

UNIVERSITY OF LATVIA
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
DEPARTMENT OF CONTRASTIVE LINGUISTICS,
TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETING

**FACTORS AFFECTING ADDITION AND DELETION
IN TRANSLATING EU TEXTS INTO LATVIAN
FAKTORI, KAS IETEKMĒ TEKSTA PAPILDINĀŠANU
UN INFORMĀCIJAS DZĒŠANU EIROPAS
SAVIENĪBAS TEKSTU TULKOJUMOS LATVIEŠU
VALODĀ**

MASTER THESIS

Author: **Ringolds Klimons**
Matriculation Card No. rk10001
Adviser: prof. Maija Brēde

RIGA 2012

Abstract

The present Master Thesis “*Factors Affecting Addition and Deletion in Translating EU Texts into Latvian*” inquires into the causes of addition and deletion in translating the Treaty on the European Union into Latvian. Since official EU texts require deliverance of the complete target text with no additions or deletions permitted a hypothesis is proposed that “*In translating legislative acts the prohibition of addition and deletion refers not to the form of the source text but to its meaning.*” and this is proved through theoretical and practical parts of the study.

The goal of the study is to register the parts of speech added and deleted in the table and to identify the causes of addition and deletion. This involves both theoretical and empirical research.

The result of the study is the table of the parts of the speech added and deleted and the eight categories of factors affecting addition and deletion in translating the Treaty on the European Union into Latvian.

The present thesis consists of the theoretical and empirical parts consisting of 61 page and 1 table. 21 reference sources are used through development of the thesis.

Key words: addition, deletion, source text (ST), target text (TT), source language (SL), target language (TL).

Anotācija

Maģistra darbs „*Faktori, kas ietekmē teksta papildināšanu un informācijas dzēšanu Eiropas Savienības tekstu tulkojumos latviešu valodā*” pētī cēloņus, kas izraisa teksta papildināšanu vai informācijas dzēšanu Līguma par Eiropas Savienību Konsolidētajā Versijā. Ņemot vērā to, ka oficiālajiem Eiropas Savienības tekstiem mērķvalodā nedrīkst būt nedz teksta papildinājumu, nedz to izlaidumu, darbā ir izvirzīta hipotēze, proti, „*tulkojot tiesību aktus, aizliegums pievienot vai izlaist informāciju attiecas nevis uz teksta saturu, bet gan uz tā jēgu*”, un tas ir pierādīts teorētiskā un empīriskā pētījuma ietvaros.

Pētnieciskā darba mērķis ir reģistrēt tabulā vārdšķiras, kas ir vai nu pievienotas tekstam vai arī izlaistas no tā, un noteikt teksta papildinājumu un izlaidumu cēloņus. Pētījums ietver gan teorētisko, gan empīrisko daļu.

Veiktā pētījuma rezultātā tabulā tika reģistrētas vārdšķiras, kas tika pievienotas Līguma par Eiropas Savienību latviešu versijai vai arī dzēstas no tā, kā arī noskaidrotas astoņas šo cēloņu kategorijas.

Maģistra darba teorētiskās un empīriskās daļas lappušu skaits ir 61. Darba izstrādei ir izmatots 21 avots.

Atslēgvārdi: papildināšana, dzēšana, avotteksts, mērķteksts, avotvaloda, mērķvaloda.

Contents

Abstract	
Introduction	5
1. Equivalence in Translation	7
1.1 Theoretical basis for the concept of equivalence	7
1.2 Equivalence vs function	10
2. Classification of Text Types	13
2.1 Informative, vocative, expressive and legal texts	13
2.2 EU texts	18
3. Text Types as Determinants of Translation Strategies	21
3.1 Addition and explicitation	25
3.2 Deletion and compression	26
4. Application of Addition and Deletion in Translating the Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the European Union into Latvian	28
4.1 Materials and methods	28
4.2 Case study	29
5. Factors Affecting Additions and Deletions	57
Conclusions	61
Theses	63
References	65

INTRODUCTION

Translation is a science along other branches of science. Any science has certain research criteria and methods. Translation is not an exception. There are certain ways to overcome the difficulties encountered in the translation process. Since translation of the official EU documents, on the one hand, requires a high degree of correspondence to the source text but, on the other hand, involves inevitable changes to the target text, it is necessary to apply different translation methods in order to make an accurate and faithful translation of the source text. The focus of this study is translation procedures known as *addition* and *deletion* that can be applied for various reasons. The evidence of these translation procedures having been employed in translating the Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the European Union into Latvian makes this study purposeful.

According to the *Guide for external translators* of the Directorate-General for Translation the official EU documents require deliverance of the complete target text with no additions or deletions permitted. However, by comparing various versions of the Treaty on the European Union it is evident that there are words, phrases and even whole sentences both added and deleted. To solve the dilemma the **hypothesis** of this paper is as follows: in translating legislative acts the prohibition of addition and deletion refers not to the form of the source text but to its meaning.

The **goal** of the study is to register the parts of speech added and deleted in the table and to identify the *factors* affecting *addition* and *deletion* in translating the Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the European Union into Latvian after establishing the theoretical grounds for the research. The identified factors should prove the thesis, namely, that additions and deletions discovered in the translation of the Treaty into Latvian have not affected its meaning.

In order to achieve the goal of the research there are several steps or **enabling objectives**:

- (1) various kinds of equivalence existing between the source text and the target text are examined and defined in view of the fact that translation of the EU documents requires a faithful and accurate translation of the source text, (2) text types are classified and analyzed and their effect on translation strategies to be employed in translation are evaluated,

(3) *cases of addition and deletion* in the Latvian version of the Treaty on the European Union as compared primarily to the English version and, by way of reference, also to the German version are analyzed in order to determine the factors affecting addition and deletion.

Methods. The theoretical part of the research lays down the ground for the empirical part by differentiating between various kinds and degrees of equivalence and defining addition and deletion. The empirical part involves a contrastive analysis of English, Latvian, and German versions of the Treaty based upon case studies. It consists of both grammatical and stylistic analysis in order to determine the causes of addition and deletion. Due to the study limits the cases of addition and deletion shall only concern some of the basic parts of speech (nouns, verbs, adverbs, adjectives), not paying attention to the other parts of speech (pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions, and interjections).

The research materials comprise the Articles of the Treaty on the European Union. The three versions of the Treaty in English, Latvian, and German are retrieved from the *Official Journal of the European Union* (eur-lex.europa.eu).

The present Master thesis consists of the theoretical part and the empirical part. The theoretical part discusses the concepts of equivalence, text typology and translation strategies that are relevant to translation of the EU documents. The empirical part touches upon the cases of addition and deletion in the Treaty on the European Union and inquires into their causes.

EQUIVALENCE IN TRANSLATION

1.1 Theoretical basis for the concept of equivalence

The concept of equivalence has been in the minds of translators since ages past. Already in the 7th century B.C. there gathered seventy scribe men in order to translate the Hebrew Bible into Greek (LXX) for the Jews in the diaspora who had forgotten the language of their ancestors. If the two versions are compared it is evident that equivalence has not been achieved. For the Jews the Scriptures are sacred and there may be neither additions to nor subtractions from the source text. However the two languages differed considerably. Later on the Jews did not accept the books of the Bible that had been translated into Greek as Sacred Scripture. This example just shows how sacred the source text has been in the past (the skopos theory will have its own say on this matter). Yet people speak different languages and translation is the medium of communication even if it involves changes to the source text. Ideas develop, attitudes as well. What was understood by equivalence long ago is not what the present day scholars mean by it. Let us briefly look at some of the main figures who have considerably contributed to the understanding of the concept of *equivalence*.

Vinay and Darbelnet see equivalent translation as “replicat[ing] the same situation as in the original, whilst using completely different wording” (1995: 342). To achieve it they proposed seven translation methods/procedures (1995: 30-39)

- borrowing (e.g. dollar)
- calque (skyscraper, *debesskrāpis*)
- literal translation (word-for-word)
- transposition (one word class is replaced with another without changing the meaning of the text)
- modulation (a variation of the form of the message)
- equivalence (replicates the same situation as in the original, whilst using completely different wording (p.342))
- adaptation (a special kind of equivalence, a situational equivalence, e.g. film titles)

Jakobson speaks of equivalence in terms of “three kinds of translation” (in Venuti 2003: 114), namely

- intralingual translation (within one language; e.g. rewording)
- interlingual translation (between two languages)

- intersemiotic translation (between sign systems)

Nida has discussed the concept of equivalence in detail. He acknowledges that there is no such thing as 100% equivalence. Instead there are different degrees of equivalence just as there are different types of equivalence, namely, the formal and the dynamic equivalence. In formal equivalence the focus is on the form and content of the message, while the dynamic equivalence is “the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message” (Nida and Taber 2003: 12), the key terms of the definition being *equivalence*, *natural*, and *closest*. The word *equivalent* points to the source text, *natural* to the recipient of the message and the word *closest* “binds the two orientations together on the basis of the highest degree of approximation” (Nida 1964: 166). In the case of dynamic equivalence the TT needs to have the same effect on the target audience as the ST has on its audience (the focus is on equivalent effect), while the formal equivalence focuses on a detailed reproduction of both form and content of the ST in the TT (e.g. nouns are translated by nouns, verbs by verbs, preserving marks of punctuation, literal reproduction of idioms, etc.). Nida (*ibid.*: 156) notices that differences in translation generally result from three factors

- the nature of the message (e.g. in poetic texts the form is very important, while in informative texts the content takes precedence over the form)
- the purpose or purposes of the author and, by proxy, of the translator (e.g. to persuade, inform, etc.)
- the type of audience (e.g. interests or age of the audience)

Another proponent of equivalence is the British scholar John Catford. According to Catford translation is “an operation performed on languages: a process of substituting a text in one language for a text in another” (1965: 1). Substitution needs to achieve a formal correspondence. For Catford the formal correspondence is achieved by keeping to the linguistic form of the ST. When it is not possible linguistic equivalence is attained through two types of shifts – level shifts and category shifts:

- level shifts (a SL item at one linguistic level has a TL translation at a different level, e.g. from grammar to lexis).
- category shifts (in unbounded translation, e.g. a phrase may be translated by a single word while in rank-bounded translation equivalence is limited to ranks and it leads to “bad translation”) (1965: 73-82).

Baker (2010) speaks of equivalence at word level, above word level (e.g. collocations, recurrent patterns), grammatical equivalence, equivalence at textual level and pragmatic equivalence. She concludes that “the ultimate aim of a translator, in most cases, is to achieve a measure of equivalence at text level, rather than at word or phrase level” (2010: 112). At any of the four levels there can be various factors that hamper equivalence just as respective strategies to overcome these factors:

- at word level, e.g. culture specific concepts can be translated by a more general word or when the target language lacks a specific term it can be translated by a phrase using unrelated words (pp. 18-40)
- above word level, e.g. in case of idioms or fixed expressions having no equivalent in the target language many factors have to be taken into account like rhetorical effect in the target language, use of an idiom similar to the source text, or paraphrase (pp. 47-78)
- grammatical equivalence involves, e.g. gender, person, syntactical structure, case inflection use, etc. use of differences between languages (pp. 83-110)
- textual equivalence relates to cohesion, word order in a sentence, theme and rhyme, etc. (pp. 120-160)
- pragmatic equivalence relates to the use of a text in a concrete situation

Koller spoke of equivalence as follows, “quality (or qualities) X in the SL must be preserved. This means that the source-language content, form, style, function, etc. must be preserved, or at least that the translation must seek to preserve them as far as possible” (1989: 100).

To sum it all up, Vinay and Darbelnet speak of equivalence in terms of replication of the source text. For Catford equivalence means substitution of the ST text by the TT message. Nida differentiates between formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence. The formal equivalence involves reproduction of both form and content of the ST, while the dynamic equivalence is catered towards achieving of the same effect that the ST has on its audience. For Baker equivalence proper is at textual level, while Koller emphasizes preservation of the SL qualities. Now let us see what is the role of function in translation.

1.2 Equivalence vs function

What is the goal of translation? To achieve an equivalent translation replicating the source text as closely as possible or to achieve a translation that would function in the same way the source text did for its audience? In the past the source text was viewed as quasi sacred. Nowadays it is the target audience that plays a pivotal role in translating a text. The pragmatic aspect of the question like - will the translation be acceptable for the audience? - plays a crucial role. In the next chapter we will see how text types influence translation.

Approaches to translation are traditionally divided into source-oriented and target-oriented. The focus thus is either on achieving the target text equivalent to the source text or on the effect of a translated text on the audience. The history of translation knows proponents of both theories. Proponents of equivalence are, e.g. Koller, Catford and Nida, although Nida distinguishes formal equivalence from dynamic equivalence. Dynamic equivalence is very close to the functionalist approaches, since it emphasizes an equivalent effect of translation. The functionalist translation is advocated by, e.g. Reiss, Vermeer, Schaefer or Genzler.

Catharina Reiss (to some extent also Nida) marks the beginning of shift towards the functionalist approach to translation. She saw translation as bound to the source text. It is the type of the source text and its function that influence the target text (TT). She thus emphasizes functional equivalence of the ST and TT. According to Reiss interlingual translation is “bilingual mediated process of communication, which ordinarily aims at the production of a TL text that is functionally equivalent to an SL text” (in Venuti 2000: 160). Although her views are later on influenced by the skopos theory of Vermeer, equivalence still plays a huge role for her. She says, “translation should be governed by...the original’s skopos...” (Reiss and Vermeer 1984: 156). It is the purpose of the source text that guides translation.

