

## Miška vs. Mausu:

# Secondary Inter-lingual Term Formation in the Slovenian and Japanese Languages<sup>1)</sup>

SETHNA Jelisava



**Key words:** 専門用語、言語計画、言語態度、スロヴェニア語  
terminology, language planning, language attitudes, Slovenian

### Abstract

Comparing the prevalent strategies which occur in the transfer of terminology from English into the Slovenian and Japanese languages, two very distinct trends can be observed: the creation of native terminology in the form of translation and neologisms in Slovenian and transliteration into katakana in Japanese. This paper presents the main patterns of secondary term formation in the two languages and discusses the socio-linguistic factors, such as language planning and language attitudes, which may influence the development of such strategies.

## 1. Introduction

In the last few decades, science and technology have made great strides. New concepts and objects are constantly created which need to be defined and named. The original, primary term formation mainly is taking place in the English-speaking world, with the US leading the way. When concepts and objects are transferred to other linguistic communities, a need arises for the second term formation in the receiving language. Individual linguistic communities employ different strategies in the transfer of terminology. At the beginning a very common way is the citing of original terms (direct borrowing) which may lead to adaptation borrowing, loan translation or complete new creation, among others. These methods of secondary inter-lingual term formation often co-exist, which may give rise to several alternative or competing new terms before a terminology stabilizes. Preference for a specific type of strategy may eventually emerge. Thus, in the Slovenian language, there is a very clear tendency to create and use native terminology, the strategy generally propagated and supported by Slovenian linguists and language planners. In the Japanese language, on the other hand, imported terminology, particularly in the IT field, is often simply transliterated using katakana phonetic script. In recent years, the so-called *katakanago* imported words have flooded the Japanese language, a phenomenon, which some linguists describe as the *katakana* revolution.

What influences the employment of such distinct strategies? This paper discusses socio-linguistic constraints that are presumed to have a bearing on the development of terminology in the Slovenian and Japanese languages. In the first part, the most common strategies employed in the transfer of terminology in the two languages are introduced. The second part of the paper discusses the influence of language policy and planning on the formation and promotion of such strategies.

## 2. Term Formation

Terminology is the study of terms. Terms are defined as lexical items, which belong to specialized areas of usage, such as science and technology. Sager (1990) defines terminology as a number of practices that have evolved around the creation of terms, their collection and explication. He sees terminology as an interdisciplinary activity linked with other sciences, such as lexicography and applied linguistics — particularly ESP, information science, philosophy, psychology and linguistics.

In the creation of terms, Sager (1990) distinguishes between primary and secondary term formation. Primary term formation occurs when a newly created concept has to be named. Initially, provisionally named terms occur in scientific position papers or theses

with stipulative definitions. When a term becomes definitive, it has to be accompanied by a full definition which links the new term to existing ones in a given knowledge structure. Secondary term formation occurs as a result of the monolingual revision of a given terminology or a transfer of knowledge to another linguistic community, which requires the creation of new terms in the target language. The fundamental difference between primary and secondary term formation lies in the fact that in primary term formation there is no linguistic precedent whereas in secondary term formation there is always the precedent of an existing term, with its own motivation, in another language. Moreover, secondary term formation is more often subject to guidelines than primary term formation. Terminologists provide such guidelines on the basis of patterns of term and word formation, which are already prevalent in the subject field and natural language in question. In technology, both primary and secondary term formation suffer from a heavy proliferation of variant forms and synonyms. These may be either accidental, because of parallel developments, or deliberate when there is a need for popular versions of scientific terms, for example. Moreover, technological terminology is volatile due to constant changes in materials, methods of production, and design, even more so in secondary term formation where knowledge is transferred from one language to another and new terms are created in the target language.

## 2. 1. Patterns of Term Formation

Sager (1990) defines three basic patterns of term formation: the use of existing resources, the modification of existing resources, and the creation of new linguistic entities (p.71). When using existing resources, the meaning of the existing term is extended to a new concept, often by such rhetorical figures as metaphor or simile. Simile helps to define a concept by some easy means of comparison (“a rock-like substance”), while metaphor defines a new concept in terms of a simple, well-known word (“mouse”, “desktop”, “virus”). Meyer (2000) claims that metaphors are very common in IT terminology and suggests that computer related terminology is consistent with the anti-authoritarian, informal, playful character of cyberculture. She believes that metaphors are user-friendly and help to reduce technostress, but can also be a great source of translation problems because of their cultural implications.

