

Makale Bilgisi: Yıldırım, O., Altay, A. (2023). AB Tasarruflarının Türkçe Çevirilerinin Revizyon Süreci. DEÜ Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi, Cilt:10, Sayı: 1, ss.89-112.	Article Info: Yıldırım, O., Altay, A. (2023). Revision Process of the Translation of EU Acts into Turkish. DEU Journal of Humanities, Volume: 10, Issue: 1, pp. 89-112.
Kategori: Araştırma Makalesi	Category: Research Article
Gönderildiği Tarih: 03.08.2022	Date Submitted: 03.08.2022
Kabul Edildiği Tarih: 13.01.2023	Date Accepted: 13.01.2023

REVISION PROCESS OF THE TRANSLATION OF EU ACTS INTO TURKISH

Ozan Yıldırım*, Ayfer Altay**

ABSTRACT

Revision is a part of the translation process, and it has an essential role in shaping the final product. Turkish translation and revision processes of the acts of EU, which concerns Turkey as a candidate country, are discussed in this article. Although the linguistic, technical, and legal revision categories are included, the focal point is the linguistic revision. In this article, it is intended to conduct a considerably specific, original, and distinctive study discussing the translation/revision policy of the Directorate for EU Affairs in Turkey, which is the only authorized institution responsible for the translation/revision process of EU acts. It is searched whether the revised products are mostly foreignized or domesticated. Thus, the final comment and conclusion about the policy of the Directorate for EU Affairs in the revision and finalized texts are discussed. The idea behind this article is to present quantitative and qualitative findings about the translation/revision policy by showing the strategies employed in the translation subjected to revision and in the revision itself. Moreover, it aims to show percentages of the strategies used both in translation and revision by putting them in a supercategory under the concept of domestication and foreignizing. The methodology is based upon translation procedures and translation strategies of domestication and foreignizing which were introduced by Luc van Doorslaer (2007, as cited in Munday, 2016). EU acts, whose translations and revisions are completed, are overviewed with a certain year limitation and examples that are worth analyzing are presented in this article. When technical terms create a challenge for revision, French and/or German-language version of the EU acts are referred to. Procedures employed in the translated and revised products are given as statistical data, visualized through a table, and enriched with comments.

Keywords: Translation of EU acts, Revision of EU Acts, EU Legal Language, Directorate for EU Affairs in Turkey, Legal Equivalence, Domestication/Foreignizing

* Yüksek Lisans Mezunu, Atılım Üniversitesi, oozanyildirim@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-8778-2804

** Profesör Doktor, Atılım Üniversitesi, ayfer.altay@atilim.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-1882-3924

AB TASARRUFLARININ TÜRKÇE ÇEVİRİLERİNİN REVİZYON SÜRECİ

ÖZ

Revizyon, çeviri sürecinin bir parçası olarak nihai ürünü şekillendirmede önemli bir göreve sahiptir. Bu çalışmada, bir aday ülke olarak Türkiye'yi de ilgilendiren Avrupa Birliği (AB) tasarruflarının Türkçe çeviri ve revizyon süreçlerine değinilmiştir. Dilbilimsel, teknik ve hukuki revizyon kategorilerinin ne olduklarına yer verilmişse de asıl odak dilbilimsel revizyon olmuştur. Bu çalışmada, AB tasarruflarının çeviri/revizyon sürecinden sorumlu tek yetkili kurum olan AB Başkanlığının çeviri/revizyon politikası ele alınarak oldukça özel kapsamlı, özgün ve fark yaratan bir çalışma yürütmek amaçlanmıştır. Revizyonu tamamlanmış ürünlere daha çok yerleştirme mi yoksa yabancılaştırma mı uygulandığı araştırılmıştır. Bu nedenle, revizyonu tamamlanmış metinlerdeki AB Başkanlığı politikaları makalede tartışılmıştır. Çalışmanın amacı, revizyona tabi tutulan çeviride ve revizyonda kullanılan izlemleri göstererek nicel ve nitel gözlemler sunmak; ayrıca bu izlemleri üst kategoride yerleştirme veya yabancılaştırma kavramlarında toplayarak yüzdelik oranlarını göstermektir. Luc van Doorslaer tarafından ortaya konan çeviri süreçleri ve çeviri izlemleri ile değerlendirme yapılmıştır. Bu çalışmada Türkçe çevirisi ve revizyonu tamamlanmış olan AB tasarrufları belli bir zaman aralığı kısıtlaması içinde taranarak incelemeye değer örneklerle yer verilmiştir. Teknik terimlerin revizyon için zorluk yarattığı zamanlarda bir seçenek olarak ilgili AB tasarruflarının Almanca ve/veya Fransızca dil versiyonlarına da bakılmıştır. İncelenen çeviri ürünleri ve revizyondan geçen çeviri ürünlerinde kullanılan süreçler istatistiğe dökülmüş, grafiklerle görselleştirilmiş ve yorumlanmıştır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: AB Tasarruflarının Çevirisi, AB Tasarruflarının Revizyonu, AB Hukuk Dili, AB Başkanlığı, Hukuki Eşdeğerlik, Yerleştirme/Yabancılaştırma

1. INTRODUCTION

This article aims to define the translation and revision processes in the European Union (EU), to explain revision categories of the Directorate for EU Affairs in Turkey, to compare the unrevised and revised versions and analyze the strategies employed, to make use of other language versions to clarify purely technical terms and to show whether the revised acts are domesticated or foreignized. The reason why a translation is subject to revision and how it is corrected shape the problem of this article. It is hypothesized that unrevised acts employ foreignizing whereas revised acts employ domestication.

