

TRANSLATION OF ABBREVIATIONS IN EU LEGISLATION:
CRITERION ISSUE

Translation of Abbreviations in EU Legislation: Criterion Issue

Summary

Abbreviations in the normative linguistic work are considered as an orthography level object, therefore they are discussed in orthography sections. However, this discussion alone makes it clear that it is difficult to restrict it to the level of an orthography – the structure of abbreviations, origin, relationship with names and other issues are dealt with as well. The purpose of the orthography sections in their turn is to provide orthographic rules, so these questions are just touched instead of being analyzed in a more detailed manner. Moreover, they are not dealt with in the works focused on other linguistic levels. The recent use of abbreviations is extremely abundant, including non-Lithuanian abbreviations, the peculiarities of which in their formation, declension and orthography coincide with the mentioned sections of the Lithuanian language orthography only partially, leads to various uncertainties in use.

The article analyzes one of the uncertainties: the issue of translation of abbreviations and acronyms. As the texts of administrative style, namely translations of EU legal acts (directives and regulations) were selected for the analysis, attention is focused on the translation criteria, i.e. seeks to find out what leads in a translation to the selection of a Lithuanian or non-Lithuanian abbreviation. In this respect, two types of abbreviations are

considered in the works of the Lithuanian language orthography: Abbreviations (acronyms) formed from the first letters of the words of the name (*EU, ECB, OECD*) and abbreviations formed by several first letters or syllables of a name (*Eurostat, Eurodac, Interpol*). It becomes clear that various factors may influence whether the abbreviations are to be translated, but the criterion of a similarity to a word or a name plays a significant role, i.e. the abbreviations with such similarity, even if they are composed solely of letters, are tend to be left in the same way as they were used in the original language. Thus, from the point of view of translation, the boundary drawn between the abbreviations does not coincide with the boundary that is drawn between them in the Lithuanian language orthography works based on their structure.

There is also a lack of conformity with the other limits provided in orthography works, such as based on orthography, inflection, relation to symbolic names. The article pays less of attention to such aspects while giving focus on the translation criteria, but they arise as problematic and unsolved issues in a normative attitude.

KEYWORDS: acronym, syllabic abbreviation, proper names, generic names, symbolic names.

RAMUNĖ VASKELAITĖ

Lietuvių kalbos institutas

P. Vileišio g. 5, 10308 Vilnius

ramune.vaskelaite@lki.lt