

## **PROBLEMS OF EU TERMINOLOGY TRANSLATION INTO RUSSIAN**

The problem of translation of terminology common in official and business quarters of Europe seems very important in Russian linguistic community. The core of this terminology is made up of specific terms and set-phrases regularly used in the countries of the European Union. The importance of the problem is conditioned by the fact that during many years the former USSR did not have any official relations with the European Union, called the Common Market at that time. The information was limited to most general facts about the structure of the EU and its membership. The few special works on the problem were meant for a narrow circle of specialists in the sphere of international relations and economics.

The perestroika brought quite a lot changes: Russia headed for Europe, many of the former USSR republics wished to become authorized members of the EU, the latter, in its turn, took the course to rapprochement with Eastern Europe countries, including Russia. Nowadays there are the EU missions in all CIS members and the Baltic countries. Various joint programs (e.g. TACIS, TEMPUS, COPERNICUS, etc.) function quite effectively. The Mass Media abound in information about the EU.

Along with numerous evident advantages, there appear a number of problems, the first one being the problem of communication between specialists in different fields. Quite frequently, the communication – generally in English – turns out not very effective or almost fails because its participants do not know the basic notions and realities of each other. That is why translators and interpreters are supposed to solve the difficult task of providing continuously developing contacts with a high quality translation. The situation is aggravated by the lack of bilingual English-Russian (German~, French~, etc.) dictionaries of the EU terminology.

It is common knowledge that dictionary and any kind of reference book compilation is a time- and labour-consuming process. Consequently, lots and lots of “rank-and-file” translators have to take decisions – sometimes at their own risk – ad hoc, thus creating along with some very felicitous translation variants terminological absurdities, unnecessary doublets, etc. So the necessity of bilingual dictionaries of the EU terminology is absolutely clear.

Among the difficulties modern translators have to face the following problematic fields can be singled out: 1) translation of special acronyms of the EU; 2) adequate translation of the EU terms from the point of view of the plane of form; 3) adequate translation of the EU terms from the point of view of the plane of content.

The EU uses plenty of acronyms. In no other world organization acronyms are paid as much attention to as in the EU. In the UNO, for example, acronyms are not numerous and they are simple – each letter of an acronym corresponds to a definite word, making the original name of the organization or program.

There are three main ways of acronyms translation into Russian.

1) Transliteration, i.e. recording a term in the alphabetical system of another language: e.g. eng. *TEMPUS* (Trans European Mobility Program for University Studies) = rus. *Темпус* (*tempus*), etc. The source of difficulty here might be the co-existence of several variants of translation, for example, *TACIS* was once translated in four different words.

2) Borrowing of the English transcription of an acronym. Thus, *COPERNICUS* is translated into Russian as *Коперникус* (*kopernikus*), though in the Russian language the name of this scientist is *Коперник* (*kopernik*).

3) Making an abbreviation of Russian equivalents of terms comprising an original English acronym. E.g., eng. *EU* = rus. *ЕС* (*es*) – *Европейский Союз* (*evropejskij soyuz*), eng. *WHO* (*World Health Organization*) = rus. *ВОЗ* (*voz*) – *Всемирная организация здравоохранения* (*vsemirnaya organizaciya zdavoohranenija*), eng. *ETUC* (*European Trade Union Confederation*) = rus. *ЕКП* (*екр*) – *Европейская конфедерация профсоюзов* (*evropejskaya konfederaciya profsoyuzov*), etc. Still, it should be mentioned that sometimes borrowing an English transcription is more preferable than this way of translation, because the latter can give something hard to pronounce.

Another source of difficulty is special terms. They can and should be treated from two aspects – the plane of form and the plane of content.

In the plane of form, for example, one of the problems concerns the words “Europe” and “European” in attributive phrases. Translators into Russian must be very careful in rendering the syntactic structure of the word combinations.

Adequate translation of the content of the term is closely connected with looking for a denotate that is very often missing in our reality. Thus, for example, the term *public procurement* has the most appropriate Russian equivalent *государственный заказ* (*gosudarstvennij zakaz*), but it is beyond doubt that these two notions do not fully correspond since the role of the state in different countries is quite diverse. Transliteration is very often used in case of the denotate missing, though sometimes attempts to find a Russian term denoting this very phenomenon are quite justified.

In conclusion it should be stated that the main translation problems are connected with the search for adequate Russian equivalents for the concepts expressed by the EU terms, as well as with the necessity to study constantly changing terminology of the European Union.