Revision has an essential role in any field of translation. As for the translation of legal texts, especially for multilingual ones, rules and standards are set by many institutions, directorates, and offices. EU acts are one such multilingual legal text and have a plethora of standards from style to form, terminology to punctuation, which differ from the translation of national legal documents. In Turkey, the Directorate for EU Affairs affiliated to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has the role of conducting Turkey and EU relations and

accession negotiations. The Department of EU Law and Translation coordinates the translation of the EU *acquis* into Turkish through a quality-based approach, considering the dynamics of the negotiation process, in coordination with other line ministries, where necessary; in addition, the Department revises the translated EU acts and maintains an inventory. The Department has been managing the ongoing work in order to develop standard terminology and quality, creating the EU terminology database (TermAB) and updating its style guide used to translate the EU *acquis*. This article seeks to clarify the following research questions by textual analysis and comparison mostly of the secondary law of the EU. 1. Which procedures are mostly employed in the translation process? 2. Which procedures are mostly employed in the revision process? 3. What are the percentages of the procedures employed in the revision process that fall under the strategies of domestication and foreignizing?

Despite the fact that the Directorate for EU Affairs affiliated with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Turkey coordinates EU affairs, not enough academic studies exist on the translation of EU acts, the process of achieving equivalence and revision process. Hence, more detailed studies are required in order to display the translation and revision process other than the instructions inscribed in the EU Translation Guide published by the Directorate. Francesca Luisa Seracini (2021, p. 69) also suggests that specific guidelines and common rules are necessary for drafting and translation of the EU legislation. The EU suggests standardization in each language version, but the questions are: How is the equivalence achieved in the Turkish version? How does the revision process work? What are the procedures employed?

The negotiation process for Turkey to become an EU Member State has been lengthy. Even though legal and international relations studies discuss the EU in-depth, translation studies discuss multilingualism and the role of translation rarely in Turkey. After the establishment of the Secretariat General for EU Affairs in Turkey, the first steps to standardize the translation process were taken, including employing several translators to work on EU affairs. Since the beginning, the translators have been working to build frameworks for the translation and revision processes, in line with the European Union translation standards in order to maintain authenticity; and all language versions have the same legal value. Although only a few translators and EU specialists were employed in the Secretariat initially, now the Directorate has legal specialists, EU specialists, and translators.

EU is a supranational organization which combines multilingual and multinational elements. Translation has a significant role in the adoption of the legal acts so that each Member State can comprehend and practice them fully. The EU language reflects the supranational nature of the Union. In this context, multilingualism is a significant concept to be considered. Owing to

the multilingual policy of the EU states, the Union's motto united in diversity represents the crucial benefaction that linguistic diversity and language learning contribute to the European project. Languages unite people and make different countries and their cultures accessible, as well as reinforce intercultural empathy. All official languages are equally important in the EU (European Commission, 2019). It is not possible to examine every other official language version therefore, English takes the primary share in the article, and it is followed to some extent by French and German. Analysis in the given article is carried out by textual analysis and comparison mostly within the secondary law of the EU. The time limitation is between 2000 and 2020. As for the theoretical framework, translation procedures and translation strategies of domestication/foreignizing are used. The reason for the time limitation and specific aspects of the procedures and strategies in question, which is also addressed by Luc van Doorslaer (2007, as cited in Munday, 2016), Peter Newmark (1988) and Lawrence Venuti (1995), will be laid down under the title of methodology in detail.

2. Methodology

This article analyses the revision process conducted by the Directorate for EU Affairs in Turkey. Linguistic revision primarily is the focal point of the article. Linguistic revision examines language quality in terms of stylistic features, cohesion and coherence, omission and addition that can change the meaning or cause wordiness, fluency, conformity to the translation guide, and accurate transfer. This article is limited to the documents published between 2000 and 2020 on the grounds that acts between the given years are consecutively available with their translation in hand. The acts were chosen on the basis of whether they contain examples that are worth discussing. The main reason for not limiting the topic but the year is to show the problems encountered in various fields, but not in a specific technical field. It is important to notice that the consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union date to 2012 and thus they do not violate the time limitation.

The discussion is chiefly about certain parts of EU acts being subject to revision. Strategies employed both in translation and revision processes are examined. Thus, revised and unrevised versions are given together under the title of data analysis; and these excerpts lead to present statistical data of the strategies employed. Unrevised versions have critical importance as they show why this translation is subject to revision and how it is corrected. Statistics reached demonstrate what strategy (domestication/foreignizing) is predominantly employed in translation by the related department of the Directorate. French and German versions, besides the English version, are also referred to for certain examples. Sometimes, the English version alone is not clear enough, especially when technical terms are in question. Hence, legally

equivalent German or French version, or sometimes both of them together are referred to in the data analysis to clarify a technical term. It is critical to notice that the use of other language versions is limited only to the translation of technical concepts or terms which are unfamiliar or not found in the target language and culture.

Unrevised and revised Turkish versions have no specific number like a CELEX number whereas the English version has one. Revised Turkish versions were requested from the Directorate for EU Affairs. When the revision is completed and there is no restriction to make it public, the revised Turkish version of an EU act can be requested from the Directorate, any time. As for the unrevised Turkish versions, thanks to the MA classes on EU Texts, they were reached as course material.

Analysis in this article is carried out by textual analysis and comparison lies mostly within the secondary law of the EU. As for the theoretical framework, translation procedures and translation strategies of domestication/foreignizing are used. Procedures and strategies in question are also introduced by several translation forerunners such as van Doorslaer (2007, as cited in Munday, 2016), Newmark (1988) and Venuti (1995). Comparing the text types, Newmark (1991, p. 115) claims that a translator of non-literary texts faces less inaccurate or poorly written texts as compared to a translator of literary texts. Newmark (1988, p. 81) also claims that translation methods are for the whole text, while translation procedures are either for sentences or smaller units of a language such as phrases.

