# German Language as a one of the Languages of the Danube Region: Translation Aspect

**Oleksandr Bilous**[1]

**Abstract:** Apart from the linguistic and semantic approaches in German to Ukrainian and Ukrainian to German translation studies, there is also the sociological approach, which presupposes studying translation from the viewpoint of sociology that is based on the interrelations of people in the process of translation, as in the Danube Region, rather than on the interrelation of texts in different languages or language systems. Our survey of the sociological approach originates from the fourteen rules resulting from the interpreting experience of numerous interpreters as well as of the author of this paper. In our opinion, these rules should be in the focus of teaching interpreting. It is worth mentioning that "the rules for interpreters" as well as the theory of translation studies itself have been created to meet the practical needs. The profession of an interpreter has clearly become widespread, so this kind of translation, among all others, needs to be professionally trained. While teaching two-way interpreting, it has been observed that good translations in interpretation booths and unprepared translations are done by students with average and below-average knowledge of foreign languages. On the contrary, students with advanced knowledge turn out incapable of this particular kind of translation activities. Hence, one may claim that the skill of complete and accurate rendering of meaning in the target language is not enough, and other rules of interpreting have to be taken into consideration.

**Keywords**: the German language of the Danube Region; interdisciplinarity; sociological approach; interpreter's experience rules; consecutive interpreting; unprepared translation; professional translation

Apart from linguistic and semantic approaches in translation studies there is also a sociological aspect which presupposes translation research from the point of view of sociology which is based on interrelations of people (***topicality***) in the process of translation, but not on texts or language systems. Our survey takes its ground on the fourteen rules formed by interpreting experience of the numerous interpreters as well as of the author of this article. In our opinions these rules should be constantly in the highlight of the interpreters training (Bilous, 2013; Maksimov, 2007; Saprykin, 2011; Chernov, 1987; Chuzhakin, 2002; Shvachko, 2004).

One cannot fail but mention that "rules for interpreters" (***subject matter***) as well as the whole theory of translation studies have been created to meet the demands of

[1] Professor, PhD, Izmail State University of Humanities, Ukraine, Address: Herojiw Ukrainy St, 38/51, Kropyvnyzkyj, Ukraine, 25031, Tel.: +38 (0522) 22 54 40, Corresponding author: obilous1955@gmail.com.

practical activity. The profession of the interpreter has become widespread, so this kind of translation, as all others, needs to be professionally trained.

While teaching two-way interpreting I have noticed that good translations in interpreter's booths or unprepared ones are done by students with average and below-average knowledge of foreign languages. On the contrary, students who can boast of advanced knowledge turn out incapable for this particular kind of translator's activities. Thus, one may claim that skills of precise rendering of sense in translation / interpreting are not enough and other rules of interpreting have to be taken in consideration.

We consider oral translation and its main "rules" to be a professional translation (subject), which means the translation, which is aimed to support the communication between the participants of the language situation; translation, which is aimed directly to create the text, which would convey the semantics of all words, which are part of the meaning of the text, we would call the learning translation.

Thus, the "rules" of interpretation pertain to **professional translation** and point out necessary actions of a translator in order to maintain communication. Means of achieving invariance of the meaning refer to linguistic competence and basically semantic translation theory (Bilous, 2013, pp. 141–142; Jäger, 1978, pp. 140–143).

The basic "rules" of interpretation are:

1) the worst translation is better than its absence;

2) the voice of an interpreter should always be loud and confident, with clear diction. Explicit self-corrections are not desirable;

3) already started translation has to be logically completed;

4) inappropriate pauses during translation, disfluency sounds (e-uh, mmm ...), sniffing, sighing etc. are **unacceptable**;

5) oral interpreter translates only that information, which he/she is absolutely confident in (that is, only the information he/she completely understood and can, therefore, translate it fully in another language). Everything else he/she omits or replaces;

6) replacement can be realized by repetition of information (already expressed) from text or declaration of reliable and accepted in the culture of the target language (encyclopedic) information on the problems of translation;

