ways of interpreting the possible errors by different readers.

Translation quality assessment is a kind of evaluation. In this study, I am the evaluator who identifies the errors and comes to a conclusion about the quality of the translations. It is problematic that these issues vary, depending on who the evaluator is. We need to think about whether the evaluator has the required linguistic and subject-related knowledge. It is also important to notice that the evaluation changes, depending on if the evaluator is a member of the target audience or a client, not a translation student or a

professional translator. “Evaluating the quality of a translation presupposes a theory of translation. Thus different views of translation led to different concepts of translational quality, and hence different ways of assessing it.” (House 1997: 1) After all, the EU articles which I am examining are not specifically targeted to people who know about translation. This means that not every error would necessary be noticed by a common reader. Then again, does it make it a good translation if the target reader does not notice the errors?

To analyse the quality of a translation one must identify every error in the translation. It is worth to mention that it varies much what people constitute an error. Some may consider typological errors as major errors and others think that they are not important if the reader can see what was meant anyway. In other words, quality can mean different things to different readers. In the context of this study (institutional translation) typological errors are always significant because they can change the meaning of the word or they create a negligent feeling to the text. This is why this study includes a category of ‘Breach of the target language system’. This category includes typological errors as well as errors in the sentence structure.

#### 4 ERROR ANALYSIS OF FOUR ENGLISH EU ARTICLES AND THEIR FINNISH TRANSLATIONS

In this section the overtly erroneous errors and covertly erroneous errors are identified using Julian House's model of translation quality assessment (TQA). In the analysis the source text is referred to with abbreviation ST and the target text with TT. This study has aimed to find out whether the quality of the translations of four EU articles are good or poor. This is done by identifying five types of errors in four different environmental articles and their Finnish translations from the European Commission webpage. The five categories for the errors were 1) wrong translation, 2) not translated, 3) deficiencies of translation, 4) creative translation and 5) breach of the target language system. These errors are all overtly erroneous errors. Before categorizing the errors, the source text and target text profiles were drawn. Any mismatches found in them are called covertly erroneous errors. (House 1977: 7) The overtly erroneous errors will be examined and categorized after the target text profiles.

According to House's model (House 1977), first the source text and the target texts need to be read through and compared closely. Then the mismatches in the translations are identified as belonging to five categories of different errors. In the analysis part the example from the source material is provided first, then the translation. The mismatch has been marked in bold in the target as well as in the source text and my comment is followed after the extracts. To make it clear, in the category of 'not translated' the bolding will be in the source text sentence where there is a word or expression identified which does not appear in the translation. I will also provide my own example of translating in the part in which an error has been identified as an example of alternative translation. I hope that this helps to understand why certain parts are identified as errors in this study.

One issue which has appeared in this study when evaluating the quality and identifying the errors was how to distinguish errors from stylistic preferences. There can be differences between on how people see errors. For example, if I find a word in a target text which in my opinion does not match with the source text word, I have identified it

as an error in this study because I am obeying the five categories of errors mentioned earlier. Other researchers could point out that it is just a stylistic difference between the source text and the target text. If the stylistic tone of the source text is preserved, then it might not be an error but if the word choice does not match and also the stylistic tone has changed then it should be classified as an error.

#### 4.1 Text profiles

The target text profile aims to identify the purpose of a text. It also identifies differences between the source text and the target text and their writers. A text profile is made by identifying the genre and register, which are supposed to capture the linguistic and situational features of both the source and target text. Register is further divided into field, tenor and mode which correlate with lexical syntactical and textual features. Field refers to the subject matter and social action. Tenor covers the addresser's personal viewpoint (intellectual, affective or social) and temporal and social provenance. Social attitude refers to formal, neutral or informal style. Mode relates to the channel; simple (written to be read) or complex (written to be spoken). Participation can be simple (no addressee built into the text) or complex (various addressees). (House 1977: 39–42)

Source text profile:

##### **Field**

Subject matter:

Article (EU)

Social action:

specialised

##### **Tenor**

Author's provenance and stance

Eu Commission

Research Directorate-General

Social role relationship:

Asymmetrical

Social attitude:

Formal

**Mode**

Medium

Participation:

Simple

Simple

**Genre**

Function:

Article (EU)

Ideational

Target text profile:

**Field**

Subject matter:

Social action:

Article (EU)

specialised

**Tenor**

Translator's provenance and stance:

Social role relationship:

Social attitude:

EU Commission translator

Asymmetrical

Formal

**Mode**

Medium

Participation:

Simple

Simple

**Genre**

Function:

Article (EU)

Ideational

After doing the text profiles for both the source text and the target text, it is noted, according to House (1977), that a covertly erroneous error has been identified; a mismatch between the author's provenance and stance (EU Commission research directorate-general) and that of the translator's (EU Commission translator). This is only natural because the original author of the text and the translator of the text are different persons. This does not change the purpose of these texts.

## 4.2 Wrong translations

This section represents the errors identified in the category of ‘Wrong translations’. Eight errors were found in total in all of the four articles. The following table shows the number of errors identified in the category of ‘Wrong translations’, in which article they occurred and how often. The error in the translation as well as the original impression in the source text have been marked by bolding. I have produced back translations in square brackets for the Finnish translations when I am discussing them after the example.

**Table 2.** Wrong Translation

Title of article	Number of errors
Animal Welfare – Eläinten oikeudet	6
Urban Research - Kaupunkitutkimus	1
Floods - Tulvat	0
Marine Sciences - Meritieteet	1
	Total 8

I will next present examples of ‘Wrong translations’. These are errors which caused total distortion of meaning in the text. They can vary from a single word to a certain

impression which has been translated unsuccessfully. The first example is from the article “Urban research” (European Commission 2011).

