

ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH VERB-BASED NOMINALS WITH SUFFIXES *-ION* AND *-MENT* AND THEIR LITHUANIAN TRANSLATION IN THE EUROPEAN UNION LEGISLATION IN FORCE

Lina Stravinskaitė, Ligita Judickaitė-Pašvenskienė

Kaunas University of Applied Sciences

Abstract. This article examines verb-based nominals in translation of the European Union legislation in force. The data for the analysis is collected from the European Union website www.eur-lex.europa.eu. The aim of this paper is to find out the frequency of usage of English verb-based nominals denoting action and process in legal written discourse and to analyze the English nominalizations with the suffixes *-ion* and *-ment* as well as their Lithuanian translations in order to show the dominant translation choices. The quantitative analysis of verb-based nominals has been carried out using an automated linguistic program created by Stravinskaitė and Balnionis. This electronic tool has been created only for personal use and specifically for calculating English suffixes. In order to find out the dominant Lithuanian translation equivalents for the English verb-based nominals with the suffixes *-ion* and *-ment*, the translation of 200 source language nominalizations has been analyzed. The results show that the use of verb-based nominals is a feature of legal texts in both English and Lithuanian. The quantitative analysis has revealed that the most frequently used English verb-based nominals are those with the suffix *-ion* (10633 occurrences) and *-ment* (4446 occurrences). Their most common Lithuanian equivalents are the verb-based nominals with the suffix *-imas/-ymas*. Direct equivalents, infinitives and participles are less common, while omission and paraphrase appear to be the least common translation options. It has to be noted that despite the criticism from the Lithuanian linguists, the use of the Lithuanian nominals with the suffixes *-imas* and *-ymas* in the translation may be advantageous as they lay emphasis on the theme acting as keywords in the text and also make the text concise. Yet, extensive use of such nominalizations might result in abstraction and statics of the legal text. Less frequent translation choices which were observed in the current analysis help to avoid repetition, make the text more vigorous and simplify its complex nature.

Keywords: verb-based nominals, translation, legal discourse, suffixes *-ion/-ment*.

Introduction

Nominalization can be defined as “any process by which either a noun or a syntactic unit functioning as a noun phrase is derived from any other kind of unit” (Halliday, 1997, p. 37). Verb-based nominals receive considerable attention from linguists who investigate their usage and translation all over the world; however, the topic is not as popular among Lithuanian scholars and the research is still fragmented. Yet, it is important to note that verb-based nominals are a characteristic phenomenon of legal texts. Nominal style often results in long, complex and vague constructions, which might be challenging to understand, while their translation problems and possibilities might become an important issue for both the beginning and experienced translators of legal discourse.

The aim of this paper is to find out the frequency of usage of English verb-based nominals denoting action and process in legal written discourse and to analyze the English nominalizations with the suffixes *-ion* and *-ment* as well as their Lithuanian translations in order to show the dominant translation choices. The reason for focusing particularly on the nominalizations with the suffixes *-ion* and *-ment* is the fact that in the course of

analysis this kind of nominalizations appeared the most frequently used. The research focuses on the European Union regulations of *Company Law* as an example of legal discourse and a source of data.

Special purpose texts: legal translation

Special-purpose texts are used to transfer unambiguous flow of information. Much quoted Mackay and Mountford (1978, p. 4) define the notion of special language as “a restricted repertoire of words and expressions selected from the whole language because that restricted repertoire covers every requirement within a well-defined context, task, or vocation”. This argument can be summarized in five points: the language of special-purpose texts is related to a specific field, it is precise, unambiguous, neutral, and economic. The language of law is one of the examples of special-purpose communication.

Globalization has affected every sphere of life and legal communication is not an exception. Open borders and extensive migration have put forward an increasing demand for legal discourse and its translation. As far as the European Union (EU) is concerned, the fact that there are 24 official languages makes legal translation one of the most important types of translation within the EU. Biel

(2014, p. 335) claims that “legal translation in the EU is regarded as a challenge to the central concepts of translation studies and it is affected by a unique combination of political, ideological and procedural factors.”

There are a number of aspects that a translator should be familiar with while working in the field of legal translation. Ostarhild (2003, p. 2) claims that the “linguistic competence, translation skills (decoding and encoding), knowledge of systems, processes, terminology and linguistic conventions which apply in particular legal specialisms” are among the main competences a legal translator should have. According to Šarčević (2000, p. 13), the major problem in legal translation is “the incongruency of legal systems”. For example, the Far East law does not exactly correspond to the concepts and categories of the European law; countries such as Canada, South Africa or India are not only plurilingual but also bilingual (ibid). Despite all the difficulties, Simonnaes and Kristiansen (2019, p. 12) state that “legal translation is one kind of interlingual translation which has recently consolidated itself as one of the most prominent and demanded specializations in the translation market.”

