

Tanja Pavlović ♦ Sanel Hadžiahmetović Jurida ♦ Alma Jahić Jašić
University of Tuzla

TRANSLATION PITFALLS IN THE CONTEXT OF EUROSPEAK

Abstract

As Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) invests efforts to join the European Union (EU), interest in translation issues grows. It has recently become evident that precise and correct translation of various documents and questionnaires plays an important role in the country's meeting all sorts of administrative requirements on its complex road to the EU. A natural part of the evolution of the EU is Eurospeak, "the kind of English being used by diplomats in the corridors of power in the new EU" (Crystal, 1997, p. 136), a language of its own, which also comes under a variety of identifiers – 'Eurojargon', 'Eurobabble', etc.

Since in BiH modern language faculties are currently the only institutions that educate prospective translators, they need to be able to address various linguistic and extra-linguistic issues so as to prepare their graduates for the language industry market and the practicalities of translation tasks. The paper investigates students' translations of Eurospeak elements. The analysis of overtly made errors focused on the mismatch in denotative meaning and the breach of the target language system. In that way, the attempt is made to raise undergraduates' awareness of the specific characteristics of Eurospeak and potential pitfalls lurking in the translation process.

Key words: Eurospeak, translation, denotative meaning, error analysis

Introduction

Due to market and societal tendencies, the demand for professional translation services in Bosnia and Herzegovina (BiH) is constantly on the increase. As this academically underresourced country traditionally lacks translation education institutions and centers (see Hadžiahmetović Jurida & Pavlović, 2016),

the responsibility rests upon modern language faculties (MLFs) (at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels) to create proper curricula and provide appropriate translation-learning instruments for student translators. It is only through proper design of translation activities that these faculties are able to prepare their students for acquiring the foundations of translation competence and the skills needed to produce acceptable target texts.

As Presas (2000, p. 8) states, the translator needs to be able to effectively mobilize the diversity of knowledge and skills. In order to do this, implementing translation quality assessment and meeting the internationally recognized standards in translation and interpreting practice need to become an integral part of translation and interpreting classes at MLFs in BiH. This becomes even more important when certain specific registers are taken into account, especially those closely related to European Union (EU) integrations. The current socio-political and economic tendencies in BiH define market needs for prospective graduates of MLFs as employment in the translation industry becomes an increasingly realistic prospect.

Over the past decades there has been research into the teaching of translation albeit very little concerted effort to create innovative pedagogical models for translation education (Kiraly, 2003). Both translation scholars and practitioners need to be brought into a position that would enable them to exchange their practices so as to change the paradigm of the traditional hand-me-down approach (Kiraly, 2003). Efforts are made for the academised university training for translators to change, thus motivating students for a more active involvement in translation classes comes to the fore. Schäffner and Adab (2000, p. x) state that translation competence is most effectively developed at an academic institution, which is why the question of how best to prepare translators for their future careers has been addressed by the emergence of specific programs offered by academic institutions. Keeping in mind that the research available predominantly deals with professional translators and interpreters (see Schäffner, 2014; Koskinen, 2014) as well as teachers (see Pym et al., 2013), academic interest should also include student translators. This may help create and engage in the activities which would further develop students' translation competence and prepare them to face the challenging features of the register-specific translation.

Theoretical Preliminaries

An extensive body of research has been made into a European variety of English in the past as many scholars have so far dealt with this topic (see Berns, 1995; Crystal, 1997, 2001; Graddol, 2001; Jenkins et al., 2001; Modiano, 2001,

2017) although academic interest has not so far focused on its importance for student translators. What the discussion has brought to the fore is a challenging task of defining Euro-English and consequently Eurospeak. Eurospeak can be said to be a natural part of the evolution of the EU, be it as a new political unit or a new social community, whose aim was to create a language of its own. It comes under a variety of identifiers – ‘Eurojargon’, ‘Eurobabble’, ‘Eurospeak.’ Eurospeak is a concoction of acronyms and jargon hastily conceived by the EU administration to help express the EU bodies, decisions, functions, and processes, and due to its complexity, it puts great demands before translators (Lukić, 2016). Modiano (2011, pp. 11-14) broadly describes it as the set of “terms which are peculiar to the European experience and which are not generally understood by users of English living in other parts of the world” and Crystal (1997, p. 136) names it as “Euro-English, [...] a label sometimes given these days to the kind of English being used by [...] diplomats in the corridors of power in the new European Union.”