- (6) **ST** When the project ends in 2008, planning and construction ‘best practices’ will be made available to designers, citizens and **policy-makers**.

**TT** Projektin päättyessä vuonna 2008 suunnittelun ja rakentamisen ‘parhaat sovellutukset’ annetaan suunnittelijoiden, asukkaiden ja **politiikan tekijöiden** käytettäväksi.

In this extract from the article “Urban research” the translator has made a significant error by translating ‘policy-makers’ as ‘politiikan tekijät’ [makers of politics]. This is unintelligible in Finnish. The translator has tried too firmly stick to the English version of word ‘policy-maker’ which causes an error in the target text. A more suitable equivalent for ‘policy-makers’ would be ‘päättäjät’ [policymakers].

- (7) **ST** We **urgently** need to improve our understanding of the processes at work and provide policy-makers with sound scientific advice on how best to protect the diversity of our oceans and ensure their sustainable development for the future.

**TT** Meidän on **ehdottomasti** pyrittävä ymmärtämään meneillään olevia prosesseja entistä paremmin, jotta kykenemme tarjoamaan päättäjille kunnollisia tieteellisiä neuvoja joiden avulla he pystyvät kunnolla suojelemaan valtameriemme monimuotoisuutta ja varmistamaan niiden kestävän kehityksen tulevaisuudessa.

In this extract from the article “Marine sciences” (European Commission 2011) the translator has translated the word “urgently” as “ehdottomasti”. The word “ehdottomasti” has a completely different meaning than the word urgently which means ‘kiireellisesti’ or ‘pikaisesti’. “Ehdottomasti” however means “absolutely” or “definitely”.

- (8) **ST** The EU’s ‘Quality of Life Programme’ provided support to 43 research projects aimed at **finding alternative testing techniques**.

**TT** Elämänlaatua koskevasta EU:n ohjelmasta tuetaan 43:a tutkimushanketta, joiden tarkoituksena on **löytää vaihtoehto testustekniikoille**.

This extract is from the article ‘Animal Welfare’ – ‘Eläinten hyvinvointi’ (European Commission 2011). The translator has used the word ‘vaihtoehto’ [an alternative]. TT suggests that EU Programme is finding a technique which would replace the testing techniques but ST tells that it is only finding alternative techniques beside the present ones. It can be seen in the plural form of the ST’s sentence. In TT the sentence is in singular. This could have been translated for example ‘vaihtoehtoisia testaustekniikoita’ [alternative testing techniques].

- (9) **ST** Researchers from the UK, Ireland, France, Italy and Germany found that even though consumers express a great concern for animal welfare and say they **are willing to pay** more for animal-friendly products, this is not translated into reality in the supermarket.

**TT** Englantilaiset, irlantilaiset, ranskalaiset, italialaiset ja saksalaiset tutkijat ovat sitä mieltä, että vaikka kuluttajat ovat hyvin huolestuneita eläinten hyvinvoinnista ja ilmoittavat **haluavansa maksaa** enemmän tuotteista, joiden tuotannossa on otettu eläinten hyvinvointi huomioon, näin ei tapahdu käytännössä valintamyymälöissä.

In this extract from the article ‘Animal Welfare – Eläinten hyvinvointi’ (European Commission 2011) the expression ‘are willing to pay’ has been translated as ‘haluavansa maksaa’ [want to pay], which changes the meaning of the ST’s sentence. It can be assumed that people do not *want to* pay more for animal-friendly products, but can be *willing to pay*, as it is stated in the ST. A more suitable translation would then be ‘halukkaita maksamaan’ [willing to pay].

- (10) **ST** The Union **has introduced** strict rules on the use of animals in R&D, and funds research to develop and validate alternative methods.

**TT** Euroopan unioni **on hyväksynyt** eläinten käyttöä tutkimuksessa ja kehityksessä koskevia tiukkoja sääntöjä, ja se rahoittaa tutkimusta vaihtoehtoisten menetelmien kehittämiseksi ja laillistamiseksi.

This extract is from the article ‘Animal Welfare – Eläinten hyvinvointi’ (European Commission 2011) and it contains an example of a wrong translation as well. The translator has translated ‘has introduced’ as ‘on hyväksynyt’ [has accepted] but now the target text sentence does not have the same meaning as the source text sentence.

‘Introduced’ could be translated for example as ‘ottanut käytäntöön’ [has taken into use] so that the meaning would be as close as possible when compared to the source text. The translation ‘Euroopan unioni on hyväksynyt eläinten käyttöä tutkimuksessa ja kehityksessä koskevia tiukkoja sääntöjä...’ does not make sense, because if the translator wants to use the impression ‘on hyväksynyt’ [has accepted] the whole word order needs to be changed. One possible way of doing this could be translate the sentence ‘Euroopan unioni on hyväksynyt tiukkoja sääntöjä koskien eläinten käyttöä tutkimuksessa ja kehityksessä.’

(11) **ST** To develop **sound policies** which take animal welfare into account, EU policy-makers need access to sound scientific advice.

**TT** Jotta EU:n päättäjät voisivat kehittää eläinten hyvinvoinnin huomioon ottavia **järkeviä poliitikkoja**, heidän on saatava hyviä tieteellisiä neuvoja.