Hans J. Vermeer was a student of Reiss. He noticed that there is inadequacy between theory and praxis. Translation theory was very much focused on equivalence while the target text had to cater to the needs of the target audience. E.g. the target text had a different function compared to the source text in adapting a prose text for a stage performance. In the light of these considerations Vermeer proposed the Skopos (aim, purpose) theory, which he defined as follows, “translate/interpret/speak/write in a way that enables your text/translation to function in the situation in which it is used and with the people who want to use it and precisely in the way they want it to function” (in Nord 1997: 29). Skopos he saw in terms of translational action, translation being part of this action. Vermeer saw skopos in terms of action and purpose. Translation also is an action and has a purpose. The purpose (skopos) of

this translational action is the target text. It is the purpose of the target text that guides translation. The aim of translation and its terms (commission), in each case, are negotiated between a commissioner and a translator, e.g. should the translation be free or literal, paraphrased, etc. It can be inferred that skopos of translation is not chosen at random. It involves a deliberate choice on the part of the translator; the translator must be able to justify the skopos of the chosen action (in Venuti 2000: 221).

The functional approach to translation is also upheld by Gideon Toury. Toury speaks of translating as part of cultural communication. Thus “translatorship amounts first and foremost to being able *to play a social role*, i.e., to fulfil a function allotted by a community...” (in Venuti 2000: 198). Translation activity is guided by certain target-culture norms lying between absolute rules of culture and mere idiosyncracies (ibid: 199). According to Toury cultural norms can be divided into

- basic norms, more or less mandatory for all instances of behaviour
- secondary norms (or tendencies), common but not mandatory
- tolerated behaviour (ibid: 208).

The importance of the cultural aspect in translating is also mentioned by Eco “...the translator is forced at all times to go beyond linguistic competence to the cultural spectrum. Consequently, translations do not constitute a comparison between two languages but the interpretation of two texts in two different languages” (2001: 14).

The “extrem” representative of functional approach to translation is Genzler. He belongs to translation theorists who call themselves deconstructionists. In his approach to translation he goes against the traditional approaches to translation, e.g. resisting the categorization of texts into source and target texts or questioning the dependence of the source text on the translated text and not vice versa. Or saying that, “the translated text writes us and not we the translated text” (1993: 146). However, like the majority of translation theorists, he acknowledges the value of the cultural setting of the target audience, albeit using deconstructionist language (e.g. words like *manipulate*). Thus he says, “translators do not work in ideal and abstract situations nor desire to be innocent, but have vested literary and cultural interests of their own, and want their work to be accepted within another culture. Thus they manipulate the source text to inform as well as to conform to the existing cultural constraints” (1993: 131).

As we can see, the key words and concepts of function oriented translation are *acceptability, purpose, aim, skopos, target culture norms* and *expectations, manipulation*, etc. Reiss spoke of achieving of the function of the ST in the TT. For Vermeer the target audience /commissioner determines the skopos of the TT. Toury pointed to the function of the TT according to concrete cultural norms. According to Gentzler the ST can be manipulated as the situation requires.

There are both differences and similarities in comparing equivalence approach to translation to functional approach to translation. The transitional point between the two approaches seem to be the notions of text function of Reiss and the dynamic equivalence spoken of by Nida. To sum it up, the focus of equivalence oriented translation is the reproduction of a close form and content of the source text both in terms of meaning and form of the sentence, while the functionalists emphasize the function of the TT in the target cultural setting. Which direction takes the Latvian translation of the Treaty on the European Union will be seen in the practical part of the study discussing the application of addition and deletion in the Treaty. Now let us look at text types and their effect on the choice of translation approaches.

CLASSIFICATION OF TEXT TYPES

2.1 Informative, vocative, expressive and legal texts

Traditionally texts are classified into informative, expressive and operative types (Bühler 1990, Reiss 1991). Zauberga classifies texts using Bühler's classification model (2001: 20-33). She distinguishes also the fourth text type - legal texts, which has come to the fore since Latvia's entry into the EU. In a sense, legal texts belong to informative texts. In the past they did not count as a separate text type (Bühler: 1990, Reiss: 1991). Later on, e.g. Garzone (1999) and Zauberga (2001) distinguish them as a separate entity in view of the special status of these texts. Žigūre also calls them "a particular type of language" (2006). EU texts are discussed as a separate category and not as a separate text type, since this kind of texts will be dealt with in the practical part of the study and they deserve our special attention.

It would be difficult to pin down a text to a particular text type even if there were a unanimous agreement on the classification of texts for there may indeed be various text types intertwined in a single text or the same text may serve multiple functions. However we can assume that a text serves some basic overall function. For this reason we will keep to the fourfold classification of texts and give a brief summary of each text type.

Informative texts

The designation itself bears testimony to the nature of these texts. Informative texts (hereinafter ITs) inform of something. Reiss calls them content-focused texts (2000: 30). They convey facts and data in a clear way. ITs include various kinds of texts like instructions, treaties, reports, etc. Precision, especially that of terminology, plays a pivotal role in translating these texts. Translation of ITs requires expertise of specific areas (e.g. computer, building or forestry). The problem that the translator may face in translating ITs is lack of knowledge of the subject matter, which can be solved by consulting specialists or parallel texts. Another problem is caused by developing terminology which has to be coined before it is officially created (e.g. in the case of EU in-house translators). The target audience plays an important role in translating ITs. If ITs are translated for professionals an adherence to terminology will be very important. If the target audience constitutes lay people the terminology will play a less important role giving way to an ordinary language.

IT can serve various functions. In this regard Smirnova (see internet resources) says that ITs can

- define
- classify
- give reasons
- give examples
- compare and contrast
- discuss cause and effect
- argue
- draw conclusions
- introduce new concepts
- report
- characterize objects and structures

Having discussed IT let us pass over to vocative (operative) texts.

Vocative (operative) texts

Reiss (2000: 38) calls operative texts appeal-focused texts. They comprise such items as tourist guides, advertisements, particular speeches, etc. Vocative texts are intended to persuade the target audience to think in a particular way or to do something. However, the efficiency of translation largely depends on the ability of the translator to cater to the needs of the target audience. The focus is on the effect that the text is intended to have on the recipient. The translated text needs to have the same effect on the target audience as the source text has on its audience. To achieve this purpose various translation techniques are employed. Zauberga (2001: 24-25), Schäler (in Baker 2011: 157-158) speak of the following “translation aspects” - adaptation, revision, localization, and zero translation.

Adaptation is widely used in translating advertisements and movies. It is also employed in literary translation, e.g. in children literature or poetry translation. Be it a story, a film, an advertisement, or a piece of poetry that needs to be cast in another culture and language an adaptation plays a pivotal role. In translating e.g. legal texts no deviations from the source text are permissible, while in translating, e.g. an advertisement the focus is not on the words of the source text but on the idea or effect that the source text is intended to have on the target audience. Adaptation is necessary due to many factors. Some of them would include

- differences in ideologies or aesthetic values, e.g. in Japan it is not used to compare a woman with a flower because a woman is much more beautiful than a flower
- phrases which are offensive to the target audience, e.g. in movies, literary translations get deleted or paraphrased in less offensive words
- what in some culture and language is a brand name in another culture and language may be a pejorative term. In Spanish, for instance, the car Mitsubishi Pajero would not sell because the word *pajero* means ‘wanker’. As a result the name was changed to Montero
- age of the target audience, e.g. children literature would have different language compared to adult literature
- local time, e.g. at late hours movies are not intended for children, etc.

Localization is necessary in order to offer a product in a different cultural setting. For some authors, the concepts of adaptation and localization overlap in meaning. Schäler, for instance, makes no difference between the words adaptation and localization. He just points out that nowadays it is “digital material” what is new in this well known method applied already by merchants and missionaries centuries ago (in Baker 2011: 157-158). However the term localization is nowadays widely used (Guidere, Zauberga, Nabil, etc.) and it is worth discussion as a separate entity.

Localization relates to a cultural setting. In order to offer a product in a different cultural setting, many factors have to be taken into account, for example

- habits and norms of the target culture, e.g. in Eastern cultures, like Japan, people stand closer to each other while speaking compared to the western world
- use of other local spoken languages (not only the official language(s)) would reach a wider audience and make a product more desirable for the target audience
- time and date, e.g. in the USA the sequence is - month, day, year)
- in designing web-pages, local key web-search-words need to be identified
- humor differences (will the source language humor be understandable for the target audience or should it be changed?)
- age (e.g. do the children of the same age wear the same clothing in the target cultural setting?)
- sex (would the muslim women wear jeans like western women do?)
- symbols and colors (e.g. white color means mourning in China and Japan, while in Latvia the same meaning is carried by the black color), etc.

Localization has to convey the sense that the product has been designed exactly for the local people. The local cultural and political norms have to be taken into account.

Zero translation (cf. Zauberga 2001: 24-25) means that the brand name of the product is left untranslated. This would apply to such well known brand names as coca-cola, Audi, Siemens, etc.

Expressive texts

Reiss (2000: 33) calls expressive texts the form-focused texts. They include literary works. Among them, e.g. essays, personal correspondence, literature works, poetry, etc. Reiss holds the view that the function of expressive texts is “communication of artistically organized content” (in Venuti 2003: 163). Translation has to convey not only the content of the source text, but above all aesthetic effect. In this regard Reiss (2000: 33) notices that in content-focused texts the question is *what* to convey, while in form-focused texts *how* to convey the content. The translated text has to have an aesthetic effect on the reader. To achieve it the translator needs to have a very good command of both the source and target languages. There is even a view that translation of literary texts can be successfully done only by literary specialists. The translator should be tuned to stylistic expression means of literary texts such as assonance, alliteration, metaphors, meter, connotations, denotations, meter, rhyme, etc. and know how to render them in the target text. If in translation, e.g. the same word play is not possible the translator has to create a new one having the same aesthetic value and effect (which would not be necessary in translating content-focused texts).

The problems the translator faces in translating literary works stem from various factors. How to achieve the same function of metaphors or connotations? What to do with extralinguistic elements that make no sense for the target reader? Substitute them for other realities known to the target audience? Should the translation be free or close to the text? These and many other dilemmas require a sharp and experienced mind in order to make good translations.

In translating literary texts many factors will be taken into account such as age, habits, political situation, etc. To give an example, Chung-ling (see internet source) in her study *Corpus-based Study of Differences in Explicitation Between Literature translations for Children and Adults* shows that the age plays a huge role in translation of novels. Summarizing her study results she concludes that in children literature translations there is a higher degree of explicitation than in adult literature translations. In children literature there is a lower density of nouns but higher density of various connectives. In adult literature

translations the figure is vice versa. Yet another example could be taken from political situation of the target culture. It is not hard to imagine that the literary work criticizing say a particular ideology should in translation be in some way adapted in order to get it published at all.

Legal texts

Legal texts comprise specialized texts such as wills, statutes, contracts, pleadings etc. Accurate translation, awareness of the differences between legal systems, knowledge of the legal terminology, etc. are required. This, however, causes a problem. On the one hand, legal texts should be made comprehensible for non-specialists in law; on the other hand, they require an unambiguous and nuanced legal language, which is understandable only to lawyers. To come to terms with legal language let us note some of its characteristic features

- legal language is embedded in a particular national culture, its history, and tied up with a national legal system. A vivid example of the Latvian legal language is the term *constitution* translated not as constitution but as *satversme*
- legal language is tied up with legal systems basically divided into three legal systems - civil law, common law, and religious law. Latvian legal system is basically civil, as opposed to common law (e.g. in England and Wales or USA)
- use of borrowings from Latin (e.g. *a priori*, *ab initio*) and French (e.g. court)
- long sentences
- use of archaic words such as *imbibe* (to drink) or *puruse* (to read, examine); or, in Latvian, the word *pametums* (līgumsods)
- use of legal technical terms used only by specialists (hereinafter, tenant, etc.)
- use of the modal “shall” translated into Latvian with the present tense
- frequent use of the passive voice
- impersonal language (frequently the third person) points to its authoritative character
- declarative sentences
- use of doublets, e.g. terms and conditions
- use of repetition in order to avoid misinterpretation
- translated legal terms have to be equivalent in meaning, significance, and function; when it is not possible, descriptive paraphrases and definitions are used (for more information see Wagner pp. 44-80).

TTC (Translation and Terminology Centre) of Latvia has issued the book on translation of Latvian legislation *Tiesību Aktu Tulkošanas Rokasgrāmata*

(<http://www.vvc.gov.lv/export/sites/default/LV/publikacijas/lv-rokasgraamata.pdf>). The book singles out the following requirements with regard to the quality of translation and provides principles of translation:

- precision (translation must reflect the contents of the original without adding to or subtracting from legislative rules)
- clarity (models alien to the target language shall be avoided; correspondence to the sense expressed in the original shall be attained by using the target language tools without copying sentence structures, etc.)
- consequence of terminology (parallel terminology is not acceptable)
- common sense (attention should be paid to the meaning of the text and not single words)
- economy (in face of various translations choose the shortest)
- the least harm (choose the best version from what you have)
- analogy (use parallel texts)
- deliberate choice (unjustified choice cannot be justified)
- structuring (set priorities with regard to contents, time etc.)
- good fellowship (consult colleagues) (see pp. 9-13).

Last but not least, translators of legal texts ought to be aware of false friends and not fall prey to them. Žīgure (2006) in her article *English-Latvian False Friends in Legal Language* differentiates between partial and absolute false friends. The problem with many terms is that they are polysemic in meaning. It is easy to translate the term *sentence* as *teikums* and fall prey to an absolute false friend. The correct translation would be *spriedums*. An example of a partial false friend would be the translation of the word *process* as *process* or *norise*, when the correct translation could be *tiesas process, metode*, etc.