Venuti (1995) principally defines translation in two categories: domestication and foreignizing. In his point of view, translation is not only limited to words solely, but culture also plays a considerable role. Inspiring from Friedrich Schleiermacher (1977, pp. 67-82), who points out these concepts in his lectures in 1813, Venuti improves domestication and foreignizing. These two concepts also create some serious clash of ideas and divide translators also into two groups. Domestication is described as taking the writer home, making the writer familiar to the reader; foreignizing is described as sending the reader away, making the reader familiar to the writer in the simplest and easiest way. Cultural equivalence, descriptive equivalence, expansion and reduction, adaptation, notes and glosses are domestication strategies, whilst transference and through-translation are foreignizing strategies.

3. Translation and Revision of Legal Texts

3.1. Legal Language

Each text type has its own distinctive features; which is also the case for a legal text. Even though these features seem general, they primarily address a western perspective and they have developed due to certain events throughout history. Ayfer Altay (2002) states the characteristics of the legal style as follows:

1. Archaic vocabulary with references to very old texts such as judicial decisions, contracts and so forth, referring to their omnipresent quality and the validity of rules, doctrines and such.
2. Formality, using formal and ritualistic language, keeping and protecting old-fashioned phrases and formal rules.
3. Complexity, using long and complex sentences as the full stop means a new concept or context.

Enrique Alcaraz Varó and Brian Hughes (2002, pp.4-14) also define certain features of the legal language such as Latinisms, terms borrowed from French or that have a Norman origin, formality and archaic orthography, archaic adverbs, archaic phrases, and redundancy because of the abundant use of synonyms or near-synonyms, and use of euphemism, either archaic or contemporary. It is important to note that any legal text should be considered under the scope of specialized texts. Altay (2013) states that specialized texts have a discourse which is different from daily language and discourse; therefore, translators have to adopt a certain kind of approach to such texts. Deductively, it can be read that deliberate specialization and limitation have been created; hence the communication has been restricted within a specialized group of professionals.

Stella Szantova Giordano (2013, pp. 447-487) suggests that the main problem is not to achieve equivalence in the target language; a legal translator may use an explanatory translation if the legal document allows. However, it is not always possible, and a legal translator cannot either use a parenthetical or referential explanation with a footnote.

In order to simplify the abovementioned arguments, it can be easily claimed that the legal language (it is named argot, jargon, or legalese by different scholars or translation forerunners) have been deliberately preserved by legal professionals. To achieve this, legal texts are full of long sentences, unusual sentence structures, flexible or vague language, technical vocabulary and archaic terminology, conservative language and attitude, legal homonyms (Tiersma, 1999, p. 61), synonyms and near-synonyms, and different use of grammar. Taking everything into consideration, a translator of EU acts always

needs to bear in mind that the flexible and vague language should also be kept in the target text.

3.2. Translation of EU Acts

Creating the EU *acquis*, the Member States have noticed that the legislative process has been a challenging path; translation of the legislation has been a problematic continuum, let alone drafting common legislation. Taking into account that the EU already has 24 official languages; translation, as Umberto Eco (2010) once said, is the language of Europe.

Susan Šarčević (2012) states that any term in one legal document does not always exactly correspond to another one, in terms of their legal language and legal culture. However, it is expected that any inter- or supranational act needs to be systematic, parallel, and consistent with one another. It should be remembered that any act in question includes gains and losses; in other words, it may include slight dissimilarities in the meaning during the translation process. In order to achieve systematicity, draw parallelism and keep consistency, a translator of official documents has to be qualified with certain requirements.

As legal instruments, EU acts are binding for all Member States and prescriptive by nature just like any other legal text that may result in sanctions. The translation of such documents needs to be conducted meticulously in order to be implemented conveniently. Therefore, the translator of EU acts is supposed to be aware of some facts such as legal language, legal equivalence, features of official documents, and other similar issues.

One of the main problems of translation studies is untranslatability. EU acts also contribute to untranslatability with the domain-specific language. Many discussions arise from untranslatability issues; and how to solve them. The problem of untranslatability in question could either stem from linguistic, contextual or cultural reasons. Andrejs Veisbergs (2005, p. 193) categorizes untranslatability as linguistic untranslatability, contextual untranslatability, and cultural untranslatability: 1. Linguistic untranslatability defines grammatical mismatches between the source text and target text. 2. Contextual untranslatability defines idioms, puns, neologisms and so forth; in other words, it defines words or phrases which are not meaningful when translated word for word but are meaningful in a context. To clarify, idioms, puns, neologisms and such reach a meaning only if they are in a context. 3. Cultural untranslatability defines every cultural issue which belongs to a culture and is specific to a culture, and certainly, reach a meaning in the culture it belongs to.

Untranslatability is a challenging problem to solve but at one point or another, it needs to be solved. Untranslatability creates a gap in the target language and this gap is called lacuna (or plural lacunae). A linguistic gap or lacuna can occur when the target language does not have the word or the notion. Lacuna can also occur when the target culture has the notion, but it does not have a common or acceptable word. Moreover, the word and notion have already been used and seen as acceptable, a new word or expression can be coined to create a new jargon, and this is called neologism. A translator of these acts should fix the lacunae occurring at any level. A translator can solve the untranslatability by employing borrowings, calques, neologisms, localization of cultural realia and many more. To clarify the abovementioned terminology, they are defined briefly. Borrowing means delivering a word or expression from the source language into the target language, e.g., *inter alia*, *déjà vu*, *tiyatro*. Calque means a type of borrowing that a word or an expression is transferred from the source language into the target language; however, the word or each component of an expression is translated literally, e.g., *gökdelen* (skyscraper), *Übermensch* (superman), *pomme d'Adam* (Adam's apple). Neologism means a word or expression that is not common in daily language. It is created either for technical or literary concerns, e.g., *işkolik* (workaholic), *tıpkıbasım* (photocopy), *örnekseme* (analogy). Localization of cultural realia means developing familiarity with a concept in the source language into a domestic concept in the target language, e.g., *muhteşem cuma/efsane cuma/şahane cuma* ("Kozmetik Çevirisinde Yerelleştirme Örnekleri – Dijital Tercüme Blog", 2021) (Black Friday). It is important to notice that Friday is a holy day for the Muslim, therefore, it is not appropriate to call a holy day together with the adjective 'black'. Wonderful or marvellous Friday (*muhteşem/efsane cuma*) is a more suitable alternative.