The translator has made a clear error when translating ‘sound policies’ as ‘järkeviä poliitikkoja’ [sensible politicians] in the article ‘Animal Welfare – Eläinten hyvinvointi’ (European Commission 2011). A better equivalent could be ‘järkeviä menettelytapoja’ [reasonable policies]. This translation changes the meaning of the source text sentence completely and is causing confusion for the reader. The translator has clearly got mistaken by the different impressions; sound policies and policy makers. Now the translation is wrong because it is saying that the policy-makers [päättäjät] are the ones who are being developed although it is infact the policies which are being developed.

(12) **ST** Meanwhile, the use of animals in laboratories **continues to cause controversy**.

**TT** Eläinten käyttöä laboratorioissa **vastustetaan kuitenkin edelleen**.

There is a wrong translation to be found in this extract from the article ‘Animal Welfare – Eläinten hyvinvointi’ (European Commission 2011). The source text says that the use of animals in laboratories is still causing differences in opinions, but the translation says that it is still being resisted. This sentence could have been translated as ‘Eläinten käyttö laboratorioissa aiheuttaa edelleen kiistelyä/on edelleen kiistanalaista.’ [The use of animals in laboratories continues to cause controversy/is still controversial]

- (13) **ST** In the minds of hard-core campaigners, tests on animals are never justified, while scientists **defend** the practice saying that it is still the only way to test the safety of some new drugs fully.

**TT** Kiivaimpien aktivistien mielestä eläinkokeet eivät ole koskaan perusteltuja. Tiedemiehet taas **puoltavat** käytäntöä toteamalla, että se on yhä vieläkin ainoa keino testata täysmittaisesti joitain uusia lääkkeitä.

There is a wrong translation to be found in the article ‘Animal Welfare – Eläinten hyvinvointi’ (European Commission 2011). The translator has translated the expression ‘defend’ as ‘puoltavat’ [prefers]. These expressions have a different type of meaning, as the word in the source text means ‘puolustavat’ in Finnish and not ‘puoltavat’ which means to prefer something in English. In other words, the meaning of the source has changed and it gives wrong information to the reader.

#### 4.3 Not translated

In this section I will present the examples which are identified as ‘Not translated’. Not translated means that a complete word or expression has been left out from the translation. These errors does not always affect as major loss of information as does the errors in the category ‘Wrong translations’ but they still change the original meaning of the source text or make the translation difficult to understand.

It is not necessary to show the results in the table because only one error was identified in the category of ‘Not translated’. It appeared in the article ‘Kaupunkitutkimus’. This example is presented next.

- (14) **ST** Cities house most of Europe’s population and consume most of **its** resources.

**TT** Kaupungeissa asuu suurin osa Euroopan väestöstä ja se kuluttaa valtaosan voimavaroista.

In this extract is from the article ‘Urban research- Kaupunkitutkimus’ (European Commission 2011). A part of the source text sentence is missing in the translation. The

translator has not translated the expression 'its' which indicates that because cities house most of Europe's population most of its resources are consumed because of that. It remains somehow unclear in the translation what resources are in question because the translator has not pointed out that it means the city's own resources. I think that this would have been important to translate to make the sentence more understandable. A possible translation could be 'Suurin osa Euroopan väestöstä asuu kaupungeissa, joka kuluttaa valtaosan sen voimavaroista.' [Most of the Europe's population is living in cities and it consumes most of its resources]

#### 4.4 Deficiencies in translation

This section contains errors which have influenced partial transference of meaning in the translation or are not completely faithful to the source text. Table 3 shows the errors notices in the category of 'Deficiencies in translation'. Most errors were identified in the article 'Animal Welfare – Eläinten hyvinvointi'. However, article 'Marine Sciences – Meritieteet' did not contain any errors in this category of 'Deficiencies in translation'. After the table I will present the errors found in the articles which were identified in the category of 'Deficiencies in translation'.

**Table 3.** Deficiencies in translation

Title of article	Number of errors
Animal Welfare – Eläinten hyvinvointi	3
Urban Research - Kaupunkitutkimus	1
Floods - Tulvat	1
Marine Sciences	0
	Total 5

- (15) **ST** COMPASS is compiling clear guidelines and an ‘expert system’ **to help** managers of which compatible (salt resistant) render and plaster mortars to use.

**TT** COMPASS laatii selkeitä ohjeita ja ‘asiantuntijajärjestelmää’ **jotka auttaisivat** rakennetun kulttuuriperinnön hoitajia (arkkitehdit, konsultit, omistajat ja perinnöstä vastaavat viranomaiset) valitsemaan, mitä sekoituskelpoista (suolankestävää) rappaus- ja kipsilaastia käytetään.

This extract from the article “Urban research” (European Commission 2011) shows an example of a deficiency of translation which means that there exists a little distortion of meaning, partial transference of meaning or not complete faithfulness to source text but it is not so severe. In this example the translator has translated ‘to help’ as ‘jotka auttaisivat’ [would help]. This impression in the target language does not have the same meaning than ‘to help’ in English. ‘To help’ in this context could be translated ‘auttamaan’. This way the meaning would not change.

- (16) **ST** Awareness has grown of the need for a consolidated approach to flood management in river basins.

**TT** Vesistöalueiden tulvien hoitoa varten on **hyväksyttävä** vahvistettu lähestymistapa.

This extract is from the article “Floods” (European Commission 2011). Here the translator has added the word ‘hyväksyttävä’ [acceptable] in the translation. There is no this type of impression in the original sentence. This creates a partial distortion of meaning to the translation. The beginning of the source text sentence “awareness has grown of the need for a...” has been left out by the translator. It has been replaced with the erroneous word ‘hyväksyttävä’ [acceptable].

