

ECONOMIC TERMINOLOGY IN SERBIAN AND CROATIAN – A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF ANGLICISMS

UDC 811.163.41 /.42 '373.45 811.163.41 /.42 '276.6 : 33

Nadežda Silaški

Faculty of Economics, University of Belgrade

Abstract. *The paper comparatively investigates the use of Anglicisms in economic terminology in Serbian and Croatian, focusing on the similarities and differences in their adoption and adaptation to the respective language systems, as well as on their justifiability in this register in both languages. The corpus consists of about 7,000 terms contained in Ekonomski rečnik (2006), published in Serbian, and about 7,000 terms from Ekonomski leksikon (1996), published in Croatian. The analysis shows that Croatian economic terminology, compared to Serbian, is to a much greater extent characterised by the proliferation of Anglicisms. Nevertheless, Serbian and Croatian economic terminologies seem to share several characteristics: an international and a domestic term usually exist in parallel with each other, some of the domestic terms seem to have become "determinologised", while new terms are introduced in a chaotic manner, according to personal preferences of authors.*

Key Words: *Anglicisms, economic terminology, Serbian, Croatian*

1. INTRODUCTION

The ever-increasing international relevance of English as well as its indisputable status of *lingua franca* in the field of commerce, business and finance have left their traces on economic terminology in many European countries. Nevertheless, linguistic research in this area, relative to the importance of this science as well as to its rapid development in recent years, has been scarce, particularly in Serbian.¹

This article comparatively investigates the use of Anglicisms² in economic terminology³ in Serbian and Croatian, focusing on the similarities and differences in their

Received December 9, 2008

¹ See, though, Drljača (2006), Zurita (2005), Hedderich (2003), Silaški (2007) and Silaški (2008).

² Following Prčić (2005), an Anglicism in this paper is defined as a word from English used in Serbian or Croatian, with varying degrees of integration into the system of the receptor language. However, a term will also be considered an Anglicism if its usage "reflects and/or follows the norm of the English language – orthographic, phonological, grammatical, semantic or pragmatic" (Prčić 2005: 59). In other words, *hidden*

adoption and adaptation to the respective language systems, as well as on the justifiability of the existing Anglicisms in this register in both languages. Following Bugarski, terminology is defined here as "a set of terms which represent a system of concepts within a certain field" (Bugarski 1986: 72) – in this case, economics.

Some Serbian and Croatian authors argue in favour of the internationalisation of terminology, claiming that international terms "are not only allowed and possible but also necessary" (Turk 1996: 77, quoted in Drljača 2006: 68), since the parallel existence of a domestic and an international term "allows for functional and stylistic de-stratification of the standard language" (*ibid*) and that scientific terminology, "in order to be truly functional, should aim at external integration, i.e. be to a large extent international" (Bugarski 1986: 87)⁴. Due to the fact that English has become an international language of science, that major developments in the field of economics, accompanied by their original terminology, come from English-speaking countries and that an unprecedentedly large body of scientific literature is published in English, Anglicisms have already gained an international status.⁵ Other authors (e.g. Prčić 2005, Drljača 2006), however, claim that the influx of Anglicisms into domestic terminology is a result of and is rather frequently motivated by some extra-linguistic factors, namely, "the insufficiently founded yet common belief among experts in almost all fields nowadays that only terms originating from English truly and authentically express a certain expert meaning, whereas domestic or naturalised terms are ignored, or, even worse, experts in the field are not even aware of them" (Prčić 2005: 150). Even if some experts are fully aware of the existence of domestic words, they use them reluctantly, demonstrating a rather snobbish insistence on the newly coined anglicised terms.

This article builds upon the findings of previous research on Anglicisms in Serbian economic terminology (Silaški 2007, Silaški 2008), where the following major tendencies in the use of Anglicisms in this field have been outlined and illustrated:

- New terms (those that fill lexical and/or conceptual gaps in Serbian) are introduced in Serbian economic terminology in a chaotic manner. Their creators are guided by their own preferences as regards the adoption or translation of original English terms into Serbian (e.g. *joint venture* has been translated as **zajedničko ulaganje**, but the terms **joint venture** and **džoint venčer** are used in parallel with the domestic term). These preferences are accompanied by the arbitrary adaptation of original terms at phonological, orthographic, morphological, syntactic and semantic levels.

- Hybrid forms (e.g. **currency teorija**, **devizni swap**, **online katalog**, **finansijski leveridž**), in which one element is translated/transshaped while the other one is adopted in its original raw form, have become ubiquitous.