3.3. Legal Equivalence

The issue of legal equivalence has the utmost priority in any legal text. Unless legal equivalence is achieved, it does not matter however well-written a text is, a legal text that does not meet relevant criteria means nothing at all. Legal equivalence is between the source text and the target text through translation into the official languages of the EU. Notwithstanding the language versions equivalent in terms of their meaning, the mandatory legal equivalence prescribes a presumed same legal effect. The presumed same legal effect also includes the principle of equal authenticity and the principle of plurilinguistic equality. Jean-Claude Beacco and Michael Byram (2007, p. 8) explains the concept of multilingualism as being or using several languages in a given geographical area while the concept of plurilingualism as the competence of the speaker, being able to use more than one language.

Emma Wagner et al. (2002, p. 7) emphasize the equal status of each official language of the EU and do not name other language versions of authentic texts as translations. Šarčević (1994, pp. 301-309) also suggests the term of parallel texts for equally authentic texts. It should be remembered that authentic or parallel texts mean legally binding texts in any official language in the EU context. Therefore, considering Turkish as one of those texts seems inappropriate until Turkey becomes a Member State of the Union.

The International Organisation for Standardisation (ISO) published the number ISO 17100 standard in 2015. ISO 17100:2015 facilitates the required resources, core processes and other essential elements for the delivery of a quality translation service which fulfils applicable specifications. It includes the translation, check, revision, review, proof reading, and final verification processes. Revision is also defined differently by scholars and language quality assessment associations or services. Brian Mossop (2014, p. 249) states that revision involves reading a translation to determine whether the quality is of the required standard and needs any necessary amendments. There is a bilingual examination of translation output for its suitability for the agreed purpose. ISO 17100 defines revision as assessing a translation and comparing it to its original in order to detect and correct possible errors, both in terms of content and formal presentation. The in-house translation service of the European Commission, the Directorate-General for Translation (DGT), defines the aim of revision as improving translation quality, serving as an instrument for quality control, and providing professional training for translators and revisers. As for the revision categories of the Directorate for EU Affairs in Turkey, they are linguistic revision, technical revision, and legal revision.

The focal point of the article is primarily the linguistic revision. EU specialist from the Directorate, Özge Özmen-Öztürk (2020) points out that the following questions should be asked during the linguistic revision process: 1. Does the translation reflect the given meaning in the source text? 2. Is any expression in the target text illogical or incoherent? 3. Does the target text have any material mistake? 4. Does any problem exist regarding clarity, whether among or within the sentences? 5. Are the source text and target text coherent? 6. Do stylistic features satisfy the given guide and/or general style? 7. Is the layout of the target text coherent with the source text? 8. Does any problem exist about the organization of the target text as a whole?

It is also important to note that the reviser needs to know not only what to look for but how to look for it. The reviser is also supposed to be aware of any special instructions that the client may have given about terminology, layout and so forth.

4. Data Analysis

Revised English, Turkish, and French/German if any, and unrevised Turkish versions are given together. It should be kept in mind that background knowledge and extra information given under the examples are not the main focus of this article. It is important to notice that the consolidated versions of the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union was signed in 2012 and thus they do not violate the time limitation. Strategies employed both in the translation and revision processes are discussed. The recognized translation is employed as a default procedure for each example without any exceptions; however, it is not stated continuously after each excerpt.

Revision procedures, which were addressed by Doorslaer (2007, as cited in Munday, 2016), Venuti (1995) and Newmark (1988), are listed below. Just one example is given for some translation procedures:

1. transference: *coup d'état*
2. adaptation: *futbol* (football)
3. cultural equivalent: *meslek erbapları* (professionals)
4. functional equivalent: *danışma avukatı* (solicitor), *duruşma avukatı* (barrister)
5. through-translation: *bilim kurgu* (science fiction)
6. modulation: *peu profound* (shallow)
7. reduction/expansion: *science linguistique* (linguistics), *çeviribilim* (translation/interpreting studies)

It is always a practical choice and alternative for the translator or reviser to check other equivalent official language versions of an EU act to have an idea about any concept or term. However, this does not mean translating or revising temerarily one paragraph from the German version, one paragraph from the French version and one paragraph from the English version. Comparing with/among other equivalent language versions can be helpful only if a phrase or term is not clear enough in the source text and is more apparent, precise and explicit in another version. It is necessary to remember that a translator is not advised to adopt this comparison as the first option.

EU Act	English (+German and/or French) Version	Unrevised Turkish Version	Revised Turkish Version
Decision (759/2010/EU)	en. head shops fr. magasins spécialisés	özel amaçlı mağazalar (functional equivalence)	“head shop”lar (transference)

Decision (759/2010/EU)	en. legal highs	yasal kafa yapıcı (functional equivalence)	“legal high” (transference)
Directive 2011/97/EU	en. child sex tourism	çocuk seks turizmi (through-translation)	çocuk fuhuşu turizmi (functional equivalence)
Directive 2011/97/EU	en. tourist organisations	turizm örgütleri (through-translation)	turizm kuruluşları (functional equivalence)
Directive 2011/92/EU	en. criminal organisation	suç kuruluşu (through-translation)	suç örgütü (functional equivalence)
Communication (2004/C 123/01)	en. consultation exercise	danışma uygulaması (reduction)	istişare çalışması (functional equivalence)
Decision (2013/115/EU)	en. hit procedures	isabet prosedürleri (through-translation)	eşleşme usulleri (functional equivalence)
Strategy No. 5643/5/14	en. abroad	yurt dışı (through-translation)	Birlik dışı (modulation)
Communication (2004/C 123/01)	en. respect	saygı (through-translation)	gözetilme (functional equivalence)
TEU (Article 27/3)	en. European External Action Service	Avrupa Dış İlişkiler Servisi (functional equivalence)	Avrupa Dış Eylem Servisi (through translation)
Decision 2008/616/JHA	en. writer’s palm de. Handkante	yazarın avuç içi (through-translation)	yan avuç izi (functional equivalence)
Communication COM/2005/0620	en. underground financial movements de. illegale Transaktionen fr. mouvements de fonds clandestins	yeraltı mali hareketler (through-translation)	kayıt dışı mali hareketler (functional equivalence)