7) no matter what a participant of linguistic communication would be talking about, the translation of it has to be logically connected (beginning of the thought, its continuation and conclusion). There has to be **structural** execution of translation;

8) according to time, translation has to continue (almost) the same time as the original speech does;

9) no matter what language an interlocutor uses, translator must translate according to the normative rules of grammar - correct word order, and according to the vocabulary – constant (commonly-used) phrases, skillful selection of translation equivalents/analogue units;

while translating you should avoid metaphors or replace them with the set expressions;

in German the longer sounds the report, the more complex sentences it has. So, to avoid the overload with the complex sentences. In Ukrainian you should parcel the utterances on the shorter sentences (the translation from Ukrainian into German you should split the text on the simple extended sentences with the direct word order, avoiding by this uppermost the mistakes in the word order in German complex sentences);

The Ukrainian sentence should begin with the adverbial modifier, and German/English with the subject;

while translating from German/English into Ukrainian you should avoid **the tautology**, while translating from German/English the tautology goes not create the negative perception;

in case You didn't understand the shortenings, names, surnames, titles, numbers or You had no preliminary information (Bilous, 2013, Jäger, 1978, pp. 112–113; Saprykin, 2011, pp. 46–53; Chuzhakin, 2002, pp. 8–9) while interpreting they are either omitted or replaced with the neutral ones, for example *last month, last/this year, our guest/ Mr/Mrs from Germany/England etc.*

As a rule, the first eight rules have **obvious social-psychological multiplier**. They lay the stress on the idea, that the main for the translator is not only the bilingualism, but **the understanding of the situation of the translation.** The translator in the sociological sense should be able to play the role (***the aim***). If he plays it right, there appears **the trust** in sociological sense between him and his **addressee**. Moreover, there is a trust exactly to the translator and the translation, but not to the source, which is translated. In other words, by **the trust** we should understand not the fact, that the translation addressee thinks that all said in the process of the translation is the truth, but that he should believe that the translator interprets correctly and does everything needed due to his professional skills and abilities.

Consider what interpreter has credibility in the audience? Those who demonstrate facility and abandoned. So first four rules pose an intention to provide filing of fidelity.

**Rule # 5** expresses very important principle of translation: an interpreter should understand the text, because the translator, which does not understand what he/she translates very fast come to light. And this can break the trust for him.

**Rule # 6** shows how technically to achieve a full understanding of the addressee of the translation, even in cases when the translator understands not all.

**Rule # 7 (consistency**) it's arising from the stereotyped evaluation of the situation of interpretation that exists in the public mind. It's accepted to think, that translated important texts promulgated by competent and credible people. From these people and, consequently, of their texts, the recipient wait the organization of skilled communication, and is primarily a logical, because it (rather than, say, emotional expressiveness, etc.) is considered an indicator of quality thinking. Even if the situation authoritative participant said translation illogical "jumping" from one to another, the students on the basis of the above-described stereotype still consider that it is illogical translation and not the original. Rule **# 9 normativity of language translation** on our view, it's connected with oral translation. Translating oraly non-normative lexis, it should be noted for the recipient that the speaker uses non-normative lexis.

In the process of interpretation **regardless of the quality of the source text** a standardized language for two reasons should be followed. *The first reason* is the necessity to build the text logically, because in the public mind, of course, there are stereotypes that *authoritative* participants of interlingual communication speak standard language. Non-normativity of translation will be perceived by audience as mistakes of interpreter. *The second reason* is the technical: there is an inability to repeat non-normative speech in another language of the source text. Hence, interpreter should not even aim to complete this task, because even at its successful solution, it will not be highly appreciated by the audience.

**Rule #10** relates to the translation of collocations. This is called "**rules of functional accuracy**" (Jäger, 1978, pp. 152-155), which is propriate to all kinds of translation. The essence of this method is that in the translation, the report should be given such linguistic forms to which addressee are used in text of the corresponded genre, content or functionality. It is clear that to fully realize this rule when interpreting (and especially when synchronous) is impossible, because in the process of translating, interpreter does not work with whole text (as in writing), but with very limited part of it. So, perhaps, the only way to provide the text in the target language more or less familiar form is to follow the rules of words combinations, typical for a target language.