- The already existing domestic or naturalised terms are being increasingly replaced by Anglicisms (mainly hidden ones), or are used in parallel with them (e.g. **indeks rentabilnosti** has been replaced by **indeks profitabilnosti** according to *profitability*

Anglicisms will also be taken into account, namely, words whose meaning and/or use is hidden in the forms of Serbian/Croatian.

³ By the term *economic terminology* we mean the terminology of major economic disciplines, such as marketing, management, international economics, statistics, accounting, econometrics, banking, insurance, etc.

⁴ See also Begović (1996).

⁵ For changes that have occurred in the terminology of some other scientific fields in other European countries, see, among others, Pritchard (1996), Mihaljević (2006), Cabanillas et al. (2007), Dimova (2007).

index, **zadruga** by **kooperativ** according to *cooperatives*, and **vanberzanski promet** by **tržište preko šaltera** according to *over-the-counter market*).

– The adoption of anglicised terms is most often motivated by their creators' urge to mystify the terminology (mystification-driven use of Anglicisms) or to display (often insufficient) knowledge of English (ignorance-driven use of Anglicisms)

– All this has inevitably resulted in non-standardised economic terminology abundant in synonymous terms.

2. WHY COMPARE CROATIAN AND SERBIAN?

Both Serbia and Croatia are undergoing major reforms in business and financial sector, facing numerous changes in the transition economy, which, due to the need for filling lexical or conceptual gaps, has inevitably influenced economic terminology. Although Serbian and Croatian are now separate standards and two official languages in two different countries, there is still close similarity between them, particularly in specialised registers abounding in scientific terms. Croatian is generally perceived in Serbia to be a language which is much more carefully protected from foreign influence than Serbian (at least officially) and that the shift away from foreign words has been and is a matter of national pride.⁶ In addition, there have been complaints from Serbian experts in the field that the terms used in the existing Croatian body of economic literature are not transparent and international enough to be easily recognised and readily comprehended, as Croatian economists prefer domestic to internationalised terms.⁷ Therefore, the starting hypothesis of the research was that Croatian economic terminology is to a much lesser extent characterised by the proliferation of Anglicisms.

The corpus analysed in this comparative study consists of approximately 7,000 key economic terms contained in *Ekonomski rečnik* published in Serbian in 2001 (second edition 2006), containing, as quoted in its foreword, "the basic concepts, key words of important economic disciplines", as well as of almost the same number of entries (7,203) from *Ekonomski leksikon*, published on CD-ROM in Croatian in 1996, which gives "a comprehensive review of economic science and economic disciplines, principles, categories and concepts". Dictionaries and lexicons in general are supposed to provide a prescriptive guide to terminology of any scientific field. It has been proved, however, that practice frequently outstrips theory, resulting in differences between what is prescribed by a renowned reference book, on the one hand, and the actual jargon used by economists, on the other. Nevertheless, these publications currently present the most relevant sources of economic terminology in Serbian and Croatian, thus providing a valid foundation for a comparative analysis.

For the purposes of this study, a corpus-based approach would have allowed both a quantitative and qualitative analysis of terms. However, the frequency of use analysis would have only proved what has already been observed – that both Serbian and Croatian economic terminology have been flooded by Anglicisms.⁸ Beyond sheer numbers, therefore, we were interested in the character and the quality of the English influence on economic terminology – whether Anglicisms are used in their raw or

⁶ See Turk (2008) for a discussion on the history of linguistic borrowing and purism in Croatian.

⁷ Personal communication with subject matter professors from the Faculty of Economics, Belgrade University.

⁸ See Silaški (2007) and Drljača (2006).

adapted form, whether they are used instead of or in parallel with already existing domestic or naturalised terms, as well as whether Croatian shares some other common characteristics with Serbian in this regard.

3. FINDINGS

Due to space constraint, the results will be presented by means of the most salient examples of *terminological pairs* – one term from the Croatian *Ekonomski leksikon* will be contrasted with the term from the Serbian *Ekonomski rečnik* denoting the same concept (verified by their same or similar definition and/or the underlying original English term⁹, which will also be supplied in brackets), to illustrate some major tendencies in the use of Anglicisms¹⁰ in economic terminology in these two languages. The Appendix contains 50 terms which best illustrate these tendencies.