In modification of existing resources, the most common methods are derivation or affixation, compounding, conversion and compression. Derivation and compounding serve the purpose of closer determination of a concept, while at the same time showing the relationship that exists between the new concept and its origin, e.g. “desktop”, “double-click”, “clip art”. Conversion involves the change of word category without morphological alteration, such as from a noun to a verb or vice-versa, e.g. “load”, “design”, “form”. New

terms can also be created by various forms of compression of existing expressions. This includes acronyms, e.g. IBM, Bit, IP, clipping or shortening in which syllables or letters are omitted from any part of the word, e.g. "lab", "vet". A particular case is that of compounding and simultaneous clipping, e.g. "bionic" = biological + electronic. This form is particularly popular in Japanese where katakana compounds are shortened to four-syllable words, for example *pasokon* "personal computer", *rimokon* "remote control".

Neologisms involve creation of new lexical entities. Regarding their form, there are basically two types: they are either totally new creations or they are borrowings from other languages. English, for example, relies heavily on borrowing elements from Greek and Latin, which are variously anglicized. In Japanese, a lot of borrowings in the past came from China. At present, English is the main source language of Japanese loanwords. In Slovenian, words of Greek and Latin origin are borrowed, e.g. *televizija*, *radio*, whereas modern technological terms of English origin are routinely translated.

## 2. 2. Guidelines for the creation of terms

The International Organization for Standardization (ISO 704, 1985) provides guidance on the creation of terms, as follows: A term should be linguistically correct, accurate, concise, monosemous, and it should easily permit the formation of derivatives (p.12). This means that terms should be lexically systematic and should conform to the phonological and morphological rules of the language. They should reflect some key features of the concepts in order to facilitate precise reference to avoid polysemy. They should be economical, which favors short, single-word words, rather than compounds (e.g. slo. *prenosni računalnik* "portable computer" > *prenosnik* "laptop", jap. *paasonaru kompyutaa* "personal computer" > *pasokon* "computer". At the same time, they should allow for easy formation of derivatives. Also, the meaning of a term should be recognizable independently of any specific context and, once accepted, a term should not be changed without compelling reasons and a strong certainty that the new term will become accepted as a full substitute.

## 2. 3. Patterns of Secondary Term Formation

The most common methods of secondary inter-lingual term formation are borrowing (direct and adapted), loan translation, and complete new creation. Table 1 gives examples of the Slovenian and Japanese equivalents of English computer terms to illustrate the most common patterns of secondary term formation in the respective languages.

Comparing the English term equivalents in the Slovenian and Japanese languages, it can be concluded that loan translation and new word creation are the prevalent methods of secondary term formation in the Slovenian language. In the Japanese language, on the

**Table 1 Examples of Slovenian and Japanese equivalents of English computer terms**

English	Slovenian	Japanese	
		katakana	roomaji
computer	računalnik	パソコン	pasokon
mouse	miška	マウス	mausu
e-mail	e-pošta	電子メール	denshimeiru
hardware	strojna oprema	ハードウエア	haadouea
memory	pomnilnik	メモリ	memori
blog	spletnik	ブログ	burogu
install	namestiti	インストールする	insutooru suru

other hand, the most typical way is the ortho-phonologically adapted borrowing.

### 3. Slovenian Language

#### 3. 1. A Short Overview

The Slovenian language is a Slavonic language and is spoken in Slovenia and adjacent enclaves in Austria (Carinthia), Italy (Friuli-Venezia-Gulia), and Hungary (the Raba river basin). It is a native language of almost two million Slovenians and is also spoken by approximately 400,000 speakers in emigrant communities in the USA, Canada, Argentina, Australia, Germany and France, among others. It was one of the official languages in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia before its disintegration in 1991, when it became the official language of the independent Republic of Slovenia. When Slovenia joined the EU in 2004, it also became one of the official languages of the EU.

