

Croatian Anthropological Terminology – Challenges and Dilemmas

Josip Lah, Olga Orlić, Lucija Šimičić, Anja Iveković-Martinis and Anita Sujoldžić

Institute for Anthropological Research, Zagreb, Croatia

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the project ANTRONA aimed at constructing basic anthropological terminology that covers the entire range of anthropology as a science. It is a part of national language planning oriented terminology management for the Croatian language, and as such it is focused solely at the production of a terminographic database. The major difficulties encountered during the procedural stages of the project are outlined, such as the wide range of the interdisciplinary field of anthropology, including concepts and terms from natural and social sciences and humanities, as well as polysemy and fuzzy boundaries between the lexicon of the general language and specialized language. On the basis of several examples, we argue that terminography should be dealt with primarily by keeping in mind the range of its subsequent applications the aim of which is not only ontological, but also communicative in nature, and that functional pragmatic approach offers a more flexible framework for dealing with the demands of terminology in such an interdisciplinary field.

Key words: anthropology, interdisciplinarity, language planing, knowledge

Introduction

One of the prerequisites to any form of linguistic communication is a shared set of symbols and their meanings. The same is true of scientific communication, which necessarily relies on terminology used by all members of a given scientific community. In order to facilitate communication between its members, it is of the utmost importance for any scientific community to standardize their terminology.

The English language has largely been accepted by the global scholarly community as their *lingua franca*. This means that scholars who are non-native speakers of English actually use (at least) two languages: e.g. English for international communication and their native language for communication within their own national scientific community. Very often, however, the two languages are not equally well equipped with appropriate terminological apparatus, especially since English is by far the largest source of new terms in virtually all disciplines. This results in an asymmetrical situation whereby English starts to permeate the other language as well, providing it with ready-made terminological solutions which are usually widely (i.e. internationally) accepted. Moreover, even when mother-tongue solutions do

exist, scholars often tend to avoid them, preferring to use English terminology, which is seen as communicatively more valuable, in the sense that it is potentially able to reach a much wider audience. This strategy also has the »advantage« of eliminating the need for the creation and standardization of terminology in the mother tongue, which may seem like a simple and effective solution, rendering our task unnecessary. Knowledge of English and its use as a *lingua franca* certainly cannot be considered negative as such, especially if it facilitates communication. However, the benefits of using one's mother tongue are by now more or less universally recognized. On the one hand, the global tendency to use English instead of mother tongue adversely affects cultural and intellectual diversity of scholarly discourse. On the other, the lack of opportunity to use mother tongue is also connected to wider social issues. For example, UNESCO's *Guidelines for Terminology Policies* state the following:

»An ever-increasing body of empirical evidence indicates that there is a critical relationship between individuals' opportunity to use their mother tongue in a full range of cultural, scientific and commercial areas, and the socio-economic well-being of their respective

language communities. People whose mother-tongue is not (or not sufficiently) developed from the point of view of terminology and special purpose languages (...) tend to be disadvantaged.« (p.v)¹.

The UNESCO Guidelines emphasize that this is especially the case with small language communities:

»Especially smaller language communities (including linguistic minorities of all sorts) have to make more efforts than the surrounding larger language communities in order to prevent marginalization with respect to scientific-technical and economic-industrial development – a factor that ultimately may lead to socio-economic decline.« (p.vi)¹.

Consequently, »a language that lags behind in its terminology for a given domain risks losing the ability to communicate in that subject in its language over time«¹. In this sense, terminological standardization in the mother tongue can be seen as essential to any effort at promoting communication in the mother tongue and sustaining its ability to provide its users with adequate and up-to-date terms within their respective scientific and scholarly disciplines.

For this reason, the Institute for Anthropological Research in Zagreb has conducted the project *Basic anthropological terminology (Izgradnja temeljnog antropološkog nazivlja – ANTRONA)*, as the first of its kind in Croatian anthropology, i.e. the first systematic endeavour at creating and standardizing anthropological terminology in the Croatian language. It is a part of the larger project *Croatian scientific terminology (Hrvatsko strukovno nazivlje – STRUNA)*, acronym for *stručno nazivlje*, eng. special field terminology), conducted by the Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics and funded since 2008 by the Croatian Science Foundation. The Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics coordinates all sub-projects within STRUNA, which are in turn conducted by experts in their respective fields. This dual structure of the project has proved not only very effective, but actually necessary due to the nature and purpose of terminology. While associates from institutions conducting the projects within STRUNA work in their own capacities as scientists, giving their expert opinion from the point of view of scientific community – i.e. the primary users of scientific terms – experts from the Institute of Croatian Language and Linguistics conduct linguistic and terminological processing of these terms.

Establishing a uniform electronic platform STRUNA as a foundation for building specialized terminological databases in various fields has been conceived of as part of corpus language planning efforts in Croatia. As such it represents one of the essential steps in the process of language standardization helping both to protect the language from excessive foreign influence and even more so to enable a more efficient communication among professionals and between professionals and laymen. The project STRUNA itself is meant to »allow for a natural flow of knowledge, scientific accomplishments and information in the Croatian language at all social levels, which is

a precondition for the survival of the standard Croatian language«². In this context, the main goal of the ANTRONA project is to standardize terminology used by scholars, researchers and students working in the area of anthropology, in the Croatian language.

Terminological Approaches and Units

Terminology is usually defined as »the discipline concerned with the study and compilation of specialized terms«^{3,4}. Conceived in this sense it fulfills at least two different functions. On the one hand, the cognitive aspect of terminology is manifested in its aim to organize mental concepts related to a specific field of knowledge, which can be done because »terminology approaches knowledge from the standpoint of conceptual logic« whereby concepts are building blocks of knowledge to which labels – linguistic and non-linguistic alike – can be assigned⁴. On the other hand, terminology is normally not a self-fulfilling activity, but serves as a prerequisite for a wide range of applications. Beside its thought-ordering function, an important goal of terminology is the transfer of knowledge about a specific field⁵. The latter can be enacted in a variety of forms (e.g. educational activities, lexicography, translating, and other types of communication among specialists in the field, etc.), most of them implying that a communicative aspect of terminological work is at least as important as its purely onomastical, hence, cognitive aspect.