3.1 MERCHANDISING_{CRO} – MERČENDAŽING_{SER} (*merchandising*)

Compared to Serbian, there is a much stronger preference for orthographically zero adapted¹¹ Anglicisms in Croatian, whereas Serbian favours their orthographic adaptation, very few terms being adopted in their original, raw form. In Croatian, this number exceeds one hundred (e.g. **brainstorming**_{CRO} – **brejnstorming**_{SER}, **copyrighter**_{CRO} – **kopirajter**_{SER}, **lobby**_{CRO} – **lobi**_{SER}, **goodwill**_{CRO} – **gudvil**_{SER}, **lock-out**_{CRO} – **lokaut**_{SER}). However, many such raw Anglicisms in Croatian are cross-referred¹³ to orthographically adapted Anglicisms (e.g. **management**_{CRO} is cross-referred to **menadžment**_{CRO}, **manager**_{CRO} →¹⁴ **menadžer**_{CRO}, **leasing**_{CRO} → **lizing**_{CRO}, **dealing**_{CRO} → **diling**_{CRO}, **dumping**_{CRO} → **damping**_{CRO}, **image**_{CRO} → **imidž**_{CRO}). This is "consistent with the Croatian orthographic tradition" (Drljača 2006: 77) according to which "orthography of Anglicism is formed on the basis of the pronunciation of the model" (Filipović 1996: 40). However, there is inconsistency as regards this rule, as many Anglicisms in *Ekonomski leksikon* have been orthographically adapted (e.g. **buking**_{CRO}, **diler**_{CRO}, **džober**_{CRO}, **liflet**_{CRO}, **varanti**_{CRO}, **piket**_{CRO}, etc.). On the other hand, some long-established naturalised terms are for unknown reasons used in their original form (e.g. **clearing**_{CRO}).

3.2 MARKETINŠKI MIKS_{CRO} – MARKETING MIKS_{SER} (*marketing mix*)

The above example illustrates the missing secondary morphological adaptation of terms in Serbian, which has already been performed in Croatian, namely expanding the

⁹ In both publications, each entry contains the following information: (1) the name of the term; (2) its original English name (not all the entries!), and (3) its definition in Serbian and Croatian, respectively.

¹⁰ For the purpose of this analysis, we have taken into account only "new" Anglicisms, those which have entered Serbian and Croatian only recently, together with new technologies and new developments in the field of business and economics. "Old" Anglicisms, those which have already been fully adapted, adopted and incorporated into these two languages and are originally mainly Latinisms, have been excluded from the analysis.

¹¹ The process of adaptation of Anglicisms to receptor languages has been thoroughly described by Filipović (1996).

¹² Henceforth, orthographic conventions are as follows: **bold** is used for terms taken from *Ekonomski rečnik* and *Ekonomski leksikon*, in Serbian (**term**_{SER}) and Croatian (**term**_{CRO}) respectively. *Italics* are used for original English terms as well as for the definitions of the entries in the two publications.

¹³ We shall return to the phenomenon of cross-referring in *Ekonomski leksikon* somewhat later in the text.

¹⁴ Henceforth, the symbol → stands for "cross-referred to".

word class by means of the appropriate suffixation processes.¹⁵ It may seem that the authors of *Ekonomski leksikon* are more aware than their counterparts in Serbia of their function as "linguistic role models" (Hedderich 2003: 49), as dictionaries should serve the purpose of standardising newly introduced terms. This can be illustrated by several other examples: **neorikardovci**_{CRO} – **neorikardijanci**_{SER} (morphological adaptation according to the English model in Serbian), **antidampinške carine**_{CRO} – **antidamping zaštita**_{SER}, **kreditno rangiranje**_{CRO} – **kredit rejting**_{SER}, **analiza portfelja**_{CRO}, which is cross-referred from **portfolio analiza**_{CRO}, the term present in Serbian *Ekonomski rečnik* as well. However, this is contradicted by occasional inconsistency throughout the Croatian corpus (e.g. **bonusne dionice**_{CRO} but **bonus sustav**_{CRO}).

3.3 MORTGAGE_{CRO} – HIPOTEKA_{SER} (*mortgage*)

A large number of terms in Croatian *Ekonomski leksikon* are used in their original English form, so much so that this reference book occasionally reminds one of an English-Croatian economic dictionary. This is done despite the fact that there is a domestic or naturalised term readily available in Croatian. Bearing in mind its French origin and unusual spelling, one shudders to think of the infinite ways in which the word *mortgage*, phonologically and orthographically unadapted, could be pronounced by Croatian non-speakers of English! For a large number of such raw Anglicisms, a domestic or a naturalised word is used in Serbian, for example: **call-opcija**_{CRO} – **kupovna opcija**_{SER}, **collateral**_{CRO} – **zaloga**_{SER}, **copyright**_{CRO} – **autorsko pravo**_{SER}, **predatory pricing**_{CRO} – **grabežljivo utvrđivanje cena**_{SER}, etc.

