

Strategies Used in Translating IMO SMCP (2001)

Ioana-Raluca VIȘAN

Oana TĂTARU

“Ovidius” University of Constanța

Abstract: *The focus of this paper revolves around the translation strategies employed when translating the official version of the Standard Marine Communication Phrases - IMO SMCP (2001) - into Romanian. The source text is “an institutional document” published by the International Maritime Organization in English, and consists of a list of phrases arranged thematically. The phrases cover a number of maritime topics which represent the dominant speech acts and moves in maritime communication. In addition, the translated text is primarily intended for Romanian speaking seafarers, shore-based personnel and trainees in Romanian Maritime Education and Training Institutions. Even though seemingly devoid of difficult lexical and terminological load, most of the source language phrases can become a real challenge for the maritime language translator, in terms of dealing with lexical gaps, semi-technical vocabulary, neologisms and/or possible cases of polysemy. Therefore, the paper provides a source-text analysis and translation problems on the terminological and terminology-related levels of linguistic description in the process of translating the IMO SMCP 2001 into Romanian.*

Keywords: *maritime terminology, Seaspeak, Maritime English (ME), maritime Romanian, translation strategy, translation difficulty, (non)equivalence*

1. Introduction

Shipping holds a prominent position within the maritime sector, representing one of the earliest human endeavours with a rich historical legacy. Over time, this industry has witnessed substantial expansion in terms of fleet size and trade volume. Its enduring influence on global geopolitics and socio-economic dynamics is evident, highlighting the ongoing need for translation services, particularly from English to diverse languages. As shipping is a global industry, English has become the lingua franca for international maritime communication. Maritime English is used not only for communication between the crew of a vessel but also for communication between vessels, port authorities, and other stakeholders in the maritime

industry. The significance of Maritime English as a universal communication language cannot be overstated. Moreover, the rise of globalization has fuelled a surge in maritime trade and shipping operations, consequently necessitating the establishment of standardized communication within the maritime industry. Recognizing the pivotal role of Maritime English, the International Maritime Organization (IMO) has acknowledged its utmost importance and has developed standards for Maritime English proficiency and training (Pritchard, *Maritime English Syllabus* 147, *Maritime Communications*; Trenkner 3). The IMO has also developed the IMO SMCP (2001) as a standard code of maritime communication phrases to ensure effective communication in emergency and other maritime-related situations. The topic of this paper is connected to an extensive research project on specialized translation, specifically our PhD dissertation titled *Translating Maritime Language*. In addition to analysing various types of maritime texts in the translation process, such as EU and other IMO texts, we also addressed the translation of the IMO SMCP (2001) into Romanian. The choice to undertake this assignment originated from our 2nd year students' need to comprehend and use maritime terminology effectively in a communicative setting, particularly during the Maritime English seminars conducted at Constanța Maritime University. In this context, the standardized phrases often posed significant challenges and proved to be difficult to master.

2. Features of IMO-SMCP (2001)

As mentioned above, the IMO SMCP (2001), (also referred to as Standard Marine Communication Phrases), comprises a comprehensive compilation of standardized phrases that find application in maritime communications. The publication of IMO SMCP (2001) in 2002 by the International Maritime Organization (IMO) aimed to establish a consistent framework that facilitates effective and clear communication within multilingual and multicultural maritime settings, specifically addressing potential language barriers. The use of IMO SMCP can be divided into two primary sections: External Communication Phrases, encompassing ship-to-ship, ship-to-shore, and shore-to-ship interactions, and On-board Communication Phrases (IMO SMCP 11). These sections are further distinguished as Part A and Part B, reflecting their specific roles within the revised framework of the IMO STCW (1978/1995) Convention. The phrases featured in Part A represent the prescribed language for obligatory use in spoken and written maritime communication at sea (Pritchard, *Maritime English Syllabus* 149-166,

Maritime Communications 3-5, Some Lexical Aspects 155-172; Pritchard & Kalogjera 149-166). On the other hand, the phrases contained in Part B, although not mandatory, encompass other safety-related expressions applicable to on-board operations, which can be valuable for training in Maritime English. The IMO SMCP (2001) is recognized as an institutional maritime text. Additionally, the document comprises elements such as a preamble, citations, recitals, enacting formula, and enacting terms, while the glossary provides a comprehensive listing of key terms along with their corresponding definitions. The phrases are arranged thematically and cover a wide range of communication scenarios (i.e. navigation, safety, distress, urgency, general communication, etc.) which stand for the most important speech acts and moves in maritime communication.

The IMO SMCP (2001) is built upon a core understanding of the English language, specifically tailored to Maritime English in a simplified manner. It represents an advanced version of the Standard Marine Navigational Vocabulary, aiming to provide a more comprehensive and improved resource for effective communication within the maritime context, being introduced in 1977. Additionally, the IMO SMCP builds upon the principles of Seaspeak, a maritime discourse-oriented initiative pioneered by Peter Strevens and Fred Weeks in 1986. In his *Encyclopaedia of Language*, David Crystal (299), defines Seaspeak as “a variety of English devised for unambiguous maritime communication”. Standard Marine Navigational Vocabulary (SMNV) came into being in 1980s through a project called Essential English for International Maritime Use (Strevens 124), which related mainly to communication by radio, including procedures for initiating, maintaining and terminating conversations, as well as recommended grammar on a wide range of maritime topics such as navigational watch, helm orders, briefings on position, anchoring, berthing, etc. The idea should be pointed out that it was the success of this project that followed other kinds of standardized language system to be investigated (e.g. Policespeak and Airspeak). IMO SMCP (2001) can be included in the category of the following synonymous labels: *restricted repertoire* (Mackay and Mountford 4), *restricted register* (Croitoru 101; Dimitriu 82), *block language*, (Quirk et. al 414; Biber et. al 263), controlled language (Hartley and Paris 307) or *minilect* (Nordman 554). Thus, SMCP phrases are written to be spoken. Spoken ME is a specialized language that has evolved to meet the needs of maritime personnel. It is a hybrid language that has been influenced by different languages, dialects, and cultural backgrounds.