The General Theory of Terminology (GTT) which is based on the tradition of the Vienna school founded by Wüster⁶ is essentially prescriptive in nature. In this framework, concepts were viewed as abstract cognitive entities that refer to objects in the real world, and terms were merely their linguistic labels. As to terms and concepts there is a stable, monosemic reference between form and content that radically distinguishes terms in specialized language from general language. In addition to disregarding terminological variations, this approach also did not consider syntactic or diachronic dimensions of terms as falling within the scope of terminology. With the burgeoning of terminological work and its extension to scientific fields outside of those initially dealt with by terminologists, there has been an inclination towards pursuing more flexibility in the interpretations of traditional terminological framework (for an overview see Cabré Castellví⁵ and Budin⁷). The theories that subsequently arose in reaction to the GTT are descriptive, and show an increasing tendency to analyze terms within the wider context in which they are used. According to L'Homme et al.⁸ such approaches include socioterminology, the Communicative Theory of Terminology and sociocognitive terminology^{5,9,10}.

In discussing metadiscourses on terminology, Antia⁴ lists several possible approaches to critical examination of terminology: a linguistic approach aimed at strategies used in forming new terms; a terminological systems approach aimed at analyzing how groups of terms reflect the relationship in the corresponding sets of concepts;

knowledge approach dealing with the effectiveness and efficiency of the terminology project as a means of imparting knowledge; a communicative approach which focuses on the usability of terminology in discourse, and a sociological approach directed at societal validation of the terminology planning effort as evidenced by knowledge of, and attitudes towards, the terms. All these approaches are intertwined to a certain extent since the strategies used to depict and terminologize concepts, which occur primarily at the linguistic level, will be reflected in structuring of the rest of related concepts and hence the efficiency of imparting knowledge. Also, because every terminographic pursuit should not be a self-fulfilling aim, and becomes visible only in actual communication, regardless of its form, supports the idea that communicative approach cannot be discussed independently of other proposed approaches. Although the two aspects of terminology – cognitive and communicative one – are of equal importance regardless of the field tackled, different approaches to terminology seem to prioritize one aspect over another or interpret them in different ways.

Due to their multidimensional nature, Cabré Castelvij⁵ compares terminological units with polyhedrons with three viewpoints, which approximately parallel the two functions of terminology in general. A cognitive aspect of terminology is concerned primarily with concepts as units of knowledge, while socio-communicative aspect is focused on situations as units of communication. In this scheme, linguistic aspect of a terminological unit is the term itself, which functions both as a unit of language and as a bond between the cognitive and the communicative 'hedron' of a terminological unit⁵.

Such a multifaceted conceptualization of a terminological unit suggests that a concept would have to be as flexible in order to be able to account for the fact that specialised subject areas work with different ontologies and are underpinned by different epistemological positions. Such a position is supported by ISO 704, which states that »individual object can be seen by different disciplines from different points of view, which gives rise to the formation of different concepts representing the same individual object«¹¹. The advocated flexibility in this case does not necessarily imply universal explanatory adequacy. This aspect of the nature of terminological units should be relevant when dealing with the communicative function of terminology, which becomes evident in LSP translation for example. Even though translation is not necessarily a part of terminography per se, translation is one of the key applications of terminography, and no application of the results of terminographic work can be dealt with without taking into account a set of pragmatic principles that gain relevance in this segment of terminology management. Traditionally, however, translation of terminology presumes the objective nature of the reality, which can unequivocally be parceled into 'concepts' onto which then terms in different languages can be assigned. It is important to keep in mind that concepts are usually conceived of as »clusters of internationally unified features expressed by means of equivalent signs of

different linguistic and non-linguistic systems«⁵ and as such should be in focus of any terminological discussion. The notion of a concept is thus based on the position that there exists an objective reality that can be depicted equally objectively regardless of cultural and linguistic contexts by means of terms that would unequivocally reflect knowledge structures. In other words, concept systems should not represent language viewpoints. This traditional view, however, all too often disregards the fact that »the way the real world is reflected in the structure of a special language may not be the same across languages, especially in fields that are not highly structured such as arts and social sciences«³ as well as the fact that it is the terms that are the units that become relevant in communication. This is the point we would like to discuss in the rest of the paper.

Purpose and Scope

It should be stressed that anthropology is the first of the humanities and social sciences to have become part of the STRUNA project, and as such the first project to encounter the specific issues which arise in the process of standardising terminology in this area in the Croatian language. Even though terminology which has been largely reflected in the ISO/TC37 norms¹¹ – in principle treats all sciences equally, in reality different areas of science and scholarship function in different ways. Created on the bases of what is often referred to as general (or traditional) theory of terminology, we came to realize that STRUNA is not always the most suitable terminographic platform for HSS terminology. The traditional Vienna school of terminology was mainly developed through the standardisation of objects and products linked to the extralinguistic reality, which provided them with relatively stable meanings¹⁰. In the humanities and social sciences, this is very often not the case, because virtually every concept may be considered an analytical tool for the interpretation of reality. Additionally, humanistic terminology abounds in polysemous terms the meaning of which is often rooted in and defined by certain paradigms and can thus be adequately interpreted only bearing in mind a historical dimension and particular theoretical positions. Some of the problems encountered in the course of the work on ANTRONA, but not pertaining exclusively to ANTRONA terminography, or to humanities and social sciences in general, regard primarily the requirement for a rather strict, inflexible and unambiguous structuring of the meaning as well as the conceptualization of the field itself at all levels.

The goal of this paper is to deal primarily with the above issues and those related to the social and communicative aspects of terminology. In this context, there are at least two points usually overseen in classical terminological work. One of them concerns the problems of text production that are often indicative of inattention by terminology planners to the syntagmatic dimension of language for special purposes, while the other one has to do with the tendency to disregard contextual factors as deci-

sive for definition of certain terms, that is for their conceptualization⁴.

We would like to elaborate on the argument that meaning is ultimately a social category and that the specificities of communication do have impact on the shape of terminology as well as extend it by pointing out that a particular communicative situation determines, not only the choice of an adequate term depending on the audience, but also that it is crucial for delimiting the meaning of a term. We will show this by scrutinizing, on the one hand, several polysemous terms that simultaneously belong to different specialized fields, but are conceptually kept apart by field boundaries. The traditional approach to terminology would not disqualify these terms from belonging to LSP, but their place can in some cases become problematic by the very fact that clear delimitation of scientific fields is rarely, if ever, possible. Even in those cases where this delineation used to be possible (as between sociology and anthropology for example, which focused primarily on quantitative and qualitative methodology, or urban vs. rural topics respectively) the need for multidisciplinary, the broadening of the research topics, as well as the recognition of the advantages of combined methodological approaches, brought about the weakening of once more stable boundaries. Hence, we will also discuss terms that belong to different fields, but the meaning of which does not differ significantly in different fields. On the other hand, as pointed out by some earlier studies^{9,10} synonymy can hardly be discarded as irrelevant in terminology in general and HSS in particular, when we realize that the meaning can sometimes be defined by nuances in the text itself since the topic normally recalls a set of historical, cultural, ideological and linguistic connotations that are necessary for employing and comprehending the term in an appropriate way.