2.2 EU texts

EU texts have been chosen as a separate category just to emphasize their special nature and function. EU texts have become especially important since Latvia's entry into the EU. Zauberga (2001: 32) describes them as "a specific subtype of legal texts." Of course, eurotexts can carry the force of law and they can be described as a subtype of legal texts. However, these texts are very different. They may have a heavy legal language, e.g. in contracts, or have a very specific terminology, e.g. that of banking. But eurotexts can also be on cultural issues, on pets, leisure activities, dietary issues, etc. These texts are basically

informative texts. Among the most important documents are treaties, regulations, directives and charts.

Treaties are translated only by the Council translators; they define the character of the EU. After translation into national languages Treaties have to be ratified by national parliaments and published in all the official languages of the EU.

Directives, regulations, and decisions make up another very important part of EU documents. As to their legal force, directives are “binding, as to the result to be achieved”, regulations are “binding in their entirety”, while decisions are “binding only on those to whom they are addressed” (Wagner 2002). Of course, there are also speeches of leading EU figures, debates of the European Parliament, daily press releases, correspondences with national ministries, website infos, booklets, etc. to be translated into national languages.

Translation of the EU documents involves many challenges. It is often impossible to determine the “original” language of the EU documents. A draft of a document may be drawn in, e.g. English with amendments in French and translated into a national language from English and German. This is so because of the equal status of all the official EU languages.

Problems that translators encounter in translating EU documents involve, e.g. Eurojargon, false friends, national slogans, eurospeak concepts etc. Not infrequently this is translators’ job to spot mistakes in documents which are drawn up by non-native speakers. In order to avoid misunderstanding in the terminology the EU documents avoid using national legal terminologies. Supranational terms, however, require their transposition into national terminologies.

In translating EU texts into Latvian one has to bear in mind that, strictly speaking, there is no such thing as “original”, since all languages of the member states are official and working languages. The designation *translation*, from the legal point of view, is not correct. Translation is just a tool for crossing language barriers. In translating EU texts into Latvian, various versions are to be consulted in order to arrive at the most appropriate text in Latvian.

The Guide for external translators (<http://ec.europa.eu/translation>) provides the following translation quality requirements:

- all specific instructions from the requesting department are followed;
- the delivered target text is complete (no omissions nor additions are permitted);
- the target text is a 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 are consistent throughout the text and with any relevant reference material;
- sufficient attention has been paid to the clarity and register of the target text;
- the target text contains no syntactical, spelling, punctuation, typographical or other grammatical errors;
- the formatting of the original has been maintained (Legiswrite, including codes and tags if applicable); and
- the agreed deadline is met.

Having discussed various text types let us see how they influence translation.

TEXT TYPES AS DETERMINANTS OF TRANSLATION STRATEGIES

The notion that text types determine translation strategies was advocated by Catharina Reiss. Reiss is a German linguist and translation scholar. According to Reiss text types (informative, expressive, and operative) affect the choice of translation strategies (1991: 150).

Contrary to that Emery holds the view that neither the notion of text type nor that of text function can provide an adequate basis for the classification and analysis of texts (2001: 171). This is true, it is difficult to attribute a text to a particular text type and use a particular classification model as a basis for text analysis (the text can have multiple functions; e.g. it can be both informative and expressive). However texts serve some overall function and can help the translator in choosing an appropriate translation method for a particular text.

The classification of translation methods is no less complicated as the classification of text types. How ought one to call a translation approach? A strategy, a method, a technique, a procedure, a tactic, or a rule? There is no clear answer to this question. Translation theoreticians use different terminology. Lörscher distinguishes strategies from methods, rules, tactics and plans. Others (e.g. van Dijk and Kintsch) regard strategies as a “subcategory of tactics” (Baker 2011: 283). According to Hönig and Kussmaul (1991: 76), translation strategy is “a potentially conscious procedure for the solution of a problem which an individual is faced with when translating a text segment from one language into another”. Venuti (1998: 240) indicates that translation strategies “involve the basic tasks of choosing the foreign text to be translated and developing a method to translate it”.

As we see for majority of translation theorists the term strategy is a reality encompassing its subcategories. Let us look at deeper analysis of subcategories of translation strategies.

Jean-Pierre Mailhac in his Article *Formulating Strategies for the Translator* (www.translationdirectory.com) distinguishes strategies from procedures. With regard to strategies Mailhac says that “they can be conscious, potentially conscious (e.g. instinctive automatized translational behavior may be accessed through introspection, if required), or totally subconscious (e.g. as would be the case with undesirable strategies such as the ones resulting in various forms of translationese)”. He defines procedures as “as a means of translating a particular element as part of a strategy”. The author mentions 10 translation procedures:

1 Lexical procedures

- lexical repetition
- use of lexical superlative/diminutive
- addition of noun
- addition of adverb or adverbial phrase
- addition of interjection - addition of particle
- addition of adjective or adjectival phrase
- addition of verb
- addition of conjunction
- addition of lexical sequence
- focus
- surprise
- lexical harmonisation

2 Syntactic procedures

- syntactic reprise
- adding a clause
- cleft sentences

3 Morphological procedures

- stressed personal pronoun
- demonstrative pronouns
- demonstrative adjectives

4 Phonetic procedures (vowel/consonant lengthening)

5 Punctuation (commas, dashes, etc.)

6 Typographical marker (e.g. bold, italics)

7 Descriptive label

8 Compensation (e.g. transfer of emphasis)

9 Combination of procedures

10 Deletion

The choice of a necessary procedure is related to 11 parameters - linguistic medium, pragmatic context, nature of the text, readership, style, level of speech, linguistic frequency norms concerning various means of conveying emphasis in the SL and TL, pragmatic function, sentence, nature of word emphasized, presence of other emphasizing element.

To sum it up in the words of the author, “a strategy thus links procedures with the conditions which obtain when they are used, these being specified in terms of parameters”. For Mailhac the choice of a translation approach is interplay among strategies, procedures and parameters.

Other authors use different terminology. Newmark differentiates between methods and procedures. He says that “while translation methods relate to whole texts, translation procedures are used for sentences and the smaller units of language” (1988: 81). Newmark (1988: 45-47) defines translation methods in the following way

Word-for-word translation - the SL word order is preserved and the words translated singly by their most common meanings, out of context

Literal translation - the SL grammatical constructions are converted to their nearest TL equivalents, but the lexical words are again translated singly, out of context

Faithful translation - attempts to produce the precise contextual meaning of the original within the constraints of the TL grammatical structures

Semantic translation - differs from 'faithful translation' only in as far as it must take more account of the aesthetic value of the SL text

Adaptation - is the freest form of translation. It is used mainly for plays (comedies) and poetry; the themes, characters, plots are usually preserved, the SL culture is converted to the TL culture and the text is rewritten

Free translation - produces the TL text without the style, form, or content of the original

Idiomatic translation - reproduces the 'message' of the original but tends to distort nuances of meaning by preferring colloquialisms and idioms where these do not exist in the original

Communicative translation - attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership

Within the framework of methods just mentioned the translator has to choose appropriate procedures for the translation of a text. Newmark (pp. 81-91) proposes the following procedures

Transference - is the process of transferring an SL word to a TL text

Naturalization - adapts the SL word first to the normal pronunciation, then to the normal morphology of the TL

Cultural equivalent - a SL cultural word is translated by a TL cultural word

Functional equivalent - is applied to cultural words, requires the use of a culture-free word, sometimes with a new specific term; it therefore neutralises or generalises the SL word; and sometimes adds a particular

Descriptive equivalent - in translation, description sometimes has to be weighed against function

Synonymy - is used for a SL word where there is no clear one-to-one equivalent, and the word is not important in the text, in particular for adjectives or adverbs of quality

Through-translation - is the literal translation of common collocations, names of organisations, the components of compounds; also known as *calque* or loan translation

Shifts or transpositions - is a change in the grammar from SL to TL, e.g change from singular to plural

Modulation - a variation through a change of viewpoint, of perspective and very often of category of thought

Recognized translation - the official or the generally accepted translation of any institutional term should usually be used

Compensation - is said to occur when loss of meaning, sound-effect, metaphor or pragmatic effect in one part of a sentence is compensated in another part, or in a contiguous sentence

Componential analysis - is the splitting up of a lexical unit into its sense components, often one-to-two, -three or -four translations

Paraphrase - is an amplification or explanation of the meaning of a segment of the text

Couplets, triplets, quadruplets - combine two, three or four of the above-mentioned procedures respectively for dealing with a single problem

Notes - additional information in a translation.

It can be inferred from the data mentioned above that Mailhac understands the term procedure differently from Newmark. However, both view procedures as an inclusive part of a broader reality. For Mailhac strategies include procedures while for Newmark methods include procedures.

The choice of translation strategies, methods and procedures are largely determined by a text type. Reiss holds the view that translation methods are related to text types, while kinds of texts “concern the linguistic elements when translating” (2000: 27). In vocative texts translation may be very flexible and free; methods like adaptation and localization are frequently used. Expressive texts require rendition of the aesthetic effect of the source text and translation method depends on identification with the author. Informative texts should convey precise information. They should be translated as plain prose using explicitation when necessary. Translation of legislative texts, on the one hand, allows for neither expansion nor narrowing of legislative norms. On the other hand, the translated text has to be clear, without employing models alien to the target language. Correspondence to the idea expressed in the original has to be achieved by translation various techniques (cf. Translation Handbook for Latvian Legislation, p.9). After discussing various terms used in translatology (strategies, methods, procedures, etc.) let us come to terms in defining addition and deletion.

1.3.1 Addition and explicitation

Additions can vary. Nida (1964: 227) distinguishes the following types of addition

- filling out elliptical expressions
- obligatory specification
- additions required because of grammatical restructuring
- amplification from implicit to explicit status
- answers to rhetorical questions
- classifiers
- connectives
- categories of the receptor language which do not exist in the source language

- doublets.

Other authors do not go into such a detailed classification. Zauberga, e.g. distinguishes between lexical addition and explicitation, and calls them methods. According to Zauberga (2001: 77) addition is “a translation method when additional information is inserted in TT to explain or express more lucidly ST messages”. Explanatory translation (or explicitation) is “a method of translation when a ST unit (usually non-equivalent) is translated by means of explanation, TT states ST information in a more explicit form than the original” (ibid.: 63). It can be inferred from Zauberga’s definitions that addition relates to smaller amounts of additional information in the target text compared to explicitation involving lengthier explanations in the target text.

Other translation theorists, e.g. Klaudy defines explicitation as “the technique of making explicit in the target text information that is implicit in the source text” (in Baker 2011: 104). Klaudy notices that some scholars see addition as incorporated in explicitation; some view the two as synonyms (in Baker 2011: 104). Vinay and Darbelnet define explicitation as “a stylistic translation technique which consists of making explicit in the target language what remains implicit in the source language because it is apparent from either the context or the situation” (in Baker 2011: 104). Berman says that “the explicitation can be the manifestation of something that is not apparent, but concealed or repressed, in the original” (Venuti 2003: 289).

Regarding its classification, e.g. Vaseva and Klaudy divide explicitation in the following types: obligatory explicitation, optional explicitation, pragmatic explicitation, and translation-inherent explicitation (in Baker 2011: 106).

This short overview shows different approaches to the method (Zauberga)/procedure (Newmark)/technique (Klaudy and Darbelnet) called addition/explicitation. It is difficult to find metaterms in order to speak about methods, procedures, techniques or strategies for they define each other. Since there is not a unanimous approach among translation theorists in defining addition and explicitation, we will choose the term that describes addition and deletion most appropriately, that being done after discussing the opposite reality of addition, namely, deletion (and compression).

1.3.2 Deletion and compression

According to Zauberga, deletion (or omission) is “a type of lexical transformation when some ST units are omitted in the translation for different reasons” like redundancy,

commercial, political or unethical reasons (2001: 58). Klaudy calls omission the implicitation and says that it as “a stylistic translation technique which consists of making what is explicit in the source language implicit in the target language, relying on the context or the situation for conveying the meaning” (in Baker 2011: 104). An explicit text unit in the ST is made implicit in the TT. This leads us to another form of omission called compression (of the text), which Zauberga defines as “omission of semantically and stylistically redundant elements in the process of translation” (2001: 55).

To sum it up, it is probably not that important how addition or deletion are defined, either ‘method’, ‘procedure’ or ‘technique’. The first involves addition of some additional information in the target text, while the second omits something from the source text in the target text. However, for the sake of clarity we have to choose the terms for designation of addition (and explicitation) and deletion (and compression).

First, let us look at the lexical meanings of the words *method*, *technique* and *procedure*. According to (online) Merriam-Webster the term *method* means a procedure or process for attaining an object; or a way, technique, or process of or for doing something. *Technique* is defined as a *method* of accomplishing a desired aim, while the term *procedure* stands for a *particular way* of accomplishing something or of acting; or a step in a procedure.

As we see the terms are inclusive of each other, because it is difficult to find metalinguistic terms in this case. The term *method* is inclusive of the terms *procedure* and *technique*. In its turn, the term *technique* is defined in terms of the term *method*. The term *procedure* appears to be the most neutral one.

Addition and deletion cannot be thus called methods since they do not include other procedures or techniques. They can be either techniques or procedures. We have to agree with Mailhac and Newmark that *procedures* are a part of something bigger, of a *strategy* or a *method*, and relate to translation of smaller lexical units. In the light of these considerations we opt for the term *procedure* in designating *addition* and *deletion*. Besides, this study does not aim at the identification of terminology as the primary goal; we are interested in discovering factors causing addition and deletion, which will be discussed in the following chapter.

