

CONSERVATION TERMS FOR WALL PAINTINGS AND ARCHITECTURAL SURFACES: DO WE HAVE A WORD IN THIS RACE?

Aleksandar Đ. VULETIĆ

University of Arts in Belgrade, Faculty of Applied Arts, Belgrade, Serbia

Aleksandra P. ORAŠANIN

University of Belgrade, Faculty of Philology, English Department, Belgrade, Serbia

<https://doi.org/10.18485/smartart.2022.2.ch29>

Abstract: The observed need for a precise, reliable and therefore coordinated and standardised communication within the international community of material heritage preservation experts has resulted in a two-year project (2014–2016) and the publication of *EwaGlos – European Illustrated Glossary of Conservation Terms for Wall Paintings and Architectural Surfaces*. The glossary, which covers terminology in 11 languages and in the realisation of which Serbian scientific and vocational conservation community did not participate, is a true trailblazer. It can guide the direction and manner in which Serbian professional terminology should evolve, adjust and become normative, providing, meanwhile, an opportunity for linguists (as recognised by the authors of this paper) and conservation-restoration practitioners to jointly contribute to the field.

The subject of this paper are selected Serbian terms and expressions used in conservation of wall paintings and architectural surfaces, that is, the selection, formation and formal-functional descriptive analysis of those terms, arising parallel to their correspondents and equivalents provided in the *EwaGlos*. The aim of our work is to come up with non-prescriptive suggestions of concrete terminology solutions in Serbian lexis related to this branch of conservation, and to do so by employing a competent research, scientific, vocational and linguistic-terminological methodology. This would primarily entail following internationally recognised recommendations for the formation of quality and sustainable nomenclature, as well as the existing Serbian scientific-vocational oral and written conservation-restoration discourse. Additionally, we hope to contribute to the process of creating norms and standards for abstruse Serbian terminology in the said field, and to draw attention of Serbian scientific-vocational community to a necessity for participating in international lexicographic endeavours, such as the *EwaGlos*. Aside from relying on a quantitative statistical method, we also took a qualitative research approach – contact-contrastive, comparative-distribu-

tional, and substitution methods, as well as structural-functional analysis. We propose that the added value of this work lies in its general benefit to the Anglo-Serbian comparative linguistics, terminological lexicography, philological and applied-art education, while also being inclusive of the whole conservation-restoration community and all the institutions dealing with the aforementioned problematics in both narrow and wider senses.

Keywords: terminology, standardisation, conservation, wall paintings, architectural surfaces

INTRODUCTION

It has long been established that successful communication within any given scientific and professional community is marked by the clearly defined, unambiguous and economical terminology. The globalisation of science, business and information exchange entails an international harmonisation of national scientific and professional terminologies. To stay off this course means to sit on the margins of important global scientific and professional events, and even to jeopardise national values and interests. Protecting a nation's cultural heritage means the simultaneous protection of the entire world cultural heritage, and such delicate work, including its heritological, cultural and linguistic aspects is undertaken not only by the national, but also by the international scientific and professional communities.¹ In order to establish high-quality national professional terminology that is internationally-harmonised, a whole string of competent experts and institutions at the highest national level have to put in well-organised and painstaking efforts.² However, first and foremost, there needs to be a will and desire to undertake such ventures, as well as a pool of adequately educated and experienced people to embark on ventures of that sort.

Research background and aims

The aforementioned need for harmonised and standardised communication within the international community, but focusing on the protection of European national cultural heritage, has resulted in a two-year project (2014–2016) and the publication of *EwaGlos – European Illustrated Glossary of Conservation Terms for Wall Paintings and Architectural Surfaces*.³ This glossary, spanning 11 languages (English, German, French, Italian, Spanish, Bulgarian, Croatian, Hungarian, Polish, Romanian

1 J. Filipović, J. Vučo, „Multimodal transdisciplinary approach to cultural heritage preservation: linguistic and cultural landscapes”, u: *Jezici i kulture u vremenu i prostoru VIII/2 – Tematski zbornik*, ur. S. Gudurić, B. Radić-Bojanić, Novi Sad, 2019, 347–359.

2 D. Vokić, „O epistemologiji konzervatorsko-restauratorske struke”, u: *Godišnjak zaštite spomenika kulture Hrvatske 33/34–2009/2010*. Zagreb, 2010, 23–38.