However, its primary goal remains the same, which is to ensure effective communication at sea.

Moreover, the use of the SMCP is mandated by the International Convention on Standards of Training, Certification, and Watchkeeping for Seafarers (STCW) established by the IMO, applying to all seafarers irrespective of their mother tongue. This ensures that all maritime personnel have a common language for communication, which is essential for safe and effective navigation and operation of ships. To conclude, the SMCP is a standardized set of phrases used in maritime communications to ensure clear and effective communication, reduce the risk of miscommunication, and enhance safety at sea. In spoken ME, there is a tendency towards conciseness, and omissions of manner adverbs and modal verbs are common. These omissions have become fixed uses and are aimed at avoiding ambiguity. Ellipsis of articles and auxiliary verbs is also observed. Despite the reduction, the clarity of communication is not affected. Certain uses that would be considered incorrect in standard English are acceptable in spoken ME, and some syntactic patterns have become standardized. Spoken ME has a rather authoritative tone, achieved through the use of formal, Latin-based words and phrases, and politeness formulas are generally avoided in the imperative.

3. SMCP as a Translation Assignment

The IMO SMCP text can be included in the category of audio-medial texts, as suggested by Katarina Reiss or in the group of international texts or hybrid texts, as put forward by Anna Trosborg (147) or Mary Snell Hornby (15). As mentioned elsewhere (see Vișan, *Transposition* 109, *Aspects of Maritime Language* 130), the translation of the IMO SMCP (2001) has been undertaken in several European countries. For example, in the Netherlands, the translation was performed by Maritime English Lecturers at the Maritime University of Applied Sciences in Rotterdam (STC Group Rotterdam), namely Professor Peter van Kluijven, Konijjin, and Professor Kuyper-Heeres. In Germany, Professor Dr. Peter Trenkner took charge of the translation, while in Croatia, the task was carried out by Professor Dr. Boris Pritchard from the University of Rijeka. It is important to highlight that in Romanian, a considerable number of these phrases, including those related to anchoring, mooring, (un)berthing, and commands to the engine room, standard wheel orders among others, share similarities with the phrases found in the previous editions of the Standard Marine Navigational Vocabulary (1978/1985) and

the draft version of IMO SMCP approved by the Maritime Safety Committee in 1997 (SMCP 11). The translation of these phrases was expertly carried out by the late professors Georgeta Albu and Paula Manolache from CERONAV, and their contributions were incorporated into the publication "Vocabular Frazeologic Englez-Român pentru Comunicații la Bordul Navei" released in 1999. The SMCP text is designed for seafarers working in a multilingual and multicultural environment at sea, the shore-based personnel operating in the domestic activities and the local maritime authorities (i.e. Romanian maritime administration and coast guard), as well as for trainees in Romanian Maritime Education and Training Institutions (i.e., Constanța Maritime University and the "Mircea cel Bătrân" Naval Academy of Constanța, Romania), its translation into Romanian is of major importance.

As a translation assignment, the SMCP requires careful consideration of context, tone, and language proficiency. The translator must be familiar with the terminology and conventions used in maritime communications and must be able to accurately convey the meaning of the original text while maintaining the intended tone and style. Pritchard's translation approach to the IMO SMCP (2001), which we also embrace, demonstrates a harmonious integration of two primary translation approaches: semantic equivalence and functional equivalence. The concept of semantic equivalence, put forward by Peter Newmark (48), highlights the significance of faithfully conveying the meaning of the source text in the target language. On the other hand, the concept of functional equivalence, initially elucidated by Hans Vermeer (20) in his Skopos Theory emphasizes the importance of considering the purpose and context of the target text. This ensures that the translation effectively serves its intended function within the given context. Therefore, this approach to translation acknowledges the importance of faithfully conveying the technical meaning of SMCP phrases while also considering the particular context and function of the translated text. This balance between accuracy and function is crucial in the translation of technical texts like the SMCP, which must not only convey technical information accurately, but also be easily understood and effectively used by the target audience. In what follows, we shall deal with some strategies used in translating these phrases into Romanian, and the difficulties that the translator might have encountered at the lexical/terminological level of linguistic description.

4. Translation Strategies

According to Chesterman (2005), the term strategy is used in different ways in translation studies, and a variety of other terms can be used to mean the same thing: procedures, techniques of adjustment, transformations, transfer operations, etc. In defining the notion of translation strategy, two different strands emerge: (a) the procedural sense (often used by those investigating psycholinguistic and cognitive approaches to translating), and (b) the textual sense. Rodica Superceanu (259) defines translation strategies as:

[...] individual cognitive procedures operating on a large or small scale, [...] used consciously or unconsciously for the solution of a translation problem, for example, search, checking, monitoring, inferring, and correlating (Superceanu 259).