Application of Addition and Deletion in Translating EU Texts into Latvian

4.1 Materials and methods

The materials include the Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the European Union. The Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the European Union is the result of Maastricht Treaty (Treaty on European Union; signed on 1992) having been amended by the Lisbon Treaty (signed on 2007). The Lisbon Treaty also amended the Treaty of Rome (Treaty Establishing the European Community; signed on 1957) and now is called the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union. Thus we shall analyze the amended Maastricht Treaty. Upon enquiry from the Directorate-General for Translation it has been established that the Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the European Union has been translated from English, partly also from French. Before laying down the methodology criteria let us look more closely at the Treaty concerned.

The Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the European Union entered (2009) was originally called the Treaty on European Union (or Maastricht Treaty). The Maastricht Treaty (1992) led to the creation of common currency euro. It also established the Maastricht criteria regarding inflation rates, government finance, exchange rate, and interest rate. In the course of the years the Maastricht Treaty has been amended by the treaties of Amsterdam, Nice and Lisbon. The present Consolidated Treaty on the European Union includes 55 Articles and is structured into six parts, namely, (I) Common Provisions, (II) Provisions on Democratic Principles, (III) Provisions on Institutions, (IV) Provisions on Enhanced Cooperation, (V) General Provisions on the Union's External Action Service and Specific Provisions on the Common Foreign and Security Policy, (VI) Final Provisions.

The methodology involves a contrastive analysis primarily of English and Latvian (and by way of reference of the German) versions of the Treaty on the European Union. It is based upon case studies in order to determine the causes of addition and deletion and to inquire into their effect on the meaning of the text. The case study is divided into three groups: additions, deletions, additions and deletions. It consists of both grammatical and stylistic analysis. Due to the study limits the cases of addition and deletion shall only concern some of the basic parts of speech (nouns, verbs, adverbs, adjectives) not paying attention to the other parts of speech (pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions, and interjections). To

facilitate the study we cite the cases concerned and not the whole paragraph. Where it is possible, sentences are shortened. An opinion is given upon each analysis, namely, whether an addition/deletion is obligatory, optional or unjustified. We also evaluate the degree of equivalence among the three versions of the Treaty concerning additions and deletions. In the end the findings regarding additions and deletions in the English and the Latvian texts of the Treaty are registered in the table and evaluated. We use italics to highlight the words or phrases both in the Articles cited and in the subsequent case analysis.

4.2 Case study

Additions:

The following Articles contain additions only: 3, 6, 10, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 25, 27, 30, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38, 40, 45 and 48.

Article 3

§1 “The Union’s aim is to *promote* peace, its values and the well-being of its peoples”.

„Savienības mērķis ir *veicināt* mieru, *stiprināt* savas vērtības un savu tautu labklājību”.

In English it is possible to say *to promote peace, values, and the well-being* for the verb *promote* in English has a wider semantic domain compared to the Latvian verb *veicināt*. It would be somewhat awkward to say *veicināt vērtības*, although one could say *veicināt labklājību*. The translator has thus chosen to insert another verb to avoid a stylistic constraint put by the chosen verb *veicināt*. In this case it is an obligatory addition, which does not change the meaning of the sentence. Like English the German version uses just a single verb *fördern* (promote) to govern the whole sentence. Comparing the three versions an equivalence degree between the German and the English versions is higher.

§ 2 “...free movement of persons is ensured in conjunction with appropriate measures with respect to external border controls, *asylum*, immigration...”.

„...personu brīva pārvietošanās ir nodrošināta saistībā ar piemērotiem pasākumiem, kas attiecas uz ārējo robežu kontroli, *patvēruma meklētājiem*, imigrāciju...”.

In the English version context the word *asylum* does not need any explicitation. In Latvian the word *asylum* needs to be explained for literally it means *patvērumš*, which is not meant in this context. If the word *asylum* were translated as *patvērumš* its contextual meaning in Latvian would not be clear. One could ask questions like *patvērumu no kā?* In this context the meaning of the word *asylum* is different. The translator has rightly added the word *meklētājiem* in order to bring out the sense of the word *asylum*. This case appears to be what Nida calls obligatory specification. The German version uses the word *das Asyl* (*asylum*) and, in this regard, is closer to the English version. In German there is also another semantically close word for *asylum* - *Zuflucht*. *Zuflucht*, however, is closer to the English words *shelter*, *refuge*.

§ 3 “It shall work for the sustainable development of Europe...”.

„Savienības darbība ir vērsta uz to, lai *panāktu* stabilu Eiropas attīstību...”.

The sentence structure in Latvian requires the verb *panāktu* because of the subordinate clause. The subordinate clause results from the translation of the verbal phrase *work for* as *vērsta uz*. The translator could say, “*Savienības darbība ir vērsta uz stabilu Eiropas attīstību*” or, “*...stabilu Eiropas attīstības panākšanu*”. There is a tendency nowadays to avoid the form *-šana*, but the first version is acceptable, since the verb *vērsta uz* already points to the future objective. The verb *panāktu* thus could be avoided if the translator did not choose a subordinate clause. It is thus an optional addition for stylistic reasons, which does not alter the meaning of the sentence compared to the English or German texts. In German it runs as follows, “*Sie wirkt auf die nachhaltige Entwicklung Europas...*”. It does not introduce either a subordinate clause or an addition and, in this regard, the English and the German versions have a higher degree of equivalence.

As the analysis of the first case shows we are dealing with the informative text type (content-focused text), if we follow the threefold distinction of text types proposed by Reiss (p. 13) or with the legal text type following Zauberga’s distinction of text types (see p. 13). The case-text is written in plain prose. It conveys information and facts. Yet, we can assume that in the course of case analysis we shall discover other features characterizing the cases under discussion.

Article 6

§ 1 “The rights, freedoms and principles in the Charter shall be interpreted in accordance with...”.

„Hartā paredzētās tiesības, brīvības un principus interpretē saskaņā ar...”.

The Latvian version has an addition (adjective) *paredzētās*. The sentence could also be rendered as *Hartas tiesības, brīvības un principus intepretē...* But this rendition would be misleading, since one could interpret the rights, freedoms and principles mentioned in the Charter as the rights, freedoms and principles of the Charter towards some other entity. In this case, however, the Charter only contains the rights, freedoms and principles to be interpreted. If translation resorted to a subordinate clause in translation, the sentence would be too long. The present translation is very successful. An addition *paredzētās* amplifies the intended meaning from implicit to explicit status (Nida’s designation, p. 25) not altering the meaning of the sentence. The German version “Die in der Charta niedergelegten Rechte...”, in this case, is closer to the Latvian text. It has a word *niedergelegten* (*paredzētās*). If we look closer at the English text (The rights, freedoms and principles in the Charter), it seems that it calls for some kind of addition, e.g. mentioned/laid down in the Charter. The English text grammar or stylistics, however, does not require it and it is omitted.

Article 10

§ 2 “Member States...themselves democratically accountable either to their national Parliaments, or to their citizens”.

„Dalībvalstis...kas *savukārt par savu darbību saskaņā ar demokrātijas principiem* atbild vai nu savu valstu parlamentiem, vai saviem pilsoņiem”.

The English version is considerably shorter. In Latvian the problem is triggered by the phrase *democratically accountable*. The translator has chosen not to translate it literally as *demokrātiski atbildīgas*; perhaps considering it as a through-translation (although one can find the phrase *demokrātiski atbildīgi* on the Council webpage). Hence the translator has chosen to render it as *par savu darbību saskaņā ar demokrātijas principiem*. Klaudy (p. 25) explains explicitation as making the implicit source-text message explicit in the target text. It is evident that the form of the three versions is very different. Are there any meaning-changes arising thereof? It is worth paying closer attention to differences of each of the three versions. In German the respective sentence is as follows “...*die ihrerseits in demokratischer Weise gegenüber ihrem nationalen Parlament oder gegenüber ihren Bürgerinnen und Bürgern*”.

Rechenschaft ablegen müssen”. The English text is the shortest. The word *democratically* in the German version appears in the form of *in demokratischer Weise*, while in Latvian it is rendered as *saskaņā ar demokrātijas principiem*. The word *accountable* in German is rendered as *Rechenschaft ablegen* (to account for sth), while in Latvian as *atbild*. In addition in Latvian there is the an explanatory phrase *par savu darbību*. It could be perhaps inferred from the differences in the form of three texts that the Latvian version has the highest degree of explicitation as regards the phrase *democratically accountable*. Except for formal differences of the texts no changes to the meaning of the text can be traced. As regards explicitation, the sentence could be made shorter if the translator used the phrase *demokrātiski atbildīgas*. Since the eurlex documents do not display this combination of words the translation made recourse to the procedure of explicitation. It is a justified explicitation without changing the meaning of the sentence if compared to the English or German versions. The analysis of the phrase *democratically accountable* shows that the same meaning can be expressed in various ways in different languages, which is also the hypothesis of this paper, namely, that the prohibition of addition and deletion refers not to the form of sentences, since it can differ for different languages, but to its meaning. All cases are viewed in the light of this hypothesis, namely, after discovering the factors affecting addition and deletion we ask if these additions and deletions have affected the meaning of the respective sentence in three languages.

§ 3 “Decisions shall be taken as openly and as closely as possible to the citizen.”

„Lēmumus pieņem iespējami atklāti, un tie cik iespējams ir tuvināti pilsoņiem.”

The English sentence uses the modal form *shall* translated in Latvian with the simple present. The *shall* form is characteristic of legal texts (p. 17). In Latvian version the sentence is divided into two clauses. In the Latvian it is impossible to say *Lēmumus pieņem iespējami atklāti un iespējami tuvināti/tuvu pilsoņiem*. Could the phrase *as openly and as closely as possible* be translated otherwise? In eurlex one can find the same phrase translated as *lēmumu pieņemšana notiek cik vien iespējams atklāti un cik vien iespējams tuvinot to pilsoņiem*. There are obvious differences in the form of translations both, however, retaining the same meaning. An addition in the form of the second adjective *iespējams* appears to be unavoidable but the form of the translatum depends on the translator’s choice of syntax varieties s/he employs. Nida would call it “addition required because of grammatical restructuring”. The wording of the German text “*Die Entscheidungen werden so offen und bürgernah wie möglich getroffen.*” is closer to English.

Article 11

§ 4 “Not less than one million citizens who are nationals of a significant number of Member States...”.

„*Savienības pilsoņi, kuru skaits nav mazāks par vienu miljonu un kas pārstāv ievērojamu dalībvalstu skaitu...*”.

The Latvian version above has two lexical additions *Savienības* and *skaits* as compared to the English text. (The phrase *who are* is translated as *un kas pārstāv*. The verb *pārstāv* is not considered as an addition, since it is just one of the ways how to render the verb form *are*.) The word *Savienības* specifies the noun *pilsoņi*. It seems more appropriate to use it in Latvian rather than omit it. If the word *Savienības* were omitted in the Latvian text one would wonder what the word *pilsoņi* denotes. Citizens of a particular country? Of the Union? The present translation is clearer to the Latvian reader. The second addition *skaits* is due to the grammatical structure of the translatum. Let us translate the sentence almost literally „*Ne mazāk kā viens miljons pilsoņu, kuri pārstāv ievērojamu dalībvalstu skaitu...*”. In this case the word *pilsoņu* remains unspecified, although the second part of the sentence clarifies it. From the stylistic point of view, the official translation sounds better. In German the specification degree is even higher than in Latvian. In the Latvian text there is only *pilsoņi* while in German both *pilsoņi un pilsones* “*Unionsbürgerinnen und Unionsbürger...*”.

Article 14

§ 1 “It shall exercise functions of political control and consultation as laid down in the Treaties.”

„Tas veic politiskās kontroles un padomdevēja funkcijas saskaņā ar *nosacījumiem*, kas paredzēti Līgumos.”

Could the sentence be translated in the following way? *Tas veic politiskās kontroles un padomdevēja funkcijas, kas paredzētas Līgumos*. It looks like a better translation. There is no addition *nosacījumiem*. However, let us note the differences. In the first case the word *funkcijas* refers to the word *Līgumos* indirectly through the word *nosacījumiem*. In the second case the word *funkcijas* directly refers to the word *Līgumos*. We could rephrase it as *funkcijas saskaņā ar Līgumu nosacījumiem* or *funkcijas saskaņā ar Līgumiem*. There is a difference

between the two versions. Which one is correct? In German the sentence runs as follows “*Es erfüllt Aufgaben der politischen Kontrolle und Beratungsfunktionen nach Maßgabe der Verträge*”. The German text also has the noun *nosacījumi* (*Maßgabe*). In addition to that, in German there is also the addition *Aufgaben* as compared to the English or Latvian texts. We could translate the German phrase *Aufgaben der politischen Kontrolle und Beratungsfunktionen* as *the duties of political control and the function of consultation*. Formal differences of the three versions are obvious as well as the fact that it is impossible to achieve one-to-one correspondence between various versions of the same document in different languages. There are small deviations in meaning for, as we see, in the German version there appears the word *Aufgaben* (duties, assignments, functions) not present in the English or Latvian texts. These small differences, however, do not affect the essence, the meaning of the text so as to bring about discord among various versions of the Treaty concerned. We could compare this case to human beings having different skin colors. Even though they differ from outside internally they have the same organs. But the question that we asked at the beginning of the analysis of this paragraph still remains open - would the proposed alternative translation be better than the official? Although there are formal differences between the two proposed versions *funkcijas saskaņā ar Līgumu nosacījumiem* or *funkcijas saskaņā ar Līgumiem* there is no essential difference in meaning since in either case the functions refer to the Treaties. We could say that the word *nosacījumiem* just specifies some aspect of the word *Treaties*. For some reason the translator has chosen to use it (*nosacījumiem*); perhaps after consulting French or other versions of the Treaty. We could call this case “amplification from implicit to explicit status” (Nida’s designation, p. 25).