- (17) **ST** Important advances has been made, **not least** the recognition in the Treaty establishing the European Community that animals are ‘sentient beings’.

**TT** Alalla on edistytty merkittävästi, **ja esimerkiksi** Euroopan yhteisön perustamissopimuksessa tunnustetaan, että eläimet ovat ‘tuntevia olentoja’.

This example is from the article ‘Animal Welfare – Eläinten hyvinvointi’. (European Commission 2011) The translator has translated the expression ‘not least’ as ‘esimerkiksi’ [for example]. It slightly changes the tone of the ST, because the usage of ‘not least’ implicates that this recognition is important unlike the expression ‘esimerkiksi’.

- (18) **ST** Animal welfare has long been a European Union (EU) **priority**, but the issue was put firmly on the political agenda in the aftermath of various food crises.

**TT** Eläinten hyvinvointi on ollut jo kauan Euroopan unionin (EU) **painopistealue**, mutta kysymys otettiin päättäväisesti poliittiselle asialistalle vasta lukuisten elintarvikekriisien jälkeen.

In this extract from the article ‘Animal Welfare – Eläinten hyvinvointi’ (European Commission 2011) the translator has translated the word ‘priority’ as ‘painopistealue’ [area of focus]. The word ‘painopistealue’ does not show the importance of animal welfare in the EU which can be seen in the phrase of the ST and it is too neutral a word to be used here. There is also another translated word at the end of this extract which does not completely correlate with the meaning it has in the source text; ‘In the aftermath’ could be translated for example ‘jätkiseurauksena’ and not as ‘jälkeen’ [after]. This way the stylistic tone of the sentence comes across more similar.

#### 4.5 Creative translation

This section shows the examples from the category of ‘Creative translation’ which means that the translator has added information to the translation. In other words, the translator has translated in a way that additional words or impressions occur in the translation that were not seen in the source text. It can be seen from the following examples that this can change the meaning of the source text or at least change the stylistic tone of the text.

- (19) **ST** Higher rainfall has strained the capacities of river systems and widespread flooding has been a **major problem in recent years**.

**TT** Korkeammat sademäärät rasittavat jokiverkostojen kapasiteettia, ja laajalle levinneet tulvat ovatkin olleet **viime vuosien vitsaus**.

In this example from the article ‘Floods’ (European Commission 2011) the translator has translated the end of the sentence somehow freely. ‘Major problem in recent years’ has been translated into ‘viime vuosien vitsaus’ [recent years scourge] which has a different stylistic feel to it. If the translator would have completely obeyed the original this part could have been translated ‘suuri ongelma viime vuosina/viime vuosien aikana’.

(20) **ST** The animal welfare protocol, which was added by the Amsterdam Treaty in 1997, is a great contribution to the protection of animals as it obliges the EU institutions and Member States to take full account of animal welfare when drawing up new agriculture, transport, research and single market policies.

**TT** Vuoden 1997 Amsterdamin sopimukseen liitettiin pöytäkirja eläinten hyvinvoinnista. Se edistää merkittävästi eläinten suojelua, koska siinä veloitetaan EU:n toimielimet ja jäsenvaltiot ottamaan eläinten hyvinvoinnin **vaatimukset** täysimääräisesti huomioon, kun ne laativat maataloutta, liikennettä, tutkimusta ja sisämarkkinoita koskevaa uutta politiikkaa.

This extract from the article ‘Animal Welfare – Eläinten hyvinvointi’ shows an incident of a creative translation. The translator has added extra information which was not needed or was not necessary. It does not make the translation especially confusing but adding information which is not in the source text is unnecessary and can constitute as a mismatch. The translator has added the word ‘vaatimukset’ [demands] whereas the source text just states ‘animal welfare’, not ‘the demands of animal welfare’. Sometimes the translator can be obligated to add information to make the translation more understandable. This incident however does not become more understandable, the added word only gives information which does not appear in the source text.

#### 4.6 Breach of the target language system

This section presents the examples of ‘Breach of the target language system’ and it contains sections in the translations in which the target language norms have not been obeyed properly. When the target language norms have been violated in the translations it often makes the translations hard to understand. Errors in the category ‘Breach of the

target language system’ are seen in the following table. It is also marked how often errors occurred in each article as was done in previous tables in this chapter as well. Most errors were found in the article ‘Floods – Tulvat’. In this error category all of the articles contained errors. This was not seen in any other category. I have marked the problematic impression by bolding. In cases where the entire sentence is seen as erroneous the bolding has not been used.

**Table 5.** Breach of the target language system

Title of article	Number of errors
Animal Welfare – Eläinten hyvinvointi	1
Urban Research - Kaupunkitutkimus	3
Floods - Tulvat	5
Marine Sciences - Meritieteet	2

(21) **ST** Forewarned is forearmed.

**TT** Ennakkovaroitus **varmistaa** tulviin.

This example is a subtitle from the article ‘Floods’ (European Commission 2011). There is a rhyming word play in the source text title. Usually it is recommended to produce a word play also in the translation but if a suitable one is not invented it is better to live it out so that the style of the original text would not change too much. In this translation the translator has not translated the word play but I would not consider that as an error because basically there might not be suitable equivalents in the target language and because this section concentrates more on the ‘clear’ violation of the target language norms.