Nominalization as a linguistic phenomenon

According to Sušinskienė and Vaskelienė (2020, p. 160), “nominalization is a word-formation process by which nouns are derived from verbs, adjectives, other nouns, or even other parts of speech, usually through suffixation.” However, nominals can have different names. For example, Schiess (2008) suggests that nominals can be called “hidden verbs”, “buried verbs”, or “smothered verbs”, in this way emphasizing their verbal origin. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (1993, p. 6), on the other hand, holds the opinion that “nominals in certain respects occupy an intermediate position between typical verbs and typical nouns.”

Sušinskienė (2009, p. 89) states that “depending on the inner character of the underlying verb, verb-based nominalizations fall into four types: activity, state, achievement and accomplishment”. Every type of verb-based nominalizations implies different features. Sušinskienė (2009) mentions that activity nominalizations imply process, state nominalizations involve no dynamics, achievement nominalizations denote the end of a process, and accomplishment nominalizations mean end-point or result. Depending on the type of verb-based nominalizations, they can function as countable or uncountable nouns. For instance, nominalizations consisting of verbs denoting activity generally function as uncountable nominalizations (e.g., *cultural evolution*) (Sušinskienė, 2009, p. 89).

However, Sušinskienė (2009) recognizes that sometimes activity verbs can function as countable nominalizations if “the user of the language wishes to express a repeated process or a result of the process” (e.g., *their investigations*) (ibid.). Similarly, verbs denoting achievement (e.g., *the arrival, technological discoveries and advances*) and accomplishment (e.g., *the departure, all inventions and discoveries*) can function as countable and uncountable nominalizations, whereas state verbs yield nominalizations that function as uncountable nominalizations (e.g., *such dominance*) (ibid.).

In general, nominalization is a highly productive process of lexical word formation, whose productivity can be explained by the variety of different suffixes which can be used to make nouns. With regard to the aim of this paper, in order to form action and process nominals alone, 7 suffixes can be used:

(a) *-al*: this suffix is attached to verbs to make nouns (e.g., *arrival, refusal, removal*, etc.); low-productivity;

(b) *-ance/-ence*: this suffix makes nouns (e.g., *acceptance*) or adjectives (e.g., *relevance*); no longer productive;

(c) *-ation/-ion/-ition/-sion/-tion/-ution*: usually they are formed from verbs (e.g., *confusion, prediction*, etc.);

(d) *-ing*: lexical *-ing* forms gerundial nouns from verbs (e.g., *killing, feeling*, etc.); it denotes abstract nouns and concrete result of a noun;

(e) *-ment*: it is common with verbs carrying prefixes *en-/em-* (e.g., *encampment, embodiment*, etc.);

(f) *-th*: it can be formed from both adjectives (e.g., *warmth*) and verbs (e.g., *growth*);

(g) *-ure*: most nouns formed by this suffix are loans (e.g., *departure, enclosure*, etc.) (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002, pp.1697-1706).

Nominalization in legal discourse

English legal texts involve a large number of nominalizations. The process of nominalization allows higher productivity in comparison to verbal structures. The productivity of nominals in legal language is related with a wide range of suffixes which can be used for this purpose. Having the nature of legal discourse in mind, such phenomenon is not surprising as, according to Klaudia Bednarova Gibova (2016, p. 1), “nominalizations enable text drafters to classify events as abstract things and predicate over them.” Gotti also notes that the process of nominalization “allows easier flow of information from new to given” (2008, p. 79). Because of nominalization, legal texts become more

coherent. Furthermore, “nominalization allows the writer to emphasize verbal action through thematization” (Gotti, 2008, p. 79). Nominalization in legal English enables a reader to understand the legal text easier because of the coherence and the accentuation of theme. The characteristics of the legal language demand for complex structures such as nominalizations in order to be unambiguous. Bhatia et al. (2008, p. 10) emphasize that legal discourse is clear and precise, and requires a language that would connect syntactic and semantic characteristics. Thus, there is a great deal of nominal structures because they give the smallest details and convey the clarity of complex legal texts (ibid.).

On the other hand, nominalization makes the text abstract and less vigorous, which may cause confusion for the reader as well as the translator. The text also becomes static because of the lack of verbal constructions. As Catalina Riera (2015, p. 149) points out, plain English advocates protest against legalese and propose to “substitute nominalization with the use of verbs in order to make the message clearer and more direct.”