**Rule #10 on the lowering of figurative expressions** applies to the interpreting. If possible figurativeness in the written translation must be fully conveyed. But when interpreting it's ridiculous to try to convey the figurativeness of the source. Let us recall the story of the translation of the speech of Nikita Khrushchev at the 15th United Nations General Assembly of 12 October 1960, when he used Russian idioms *"Я вам покажу кузькину мать"* that interpreter translated as *"He will show you Kuzma's mother."* The fact is that the figurativeness has a dual nature: on the one hand, it is a function of language, its structures and rules, and on the other - a characteristic feature of individual style of the author (idiolect). Therefore, the mechanical transfer of figurativeness from one language to another is just **impossible.** It is known to all translators of literary art. It is quite clear that with the time limit, which "press" on the interpreter when he cannot “think over” no one expects the translation of figurative language units, with only a piece of general text, therefore you should not be distracted trying to find figurative equivalents.

**The second part of the rules (11 to 14)** is narrowly linguistic nature and while interpreting uses such basic **professional translation techniques** (Chuzhakin, 2002, pp. 5-6): 1) generalization or descriptive translation; 2) specification; 3) antonymous translation; 4) omission of extra information; 5) reasonable (appropriate) questioning; 6) editing (improvement of the source); 7) segmentation of the sentence; 8) combining of sentences; 9) logical adjustment in translation of long speech passage; 10) the ability to defuse tensions, without whipping up and escalating it, but also without reducing emotional evaluating (usually negative-aggressive) vector, which is part of the process of interpretation;

11) the ability to vary speech rate and to avoid a significant gap from the speaker: **a)** a clear diction, compliance with the rules of orthoepy; **b)** speech addressed directly to the listener; **c)** limitations in gestures, smooth, calm behaviour in any situation; **g)** the necessity to look after yourself and to eliminate psychomotor reactions (blushing, enhanced mobility of the arms etc.); **d)** the ability to maintain the proper posture; **e)** a presentable and appropriate appearance (clothing, footwear, accessories).

For more precise clarity we illustrate the use of some of these techniques. **Generalisation** or **descriptive translation** are used in cases when: **a)** another translation is almost impossible because of the lack of analogue or the equivalent in the language (wordplay, pun, culture-specific elements, proverbs, sayings, popular quotation, peculiar expressions, slang, jargon etc.) or other reasons; **b)** the analogue/equivalent is available but you have forgotten or do not know it; **c)** the presence of complex terms from various fields of knowledge that are little-known or unknown to you (e.g. medicine, banking, finance, technology, law etc.). In this case, the method of **“corrective transliteration”** is used, that is, the original term is translated according to the morphology and phonetics of the target language. This is allowed because most of the terms have Latin, Greek, French, and now even more English origin (especially in the field of economics, finance and informatics), where Ukrainised English terms are often used (provider, site, monitor, Winchester etc.), and sometimes the English words together with Ukrainian, such as: ***Jobber – джоббер, futures – фючерси, factoring – факторінг*** *etc.*

It should be mentioned that such situation occurs when communication of professionals when internationalisms facilitate the communication and understanding. So don’t be afraid that they can be the “false friends of a translator”.

**Antonymic translation (AT)** in some cases is a highly desirable way of translation from the standpoint of stylistics (phrase) and it is often only a one possible way. AT, undoubtedly, is important, because it fully reflects the linguocultural differences. AT can be widely used in the practice of *interpretation* and *translation from the sheet*. The essence of AT is the replacement of the concept on the opposite one. The simplest example is the substitution of the word by its antonym, with the simultaneous introduction of objection: ***eine ältere Dame – not young woman.***

An inverse method is often used – the word that is negative in source language, in translation is replaced by the antonym. The negation ***is omitted:… die Freiheit geht nie unter – the wish will win.***

Sometimes there are more complex types of AT: ***Er hörte schon auf, mich zu dutzen – He again turned to me on "you".***

The verb **dutzen** is replaced by the antonymic phrase **"to turn to somebody on "you"**. Such translation became possible due to the presence of the other antonymic replacement in the same sentence***: hörte schon auf – to turn to somebody again.*** Thus, here AT consists in the replacement of the notion by denying its opposite.