Directive 2014/36/EU	en. documentary evidence de. schriftliche Nachweise	belge niteliğinde kanıtlar (through- translation)	yazılı kanıtlar (functional equivalence)
Decision (2010/759/EU)	en. illicit market de. Schwarzmarkt fr. marché noir	kaçak pazar (expansion)	karaborsa (functional equivalence)
Directive (EU) 2016/680	en. competent authority	gerçek veya tüzel kişi, kamu kuruluşu, kurumu veya diğer herhangi bir organ (expansion)	yetkili makam (through- translation)
Communication COM 2015/240	en. asylum shop	eş zamanlı olarak veya birbiri ardına mükerrer sığınma talebi (expansion)	iltica pazarı (through- translation)
Regulation (EU) 575/2013	en. paragraph	fıkra (cultural equivalence)	paragraf (transference)
Decision (EU) 2019/593	en. Article 209(2)	209. maddenin 2. paragrafı (expansion)	209(2) maddesi (through translation)
Decision (2006/757/EC)	en. IT support	IT desteği (adaptation)	BT desteği (through- translation)
Regulation (2016/399/EU)	en. 'internal flight'	"dâhili uçuş" (through- translation)	"iç hat uçuşu" (expansion)
TEU (Article 14/1)	en. European Parliament	Avrupa Birliği Parlamentosu (expansion)	Avrupa Parlamentosu (adaptation)
TEU (Article 13/1)	en. Court of Justice of the European Union	Avrupa Birliği Adalet Mahkemesi (through- translation)	Avrupa Birliği Adalet Divanı (cultural equivalent)
TEU (Article 19/1)		Adalet Mahkemesi	Adalet Divanı (cultural equivalence)

	en. Court of Justice	(through-translation)	
TEU (Article 19/1)	en. General Court	Genel Divan (cultural equivalence)	Genel Mahkeme (through-translation)
TEU (Article 13/1)	en. European Council	Avrupa Konseyi (through-translation)	Avrupa Birliği Zirvesi (functional equivalence)
Council Decision (759/2010/EU)	en. on the day following its publication	yayımlanmasını takip eden gün (through-translation)	yayımlanma tarihini takip eden gün (expansion)
Decision (2013/115/EU)	en. Sirene Bureau	Sirene Büroları (modulation)	Sirene Bürosu (adaptation)
Report (2015, Turkey)	en. confiscation	müsadere (through-translation)	el koyma (functional equivalence)
Decision (2013/115/EU)	en. 'URGENT'	"ACİL" (through-translation)	"URGENT" (transference)
Decision (2008/616/JHA)	en. Having regard to the Article 33 of Council Decision 2008/616/JHA	2008/616/JHA sayılı Konsey Kararı'nın 33. maddesini göz önünde tutarak (transference)	2008/616/Aİİ sayılı Konsey Kararı'nın 33. maddesini göz önünde tutarak (through-translation)
Decision (2014/283/EU)	en. ratification, acceptance and approval	onay, kabul ve tasdik (through-translation)	onay, kabul ve uygun bulma (functional equivalence)
Directive (2009/52/EC)	en. illegal immigration	yasa dışı göç (through-translation)	düzensiz göç (modulation)
Decision (2013/115/EU)	en. on an aircraft:	uçakla ilgili olarak: (reduction)	hava aracıyla ilgili olarak: (through-translation)
Decision (2015/219/EU)	en. procedure of consultation	istişare prosedürü (adaptation)	istişare usulü (through-translation)
Decision (2015/219/EU)	en. serious crime	ciddi suç (through-translation)	ağır suç (modulation)
Decision (2015/219/EU)			

	en. specific checks	belirli kontroller (through- translation)	özel kontroller (modulation)
Directive (2014/26/EU)	en. intellectual creation	entelektüel yaratıcılık (adaptation)	fikri yaratıcılık (through- translation)
Decision (2010/759/EU)	en. criminal penalties	para cezaları (reduction)	ceza (expansion)
Decision (2007/815/EC)	en. the period 2008 to 2013	2008 ve 2013 arasında (modulation)	2008-2013 dönemi (through- translation)
Directive (2014/36/EU)	en. seasonal worker	sezonluk işçi (adaptation)	mevsimlik işçi (through- translation)
Regulation (2019/1240/EU)	en. illegal immigration	yasa dışı göç (through- translation)	düzensiz göç (modulation)
Directive (2014/66/EU)	en. family members	aile üyeleri (through- translation)	aile fertleri (modulation)
Directive (2014/66/EU)	en. trainee employees	stajyerler (reduction)	yetiştirme döneminde çalışanlar (expansion)
Council Common Position (2005/69/JHA)	en. formatted	biçimlendirilen (through- translation)	formatlanan (adaptation)
Regulation (2017/2391/EU)	en. is conferred	tevcih edilir (cultural equivalence)	verilir (through- translation)
Regulation (2013/1053/EU)	en. remedial action	iyileştirici eylem (through- translation)	düzenleyici eylem (modulation)
Decision (2012/506/EU)	en. latest data	mevcut veriler (modulation)	en son veriler (through- translation)
TEU (Article 19/1)	en. European Central Bank	Avrupa Birliği Merkez Bankası (expansion)	Avrupa Merkez Bankası (through- translation)
Regulation (2016/794/EU)	en. entry into force	yürürlüğe girme (through- translation)	yürürlük (reduction)
Directive (2009/71/Euratom)	en. HAVE ADOPTED THIS DIRECTIVE	İŞBU YÖNERGE'Yİ KABUL ETMİŞTİR	İŞBU DİREKTİF'İ KABUL ETMİŞİR (adaptation)