Considering Lithuanian legal language, Mockienė and Rackevičienė (2015, p. 2) state that “during the Soviet period (1945-1990) Lithuanian legal terminology was formed according to general Soviet legal standards”, however, “after the restoration of independence in 1990 <...> new Lithuanian terms have been created to name new legal concepts.” Despite different historical background, Lithuanian legal language is similar to English in terms of nominalization. For instance, Janulevičienė and Rackevičienė (2009, p. 378) point out that the biggest part of legal terms is composed of verbal nouns. In legal texts they often occur as nominalizations with the suffix *-imas/-ymas* (ibid). Vladarskienė (2003) also notes that nominalization is a common phenomenon of legal Lithuanian and claims that this is determined by the concise nature of legal documents. However, nominalizations receive considerable attention and criticism from the Lithuanian linguists because of their unnecessary burdening of the language. It is offered that, wherever possible, verbs or relative clauses should be used instead (Pečkuvienė, 2005, p. 142). Kniūkšta (2005, p. 72), for instance, criticizes the use of nominal constructions in the Lithuanian *Code of Violations of Administrative Law* and gives an example of the verbal noun in genitive case “privatizavimo objektų”, which could be replaced by the passive participle “privatizuojamų objektų”. Despite the fact that verb-based nominals is a topic which attracts Lithuanian scholars’ attention the research of this phenomenon in the context of translation is scarce.

Research Methodology

The source of data for this paper is the European Union website *Eur-lex* (www.eur-lex.europa.eu), which has been chosen for the analysis because of its convenience and ability to show the bilingual display of legal acts. The bilingual display is a simple tool which allows to compare the parallel texts and translation equivalents. To narrow down the corpus, the European Union regulations have been chosen. They have been randomly selected from the *Legislation in Force* category, from which 31 regulations of *Company Law* are analyzed as the examples of legal texts: Act No. 31977L0091, Act No. 31978L0660, Act No. 31978L0855, Act No. 31978L0876, Act No. 3198L0891, Act No. 31983L0349, Act No. 31985R2137, Act No. 31989L0666, Act No. 31990L0435, Act No. 32001L0086, Act No. 32001R2157, Act No. 32002R1606, Act No. 32003L0049, Act No. 32003L0072, Act No. 32003R1435, Act No. 32004D0706, Act No. 32004H091, Act No. 32004L0025, Act No. 32005D0909, Act No. 32005H0162, Act No. 32005L0056, Act No. 32006L0043, Act No. 32007L0036, Act No. 32008H0362, Act No. 32008H0473, Act No. 32008R1126, Act No. 32009H0384, Act No. 32009L0101, Act No. 32009L0102, Act No. 32010D0064, Act No. 32010D0485.

The quantitative analysis of verb-based nominals has been carried out using an automated linguistic program created by Stravinskaitė (the co-author of this article) and Balnionis. This electronic tool has been created only for personal use and specifically for calculating English suffixes. The program shows the array of words with a selected suffix for the analysis. In addition to this, it simplifies the calculation of words with the targeted suffix and highlights the words in the text. Thus, the program was used to find and count the number of English verb-based nominals denoting action and process (i.e. with suffixes *-ion*, *-ment*, *-ance*, *-ence*, *-ure*, *-as*, *-th*) in the selected corpus (135,000 words). It is important to note that verb-based nominals with the suffix *-ing* are not included in the investigation because of their grammatical variability. That is, some words with the suffix *-ing* are not verb-based nominals and this causes difficulties for quantitative analysis.

The translation analysis focuses only on the most frequent English nominalizations (i.e., those with the suffixes *-ion* and *-ment*) and their Lithuanian renderings. In order to find out the dominant Lithuanian translation equivalents for the English verb-based nominals with the suffixes *-ion* and *-ment*, the translation of only 200 randomly chosen source language (SL) nominalizations is analyzed.

Translation analysis of English verb-based nominals with the suffix *-ion* and their Lithuanian equivalents

The overall quantitative analysis of English verb-based nominals denoting action and process in 31 European Union regulations shows that the most frequent suffix of verb-based nominals is *-ion* and its allomorphs (*-ation/-ition/-sion/-tion/-ution*). Table 1 shows the frequency of all verb-based nominals under analysis.

Table 1. Frequency of English verb-based nominals with the suffixes *-al*, *-ance/-ence*, *-ion*, *-ment*, *-ure*, and *-th* in 31 European Union regulations

Suffix	Frequency
<i>-ion</i>	10633 occurrences
<i>-ment</i>	4446 occurrences
<i>-ance/-ence</i>	2431 occurrences
<i>-ure</i>	652 occurrences
<i>-al</i>	466 occurrences
<i>-th</i>	45 occurrences
Total	18646 occurrences

As the table shows, the suffix *-ion* is the most frequent. It may be presumed that the popularity of the suffix *-ion* is determined by its variety of allomorphs: *-ation/-ion/-ition/-sion/-tion/-ution* (for example: *cancellation*, *definition*, *composition*, *discussion*, etc.) However, the variety of allomorphs of verb-based nominals is not the major reason determining their frequency. Taking into consideration the frequency of the suffixes *-ance/-ence*, and *-ment*, the suffix *-ance/-ence* has two allomorphs but it is even less frequent than the suffix *-ment*, having no allomorphs.