3.4 POLUGA_{CRO} – LEVERIDŽ_{SER} (*leverage*)

The opposite case is when Croatian uses a domestic or naturalised term, while Serbian either employs a raw or an orthographically adapted Anglicism. However, a derived term **leveraged buyout (LBO)**_{CRO} is cross-referred to a long paraphrase, not suitable for being used as a term, namely **preuzimanje poduzeća uz pomoć aktive preuzetog poduzeća**_{CRO}. In *Ekonomski rečnik*, however, the term for the same concept is **leveridž otkup**_{SER}, which is, in our opinion, fully justified¹⁶ as it is more economical than the Croatian long paraphrase and it is certainly introduced into terminology to fill a lexical gap. When the domestic word does not conform to one of the most basic principles of coining terms, that of *brevity*, the introduction of Anglicisms is a legitimate way of enriching terminology with new terms. However, there are examples of terms in *Ekonomski rečnik* where the use of Anglicisms is fully unjustified: **popis adresa**_{CRO} – **mejling lista**_{SER}, **lovac na glave**_{CRO} – **hedhanter**_{SER}, **vezana trgovina**_{CRO} – **countertrade**_{SER}, **odnosi s javnošću**_{CRO} – **public relations**_{SER}, **plaćanje prema zaradi**_{CRO} – **pay-as-you-earn**_{SER}, etc.

¹⁵ For a more detailed analysis of the NOUN+NOUN structures in Croatian as a result of English influence see Starčević (2006).

¹⁶ Both terms are taken from Prčić (2005), who offers a justifiability scale of Anglicisms in Serbian, ranging from *fully justified* to *fully unjustified*.

3.5 PRIME RATE_{CRO} – PRIME RATE_{SER} (*prime rate*)

In both languages there is a large number of fully unjustified or unjustified Anglicisms, used despite the fact that there already is a domestic or naturalised word or expression available for the English one, that they do not serve to fill a lexical or a conceptual gap, as well as the fact that it is possible to translate English content into Serbian/Croatian, without being stuck with a long and cumbersome paraphrase. Such terms, accepted from English in their original form, are mainly incomprehensible to non-speakers of English, which leaves them out of the communication. Moreover, the authors of *Ekonomski rečnik* and *Ekonomski leksikon* who named the term by using an English word, then go on to use the domestic word to define the term, confirming by themselves that their preference for an Anglicism stems from two different motivations. The first motivation is an attempt to preserve the internationality and transparency of the terminology. However, the second kind of motivation is based on the fact that nowadays, both in Serbian and Croatian, "the symbolic function of Anglicisms has become as important if not more important than their informative/denotative function" (Piper 2003: 5)¹⁷, which shows, on the other hand, that the anglicised terms are not always used because they are objectively superior to the domestic ones. The above term, *prime rate*, is defined in Serbian as *referentna stopa*, while in Croatian it is defined as *prvorazredni kamatnjak*. Several other most salient examples follow, with a domestic word or expression, used to define the term, in brackets: **overdraft** (*prekoračenje*)_{CRO} – **overdraft** (*prekoračenje*)_{SER}, **piggyback marketing** (*priključeni marketing*)_{CRO} – **piggyback poslovi** (*partnerski aranžmani*)_{SER}, **market maker** (*stvaratelj tržišta*)_{CRO} – **market making** (*pravljenje tržišta*)_{SER}, etc.

3.6 PROVIZIJA_{CRO} – KOMISIJA_{SER} (*commission*)

In *Ekonomski rečnik* there is a significant number of terms which clearly reflect unawareness on the part of the term creators of false friends in English and Serbian. This is manifested in terms such as **komisija**_{SER} instead of *provizija* (*commission*), **industrijski sindikat**_{SER} instead of *granski sindikat* (*industry union*), **investicioni poreski kredit**_{SER} instead of *poreske olakšice na incestiranje* (*investment tax credit*), **delegiranje autoriteta**_{SER} instead of *prenos ovlašćenja* (*delegating authority*), **kreditno pismo**_{SER} instead of *akreditiv* (*letter of credit*), **rojalitet**_{SER} instead of *tantijeme* (*royalty*), etc. The existing corresponding terms in *Ekonomski leksikon* illustrate that this tendency, observed in Serbian terminology, is not characteristic of Croatian economic terminology (*provizija*_{CRO}, *akreditiv*_{CRO}, *tantijema*_{CRO}, *porezna olakšica za investicije*_{CRO}).