Slovenian is a highly inflectional language. Inflective word classes include nouns, adjectives, and pronouns, as well as verbs. Nouns are divided into three grammatical genders (masculine, feminine, neutral), have six cases and usually three numbers (singular dual, plural).

#### 3. 2. Word Formation in Slovenian

The most widely used means of word formation in Slovenian are affixation (derivation) and various types of compounding. Loanwords are as a rule quickly adapted in Slovenian, so that they decline appropriately and are "Slovenicised" in terms of pronunciation and spelling, e.g. *menedžer* "manager", *heker* "hacker". From these new words are formed using Slovenian word-formational elements: e.g. *hekerski* "of hackers". Deaffixation, where a word is truncated, is also encountered and mainly affects verbs, e.g. *prenos* "transmission" < *prenašati* "to transmit". In recent years, the need for filling

nomenclative gaps in scientific and academic fields (i.e. terminology) has made the Slovenian language really vibrant, whereby foreign (mainly English) terminology was first borrowed and then gradually replaced by the creation of its own, native terminology.

### **3. 3. Analysis of Secondary, Interlingual Term Formations in the Slovenian language**

In the Slovenian language, methods of secondary inter-lingual term formation include borrowing, loan translation (calquing) and creation of new words (neologisms). Gorjanc (1998) summarizes the most common patterns of secondary term formation in Slovenian, as follows:

#### **3. 3. 1. Borrowing**

The first step in the transfer of a new term is direct borrowing whereby the term is cited in its original form. Direct borrowings are temporary and allow for new, native words to replace them with time. In the Slovenian language, the names of some function keys remain unchanged, e.g. Alt (key), Delete (key), Home (key).

The second step is adaptation whereby a borrowed word undergoes orthographic, phonological and morphological assimilation to the receiving language. This method is an important source of enrichment of Slovenian computer terminology. In early texts, the base is not nativised, e.g. *twitterjati* "to twit", *hackerski* "of hacker". Such words are later replaced by native terms or adapted to the ortho-phonological system of the Slovenian language, i.e. *tvitati*, *hekerski*. Affixation to a foreign base has gradually fallen out of practice, which means that the process of adaptation has become a condition for secondary term formation in Slovenian.

#### **3. 3. 2. Loan Translation**

Loan translation has become a preferable way of secondary term formation in recent years, whereby an English term is replaced by a Slovenian equivalent, e.g. *okno* "window", *stolpec* "column", *miška* "mouse".

#### **3. 3. 3. Creation of New Words (Neologisms)**

Neologisms are newly created words that replace a borrowed word. In the Slovenian language, the function represents the main motive for a new term formation, e.g. *usmerjevalnik* "router", from *usmerjati* "to direct, to channel"; *pomikalnik* "scroll bar", from *pomikati* "to move"; *odložišče* "clipboard", from *odlagati* "to deposit".

Neologisms often occur among verbs, since English verbs offer less inducement for direct translation than nouns, e.g. *onemogočiti* – *opustiti*; *opustitev* "to abort" *očistiti*–

*odstraniti, odstranitev* “to clear”.

Compound neologisms may be further reduced into a single word; *notesni računalnik* > *notesnik* “notebook computer”, *mobilni telefon* > *mobilnik* “mobile telephone”, *brizgalni tiskalnik* > *brizgalnik* “ink-jet printer”. It is interesting to observe that non-reduced neologisms *strojna oprema* “hardware” and *programska oprema* “software” are preferred to the shorter borrowed words *hardver* and *softver*, defying the terminology rule of economy (see Corpus Gigafida for word frequency).

## 4. Japanese language

### 4. 1. A Short Description of Japanese Orthography

Modern Japanese uses a combination of three scripts: *kanji* Chinese characters, and the two phonetic scripts *hiragana*, and *katakana*. Characters were imported from China in the sixth century in the absence of any native script, but were not sufficient to represent the Japanese language in writing because of different typologies. Chinese is an uninflected language, in which each character represents a separate morpheme, while Japanese has verbal and adjectival inflexions and grammatical postpositions. Today, Japanese is written with characters to represent meaning, the rounded *hiragana* to indicate Japanese grammar or to write a word without resource to characters, and *katakana* to mainly indicate foreign words and non-Chinese loanwords, which are also called *katakanago* “words written in katakana” or *gairaigo* “words that came from abroad”.