As stated in the introductory part of the article, the analysis focuses only on the Lithuanian equivalents for the English verb-based nominals with the suffixes *-ion* and *-ment*, since their frequency is the highest in the European Union legislation in force. The research shows that the most frequently used Lithuanian equivalents are verb-based nominals with the suffix *-imas/-ymas*, despite the fact that Lithuanian verb-based nominals with this suffix should be used with considerable care, for example:

(1a) the companies furnishing such **consideration** guarantee, up to an amount equal to that indicated in paragraph (c), the debts of the recipient company arising between the time the shares are issued for a **consideration** other than in

cash and one year after the **publication** of that company's annual accounts for the financial year during which such **consideration** was furnished. (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:31977L0091&from=DE>)

(1b) bendrovės, pateikiančios tokį **apmokėjimą**, garantuoja ne didesne kaip c punkte nurodyta suma padengti apmokėjimą gaunančios bendrovės skolas, atsirandančias nuo akcijų už **apmokėjimą** ne gryniaisiais pinigais išleidimo iki pračina vieneri metai nuo bendrovės metinių ataskaitų už finansinius metus, kuriais toks apmokėjimas buvo pateiktas, **paskelbimo**. (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:31977L0091&from=ET>)

In examples (1a) and (1b), the accentuation of the theme is emphasized through verb-based nominals. Example (1b) involves heavy amount of information about financial responsibility of companies. Nominalizations help to follow the information and lay the emphasis on the keyword *apmokėjimas*. The analysis of other examples when the English nominals with the suffix *-ion* are translated as Lithuanian nominals with the suffix *-imas/yimas* shows that in many cases such translation choice helps to emphasize the main topic of the sentence or text, but can also result in abstraction and lack of dynamics.

In some cases, synonymous equivalents of verb-based nominals are used in order not to repeat the same word, for example:

(2a) In order to facilitate cross-border merger operations, it should be provided that monitoring of the **completion** and legality of the decision-making process in each merging company should be carried out by the national authority having jurisdiction over each of those companies, whereas monitoring of the **completion** and legality of the cross-border merger should be carried out by the national authority having jurisdiction over the company resulting from the cross-border merger. (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/GA/TXT/?uri=celex%3A32005L0056>)

(2b) Siekiant palengvinti vienos valstybės ribas peržengiančio jungimosi vykdymą turėtų būti nustatyta, kad kiekvienu atveju nacionalinės institucijos, turinčios jurisdikciją kiekvienos iš besijungiančių bendrovių atžvilgiu, turėtų tikrinti sprendimų priėmimo procedūros teisėtumą ir **užbaigimą**, o vienos valstybės ribas peržengiančio jungimosi **įvykdymą** ir teisėtumą turėtų tikrinti nacionalinė institucija, turinti jurisdikciją po jungimosi veiksiančios bendrovės atžvilgiu. (*Eur-*

Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:02005L0056-20140702&from=SV>

Examples (2a) and (2b) show that the English verb-based nominal *completion* is translated into Lithuanian as *užbaigimą* and *įvykdymą*, both of which express the accomplishment of an action.

Apart from verb-based nominals with the suffixes *-ymas/ -imas*, there are cases when participial structures are chosen in the Lithuanian translation:

(3a) However, where shares are issued for a **consideration** other than in cash at the time the company is incorporated or is authorized to commence business, the **consideration** must be transferred in full within five years of that time. (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:31977L0091&from=ET>)

(3b) Tačiau, jei bendrovę steigiant ar gavus leidimą imtis verslo akcijos yra išleidžiamos už jas **apmokant** kitaip nei grynaisiais pinigais, visiškai **apmokėta** turi būti per penkerius metus. (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:31977L0091&from=ET>)

Here, the equivalent *apmokant* belongs to indeclinable forms of the active participle, traditionally called a *present gerund*. Another equivalent, *apmokėta*, is expressed by the past passive participle. Both *apmokant* and *apmokėta* have verbal properties and a very strong relationship with verbs. This choice of the equivalents (instead of verb-based nominals) increases the dynamics of the legal text.