		(cultural equivalence)	
--	--	---------------------------	--

Table 1. Translation/Revision procedures

Three points in the table above need to be explained briefly: The first one is the term ‘confiscation’. In the 2015 Turkey Report by the European Commission, the term confiscation is used. *Müsadere* and *el koyma* can be the equivalence of confiscation; however, the context has key importance here. It is a known fact that not only legal terms and jargon, but also legal systems and mechanisms pose a challenge in translation. Turkish Penal Code (TCK) Number 5237 and Code of Criminal Procedure (CMK) Number 5271 defines *müsadere* as a sanction that results in dispositioning of the ownership of a property. The state takes all or part of the property as a result of a committed crime. *El koyma*, on the other hand, is a protection measure. It guarantees the accurate functioning of criminal procedure, does not terminate the ownership, it is temporary. The case here is a temporary protection measure. The function is highlighted. The unrevised version can bear different legal consequences as it suggests a different sanction or action.

The second term is “urgent” in the Commission Implementing Decision (2013/115/EU). The system where Sirene forms are found does not have a Turkish language version so the only option that can be chosen is “urgent” in the system. When it is translated as *acil*, it does not correspond to anything as the highest priority cannot be marked as *acil*. The translation guide of the Directorate clearly suggests that Turkish words are supposed to be chosen in the translation of EU acts. Two exceptions exist for this suggestion. The first one is if an established foreign abbreviation is commonly used in Turkish, then the abbreviation in question is kept. The second one is like the excerpt above: some marks, degrees, numeric or letter expressions and so forth are also kept.

The last one is the phrase “ratification, acceptance and approval” in the Council Decision (2014/283/EU). Kemal Gözler (2016, pp. 21-46) explains the concepts of ratification, acceptance and approval. Even though each term has similar meanings, ratification is the consent of a state to abide by an international act, acceptance and approval is also the consent of a state to abide by the national law. Altay (2002) also points out the use of synonyms in legal language is a typical feature.

It should be once again remembered that French and/or German-language version of the EU acts are referred to only if technical terms create a challenge for revision. Moreover, by doing that, it is easier to see the inspiration of the strategy employed either in the translation process or revision process.

5. Results and Discussion

	Translation Procedures	Revision Procedures
Through-translation (F)	25	15
Expansion (D)	6	4
Functional Equivalence (D)	3	13
Cultural Equivalence (D)	4	2
Reduction (D)	4	1
Adaptation (D)	4	4
Modulation (D)	3	7
Transference (F)	1	4

D: Domestication F: Foreignizing

Table 2. Translation/Revision strategies according to Venuti's foreignizing and domestication concepts

Table 2 clearly shows the strategies employed in the translation process and revision processes. Through-translation is the most employed strategy by 50%, expansion follows it by 12% and reduction takes the third place by 8% in the translation strategies. Revisers mostly changed through-translation when the function is neglected. They also changed translations employing expansion, because a legal translator is not expected to clarify or expand vague expressions, and a legal translator is not expected to justify or comment on a statement either. Unrevised acts are 52% foreignized and 48% domesticated.

The table above also shows the strategies employed in the revision process. Through-translation is again the most opted strategy by 30%, functional equivalence follows it by 26%, modulation takes the third place by 14%. While through-translation loses 20 points, functional equivalence gains 10 points in the revision process, compared to the translation process. Seeing that notes and glosses have no percentage in the table, it is once again understood that a legal translator or reviser is not expected to clarify any legal statement. The purpose is to translate accurately within the boundaries of what is given in the source text. Furthermore, functional equivalence, being the second most opted strategy, fits for the purpose of the translation guide of the Directorate as it suggests choosing established Turkish words for the translation of EU acts.

It is important to note that through-translation and transference strategies fall under the foreignizing strategy, whereas functional equivalence, cultural equivalence, adaptation, modulation, expansion and reduction fall under the domestication strategy. Thus, revised acts are 62% domesticated and 38% foreignized. Even though some terms are deliberately kept distant from the established terminology and jargon used in Turkish national law, domestication seems to be a more opted strategy. Fundamentally, EU acts are drafted and translated in order to be clearly understood and implemented. This

is achieved by employing a domestication strategy for the Turkish translations.

Standardization is a must for every language version. Diana Yankova (2008) states that standardization brings foreignizing together as a translation strategy. Furthermore, Yankova (2008) states that EU language is foreign to everyday language, and all language versions of the EU acts have to be linguistically equal paragraph by paragraph and even sentence by sentence. Accordingly, the official languages of the EU are permissive for foreign factors. C.J.W. Baaij (2018, pp. 111-112) points out that foreignization is also known as externalization and domestication is also known as familiarization in the EU context (pp. 111-112). Baaij (2015, pp. 109-121) also adds that the concepts of domestication and foreignization are recently used in the legal context.

It should be remembered that EU terms are deliberately kept different from national law terms. However, this article shows that the dominant translation strategy is domestication for the Turkey case. It is actually the puzzle of this article. Even though the translation of certain terms is deliberately kept distant from the daily language and national law terms, domestication has the biggest share after the revision process. It may be because Turkey is not a Member State yet. Current Turkish versions of the EU acts may change after the accession process for Turkey. Lastly, it should be noticed that the data is limited but examples are substantial and worth discussing.

6. CONCLUSION

The revision process of EU acts translated into Turkish is analyzed in this article. The most specific aspect of this study is that it presents the translation policy of the Directorate for EU Affairs. In other words, this article is about the Department of EU Law and Translation within the Directorate and discusses solely its revision policy. No other institution is taken as a reference for the reason that the Directorate is the only responsible official institution for the revision of EU acts in Turkey. The purpose is defined as showing both qualitative and quantitative data obtained from the translation and revision strategies employed in the translation and revision processes of EU acts translated into Turkish. In other words, not only the translators' and revisers' preferences are presented in numbers by giving statistics but also, they are discussed in terms of technicality, correspondence and EU legal language. The results obtained are plainly displayed in Table 1 and Table 2, and they are enriched with comments accordingly.

