

## ENGLISH FOR NAVAL ARCHITECTURE PURPOSES (E.N.A.P.), ENGLISH FOR SHIPBUILDING PURPOSES (E.SB.P.) AND ENGLISH FOR MARITIME PURPOSES (E.M.P.) – A TERMINOLOGICALLY-RELATED TRIAD

Floriana POPESCU<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Professor Department of English, Faculty of Letters, “Dunarea de Jos” University of Galați, Romania

**Abstract:** *Most of the historical approaches to human civilization have ascertained water to have always played a vital role in the settlement, development and wealth of any community, providing many other facilities in addition to the necessary beverage complementing our daily bread. As a source of wealth, water has been of great help in the house building process, in gardens and courts for plants and animals or has incited people to spend their time fishing or lying in the sun, travelling or cruising, in all sorts of competitions. Locally, nationally and internationally, water has most of the times provided a wide variety of jobs which were beneficial both to the actively involved individuals and to the urban or rural areas they were part of. Few are the Romanian spots which are in a position similar to that of the town of Galati, where well-articulate institutions have trained professionals specialized in water-based jobs for over seventy-five years. In spite of the numerous facts related to water-dependent jobs, to (high) education opportunities ensured by this town or to the benefits that water may bring to any region wherever in this world, which could open a wide variety of topics of academic discussion, our approach is essentially focused on terminology. This approach is devised to make a few linguistic remarks which concern the three major specialist fields mentioned in the title. It opens a perspective embracing these three professional environments whose linking element is water, i.e. naval architecture, shipbuilding and finally, travelling at sea for touristic journeys or leisure, for commercial or military purposes.*

*We consider these three domains to be tightly intertwined for they work with ships, the ultimate product of naval architects, shipbuilders and ship operators. As research has indicated it, from a strictly linguistic point of view, the three groups of specialists use a terminology consisting of shared elements as well as of field-specific words or syntagms. Since our view is exclusively terminological, the selected examples will be only terms, leaving aside syntagms, idioms or idiomatic structures, and clichés. The paper will present four sets of illustrations to support our identified lexical categories, thus proving that a textual analysis of such samples of language for specific purposes clearly indicates that the study of English for specific purposes has still a lot to offer.*

**Keywords:** *highly specialized terms, jargon, specialized terms*

### Background and introduction

The ELT tree is a graphical representation authored by Tom Hutchinson and Alan Waters and launched in 1987, which has preserved its validity ever since. This tree whose roots are indicative for the importance of language and communication has an impressively sturdy trunk. Language teaching and English language teaching are the next two upward zones developing from the roots and which distinguish the positions the English language assumes within the teaching and evaluation process, i.e. as a mother tongue, as a foreign language and as a second language. The mid-branch, English as a foreign language, is represented as further dividing into General English (G.E.) and English for Specific Purposes (E.S.P.), which in turn splits into English for Science and Technology (E.S.T.), English for Business and Economics (E.B.E.) and English for Social Sciences (E.S.S.). Each of these three ramifications produces the same binomial

distinction between English for Academic Purposes (E.A.P.) and English for Occupational Purposes (E.O.P.). as its authors specify it, this tree considers all these branches of language teaching as “an approach not as a product” (Hutchinson and Waters 1989: 17). Our perspective is quite the opposite, with English for Naval Architecture Purposes (reduced to E.N.A.P. henceforth), English for Shipbuilding Purposes (E.SB.P. from now on) and English for Maritime Purposes (abbreviated to E.M.P. in what follows) as product-fields which will be explored for a terminological inquiry.

This recourse to ESP is both helpful and practical for a terminological analysis, since its ramifications create a comprehensive image about the possible relationships underlying the numerous views and interpretations which have been assigned to the professional languages or jargons. Although the EST branch was well defined when this figure was published, science and technology were

generically seen together for the authors' didactical destination of the volume required the presentation to be this way. The current perspective further expands this 'twig' into well structured and clearly concretized ramifications of professional domains which present ENAP in close relationship with ESBP but in a rather loose relationship with EMP. E.N.A.P., E.SB.P. and E.M.P. would represent a seemingly very dull association behind which, in the real world, a long-lasting creative process and lots of pains-taking efforts of numerous teams of specialists and craftsmen have joined their knowledge, expertise and skillfulness to contribute to the making of these very highly complex products generically called ships.