Finally, we argue for a broad interpretation of the communicative aspect of terminology that goes beyond purely technical organization of specialized knowledge to encompass adequate means of knowledge dissemination to potentially very different audiences. Because traditional approaches to terminology do not dispose of the means to address this challenge of terminology as a discipline, we will avail of a more recently proposed functional pragmatic approach to terminology¹². We will also show that this approach is more suitable for addressing the issue of translation in terminography and, even more importantly, in contextualized LSP translation keeping in mind that language planning theory has traditionally failed to consider the »process of term evaluation in various situations of discourse (i.e. in editing, lecturing, writing of manuals, industrial training, laboratory report writing, etc.«¹³.

Conceptualization of the Field of Anthropology

The ANTRONA project, as a part of STRUNA, follows an adapted version of traditional terminographic description which is based on principles elaborated in the ISO norms (within the Technical Committee 37), which are in turn based on the Vienna school of terminology. This terminological tradition in particular emphasizes the importance of the concept system in the process of terminologisation, since it reveals the relationships between concepts, which are crucial for their comparison. By studying these relationships, it should be possible to clearly delineate and define concepts². In the case of ANTRONA, the most general conceptual framework was defined by the rules of STRUNA, which follow the national systematization of arts and sciences in the Republic of Croatia. In it, anthropology is a branch of »anthropology and ethnology«, which is in turn a field within the area of the humanities. It should be noted that, according to this systematization, the other two branches in the field of »anthropology and ethnology« are ethnology and folklore. From this point on – or down – it was up to the anthropologists working on the project to create a system of subfields and other subdivisions of anthropology.

Traditionally, especially in the American tradition, anthropology is divided into four sub-fields: biological/physical, sociocultural, linguistic and archaeological anthropology. This division has been increasingly criticised in the last several decades and many alternative views have been expressed, but none have been fully successful in undermining it. Therefore, the four-partite structure was taken as a (relatively) stable basis for the initial, highest-level conceptualization of the science of anthropology for the purposes of ANTRONA. The STRUNA database allows for such a division in the form of »sub-field« * designations. Some authors, e.g. Birx¹⁴, add applied anthropology as the fifth field, but this addition was seen as unproductive and even paradoxical, since anthropology, and indeed any other science, should be intrinsically applicable, i.e. able to bridge the gap between the academic discourse and real-life situations. Furthermore, from the terminological point of view it is hardly conceivable that applied anthropology would be represented by a special set of terms, distinct from the other fields of anthropology.

However, the process of conceptualization was complicated already at this stage, due to the very nature of anthropology as a holistic and comprehensive discipline, which aims at describing the human kind from all aspects. As Haviland notes, there is a need to conceptualize anthropology from an integrative approach, studying the human kind in its totality, bearing in mind that »we cannot fully understand humanity in all its fascinating complexity unless we appreciate the systemic interplay among

* »Sub-field« is, therefore, in this case synonymous with the term »field« in the traditional structure of anthropology, because, as we have mentioned, »field« is used in ANTRONA in the meaning it has in the national systematization, denoting »anthropology and ethnology«.

environmental, physiological, material, social, ideological, psychological, and symbolic factors, both past and present¹⁵. It was decided that the best approach would be to combine the basic four-partite scheme with the integrative principle, recognizing the fact that it may be difficult to assign certain terms to just one particular field, either because they were equally relevant in several fields, or because they were a part of the core anthropological terminology, fundamentally shared by the whole discipline of anthropology. Such concepts are numerous: »holism«, »evolution«, »adaptation«, »humanity«, etc. Each of the four fields was then further analysed with respect to its own set of key concepts. The goal was to use this concept system to encompass all areas of anthropology, selecting the most important concepts and including them in our corpus. This kind of »top-down« approach is favoured by terminology, which, as we have pointed out, seeks not only to define concepts, but also to fit them into a concept system. Indeed, Temmerman calls this the second principle of terminology, which »states that concepts should not be studied in isolation, but rather as elements in a concept system that can be drawn up based on a close study of the characteristics of concepts, which bring out the existing relationships between the concepts«¹⁰.

Terminography is a process of assigning names to concepts, which means that terminographers start with the concept and then find the appropriate linguistic expression – term – for it. As such, it is often contrasted with lexicography, which functions the other way round: it takes words from the dictionary and then characterizes them functionally and semantically, arriving at concepts³. The former perspective is called onomasiological, while the latter is called semasiological. It is precisely the central point of the onomasiological perspective to elaborate the concept system prior to naming the concepts themselves. For example, in ANTRONA the field of sociocultural anthropology has been analysed with respect to several categories: certain key concepts (e.g. culture, society, kinship, colonialism, etc.), theories (evolutionism, diffusionism, historical particularism, structuralism, etc.), methods (quantitative, qualitative, holocultural, etc.) and also major sub-fields of sociocultural anthropology (cognitive anthropology, psychological anthropology, political anthropology, medical anthropology, etc.). Each of these branches contains terms as well as potential further, smaller branches with their respective terms, etc. For example, »society« has as one of its branches »social organisation«, which yields »patriarchy« and »matriarchy«. Similarly, »marriage« will provide »endogamy«, »exogamy«, »levirate«, etc. Ideally, the end result of this process would be a concept system resembling an inverted tree, with »anthropology« as the root and the four fields as the major branches with further smaller branches, i.e. subdivisions. However, this approach alone does not guarantee a one-hundred-percent coverage of all of the anthropological terminology, simply because of the difficulties in establishing clear relations between all concepts. The Wüsterian tradition typically recognises the following relationships: logical relation-

ships, ontological relationships (partitive relationships, relationships of succession and relationships of material-product), and relationships of effect¹⁰. Among these, logical and ontological relationships are considered the most important, because they are seen as reflecting the concepts' characteristics more directly. However, in practice, placing particular concepts within a clearly defined web of relationships very often presents a daunting challenge. For example, it is far from clear where exactly to place such concepts as »tradition«, and consequently how to treat the concepts of »little tradition« and »great tradition«. The latter two concepts have been created by the anthropologist Redfield¹⁶ to distinguish between what he saw as two different kinds of tradition, but we may not necessarily agree with him, nor do we have to accept that *all* tradition can or should be thus categorised. In other words, »tradition« *may* be divided into »little tradition« and »great tradition«, but only if we choose to interpret it in such a way. For the discipline of anthropology, this does not pose any considerable difficulty because it is generally accepted that there exist numerous different ways of conceptualising reality. On the other hand, for terminology it is something of a problem, because terminology requires conceptualisation as a first step in the process of terminologisation. While »terminology is primarily concerned with the relationship between objects in the real world and the concepts that represent them«³, anthropology, as a humanistic science *par excellence*, seeks to *interpret* the »real world« and the relationships therein, and interpretations are of necessity multiple.