Before we continue with case analysis let us recall at this point various equivalence theories and ask if they fit the cases having been analysed? Reiss spoke of the function of the ST in the TT. We can agree with her because the English, German, and Latvian versions have the same informative function. Vermeer emphasized the primary role of the target audience and the commissioner who determine the skopos of translation. According to skopos theory if the parties decide to achieve a close correspondence between texts in different languages then it is the skopos of translation. In this way the skopos theory is applicable even to translation of EU documents requiring a close correspondence between a source text and a target text. Vinay and Darblnet spoke of replication, but this is not the case, because, as we saw, the formal differences among the texts can be considerable. Neither can we agree to Koller who speaks of preservation of the SL qualities for they frequently get lost in translation. We can agree to the dynamic equivalence spoken of by Nida (the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message) since it nicely fits translation qualities that we observe in case

analysis. As we see some theories on equivalence are closer to what we observe in case analysis while some are far away from the reality. We can say that the three versions of the Treaty aim at preserving equivalence in terms of meaning but at the same time allow for formal differences in view of language and culture peculiarities affecting translations.

Article 16

§ 4 “A blocking minority must include at least four Council members, failing which the qualified majority shall be deemed attained.”

„Bloķējošais mazākums ir jāveido vismaz četriem Padomes locekļiem, pretējā gadījumā tiek uzskatīts, ka ir panākts kvalificēts *balsu* vairākums.”

The term *qualified majority* the LAS (Latvian Academy of Sciences) translates as *kvalificēts balsu vairākums*, although one can find it in official web sites translated as *kvalificēts vairākums*. Even though the sentence would be understandable if the form *kvalificēts vairākums* were used, the official term is to be preferred. A lexical addition in the form of *balsu* can thus be considered as an obligatory specification amplifying the information implicit in the source text. As for the German text it is closer to English “*die qualifizierte Mehrheit*”.

Article 18

§ 2 “He shall contribute by his proposals to the development of that policy...”

„Izsakot priekšlikumus, Augstais pārstāvis veicina šīs politikas attīstību...”

The participle *izsakot* is an *obligatory specification* (designation proposed by Nida, p. 25), since it would be impossible to say in Latvian *ar saviem priekšlikumiem*, which would be a literal translation of the phrase *by his proposals*. We see that a faithful translation of the source text in the target language (Latvian) is achieved by employing the target language tools and it avoids literal translation. It is done in accordance with the provisions of translation of Legal texts, namely, models alien to the target language shall be avoided; correspondence to the sense expressed in the original shall be attained by using the target language tools without copying sentence structures, etc. (p. 18). An added participle does not change the meaning of the text. For comparison the phrase of the German text “...*durch seine Vorschläge*...” (literally *caur saviem priekšlikumiem*) is closer to the English text.

Article 20

§ 1 “Enhanced cooperation shall aim to further the objectives of the Union...”.

„Ciešākas sadarbības mērķis ir veicināt Savienības mērķu *sasniegšanu*...”.

The added noun *sasniegšanu* fits the context very well. It is hard to imagine how else the sentence could be rendered. It would be stylistically wrong to say *veicināt Savienības mērķus*; rather *mērķu sasniegšanu*. Is it an obligatory specification? On the one hand, it seems that it is not, since lack of an addition would not affect the meaning of the *translatum*. On the other hand, some form of an addition is unavoidable in order to render the translation that corresponds to the Latvian language requirements. In German the sentence runs as follows ”*“Eine Verstärkte Zusammenarbeit ist darauf ausgerichtet, die Verwirklichung der Ziele der Union zu fördern...”*. As we see the noun *sasniegšana* (*Verwirklichung*) is present in the German text as well. Both in Latvian and in German it is a standard phrase *sasniegt mērķus* or *Ziele zu erreichen*. Both Latvian and German versions employ the verb *veicināt* (*fördern*) with reference to the noun *mērķus* (*Ziele*). In neither language the words *veicināt* and *mērķus* form a word pair without other parts of speech. The addition *sasniegšanu* is due to the chosen verb *veicināt*.

Article 22

§ 1 “Decisions of the European Council on the strategic interests and objectives of the Union shall relate to the common foreign and security policy...”.

„Eiropadomes pieņemtie lēmumi par Savienības stratēģiskajām interesēm un mērķiem attiecas uz kopējo ārpolitiku, drošības politiku...”.

The phrase *foreign and security policy* has in English a single noun *policy* specified by adjectives *foreign* and *security*. The Latvian standard phrase for it is *ārpolitika* rather than *ārējā politika*. This case refers to conventional language norms. In contrast it is conventional to say *ārējā tirdzniecība* or *ārējā bilance*. As regards the phrase *foreign and security policy* in German the construction is similar to English “... *Außen- und Sicherheitspolitik*...”. We notice again the formal differences between English and Latvian or German but it does not trigger any essential meaning differences among the three texts. Since the phrase *foreign and security*

policy repeats many times in the Treaty we will not analyse it anymore. It occurs in the following Articles: 22, 24, 27, 30, 32, 36, 38, 40, 42.

Article 31

§ 2 “when adopting a decision defining a Union action or position on the basis of a decision of the European Council relating to...”.

„pieņem lēmumus par Savienības rīcību un nostāju, pamatojoties uz Eiropadomes *pieņemtu* lēmumu, kas attiecas...”.

The addition *pieņemtu* could be avoided and the phrase *a decision of the European Council* could be translated as *Eiropadomes lēmumu*. The German version does not have it either “...auf der Grundlage eines Beschlusses des Europäischen Rates...”. The word combination *pieņemt lēmumu* belongs to standard legal phrases in the Latvian language and this is probably the cause of addition. Nonetheless it appears to be a case of optional lexical addition not affecting the sense of the text.

“If a member of the Council declares that, for vital and stated reasons of national policy, it intends...”.

„Ja kāds Padomes loceklis paziņo, ka būtisku un pamatotu iemeslu dēļ, kas *saistīti ar* valsts politiku, viņš vēlas...”.

The translator has opted for a subordinate clause rather than genitive construction. This, in turn, triggers an addition in the form of *saistīti ar*. An alternative translation, employing the genitive construction, could be „...ka būtisku un pamatotu valsts politikas iemeslu dēļ...”. The phrase *valsts politikas iemeslu dēļ*, although understandable, is too long and less clear. For this reason the official text resorts to a subordinate clause making the sentence clearer. The addition *saistīti ar* does not affect the meaning of the sentence. On the contrary, it clarifies it. The addition *saistīti ar* is due to the grammatical restructuring of the sentence in Latvian. In this regard the German phrase (*aus wesentlichen Gründen der nationalen Politik*) is closer to English, since it uses the genitive.

Article 34

§ 2 “Member States...shall keep the other Member States and the High Representative informed of any matter of common interest”.

„dalībvalstis...informē pārējās dalībvalstis un Augsto pārstāvi par visiem jautājumiem, kas *izraisa* kopēju ieinteresētību”.

Since the translation introduces a subordinate clause an addition in the form of a verb is unavoidable. The added verb *izraisa* is a good solution in this case. If the string of Genitives were used (*informē...par visiem kopējas ieinteresētības jautājumiem*) the translation would be less successful from the stylistic point of view. We see that a faithful and accurate translation is achieved by employing the tools of the target language without sticking to a close wording of the source text. The German case (like English) does not involve any addition “...*unterrichten die Mitgliedstaaten... über alle Fragen von gemeinsamem Interesse*”. In this case, the chosen grammatical sentence structure in Latvian is the cause of an addition in the text.

Article 45

§ 1a “contribute to identifying the Member States’ military capability objectives...”.

„palīdzēt noteikt mērķus, kas dalībvalstīm *jāsasniedz* militāro spēju *jomā*...”.

In this case there are two added words compared to the English version. An alternative translation could be *palīdzēt noteikt dalībvalstu militāro spēju mērķus*, but it would involve too many Genitive inflections. The German version “*bei der Ermittlung der Ziele im Bereich der militärischen Fähigkeiten der Mitgliedstaaten...mitzuwirken*”, like the Latvian, has an equivalent for the word *jomā* (Bereich), but does not have one for the word *jāsasniedz*. The two additions in the Latvian text are obligatory and result from grammatical restructuring. If an alternative translation were chosen an equivalence degree between the English and the Latvian texts would be higher but less successful from the point of view of stylistics. Since the two additions do not affect the meaning of the translated text they are justified.

Before we proceed with the analysis of deletions let us briefly summarize the results of the cases involving additions. As we have seen additions in the Latvian version of the Treaty have affected its form as compared to the English or German texts but not its meaning. The factors affecting additions can be divided into the following categories

- grammatical restructuring of the source text in the target text (5)
- amplification from implicit to explicit status (4)

- conventional usage of the Latvian language (2)
- stylistic reasons (2)
- obligatory specification (2).

The cases studied so far involve thirteen obligatory additions, three optional additions and zero unjustified additions. The equivalence ratio is as follows: EG (12), EL (1), LG (3). As we see English and German (12 correspondance cases) texts have the highest degree of equivalence in terms of words/phrases added or deleted.

Deletions:

The following Articles contain deletions only: 8, 9, 19, 21 and 29.

Article 8

§ 2 “Their implementation shall be the *subject* of periodic consultation.”

„Par to īstenošanu regulāri apspriežas.”

An alternative translation could be *To īstenošana ir regulāru apspriežu temats*. The degree of equivalence between the two texts would be higher. However, an alternative translation can also be criticized. There is a tendency in contemporary Latvian language to avoid unnecessary use of the ending *-šana*. If we compare the official and the alternative version the official version is to be recommended from the point of view of stylistics of Latvian language. But the question can still be asked: is the word *temats* essential to the meaning of the sentence? As it was stated in the thesis, in translating legal texts the source text must be delivered complete. Does it mean that the form of the source text must be preserved in the target text? The answer to this question can be found in the *Translation Handbook for Latvian Legislation*. According to the principle of clarity, correspondence to the sense expressed in the original shall be attained by using the target language tools without copying sentence structures, etc. (see above p. 18). Thus, if the word *subject* is essential to the meaning of the sentence it must be preserved in translation. In this case it is just a peculiarity of English language. The English sentence could be rephrased as *Their implementation shall be periodically discussed*. From the point of view of meaning there is no difference between the official and the alternative versions. For this reason the translator makes the word *subject* implicit in the Latvian version. In terms of skopos theory the goal of translation must be negotiated between the translator and the commissioner. If the goal of translation were to

render a complete text in the target language, as prescribed in the rules of the *Guide for External Translators*, the official translation would be a vivid example of the realized skopos rule. The German version does not have an equivalent for the word *subject* either “*Zur Durchführung der Übereinkünfte finden regelmäßige Konsultationen statt*”. We see that equivalence between the texts is achieved on the level of meaning and not on the formal level.

Article 9

“In all its activities, the Union shall observe the principle of the equality of its citizens, who shall receive equal attention from its *institutions, bodies, offices and agencies*.”

„Visās darbībās Savienība ievēro pilsoņu vienlīdzības principu, pret ikvienu paužot vienlīdzīgu attieksmi savās *iestādēs un struktūrās*.”

This is an interesting case, since the terms *institutions* and *bodies* are compressed into *iestādēs* and the terms *offices and agencies* into *struktūrās*. It is indeed hard to distinguish the terms *institution* and *body*. According to the terminology data base of the LAS the term *body* (as regards this context) can be translated as either *institūcija* or *organizācija*, while the term *institution* translates as either *institūcija*, *organizācija*, *iestāde* or *institūts*. The reason for this compression obviously lies in the fact that the terms *institūcija*, *iestāde* and *organizācija* are frequently used interchangeably in the Latvian language. However, speaking about the state governance, the term *organizācija* is not used, since it usually refers to commercial and nongovernmental organizations. According to the same data base the term *agency* (as regards this context) translates as either *aģentūra*, *orgāns*, *dienests* or *institūcija*, while the term *office* means either *iestāde*, *ofiss*, *nodaļa* or *uzņēmums*. The reason for the compression of the terms *offices* and *agencies* into the term *struktūrās* is difficult to determine, since the eurlex search shows the terms *offices* and *agencies* being translated as either *struktūrās* (compression) or *biroji un aģentūras*. The IATE translates the four elements *institutions, bodies, offices and agencies* as *iestādes, struktūras, biroji un aģentūras*. For comparison, the German version combines them in the following way, „...*denen ein gleiches Maß an Aufmerksamkeit seitens der Organe, Einrichtungen und sonstigen Stellen der Union zuteil wird*.” The key terms in the German version would be *Organe* and *Einrichtungen*. Both terms, according to the online English-German dictionary Leo, translate as *institution*. Not knowing the German conventions regarding the translation of these terms it is impossible to give any definite answer as regards the German version of the phrase *institutions, bodies, offices and agencies*. At this point we need to ask the question if these formal differences have affected the meaning of the Latvian

version as compared to the English text. In the English version there are four elements, while in the Latvian version only two. According to the explanation given by Sandra Kaupuža (DGT-Riga representative), the four elements should be cited only in the case of quoting the particular Article; otherwise the rendition corresponding to the source text shall be used. This explanation accords to the translation principle of clarity mentioned in the previous case. Hence we can conclude that the formal differences between the two texts do not involve any essential meaning changes.

Article 19

§ 3b “give preliminary rulings, at the request of *courts or tribunals* of the Member States...”.
„pēc dalībvalstu *tiesu* pieprasījuma sniedz prejudiciālus nolēmumus...”.