What I do constitute an error is that ‘forearmed’ is translated as ‘varmistaa [ensures]. The original title means that when we get a forewarning we can be better armed and prepared to the floods. If the translator was to follow this pattern, the translation should be ‘Ennakkovaroitus valmistaa tulviin’. But if the translator had really meant to use the verb ‘varmistaa’ then the object, ‘tulviin’ should be translated as ‘tulvan’ or ‘tulvat’. This translation would mean that by forewarning we can be sure that a flood is coming. This would be correct in Finnish language but it is not the best understandable solution. The existing translation ‘Ennakkovaroitus varmistaa tulviin’ can be treated as a breach of the target language system because the sentence is deviating from the target language norms.

- (22) **ST** The days of building for today and forgetting about tomorrow are less common, thanks to EU-wide efforts to deliver tools, technologies, methodologies, indicators and policies **to those in the best position to use them effectively – builders and building authorities.**

**TT** Nykypäivää varten rakentaminen ja huomisen unohtaminen ovat käyneet harvinaisemmiksi. EU:hun ulottuvien pyrkimysten ansiosta tarjoutuu työkaluja, teknologioita, metodeja, indikaattoreita ja menetelmätapoja niille, **joilla on parhaat mahdollisuudet käyttää niitä tehokkaasti, eli rakentajat ja rakennusliitto.**

This extract is from the article “Urban research” (European Commission 2011). As can be seen the whole translation is somewhat clumsy. The sentence structure does not obey the norms of the target language system at the best possible way. It seems that the translator is too firmly trying to stick to the English sentence structure when writing “EU:hun ulottuvien pyrkimysten ansiosta tarjoutuu työkaluja, teknologioita, metodeja...” There is even more significant breach of the target language system to be seen in the end of the sentence; “rakentajat ja rakennusliitto”. The translator has used erroneous forms of these nouns. The sentence does not allow to use these words in their basic form. The correct way of translating this would be “rakentajille ja rakennusliitolle” because it is shown in the sentence that these tools are delivered for *someone*.

- (23) **ST** Increasingly, the emphasis is being placed on an ecosystems approach to the management of fishery resources, involving the integration of various

scientific disciplines and collaboration and the exchange of information between all the different actors involved.

**TT** Yhä enenevässä määrin painotetaan kalavarojen hallinnan ekosysteemilähtöistä lähestymistapaa, johon kuuluu eri tieteenalojen integrointi ja yhteistyö ja tietojen vaihto kaikkien toimijoiden välillä.

In this extract from the article “Marine sciences” (European Commission 2011) the translator has not succeeded in obeying the target language syntax. By starting the sentence in the same way as the original version starts ‘Increasingly’ -> ‘Yhä enenevässä määrin’ the sentence structure becomes clumsy. It is often necessary to change the original sentence structure to make the sentence sound natural in the target language. The translator could have organized the sentence for example in the following way; ‘Kalavarojen hallinnan ekosysteemilähtöistä lähestymistapaa painotetaan yhä enenevässä määrin. Siihen kuuluu eri tieteenalojen integrointi ja yhteistyö, ja tietojen vaihto kaikkien toimijoiden välillä.’

Another breach of the target language system can be found at the end of the sentence. There should be a comma between ‘yhteistyö’ and the word ‘ja’.

(24) **ST This state-of-the-art rainfall and flood-modelling technology alerted the authorities to danger spots**, enabling them to evacuate 200 000 people and save the old city from major damage.

**TT Viranomaisia voitiin varoittaa tällä ajantasaisella sademääriä ja tulvien mallinuksia koskevalla tekniikalla vaarallisista alueista.** Tämän ansiosta viranomaiset pystyivät siirtämään tulva-alueelta pois 200 000 ihmistä ja pelastamaan vanhankaupungin vakavilta vahingoilta.

This extract from the article ‘Floods’ (European Commission 2011) contains a long and a complicated sentence in the source text. It could be useful to cut it into two so that the translation would be easier to read and understand. This is what the translator has done but it did not increase the readability because there is a clear breach of the target language system in the first sentence. The word order is very clumsy and it is hard to notice what the connections are between the words. The translator has not changed the sentence structure enough so that it would correspond with the correct word order in the

target language. In Finnish language the word order is not completely strict but this example shows how one word order can still be more confusing and more difficult than another. A better solution for this translation could for example be ‘Tällä ajantasaisella sademääriä ja tulvien mallinnuksia koskevalla tekniikalla voitiin varoittaa viranomaisia vaarallisista alueista.’

- (25) **ST** Furthermore, EU research has contributed to the emergence of an integrated assessment framework for sustainable decision-making.

**TT** EU-tutkimus on lisäksi vaikuttanut osaltaan siihen, että on muodostettu kestäväille päätöksenteolle puitteet kokonaisvaltaista arviointia varten.

Another example of a confusing word order is found in the article ‘Urban research’ (European Commission 2011). It seems that changing the sentence structure of the original has been challenging for the translator. This sentence becomes more understandable and sounds more natural with small changes; switching the positions of some words. So that this translation would read fluently it should be ‘EU-tutkimus on lisäksi osaltaan vaikuttanut siihen, että kestäväille päätöksenteolle on muodostettu puitteet kokonaisvaltaista arviointia varten. As mentioned earlier the Finnish language does not have totally strict rules for word order but how the sentence has been structured affects how the reader understands the sentence. If the translator has meant to emphasize the verb ‘muodostettu’ it still requires small changes to the structure of the sentence. A fluent alternative could be ‘EU-tutkimus on lisäksi vaikuttanut osaltaan siihen, että puitteet kestäväille kehitykselle kokonaisvaltaista arviointia varten on muodostettu’.

- (26) **ST** In the build up to a flood situation, major decision – some potentially life or death – have to be made rapidly. The authorities must pinpoint **the areas** to be evacuated and where to set up emergency defences.