The Role of (Con)Textual Factors within a Particular Special Field

While the choice of terms, i.e. defining the scope of a terminological database, will always be, to some extent at least, based on an editor's choice, the 'right' definition of concepts is the next, terminologically far more relevant, issue to tackle. However, even the most basic concepts in anthropology are sometimes difficult to define unambiguously. As pointed out by Riggs et al.¹⁷ over a decade ago, »in many fields, the concepts needed are still imprecise and fluid. Few agreements, or none, can be reached on the concepts themselves or on the terms used to designate them«. This is especially true where the same subject field has been broached from diverse angles, that is from different geographical, historical and professional backgrounds. Antia⁴ discusses this point in relation to the terminology management in Nigeria by pointing out the need of agreement on (concept) definitions first before an agreement regarding terms themselves can be reached.

The concept of ethnography

The term »ethnography« has been defined in different ways by different authors. In one of our sources, Nanda and Warms define ethnography as »the written description and analysis of the culture of a group of people based on fieldwork«¹⁸. For Barnard and Spencer, 'ethnography'

has a double meaning in anthropology: ethnography as *product* (ethnographic writings – the articles and books written by anthropologists), and ethnography as *process* (participant observation or fieldwork)¹⁹. Birx defines ethnography as »the study of people in a natural setting«, but then goes on to equate it with the terms *participant observation* and *field research*¹⁴. For Ashcroft et.al.²⁰, ethnography is both a field of anthropological research and its methodology:

»Ethnography is that field of anthropological research based on direct observation of and reporting on a people's way of life. It is the basic methodology employed by cultural anthropologists and consists of two stages: fieldwork, which is the term used for the process of observing and recording data; and reportage, the production of a written description and analysis of the subject under study.« (p.85)²⁰.

Different authors, apparently, have different ways of understanding the concept of ethnography. Since the term is defined in several (significantly) different ways, what we are dealing with is polysemy. Terminology, however, does not tolerate polysemy, but seeks clear and unambiguous definitions, with one-to-one relations to the terms they describe. This principle of assigning permanent one-to-one relations between terms and their definitions is called univocity and it has been extensively criticised by many theoreticians and practitioners of terminology, especially with respect to the humanities and social sciences. To comply with the rules of STRUNA, our entry in ANTRONA defines ethnography only as »a systemic collection of cultural data of a community using participant observation method«,* but then in the note section other meanings are elaborated.

The concept of culture

One of the most frequently used concept bearing a variety of meanings in anthropology is culture. Thus, American anthropologists Kroeber and Kluckhohn listed more than 164 definitions of culture, ranging from »learned behaviour« to »ideas in the mind«, »a logical construct«, »a statistical fiction«, »a psychic defense mechanism« and so on²¹. Evidently, the concept of culture is not an object found »ready-made« for our conceptualisation, but is in fact *created* in the process of our conceptualisation. It reflects our experience and understanding of the world around us, and that is precisely what is standing in the way of terminological standardisation as was imagined by the Vienna school of terminology. Nanda and Warms showed how the concept of culture changed over time, from the 19th century evolutionist idea about universal human culture that is, in different degrees,

present in all societies, up to contemporary postmodern confession of the impossibility to completely or accurately describe culture, because the understanding of cultures very much reflects the observer's bias¹⁸.

In our attempt to find a general enough, but anthropologically acceptable definition of culture we came up with the following definition »*totality of conceptual, active, and material organization of the way of life that serves as a means of adaptation to the environment and of ensuring the survival of the individual and community*«.***

However, the ambivalence related to the term culture causes conceptual problems with some other compound words that contain it. Multiculturalism can be used to make the point. The term came into wider political usage in the 1960's and 1970's in Canada, and alluded to the promotion of regulation of inter-ethnic relations in that country²². Very soon the term and the adjectives derived from it became the regular vocabulary of political, social and general discourse, at least in the Western world and was often confused with similar concepts like cultural pluralism (referring to the co-existence of different cultures in the same territory), interculturalism or pluriculturalism, with quite a different meanings. Kymlicka also notes that the term is usually used while stating that modern societies are increasingly multicultural²³, but he recognized that actually it is »a vague term that often obscures important distinctions«. He demonstrated what he had in mind by using the example from Canada where the term 'multiculturalism policy' was rejected by general public, because it was (wrongly) understood as policies giving nationhood rights to immigrants, alongside with, what Kymlicka names institutionally complete societal cultures.*** Mesić rightly pointed out that the authors who tried to define multiculturalism broadly enough, so that the term could be in general use, made the term unusable for any analytical or operational purpose²².

Trying to solve the complexity of use of the concept of culture, Kymlicka offers two definitions. The first one defines culture as *ethos*, *custom*, or the way of life of a certain group which means that various lifestyle enclaves, social movements and voluntary organizations, obviously, possess their own culture (and we can speak of gay cultures, bureaucratic culture, etc.). The second approach to defining culture uses civilization as its starting point. According to Kymlicka these two modes of defining culture led to two different types of understanding of what multiculturalism is²³. If the term multiculturalism covers all the cultures that are defined by its way of life, then multiculturalism could refer to any marginalized group****. However, if we define multiculturalism by us-

* Definition in Croatian: *sustavno prikupljanje podataka o kulturnim obilježjima određene zajednice metodom promatranja sa sudjelovanjem*.

** Definition in Croatian: *sveukupnost idejne, djelatne i materijalne organizacije načina života koja služi kao sredstvo prilagodbe okolini i osiguranja opstanka pojedinca i zajednice*.

*** By »institutionally complete societal culture« Kymlicka means »containing a full range of social, educational, economic and political institutions, encompassing both public and private life«.