In this case we see a compression of two terms *courts* and *tribunals* into a single term *tiesu*. It is interesting that in the German version the same tactic is employed “*im Wege der Vorabentscheidung auf Antrag der einzelstaatlichen Gerichte...*”. Let us inquire into the reason(s) of this compression. In the judicial vocabulary (according to LAS) the word *court* means *tiesa*, while the word *tribunal* translates as *tribunāls* or *tiesa* (according to IATE). The compression obviously arises from the fact that in the present Latvian judicial system tribunals do not exist. Since the lexeme *tribunal* allows to be translated as *tiesa* it gets rendered this way. In German the term *tribunal* translates both as *Tribunal* (tribunāls, tiesa) and *Gericht* (tiesa). Not knowing the German judicial system it is impossible to give a definite answer regarding the use of the term *Gericht* in German. As regards the differences between the English and the Latvian texts in terms of meaning we do not observe any, since the single term *tiesa* denotes both English terms (*courts* and *tribunals*). In terms of equivalence the correspondence between the English and the Latvian versions can be described as dynamic equivalence (see p. 8) or as functional equivalence when the skopos of the target text is rightly defined (pp. 9-11).

Article 21

§ 1 “The Union’s action on the international *scene* shall be guided by the principles...”.
„Savienības starptautiskās darbības virzītājspēks ir principi...”.

The noun *scene* does not appear in Latvian, but is present in German “...auf internationaler Ebene von den Grundsätzen leiten...”. The phrase *action on the international scene* is translated as *starptautiskās darbības*. An alternative translation could be „Savienība, darbojoties starptautiskajā mērogā, vadās pēc principiem...”. This translation would be closer to both English and German versions having an equivalent for the word *scene*, but the preference has been given to the principle of economy (see p. 18).

Article 29

§ 1 “The Council shall adopt decisions which shall define the approach of the Union to a particular matter of a geographical or thematic *nature*”.

„Padome pieņem lēmumus, kuros nosaka Savienības attieksmi īpašos ģeogrāfiskos vai tematiskos jautājumos”.

The noun *nature* appears to have been subsumed into the noun *jautājums* (matter). In English and German the noun *nature* has a wider semantic domain, while in Latvian it is more restricted to certain semantic contexts. If the noun *veids/daba* were inserted in the Latvian text it would make for a bad style „...īpašos ģeogrāfiska vai tematiska veida/dabas jautājumos”. Another version could be „Padome pieņem lēmumus, kuros nosaka Savienības attieksmi attiecībā uz konkrētu ģeogrāfisku vai tematisku jautājumu”. The problem with various versions stems from the fact that the target text must be a faithful translation of the source text and it does not allow for free interpretation. In this case, it appears that neither version sounds “ideal” to the Latvian reader. The factor affecting deletion in the official version relates to the stylistics of the Latvian language. In this context it is an obligatory deletion/compression not changing the meaning of the sentence. For comparison, the noun *nature* appears in the German version “...Frage geografischer oder thematischer Art...” and fits the context very well. This case obviously utilizes the principle of the least harm (see p. 18).

As we see deletions have affected the form of the target text but not its meaning compared to the English or German texts. Factors affecting deletions can be divided into the following categories:

- conventional usage of the Latvian language (2)
- stylistic reasons (3)
- principle of economy (1).

The deletion cases involve three obligatory deletions and two obligatory compressions. There are no optional and unjustified deletions/compressions in this section. The equivalence ratio among the three versions of the Treaty is as follows: EG (2), EL (0), LG (3). The highest degree of equivalence in terms of words/phrases added or deleted is between the Latvian and the German versions of the Treaty (3 correspondance cases).

Additions and deletions:

The following Articles contain additions and deletions in a sentence unit – 2, 4, 5, 7, 11, 15, 17, 20, 24, 26, 28, 42.

Article 2

“The Union is *founded on the values* of respect for human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and *respect* for human rights, including the rights of *persons belonging* to minorities.

„Savienība ir dibināta, *pamatojoties uz vērtībām*, kas respektē cilvēka cieņu, brīvību, demokrātiju, vienlīdzību, tiesiskumu un cilvēktiesības, *tostarp minoritāšu tiesības*.”

The Latvian version displays both lexical addition and compression. The translator seems to have chosen to add the word *pamatojoties* for the stylistic reason not wishing to render the phrase *founded on the values* literally, which would be *dibināta uz vērtībām, kas respektē*... Instead the verb *dibināt* (*founded on*) was chosen, which in Latvian is semantically constricted to certain linguistic contexts. One can say *dibināt biedrību*, but one could not say *dibināt vērtības*. This association probably was the cause of not using the phrase *dibināta uz vērtībām*. The second thing that we notice is the compression of two nouns *respect* into a single verb *respektē*. It appears that the compression is due to the fact that the noun *respect* the Latvian text renders as the verb *respektē* and there is no need to repeat the verb *respektē* twice. In German the phrase *respect for human rights* is rendered as *die Wahrung der Menschenrechte* (observance of human rights) and there is not compression of the two nouns *respect* into a single noun like in Latvian. Thirdly, the translation of the phrase *the rights of persons belonging to minorities* (in German, *Personen, die Minderheiten angehören*) as *tostarp minoritāšu tiesības* is very successful. A direct translation could be *tostarp to personu tiesības, kuras pieder minoritātēm* and it would be too wordy. The choice to make a more concise translation of the respective phrase appears to be justified. Once again we see the

principle of economy at work. As regards the form of the text from the point of view of equivalence at word level the English and the German texts are closer. However the differences at the word level do not bring about the differences at the meaning level, if the three versions are compared.

“These values are common to the Member States in a society in which pluralism, *non-discrimination*, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality between women and men *prevail*.”

„Šīs vērtības dalībvalstīm ir kopīgas sabiedrībā, kur *valda* plurālisms, tolerance, taisnīgums, solidaritāte un *kur nav diskriminācijas*, kā arī *valda* sieviešu un vīriešu līdztiesība.”

The English sentence structure above resembles German grammar where the verb goes to the end of a subordinate clause. The Latvian version has the lexical addition *valda* which results from the following causes. First, the translator has chosen to translate the verb *prevail* as *valda*. The problem is caused by the noun *non-discrimination*, which in Latvian cannot be translated as *nediskriminācija*. Hence it needs to be reworded, in this case, as *kur nav diskriminācijas*. In English the string of nouns is governed by the single verb *prevail*. In Latvian the verb *valda* (*prevail*) cannot govern the phrase *kur nav diskriminācijas*. In order to continue the thought flow governed by the verb *valda* the phrase *kur nav diskriminācijas* is replaced in the sentence. The thought flow determined by the verb *valda*, however, gets abruptly. For this reason the translator repeats the verb to finish the sentence (*valda* sieviešu un vīriešu līdztiesība). The lexical addition in the form of the repeated verb *valda* is caused by the morphology of the noun *non-discrimination* in Latvian. In German, like in English, the noun-string *pluralism, non-discrimination, tolerance, justice, solidarity and equality* is governed by the single verb *sich...auszeichnet*.

Article 4

§ 3 “The Member States shall take any appropriate measure, general or particular, to ensure fulfilment of the obligations *arising out* of the Treaties or *resulting from* the acts of the institutions of the Union.”

„Dalībvalstis veic visus vajadzīgos vispārējos un īpašos pasākumus, lai nodrošinātu to pienākumu izpildi, kas *izriet* no Līgumiem vai no Savienības iestāžu aktiem.”

In English, it is more proper to say *obligations arising out of the Treaties*, but acts usually *result from* rather than *arise from*. Hence the distinction. This is, however, not

necessary in Latvian. One can compress the two verbs *arising out* and *resulting from* into the single verb *izriet*. It is possible since both verbs are semantically close in meaning. There is no need to translate the verb *resulting from* as *rodas*, since the verbs *izriet* and *rodas* are basically synonymous, and the other lexemes of the sentence allow to be governed by the verb *izriet*. For comparison let us look at another example to be found in the eurlex. It is almost equal to the aforementioned sentence, namely, “*obligations arising out of the Treaty or resulting from action taken by the institutions of the Community*” translated as „*lai nodrošinātu to pienākumu izpildi, kas izriet no minētā Līguma, vai ko rada Kopienas iestāžu darbība.*” In this case the verb *resulting from* is translated as *rada*. If we shorten the sentence „*lai nodrošinātu to pienākumu izpildi...ko rada Kopienas iestāžu darbība*” it is difficult to grasp the meaning. What does it mean to say *nodrošināt pienākumu izpildi, ko rada iestāžu darbība*? The meaning of this sentence does not concern our study. It is just to show how ambiguous the eurotexts can be. In our case the meaning is clear and it corresponds both to English and German versions. The German version, just as Latvian, uses the single verb *sich ergeben* (*izriet*) instead of two verbs in English (*arise out* and *result from*).

Article 5

§ 1 “The use of Union competences is governed by the principles of subsidiarity and proportionality.”

„Savienības kompetenču īstenošanu nosaka subsidiaritātes princips un proporcionalitātes princips.”

In this case the use of the word *princips* twice in Latvian could be avoided. The phrase could run as *subsidiaritātes un proporcionalitātes princips*. It is rather a mere choice of the translator to use it, maybe for the purpose of emphasis. According to Klaudy’s classification it would be an *optional explicitation* (see p. 26). The German text is closer to English “*die Grundsätze (principles) der Subsidiarität und der Verhältnismäßigkeit*”.

§ 3 “...the Union shall act only if and in so far as the objectives of the proposed action cannot be sufficiently achieved by the Member States, either at *central level or at regional and local level*, but *can rather*, by reason of the scale or effects of the proposed action, be better achieved at Union level.”

„...Savienība rīkojas tikai tad, ja dalībvalstis *centrālā vai reģionālā un vietējā līmenī* nevar pietiekami labi īstenot paredzētās darbības mērķus, bet ierosinātās darbības mēroga vai seku dēļ tie ir *labāk* sasniedzami Savienības līmenī.”

The translator has used the word *līmenī* only once, obviously in order to avoid redundancy (the same in the German version). As to the adverb *rather* its equivalent does not appear in the Latvian text. However, the adverb *rather* appears in German the (*vielmehr*) version. It intensifies the phrase *at Union level*. In the framework of the present translation one could only add the word *daudz* (if an adverb *rather* is thus translated) before the word *labāk*. Would it be more proper to say *daudz labāk sasniedzami Savienības līmenī*? It appears that in Latvian an adjective *labāk* suffices and there is no need to say *daudz labāk*. In such a case it sounds like the superlative, but in the example above we are not dealing with the superlative. Although one can find examples of *daudz labāk* in eurlex, the present translation is stylistically preferable.

Article 7

§ 3 “In doing so, the Council shall take into account the possible consequences of such a suspension on the rights and obligations of natural and legal persons. The obligations of the Member State in question under this Treaty shall in any case continue to be binding *on that State*.”

„To īstenojot, Padome ņem vērā iespējamās sekas, ko šāda tiesību atņemšana *var radīt attiecībā uz* fizisku un juridisku personu tiesībām un pienākumiem. Attiecīgai dalībvalstij joprojām ir saistoši Līgumu *uzliktie* pienākumi.”

In the Latvian version there are two additions and a deletion compared to the English version. The translator has rightly chosen to use a subordinate clause in translation rather than a Genitive construction. Would it be better to say, „*To īstenojot, Padome ņem vērā šādu tiesību atņemšanas iespējamās sekas attiecībā uz fizisku un juridisku personu tiesībām un pienākumiem*”? If so, one could misinterpret the phrase *šādu tiesību atņemšana*, since, in such a case, emphasis lies not on the process of withdrawal of rights but on the rights themselves. The difference lies in the case of the demonstrative pronoun *šāds*. In the official text it is in the Nominative, while in the alternative text it is in the Genitive. Hence the difference in meaning (*šāda tiesību atņemšana* or *šādu tiesību atņemšana*). The translator's rendition in Latvian avoids misunderstanding and is very successful. This, however, calls for an

explicitation in Latvian, which is justified. The explicitation *var radīt attiecībā uz* is not present in German.

The other added lexeme is *uzliktie*. In Latvian we say, *Līgums saista* or *uzliek pienākumus*. The phrase *uzliktie pienākumi* is natural to the Latvian language and fits the context very well. The translation is probably carried out using translation memory (TM) that contains such conventional phrases. One can find *līguma uzliktie pienākumi* in eurlex, but will not find *līguma pienākumi*. Besides, the addition *uzliktie* clarifies that obligations arise from the Treaty and not from the necessity to conclude the Treaties. It thus clarifies the meaning. The present and the previous cases appear to be obligatory specifications. In German we can find the same addition *uzliktie* “*aus den Verträgen ergebenden Verpflichtungen*”.

The second sentence has also a deletion. In Latvian the phrase *on that State* is dropped. In the present translation the phrase *on that State* is not necessary. In German it is substituted by the pronoun *this (diesen)*. „*Attiecīgās dalībvalsts pienākumi, kas izriet no Līguma, joprojām ir tai saistoši*” could be an alternative translation using a pronoun like in German. However this translation is less succinct compared to the official text. The absence of the phrase *on that state* in the Latvian text appears to be justified. It avoids redundancy.

Article 11

§ 4 “The procedures and conditions *required* for such a *citizens’* initiative shall be determined...”.

„Procedūras un nosacījumi šādas iniciatīvas *iesniegšanai* ir noteikti...”.

In Latvian we say *iesniegt prasību vai priekšlikumu*. The official text prefers using the noun *iesniegšanai*. An alternative Latvian version could be „*Procedūras un nosacījumi, kas nepieciešami, lai īstenotu šādu priekšlikumu/iniciatīvu, ir noteikti...*”. The alternative version, however, would involve two subordinate clauses and would be longer. The words *required* and *citizens* are omitted, although they appear in the German version “*die für eine solche Bürgerinitiative gelten*”. In the present context the *implicitation* (cf. Klaudy, p. 25) of the words *required* and *citizen’s* in the Latvian version is understandable. Information is omitted/implicitated in the target text since it does not affect the meaning of the sentence. It appears that the principle of economy (see p. 18) is at work both in the case of addition and in the case of *implicitation*.