As Lukić (2016, p. 6) states, it is necessary to explain that the word language is used mainly (if not exclusively) to refer to its lexicon and graphological features, as the rest of it (e.g. grammar) is relatively unaffected by Europeanisation or rather largely adopts the general conventions and changes found in diplomatic and legal discourse. She also states that it would be most accurate to refer to Eurospeak (and Euro-English by extension) as “a conceptual and terminological field first developed primarily to avoid the use of potentially offensive language in the post-World War II context and expanded over time to facilitate communication on EU-specific situations and matters” (Lukić, 2016, p. 6).

Euro-English is characterized by newly emerged abbreviations, neologisms and portmanteaux words. Consequently, it is highly productive when it comes to various word-formation processes, such as borrowing (*rapporteur*), derivation (*actorness*), conversion (*opt-out*), back formation (*refoule*), blending (*Eurocrat*), clipping (*logframe*), and compounding (*six-pack*). It should be mentioned here that precisely due to all these features that add to its complexity, the general linguistic knowledge and the knowledge in translation might prove of no use in deciphering the meaning of certain concepts and phrases. Some of these are given as follows:

Refoule, v.

From the originally French n. *refoulement* “used to describe the practice of rounding up illegal immigrants and failed asylum seekers and sending them back to the country from where they entered the Union.”

E.g. They can be *refouled* for very serious grounds under Article 33.2 of the Convention, but Article 3 ECHR will rule that out.

Six-pack, n.

“A package of six legislative measures (five regulations and one directive) improving the Economic governance in the EU.”

E.g. The six-pack ensures stricter application of the fiscal rules by defining quantitatively what a significant deviation from the MTO.

These examples clearly support the abovementioned idea regarding the potential obstacles that can lurk in the translation of Eurospeak, particularly for the inexperienced translators. In line with Modiano’s statement (2017) that English within the EU now has extensive governmental, educational, informational, and work-related functionality, as well as increasing utility in the creation of intellectual properties, this is particularly important for the countries that have still not joined the EU as so many administrative and legal terms need to be adjusted to the existing common source.

Translating Euro-English in BiH

BiH does not participate in the drafting of EU legislation but merely transposes it. Similarly, we either receive from the EU (through its services, projects, etc.) or extract from public sources most of the general literature on EU matters. The selected collocations presented in Table 1 come from the Directorate for European Integration (DEI) English-Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian Glossary of a core text of the Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) between the European Communities and their Member States and Bosnia and Herzegovina and can be used to illustrate some of the features of Eurospeak translation. Even though the collocations appear to be rather complex, their translation is somewhat less demanding (for experienced translators) as the meanings can be derived from individual lexemes

Table 1. Selected Eurospeak collocations

Source Language (SL) English	Target Language (TL) Bosnian/Croatian/ Serbian	SAA reference
Authorised stay of employment	Odobreno zapošljavanje	Art. 47
Favour certain undertakings	Davanje prednosti određenim preduzećima/ poduzećima	Art. 71

Impartial recruitment procedure	Transparentni postupak odabira zaposlenika	Art. 111
Operationally independent public authority	Samostalno državno tijelo Samostalni državni organ	Art. 71

Notwithstanding isolated glossaries prepared either by the DEI or particular EU-funded projects, to the best of authors' knowledge there is no published Euro-English/(Euro-) Bosnian dictionary. The majority of the resources available to the translators whose everyday practices include Eurospeak terminology come mostly from different mono- and multilingual on-line sources, ranging from EU-Lex (database that provides direct free access to the European law, the Official Journal of the EU as well as the treaties, legislation, case-law and legislative proposals), IATE database (the EU's multilingual term base), Dictionary of European Integration Terms, to SAA Glossary, and BiHTerm (English-Bosnian/ Serbian/Croatian Dictionary of European Integration Terms that is continuously updated with terminology taken from EU legal acts and other EU related documents), as well as laws and bylaws published in BiH Official Gazette. The resources also include the official translations of EU directives, regulations and decisions in Croatian, given that as of 2013 when the Republic of Croatia joined the EU they are not only the documents written in a language shared by the two countries but also an equal and authentic language version of the EU law. These resources are mainly used in everyday practice of professional translators working at various national state bodies in charge of administrative procedures required for cooperation with the EU as well as international bodies with the seat in BiH.