As these translations are done within the intersecting domains of governmental and legal affairs, it is fairly easy to understand why through-translations would show themselves. There is a sense of rigidity that such affairs can produce due to their nature that shows itself in their language use,

which incidentally affects the produced translations. However, one must also consider how such domains are tied to their region and culture in which they operate. Despite the rather inflexible nature of EU legal language, the high choice of domestication revision could very well be not a preference but a requirement in order to implement EU acts seamlessly to the practical realm. As the data in this article is presented, the comments are added with the aforementioned points in mind.

In the final analysis, research questions ask about the strategies employed in the translation process and in the revision process. It is clearly seen that translations (unrevised acts) which are subject to revision employ through-translation by 50% and the most employed strategy in revision (revised acts) is again through-translation by 30% but it loses 20 points compared to the translation process. The focal point of this article is to show which translation strategies are used in translation and in revision, and whether they show any change in the final product. They are displayed in Table 2 and enriched with comments. Carrying these data to an upper category, it is also shown that the dominant revision strategy is domestication by 62%. Therefore, it can be strikingly deduced that in Turkey the Directorate conducts a policy of domestication in the final revised versions of the translated EU acts, although the translator of these acts tends to produce foreignized versions.

For further studies, it can be suggested that domestication and foreignizing strategies are discussed in the context of EU and translation. Such a study can argue, comment on, or criticize either positively or negatively the strategies used for the revision process.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests regarding this research.

ETHICS COMMITTEE APPROVAL / PARTICIPANT CONSENT

Ethics committee approval is not required for this study. There are no participants in this study.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT

The authors did not receive any kind of financial support for this research.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

This research article was produced from a master's thesis within the scope of Translation Studies Master's Program at Atılım University, which was written by Ozan Yıldırım and supervised by Ayfer Altay.

REFERENCES

- Alcaraz-Varó, E., & Hughes, B. (2002). *Legal translation explained* (1st ed.). Routledge.
- Altay, A. (2002). Difficulties Encountered in the Translation of Legal Texts: The Case of Turkey. *Translation Journal*, 6 (4). <https://translationjournal.net/journal/22legal.htm>
- Altay, A. (2013). *English legal language and Translation of Legal Discourse* [PowerPoint presentation]. Translation of Legal Texts, Ankara, Turkey.
- Baaij, C. J. W. (2015). EU translation and the burden of legal knowledge. In S. Šarčević (Ed.), *Language and culture in EU law. Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 109-121). Ashgate.
- Baaij, C. J. W. (2018). *Legal integration and language diversity. Rethinking translation in EU lawmaking*. Oxford University Press.
- Beacco, J.& Byram, M . (2007). From linguistic diversity to plurilingual education. DGIV - Council of Europe.
- Communication 2004/C 123/01. *On the follow-up to the Commission communication on certain legal aspects relating to cinematographic and other audiovisual works*. the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Region. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:C2004/123/01&qid=1680888224048&from=EN>
- Communication COM/2005/0620. *Amending Regulation (EU) No 1387/2013 suspending the autonomous Common Customs Tariff duties on certain agricultural and industrial products*. European Commission. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52015PC0620&qid=1680888452206&from=EN>
- Communication COM/2015/240. *A European agenda on migration*. The European Parliament, The Council, The European Economic and Social Committee and The Committee of the Regions. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52015DC0240&qid=1680888632986&from=EN>
- Council Common Position 2005/69/JHA. *On exchanging certain data with Interpol*. The Council of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32005E0069&qid=1680888847115&from=EN>
- Decision 2006/757/EC. *On amending Sirene Manual*. The Commission of the European Communities. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32006D0757&qid=1680889440992>
- Decision 2007/815/EC. *Implementing Decision No 573/2007/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the adoption of the strategic*

guidelines 2008 to 2013. The Commission of the European Communities. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32007D0815&qid=1680889536266&from=EN>

Decision 2008/616/JHA. *On the implementation of Decision 2008/615/JHA on the stepping up of cross-border cooperation, particularly in combating terrorism and cross-border crime.* The Council of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32008D0616&qid=1680889635988&from=EN>

Decision 2010/759/EU. *On submitting 4-methylmethcathinone (mephedrone) to control measures.* The Council of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32010D0759&qid=1680889750536&from=EN>

Decision 2012/506/EU. *Amending Decision 2002/253/EC laying down case definitions for reporting communicable diseases to the Community network under Decision No 2119/98/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council.* The European Commission. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32012D0506&qid=1680889869299&from=EN>

Decision 2013/115/EU. *On the Sirene Manual and other implementing measures for the second generation Schengen Information System (SIS II).* The European Commission. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32013D0115&qid=1680890010808&from=EN>

Decision 2014/283/EU. *On the conclusion, on behalf of the European Union, of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity.* The Council of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32014D0283&qid=1680890104862&from=EN>

Decision 2015/219/EU. *Replacing the Annex to Implementing Decision 2013/115/EU on the Sirene Manual and other implementing measures for the second generation Schengen Information System (SIS II).* The European Commission. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32015D0219&qid=1680890176470&from=EN>

Decision 2019/593/EU. *On the conclusion, on behalf of the European Union, of the Agreement establishing the EU-LAC International Foundation.* The Council of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32019D0593&qid=1680890379076&from=EN>