Carroll (2001) gives an overview of research done on motivations for receptiveness of loanwords in Japanese. She believes that the main stimulus is the factor that no native synonym is available to replace the imported word (p.160). Once taken into Japanese, words are frequently abbreviated, which accelerates their integration and makes it difficult to trace their etymology.

### 4. 2. Analysis of Japanese Secondary Term Formation

The most common method of secondary term formation in Japanese is adapted borrowing, whereby imported terms undergo phonological, morphological and orthographic alteration.

#### 4. 2. 1. Truncation

Truncation is a very popular method of word formation in Japanese, e.g. パソコン *pasokon* < *pasonaru konpyuuta* “personal computer”, analogous to the shortening of Chinese characters, e.g.. 国連 *kokuren* < 國際連合 *kokusai rengo* “United Nations”. Four-syllabic words are very popular in modern Japanese word formation and follow the

adaptation of the *mora* phonological unit structure of Japanese. Further examples illustrate their frequency and extent: ラジカセ *rajikase* “**radio cassette**”, リモコン *rimokon* “**remote control**”, マスコミ *masukomi* “**mass communication**”, セクハラ *sekuhara* “**sexual harassment**”.

#### 4. 2. 2. Compound words

Sometimes, elements of foreign words are combined with Japanese or Chinese morphemes to form new compounds, e.g. *enکو* “engine breakdown”, from **engine** and *kosho* “breakdown”; *namakon* “raw concrete”, from *nama* “raw” and **concrete**. Similarly, a compound 電子メール *denshimeiru* “e-mail” comprises the native term for “electronic” written with Chinese characters 電子 *denshi* and メール *meiru*, “mail”, written in *katakana*. Similar examples may be found in the Slovenian compounds and their derivatives, whereby one component, usually the second, is nativised, e.g. *avdionacín* “audio method”, from *avdio* “audio” + *načín* “method”; *mikrotračni* “micro rail”, from *mikro* “micro” and *tračni* “rail”.

#### 4. 2. 3. Verbs

Japanese verbs for computer functions are formed by using a borrowed noun which is followed by a Japanese verb *suru* “to do”, e.g. インストールする *insutooru* “to install” + *suru* “to do”, ログインする *roguin suru* “to login”. Native verbs are also used, e.g. 保存する *hoozon suru* “to save”, 印刷する *insatsu suru* “to print”, while the noun form remains a borrowed プリンター *purintaa* “printer”. Particularly interesting is the formation of verbs by adding the verbal ending *-ru*, e.g. *saboru* “to play truant” from the word sabotage. Carroll (2001) believes it is this final stage that works toward integration of loanwords into the native morphological system (p.161). *Katakanago* borrowing has become so widespread in the Japanese language in recent years that people started to talk about *katakana* revolution taking place. On the initiative of the former PM Junichiro Koizumi, the National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics (NINJAL) started to make attempts at curbing the trend. A hotline was opened for people to contact them with questions about loanwords. Several surveys were conducted in which over 60% of people surveyed expressed a wish that foreign words be replaced by easy-to-understand Japanese expressions. Based on the surveys, the Institute prepared a list of loanwords with the suggested Japanese equivalents to replace them.

The role of language planning in the employment of strategies for terminology transfer will be discussed in the next section.



## 5. Language Planning

Language planning is the umbrella term for the broad range of activities seeking to change the language and its use. The father of language planning, Haugen (1987), classifies these activities into social planning which is concerned with the language status and language planning which includes corpus planning (p.626). Cooper (1989) broadens the scope of language planning to include acquisition planning and defines language planning as deliberate efforts (of language planners) to influence the behavior of others with respect to the acquisition (school education), structure (standardization), or functional allocation of their language codes (language use) (p.45). These efforts are carried out by language planners, which include government bodies as well as individuals and interest groups, such as educational institutions, translators, and indirectly, newspapers, television and other media as well.