The researcher points out that translation methods, translation techniques and translation procedures are all goal-oriented, however, only translation strategies are problem oriented and they are used when the translator realizes that the usual procedure is not sufficient for reaching a certain goal. Translation strategies have been divided into local and global strategies (Jääskeläinen, *Investigating Translation Strategies* 115–16; Lörcher, *Translation Performance* 71, *The Translation Process* 603). When addressing the translation of specific language structures, translators generally use local strategies, whereas global strategies operate on a broader scale. Global strategies encompass broader aspects of textual style and involve making decisions regarding the emphasis or de-emphasis of specific elements in the source text. Vinay and Darbelnet (84-93) have classified translation strategies into two primary categories: direct and oblique. In the specific context of this paper, the investigation of strategies, methods, and procedures employed in the translation of standard marine communication phrases will incorporate the valuable perspectives and terminology put forward by Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet (*Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*), John Catford (*A Linguistic Theory of Translation*), Mona Baker (*In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*), Mona Baker & Gabriela Saldanha (*Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*), Peter Newmark (*A Textbook of Translation*), Elena Croitoru and Antoanela Dumitrașcu (*Collocations and Colligations in Specialized Texts*). It should be pointed out that the phrases in the IMO SMCP 2001 meet the requirements outlined by Maurizio Gotti

(*Investigating Specialized Discourse, Studies in Specialized Discourse*) in relation to the characteristics of specialized discourse. Thus, mention has to be made here of certain discourse characteristics such as monoreferentiality (e.g. *ullage, galley, deeptank, single up, seamark*, etc.), reduced ambiguity (for instance, the question *Are dangerous goods on fire*¹ requires the full answer: *Yes, dangerous goods are on fire*, and not just the contracted form *Yes they are.*), conciseness (which is mainly achieved by the use of abbreviations and initialisms: *PST, DSC, COW*, etc.), and the specialization of meaning (e.g. certain terms used in IMO SMCP are derived from general language words: *bow, stern, painter, watch, wake*, etc.). Therefore, we can assert that some of the lexis in the IMO SMCP (2001) fulfils specific overarching terminological criteria proposed by Gotti (*Investigating Specialized Discourse, Studies in specialized discourse*), Maria-Teresa Cabré (*Terminology: Theory, Methods; Elements for a theory*), and Angela Bidu-Vrănceanu (*Dicționar de științe; Lexicul specializat în mișcare*) in a commendable manner, while at the same time recognizing that there are instances of lexical units that exhibit potential ambiguity. This is particularly evident with nouns such as *casualty, line, cable, and damage*, as well as with verbs like *stand by* and *check*, whose meanings can be misleading within the maritime context. In order to exemplify, the interpretation of the verbal collocation "check the cable" mentioned in Table 2 is unclear since it can have two possible meanings: either referring to the action of examining a cable, or indicating the gradual loosening of a cable. Naturally, it is the surrounding context that clarifies the intended meaning of this expression, and thus, its second, specialized meaning must be accounted for. In addition, the phrasal verb *stand by* in IMO SMCP can be also problematic since this verb may stand for: (1) to be in readiness or prepared to execute an order as in *Stand by on VHF Channel.../frequency* → *Rămâneți în canalul...VHF* and (2) to be readily available as in *Stand by lifeboats/ liferafts* → *Pregătiți bărcile/ plutele de salvare*. The situation may be further complicated by some other minute differences of meaning and the translator has to be aware of the pitfalls s/he might encounter in the decoding and encoding stages of translation (e.g. the meaning of *stand by* in *Stand by engine* is attention, and the meaning of the same verb in *Standing by on VHF Channel* is wait/keep a radio watch).

¹ All the examples of standard marine communication phrases included in this paper are taken from IMO-SMCP (2001), which is accessible in both printed form and on-line.

The most important translation strategies and procedures employed in achieving translation equivalence at the terminological level are the following: literal/free translation, borrowing, calquing, transposition, paraphrase, modulation, explicitation, implicitation and/or deletion. It should be noted that opting for a literal translation of standard marine communication phrases may appear to be the most suitable approach during the initial phase of translation. However, there are instances where relying solely on this strategy can result in incorrect translations. (e.g. The correct translation of *Are bilge pumps operational?* is *Sunt pompele de santină funcționale?* and not *Sunt pompele de santină operaționale?**). Borrowing is also one of the strategies employed in order to deal with various forms of more or less adapted borrowings (e.g. *forepeak* → *forpic*; *afterpeak* → *afterpic*; *cargoplan* → *cargoplan*; *ullage* → *ulaj*; *dunnage* → *dunaj*; *deeptank* → *diptanc*; *plotting* → *plotare*; *radar* → *radar*; but also, several abbreviations and initialisms: *LORAN*, *PAD*, *NAVTEX*, *DSC*, *SOLAS*, *IMO*, etc.).