3.7 SUNK COST_{CRO} → NEPOVRATNI TROŠKOVI_{CRO} – SUNK TROŠKOVI_{SER} (*sunk costs*)

Both in *Ekonomski rečnik* and *Ekonomski leksikon* there are terms which seem very difficult to translate into Serbian and Croatian, respectively. One of such terms is *sunk cost*, which has a number of translation equivalents in both languages, all of which are given a separate entry. This illustrates non-standardised economic terminology, as well as the fact that the basic characteristic of a term – its *non-synonymy* – is violated in this

¹⁷ A similar view is shared by Drljača (2006: 67).

way. Examples of "double" or even "triple" entries abound in both publications: **potopljeni troškovi**_{CRO} + **neizbježivi troškovi**_{CRO} + **nepovratni troškovi**_{CRO}, **natjecanje**_{CRO} + **konkurencija**_{CRO} (*competition*), **mala privreda**_{CRO} + **mali biznis**_{CRO} (*small business*), **povlaštene dionice**_{CRO} → **preferencijalne dionice**_{CRO} + **prioritetne dionice**_{CRO} + **privilegirane dionice**_{CRO}, **sunk troškovi**_{SER} + **neotklonjivi troškovi**_{SER} + **nepovratan trošak**_{SER} (*sunk costs*), **maloprodaja bez prodavnice**_{SER} + **maloprodaja bez lokacije**_{SER} (*non-store retailing*), **preferencijalne akcije**_{SER} + **prioritetne akcije**_{SER} + **povlašćene akcije**_{SER}, etc.

3.8 FREE RIDER_{CRO} → SLOBODNI JAHAC_{CRO} – BESPLATNI JAHAC_{SER} (*free rider*)

The above terminological pair illustrates the process of calquing, or loan translation, which is one of the most productive processes of translating English terms into Serbian and Croatian. Unfortunately, in this process there could be pitfalls which arise from the insufficient knowledge of English and result in wrongly translated terms. The English term *free rider* has been translated both into Serbian and Croatian in a superficial manner, without taking into account the complete meaning of the term, but only by strict adherence to the most basic (and, according to poor speakers of English, the only) meaning of its constituent parts. *Free rider* is neither *slobodan* nor *jahač* – the most appropriate translation equivalent would be *slepi putnik*, the one who "accepts a benefit or service that other people pay for or have worked to get". Other examples include: **neparne cene**_{SER} and **neparne cijene**_{CRO} (*odd pricing*) instead of *nezaokružene cene*, **vruć novac**_{SER} and **vruć novac**_{CRO} (*hot money*), etc.

4. CROSS-REFERRING AS A TOOL OF DE-ANGLICISATION

The perception of Croatian as a language much more carefully protected from foreign influence than Serbian, generally held in Serbia, turns out to be correct if a very useful procedure is taken into account – cross-referring of several types observed in *Ekonomski leksikon*. The first, already mentioned type, occurs when an original English term is cross-referred to a domestic term. Thus, **callable bonds**_{CRO} is cross-referred to **otkupive vrijednosnice**_{CRO}, **short sale**_{CRO} → **kratka prodaja**_{CRO}, **merger**_{CRO} → **fuzija**_{CRO}, **lifetime employment**_{CRO} → **doživotno zaposlenje**_{CRO}, **price distortion**_{CRO} → **odstupanje cijena**_{CRO}, **settlement day**_{CRO} → **dan namire**_{CRO}, **yield curve**_{CRO} → **krivulja prinosa**_{CRO}, etc. Another type of cross-referring in Croatian is when a cross-reference is made from a hidden Anglicism to a domestic word, e.g. **balansirani razvoj**_{CRO} → **uravnoteženi razvoj**_{CRO} (*balanced growth*), **agregatni indeks**_{CRO} → **skupni indeks**_{CRO} (*aggregate index*), **nedodirljiva imovina**_{CRO} → **nematerijalna imovina**_{CRO} (*intangible assets*), **volumen trgovine**_{CRO} → **obujam trgovine**_{CRO} (*trade volume*), **prelomna točka**_{CRO} → **prag rentabilnosti**_{CRO} (*breakeven point*), etc. This procedure illustrates the fact that "a critical attitude towards loanwords has been a feature of Croatian since the dawn of its literacy and has marked its whole history" (Turk/Opašić 2008: 83).