**** According to Barry, this could include almost every group on Earth, except White, healthy and not too old males²⁴.

ing the second definition of culture, than all modern societies would share the same culture and one could rightfully ask – what about pre- or non-modern societies? In this case the multicultural world would actually mean co-existence of modern and pre-modern societies (and their cultures)²³. Finally, in his definition of liberal multiculturalism Kymlicka equals culture with nation/people (so called societal cultures), but nevertheless admits that some people use the term multiculturalism in an even broader sense, »to encompass a wide range of non-ethnic social groups which have, for various reasons, been excluded or marginalized from the mainstream of society«²³. While recognizing the exclusionary nature of his definition, Kymlicka even states that »what matters is not the terminology we use, but that we keep certain distinctions in mind«, thus stressing the issue of the context of scientific interpretation²³.

The concept of identity

Identity is also an interesting example, especially being one of the most useful analytical concepts and used so often that now it represents a burden, because almost everything can and most probably has been analyzed through the lenses of identity either as a symbol of identity, or as a sense of belonging, or as a practice aimed at intensifying the identity. Some authors offer a logical definition of identity as something »what you are« or as a »common word for the peoples' sense of who they are«²⁵. The numerous approaches to identity, however, make a formulation of non-ambivalent definition difficult. From one point of view, identity is perceived as sameness, complete equality with the self²⁶ but it is also possible to make an inverse definition according to which identity implies difference from others^{27,28}.

With the changes in the modernist paradigm, further reflections upon the nature of the concept led to a diversification of definitions of identity. Thus, essentialist concepts of identity, according to which it is a stable core of oneself, usually marked by »unchangeable« characteristics such as race, language, ethnicity etc. have fallen out of use in academic discourses. According to Hall identity is dynamic, situational and contextual²⁸, while Barth's interactionist approach to group identity postulates that group dynamics is crucial in the processes of constructing social identity, which is always constructed in relation to the other, whoever that other may be²⁹. Hall even prefers the term identification processes, in order to make the distinction between the static and dynamic concept of identity²⁸. However, the term identity is still in general use but, usually, in the academic discussions authors that use these complex concepts like identity, start their papers/books by offering their own definition of the concept/term in question.

It is impossible to completely analyze and define unambiguously such a complex concept which could be clearly compared to the polyhedron mentioned by Cabré

Castellví⁵, with the »only« difference that it has many more sides. In Croatian anthropology, ethnology, sociology and linguistics (and the list could be expanded) a lot has been written about identity from various perspectives and always having one particular aspect of identity in mind^{30–33}

In the ANTRONA database we used Leve's concept of identity as a basic definition of identity. According to her, identity represents a »reflective construct or experiential modality through which one knows oneself and claims recognition«³⁴. We defined identity as »a set of features that individuals or groups ascribe to themselves or that are recognized as such by others«.*

The concept of dialect

In a similar way, 'dialect' is a term which can potentially cause a number of problems in specialized communication. As discussed earlier, one of the tenets of classical terminological approach supports the idea that terms in different languages should be depicting the same objective reality and thus be independent of a particular language grammatical and semantic constraints. If we analyze the meaning of the term 'dialect' in only three European languages – Croatian, English, and Italian – we soon come to realize that an etymologically same term (deriving from Ancient Greek *διά* + *λέγω* > *διάλεκτος*) shares a common semantic core, but due to different and culturally specific contexts in which the meanings of the three variants evolved, not only does not depict the same objective reality (as there is no such thing!), but cannot be unambiguously translated in any kind of specialized communication. In English a 'dialect' refers to a language variety typically used by a particular group of speakers defined either geographically or socially. In Italian '*dialetto*' is considered to be any historical Romance variety that has not acquired the status of an official language (such are, for instance, *il lombardo*, *il napoletano*, *il veneto*, *il siciliano*, etc.). In Croatian specialized linguistic parlance, a '*dijalekt*' is a group of local (organic) speeches, i.e. a non-organic (non-authentic) diatopic variety.

Besides, the term itself undoubtedly belongs to specialized language, but its use is not limited to communication among linguists. Because of the relevance of speech for identification processes of a community, *dijalekt* is the term quite frequently used in communication of people who do not consider it *terminus technicus* and as such it can be considered a lexeme of general language. The relevance of contextual factors for understanding how terminology works becomes relevant when specialists use it in communication with 'laymen', and when in adjusting their discourse to their audience, 'dialect' – in the Croatian context at least – acquires a broader meaning of any local, geographically defined, parlance. Even in cases when this meaning is not intended, it will undoubtedly be interpreted as such. As a

* Definition in Croatian: *skup značajka koje pojedinci ili skupine smatraju samo sebi svojstvenima ili koje drugi prepoznaju kao njihovu posebnost.*

concept in anthropology, therefore, it is determined with a wider meaning of »socioculturally defined group of recognizable, geographically or socially limited linguistic features«.*

At the Fields' Crossroads – Interdisciplinary Intersections

There are a number of terms which belong to different domains of specialized language, but their meanings are often so radically different that even a glance at the text would immediately suggest right associations. We will discuss below two terms in this context: 'articulation' and 'migration'.

In socio-cultural anthropology, we defined 'articulation' as »a process of establishing relations between discursive elements that modify their identity«**. In the STRUNA subproject dealing with basic medical terminology, and more specifically physiology, 'articulation' is defined as »harmonized contractions of mouth, tongue, larynx and vocal cords muscles by means of which sounds are shaped into clear words«***. In stomatology (subfield of oral and dental anatomy), however, 'articulation' is considered the conforming of the occlusal surfaces of the upper and lower teeth during the masticatory movement of the lower jaw in various directions.

In chemical engineering 'migration' refers to a »transfer of a substituent of one plastic material into another contact material«****. In HSS the meaning of 'migration' is quite diverse. In anthropology it is considered »permanent or semi-permanent change of settlement of an individual or a group« and is used in a similar sense in demography and some other social sciences. In the context of EU legal terminology, however, 'migration' is highly specified as 'leaving of one state or region and settling in another'.

Although these concepts may be semantically very far apart, in most cases they are the result of metaphoric extension of meaning and thus qualify for polysemy. As long as polysemy is so clear that the concepts such terms refer to do not cross the field boundaries, their interpretation should not pose any problems as their (at least approximate) meaning can easily be derived from the context. It is true, though, that the medical definition of 'articulation' as defined in STRUNA is commonly used in phonetics and the physiology of speech, but because it is semantically very distant from 'articulation' in discourse, the use and meaning of the two can hardly be confused. However, 'migration' in anthropology and 'migration' in EU law are not strictly polysemous; their semantic fields largely overlap and the failure to read into the context could certainly provoke some misunderstandings.