Calquing, another type of direct translation strategy is often used when translating maritime abbreviations and initialisms (see also Table 1 below): *Automatic Identification System (AIS)* → *Sistemul de Identificare Automată (AIS)*; *Traffic Separation Scheme (TSS)* → *schema de separare a traficului*; *Electronic Chart Display and Information System (ECDIS)* → *Display hartă electronică și sistem de informații (ECDIS)*, also referred to as *hartă ECDIS*; *Emergency Position Indicating Radio Beacon (EPIRB)* → *radiobaliză pentru localizarea poziției de sinistru*, also known as *radiobaliză EPIRB*, etc. It is also possible to achieve the desired translation of abbreviations by using a combination of two different translation procedures, which is commonly referred to as a *couplet* according to Newmark (91). This can be observed in examples like the translation of terms such as *convenția SOLAS* and *sistemul AIS*. The abbreviation EPIRB which means emergency position indicating radio beacon is translated into Romanian as *radiobaliza pentru localizarea sinistrelor*. The abbreviation *DSC (Digital Selective Calling)* → an installation on board a vessel or coast station that is intended to digitally announce and initiate ship/ship/, ship/shore radiotelephone or radio telex calls, is rendered into Romanian with the lexical calque *apel digital selectiv* or simply, with a structural calque (i.e. *apel DSC*). The use of structural calques often leads to the creation of a third language, namely Romglish.

Table 1. Example of initialisms in SMCP translation (SMCP 34-35)

A1/1.2.1.8.2 I will abandon vessel at ... hours <i>UTC</i> .	A1/1.2.1.8.2 Voi abandona nava la orele <i>UTC</i> .
A1/1.2.1.9 Is your <i>EPIRB/SART</i> transmitting?	A1/1.2.1.9 Transmite <i>EPIRB-ul / SART-ul</i> dumneavoastră?
A1/1.2.1.9.1 Yes, my <i>EPIRB/SART</i> is transmitting.	A1/1.2.1.9.1 Da, <i>EPIRB-ul / SART-ul</i> meu/ <i>radiobaliza EPIRB/ transponderul SART</i> transmite.
A1/1.2.1.9.2 Yes, my <i>EPIRB/SART</i> is transmitting by mistake.	A1/1.2.1.9.2 Da, <i>EPIRB-ul / SART-ul</i> meu transmite din greșală.
A1/1.2.1.10 Did you transmit a <i>DSC distress</i> alert?	A1/1.2.1.10 Ați transmis <i>alerta de primejdie /sinistru DSC</i> ?
A1/1.2.1.10.1 Yes, I transmitted a <i>DSC alert</i> .	A1/1.2.1.10.1 Da, am transmis <i>alerta DSC</i> .
A1/1.2.1.10.2 Yes, I transmitted a <i>DSC alert</i> by mistake.	A1/1.2.1.10.2 Da, am transmis <i>alerta DSC</i> din greșală.

The idea should be pointed out that calquing is a commonly used translation strategy, even when this produces a distortion in relation to normal usage (Schäffner and Adab 328, Cronin 22, House, *Text and context* 345, *Global English* 97). Our research has shown that, as far as maritime discourse is concerned, any concessions to Romanian style are minimal. This strategy may be considered as Bennet (8) calls it, “epistemicidal” because of the possible consequences that it might have upon traditional Romanian discourse as a whole. In addition, we are in support of the idea that that calquing might indirectly lead to language change by creating a channel through which English language structures can be legitimately imposed upon maritime Romanian as a target language (i.e. the syntagma *multiple echoes* in radar navigation is generally rendered with *multiple ecouri* by maritime specialists). A distinctive mark of maritime terminology is the category of adverbs and adjectives that describe directions on board and that are prefixed *a*: *afore* → *la prova, către prova*; *aft* → *la pupa, din pupa, spre pupa*; *abaft* → *în/la/spre pupa*; *aback* → *înapoia, în urmă*; *abreast* → *travers de, bord la bord*; *adrift* → *în derivă*; *afloat* → *în stare de plutire/ pe apă*; *afore* → *înainte, înspre prova, în față*; *alee* → *sub vânt, în bordul de sub vânt*; *aloft* → *în gabie, în arboradă*; *aloof* → *în larg, la distanță de coastă*; *alow* → *în jos, sub punte*; *amain* → *în bandă*; *amidship(s)* → *în axul navei, la centrul/mijlocul navei*; *apeak* → *la pic, deasupra ancorei*; *apoop* → *la / spre pupa*; *astay* → *la pic lung/ în axa navei*; *astern* → *în/la pupa*; *athwart* → *transversal / travers / la travers*; *athwartship(s)* → *transversal / travers pe navă*; *aweather* → *în vânt / către bordul din vânt*. The Romanian equivalents