**TT** Tulvatilanteen kartoittamisessa on usein tehtävä nopeasti tärkeitä päätöksiä, joissa saattaa olla kyse elämästä ja kuolemasta. Viranomaisten on määritettävä **alueita**, joista ihmiset on siirrettävä pois ja joihin on pystytettävä hätäesteitä.

This extract is from the article ‘Floods’ (European Commission 2011) and it shows another example of breach of the target language system. A more suitable equivalent for ‘areas’ would be ‘alueet’ and not ‘alueita’. There is nothing in the source text context which would determine the translation be ‘alueita’.

(27) **ST** As Europe is becoming warmer, some areas, particularly in the north, are getting wetter, while others, such as the Mediterranean, are getting drier.

**TT** Kun Euroopan ilmasto lämpenee, joillakin etenkin pohjoisessa sijaitsevilla alueilla sataa enemmän kun taas esimerkiksi Välimeren alueella kärsitään kuivuudesta.

There is a comma missing in this sentence from the article ‘Floods’ (European Commission 2011). It should be between the word ‘enemmän’ and the expression ‘kun taas’. This addition makes the sentence easier to read. The expression ‘kun taas’ in a sentence simplifies that a comma has to be marked before it, in other words, it is a grammatical rule in Finnish language.

(28) **ST** As was demonstrated so clearly in the summer of 2002, floods wreak havoc – they are a menace to public safety, disrupt people’s daily lives, threaten out cultural heritage, and inflict enormous **economic and environmental losses**.

**TT** Kuten kesän 2002 tapahtumat niin selvästi osoittivat, tulvat saavat aikaan sekasortoa: ne uhkaavat yleistä turvallisuutta, häiritsevät ihmisten jokapäiväistä elämää, vaarantavat kulttuuriperintemme sekä aiheuttavat valtavia **taloudellisia ja ympäristövahinkoja**.

The translator has deviated from the target language norms in this translated sentence from the article ‘Floods - Tulvat’ (European Commission 2011). The last two words should be correctly written ‘taloudellisia- ja ympäristövahinkoja. This is a grammatical rule in Finnish language.

(29) **ST** European research has contributed to many innovative solutions for **air quality** management in cities choking on fumes from heating and ventilation systems, traffic and factories.

**TT** Eurooppalainen tutkimus on vaikuttanut osaltaan moniin innovatiivisiin ratkaisuihin koskien **ilman laadun** hoitoa kaupungeissa, jotka ovat

tukehtumassa lämmitys- ja ilmanvaihtojärjestelmien, liikenteen ja tehtaiden katkuihin.

Yet another grammatical error can be found from the article ‘Urban research’ (European Commission 2011). The translator has deviated from the target language syntax by writing ‘ilman laadun’ but it is a compound word and should be written ‘ilmanlaadun’.

(30) **ST** The Union **has introduced strict rules on the use of animals in R&D**, and funds research to develop and validate alternative methods.

**TT** Euroopan unioni **on hyväksynyt eläinten käyttöä tutkimuksessa ja kehityksessä koskevia tiukkoja sääntöjä**, ja se rahoittaa tutkimusta vaihtoehtoisten menetelmien kehittämiseksi ja laillistamiseksi.

This extract is from the ‘Animal Welfare – Eläinten hyvinvointi’ (European Commission 2011). The translator has tried to obey the English sentence structure too firmly. The translation does not follow the Finnish language structure properly and because of that it is unnatural and confusing. The structure ‘rules on the use of...’ does not appear in Finnish. There was an error identified in the beginning of the sentence but since it was already examined in the section of ‘wrong translations’ I will not go through it twice. To make the sentence more fluent and understandable the translation could have been for example ‘Euroopan unioni on hyväksynyt tiukkoja sääntöjä koskien eläinten käyttöä tutkimuksessa ja kehityksessä...’

## 5 CONCLUSIONS

In this thesis my aim was to study the translation quality of four different environmental EU articles Finnish translations. The articles were published in the European Commission webpage and they are titled ‘Animal Welfare – Eläinten hyvinvointi’, ‘Floods – Tulvat’, ‘Urban Research – Kaupunkitutkimus’ and ‘Marine Sciences – Meritieteet’. These articles are written to provide information to the EU citizens. Anyone who is interested has access to them. It was noted in the study that providing information can be stated as the *skopos*, the purpose of these articles and their translations. The translations are made so that the citizens from as many member countries as possible could read the articles. By acknowledging these two aspects it can be stated that it is important that the texts are translated intelligible and that they read fluently in the target language. If there are errors in the translations, the message of the source text might not be successfully transferred to another language and, therefore, the information might be distorted. In addition, if the translations do not read fluently, the reader may have difficulties in understanding the translation and the message it is trying to transfer.