However, the opposite type of cross-referring is also observed in Croatian when, strangely enough, a cross-reference is made from a domestic word to a hidden Anglicism, the one that, although it looks and sounds Croatian, is actually the result of the influence of English (Prčić 2005: 121-122). For example, **posredna dobra**_{CRO} is cross-referred to

intermedijarna dobra_{CRO} (according to *intermediary goods*), **neraspoređena dobit**_{CRO} → **zadržani dobiti**_{CRO} (*retained earnings*), **odobrene obveznice**_{CRO} → **autorizirane obveznice**_{CRO} (*authorised bonds*), **dražba**_{CRO} → **aukcija**_{CRO} (*auction*), **privredni ciklus**_{CRO} → **poslovni ciklus**_{CRO} (*business cycle*), **neformalno tržište**_{CRO} → **OTC-tržište**_{CRO}, etc.

In Serbian *Ekonomski rečnik* there are no cross-references, most probably due to the print character of the publication, compared to a more modern medium, CD-ROM, which allows infinite cross-referring with minimal effort or waste of time and space. However, a similar phenomenon may still be observed in Serbian – synonymous terms are each given a separate entry, being defined in a similar way. This reflects different preferences that the authors of *Ekonomski rečnik* have regarding the choice between a domestic word and the adoption of an Anglicism. Thus, for example, two different entries exist for the English term *merger*, **udruživanje**_{SER} and **merdžer**_{SER}. There follow some other examples: **bonitet**_{SER} + **kredit rejting**_{SER} (*credit rating*), **ortačko društvo**_{SER} + **partnersko preduzeće**_{SER} (*partnership*), **analiza dobavljača**_{SER} + **vendor analiza**_{SER} (*vendor analysis*), etc. Sometimes there are even three terms available for the same concept (e.g. **neotklonjivi troškovi**_{SER} + **sunk troškovi**_{SER} + **nepovratan trošak**_{SER} (*sunk costs*), **tender**_{SER}, **konkurs**_{SER}, **ponude**_{SER} (*tender*), etc.

5. CONCLUSION

Judging from the corpus, there is a number of differences between Serbian and Croatian economic terminology. However, they also share several characteristics. What follows is a list of major tendencies comparatively observed in Croatian and Serbian:

- In Croatian there is a much stronger preference for orthographically zero adapted Anglicisms, while Serbian favours their orthographic adaptation.
- In Croatian, the secondary morphological adaptation of terms, missing in Serbian, has in many cases already been performed.
- In Croatian a large number of terms are used in their original English form, despite the fact that there is a domestic or naturalised term readily available in Croatian. In Serbian, such terms are usually orthographically adapted.
- In Serbian, there is a significant number of terms which are introduced in economic terminology disregarding false friends in English and Serbian. This tendency, observed in Serbian, is not characteristic of Croatian economic terminology.
- In both languages there are terms which are translated from English in a cursory and superficial fashion, illustrating the insufficient knowledge of English on the part of their creators.
- For many terms in both languages there are several translation equivalents, all of which are given a separate entry, which illustrates non-standardised economic terminology and the violation of one of the basic characteristic of a term – its *non-synonymy*.
- An international and a domestic term usually exist in parallel with each other, competing for survival.
- Some of the domestic terms, both in Serbian and Croatian, seem to have somehow depreciated and become "determinologised" in the process of the loosening of

their terminological meaning. Namely, according to Meyer and Mackintosh (2000: 112), "when a term captures the interest of the general public [...] a lexical item that was once confined to a fixed meaning within a specialized domain is taken up in general language" through the process of *de-terminologisation*. It seems as though Serbian and Croatian economists believe that domestic terms have become "worn out" and no longer "deserve" to be used within economic terminology. It seems as though the time has come to regard such terms as being reserved only for laypeople, and, consequently, to "replace" them with terms which are more "scientific" and more "expert" – Anglicisms.

In conclusion, our findings contradict what Drljača says about economic Anglicisms in Croatian, namely that "there have been attempts to control a huge flood of borrowings, to find adequate domestic replacements, to adapt them to the Croatian language rules, as well as to warn of cases of their non-adaptation" (Drljača 2006: 81). They also contradict Muhvić-Dimanovski's opinion that dictionaries in Croatian serve as guardians of the language standard (Muhvić-Dimanovski 1986: 497, quoted in Drljača 2006: 69), as the language standard certainly does not allow borrowings for which there are domestic words available. Therefore, the starting hypothesis of this research that Croatian economic terminology is to a much lesser extent characterised by the proliferation of Anglicisms, has proved to be incorrect.

Anglicisms are ubiquitous both in Serbian and Croatian business and economic terminology and both languages seem to be losing their capacity of generating new terms. Such a large number of Anglicisms (adapted and adopted in an arbitrary manner) threatens to completely marginalise domestic terminologies. Without any intention of advocating linguistic purity, particularly in the realm of scientific terminology, we still argue that a certain degree of de-anglicising is necessary if economics as a science is to have its autochthonous Serbian or Croatian jargon.