Now we will turn to the term the meaning of which does not change so dramatically in various specialized languages. 'Performance' is a good example for problematizing both conceptual and communicative aspects. As Abrahams noted, performance is one of those terms that have several different meanings both in everyday speech and academic discussion³⁵. Most specialist meanings of the term rely on its general meaning, which is to be found in any all-purpose dictionary. Firstly, performance refers to the act, process, or art of performing, and secondly to the theatrical and dramatic production. The third meaning concerns the manner or quality of a machine's performance. These three meanings of the term performance will be elaborated upon later on.

Abrahams, who considers that the use of the term performance is central to any cultural content (and what he was concerned about, was, primarily folkloristic performance), emphasized that it is especially problematic that the term is »taken« from the Chomskyan linguistics, and formal linguistic context where it refers to the actual use of language in concrete situations (as opposed to the competence referring to the speaker-hearer's knowledge of a language³⁵). In Croatian, the Chomskyan meaning of performance is most commonly translated as *izvedba*, as opposed to *sposobnost* (competence). Abrahams, however does not mention yet another meaning of the term performance used in phonetics, where it refers to the technique whereby aspiring practitioners of the subject are trained to control the use of their vocal organs. This »second« meaning of the term performance in linguistics, is most often translated into Croatian in academic literature as *govorna izvedba* (i.e. speech performance). In order to avoid polysemy, in ANTRONA we decided to »translate« the concepts competence-performance with *jezična kompetencija* and *jezična uporaba* (linguistic competence and linguistic usage).

Ben Amos defines (folkloristic) performance as a »mode of presentation that gives social allowance for communicating of exceptional forms of speaking and acting«³⁶. While Abrahams, Ben Amos and others discussed it primarily within the discipline of folklore, the concept itself was also elaborated in the field of sociolinguistics. Hymes defines performance as »the realization of known traditional material – as something creative, realized, achieved, even transcendent of the ordinary course of events«³⁷. Speaking of the role of performance in verbal art, Bauman sees »performance as a mode of spoken verbal communication that consists in the assumption of responsibility to an audience for a display of communicative competence«³⁸.

The conceptualization of performance, as elaborated in the work of sociologist Erving Goffman is quite often used in anthropology³⁹. Goffman perceives any interac-

* Definition in Croatian: *sociokulturno definiran skup prepoznatljivih, zemljopisno ili društveno omeđenih jezičnih obilježja.*

** Definition in Croatian: *proces uspostavljanja odnosa među diskurzivnim elementima koji mijenjaju njihov identitet.*

*** Definition in Croatian: *oblikovanje glasova u jasne riječi usklađenim kontrakcijama mišića usta, jezika, grkljana i glasnica (STRUNA).*

**** STRUNA.

tion between individuals as a »performance«, shaped by the environment and audience, constructed to provide others with »impressions« that s/he wishes to give (not to give off). In this way performance is conceptualized (and defined) as »activity of a given participant on a given occasion which serves to influence other participants.«³⁹. This dramaturgical framework proved very useful not only for sociologists (of role theory), but anthropologists and ethnologists as well, including Croatian ones. We defined the concept of performance as »expressively marked verbal-active or discursive-interactive representation of identities and socio-cultural entities*« and referred to it as *izvedba* in ANTRONA.

Bearing in mind the role of terminology as a source for knowledge construction of a particular special field, one cannot but object to this requirement by arguing that scientific fields are rarely coherently structured wholes. The consequence is that an attempt to delineate the boundaries of a particular scientific field will often be problematic because arbitrary and influenced by a certain ideological stance. As far as anthropology is concerned, however, these boundaries may be even less clear-cut as anthropology itself is defined differently in different contexts (e.g. American vs. European one). If a classical American four-field approach is pursued, which was the case in ANTRONA, an attempt to objectively draw a line between (socio)linguistics and linguistic anthropology or archaeology and anthropological archaeology, for instance, becomes impossible. Besides, the issue at hand can be complicated further by the fact that a number of terms were first defined by a discipline other than anthropology (such as sociology, philosophy, literary theory), but subsequently were accepted or further elaborated by anthropologists. It is therefore hardly clear whether the terms 'isogloss', 'language universal' and 'prototype theory' should be classified as anthropological or rather linguistic terms belonging to linguistic geography, so called 'basic linguistic theory' and semantics respectively.

Not the same, but related to the impossibility of separating different scientific fields apart is the difficulty of separating specialized from non-specialized language, i.e. the impossibility to unambiguously 'extract' terminology from the vocabulary pertaining to 'general' language. Examples are the terms »man«, »communication«, »speech« and a number of others (as defined in ANTRONA), which represent essential concepts in anthropology, but clearly overlap with general language.

Alternative Approaches to Dealing with Terminology

All of these examples demonstrate the limits of traditional terminology and its principles. Even though, ideally, terminologisation should start with concepts, embedded into the concept system, and proceed with assi-

gning terms to the concepts, in terminological practice it has been proved necessary at the same time to create a corpus of terms used by experts in the field. For this reason, we had to collect relevant publications and extract anthropological terms. This task involved both the collection of terms in the Croatian language and the parallel process of creating a corpus of English anthropological terms, since English, as the global *lingua franca*, was judged the richest source of up-to-date terminology. The project aimed at creating anthropological terminology in the Croatian language, but in a way that would respect the existing tradition in Croatian science and terminology that is currently used by anthropologists in Croatia. The Croatian part included original publications in the Croatian language, books and individual papers published in numerous scientific journals in Croatia. The total number of Croatian sources, i.e. all titles including books and individual papers, exceeded 160.

The English sources included several dictionaries of specialized anthropological vocabulary as the starting point. However, dictionaries proved to be inadequate as a sole source of terms and definitions, because they failed to provide a comprehensive set of concepts/terms which would cover all the (sub)fields of anthropology in detail. What is more, their definitions very often proved to be terminologically unsuitable and sometimes even biased (culturally, politically, etc.). Every single term had to be compared to its Croatian equivalent in order to ensure that the definition truly reflects the experience, or tradition, of Croatian anthropology and the meaning in which anthropologists in Croatia use the term. This testifies to the importance of a critical approach to terminology, which proved to be more than a simple technical process of one-to-one translation, which the ISO Technical Committee 37¹¹ might suggest. Other types of reference literature were therefore extensively used as well, mainly specialized encyclopaedias with more extensive entries on particular concepts or subject areas, which basic dictionaries were unable to adequately cover. Again, many individual publications proved priceless in many specific cases where general overviews turned out to lack depth. All in all, more than two hundred foreign-language titles – books, dictionaries, papers – were used by ANTRONA associates.