In current study the translation quality of the Finnish translations was examined by Translation Quality Assessment by Juliane House. According to House (House 1977: 1) “TT, in order to be equivalent to its ST, should have a function – consisting of an ideational and an interpersonal functional component – which is equivalent to ST’s function”. Any mismatch is constituted an error. I have applied this model to identify errors in five different categories; 1) wrong translation, 2) not translated, 3) deficiencies in translation, 4) creative translation and 5) breach of the target language system. More specifically, group one consists of errors which influence total distortion of meaning. Group two includes words or expressions which are not translated either because of translator’s negligence or incompetence. In group three there are errors which cause partial transference of meaning or not complete faithfulness to the source text but not total distortion on meaning. Group four consists of words or expressions which the translator has translated freely by adding some words or information. The final group

five includes errors which can be named as a clear breach of the target language norms. These errors are called overtly erroneous errors. Before examining these errors I have made the source text and the target text profiles according to House's Translation quality assessment. These profiles are made by identifying the genre and register which are supposed to capture the linguistic and situational features of the source text. Register is further divided into field, tenor and mode which correlate with lexical syntactical and textual features. Field refers to the subject matter and social action. Tenor covers the addresser's personal viewpoint (intellectual, affective or social) and temporal and social provenance. Social attitude refers to formal, neutral or informal style. Mode relates to channel; simple (written to be read) or complex (written to be spoken). Participation can be simple (no addressee built into the text) or complex (various addressees). (House 1977: 39–42) Any mismatch between these profiles constitutes a covertly erroneous error.

According to House (House 1977:107) covert translations 'enjoy the status of an original ST in the target culture'. In my material, the four environmental articles, it has not been marked or stated otherwise in the texts that they are translations. The source text and its covert target text have equivalent purposes, and they are based on equivalent needs of a comparable audience in the source and the target language groups.

Most errors were identified in the category of 'breach of the target language system' (11 errors), second most in 'wrong translation' (9 errors), third most in 'deficiencies of translation' (5 errors), fourth most in the category of 'creative translation' (2 errors) and the least in 'not translated' (1 error). On the other hand there were categories in which some target texts did not contain errors at all. In the category of 'wrong translations' the article 'Tulvat' did not contain errors. The article 'Meriteteet' did not contain errors when quality was examined through the category of 'deficiencies in translation'. The articles 'Kaupunkitukimus' and 'Meriteteet' were error-free when it came to the category 'creative translation'. Only in the translation 'Kaupunkitukimus' there was an example of a not translated word. In the category of 'breach of the target language system' every article contained errors.

It is interesting to notice how some of the target texts contain errors in certain error category but are lacking them in another.. The most significant variation of errors can be seen in article ‘Eläinten hyvinvointi’. Whereas the article contains six errors in the category of “wrong translations” and three in “deficiencies in translation”, it has only one error in each of the two other error categories; “creative translation” and “breach of the target language system”. On the other hand in article ‘Tulvat’ there were five errors identified in the category of “breach of the target language system”, one in “deficiencies in translation” and “creative translation” but none in “wrong translation”. It can be stated that the number of errors varies much between the articles and the error categories. This could possibly be due to translators’ personal skills and how they differ between certain language skills.

It can be asked why the number of errors differ that much between the articles. For example, there are six errors in the article ‘Eläinten hyvinvointi’ when considering “wrong translations” but only one “breach of the target language system”. In the article ‘Tulvat’ there are five errors to be found in the category “breach of the target language system” but none in “wrong translations”. There can many possible reasons for this. One being that the translator of those articles might not be the same person. The translator’s name was not given in the translations in the European Commission webpage. The circumstances may be that the translator who has translated the article ‘Animal Welfare’ may have insufficient capability in the area of terminology in the subject but then again good skills in target language and its grammatical aspects and vice versa concerning the translation of the article ‘Floods’. It was also noted previously in the study that some of the translation work in European Commission is made by external translators, not the in-staff translators and that the results are not always good. It is possible that these translations were made by external translators because they are not legal documents but their aim is to produce information to the general public.

My expectation was that only few mistakes would be found because translating EU texts and LSP texts in general requires special professionalism in the field. My hypothesis also included the expectation that most errors would be found in translating terminology. This study does not include terminological errors in their own category,

but these errors are included in the group of “wrong translation” as any other words or expression if they are translated completely wrong causing a distortion of meaning. This hypothesis was proved wrong because most errors were identified in the category of “breach of the target language system” (11 errors). This affects the quality of the translations because as mentioned earlier the fluency of the language has an impact on the text’s readability, understandability and intelligibility. My hypothesis about the number of errors was that only few would be found. To discuss this aspect it is necessary to think the translation quality on the other way around. The number of errors has already been identified in each error category, but to examine the quality more, the articles need to be concentrated on their own, concerning the number of errors. An overall conclusion about the quality of the translations cannot be done before the errors in each article are counted. This is also because House’s model of Translation quality assessment does not pay attention to what type of errors are the most influential or severe when thinking about the translation quality. The following table shows the number of errors in each article.

**Table 6.** The number of errors identified in each translation

Title of Article	Number of Errors
Eläinten hyvinvointi	11
Kaupunkitutkimus	7
Tulvat	6
Meritieteet	3

It can be stated that the quality is better in some articles compared to others. The article 'Eläinten hyvinvointi' has eleven mismatches so the quality of that article is the lowest. The best quality can be seen in the article 'Meritieteet' because it has the least mismatches. As a conclusion I would say that three mismatches is fairly low number in a whole article so the quality of it can be stated to be good. However all the other three articles had six or more mismatches which is twice as much or more than in the article 'Meritieteet'. In a result, the translation quality of these articles could be better. 'Eläinten hyvinvointi' article had the worst translation quality because there were eleven errors identified. Most of these errors were in the category of "breach of the target language system" which has a negative effect on the readability and understandability of the text.

The results of this study show that the translators' skills especially in the target language are extremely important for the understandability of the translations. This statement is based to the notion that the category of 'Breach of the target language system' contained the most errors. Basic grammar rules should be paid attention to make the translations easy for the reader to comprehend and follow. Not only errors in the translation of terminology can cause distortion of the source text message. A breach from the target language norms can change the message of the original meaning as well. Deviation from the target language norms can also make the translations difficult to read. I hope that this study can contribute to make this aspect more visible in the area of EU translation.