are made up of one, two, three or even four-word denomination, usually following the patterns: Prep + Noun; Adv + Prep + N; Prep + N + Prep + N; N + Prep + N. In addition, most of the adjectives prefixed *a* are also used to describe the form, state or quality of certain devices and parts of the ship, and they are rendered into Romanian by adjectives, an adjective + adverb or a prepositional noun phrase (e.g.: **abox** → *contrabrațat*; **abroad** → *înălțat / ridicat*; **afoul** → *încurcat (despre lanțul de ancoră)*; **adrift** → *derivat de vânt (sau de current)*; **afoul** → *încurcat (despre lanțul de ancoră)*; **aleak** → *crăpat, fisurat (despre bordajul navei)*; **astay** → *întins înainte (despre lanț)*; **atrip** → *smuls, desprins*; **aweigh** → *smuls, desprins de fund*). As it can be noticed, some of these adverbs and adjectives do not have a one-to-one equivalent in maritime Romanian and are sometimes translated by making use of explicitation which involves a shift from the ST word in structure and meaning (e.g. *start rescue* → *a începe operațiunea de salvare*; *ice damage* → *avarii produse din cauza gheții*; *search and rescue communication* → *comunicații utilizate în operațiunile de căutare și salvare*; *urgency traffic* → *trafic în situații de urgență, etc.*). The maritime language translator should possess the ability to understand the terms in both semantic and pragmatic contexts and accurately convey them in the desired target language. This is particularly important when some constituent elements of a multi-word lexical unit are ambiguous. To exemplify, the general English noun *cable* has several meanings in maritime language since it can stand for: *anchor chain*; *thick rope*; *electric cable*; or *unit of length measurement*). Thus, a difficulty in translating IMO SMCP (2001) is related to semi-technical terms (i.e., words which belong to the common vocabulary but which take on a specialized meaning in the maritime context). Examples include: nouns (e.g. *list, gypsy, line, painter, operation, damage, cable*) and verbs (*walk back, walk out, check, pay out, pay away, etc.*). As Boris Pritchard (*Some Lexical Aspects* 273-274) rightfully points out, the word *damage* may be very difficult to translate when part of several compounds (e.g. *damage control, damage control team, damage control equipment, damage control material*). The compound *damage control* cannot be translated literally into Romanian as *controlul daunei/ daunelor/pagubei/ pagubelor** but as *gestionarea / limitarea avariei* and even as *control de avarie/ control în caz de avarie*. This is because the noun *damage* here does not refer to “its dominant sense of harm impairing the function of a thing, but to control of the sea or water leakage” (Pritchard, *Some Lexical Aspects* 275). Consequently, compounds in Maritime English can indeed pose a challenge to translators, as they often

carry a specialized meaning that cannot be easily deduced from the individual components. In the case of *damage control team*, the compound refers specifically to a group of individuals who are trained and equipped to respond to emergency situations on a ship, such as fires, flooding, or collisions. The equivalent phrase in Romanian is *echipă de intervenție la avarie* (our emphasis), which also conveys the specialized meaning of a team that responds to emergency situations on a ship. It is important for translators to be aware of these differences in order to accurately convey the intended meaning in the target language.

Another instance of lexical difficulty in maritime language translation, is the word *dead*. In the context of IMO SMCP, this word is part of several adverbial and prepositional phrases and acts both as an adverb and/or intensifier. For instance, the SMCP structures ***dead ahead*** → *drept în prova / încet înainte*; ***dead astern*** → *drept în pupa/ încet înapoi*; ***dead slow ahead*** → *foarte încet înainte*; ***dead slow astern*** → *foarte încet înapoi*; ***dead on end*** → *drept în prova* are part of standard engine orders which are given to and repeated by “the person operating the bridge telegraph, while the officer of the watch should ensure that the orders are carried out correctly and immediately” (SMCP 2002). Furthermore, *dead* is also part of the following word combinations: *dead man/ deadman* → *gai de bigă*; *dead on end* → *drept în prova* (for more details see Vișan, *Aspects of Maritime Language* 273-274). In addition, the word *dead* is part of several collocations or compound nouns used in naval architecture, shipbuilding and maritime economics do designate specific concepts.

Another translation strategy which is often made recourse to is transposition. In his work "Approaches to Translation," Peter Newmark (85) employs the term "transposition" interchangeably with "shift," highlighting its intuitive utilization by translators. Additionally, Klaudia Gibová (36-37) views transposition as an intentional and often inevitable modification that occurs during the translation process from the source language (SL) to the target language (TL). Gibová categorizes transpositions into two types: word-class transpositions and sentence-member transpositions. Word class transpositions within the IMO SMCP primarily consist of obligatory transpositions. Thus, through the translator's aim to achieve economy of expression within this particular discourse (Vișan, *Transposition* 110-111), verbs in the source text are frequently transformed into nouns, and sometimes into adjectives, in the target text (e.g. "*I am leaking flammable cargo*" → *Am scurgeri de marfă inflamabilă*). Furthermore, the phrase "*I have a list to*

port/starboard" can be translated into Romanian in at least two distinct ways. The translator can choose either a noun-to-noun rendering, as in "*Am canarisire la babord/tribord*," or a noun-to-predicative adjective rendering, such as "*Sunt canarisit la babord*", which sounds more natural. Another translation solution would be to opt for the structure *Am unghi the canarisire la babord*, where the addition of the noun *unghi* contributes to the technical meaning of the whole structure. It is worth mentioning that transpositions within the SMCP also involve modifications in noun number, alterations in the syntactic function of the source text unit, as well as changes in verb voice as in "*The wind in your position/in position... is expected to increase/decrease*" → "*Se așteaptă ca vântul din poziția dumneavoastră/din poziția... să crească/scadă în intensitate*"), where the passive *is expected* is translated into the passive reflexive *se așteaptă*).

Modulation is another commonly employed translation strategy, laying stress not on words, but on what they refer to. The most important reason for the translators' use of modulation is that "they believe that in a particular context, a span of text would be more naturally formulated in a different way in the TT from the way it appears in the ST" (Salkie 439). The most common types of modulations are abstract for concrete/ concrete for abstract modulations, change of symbol modulations and one part for another (e.g.: as in *What is your present course and speed?* → *Care este drumul și viteza actuală?*).