Translation at MLFs has been commonly viewed as a means of improving the students' general knowledge of a second language. However, due to the market and societal tendencies, there is a constant pressure for translation practice classes to be transformed into a translation-learning instrument. The only type of formal translation education in BiH is provided at postgraduate levels of studies at the existing MLFs as undergraduate programs in the country do not exist. Although practitioners proliferated, either through available formal education or other informal types of training, the field of translation education is still rather unregulated in the sense of providing adequate national pool of experts (the know-how). The most serious accusations related to translation activities at MLFs are directed towards the very function of translation exercises as they are regarded as a pure means of teaching and practicing grammar and lexicon. That is why additional attention must be directed towards the appropriate representation of translation activities within the existing curricula.

Methodology

In order to be able to address the above-mentioned issues, the authors employed the analysis of errors based on the model proposed by House (1997, p. 45) who divides errors into covert and overt, whereby the overtly erroneous ones represent “either [...] a mismatch of denotative meanings of source and translation text elements or [...] a breach of the target language system.” House (1997, p. 45) further identifies them as follows:

- the changes in denotative meaning caused by the translator are divided into: omission, additions, and substitutions “consisting either of wrong selections or wrong combinations of elements” (labeled in the paper as Category A)
- the errors made through the violation of the target language system, further divided into two categories; they cover the cases of ungrammaticality (clear violations of the TL grammar of any type) which include breach of the language system (prepositions, tenses, cases) as well as dubious acceptability or breaches of the norm usage (word-for-word translations). (labeled in the paper as Category B)
- for the purpose of the study, additional category (Category C) was introduced, to mark the combination of A and B.

The present study included 23 fourth year students, who volunteered to participate in the study, with previous 2-semester experience in translating various general types of texts. In producing their in-class translations, they were allowed to use external resources (personal notes, glossaries, dictionaries). It needs to be noted here that this was not the first time the students performed such tasks as texts with similar content were dealt with in their previous education. Their language competence is expected to be relatively high as their L2 competence at the end of their fourth year is expected to have reached the equivalent of level C (C2 being the highest, native or near-native level of competence) of the Council of Europe’s (2010) Common European Framework of Reference, CEFR.

For the purposes of this study, the source text examples were taken from various press-related articles and the official EU website (www.ec.europa.eu). It was assumed that these would provide language realistic enough to facilitate the translation tasks. For practical reasons, the study presents one segment of the examples registered in target texts, and is elaborated on in the following section.

Results and Discussion

This section provides an overview of examples taken from the corpus and the three categories observed (labeled A, B and C, explained below), where target texts are given in the original form, without any interventions. Hence, Category A includes any kind of error that includes a change of denotative meaning (of any type). On the other hand, Category B focuses on ungrammaticality of any type, and finally, Category C represents a combination of Categories A and B.

Here are the examples as they were taken from 8 source text segments and their respective translations as identified in a total of 34 target text segments:

Source text:

Target text:

1. aplicirati za članstvo u EU

(to apply for EU membership)

1.1. **applicate** for EU membership (A)

1.2. to apply for the **accession** (A),

1.3. **submitting an application** for EU membership (A)

1.4. **submitting** EU application **membership** (C)

Examples 1.1.-1.3. above all belong to Category A as they feature an omission, addition, or substitution consisting either of wrong selections or wrong combinations of elements. As evident from example 1.4. above, the target text segment features a combination of ungrammaticality and change of denotative meaning (wrong selection of elements and their positioning), thus resulting in a noun phrase far too complex keeping in mind the source text.

2. vlasti BiH

(BiH authorities)

2.1. The Bosnian **government** (A)

2.2. **Administration** of Bosnia and Herzegovina (A)

2.3. **State power** of Bosnia and Herzegovina (A)

2.4. Authorities **in** BiH (B)

It is clear from the target text examples above (2.1.-2.3.) that change of denotative meaning prevails in this group. These three segments are all cases of substitution including wrong selection of elements combined with the wrong combination of elements, whereas example 2.4. is a clear case of ungrammaticality (wrong use of the preposition).