Although each of these fields of activity can be defined from a theoretical perspective, the literature underlying this approach celebrates those people who along the years have worked with dedication, responsibility, a keen sense of observation and concern for the generations to come as well as a particular interest in the preservation of the good practices in the yard. Thus, Attwoods (1922: vii-viii) focuses on naval architects although his book deals with theoretical naval architecture. He places them at the basis of what I would venture to imagine as a terminologically-related triangle. To successfully conceive a ship on paper, or as nowadays things have evolved, in the virtual space of computers, naval architects are first and foremost expected to be endowed with the ability of casting a bird's eye, a 'helicopter view' or an assembly perspective since they have "to be responsible for the ship as a complete design, and in this capacity should have some familiarity with all that pertains to a ship" (Attwoods 1922: vii-viii). In the case of naval architects, his author's list of job requirements is genuinely comprehensive. This author considers that they "should know something of Marine Engineering (especially of propellers); of Electricity and Magnetism; of armour, guns and gun-mountings in war-ships; of masts, rigs, etc, in sailing vessels; of work of stevedore in cargo vessels; of questions relating to the decking and undocking of ships; of appliances for loading and unloading of ships; of the regulations of the Registration Societies and the Board of Trade regarding structure, freeboard and tonnage; of appliances for navigating, as well as having a thorough knowledge of the practical work in the shipyard" (Attwoods 1922: vii-viii). In spite of their present-day computer-assisted work, naval architects still have master an impressive amount of knowledge for the human factor still plays the key role in naval architecture. Shipbuilders are also complex personalities who have a very difficult mission even if their job is not so demandingly

accounted for. More practically described, *shipbuilding* is that particular occupational field which considers "the work on and around the shipways" (MacBride 1921: v). But this work "on or around" a ship cannot be performed randomly; it requires different skills and a lot of expertise. It also is true, almost one hundred years have elapsed since this definition was provided and extremely many things have changed in the shipbuilding process, but the product has ultimately preserved all the traditional stages related to its coming into being (from the inquiry of offer to the end-customer) as well as its final destination, transportation on water.

Unlike naval architects, who will provide a product finished in designs or in the virtual space only, and which is passed on to shipbuilders to turn it into something palpable and concrete, the maritime world look at ship with a different eye. The marines are the privileged beneficiary of ships, they have to exploit, maintain and, if need be, sometimes troubleshoot and even possibly repair minor defects while at sea. As far as the word *maritime* is described, its meaning shows the field to be fairly distant from the other two, since it refers to the "business pertaining to commerce or navigation transacted upon the sea or in seaports in such matters as the court of admiralty has jurisdiction" (Glossary of Shipping Terms 2011: 66). Nevertheless, we consider that our introductory complementation to this definition is worth making, for in our opinion the quoted definition is a bit limiting and it omits some of the main issues sailor face when they are all alone at sea with their vessel.

The following observations referring to the terminology under scrutiny have been acquired during my four-year's experience as a translator in Galatz Shipyard, between 1986 and 1990. This experience was systematically improved through my daily collaboration with my husband<sup>1</sup>, a successful naval architect working also in this institution. His knowledge, experience, expertise and open-minded views could be read between numerous of the lines which follow. Therefore, the materials underlying this terminological research are much more numerous than those which are mentioned in the section of references and they originate in a lifetime of work experience.

---

<sup>1</sup> For further details, please visit <http://www.ziare.com/galati/stiri-business/cu-navele-pe-masa-2473260> or [http://www.damen.com/~media/New-Corporate-Damen/Images/Companies/Damen-Shipyards-Galati/Downloads/Newsletters/Damen\\_Shipyards\\_Galati\\_NEWS\\_10.ashx](http://www.damen.com/~media/New-Corporate-Damen/Images/Companies/Damen-Shipyards-Galati/Downloads/Newsletters/Damen_Shipyards_Galati_NEWS_10.ashx)

The **work method** basically relies on my personal analyses of term usage and their belonging to one field or another, which became valuable observations making the core of a consistent number of individually-created terminological cards.

All these lexical products are the result of the manual selection and organization of the rich information published in locally created professional language teaching materials, such as dictionaries (Bejan 1984), textbooks (Bejan and Gavrilu 1986), studies (Bejan 1981). A useful source of information was a sort of lexical column in the bulletins of Registrul Naval Român (or the Romanian Classification Society). They have all contributed to paving the way for some other preceding interventions (Maftai and Popescu 2005, Popescu 2006, Popescu 2007) as well as for the current lexical analysis which is intended to demonstrate whether these three fields are related as far as their terminologies are concerned. And they cannot be otherwise since they swirl around one and the same thing which is the ship. It is true, while naval architecture and shipbuilding have the vessel as their major focus, i.e. the delivery of a final product, the maritime field relies on vessels to turn other (commercial, humanitarian, social and military) purposes to life.

#### **Data collection**

The information which was mainly collected from my translator portfolio activities amounts to five hundred Romanian-English dictionary entries and to an equal number of English-Romanian counterparts. They mainly explicitate (simple and compound) nouns as well as a reduced number of verbs, adjectives and adverbs, together with complex noun phrases and syntagms which have become fossilized in the naval architecture vocabulary. Since the data was interpreted through the terminological perspective, idiomatic structures complex verbs and adverbials were waived in this analysis.

#### **Results and discussion**

Our examples “have been carefully selected from the myriad of terms pertaining to” (Glossary of Shipping Terms 2011: 8) the universe of ships, and they include the following larger groups:

- (a) highly specialized terms
- (b) specialized terms: *hull, to caulk,*
- (c) common words which are frequent in everyday speech, but which have acquired

a specialized meaning: *guy, catwalk, manifold*

- (d) words which are common in everyday speech: *plywood, wedge, tarpaulin, railing, bakery.*

The interpretation of the collected data reveals a considerable proportion of the ship-related terminology which is identifiable in all these specialist fields. It mainly refers to ship design, ship construction and seamanship. For example, both naval architects and shipbuilders use *hull, plate, keel, hatch, hatch, windlass, anchor, guy, rudder, radar, funnel, cofferdam, bulkhead, watertight, bilge, derrick, burton, swivel, athwarships, bolster and stern*, among others, and so do the maritime personnel handling the ship.