With a view to nominal and verbal collocations in IMO SMCP, they are generally rendered either by the form-based strategy or the meaning-based strategy, as put forward by Elena Croitoru & Antoanela Dumitrașcu (*Collocations and Colligations*). In a previous study on verbal collocations in translating maritime language, co-authored with our doctoral supervisor Elena Croitoru, we observed a noteworthy syntagmatic characteristic in certain collocations found in the IMO SMCP. It is evident that most verbs in these collocations are combined with nouns formed through derivation, composition, or with verbal nouns. For instance, *require assistance* can be rendered in Romanian as *a solicita/cere ajutor* and *keep a look-out* is translated as *a executa/ menține o veghe*. These collocations are directly translated into Romanian (Vișan & Croitoru 135). Another observation that we have made is that in maritime discourse, a majority of verbal collocations comprise of transitive verbs that denote activation and are paired with nouns expressing physical objects. Examples include: *to stop engine* → *a opri motorul/ mașina*; *to rig the ladder* → *a pregăti scara de pilot*; *to jettison*

cargo → *a arunca marfa peste bord* and *to heave the anchor* → *a ridica ancora* as well as *to handle a ship/rope* → *a manevra / opera o nava / a manipula o parâma* (Vișan & Croitoru 135). The translation of a verb + noun collocation in Maritime English, namely, *alter course* and *drag the anchor* require a verb + preposition + noun rendering in maritime Romanian, namely, *a schimba de drum* and *a derapa pe ancoră*, the Romanian structures pointing to the beauty and specificity of maritime discourse. Mention needs to be made that the noun *course* which is a false friend in IMO SMCP (2001), requires to be translated with *drum* and not with *curs* (see also the colligations *course made good* and *course over ground*).

As illustrated in Table 2 below, the pattern of verb + adverbial particle (phrasal verb) + noun is prevalent in anchoring and mooring orders, or when issuing commands during vessel entry and exit from the harbour (e.g. *walk back the anchor* → *a fila ancora*; *walk out the anchor* → *a coborî ancora*; *standy by port anchor* → *a pregăti ancora din babord*; *slack out a cable* → *a fila lanțul ancorei*; *hold on port anchor cable* → *a ține lanțul de ancoră din babord*).

Table 2. Example of SMCP phrases used in anchoring (SMCP 62)

Maritime English	Maritime Romanian
A2/3.5.1.1 Stand by port / starboard / both anchor(s) for letting go.	A2/3.5.1.Pregătiți ancora din babord / ancora din tribord / ambele ancore pentru fundarisire.
A2/3.5.1.2 Walk out the anchor(s).	A2/3.5.1.2 Coborâți ancora/ancorele prin nară.
A2/3.5.1.3 We are going to an anchorage.	A2/3.5.1.3 Ne îndreptăm spre un loc de ancoraj.
A2/3.5.1.5 Put... shackles in the water / in the pipe / on deck.	A2/3.5.1.5Lăsați ... chei de lanț la apă / în nară / pe punte.
A2/3.5.1.6 Walk back port / starboard / both anchor(s) one/ one and a half shackle(s).	A2/3.5.1.6 Filați ancora/ancorele din babord/tribord/ambele ancore /o cheie/o cheie de lanț și jumătate.
A2/3.5.1.7 We will let go port / starboard / both anchor(s)... shackle(s) and dredge it / them.	A2/3.5.1.7 Vom fundarisi ancora/ancorele din babord/tribord/ambele/ cu ... chei(e) de lanț și o/le vom grapa.
A2/3.5.1.9 Slack out the cable(s).	A2/3.5.1.9 Fila lanțul/lanțurile de ancora.
A2/3.5.1.9.1 Check the cable(s).	A2/3.5.1.9.1 Fila lanțul/lanțurile de ancora.

The idea should be pointed out that the presence of phrasal verbs followed by nouns often leads to confusion and poses translation challenges for non-professional translators. This may be attributed to the influence of

standard language, where certain phrasal verbs possess multiple meanings (e.g. *pay out the chain* → *a fila lanțului*; *run out the head rope* → *a da parâma prova*; *cast off the bow spring/head rope* → *a mola șpringul prova/parâma prova*). We agree with Baker (48) in recognizing that certain words, specifically verbs in our case, exhibit a broader range of collocations compared to others. This characteristic can be attributed to two primary factors that influence the collocational range of a word, namely its level of specificity and the number of senses it encompasses.

Furthermore, it is worth noting that a considerable repertoire of collocations pertaining to maritime discourse in general, and to the IMO SMCP (2001) in particular, involves the amalgamation of verbs with adverbs created through the use of the prefix *a*. Notable examples include *aft*, *ahead*, *astern*, *aground*, *abeam*, *abreast*, as seen in phrases like *go astern/abaft* → *a merge la pupa* and *lay aft* → *a trece în pupa*. These lexical combinations are generally used in the nautical register. The transfer of collocational patterns from English into Romanian can pose a challenge for translators, particularly when there are formal dissimilarities between the two languages. In such cases, it is important for translators to understand the collocability rules specific to each language and to adapt the collocational patterns accordingly to ensure that the semantic content of the source text is preserved in the target text. This requires a deep understanding of both the source and target languages, as well as the context in which the text is being used.

Conclusions

The conclusion can be drawn that translating an institutional text such as the IMO SMCP requires a high level of language proficiency, familiarity with maritime terminology and conventions, and attention to context, tone, and accuracy. The translator must ensure that the translated phrases are clear, consistent, and easily understandable to the target audience while maintaining the intended tone and style of the original text. In order to guarantee the accuracy and suitability of the translation for the intended audience, collaborating with maritime specialists can offer valuable insights into maritime terminology, jargon, and other aspects related to the subject matter that may not be readily evident to the translator (Croitoru, *Interpretation and Translation* 157). Moreover, such collaboration can contribute to ensuring that the translation is consistent with the standards and conventions of the maritime field or industry.