Article 15

§ 3 “When the agenda so requires, the members of the European Council may decide each to be assisted by a minister and, *in the case of* the President of the Commission, by a member of the Commission.”

„Atkarībā no darba kārtības katrs Eiropadomes loceklis var pieņemt lēmumu par kāda ministra dalību un Komisijas priekšsēdētājs – par Komisijas locekļa *dalību*.”

The equivalent of the phrase *in the case of* in the Latvian version has been omitted, since its absence in the Latvian version does affect the meaning of the text as compared to the English text. In German the phrase *in the case of* is present *im Fall*.

Objection is to the translation of the word *assisted* (translated as *dalību*). The word *dalība* does not necessarily imply assistance. The German version uses the word *unterstützen* (support, assist). Although the noun *dalība* implies the sense of the word *assist* we think that the word *atbalstīt/saņemt atbalstu* (or its close equivalent) should have been in some way incorporated in the Latvian text. However, we have to admit that the official version does not involve any significant meaning differences compared to the English or German versions.

§ 4 “Except where the Treaties provide otherwise, decisions of the European Council shall be taken *by consensus*”.

„Ja vien Līgumos nav paredzēts citādi, Eiropadome lēmumus pieņem, *ievērojot konsensa principu*”.

It looks that the translator did not want to translate the word *consensus* as *vienprātīgi*, and the sentence as „...*Eiropadome lēmumus pieņem vienprātīgi*”. In eurotexts the word *consensus* is frequently rendered as *konsenss*. Since this is a eurotext the translation employs this term. Since it is impossible to say in Latvian *pieņem lēmumus konsensi* an explanation *ievērojot konsensa principu* is employed. It appears that the conventional rendition of the word *consensus* as *konsenss* in eurotexts leads to obligatory explicitation. The German text uses the phrase *by consensus (im Konsens)*.

§ 5 “The European Council shall elect its President, by a qualified majority, for a term of two and a half years, *renewable once*.”

„Eiropadome ar kvalificētu balsu vairākumu ievēl priekšsēdētāju uz divarpus gadiem, *ar iespēju pārvēlēt viņu uz vēl vienu termiņu*.”

The phrase *renewable once* does not allow for a literal translation. It is rendered in Latvian by way of explanation. The German version uses the phrase *der Präsident kann einmal wiedergewählt werden*, which could be translated as *priekšsēdētāju var ievēlēt uz vēl vienu termiņu*. The German and the Latvian versions are closer. The cause of addition in Latvian is necessitated by the need to explain the phrase that cannot be rendered literally (in German as well). It is an obligatory explicitation not affecting the meaning of the sentence.

d) “The President of the European Council shall, at his level and *in that capacity*, ensure...without prejudice to the powers of the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.”

„Eiropadomes priekšsēdētājs, *ievērojot* attiecīgo kompetenci, savā līmenī nodrošina... neskarot pilnvaras, kas *piešķirtas* Savienības Augstajam pārstāvim ārlietās un drošības politikas *jautājumos*.”

The first addition *ievērojot* is caused by the phrase *in that capacity*. The meaning of the phrase is put in Latvian by way of explanation. Explicitation, just as in the case above, is caused by the need to explain the phrase that cannot be rendered literally. The German text, however, corresponds to the English, namely, “*auf seiner Ebene und in seiner Eigenschaft*”. The second case involves lexical additions *piešķirtas* and *jautājumos*. As regards the first addition *piešķirtas*, we see the Dative case taking over the Genitive. An addition is caused by the chosen syntax. The second addition *jautājumos* is due to the Latvian language stylistics. One can say *pilnvaras, kas piešķirtas...ārlietās*, but cannot say *pilnvaras, kas piešķirtas...drošības politikā*; rather *politikas jautājumos*. All in all, the first addition *piešķirtas* could be avoided if the translator employed the Genitive case, but the second addition *jautājumos* is a must.

Article 17

§ 1 “The Commission shall promote the general interest of the Union...”.

„Komisija sekmē vispārējās Savienības intereses...”.

This example has been chosen not because of addition or deletion, but because of ambiguous wording. It should be translated as *Komisija sekmē Savienības vispārējās intereses...*”. The adjective *general* specifies the noun *interest*. In the official translation it can be interpreted as *vispārējā Savienība*, which is not the case. The German version is very clear

“Die Kommission fördert die allgemeinen Interessen (general interests) der Union”. The same paragraph contains a lexical addition.

§ 1 “It shall initiate the Union’s annual and multiannual programming with a view to...”.

„Tā ierosina Savienības gada un daudzgadu programmu *izstrādi*, lai panāktu...”.

The need to add the noun *izstrādi* is dictated by the gerund *programming*, which serves as an object of a sentence. If it were used in the sense of *programmēšana*, no addition would be required. Since it denotes elaboration of programs (*Programmplanung*) an addition in the form of object of the clause (*izstrādi*) is unavoidable. The addition is justified and is due to the need to amplify in the target text the implicit meaning of the word *programming*.

In § 3 the terms *institutions* and *bodies* are compressed into *iestādēs* and *offices and agencies* into *struktūrās*. This case has already been analyzed in Article 9 (see above) and is not dealt with.

§ 5 “The members of the Commission shall be chosen...on the basis of a system of strictly equal rotation between the Member States, reflecting the...”.

„Komisijas locekļus izraugās...pamatojoties uz dalībvalstu absolūti vienlīdzīgas rotācijas sistēmu tā, lai *atbilstoši* tiktu atspoguļots...”.

An addition *atbilstoši* could have equally been avoided. The translator has inserted it just for the purpose of emphasis. This shows that, even in translating EU Treaties, there is some room for free interpretation if it does not affect the meaning of the text. In the German text there is not an equivalent word for *atbilstoši*.

Article 24

§ 2 “based on the *development* of mutual political solidarity among Member States, the identification of questions of general interest and the *achievement* of an ever-increasing *degree* of convergence of Member States’ actions”.

„...pamatojoties uz savstarpēju politisku solidaritāti dalībvalstu starpā, uz vispārēju interešu noteikšanu un uz arvien lielāku dalībvalstu darbības konvergenci”.

The nouns *development*, *achievement* and *degree* have been omitted in the Latvian text. The German version contains them (with the exception of the noun *degree*) “*die auf einer Entwicklung der gegenseitigen politischen Solidarität der Mitgliedstaaten, der Ermittlung der Fragen von allgemeiner Bedeutung und der Erreichung einer immer stärkeren Konvergenz des Handelns der Mitgliedstaaten beruht*”. Let us inquire into the meaning of the two nouns. The word *development*, according to Webster, means *the act, process, or result of developing*. If the noun *development* denoted the result of developing it could be omitted and the translation could be as it is, but, in this context, the noun *development* denotes the process. It can be inferred from the key words like *identification* or *convergence* which denote the process rather than the result. For this reason the words *development* and *achievement* should have been integrated in some form in the Latvian text, as it has been done in the German text. The alternative translation could be, e.g. „...*pamatojoties uz savstarpējas politiskas solidaritātes attīstību dalībvalstu starpā, uz vispārēju interešu noteikšanu un uz arvien lielākas dalībvalstu darbības konverģences sasniegšanu*”. The noun *degree* can be omitted in translation, since it can be compressed into the phrase *arvien lielāku*. The present case of deletions is close to being unjustified. Yet the Latvian text does not involve the essential meaning differences compared to the English or German versions. The cause of omissions is difficult to determine. Perhaps the English text was not consulted and the translation was done from French (see p. 28, Materials and methods).

The Article 24 also contains six cases of addition that refer to the phrase foreign and security policy (*ārpolitika un drošības politika*). The phrase has already been analyzed in Article 22 (p. 27) and there is no need to repeat the analysis.

Article 28

§ 1 “They shall lay down their objectives...if necessary their duration...”.

„Tajā nosaka tās mērķus...vajadzības gadījumā arī darbības laiku...”.

The word *necessary* is rendered as *vajadzības gadījumā* and involves an explanation, since the word *necessary* means *nepieciešams*, *vajadzīgs*. An alternative translation could be „Tajā nosaka tās mērķus...ja nepieciešams, arī darbības laiku...”. The German version employs the phrase akin to the Latvian version, namely, *erforderlichenfalls* (*vajadzības gadījumā*). In this case it is not that important how the word *necessary* is rendered in Latvian or German, since its various translations do not affect the meaning of the sentence in any way. It is thus an optional addition.

Article 42

§ 3 “Member States shall undertake progressively to improve their military capabilities”.

This is the first sentence of the third paragraph. It has been chosen not because of any particular addition or deletion but because the whole sentence is absent in the Latvian version. Neither has it been incorporated in the previous or subsequent sentence; it is completely **missing** in the Latvian version! The German version runs as follows “*Die Mitgliedstaaten verpflichten sich, ihre militärischen Fähigkeiten schrittweise zu verbessern*”. One can only wonder as to what was the cause of not incorporating it...a mistake? It would be interesting to inquire the DGT regarding this case and see what explanation they provide. All that we can do in terms of our study is to provide a translation for the missing sentence. The following translation is offered for consideration „*Dalībvalstis apņemas pakāpeniski uzlabot savas militārās spējas*”.

§ 5 “The Council may entrust the execution of a task, within the Union *framework*, to a group of Member States...”.

„Padome var uzticēt kāda Savienības uzdevuma izpildi dalībvalstu grupai...”.

The case involves an omission *framework* retained in the German version “*im Rahmen der Union*”. Would it be better to translate the phrase *within the Union framework* as *Savienības ietvaros*? Is it *Savienības uzdevums* or *uzdevums Savienības ietvaros*? What kind of task is it? Is the task external to the Union or inherent to it? The phrase *within the Union framework* could be paraphrased as *in the Union* and the sentence could run as follows „*Padome var uzticēt kāda uzdevuma izpildi Savienībā dalībvalstu grupai...*”. The phrase *uzdevuma izpildi Savienībā*, from the point of view of stylistics, is not very successful. It clarifies the choice of the translator. Besides the official translation finds its justification in the eurlex data base. The translator’s choice is justified, since it renders the sentence both succinctly and fluently.

§ 7 “If a Member State is the victim of armed aggression on its territory...”.

„*Gadījumos, kad kāda dalībvalsts kļūst par bruņotas agresijas upuri savā teritorijā...*”.

Compared to the English text, both in Latvian and German there is an addition *gadījumos* “*Im Falle...*”. The Latvian text could also begin *Ja kāda dalībvalsts...* This is, however, not the case. In order to establish the cause of the use of the noun *gadījumos* an additional comparison with other official languages (French) is required. However this small difference in meaning does not affect the meaning of the sentence as a whole.

Factors affecting additions and deletions in the mixed cases (additions and deletions) can be divided into the following categories:

- unjustified omissions (3)
- conventional usage of the Latvian language (1)
- stylistic reasons (14)
- principle of economy (4)
- grammatical restructuring (3)
- morphology (1)
- obligatory specification (2)

The section on additions and deletions involves twenty obligatory, five optional and three unjustified cases of additions or deletions. The equivalence ratio among the three versions of the Treaty is as follows: EG (8), EL (0), LG (17). The highest degree of equivalence in terms of words/phrases added or deleted is between the Latvian and the German versions of the Treaty (17 correspondance cases).

After finishing case analysis let us now register the cases of addition and deletion in the table. Additions and deletions refer basically to the four parts of speech: nouns, verbs, adverbs and adjectives. The cases involving participles (belonging to verbs) and negations form just a supplementary material. The mathematical symbol + refers to additions while the symbol – refers to deletions.

Register of Additions and Deletions
(Comparison of English and Latvian Versions of the Treaty on the European Union)

Table 4.1

Article Nr	Noun	Verb	Adverb	Adjective	Participle	Negation		
1								
2	--	+			+-	+		
3	+	++			+			
4				-	+			
5	+++ - +		--			-		
6				+				
7	--+	+						
8	-							
9	--							
10	++		+					
11	+++							
12								
14	+							
15	- ++++++			+	+			
16	+							
17	+ --	+	+					
18			+					
19	+							
20	+							
21	-							
22	++				+			
23								
24	+++++-- --							
25	+							
26	++++	--						
27	++							
28	+- -							

29	-							
30	+							
31	+	+		+				
32	+							
33								
34		+						
35								
36	+							
37								
38	+							
39								
40	+							
41								
42	-----+	-	-					
43								
44								
45	+	+						
46								
47								
48								
49								
50								
51								
52								
53								
54								
55								

Additions and Deletions

Added

Nouns – 45

Deleted

Nouns - 23

Verbs – 8	Verbs - 3
Adverbs – 3	Adverbs - 3
Adjectives – 3	Adjectives - 1
Participles – 5	Participles - 1
Negations – 1	Negations – 1

The register shows that out of 55 Articles of the Treaty on the European Union 35 Articles involve cases of addition, deletion or addition and deletion. Nouns account for the most cases of addition and deletion and is the part of speech which gets added/deleted most of all. Other parts of speech get added/deleted considerably less and their addition:deletion ratio is relatively close. Twenty Articles out of fifty-five do not involving any cases of addition or deletion.

Cases of Addition, Deletion, Addition and Deletion

(Sentence as a Case Unit)

Cases of Addition – 21

Cases of Deletion – 5

Cases of Addition and Deletion – 11

Sentences containing additions only involve twenty one cases. Those containing only deletions five cases, and a combination of additions and deletions eleven cases.