**Grounded re-interrogation** – the opportunity for the translator to clarify the oral information which he could not obtain in negotiations/conversations etc, as a result of objective or subjective obstacles: side interference, excessive noise, failure of technical facilities etc. In professional translation a grounded re-interrogation is recommended to use in exceptional cases, when a high level of translation cannot be put into question. The possibility of usage of the grounded re-interrogation depends on the specific situation: on the relations between the objects of communication, on the degree of informality of the atmosphere of the communication etc.

**The use of neutral turns** on UP is possible in case of formation of the so-called ***Information gap*** (failure) during communication by virtue of the subjective factor (something you do not understand, do not hear, not possess a certain term, a certain name, etc.) and objective factors (features of the received information, necessity to complete the translation and move to the next question, etc.).

So, as we can see, rules **from 11 to 14** are essentially linguistic and according to the content are comparable to the achievements of linguistics. Such correlated patterns are justified in contrastive linguistics by statistics and other means. But then the question appears: in fact, why the rules included only those regularities because there are many other known and bilateral patterns of languages which contact in the translation process. Or maybe these laws are the most important? But then there is a counter question what criteria of importance / insignificance determined by these laws?

In our opinion, the answer is like this. Any text translation (regardless of type and genre), although it should reflect the specific features arising from the characteristics of the source, it would have to follow another fundamental requirement: it should be complete text of the target language. It seems to me that **socio-psychological justification** for this general translation requirement serves the same requirement regarding consistency and normative speech at interpreting. It is believed that if someone translate texts written by the certain author, then the author deserves it and therefore the audience expect a quality text from translator.

The very idea of **qualitative text** is closely connected to the idea of double correlation of the target text: with the source text, on the one hand, and with the accepted way to create similar in content and function texts by the means of the language of the target text (LT) – on the other hand. In our opinion, the presented in the “rules” of interpretation comparable regularities are the necessary and sufficient factors to achieve **qualitative** Ukrainian (and accordingly **qualitative** German/English) **target text.** That means, that **qualitative text** should refer to the target text, that is specific to a particular language and culture community at some historical stage, and the evaluation criterion of such a text is the perception of the text by this language community. Such an approach to the target text evaluation has the right to exist, even though the statements **“qualitative/non-qualitative”** are to some extent the matter of the **“personal taste of the recipient”**, still, this evaluation is largely characteristic of the whole language and culture community, because every ethnic group has the so called **ideal** of proper and exquisite speaking and writing, which the interpreters also want to achieve. The society considers the texts, which are close to this ideal, to be exemplary, classic and worthy of imitation. Therefore, the rules **11-14** are taken from the practice of interpretation, and following them can result in the text being evaluated as **qualitative** by the language and culture community.

## References

Bilous, O. (2013). *Theory and Technology of Translation/Теорія і технологія перекладу.* Кіровоград: РВВ КДПУ ім. В.Винниченка. 200 с.

Chernov, G. (1987). *Elements of Simultaneous Interpreting/Основы синхронного перевода.* Москва: Высшая школа. 256 с.

Chuzhakin, A. (2002). *World of Translation. Interpreting XXI/Мир перевода. Устный перевод XXI.* Москва: Р.Валент. 232 с.

Jäger, G. (1978). *Communicative and Functional Equivalence/Коммуникативная и функциональная эквивалентность.* Москва: Международные отношения. С. 137–156.

Maksimov, S. (2007). *Two-way Interpreting (English and Ukrainian Languages)/Усний двосторонній переклад (англійська та українська мови).* Київ: Ленвіт. 416 с.

Saprykin, S. (2011). *World of Interpretation/Світ усного перекладу*. Вынниця: Нова книга. 224 с.

Shvachko, S. (2004). *Problems of Simultaneous Interpreting/Проблеми синхронного перекладу.* Вінниця: Фоліант, 2004. 112 с.