3 A. Weyer et al (eds.). *EwaGlos – European Illustrated Glossary of Conservation Terms for Wall Paintings and Architectural Surfaces (2nd revised digital edition)*. Petersberg: Michael Imhof Verlag, 2016.

and Turkish)⁴ and in the creation of which Serbian professional conservation community did not participate, is an outstanding example of good international conservation-terminology cooperation and practice. The reasons behind the choice of a specific conservation field and the creation of this illustrated glossary are laid out in the publication's introduction:

“Wall paintings and architectural surfaces are a significant part of the European heritage. The traditions of conservation-restoration within this facet of heritage can be traced back to the Renaissance. In spite of the cultural diversity, the principles in the conservation and restoration of wall paintings and architectural surfaces are the same around the continent. Nevertheless, there is no multilingual dictionary to help professionals in their practice and use of language.”⁵

Axel Ermert, a member of the Technical Committee, adds:

“[*EwaGlos*] is based on a carefully selected word list of the most important technical terms in the field of wall paintings and architectural surfaces, its entries aptly combine a short delimiting definition with a subsequent lexicon-style explanation and information useful and required for the full understanding of each issue and its associated term. *EwaGlos* is organised on a subject-oriented basis; it is substantially multilingual, and each entry spans over two facing pages so that easy overview over all of the entries is guaranteed. In addition, it has images for each of the phenomena which are listed through their terms and which are so explained.”⁶

The reasons behind the existence of this publication are clear. What is unclear, however, is why Serbian conservation-restoration community did not take part in this and other projects of this type. It is also unclear why, even five years after the publication of the glossary, there is a lack of interest in the standardization of Serbian vocational language and its harmonisation with the abovementioned global trends.

This is where the general aim of our work stems from, as well as the motivation for its commencement. Those would be: to indicate the obscurity of terminological research in the field; to underline the necessity for concrete action as pertains to the creation of standardised conservation-restoration terminology in Serbian; to draw attention to the fact that cooperation between conservation-restoration profession-

4 There are many important lexicography-oriented publications which, aside from focusing on a national language, include field-related terminology solutions as found in multiple other languages, which is not the case with Serbian practice, for example: Argyropoulos, Vasilike et al. (eds.). 2001. *The Conservation Dictionary: A multilingual dictionary of conservation/restoration terminology in printed and digital format*, Athens: CGRC; Monika Bogdanowska et al. (eds.). 2016. *Interdisciplinary Multilingual Dictionary*. Cracow: Cracow University of Technology; *Illustrated glossary on stone deterioration patterns. Glosario ilustrado de formas de deterioro de la piedra*, 2011 (<http://iscs.icomos.org/glossary.html>), Mora et al.: *La conservation des peintures murales*, Bologne 1977, translated into English 1984, into Romanian 1986, into Italian 1999, into Spanish 2003; IComoS Principles 2003; and so on (see also: <https://www.conservable.net/en/knowledge/conservation-glossaries-and-encyclopedias-online>).

5 S. Corr, President of ECCO (European Confederation of Conservator-Restorers' Organisations), July 2015, in: *EwaGlos – European Illustrated Glossary of Conservation Terms for Wall Paintings and Architectural Surfaces (2nd revised digital edition)*, A. Weyer et al (eds.), Petersberg, 2016, 8.

6 A. Ermert, Member of the German delegation to CEN/TC 346/WG 1 “Conservation of cultural heritage, WG 1 Foundations and vocabulary”; Institute for Museum Research, State Museums Berlin, Foundation Prussian Heritage (SPK), Berlin, August 2015, in: *EwaGlos – European Illustrated Glossary of Conservation Terms for Wall Paintings and Architectural Surfaces (2nd revised digital edition)*, A. Weyer et al (eds.) Petersberg, 2016, 10.

als and linguists is a prerequisite for creating terminology. On the other hand, one of the specific aims of our work is to describe and analyse results obtained via a micromodel, designed by the authors as a mode of initiating the said processes. The concept of a 'micromodel' is used with a preliminary, *ad hoc* application in our research and with clearly stated remarks so that this model, in a sociolinguistic sense, could be developed in a further line of research at a comprehensive level. *EwaGlos* has served us well as the ideal framework for terminological research within the given model.