FACTORS AFFECTING ADDITION AND DELETION

In order to discover the factors affecting addition and deletion we examined thirty five cases in total. Each case presented an excerpt of the concrete Article containing addition or deletion. The examination involved a contrastive study of English and Latvian texts of the Treaty on the European Union. In order to get a broader view of the concrete case the German version of the Treaty was also consulted.

Additions:

Case study yielded five categories of factors affecting addition.

1. *Grammatical restructuring of the source text in the target text* (five cases).

Since languages have different sentence structures in terms of syntax it is necessary to restructure the source text message in the target language. This involves differences in terms of word order, explicitation in the target text, etc. An example of addition resulting from grammatical restructuring would be the phrase *reasons of national policy* and its Latvian version *iemesli, kas saistīti ar valsts politiku* (cf. Article 32, p. 38).

2. *Amplification from implicit to explicit status* (four cases).

This cause of addition (see above, p. 25) refers to additional information in the target text. Information that is implicit in the source text may require its explicitation in the target text. An example would be the phrase *The rights, freedoms and principles in the Charter* rendered in Latvian as *Hartā paredzētās tiesības, brīvības un principus* (cf. Article 6, p. 31).

3. *Conventional usage of the Latvian language* (two cases).

Words or phrases may have a definite meaning in a given country or region. People are accustomed to use words in certain combinations. Especially it refers to the specialist language lexicon. An example from the Treaty would be the phrase *foreign policy* rendered in Latvian not as *ārējā politika* but as *ārpolitika* (Article 22, p. 37).

4. *Stylistic reasons* (two cases).

Stylistics is a broad term relating to linguistics. It has many definitions, but basically it relates to the style of language. The style relates to the manner of expression of language. An example of style affecting the translation would be the phrase *subject of periodic consultation*

rendered in Latvian as *par to regulāri apspriežas* (Article 8, p. 40). The phrase could also be rendered as *regulāras apspriešanās temats*. However the word *apspriešanās* is not good from the point of view of stylistics.

5. *Obligatory specification* (two cases).

The designation is proposed by Nida (p. 25). It is required in order to avoid ambiguities and misinterpretation in the target language. In Article 2 (p. 30) a word *asylum* is rendered in Latvian as *patvēruma meklētājiem*. It involves an obligatory specification in the form of the word *meklētājiem*, since the meaning of the word *asylum* is not *patvērums* but refers to those who seek it.

Deletions:

As regards the factors affecting deletions *we shall not repeat the description of the factors that have already been formulated in the previous section on additions* (this also pertains to the section on additions and deletions). However, examples are provided and comments made. We discovered the following factors affecting deletion

1. *Conventional usage of the Latvian language* (two cases).

For example, in Article 19, p. 42 the phrase *courts or tribunals* is compressed into a single word *tiesas*, since in the Latvian legal system there are no tribunals.

2. *Stylistic reasons* (three cases).

For instance, in Article 29, p. 43 the noun *nature* in the phrase *matter of a geographical or thematic nature* does not appear in the Latvian text *īpašos ģeogrāfiskos vai tematiskos jautājumos*. It is omitted since it would be stylistically wrong to say *īpašos ģeogrāfiskas vai tematiskas dabas jautājumos*.

3. *Principle of economy* (one case).

The principle of economy states that in face of various translation options the shortest is preferable (see above p. 18). To see an example of this category see Article 29, p. 43.

Additions and deletions:

Factors affecting additions and deletions in the mixed cases (additions and deletions) can be divided into the following categories

1. *Unjustified omissions* (three cases).

Unjustified omissions refer to the cases that we believe have unnecessarily omitted some important information present in the source text which can affect the meaning of the target text. The most conspicuous case is a whole sentence missing in the Latvian version of the Treaty. For more information see Article 42, p. 53.

2. *Conventional usage of the Latvian language* (one case).

In § 4 of Article 15, p. 49 the phrase *taken by consensus* is rendered in Latvian as *ievērojot konsensa principu* which is an officially accepted standard phrase in the Latvian legal language.

3. *Stylistic reasons* (fourteen cases).

§ 5 of Article 17, p. 51 is an example of addition in the Latvian text due to the stylistic reasons.

4. *Principle of economy* (four cases).

§ 4 of Article 11, p. 48 is an example of preferring a shorter version in the face of other possible translations.

5. *Grammatical restructuring* (two cases).

§ 3 of Article 15, p. 49 is an example of how a different sentence structure in the target language leads to a lexical addition.

6. *Different word morphology* (one case).

Article 2, p. 46 shows how the different word morphology of the target language leads to explicitation (the word *nondiscrimination* is explained as *kur nav diskriminācijas*).

7. *Amplification from implicit status to explicit status* (one case).

An example would be § 1 of Article 17, p. 51 showing the amplification of the word *programming* in Latvian.

8. *Obligatory specification* (two cases).

§ 3 of Article 7, p. 47 shows how important is legal precision.

CONCLUSIONS

The present research posited the statement that the official EU documents require deliverance of the complete target text with no additions or deletions permitted. However, as the contrastive analysis of the English, Latvian, and German versions of the Treaty on the European Union shows there are both additions and deletions in the Latvian version of the Treaty on the European Union. To solve the issue a hypothesis was proposed that in translating legislative acts the prohibition of addition and deletion refers not to the form of the source text but to its meaning. The **hypothesis** proved to be true, since we did not discover any essential meaning differences in comparing English, Latvian, and German versions of the Treaty. An exception is a missing sentence in the Latvian version of the Treaty on the European Union which is present both in the English and German versions. This omission clearly affects not only the form of the target text but also its meaning. The question regarding the cause of its absence remains open...

The **goal** of the study was to identify words representing the main *parts of speech* added or deleted and register them in the table as well as to discover the *factors* affecting *addition* and *deletion*. To achieve this the study involved the theoretical part (chapters 1-3) and the empirical part (chapters 4-5).

In the *first* chapter we inquired into the various kinds and degrees of equivalence, since translation of the official EU texts requires a high degree of correspondence to the source text. We discovered that there are basically two approaches to translation: the source text oriented approach (equivalence oriented) and the target text oriented approach (function oriented). The translation of the Treaties relates to the first case, since it does not allow free interpretation of the source text in the target text. However, it does not mean word-for-word translation but involves various translation approaches in order to achieve a faithful, accurate and consistent translation of the source text. The *second* chapter examines various text types in order to establish the nature and function of the texts. We reviewed different text-classification models and analyzed text types. We saw that the Treaties belong both to legal and informative text types and require accuracy, precision, and consistency in the translation process. To see how the text types affect the choice of translation strategies the *third* chapter analyzed various translation strategies, methods, techniques and procedures. We came to terms in defining addition and deletion as procedures and inquired into the nature of addition and deletion.

In chapter *four* we, first, described the material (The Treaty on the European Union) to be studied and afterwards laid down the methodology criteria for case study. The case study was divided into three parts consisting of deletions, additions, and mixed cases of additions and deletions. The parts of the speech added and deleted were registered in the table and subsequently reviewed. The chapter *five* summarized the factors affecting addition and deletion into eight basic categories: 1) conventional usage of the language, 2) stylistic reasons, 3) amplification from implicit to explicit status, 4) obligatory specification, 5) principle of economy, 6) grammatical restructuring, 7) different word morphology, 8) unjustified omission.

At the end of each section on additions, deletions, or additions and deletions we also evaluated the degree of equivalence among the three versions of the Treaty as regards additions and deletions as well as made a value judgment regarding the necessity of additions or deletions in cases concerned.

The present study delineates relatively broad categories of factors causing addition and deletion. To get a more precise picture of the respective causes a more quantitative and focused study is advised.

By way of conclusion, the translation of Treaties does not entail language structures alien to the target language, since various translation approaches can be employed in order to convey the source text message to the target reader.

THESES

The following theses refer to observations based on the study results of the present research. Additional study on words belonging to other parts of speech could yield different results.

1. Translation process always involves various factors affecting it. They relate to equivalence between the source text and the target text, text types and their function, translation strategies and other factors lying beyond the scope of this study.

2. A faithful and accurate translation requiring a high degree of correspondance to the source text (e.g. EU Treaties) does not mean word-for-word translation. It can be achieved by employing the translation tools of the target language, e.g. procedures of addition and deletion.

3. Text types and text kinds are characterized by certain features. The knowledge of text types and text kinds helps the translator to better appreciate the text for translation.

4. The awareness of the text functions help the translator choose an appropriate translation approach. For instance, informative texts require translation into prose, expressive and vocative texts make frequent use of adaptation or localization.

5. The register of additions and deletions provides for better understanding of the main parts of speech added and deleted. Nouns account for the part of speech added/deleted most of all. A separate study on issues regarding the translation of this particular part of speech would be meaningful. Nouns as the grammatical form of additions/deletions are followed by verbs, adverbs, and adjectives as regards their frequency in the target text.

6. The distribution density allows to make conjectures with respect to the source text language (either English or French) in view of the fact that the table data pertains to the cases of addition and deletion in English and Latvian texts of the Treaty. The distribution density of the parts of speech in the table is especially high in Articles 2-5 and 15-17 and it triggers the question if these Articles in particular have been translated from French into Latvian in comparison to other Articles translated from English into Latvian, since they involve fewer additions and deletions or no additions and deletions at all.

7. Additions and deletions in the Treaty relate to various factors. Awareness of these factors sheds the light on the causes of addition and deletion and provides an insight into the possible solution ways. The factors causing addition/deletion are: 1) conventional usage of the language, 2) stylistic reasons, 3) amplification from implicit to explicit status, 4) obligatory specification, 5) principle of economy, 6) grammatical restructuring, 7) different word morphology, 8) unjustified omission.

8. Translation approaches employed and factors affecting addition/deletion are closely related. In certain cases, if a different translation approach were chosen addition/deletion could be avoided.

9. The degree of equivalence (as regards the cases studied) in terms of words and phrases added/deleted is higher between the following language pairs: English-German (EG) or German-Latvian (GL). This allows to infer that there are different “source” languages employed in translation.

10. The distinction of additions and deletions into obligatory, optional and unjustified provides for better understanding of their necessity in translation. Obligatory additions/deletions necessarily belong to the text framework. The presence/absence of optional additions/deletions do not bring any significant changes to the meaning of the text, while unjustified additions/deletions affect the meaning of the text.

REFERENCES

1. Baker, M. (2010) *In Other Words (A Coursebook of Translation)*. Routledge: New York: Routledge.
2. Bell, R. T. (1998) *Psychological/cognitive approaches*. In M. Baker (ed.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies*. London & New York: Routledge.
3. Baker, M. and Saldanha, G. (eds.) (2011) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, Second Edition. New York: Routledge.
4. Bühler, K. (1990) *Theory of Language*.: Amsterdam: Benjamins Publishing Company.
5. Catford, J.C. (1965) *A Linguistic Theory of Language*. London: OUP.
6. Eco, U. (2001) *Experiences in Translation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
6. Gentzler, E. (1993) *Contemporary Translation Theories*. New York, Rotledge.
7. Hatim, B. (2001) *Teaching and Researching Translation*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
8. Hönl, H.G. and Kussmaul, P. *Strategie der Übersetzung. Ein Lehr- und Arbeitsbuch* (4th edition), Gunter Narr: Tübingen, 2006.
9. Jakobson, R. (1959) *Linguistics Aspects of Translation*. New York: Harvard University Press.
10. Lörcher, W. *Translation Performance, Translation Process and Translation Strategies: A Psycholinguistic Investigation*. Gunter Narr: Tübingen, 1991.
12. Newmark, P. (1988) *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1988.
14. Nida, E. (1964) *Towards a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
15. Nida, E. and Taber, C. R. (2003) *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
16. Nord, C. (1997) *Translating as a Purposeful Activity*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
17. Reiss, C./Vermeer, H.J. (1991) *Grundlegungen einer allgemeinen Translationstheorie* (2. Auflage). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlage.
18. Venuti, L. (ed.) (2003) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.
19. Vinay, J.P. and Darbelnet, J. (1995) *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: a Methodology for Translation*, translated by J. C. Sager and M. J. Hamel, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

20. Wagner, E., Bench, S. and Martinez, J.M. (2002) *Translating for the European Union Institutions*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

21. Zauberga, I. (2001) *Developing Translation Competence*. Riga: The University of Latvia. Department of Contrastive Linguistics.

Articles

2. Emery, P. *Text classification and text analysis in advanced translation teaching*. *Meta*, XXXVI (4): pages 567-570.

Electronic resources

1. Garzone, G. 'The translation of legal texts. A functional approach in a pragmatic perspective'. In <http://www.tradulex.org/Actes2000/Garzone.pdf>. Last visited on May2, 2012.

2. Guidere, M. *The Translation of Advertisements: From Adaptation to Localization*. In <http://www.translationdirectory.com/article60.htm>. Last visited on April 10, 2012.

3. Nabil, F. *Five Localization Myths*. In <http://www.translationdirectory.com/articles/article2264.php> . Last visited on april 10, 2012.

4. Shih, C. *Corpus-based Study of Differences in Explicitation Between Literature translations for Children and Adults*. In <http://www.translationdirectory.com/articles/article1754.php> . Last visited on April 12, 2012.

5. Smirnova, T. *Task Type: Understanding Text Function and Structure*. In https://eduspace.lv/macibas/pluginfile.php/900/mod_label/intro/Understanding%20Text%20Function%20and%20Structure.PD. Last visited on April 2, 2012.

6. IATE

7. Online terminological data base of the Latvian Academy of Sciences

International Documents

The Consolidated Version of the Treaty on the European Union. Available on the internet at: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2006:321E:0001:0331:EN:PDF>