### 5. 1. Language Planning in Slovenia

In Slovenia, Pogorelec (1998) maintains that “language planners are all those organizations and individuals that create social relationships in formal communication and thus actualize the linguistic norm that has been shaped for the formal needs of a society” (p.54). She believes that, in language planning, three key activities need to be addressed: the development of terminology in science and professional fields, which is a constant and never-ending process, the development of norms in translation, and the development of the language culture, i.e. standardization of its use in public (p.50). Among the organizations that played a crucial role in the development of Slovenian terminology, mention should be made of work groups of the Council for (Slovenian) Language within the Socialist Association of Workers in socialist Yugoslavia whose role was to “develop a fully functional Slovenian language and promote the culture of public speech” (Vidovic Muha 1998, p.40), fending off unitary pressure and perceived threat of Serbo-Croatian dominance in the 1970s and 1980s. These groups, which operated within various subject fields including economy, science, the military, and film and television, created new, native terminologies for the growing number of imported technical words in their respective fields. Their work has been continued by institutions of the independent Slovenian state, such as Terminological Section at the Institute of the Slovenian Language within the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Translation and Interpretation Division of the Government Office for European Affairs with its terminological corpus *Evroterm* and multi-lingual corpus of translations *Evrokopus*, later entrusted to the Secretariat General, as well as voluntary professional groups, such as *Islovar* of the Slovene Association *Informatika*. In 2004, the government passed the Act on Public Usage of the Slovenian Language (APUSL)

which defines the basic rules of the public usage of Slovenian as the official language in Slovenia. Article 4 of the Act stipulates, as follows:

The Republic of Slovenia shall ensure the status of Slovenian by an active language policy that includes the care to provide a legal basis for its usage, care for constant scientific and research monitoring of the living language, the care to enhance language possibilities, and the care for the development and culture of the language. (APSUL, p.2)

## 5. 2. Language Planning in Japan

In contrast to language planning in Slovenia, where the focus has been on the status and linguistic purity, language planning activities in Japan have concentrated on the script reforms aimed at simplifying the written language (Gottlieb 2000). The contemporary Japanese writing system is indeed very complex. Daily use Japanese consists of thousands of *kanji* ("Chinese" characters), 47 *hiragana* (cursive syllabary), 47 *katakana* (angular syllabary), and the "Roman" alphabet. Since the Meiji Reformation in the second half of the nineteenth century, there have been arguments for simplification and standardization of the Japanese writing system. Major issues have included the total number of characters to be used, the number of different pronunciations to be attached to any one character, the division of labor between *kanji* and the *kana* that supply declensional elements and prepositions (standardizing *okurigana*), among others. These issues have been controversial because they are often linked to the notion of Japanese identity and uniqueness, and some see simplification as an attack on what it means to be Japanese (Gottlieb 2000, p.26). It seems that due to the preoccupation with orthography, other areas of language planning, such as the tackling of the onslaught of loanwords has been neglected.

The language policy body within the government is *Kokugo Shingidai*, The National Language Council which was originally set up in 1934 and has undergone several changes since then. At present, the Council is an appendage of the Agency for Cultural Affairs within the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology. In 1987, the Council carried out a survey on the usage of loanwords in Ehime Prefecture. 67-70 % of the participants aged over 40 expressed a wish that *kataganago* should be abolished, while younger participants felt that it was positively good to use such words (Carroll 2001, p.124). Later surveys confirmed the fact that older Japanese, particularly those over 60, have trouble understanding *katakanago*. *Katakanago* are regularly used in advertising and evoke connotations of being "modern", "fashionable" and "popular". It is, therefore, not surprising that the young are more ready to embrace them. Also, after WWII with the

American occupation, English became a compulsory school subject and English-origin words became easy to understand for many Japanese. Consequently, a sharp rise in the percentage of phonetic adoptions from English among Japanese technical terms can be observed (Matsuda, Goto, Nagano, Hayase, & Mikami, 2008). Besides being used in specialist and technical terminology, *kataganago* are frequently used in official documents of public officials, especially at the local level.