Terminology, standards, definitions

The ways to form internationally recognised professional terminologies are clearly defined by ISO standards, so it is advisable to follow them in this case as well – when we speak of forming Serbian terminology in the field of conservation of wall paintings and architectural surfaces. We have already pointed out these crucial standards in our previous work:

“As regards the process of forming new terms where needed, all sides should follow ISO recommendations. Its Technical Committee 37 (TC37) states the following criteria should be respected: *term adequacy* – semantic and stylistic conformity with the concept being denoted; *the economy of terms* – language is economical and terms should be concise; *morphological potential of the term* – other words and potential new terms should be easily derived from the starting one.”⁷

On these occasions, we always additionally underlined that

“In the standardization efforts in Serbia, all parties to the process should pay special attention to the principle of *univocity* when it comes to scientific terminology. That principle prescribes that ‘one designation corresponds to one concept (a term shall have only one meaning) and that, equally, one concept corresponds to one designation (a concept shall be named by only one term).’”⁸

In line with the results of reputable linguistic and terminological research⁹ published up to date, we have defined the criteria matrix that should be followed in the process of forming terms of appropriate quality:

- formal and functional criteria: derivation potential, economy of form, ease of pronunciation
- semantic and pragmatic criteria: precision, monosemy, prime status given to native language (Serbian) where possible, but not disregarding the longstand-

7 A. Orašanin and A. Vuletić, “The glue that holds us together: Challenges of translating conservation-restoration terminology from and into Serbian” in: *Proceedings from the First International Conference Smartart*. Belgrade, 2020, 493.

8 Based on K. Warburton, “Naming of scientific concepts. Requirements from international terminology standards”, ISO Technical Committee 37 Chair presentation, available at https://www.itu.int/dms_pub/itu-r/oth/oa/oe/RoAoE0000960011PDFE.pdf in: A. Orašanin, A. Vuletić, “The glue that holds us together: Challenges of translating conservation-restoration terminology from and into Serbian” in: *Proceedings from the First International Conference SmartArt*. Belgrade, 2020, 493.

9 See: ISO 704: Principles and methods of terminology, 1987; ISO 10241 “Presentation of terminological entries in vocabularies” (new edition 2015); ISO 704 “Terminology work: Principles and methods” (latest edition: 2009) at <https://www.iso.org/standards.html>; K. Valeontis, and E. Mantzari (2006), “The Linguistic Dimension of Terminology: Principles and Methods of Term formation”, 1st Athens International Conference on Translation and Interpretation Translation: Between Art and Social Science. 13–14 October 2006. [retrieved 2/6/2021 from <http://academia.edu.>]; J.C. Sager, *A Practical Course in Terminology Processing*, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia, 1990; M.T. Cabré, *Terminology. Theory, Methods and Applications*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia, 1999.

ing tradition of employing foreign terms in arts (Romance, Germanic, now also Anglicisms)

- miscellaneous criteria: productivity, systematic use and frequency of use which govern the selection of terms in cases where there are more lexical units denoting the same concept.

Additionally, we must not forget the contemporary approach to understanding the very concept of a *term*: it is a primarily communicative, dynamic macro-linguistic unit related to specialised fields of knowledge, but it is also a part of specialised discourse and professional communication, showing up in a clearly defined communication environment and possessing certain discursive characteristics.¹⁰

Finally, speaking of standards and defining terms, it is necessary to conceptually analyse the lexeme *wall painting* (Serbian: *zidno slikarstvo*), a key field in which our research takes place, and which *EwaGlos* defines as follows: “Painting executed directly on an architectural surface; can include various painting techniques.”¹¹ Immediately after this definition, in a section titled Comment, we find the following:

“Paintings can be applied directly on a support (e. g. oil on stone) or on a previously prepared support (with various paint coats or plasters). Among the painting techniques used on lime plaster, paintings executed on a fresh and still damp plaster (fresco, lime fresco) should be distinguished from paintings executed on a dry plaster (e.g. secco, lime secco) or on a half-damp plaster (mezzo fresco). Painting techniques also include sgraffito and two additional techniques: decorative applications and polishing the wall paintings with wax and oil as a protective and/or decorative measure (lustro). Synonym: mural painting.”¹²

METHODOLOGY

The micromodel we spoke of before, i.e. the chosen methodology of our work, is based on the participation of members of the conservation-restoration scientific-professional community, in the role of respondents to a survey (questionnaire), and of linguists who wrote the initial setup of the questionnaire, formed the corpus of terms for analysis, conducted preliminary research, and finally, performed a quantitative-qualitative analysis of the data gathered. The preliminary research entailed, among other things, a careful perusal of extensive literature in the field, primarily the one published by eminent experts, superior European and world institutions dealing with cultural heritage protection (i.e. conservation and restoration of material heritage), lexicography-oriented publishing houses and other similar institutions. Due to

10 M.T. Cabré, *Terminology. Theory, Methods and Applications*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia, 1999, 101.