3. usaglašavanje Ustava sa evropskim standardima ljudskih prava
(harmonizing the Constitution with the European human rights standards)

3.1. **coordination** of Constitution with European standards of human rights (C)

3.2. **to finish all the work** on the law for European human rights standard (A)

3.3. **synchronization** of the constitution with... (A)

As can be seen above, examples 3.2. and 3.3. again result in wrong selection and/or combination of elements, whilst example 3.1. combines ungrammaticality (lack of definite article) and both types of errors identified in the other two examples.

4. usvajanje zakona (o popisu i državnoj pomoći)
(adoption of the Laws on Population Census and State Aid)

4.1. (adoption of the law) **about the list** and state **help** (C)

4.2. **acquisition** of (the census law) and state **help** (A)

4.3. adopting law about census and governmental power (C)

4.4. **accepting** the law on census and state **assistance** (A)

4.5. adoption of the **register** and state aid (A)

4.6. **passing** the law on census and **country's help** (A)

4.7. adoption of law **aboutlisting** and **governmental help** (C)

Noteworthy here is the fact that no clear cases of ungrammaticality only were observed, even though three examples of the target text belong to category C, combining ungrammaticality with change of denotative meaning, and four examples clearly showing change of denotative meaning only (e.g. substitution in 4.2. the word acquisition instead of adoption etc.) Also worth highlighting here is that, even though the students had previous experience in translation of documents with similar topics, including the case of population census and state aid, they made many errors. This resulted in a wide variety of target text segments falling into categories A and C – wrong elements combined with wrong modification and use of articles and/or prepositions.

5. Vijeće ministara
(Council of Ministers)

5.1. **Ministry** Council (A)

5.2. **State** Council (A)

5.3. Council of **Ministry** (A)

All errors in these three target texts are clear-cut cases of change of denotative meaning as they are all cases of wrong selection –substitution with wrong elements.

6. Parlamentarna skupština Vijeća Europe
(the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe)

- 6.1. the **Parliament** of **European Council** (A)
- 6.2. the **European Parliament** (A)
- 6.3. the **European Council Parliament Assembly** (B)
- 6.4. the Assembly of the Council of the **European Union** (A)
- 6.5. the **Parliament** Assembly of the **Europe Council** (A)

Much like in Example 4 above, many errors were registered in students' translations regardless of their previous experience in translating texts on similar topics. As a result, a wide variety of target text segments fall into category A – substitution with wrong elements, and one example (6.3.) showing various types of ungrammaticality.

7. Prijedlog (će biti korektan i izbalansiran)
(the proposal will be fair and balanced)

- 7.1. the **suggestion** will be **correct** and balanced (A)
- 7.2. the **motion** will be ... (A)
- 7.3. the **preposition** to ... (A)
- 7.4. **solution** will be **correct** and balanced (C)
- 7.5. the proposition will be **concrete** (A)

The only target text segment featuring both ungrammaticality and change of denotative meaning here is 7.4 as it lacks an article and there is a wrong element included. All other target text segments are clear-cut cases of substitution with a wrong element (suggestion, motion, preposition, solution, proposition) where the word proposal was expected, and assumed to have been used by the students, particularly because they had dealt with such sentence structures in their previous translation tasks.

8. specijalni izaslanik
(special envoy)

- 8.1. special **delegate** (A)
- 8.2. special **deputy** (A)
- 8.3. special **ambassador** (A)

As can be seen above, examples 8.1.-8.3. all clearly show a change of denotative meaning, more specifically a wrong selection of an element (delegate, deputy, ambassador), instead of the word envoy. Since the word envoy is of relative specificity, the participants clearly lacked the knowledge of the lexeme and relied on the words they had available in their vocabulary repertoire.