The level on which translation strategies work varies, however, the most important thing is to realize that a good professional translator resorts to changes as the circumstances demand. Unfortunately, in maritime language translation there is still a tendency to follow the syntactic and lexical structure of ST too closely and this often leads to translation that sounds unnatural. The ultimate aim is for maritime language translators to become so proficient that they do not have to consciously consider using translation strategies at an expert level. Instead, they can focus on more advanced considerations such as the purpose of the text, the intended use of the text, and the potential readership.

Works Cited

- Albu, Georgeta., Manolache. Paula. *Vocabular Frazologic Englez-Român pentru Comunicații la Bordul Navei*. Constanța: Ceronav, 1999.
- Baker, Mona. *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. London & New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Baker, Mona; Saldanha, Gabriela. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. New York: Routledge, 1998/2009.
- Bennet, Karen. “Epistemicide! The Tale of a Predatory Discourse”. In Cunico Sonia, Munday Jeremy (eds.) *Translation and Ideology: Encounters and Clashes, Special Issue of the Translator* 13(2), (2007): 151-169.
- Biber, Douglas., Johansson, Stig., Leech, Geoffrey., Conrad, Susan., Finegan, Edward. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Pearson Education Limited, Harlow, 1999.
- Bidu-Vrânceanu, Angela. *Dicționar de Științe ale Limbii*. București: Nemira, 2005.
- Bidu-Vrânceanu, Angela. *Lexicul Specializat în Mișcare: De la Dicționare la Texte*. București : Editura Universității din București, 2007.
- Cabré, Maria-Teresa. *Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications*. Philadelphia PA: John Benjamins, 1998, [transl. of *La Terminologia. La teoria, els mètodes, les aplicacions*, Barcelona, Emúries, 1992].
- Cabré, Maria-Teresa. *Terminology, Theory Methods and Applications*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1999. ISBN 90 272 16339.
- Cabré, Maria-Teresa. “Elements for a Theory of Terminology: Towards an Alternative Paradigm”. In *Terminology. International Journal of*

Theoretical and Applied Issues in Specialized Communication, 6.1, (2000): 35-57.

- Catford, John., Cunniison. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980.
- Chesterman, Andrew. “Problems with Strategies”. In Krisztina Károly and Ágota Fóris (eds.) *New Trends in Translation Studies: In Honor of Kinga Klaudy*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, (2005): 17-28.
- Crystal, David. *Encyclopaedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Croitoru, Elena. *Interpretation and Translation*. Galați: Porto Franco, 1996.
- Croitoru, Elena. (ed.) *English through Translation: Interpretation and Translation Oriented Text Analysis*. Galați: Editura Fundației Universitare, 2004.
- Croitoru, Elena., Dumitrașcu, Antoanela. “Collocations and Colligations in Specialized Texts”. In *Specialized Discourse: Theory and Practice*. Galați: Europlus Publishing House, 2006: 103-113.
- Cronin, Michael. *Translation and Globalization*. London & New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Dimitriu, Rodica. *Theories and Practice of Translation*. Iași: Institutul European, 2002. ISBN 973-611-171-7.
- Gibova, Klaudia., Bednarova. “Translation procedures in the Non-Literary and Literary Text Compared (based on an analysis of EU institutional-legal text and novel excerpt “the Shack” by William P. Young), 2012, available from <<http://www.publib.sk/elpub2/FF/Giboval/index.html>>, 16 March, 2017.
- Gotti, Maurizio. *Studies in Specialized Discourse*. Bern/ Berlin/ Bruxelles/ Frankfurt am Main/ New York/ Oxford/ Wien: Peter Lang, 2006.
- Gotti, Maurizio. *Investigating Specialized Discourse*. Bern/Hartley: Peter Lang AG, European Academic Publishers, 2006.
- House, Juliane. “Text and Context in Translation” In *Journal of Pragmatics*, (2006.): 338–58.
- House, Juliane. “Global English and the Destruction of Identity?”, in Paschalis Nikolaou and Maria-Venetia Kyritsi (eds.) *Translating Selves: Experience and Identity Between Languages and Literatures*. London & New York: Continuum, (2008): 87- 107.
- Jääskeläinen, Ritta. “Investigating Translation Strategies”. In Sonia Tirkkonen-Condit and John Laffling (eds.) *Recent Trends in Empirical*