The National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics (NINJAL) is a research organization which tackles language problems and conducts the basic research for language policy. In recent years, a special committee has been set up at the Institute to research the perceived overuse of loanwords in the Japanese language in which they measured the recognition, comprehension and usage of 345 loanwords. Based on the results, the Institute has prepared four white papers with recommendations for the replacement of loanwords with equivalent Japanese terms. The list includes such computer-related words as "access", "interactive", "backup", "log-in", "framework", "tool", "virtual", etc.

## 6. Attitudes to National Languages

One of the tasks of language planning is to develop awareness of national language, which will assure the correct usage and a desired attitude towards the language. Cooper (1989) maintains that the efforts of language planning are more successful in shaping language attitudes than language usage (p.184).

Below is a list of attitudes of some Slovenian and Japanese linguists and language planners to their national language, which the author has come across during her research.

Slovenia:

- The Slovenian language is a symbol of Slovenian nationality
- The Slovenian language is endangered
- The Slovenian language has a small number of speakers
- The Slovenian language needs to be cultivated for scientific, administrative and other use
- The Slovenian language is threatened by linguistic defection under pressure from English

Japan:

- The Japanese language is the key symbol of Japanese culture and national

identity

- Borrowing has a special role in the Japanese language
- *Katakanago* loanwords enrich the Japanese language with expressions for objects and concepts that do not exist in Japanese culture.
- After WWII, English loanwords became part of the process of democratization and re-opening to the world.
- *Kataganago* evoke connotations of modernity and cosmopolitanism
- The main source of resistance to *katakanago* seems to be a lack of comprehension rather than the preservation of linguistic purity.

Both in Slovenia and Japan, the national language is the symbol of national affiliation, culture and identity. However, different social, political and economic conditions in each country have defined divergent approaches to problems associated with the national language. For example, Vidovic-Muha (1998) concludes that the development of the Slovenian language has been determined by two main factors: varied degrees of non-statehood and a relatively small number of speakers (p.18). As a result, many language planners express their concern for the status and preservation of the language. After gaining independence in 1991, the Slovenian language achieved the status of a state language. When Slovenia joined the EU in 2004, Slovenian became one of the official languages within the EU which now count 24. The changed socio-political conditions offer new possibilities for the development of the language, as well as present new challenges. At the same time, great care has been taken to make the language fully functional in all specialist and technological fields. This is especially evident in the transfer of terminology where the need for native equivalents is constantly stressed. Several groups of specialists are actively engaged in creating new, native Slovenian terminology, sometimes with the participation of the general public, as is the case of Islovar of the Slovenian Association Informatika.

In the Japanese linguistic environment, the attitude towards borrowed lexis is more open. Linguistic borrowing has had a long tradition in Japan. The first wave of borrowing reached Japan in the 6<sup>th</sup> century with Buddhism, when Japanese imported from China not only many new words but also the script. The next invasion occurred during the reformation of the Meiji Period in the latter part of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when Japan opened its doors to science and technology from the West. The third wave started after WWII and has strengthened in recent years under the influence of internationalization, globalization, and the spread of information technology. (See Mark Irwin, 2011, for an overview). Before WWII, under the influence of the then military and nationalist regime, an attempt was made to purify the Japanese language of its foreign (= western) elements. After the

defeat and the subsequent American occupation, the country accepted democracy and in a short span of twenty years developed into an economic world power. *Katakanago* loanwords, mainly borrowed from English, became part of the process of democratization and opening to the world. They are now used abundantly in advertising and are associated with modernity and cosmopolitanism. Politicians and intellectuals resort to their use when they want to show their knowledge and their intellectual and social supremacy. Conversely, the results of national surveys conducted by the National Language Council and the National Institute of Japanese Language show negative effects of borrowing, whereby common citizens, especially the older generation, cannot understand the adopted terminology.