In summary, these examples clearly illustrate the fact that a vast majority of errors fall into category A (25 out of 34 examples, i.e. 73.5%), which might be explained by the lack of specialized knowledge as well as the failure to consult adequate resources. Category A includes the changes in denotative meaning (omission, additions, and substitutions) and encompasses cases of wrong selection or wrong combination of elements. In addition, the study found 7 cases in category C (20.5%), which combines changes in denotative meaning and ungrammaticality, whilst there were few cases in category B – only 2, to be precise (5.8%), which was, in a way, expected, given that cases of ungrammaticality are not frequently made by students at this level. In fact, the small number of clear B cases indicates the relatively well-developed foreign language competence in line with the CEFR. Given the relatively small sample in this study, a larger scale analysis would be needed for generalization (in terms of participants as well as source language structures).

The results of the research are twofold. First of all, they point to the necessity of introducing the elements of Eurospeak in translation curricula of MLFs. In addition, they indicate the need for the fully fledged development of the state-level language resources (dictionaries and specialized glossaries) which might contribute to the regulation of various linguistic issues in the field of translation. The creation of such custom made resources in combination with the existing ones should find its place in translation activities as students need to acquire the skills for the efficient usage of such assets.

Concluding Remarks

A set of very important questions arises from the presented material: How the sufficient number of translators able to work with Eurospeak material will be provided? Which institutions will be in charge of education of such professionals? Which institutions will be in charge of additional training of such professionals? These are some of the important issues that all the stakeholders in the process of BiH's accession to the EU need to bear in mind when it comes to translation. Ultimately, it all boils down to the people with experience as well as the professionals employed with relevant institutions. That is why one of the practical and efficient solutions would be to match the academia and the

practitioners in the field of translation, so as to provide for a multidisciplinary approach to translation, particularly in the context of Eurospeak.

The presence of Eurospeak in official circles of BiH's international relations is expected to increase. As due to its complexity it places burden on prospective translators educated at MLFs, these faculties, as the only institutions that provide education for prospective translators, need to incorporate the elements of Eurospeak in their curricula. In that way, MLFs might start changing the traditional view of translation activities as a means of improving the students' general knowledge of a second language and turn these activities into the key to potential future career. In that way, these higher education institutions would be able to respond to a constant pressure for translation practice classes to be transformed into a translation-learning instrument.

In order to functionally structure translation practice classes, and in keeping with the current trends in the society (accession to the EU), curricula developers (higher education institutions) in BiH need to properly address the issue of all linguistic features this process requires. While striving to achieve this goal, these education institutions should never lose sight of all other stakeholders as only through close contacts and strengthened cooperation with practitioners and state bodies will they be able to equip their graduates with operational translation competences and skills needed in the professional world.

References

- Adams, V. (1973). *An Introduction to Modern English Word-formation*. London: Longman
- Berns, M. (1995). English in the European Union. *English Today* 11(3), 3–11.
- Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR). Council of Europe. accessed March 02, 2018. http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/linguistic/cadre1_en.asp.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2001). The future of Englishes. In A. Burns & C. Coffin (Eds.), *Analyzing English in a global context* (pp. 53–64). London: Routledge.
- English-Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian Glossary of a core text of the Stabilisation and Association Agreement (SAA) between the European Communities and their Member States and Bosnia and Herzegovina. Prepared by DEI BiH in 2008, accessed March 15, 2018 http://www.dei.gov.ba/direkcija/unutrasnja_struktura/prevodjenje/resursi/default.aspx?id=2899&langTag=bs-BA
- English-Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian Dictionary of European Integration Terms. Prepared and published by DEI BiH in 2005 accessed March 15, 2018