- Translation Research*, Joensuu: University of Joensuu, Faculty of Arts, (1993): 99-119.
- Lörscher, Wolfgang. *Translation Performance, Translation Process and Translation Strategies: A Psycholinguistic Investigation*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1991.
- Lörscher, Wolfgang. *The Translation Process: Methods and Problems of its Investigation*. *Meta* 50(2): (2005): 597-608.
- Quirk, Randolph. et. al *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman, 1972.
- Mackay, Ronald., Mountford, Alan. *English for Specific Purposes*, Longman Group Limited, 1984.
- Newmark, Peter. *A Textbook of Translation*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall International, 1988.
- Nordman, Marianne. “Cooking Recipes and Knitting Patterns: Two Minilects Representing Technical Writing”. In Kalverkämper, Hartwig, Baumann, Klaus-Diter (eds.) *Fachliche Textsorten: Komponenten, Relationen, Strategien*. Tübingen: Gunter Naar Verlag, (1996): 554-575.
- Nord, Christiane. “A Functional Typology of Translations”. In Trosborg, Anna (ed.), *Text Typology and Translation* Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1997.
- Pritchard, Boris. & Kalogjera, Damir. ‘On some features of conversation in maritime VHF communication’, in M. Coulthard, J. Cotterill & F. Rock, F. (Eds.), *Dialogue Analysis VII: Working with Dialogue*, Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen, pp. 185-196 *WMU Journal of Maritime Affairs*, 2(2), (2000.): 149-166.
- Pritchard, Boris. ‘On some issues in the standardization of Maritime English: Pedagogical Implications’ in Osman Kamil Sag, Hisashi Yamamoto (eds.), *The Proceedings of the International Seminar on Maritime English*, JICA-ITUMF, Istanbul, (2002): 68 – 90.
- Pritchard, Boris. “Maritime English syllabus for the modern seafarer: safety-related or comprehensive courses? *WMU Journal of Maritime Affairs*, 2 (2), (2003a): 149-166.
- Pritchard, Boris. *Maritime Communications and IMO SMCP 2001 (draft version)*, 2003b. Retrieved from http://www.pfri.uniri.hr/~bopri/documents/MaritimeCommunicationsandSMCP_001.pdf

- Pritchard, Boris. “Some Lexical Aspects of Translating Specialized Texts”. In Maurizio Gotti, and Šarčević, Susan. (eds.). *Insights into Specialized Translation*. Bern: Peter Lang, (2006): 155-172.
- Pritchard, Boris. “Minimum (technical) vocabulary—Some Issues in Maritime English”. *ESP Maritime English Journal*, 1, (2011):3-23. Retrieved from <http://bib.irb.hr/prikazi-rad?&lang=en&rad=355031> on 14 March 2012.
- Salkie, Raphael. “A New Look at Modulation”, in Translation and Meaning, part 5, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, (2001): 433-441.
- Schäffner, Christina., Beverly Adab. “Translation as Intercultural Communication: Contact as Conflict”. In Mary Snell-Hornby, Zuzana Jettmarová and Klaus Kaindl (eds.), *Translation as Intercultural Communication: Selected Papers from the EST Congress*, Prague 1995. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins, (1995): 325-38.
- Snell-Horby, Mary. “The Ultimate Comfort: Word, Text and the Translation of Tourist Brochures”. In Anderman, G., Rogers M. (eds.) *Word, Text, Translation: Liber Amicorum for Peter Newmark*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, (1999): 95-103.
- Stevens, Peter. Johnson, Edward. “Seaspeak: A project in applied linguistics, language engineering, and eventually ESP for sailors”. In *The ESP Journal*, 2(2), (1983): 123-129.
- Stevens, Peter., Weeks, Fred. *The Creation of a Regularised Subset of English for mandatory Use in Maritime Communications: SEASPEAK*, Honolulu: Institute of Culture and Communication, 1985.
- Superceanu, Rodica. “Evaluation and Revision Procedures used in Translation”. In Luminița Frențiu (ed.) *Romanian Journal of English Studies*, Editura Universității de Vest, Timișoara, (2006): 257-263.
- Trenkner, Peter. “Maritime English. An attempt at an Imperfect Definition”. In *Proceedings of the Second IMLA Workshop on Maritime English in Asia*. Dalian, China: Dalian Maritime University, (2000): 1-8.
- Trosborg, Anna. “Translating Hybrid Political Texts”. In Trosborg, A. (ed.), *Text Typology and Translation*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing House, (1997): 145-158.
- Vermeer, Hans, Josef. *Skopos and Translation Commission- Aufsätze*, Heidelberg: Universität, 1989.

- Vinay, Jean-Paul., Darbelnet, Jean. “A Methodology for Translation”. In Lawrence Venutti (ed) *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Vinay, Jean- Paul., Darbelnet Jean. *Comparative Stylistics of French and English: A Methodology for Translation*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1958/1995.
- Vișan, Ioana-Raluca, Croitoru, Elena. “Verbal Collocations in Maritime Language Translation”. In Elena Croitoru, Floriana Popescu (eds.) *Proceedings of the 4th Conference Translation Studies: Retrospective and Prospective Views*, Galați: Galați University Press, pp. 133-139. Available from https://www.academia.edu/1243510/VERBAL_COLLOCATIONS_IN_MARITIME_LANGUAGE_TRANSLATION
- Vișan, Ioana-Raluca. “Transposition in IMO SMCP (2018) Translation”. In Agapova E., Beresova, J. (eds.), *Language Individual and Society Journal*, Vol. 12, (2018):108-115, ISSN 1314-7250 (online), <https://www.scientific-publications.net/en/issue/1000032/>
- Vișan Ioana-Raluca. *Translating Maritime Language (Vol 2): Aspects of Maritime Language in Translation*. Timișoara: Editura Politehnica, 2021.
- *** *IMO SMCP: Standard Marine Communication Phrases*, London: IMO Publication, the InternationalMaritime Organization, 2002., also available from [https://www.classnk.or.jp/hp/pdf/activities/statutory/ism/imo/A.918\(22\).pdf](https://www.classnk.or.jp/hp/pdf/activities/statutory/ism/imo/A.918(22).pdf)