REFERENCES

1. Ćimović, S. et al, (2001), *Ekonomski rečnik*, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Ekonomski fakultet (2nd edition 2006).
2. Begović, B., (1996), "Prevođenje novih termina ekonomske nauke: slučaj kontestabilnosti", In: Vinaver, N. et al. (eds.): *Standardizacija terminologije*, 67-74, Beograd, Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti.
3. Bugarški, R., (1986), *Lingvistika u primeni*, Beograd, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.
4. de la Cruz Cabanillas, I., (2007), "English loanwords in Spanish computer language", *English for Specific Purposes* 26, 52-78.
5. Dimova, S., (2007), "English, the Internet and computer terminology in Macedonia", *World Englishes* 26/3, 373-387.
6. Drljača, B., (2006), "Anglizmi u ekonomskome nazivlju hrvatskoga jezika i standardnojezična norma", *Fluminensia* 18/2, 65-85.
7. Baletić, Z., (ed.), (1996), *Ekonomski leksikon*, CD-ROM, Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, Masmedia.
8. Filipović, R., (1996), "English as a word donor to other languages of Europe", In: *The English Language in Europe*, ed. Reinhard Hartmann, 37-47, Oxford, Intellect.
9. Hedderich, N., (2003), "Language Change in Business German", In: Christiane E. Keck and Allen G. Wood (eds.): *Global Business Languages*, W. Lafayette, IND, Purdue Research Foundation, 47-55.
10. Meyer, I. and K. Mackintosh, (2000), "When terms move into our everyday lives: An overview of de-terminologization", *Terminology* 6(1), 111-138.
11. Mihaljević, M., (2006), "Hrvatsko i englesko računalno nazivlje", *Jezik* 53/2, 41- 80.

12. Piper, P., (2003), "O 'međurežimskim' jezičkim ekvivalentima i paralelama", *Jezik danas*, br. 17, Godina VII, 1–4.
13. Prčić, T., (2005), *Engleski u srpskom*, Novi Sad, Zmaj.
14. Pritchard, B., (1996), "Anglicizmi u poslovnim komunikacijama u hrvatskom pomorstvu", *Suvremena lingvistika* 41–42/1-2, 529–543.
15. Silaški, N., (2007), "Language in transition – of mergers, leverages and customisations", Proceedings of the International Conference *Contemporary challenges of theory and practice in economics*, 26–29 September 2007, Belgrade, Faculty of Economics.
16. Silaški, N., (2008), "Anglicisms as an integral part of Serbian business and economic terminology", Proceedings of the International Conference *English language and literature studies: structures across cultures* (ELLSSAC). 7–9 December 2007, Faculty of Philology, University of Belgrade, Serbia.
17. Starčević, A., (2006), "Imenice kao atributi – nove strukture u hrvatskom jeziku", *Jezik i mediji – jedan jezik, više svijetova*, HDPL, Zagreb-Split.
18. Turk, M., (1996), "Jezični purizam", *Fluminensia* 1–2, 63–79.
19. Turk, M., M. Opašić, (2008), "Linguistic Borrowing and Purism in the Croatian Language", *Suvremena lingvistika* 65/1, 73–88.
20. Zurita, P. L., (2005), "Economic anglicisms: adaptation to the Spanish linguistic system", *Ibérica* 10, 91–114.

APPENDIX

English term	CROATIAN	SERBIAN
1. <i>aggregate index</i>	agregatni indeks → skupni indeks	agregatni indeksi + kompozitni indeksi + grupni indeksi
2. <i>boom</i>	boom → bum	Bum
3. <i>call option</i>	call-opcija	call opcija + kupovna opcija
4. <i>exchange rate target zones</i>	ciljane zone za devizne tečajeve	targetna zona
5. <i>clearing</i>	Clearing	Kliring
6. <i>swap</i>	devizni swap	devizni swap
7. <i>forward</i>	Forward	forward + terminski ugovor
8. <i>zfranchising</i>	davanje franšiza → franchising	Franšizing
9. <i>breakeven point</i>	donja mrtva točka + prijelomna točka → prag rentabilnosti	prelomna tačka
10. <i>forfeiting</i>	Forfaiting	Forfeting
11. <i>free rider</i>	free rider → slobodni jahač	besplatni jahač
12. <i>futures</i>	Futures	Fjučers
13. <i>hedging</i>	Hedging	Hedžing
14. <i>joint venture</i>	joint venture → zajedničko ulaganje	džoint venčer + joint venture + zajedničko ulaganje
15. <i>clearing house</i>	klirinška kuća → obračunska kuća	klirinška kuća
16. <i>know how</i>	know how + znanje i umijeće	know how
17. <i>credit rating</i>	kreditno rangiranje	kredit rejting
18. <i>leasing</i>	leasing → lizing	Lizing
19. <i>leveraged buyout</i>	leveraged buyout → preuzimanje poduzeća uz pomoć aktive preuzetog poduzeća	leveridž otkup
20. <i>human capital</i>	ljudski kapital	humani kapital + ljudski kapital