- Directive 2009/52/EC, *On imports of hand pallet trucks and their essential parts originating in the People's Republic of China, repealing the duty with regard to imports from one exporter in this country and making these imports subject to registration.* The Commission of the European Communities. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32009R0052&qid=1680890625665&from=EN>
- Directive 2009/71/Euratom. *Appointing a Spanish member of the European Economic and Social Committee.* The Council of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32009D0071&qid=1680890766260&from=EN>
- Directive 2011/92/EU. *On the assessment of the effects of certain public and private projects on the environment.* The European Parliament and the Council of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32011L0092&qid=1680890863909&from=EN>
- Directive 2011/97/EU. *Amending Directive 1999/31/EC as regards specific criteria for the storage of metallic mercury considered as waste.* The Council of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32011L0097&qid=1680891148183&from=EN>
- Directive 2014/66/EU. *On the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals in the framework of an intra-corporate transfer.* The European Parliament and the Council of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32014L0066&qid=1680891255382&from=EN>
- Directive 2014/26/EU. *On collective management of copyright and related rights and multi-territorial licensing of rights in musical works for online use in the internal market.* The European Parliament and the Council of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32014L0026&qid=1680891403046&from=EN>
- Directive 2014/36/EU. *On the conditions of entry and stay of third-country nationals for the purpose of employment as seasonal workers.* The European Parliament and the Council of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32014L0036&qid=1680891491125&from=EN>
- Directive 2016/680/EU. *On the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data by competent authorities for the purposes of the prevention, investigation, detection or prosecution of criminal offences or the execution of criminal penalties, and on the free movement of such data, 27.04.2016; date of signature.* The European Parliament and the Council of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal->

content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32016L0680&qid=1680891578005&from=EN

Eco, U. (2010). *Lecture at the Assises de la Traduction littéraire in Arles*, Sunday 14 November 1993. EU Trio. <http://www.eutrio.be/language-europe-translation>

European Commission (2019, August 14). *About multilingualism policy*. https://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/multilingualism/about-multilingualism-policy_en.

EU Strategy No 5643/5/14. *Revised EU strategy for combating radicalisation and recruitment to terrorism*. The Council of the European Union. <https://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST%209956%202014%20INIT/EN/pdf>

Gözler, K. (2016). The question of the rank of international treaties in national hierarchy of norms: A theoretical and comparative study. In K. Reçber, B. Özdal & Z. Özgenç (Eds.), *Prof. Dr. Mehmet Genç'e Armağan* (pp. 21-46). Dora.

Kozmetik Çevirisinde Yerelleştirme Örnekleri – Dijital Tercüme Blog. (2021). <https://www.dijitaltercume.com/blog/kozmetik-cevirisinde-yerellestirme-ornekleri/>

Mossop, B. (2014). *Revising and editing for translators*. Routledge.

Munday, J. (2016). *Introducing Translation Studies*. Routledge.

Newmark, P. (1988). *A Textbook of Translation*. Longman.

Newmark, P. (1991). *About Translation*. Multilingual Matters.

Özmen-Öztürk, Ö. (2020). *AB Mevzuatı Revizyon Süreci*. Presentation, Atılım University.

Regulation (EU) 2013/1053. *Establishing an evaluation and monitoring mechanism to verify the application of the Schengen acquis and repealing the Decision of the Executive Committee of 16 September 1998 setting up a Standing Committee on the evaluation and implementation of Schengen*. The Council of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32013R1053&qid=1680892348164&from=EN>

Regulation (EU) 2016/399. *On a Union Code on the rules governing the movement of persons across borders (Schengen Borders Code)*. The European Parliament and the Council of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32016R0399&qid=1680892240380&from=EN>

Regulation (EU) 2016/794. *Approving silicon dioxide Kieselguhr as an existing active substance for use in biocidal products of product-type 18*. The European Commission. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32017R0794&qid=1680892092647&from=EN>

- Regulation (EU) 2017/2391. *Amending Regulation (EC) No 1059/2003 as regards the territorial typologies (Tercet)*. The European Parliament and the Council of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32017R2391&qid=1680891987652&from=EN>
- Regulation (EU) 2019/1240. *On the creation of a European network of immigration liaison officers*. The European Parliament and the Council of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32019R1240&qid=1680891879656&from=EN>
- Regulation (EU) 575/2013. *On prudential requirements for credit institutions and investment firms and amending Regulation (EU) No 648/2012*. The European Parliament and the Council of the European Union. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32013R0575&qid=1680892487122&from=EN>
- Report (2015). *Commission Staff Working Document – Turkey*. European Commission.
- Schleiermacher, F. (1977). On the Different Methods of Translation. In A. Lefevere (Ed.), *Translating Literature: The German tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig* (pp. 67-82). van Gorcum.
- Szantova Giordano, S. (2013). It's all Greek to me: Are attorneys who engage in or procure legal translation for their clients at risk of committing an ethical violation? *Quinnipiac Law Review*, 31(447), 447-487.
- Šarčević, S. (1994). Translation and the law: An interdisciplinary approach. In M. Snell-Hornby, F. Pöchhacker & K. Kaindl (Eds.), *Translation Studies: An 99 Interdiscipline: Selected papers from the Translation Studies Congress, Vienna, 1992* (1st ed., pp. 301-309). John Benjamins.
- Šarčević, S. (2012). Language and law in the European Union: The multilingual jurisprudence of the ECJ. In Solan and Tiersma (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Language and Law*. Oxford University Press.
- Seracini, L. S. (2021). Translation universals in legal translation: A corpus-based study of explicitation and simplification. *Translation Quarterly*, 101, 67-91.
- Tiersma, P. (1999). *Legal Language*. University of Chicago Press.
- Treaty on European Union (TEU), Articles 13/1, 14/1, 19/1, 27/3.
- Veisbergs, A. (2005). *Latvian language – Widening borders*. Valsts valodas komisijas raksti.
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The translator's invisibility: A history of translation*. Routledge.
- Wagner, E., Bech, S., & Martínez, J. (2002). *Translating for the European Union institutions* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Yankova, D. (2008). The Text and Context of EU Directives: Implications for Translators. *Ibérica*, 16, 134,143.