11 A. Weyer et al (eds.), *EwaGlos – European Illustrated Glossary of Conservation Terms for Wall Paintings and Architectural Surfaces* (2nd revised digital edition). Petersberg, 2016, 66.

12 *Ibid.*

the great importance of these sources, but also due to limited space allocated to this paper, here we cite just a few of those most frequently used sources.¹³

The Survey and Questionnaire

In our survey – taking the form of an anonymously completed questionnaire – there were twenty respondents: conservators and restorers, mainly employed at state, provincial and municipal levels, including one higher level educational institution and the Serbian society of conservators.¹⁴ The respondents' personal information – sex, age and work positions were not highlighted in this micromodel, as our focal points were the respondents' attitudes, opinions on and suggestions for the most adequate terms in Serbian which correspond to the 15 standardised terms from *EwaGlos*. The questionnaire we wrote is of an exclusive-inclusive intersectoral type and relies on subjective and emic input.

The questionnaire is in the form of a table comprising six columns and fifteen rows. Each of the rows provides a term from *EwaGlos*. The first column allocates a number to a term (T1, T2... T15). The second column contains the term and its definition in English (as found in *EwaGlos*). The third column lays out the standardised equivalents in French, German and Italian (also taken from *EwaGlos*). The fourth column offers potential translation equivalents and formal correspondents of the terms in Serbian – the pre-existing solutions which the authors have identified in

¹³ *Art Conservation Terms. Glossary of Art Conservation Terms*, CEO, The Conservation Center, Chicago, www.theconservationcenter.com/conservation-services/art-conservation-glossary; *CAMEO Conservation & Art Material Encyclopedia Online*, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, http://cameo.mfa.org/wiki/Main_Page; Clarke, M. 2010. *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Art Terms*. Oxford: OUP; Harris, Cyril M. (ed.). 2006. *Dictionary of Architecture and Construction, 4th edition*, New York; ICOM-CC. 2008. "Terminology to characterize the conservation of tangible cultural heritage", Resolution adopted by the ICOM-CC membership at the 15th Triennial Conference, New Delhi, 22–26 September 2008. <http://www.icom-cc.org/242/about/terminology-for-conservation/>; ICOMOS "Principles for the Preservation and Conservation/Restoration of Wall Paintings, 5th and final draft for adoption at the ICOMOS General Assembly", Victoria Falls, October 2003, see: www.international.icomos.org/victoriafalls2003/wall_eng.htm; Trench, Lucy (ed.). 2000. *Materials and Techniques in the Decorative Arts. An illustrated Dictionary*. London, UNESCO: Glossary http://www.unesco.org/culture/en/natlaws/db/database_glossary_e_2009.pdf; Nikolić, A. 2008. „Terminologija – konzervacija kulturnog nasleđa”, *Diana* 13 2008/2009, Beograd: Odeljenje za preventivnu zaštitu, Narodni muzej u Beogradu.

¹⁴ The underwhelming number of respondents who have accepted the invitation to participate in the survey is the result of a scandalous letter, sent from the managing offices of the Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments in Serbia and which, needlessly and without any previous provocation, discredits this research and its authors and indirectly advises the employees at the Institute against participating (Dopis RZZSKS br. 7–109/2021/1 od 7.4.2021). In their response to the Letter, the authors of this paper informed the Letter-writers that neither they nor anyone else can forbid linguists to undertake linguistic research, inviting them not to stand alone in their dissent and inactivity, but to instead 1. join their conservator and restorer colleagues and linguists and take part in the processes of describing and analysing the professional terminology that they had embarked on; 2. embrace progressive scientific steps in that direction, and finally, 3. conscientiously do their job so that the Serbian professional terminology and the Serbian cultural heritage would cease to be on the outskirts of current trends in the field in question. As was to be expected, upon sending their Response, the authors did not hear from the Letter-writers again.

oral and written conservation-restoration discourse.¹⁵ The fifth column is also designated to Serbian and is for the respondents' additional solutions and suggestions related to the term in question, should they have any. Finally, the sixth column is intended for any comments, opinions and recommendations that the respondents may wish to share.