As the analysis of the equivalents of English verb-based nominals with the suffix *-ion* has shown the infinitive structures occur as often as the participial structures in translation. For example:

(4a) The group's tasks are mainly to: - facilitate **cooperation** between public oversight systems of Member States and to bring about an exchange of good practice concerning the establishment and ongoing **cooperation** of such systems; <...> (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32016L1148&rid=1>)

(4b) Grupės pagrindiniai uždaviniai: - padėti **bendrai veikti** valstybių narių visuomeninės priežiūros sistemoms ir dalytis gera šių sistemų įdiegimo ir tolesnio **bendro veikimo** praktika, <...> (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32016L1148&rid=1>)

[content/LT/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32016L1148&rid=1](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32016L1148&rid=1))

As seen from the examples, two different equivalents for *cooperation* are used. i.e., *bendrai veikti*, which is an infinitive structure, and *bendro veikimo*, which is a verb-based nominal. The infinitive structure seems to be less static and involves more activeness, in comparison with the verb-based nominal structure.

Another translation strategy which is used to translate English nominalizations is the use of direct equivalents. Sometimes direct equivalents are legal terms that have been established by the language specialists. For example:

(5a) Legislation applicable to the **negotiation procedure**. (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52008DC0591:EN:HTML>)

(5b) **Derybų tvarką** reglamentuojantys teisės aktai. (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/?uri=celex%3A12012E%2FTXT>)

As a legal term, the target language (TL) equivalent *derybų tvarką* still conveys the verbal origin of the verb-based nominal *negotiation* in the source text (ST) as it derives from the Lithuanian verb *derėtis*. This shows how verbal value is shared between the ST and the TT, even though verb-based nominals or infinitives are not used.

Finally, the least frequently used translation strategies are omission and paraphrase:

(6a) Where an undertaking included in a **consolidation** manages another undertaking jointly with one or more undertakings not included in that **consolidation**, a Member State may require or permit the inclusion of that other undertaking in the consolidated accounts in proportion to the rights in its capital held by the undertaking included in the **consolidation**. (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:31983L0349&from=FI>)

(6b) Jeigu **konsoliduotą** bendrovių grupę priklausanti bendrovė valdo kitą bendrovę kartu su viena arba daugiau **tai bendrovių grupę** nepriklausančių bendrovių, valstybė narė gali reikalauti arba leisti tą kitą bendrovę **įtraukti** į konsoliduotą atskaitomybę proporcingai jos kapitalo daliai, kuri priklauso konsoliduotai bendrovei. (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:31983L0349&from=FI>)

Here, the ST sentence contains four verb-based nominals, whereas in the TT no such nominals are used. The SL nominal *inclusion* is expressed by the

infinitive *įtraukti*; *consolidation* is translated twice as the participial structures *konsoliduotų bendrovių grupėi* and *konsoliduotai bendrovei*. In the TT, the verb-based nominal *consolidation* is omitted once and the paraphrase *tai bendrovių grupėi* is used. In order to avoid repetition, the anaphoric reference *tai* is chosen to refer to the information mentioned before.

To conclude, the verb-based nominals with the suffix *-imas/-ymas* tend to be the most prominent Lithuanian translation equivalent for the English nominals with the suffix *-ion*. The advantage of this translation choice involves the emphasis on the topic; on the other hand, this might result in abstraction of the TT and the lack of dynamics.

Translation analysis of English verb-based nominals with the suffix *-ment* and their Lithuanian equivalents

The equivalents for the English verb-based nominals with the suffix *-ment* share the same translation strategies as the equivalents for those with the suffix *-ion*. The majority are translated using the Lithuanian verb-based nominals with the suffix *-imas/-ymas*. For instance:

(7a) Similarly, in accordance with IAS 36 **Impairment** of assets, the carrying amount of an asset for which there is an indication of **impairment** is the lower of its carrying amount before considering possible **impairment** losses and its recoverable amount. (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32008R1126>)

(7b) Panašiai pagal 36-ąjį TAS “Turto vertės **sumažėjimas**” turto, kai nustatomas vertės **sumažėjimas**, balansinė vertė yra arba jo balansinė vertė, buvusi prieš nustatant galimus vertės **sumažėjimo** nuostolius, arba turto atsiperkamoji vertė, atsižvelgiant į tai, kuri yra mažesnė. (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32008R1126>)

In the examples above, the verb-based nominal *impairment* is translated as the Lithuanian verb-based nominal *sumažėjimas* in all three instances, which lays emphasis on the legal topic of the sentence and indicates the importance of the word *sumažėjimas* over other themes, such as *turtas* or *turto vertė*.