- http://dei.gov.ba/dei/media_servis/publikacije/default.aspx?id=591&lang-Tag=bs-BA
- Graddol, D. (2001). The future of English as a European language. *The European English Messenger* X(2), 47–55.
- Hadžiahmetović J.S., & Pavlović, T. (2016). Translation Curriculum Development at a Modern Language Faculty in Bosnia and Herzegovina: A Case of the University of Tuzla. *Current Trends in Translation Teaching and Learning E*, 3, University in Helsinki, 69–86. Available at http://www.cctl.org/uploads/5/2/4/3/5243866/cctl_e_jurida___pavlovic.pdf
- Jenkins, J., Modiano, M., & Seidlhofer, B. (2001). EuroEnglish. *English Today* 17(4), 13–19.
- Kiraly, C. D. (2003). From instruction to collaborative construction: A passing fad or the promise of a paradigm shift in translation education. In B.J.Baer & G.S. Koby (Eds.), *Beyond the Ivory Tower: Rethinking Translation Pedagogy* (pp. 3-32). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Koskinen, K. (2000). Institutional Illusions: Translating in the EU Commission. *The Translator* 6(1), 49-65.
- Koskinen, K. (2008). *Translating Institution: An Ethnographic Study of EU Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Lukić, O. (2016). *Language Implications of European Integration*. Unpublished Diploma Paper. University of Tuzla.
- Modiano, M. (2001). A new variety of English. *English Today* 68, 13–16
- Modiano, M. (2017). English in a post-Brexit European Union, *World Englishes*. DOI: 10.1111/weng.12264
- Presas, M. (2000). Bilingual Competence and Translation Competence. In C. Schäffner & B. Adab (Eds.), *Developing Translation Competence* (pp. 19-32). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pym, A, Malmkjær K., & del Mar Gutiérrez-Colón Plana, M. (2013). *Translation and language learning: The role of translation in the teaching of languages in the European Union. A study by Directorate-General for Translation, European Commission*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. DOI: 10.2782/13783
- Schäffner, C. (2014). Translation practices in political institutions: a comparison of national, supranational, and non-governmental organizations. *Studies in Translation Theory and Practice* 22, 493-510.
- Schäffner, C., & Adab, B. (Eds.) (2000). *Developing Translation Competence*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Online sources

- <http://bihterm.anyterm.info/index.php?jezik=engl>
- http://dei.gov.ba/dei/media_servis/publikacije/default.aspx?id=591&langTag=bs-BA, accessed February 20, 2018
- http://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/articles/governance/2012-03-14_six_pack_en.htm, accessed April 05, 2018
- <http://esharp.eu/jargon#refoulement>, accessed March 10, 2018
- <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/homepage.html>, accessed April 05, 2018
- <http://eurocrislaw.eui.eu/country/uk/topic/six-pack/>, accessed April 05, 2018
- <http://iate.europa.eu/SearchByQueryLoad.do?method=load>, the EU's multilingual term base
- <http://www.collinsdictionary.com/submission/15908/Grexident>, accessed May 10, 2018
- http://www.dei.gov.ba/direkcija/unutrasnja_struktura/prevodjenje/resursi/default.aspx?id=2899&langTag=bs-BA
- <http://www.dei.gov.ba/press/publikacije/?id=2837>, accessed March 15, 2018

EUROSPEAK KAO POTENCIJALNI IZVOR PROBLEMA ZA PREVODITELJE

Sažetak

Interes za prevođenjem i tematikom prevođenja u Bosni i Hercegovini (BiH) je u porastu paralelno sa naporima koje BiH ulaže u cilju pridruživanja Europskoj uniji (EU). U skori je vrijeme postalo više no očigledno da tačan i precizan prijevod različitih dokumenata i upitnika ima vrlo važnu ulogu u ispunjavanju raznih vrsta uvjeta koji su postavljeni BiH na njenom putu u EU. Prirodni dio evoluiranja EU je i Eurospeak, ona vrsta engleskog jezika kojom se diplomate koriste u komuniciranju i odlučivanju u novoj EU, jezik vrlo poseban, i kojega se ponekad identificira kao ‘Eurojargon’, ‘Eurobabble’, itd.

Imajući u vidu da su fakulteti na kojima se studiraju moderni jezici u BiH jedine ustanove koje obrazuju perspektivne prevoditelje, one trebaju biti u mogućnosti baviti se raznim lingvističkim i ekstra-lingvističkim pitanjima kako bi svoje diplomirane studente pripremile za tržište jezične industrije i sve praktične detalje prevoditeljskih zadataka. U ovom se radu istražuju studentski prijevodi elemenata Eurospeak-a. Analiza grešaka daje osvrt na neslaganje u denotativnom značenju i kršenju sustava ciljnog jezika. Na taj se način pokušalo podići razinu svijesti studenata dodiplomskog studija o specifičnim osobinama Eurospeak-a i potencijalnim opasnostima koje vrebaju u procesu prevođenja.

Ključne riječi: Eurospeak, (pismo) prevođenje, denotativno značenje, analiza grešaka