English term	CROATIAN	SERBIAN
21. <i>management buyout</i>	management buy out → menadžerski otkup	menadžment otkup
22. <i>marketing ethics</i>	marketinška etika	marketing etika
23. <i>marketing manager</i>	marketinški menadžeri → rukovoditelji marketinga	marketing menadžer
24. <i>merchandising</i>	Merchandising	merčendajzing
25. <i>merger</i>	merger → fuzija + amalgamacija + spajanje	merdžer + udruživanje
26. <i>mortgage</i>	Mortgage	Hipoteka
27. <i>non-tariff barriers</i>	necarinska zaštita	netarifne barijere + vancarinska zaštita
28. <i>OTC (over-the-counter) market</i>	neformalno tržište → OTC-tržište	tržište preko šaltera + vanberzanski promet
29. <i>cost drivers</i>	nositelji troškova	izazivači troškova + pokretači troškova+ nosioci troškova + uzročnici troškova
30. <i>public relations</i>	odnosi s javnošću	public relations
31. <i>offshore industry</i>	odobalna industrija	ofšor industrija
32. <i>offshore company</i>	offshore kompanija	off-shore kompanija
33. <i>participating preferred stock</i>	participativne povlaštene dionice	participativna preferencijalna akcija
34. <i>partnership</i>	partnerstvo → ortaštvo	partnersko preduzeće + ortačko društvo
35. <i>pay-as-you-earn</i>	plaćanje prema zaradi	pay-as-you-earn
36. <i>mailing list</i>	popis adresa	mejling lista
37. <i>investment tax credit</i>	porezna olakšica za investicije	investicioni poreski kredit
38. <i>intermediate goods</i>	posredna dobra → intermedijarna dobra	intermedijarna dobra
39. <i>portfolio analysis</i>	portfolio analiza → analiza portfolija	portfolio analiza
40. <i>predatory pricing</i>	predatory pricing	predatorske cene + grabežljivo određivanje cena
41. <i>prime rate</i>	prime rate	prime rate
42. <i>commission</i>	Provizija	Komisija
43. <i>put option</i>	put opcija	put opcija + prodajna opcija
44. <i>spot market</i>	spot devizno tržište	spot tržište + promptno devizno tržište
45. <i>switching</i>	switch-posao	svič poslovi
46. <i>sunk costs</i>	sunk cost → nepovratni troškovi + potopljeni troškovi + neizbježivi troškovi	sunk troškovi + neotklonjivi troškovi + nepovratan trošak
47. <i>technological gap</i>	tehnološki jaz	tehnološki gep
48. <i>rent seeking</i>	traganje za rentom	rent seeking + traženje rente
49. <i>sole trader</i>	tvrtka u pojedinačnom vlasništvu	trgovac-pojedinac + mali trgovac + lično preduzeće
50. <i>warrants</i>	warrants → varanti	Varanti

**TERMINOLOGIJA EKONOMSKE NAUKE
U SRPSKOM I HRVATSKOM JEZIKU –
KOMPARATIVNA ANALIZA ANGLICIZAMA**

Nadežda Silaški

U radu se komparativno istražuje upotreba anglicizama u ekonomskoj terminologiji u srpskom i hrvatskom jeziku. Bavimo se sličnostima i razlikama u njihovom usvajanju i adaptaciji na jezičke sisteme ova dva jezika, kao i njihovom opravdanošću u ekonomskom registru. Korpus se sastoji iz oko 7000 termina iz Ekonomskog rečnika objavljenog na srpskom, i oko 7000 termina iz Ekonomskog leksikona objavljenog na hrvatskom jeziku. Analiza pokazuje da je hrvatska ekonomska terminologija u poređenju sa srpskom pod većim uticajem engleskog jezika. Uprkos tome, srpska i hrvatska ekonomska terminologija imaju nekoliko zajedničkih karakteristika: međunarodni i domaći termini često se koriste uporedo, pojedini domaći termini postali su neopravdano determinologizovani, dok se novi termini uvode haotično, u skladu sa ličnim preferencijama autora.

Ključne reči: anglicizmi, ekonomska terminologija, srpski, hrvatski