In specialist literature *highly specialized* or *highly technical words* are those terms or words which represent “an intrinsic part of the learning of the discipline itself” (Kennedy and Bolitho 1984: 57-8). We assign *bulwark, deadweight, galley, rudder, bilge, cofferdam*, and *spar* to this category of terms.

The semi technical elements of vocabulary are “those words which are unique to particular subject specializations and which rarely occur outside it” (Mackay & Mountford 1978: 145) or, according to other authors, are those “used in general language but a higher frequency of occurrence in scientific and technical description and discussion” (Dudley-Evans and St. John 1998: 82). The set of semi technical or specialized terms includes words as *shaft, propeller, cam, crank, crankshaft, liferaft, draught*.

Within the set of our third category of common words which have been borrowed from the daily vocabulary and have acquired new meanings *guy, catwalk, pintle, board (to gain access to a vessel), fender, evaporators, beam (the width of a ship), manifold, bow, stern, peak* are suitable examples.

Our selection of words of the fourth set, the words of the general stock will be illustrated with: *pump, verneer, trunk, railing, stanchion, pontoon, jack, and stud*.

On the other hand, the interpretation of our terminological bank indicates that an extremely few number of terms are peculiar to the maritime vocabulary exclusively. So, this short list includes *dogstopper, bunkers, bight, grommet* and *thimble*.

#### **CONCLUSIONS**

The inquiry into the triadic ship-oriented terminology was proven to validate our work hypothesis. The three fields of activity rely on a sound terminological basis which consists of four sets of terms, i.e. those words which have an exact meaning.

These sets distinguish:

- highly specialized/technical terms

- specialized/subtechnical/semi technical terms
- terms of the daily vocabulary which have acquired a specialization of meaning
- terms which behave as words in everyday communication.

Although each of these fields of activity covers a well-defined stage in the life of a ship, in their greatest majority they share the same terms.

It is true that 9% of any specialist vocabulary represents the category of highly specialized terms, which is more easily noticeable in the case of EMP but not in ENAP as opposed to ESBP for these two are more closely interrelated as a consequence of their professional concerns, i.e. of the latter to check and confirm or infirm the validity of the designs created and advanced to being produced by the former.

It is, above all, fundamental to emphasize that each of the fields in our interrelated triad has had a long tradition in the southeastern part of Romania and that it is our moral duty to show (albeit linguistically) what has been done up to this day, both in these fields and in their particular linguistics.

## **BIBLIOGRAFI**

- [1] Attwoods, L. E., 1922, *Theoretical Naval Architecture*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, New York: Longmans, Green and Co.
- [2] Bejan N., 1984, *Dictionar naval englez-român*, Atelierul de multiplicare al Universitatii Galati
- [3] Bejan, N., 1981, *Scientific and technical terms in English: the Register of Shipbuilding*. - manuscript of the unpublished dissertation paper, available at the Library of Dunarea de Jos University of Galati, the Compartment of References and Bibliographic Research
- [4] Bejan, N., Gavrilu, E., 1986, *Limba engleză pentru construcții navale*, Atelierul de multiplicare al Universitatii Galati
- [5] Dudley-Evans, St. John, M. J., 1998, *Developments of English for Specific Purposes. A Multi-Disciplinary Approach*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- [6] Hutchinson, T., Waters, A., 1989, *English for Specific Purposes. A Learning-Centered Approach*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- [7] Kennedy, Ch., Bolitho, R., 1984, *English for Specific Purposes*. London: Macmillan Press
- [8] MacBride, J. D., 1921, *A Handbook of Practical Shipbuilding*, New York: D. van Nostrand Company
- [9] Mackay, R., Mountford, A., (eds.), 1978, *English for Specific Purposes*, London: Longman
- [10] Maftai, C., Popescu, F., 2005, “A Linguistic Description of Shipbuilding and Maritime English”, in *Analele Universității “Dunărea de Jos” Galați. Fascicula XIII. Limbă și literatură*, xvii, 17(18), pp. 147-156
- [11] Popescu, F. 2006, “Anglicisms in the Romanian Shipbuilding Specialized Terminology”, în *Romanian Journal of English Studies*, no. 3, Timișoara: Editura Universității de Vest, pp. 160-163
- [12] Popescu, F., 2007, “Translating Shipbuilding and Maritime Eponyms”, în Antofi, S. (ed.) *Discursul intelectual la răspântiile istoriei*, Galați: Europlus, pp. 107–110
- [13] U.S. Department of Transportation, 2011, *Glossary of Shipping Terms* retrieved on 21 March 2016 from [http://business.usa.gov/sites/default/files/Glossary\\_final.pdf](http://business.usa.gov/sites/default/files/Glossary_final.pdf)