When translating English nominalizations, infinitives also play an important role. Consider the following example:

(8a) a) the part of the contingent **settlement** provision that could require settlement in cash or another financial asset (or otherwise in such a way that it would be a financial liability) is not genuine;

or <...> (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32009R0053&rid=1>)

(8b) a) dalis neapibrėžtųjų atsiskaitymo atidėjinių, už kuriuos gali tekti **atsiskaityti** grynaisiais pinigais ar kitu finansiniu turtu (arba finansinio įsipareigojimo būdu), nėra tikra; arba <...> (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32009R0053&rid=1>)

As the example shows, the verb-based nominal *settlement* is translated as the infinitive *atsiskaityti*. Such translation choice increases the dynamics and decreases the abstraction of the text.

Another translation strategy for the English verb-based nominals with the suffix *-ment* is the translation using participial phrases. In the TT, equivalents expressed by the participial phrases either occur alone or they are sometimes used together with the verb-based nominals with the suffix *-imas/-ymas* or other participial structures, for instance:

(9a) Before the **appointment** of non-executive or supervisory directors, adequate information should be provided on these issues and that information should be updated with sufficient frequency. (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32005H0162&from=IT>)

(9b) Prieš **paskiriant** direktorius konsultantus arba stebėtojų tarybos narius turėtų būti pateikiama informacija tais klausimais, kuri turėtų būti pakankamai dažnai atnaujinama. (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32005H0162&from=IT>)

The examples 9a and 9b show that the verb-based nominal *appointment* is translated as the participial phrase *prieš paskiriant*, which consists of the active participle *paskiriant* that has verbal features. This translation choice illustrates the variety of equivalents that can be used in Lithuanian instead of the verb-based nominals with the suffix *-imas/-ymas*.

In addition to participial phrases, direct equivalents are used quite often when translating English verb-based nominals with the suffix *-ment*, but not as frequently as for the verb-based nominals with the suffix *-imas/-ymas*. Consider the following example as an illustration:

(10a) If the right to **reimbursement** arises under an insurance policy that exactly matches the amount and timing of some or all of the benefits payable

under a defined benefit plan, the fair value of the **reimbursement** right is deemed to be the present value of the related obligation, as described in paragraph 54 (subject to any reduction required if the **reimbursement** is not recoverable in full). (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32012R0475&from=PT>)

(10b) Jeigu teisė į **kompensaciją** atsiranda pagal draudimo polisą, kuris tiksliai atitinka kai kurių arba visų pagal nustatytų išmokų planą mokėtinų išmokų sumą ir terminus, teisės į **kompensaciją** tikroji vertė yra dabartinė susijusio įsipareigojimo vertė, apibūdinta 54 straipsnyje (atliekant bet kurių sumažinimą, jeigu galima susigrąžinti ne visą **kompensaciją**). (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32012R0475&from=PT>)

As it can be seen, the verb-based nominal *reimbursement* is translated as *kompensaciją* in all three instances. The repetition of the same direct equivalent highlights the theme and increases the cohesion of the sentence.

The least frequent strategies used to translate English nominalizations with the suffix *-ment* are omission and paraphrase, for example:

(11a) This could occur, for example, because the plant and **equipment** will be depreciated by the purchasing entity and the amount initially recognized for the plant and **equipment** may change if the forecast intragroup transaction is denominated in a currency other than the functional currency of the purchasing entity. (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:31052R0375&from=PT>)

(11b) Taip gali atsitikti, kadangi nusipirkęs ūkio subjektas nudėvės įrangą ir **įrengimus**, o pradinė ateities sandoryje nustatyta suma gali pasikeisti, jeigu perkančio ūkio subjekto funkcinė valiuta yra kita. (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:31052R0375&from=PT>)

As the examples show, the repetition of the verb-based nominal *equipment* is not retained in the TT. Such omission, however, does not harm the informational content of the TL sentence as it can be deduced from the context that the word *suma* refers back to the word *įrengimus* in the Lithuanian sentence.

In some rare instances, the paraphrase is used for the translation of the verb-based nominals with the

suffix *-ment*. This choice is illustrated in the following examples:

(12a) This is commonly the case for sick pay (to the extent that unused past **entitlement** does not increase future **entitlement**), maternity or paternity leave and compensated absences for jury service or military service. (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:2003R1725:20081017:EN:PDF>)

(12b) Paprastai taip yra nedarbingumo pašalpos (jei praėjusį laikotarpį neišnaudotas **atostogų laikas** nepailgina jų būsimaisiais **laikotarpiais**), motinystės ir tėvystės atostogų ir mokamo ne darbo laiko dėl prisiekusiojo prievolės ar karinės tarnybos atvejais. (*Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:2003R1725:20081017:LT:PDF>)

In the example (12b), the verb-based nominal *entitlement* is translated as *atostogų laikas* and *laikotarpiais*. These phrases denote the period of time but the particular shade of meaning, denoting “a right to benefits specified especially by law or contract” (*Dictionary by Merriam-Webster*, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/entitlement>) is not clearly expressed. However, it can be deduced from the context.