## 7. Conclusion

This paper compares the most common strategies employed in the secondary interlingual term formation in the Slovenian and Japanese languages and attempts to show that certain socio-linguistic factors, such as language policy and planning, as well as language attitudes, can play an important role in the formation of such strategies. In the Slovenian language, the tendency is to replace imported words with the native terminology as soon as possible, while in the Japanese language the prevalent strategy is the adapted borrowing whereby imported words undergo phonological, morphological and orthographic alterations. The above strategies may reflect attitudes of the respective language communities. The Japanese language has an open, *laissez-faire* attitude towards the import of foreign terminology, which may cause comprehension problems, especially among the elderly population. The National Institute for the Japanese Language and Linguistics is trying to rectify the situation by proposing native alternatives for certain loanwords. Attitudes in the Slovenian linguistic space tend to be more purist and are underscored by concerns for its preservation and development as a fully functional language. This can lead to linguistic purism, which does not respect the self-regulatory mechanisms of language, according to which language finds its natural balance and discards those terms that are not in compliance with the basic guidelines of term formation (Sager 1990, p.85). This, of course, does not mean that terminologists' work is futile, but highlights the importance of a properly monitored development of terminology whereby new terms are linguistically correct, accurate, concise, unambiguous, and easy to form derivatives (ISO 704, 1985). This demanding task has been successfully carried out by the Slovenian terminologists, which, in turn, has made the Slovenian language vibrant and fully functional in specialist and technological fields.

## Note

- 1) This paper is a translated and updated version of the paper given at the symposium Obdobja 24, Razvoj slovenskega strokovnega jezika, at the University of Ljubljana in 2007.

## References

- APSUL (Act on Public Usage of Slovenian Language). (2004). Retrieved from <http://www.eui.eu/Projects/InternationalArtHeritageLaw/Documents/NationalLegislation/Slovenia/lawonpublicusageofslovenianlanguage.pdf>. (7.9.2014).
- Carroll, T. (2001). *Language planning and language change in Japan*. Richmond: Curzon.
- Cooper, R. L. (1989). *Language planning and social change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Corpus of Slovenian language. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.gigafida.net/>. (25.10.2014).
- Evroterm Multilingual Corpus of the EU. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.gov.si/evroterm/>.
- Gorjanc, V. (1998). Terminologija novejših naravoslovno-tehničnih strok. In A.Vidovič-Muha. (Ed.), *Slovenski jezik* (pp.221-234). A. Opole: Unywerytet Opolski–Instytut Filologii Polskiej.
- Gottlieb, N. (1995). *Kanji politics: Language policy and language script*. London: Kegan Paul International.
- Haugen, E. (1987). Language planning. In U.Ammon, N. Dittmar and K. Matthieier (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics: An international handbook of the science of language and society* (Vol.1). Berlin: de Gruyter Mouton.
- Irwin, M. (2011). *Loanwords in Japanese*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Islovar, Slovene Association Informatika. (n.d.). Retrieved from [http://www.islovar.org/iskanje\\_enostavno.asp](http://www.islovar.org/iskanje_enostavno.asp). (7.9.2014).
- ISO 704 (1985). *Principles and methods of terminology*. Geneva: International Organization for Standardization.
- National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics (NINJAL). (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.ninjal.ac.jp/>. (25.10.2014).
- Matsuda, M., Goto, H., Nagano, R., Hayase, Y., & Mikami, Y. (2008). Technical terminology in Asian languages: Different approaches to adopting engineering terms. *The 6<sup>th</sup> Workshop on Asian Language Resource 2008*, 25–32. Retrieved from <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/I08-7004>. (5.9.2014).
- Meyer, I. (2000). Computer words in our everyday lives. In U. Heid et al., (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Ninth Euralex International Congress* (Vol.1) (pp.39–58). Stuttgart: Stuttgart University Press.
- Pogorelec, B. (1998). Jezikovno načrtovanje in jezikovna politika pri Slovencih med 1945 in 1995. In A. Vidovič-Muha (Ed.), *Slovenski jezik* (pp.49–72). A.Opole: Unywerytet Opolski – Instytut Filologii Polskiej.
- Sager, J. C. (1990). *A practical course in terminology processing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vidovič-Muha, A. (1998). Razvojne prvine normativnosti slovenskega knjižnega jezika. In A. Vidovič-Muha (Ed.), *Slovenski jezik*, (pp.19–48). A.Opole: Unywerytet Opolski–Instytut

Filologii Polskiej.

Vintar, Š. (2005). Uvod v terminologijo. Retrieved from <http://www2.arnes.si/~svinta/spela-en.htm>. (7.9.2014).