## WORKS CITED

## Primary sources:

*Animal Welfare*. European Commission (2011) [online]. [Cited 15.4.2011] Available at [http://ec.europa.eu/research/leaflets/animal/page\\_69\\_en.html](http://ec.europa.eu/research/leaflets/animal/page_69_en.html)

*Eläinten hyvinvointi*. European Commission (2011) [online]. [Cited 15.4.2011] Available at [http://ec.europa.eu/research/leaflets/animal/page\\_69\\_fi.html](http://ec.europa.eu/research/leaflets/animal/page_69_fi.html)

*Urban Research*. European Commission (2011) [online]. [Cited 15.4.2011] Available at [http://ec.europa.eu/research/leaflets/animal/page\\_69\\_fi.html](http://ec.europa.eu/research/leaflets/animal/page_69_fi.html)

*Kaupunkitutkimus*. European Commission (2011) [online]. [Cited 15.4.2011] Available at [http://ec.europa.eu/research/leaflets/animal/page\\_69\\_fi.html](http://ec.europa.eu/research/leaflets/animal/page_69_fi.html)

*Floods*. European Commission (2011) [online]. [Cited 15.4.2011] Available at [http://ec.europa.eu/research/leaflets/animal/page\\_69\\_fi.html](http://ec.europa.eu/research/leaflets/animal/page_69_fi.html)

*Tulvat*. European Commission (2011) [online]. [Cited 15.4.2011] Available at [http://ec.europa.eu/research/leaflets/animal/page\\_69\\_fi.html](http://ec.europa.eu/research/leaflets/animal/page_69_fi.html)

*Marine Sciences*. European Commission (2011) [online]. [Cited 15.4.2011] Available at [http://ec.europa.eu/research/leaflets/animal/page\\_69\\_fi.html](http://ec.europa.eu/research/leaflets/animal/page_69_fi.html)

*Meritieteet*. European Commission (2011) [online]. [Cited 15.4.2011] Available at [http://ec.europa.eu/research/leaflets/animal/page\\_69\\_fi.html](http://ec.europa.eu/research/leaflets/animal/page_69_fi.html)

## Secondary sources:

Brekke Magnar, Oivin Andersen, Trine Dahl & Johan Myking (1994). *Applications and implications of current LSP research*. Volume 1. Proceedings of the 9<sup>th</sup> European Symposium on LSP.

Christer Lauren & Marianne Nordman (1989). *Special Language*. From Humans To Thinking Machines. Multilingual Matters Ltd.

EU Commission (2009). *Programme for Quality Management in Translation*. [online website] [Cited 14.3.2012] Available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/publications/studies/quality\\_management\\_translation\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/translation/publications/studies/quality_management_translation_en.pdf)

Hatim Basil & Ian Matson (1990). *Discourse and the Translation*. Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

- House, Julian (1977). *A Model for Translation Quality Assessment*. TBL Verlag Gunter Narr. Tübingen.
- Gutt, Ernest-August (1991). *Translation and Relevance*. Cognition and Context. Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Khurshid Ahmad & Margaret Rogers (2007). *Evidence-based LSP*. Translation, Text and Terminology. Bern: Peter Lang. Linguistic Insights, 47.
- Kotimaisten kielten keskus (2005). *Suomen vaadittava selkeitä alkutekstejä EU-puheenjohtajakaudella*. [online website] [Cited 5.5.2015] Available at: [http://www.kotus.fi/ohjeet/suomen\\_kielen\\_lautakunnan\\_suosituksia/kannanotot/suomen\\_vaadittava\\_selkeita\\_alkuteksteja\\_eu-puheenjohtajakaudella](http://www.kotus.fi/ohjeet/suomen_kielen_lautakunnan_suosituksia/kannanotot/suomen_vaadittava_selkeita_alkuteksteja_eu-puheenjohtajakaudella)
- Koskinen, Kaisa (2008). *Translating Institutions*. An Ethnographic Study of EU Translation. St. Jerome Publishing.
- Nida, A. Eugene (1964). *Toward A Science of Translating*. Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill.
- Pinchuck, Isabelle (1977). *Scientific and Technical Translation*. Boulder, Colo: Westview Press.
- Roinila, Pauli (1986). *Mitä kääntäminen on*. Teoriaa ja käytäntöä. Oy Gaudeamus Ab.
- Šarčević Susan & Maurizio Gotti (2006) *Insights into Specialised Translation*. Linguistic Insights – Studies in Language and Communication. Volume 46.
- Sosoni, Vilelmina (2011) *Training Translators to work for the EU institutions: luxury or necessity?* The Journal of Specialised Translation. Issue 16. [online website] [Cited 14.3. 2012] Available at: [http://www.jostrans.org/issue16/art\\_sosoni.php](http://www.jostrans.org/issue16/art_sosoni.php)
- Toyry, Gideon. (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Translatum Oy (2013). *Ethän kirjoita epäsuomea? Vältä nämä yleiset lainarakenteet*. Kansainvälistä viestintää käännöstoimiston silmin. [online website] [Cited 12.3.2015] Available at: <http://blogi.translatum.fi/bid/306083/Eth-n-kirjoita-ep-suomea-V-lt-n-m-yleiset-lainarakenteet>
- Venuti, Lawrence (2004). *The Translation Studies Reader*. Second Edition. Routledge, New York and London: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Wagner Emma, Svend Bech & Jesus M. Martinez (2002). *Translating for the European Union*. St. Jerome Publishing.