In brief, the translation choices of the English verb-based nominals with the suffix *-ment* are very similar to those of the nominals with the suffix *-ion*, the most frequent translation equivalents being the Lithuanian verb-based nominals with the suffix *-imas/-ymas*. They are often used repetitively in order to accentuate the theme and put the emphasis on the keywords. In addition to this, verb-based nominals in the TT increase the conciseness. However, too many nominalizations may decrease the dynamics and vigorousness of the legal text.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the use of verb-based nominals is a feature of legal texts in both English and Lithuanian. The quantitative analysis has revealed that the most frequently used English verb-based nominals carry the suffix *-ion* (10633 occurrences) and *-ment* (4446 occurrences). Such frequency can be related to the variety of allomorphs such as *-ation*, *-ition*, *-sion*, *-tion*, and *-ution*.

The quantitative analysis of the Lithuanian equivalents for the verb-based nominals with the suffixes *-ion* and *-ment* has demonstrated that despite the criticism from the Lithuanian linguists, the most frequent equivalents are verb-based nominals with the suffix *-imas/-ymas*. However, instead of verb-based nominals, sometimes attempt

to use other direct equivalents, infinitives, or participles can also be observed. The paraphrase and omission appear to be the least frequent strategies to be used for the translation of the English nominalizations under analysis.

It has to be noted that the use of the Lithuanian nominals with the suffixes *-imas* and *-ymas* in the translation may be advantageous as they lay emphasis on the theme acting as keywords in the text and also make the text concise. Yet, extensive use of such nominalizations might result in abstraction and statics of the legal text.

References

- Bendarova-Gibova, K. (2016). Nominalization, translation studies and critical stylistics: A case study of EU-ese in parallel English-Slovak texts. In Ferencik, M., Bendarova-Gibova, K. (eds.), *Discourse and Ideology: Studies in Critical Stylistics. Opera linguistica series 1/2016*. Prešov: Filozofická fakulta, pp. 33-52
- Bhatia, V. K., Candlin, Ch. N. and Allori, P. E. (eds). (2008). *Language, Culture and the Law: the Formulation of Legal Concepts across Systems and Cultures*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Biel, Ł. (2014). The textual fit of translated EU law: a corpus-based study of deontic modality. *The Translator* 20(3), 332-355.
- Entitlement*. Dictionary by Merriam-Webster. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/entitlement>
- Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*. www.eur-lex.europa.eu
- Gotti, M. (2008). *Investigating Specialized Discourse*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Huddleston, R. D. and Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Janulevičienė, V. and Rackevičienė, S. (2009). Nusikalstamų veikų pavadinimai lietuvių ir anglų kalbomis. *Socialinių mokslų studijos/ Social Sciences Studies*. Mykolo Romerio universitetas, pp. 357-381.
- Kniūkšta, P. (2005). *Administracinė kalba ir jos vartosena*. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos instituto leidykla.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, M. (1993). *Nominalizations*. London: Routledge.
- Mackay, R. and Mountford, A. J. (eds.). (1978). *English for Specific Purposes: a Case Study Approach*. London: Longman.
- Mockienė, L. and Rackevičienė, S. (2015). Jungtinės Karalystės ir Lietuvos konstitucinės teisės aktuose vartojamų vientisinių terminų šaltiniai. *Taikomoji Kalbotyra*, (7), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.15388/TK.2015.17498>
- Ostarhild, E. (2003). Aspects of Legal Translation in Europe: the Need for Comparable Standards. *Tradulex: Multilingual Communication*. <http://www.tradulex.com/articles/Ostarhild.pdf>
- Pečkuvienė, L. (2005). Kai kurių išvestinių daiktavardžių ir būdvardžių vartojimas teisės kalboje. *Jurisprudencija. Mokslo darbai*. 70 (62). Mykolo Romerio universitetas, pp. 141-146.
- Riera, C. (2015). Plain English in Legal Language: A Comparative Study of Two UK Acts of Parliament. *Alicante Journal of English Studies* 28. University of Alicante, pp. 147-163.
- Schiess, W. (2008). When Verbs Become Nouns. *Legal writing*. <https://law.utexas.edu/faculty/wschiess/legalwriting/2008/05/when-verbs-become-nouns.html>
- Simonnæs, I. and Kristiansen, M. (eds.). (2019). *Legal Translation: Current Issues and Challenges in Research, Methods and Applications*. Berlin: Frank & Timme.
- Sušinskienė, S. (2009). Nominalization as a Micro-structural Items of English Scientific Discourse. *Respectus Philologicus* 21: 84-92.
- Sušinskienė, S. and Vaskelienė, J. (2020). On comparative study of deverbal nominalizations denoting process and result in Lithuanian and English. *Valoda: nozime un forma* 11. <https://doi.org/10.22364/vnf.11.10>
- Šarčević, S. (2000). *New Approach to Legal Translation*. Hague: Kluwer Law International
- Vladarskienė, R. (2003). Sintaktinių struktūrų konkurencijos atvejai dokumentų kalboje. *Lituanica* 54, pp. 63-71.