The large number of sources was necessary in order to overcome the difficulties that kept reappearing throughout the project and that we have mentioned earlier in the text. It was more a rule than an exception that terms were understood and defined differently by different authors. Occasionally, great effort was required to try to distil the essential meaning in an effort to create a single, relatively simple definition that would capture the gist and at the same time do justice to all, or as many as possible, different points of view. Luckily, the STRUNA database provides for a special field called »remark« (*napomena*), which can be resorted to in case further ex-

* Definition in Croatian: *izražajno obilježena verbalno-akcijska ili diskurzno-interakcijska reprezentacija identiteta i sociokulturnih entiteta.*

planation apart from the definition itself is needed in order to understand the meaning of the term. The remark is similar to the element called »explanation« in traditional terminology, which is a description of a concept which does not reflect its position in a concept system¹⁰. The essential difference is that our remark does not replace the definition, but provides additional information necessary to understand the meaning of the term. The remark option has been used by the ANTRONA associates extensively because it was often the only way to convey the much needed information on the use of the term, which terminological definition does not allow. Indeed, ANTRONA has arguably used the remark option more often than any other project within STRUNA. Such information included, for example, the nuances of meaning needed to understand the concept, restrictions in use, theoretical framework in which it is used, connotations, and any other information that would situate the concept in the social and discursive framework. The remark was also useful because of another issue, called the synchronicity principle, which states that terminology should be interested only in the meaning that terms have in the present time. Unlike, perhaps, in the technical sciences, in anthropology – and other humanistic and social sciences – meaning does indeed change over time. And also unlike the technical sciences, this change not only matters, but is often the very subject of research. Concepts such as »race« or »primitivism« had significantly different meanings at different points in time. For example, »primitivism« had a very specific meaning in the 19th century evolutionist theory, where it functioned as an opposite to civilisation, whereas in the first half of the 20th century it started to have a more neutral meaning, without the negative connotations. Nowadays, however, it is not used at all, unless the context is such that it cannot be avoided, e.g. in a discussion about the history of anthropology. Therefore, the term »primitivism« may be said to refer to something that is not even considered to exist, or is simply rejected as an archaic concept. »Race« is perhaps an even better example, especially if we consider the drastic change it has gone through: from an unquestionable scientific truth to an almost empty signifier. It has been proven that the concept of »race« has no biological or genetic basis, but is in fact a cultural construct, prevalent in the European scientific thought until as late as a few decades ago. The fact that race does not exist, however, does not and cannot exclude it from the corpus of anthropological terms, but it requires adequate explanation in order to be understood by the user. Terminological norms have difficulties dealing with such situations, stating that »philosophical discussions on whether an object actually exists in reality are unproductive and should be avoided«¹¹. Remarks need to be resorted to in all such cases in order to avoid misleading the user as to the true meaning of a particular term.

On the bases of our examples we argue for the need to allow for the tenets of functional pragmatic framework to become operable in terminography. Terminography refers primarily to »the recording of terminological infor-

mation«, and as such does not necessarily include a communicative aspect characteristic of a more broadly conceptualized terminology management, which »can be considered a special kind of 'information management' that focuses on structuring, storing, exchanging, disseminating and using terminological information for text production«³⁹. However, in order to render the results of terminographic work more applicable in actual specialized communication, the importance of pragmatic factors cannot be disregarded even in the initial step of terminology management.

Functional pragmatic framework departs from the presumption that it is the function of communicative elements which is defined by the context. It refers to the appropriateness conditions of the previously accomplished speech act itself. In terminology, this approach would imply the impossibility of using and/or translating terms in communicative isolation. According to Kvam¹² »[b]oth the specific translation situation (the intended effect(s) of the target text in a specific situation) and the specific socio-lingual context (semantic, structural and cultural factors) of the translation constrain the lexicalisation and grammaticalisation of specific onomastic fields«.

If we depart from the presumption that terminological units should be treated, among other, as units of communication rather than purely units of knowledge then this traditional approach is doomed to fail. The same is true of specialized communication outside of professional circles. A way out in both cases would be to admit that contextual factors – interlocutors and especially the topic (i.e. a language-specific situation in this case, and theoretical approach in other cases) – are crucial factors not only in choosing the appropriate term as pointed out by Kvam¹², but also in adequately interpreting the meaning of the term.

Conclusions

The result of the ANTRONA project is a corpus of 1529 terms that covers the basic concepts in anthropology, as they are used in contemporary anthropological theory and practice. Since one of the important tasks of the overall STRUNA project is to enable »the establishment of equivalence among systems of different languages«², all the terms have been linked to their equivalents in other languages – as a rule English, but also German, French, and other languages. Each term was provided with a definition, in compliance with the terminological rules discussed above. When necessary, the remark option was used to provide additional explanation. The necessity of the remark option is best evidenced by the frequency of its use: out of the total of 1529 terms entered into the database by ANTRONA associates, 981 terms – or 64%! – include some sort of remark. This is a good indicator that explanations such as these should not be considered exceptions, but an integral part of terminology. As we have seen, it is often very difficult to unambiguously define certain concepts and place them within a clear concept system. If information contained in the

explanation is needed to understand the concept, then it should *de facto* be considered constitutive of the overall meaning of the concept. Multiple meanings are a reality and experience clearly points to the need to employ a more flexible and complex approach, which should find a way to combine terminological and lexicographical strategies. Such an approach would, ideally, rely on the terminological foundations, but at the same time respect the existing discursive practices in anthropology. It is important to overcome terminological reductionism which, as we have seen, does not do justice to the semantic and communicative complexity of contemporary anthropological terminology.

Terminology should be defined both onomastically and socially, as a part of contextualized communication, depending on specific situation and culture. Throughout this paper we relied on the twofold distinction of terminological functions as proposed by Cabré Castellví⁵, comprising (1) representation of knowledge, and (2) communication of specialized knowledge. We then discussed some obstacles encountered in the course of the work on building basic (linguistic and socio-cultural) anthropological terminology, which might result as problematic once the product of this terminological endeavor will be applied. We have found that regardless of the aspirations to keep the influence of contextual factors to a minimum

in terminological work, LSP is never produced in a social vacuum and is rather always directed to a certain audience, communicated on a certain occasion, and thus incorporated into a broader context.

In conclusion, we support the need for diversification in the methodology of terminography. More concretely, we argue that, in line with functional-pragmatic approach, the communicative context is of key importance in choosing an appropriate term as well as for interpreting the ones found in a specific (con)text. The ANTRONA project has tried to strike a balance between the often rigid terminological ideals and the main mission of the project: creating a useful and comprehensive set of terms to be used by various user types, from experts and students of anthropology to the general public. Since the success of any terminological endeavour is judged by the level of its acceptance by users, the real results of the ANTRONA project remain to be seen in future.