Sources of examples

- Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė*. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:31977L0091&from=DE>
- Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:31977L0091&from=ET>
- Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/GA/TXT/?uri=celex%3A32005L0056>

4. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:02005L0056-20140702&from=SV>
5. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:31977L0091&from=ET>
6. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:31977L0091&from=ET>
7. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32016L1148&rid=1>
8. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32016L1148&rid=1>
9. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52008DC0591:EN:HTML>
10. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/?uri=celex%3A12012E%2FTXT>
11. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:31983L0349&from=FI>
12. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:31983L0349&from=FI>
13. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32008R1126>
14. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A32008R1126>
15. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32009R0053&rid=1>
16. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32009R0053&rid=1>
17. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32005H0162&from=IT>
18. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32005H0162&from=IT>
19. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32012R0475&from=PT>
20. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32012R0475&from=PT>
21. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:31052R0375&from=PT>
22. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LT/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:31052R0375&from=PT>
23. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:2003R1725:20081017:EN:PDF>
24. *Eur-Lex: Europos Sąjungos teisė* <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:2003R1725:20081017:LT:PDF>

ANGLŲ KALBOS VEIKSMAŽODINIŲ DAIKTAVARDŽIŲ SU PRIESAGOMIS *-ION* IR *-MENT* BEI JŲ LIETUVIŠKŲ EKVIVALENTŲ ANALIZĖ EUROPOS SĄJUNGOS GALIOJANČIŲ TEISĖS AKTŲ VERTIME

Anotacija

Šiame straipsnyje nagrinėjami veiksmažodiniai daiktavardžiai su priesagomis *-ion* ir *-ment* Europos Sąjungos galiojančių teisės aktų vertime. Duomenys buvo surinkti iš Europos Sąjungos tinklalapyje (www.eurlex.europa.eu) skelbiamų galiojančių teisės aktų, pasinaudojant dvikalbės paieškos įrankiu. Darbo tikslas – išsiaiškinti anglišku veiksmažodinių daiktavardžių, reiškiančių veiksmą ir procesą, vartojimo dažnumą Europos Sąjungos rašytiniame teisiniame diskurse ir išanalizuoti angliškus veiksmažodinius daiktavardžius su priesagomis *-ion* ir *-ment*, atkreipiant dėmesį į jų lietuviškus ekvivalentus ir pasirinktas vertimo strategijas. Kiekybinė veiksmažodinių daiktavardžių analizė atlikta naudojant L. Stravinskaitės ir D. Balnionio sukurtą paieškos įrankį anglų kalbos nominalizacijų galūnėms skaičiuoti. Analizei atlikti atsitiktinai pasirinkta 200 anglų kalbos veiksmažodinių daiktavardžių vertimo pavyzdžių. Tyrimo rezultatai rodo, jog iš visų anglišku veiksmažodinių daiktavardžių, reiškiančių veiksmą ir procesą, dažniausiai pasitaikantys daiktavardžiai yra su priesagomis *-ion* ir *-ment*, o į lietuvių kalbą jie dažniausiai yra verčiami kaip veiksmažodiniai daiktavardžiai su priesagomis *-imas/ -ymas*. Tiesioginiai ekvivalentai, bendratys ir dalyviai yra retesni vertimo pasirinkimai analizuotuose teisiniuose tekstuose, o perfrazavimai ir praleidimai pasitaiko rečiau.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: veiksmažodiniai daiktavardžiai, vertimas, teisinis diskursas, priesagos *-ion/ment*.

Information about the authors

dr. Ligita Judickaitė Pašvenskienė. Kauno kolegijos Menų ir ugdymo fakulteto kalbų centro docentė.
Mokslinių tyrimų kryptys: kalbotyra, vertimas.
El. pašto adresas: ligita.pasvenskiene@go.kauko.lt

Lina Stravinskaitė. Kauno kolegijos Menų ir ugdymo fakulteto kalbų centro lektorė. Mokslinių tyrimų kryptys: kalbotyra, vertimas.
El. pašto adresas: lina.stravinskaite@go.kauko.lt