Acknowledgements

The research for this paper was supported by funding from the Croatian Science Foundation (grant 07.01./22) and the Ministry of Science, Education and Sport of the Republic of Croatia (grant 196-1962766-2743).

REFERENCES

1. UNESCO, Guidelines for Terminology Policies. Formulating and implementing terminology policy in language communities (Infoterm, UNESCO, Paris, 2005). — 2. HUDEČEK L, MIHALJEVIĆ M, Hrvatski terminološki priručnik, (Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, Zagreb, 2010). — 3. CABRÉ MT, Terminology: Theory, methods and applications (John Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, 1999). — 4. ANTIA B, Terminology and Language Planning: An alternative framework of practice and discourse. (John Benjamins, Amsterdam / Philadelphia, 2000). — 5. CABRÉ CASTELLVÍ MT, Terminology, 9 (2003) 163. — 6. WÜSTER E, Einführung in die allgemeine Terminologielehre und terminologische Lexikographie (Springer, Vienna, 1979). — 7. BUDIN G, ITTF Journal 12 (2001) 7. — 8. L'HOMME M C, International Journal of Lexicography 16 (4) (2003) 403. — 9. TEMMERMAN R, Hermes, Journal of Linguistics 18 (1997) 51. — 10. TEMMERMAN R, Towards new ways of terminology description: The Sociocognitive Approach (John Benjamins, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 2000). — 11. TECHNICAL COMMITTEE ISO/TC 37, Terminology work – Principles and methods (ISO 704: 2009). — 12. KVAM, S, Terminology and translation theory: A functional-pragmatic approach. In: Greek Language and Terminology. (ELETO 6th Conference Proceedings, Athens: TEE, 2007). — 13. JERNUDD BH, NEUSTUPNÝ J, Multi-Disciplined Language Planning. In: MARSHALL DF (Ed) Focus on Language Planning: Essays in honour of Joshua A. Fishman (John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1991). — 14. BIRX JH, Encyclopaedia of Anthropology (Thousand Oak, London; Sage, New Delhi 2006). — 15. HAVILAND WA, Cultural Anthropology (Harcourt Brace College Publishers, Fort Worth, 1999). — 16. REDFIELD R, The Little Community and Peasant Society and Culture (University of Chicago Press, 1989). — 17. RIGGS FW, MÁLKIA M, BUDIN G, Descriptive Terminology In the Social Sciences. In: WRIGHT SE, BUDIN G (Eds.) Handbook of Terminology Management: Basic Aspects of Terminology (John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 1997). — 18. NANDA S, WARMS RL, Cultural Anthropology (Thomson Wadsworth, Belmont, 2007). — 19. BARNARD A, SPENCER J, Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology (Routledge, London/New York, 2010). — 20. ASHCROFT B, GRIFFITHS G, TIFFIN H, Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies, (Routledge, London/New York, 2001). — 21. KROEBER AL, KLUCKHOHN C, Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions (Cambridge, Mass. Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, 1952.). — 22. MESIĆ M, Multikulturalizam, (Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 2005). — 23. KYMLICKA W, Multicultural Citizenship (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1999 (1995)). — 24. BARRY B, Kultura i jednakost: egalitarna kritika multikulturalizma (Naklada Jesenski i Turk, Zagreb, 2006). — 25. JOSEPH JE, Language and Identity (Palgrave Macmillan, 2004). — 26. BUCHOLTZ M, HALL K, Language in Society 33 (2004) 501. — 27. JENKINS R, Social identity (Routledge, London/New York, 1996). — 28. HALL S, Introduction: Who Needs Identity? In: HALL S, DU GAY P (Eds): Questions of Cultural Identity (Sage, London, 1996). — 29. BARTH F. 1969. Introduction, In: Barth F (Ed.) Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. *The Social Organization of Cultural Difference* (Little Brown and Co., Boston, 1969). — 30. RIHTMAN-AUGUSTIN D, (Ed.) Simboli identiteta (studije, eseji, grada) (Biblioteka hrvatskog etnološkog društva, Zagreb, 1991). — 31. GRBIĆ J, Narodna umjetnost 41(2) (2004) 235. — 32. JELINČIĆ DA, Etnološka istraživanja 11 (2006) 185. — 33. SUJOLDŽIĆ A, Coll Antropol, 33(4) (2009) 1335. — 34. LEVE L, Current Anthropology, 52(4) (2011) 513. — 35. ABRAHAMSB RB, Narodna umjetnost 19 (1982) 75. — 36. BEN-AMOS D, Narodna umjetnost, 1 (1981) 29. — 37. HYMES D, Breakthrough Into Performance. In: BEN-AMOS D, GOLDSTEIN KS (Eds.) Folklore: Performance and Communication (Mouton, The Hague 1975). — 38. BAUMAN RA, Verbal Art as Performance (Newbury House, Rowley, Mass. 1977). — 39. GOFFMAN E, Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. (Penguin Books, London, 1990 (1959))

J. Lah

*Institute for Anthropological Research, Gajeva 32, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia
e-mail: josip.lah@inantro.hr*

HRVATSKO ANTROPOLOŠKO NAZIVLJE – PROBLEMI I DVOJBE

S A Ž E T A K

Rad opisuje projekt izgradnje temeljnog antropološkog nazivlja ANTRONA koji je dio je nacionalne elektronske baze *Hrvatsko strukovno nazivlje* (STRUNA), posvećene terminologizaciji jezika specijalne namjene u Hrvatskoj. U radu se iznose poteškoće u izradi terminografske baze unutar zadanog klasičnog terminološkog pristupa, a odnose se na široki raspon interdisciplinarnog područja antropologije koje uključuje pojmove iz prirodnih i društveno-humanističkih znanosti, terminološko preklapanje s drugim znanstvenim područjima, polisemiju i sinonime te nejasne granice između rječnika općeg jezika i strukovnih naziva. Kroz prikaz konceptualizacije nekoliko naziva iz područja sociokulturne antropologije preispituju se nedostaci klasičnog terminološkog pristupa. Na temelju iznesenih primjera ukazujemo na potrebu primjene fleksibilnijeg funkcionalno-pragmatičnog pristupa u terminografiji, posebice s obzirom na mogući opseg njezinih primjena koje nisu isključivo ontološke, već i komunikacijske prirode.