The instructions accompanying the questionnaire state that the table contains 15 terms from the field of conservation and restoration of wall paintings and architectural surfaces. Each term is provided in four languages – English (along with the definition), French, Italian and German. It is explained that these terms have been standardised and that there is only one official term for each concept in all of the cited languages. The respondents are informed that the aim is to suggest a single term in Serbian which would be the most appropriate formal correspondent, or translation equivalent, for each of the terms already established in the other languages. In other words, following the provided standardised terminology solutions found in the other languages, and relying on their own professional, scientific, vocational, educational and research experience, which means contact with and usage of these specific terms, the respondents are called upon to choose one of the suggested terms in Serbian in the cases where they deem the most precise and appropriate solution has been presented and can become the standard term in Serbian. If, however, such a term has not been provided in the table, they are asked to provide their own solutions/suggestions for a term in Serbian (this could be one coined by them and/or used in their scientific and professional community). Furthermore, if they are unfamiliar with a specific foreign term, if they do not know of it in Serbian, or if they are unable or unwilling to provide an answer, they are asked to mark the column “Term in Serbian – additional solutions and suggestions” with an X (which would denote ‘I do not know’ or ‘I am not familiar with this’). They are also encouraged to provide something for the column *Comment, opinion, recommendation concerning the term*, as such input means a great deal for our research. Sidenote concerning column four is that the authors, prior to sharing the language material in Serbian with the respondents, had made all the necessary editing and copy-editing interventions, in the sense of correcting and removing any spelling or grammatical errors and mistakes.¹⁶ In short, the respondents were provided with a semantically, lexically, grammatically and orthographically clean language material, as is the norm in surveys and research into standard language.

Methods and corpus

Our work drew upon a few different research methods – linguistic and interdisciplinary. For our data analysis we used the quantitative statistical method. As relates to qualitative methods, in macro-linguistic and micro-linguistic senses, we relied on a

¹⁵ Aside from extensive *in situ* and *ab experto* material, primarily of an oral discourse nature, the material also comes from, among other sources: *Гласник Друштва конзерватора Србије* (the gazette of the Society of Conservators of Serbia), свеске 1–42, Београд: Друштво конзерватора Србије, <http://dks.org.rs/scc/izdavastvo/>; *Moderna konzervacija*, свеске 1–6, magazine of the National Committee ICOMOS Serbia; <http://icomos-serbia.com/>; *Nasleđe*, свеске 1–21, magazine of Belgrade City Institute for the Protection of Cultural Monuments; https://beogradskonasledje.rs/casopis-nasledje?_rstr_nocache=rstr527602a3fd196da1; Vukićević, Branko. 2018. *Dictionary of Visual Arts and Crafts*. Beograd: AGM knjiga.

¹⁶ For example: although certain sources cite the term *pariški* (for plaster of Paris), the correct form of this possessive adjective in Serbian is *pariski*. See section on *Plaster of Paris*.

descriptive method, contact-contrastive method, comparative-distributive method, method of substitution and structural-functional analysis.

While choosing the terms from *EwaGlos* we used the technique of random sampling, bearing in mind the need to have an equal representation of the glossary's fields and subfields: Art and Craft Techniques (Construction, Surface Design, Construction Aids), Condition (Deterioration Sources, Deterioration Phenomena), Interventions (Documentation and Investigation, Preventive Conservation, Conservation, Restoration), Materials Appendix. A few factors played a part in this equal representation. Our corpus does not include internationalisms already in regular use in Serbian (e.g. sgraffito, secco, fresco, patina, encaustic, impasto, sinopia, etc), as there is nothing disputable in their lexical-terminological status.¹⁷ The term being monolexic or polylexic, having a general or very narrow application, belonging to a certain part of speech category, or its potential frequency of use and (non)transparency were not eliminatory criteria for it being chosen. Opting to cover 15 terms was a choice of 'median value', meaning that this anticipated a satisfactory temporal and mental operational functioning of the respondents, aside from aiming for the already mentioned equal representation of terms from all (sub)fields of the glossary. In terms of linguistics, this terminological corpus is specific and falls under the scientific-technical and scientific-vocational functional style. *EwaGlos* drew upon written discourse as a source of terms, while the analysed and described Serbian terms have a dual discourse background – oral and written, with a tendency towards making it primarily written by the time the standardization process has been completed.

Due to the nature of the corpus and the specificity of its functional style, as well as to the fact that we had already come across similar terminology material, we took a communicative, pragmatic translology approach.

“Newmark divided translation into semantic and communicative. He also labelled semantic translation *contextual*, at the same time naming communicative translation *pragmatic* – focused on the recipient of the message and based on translation equivalence, rather than on formal correspondence. This approach to translating is fully compatible with the approach of this paper's authors to the material in question.”¹⁸

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The analysis of the (selected) lexemes provided below relies primarily on statistical data obtained from the survey, and on the criteria for term formation outlined in the previous section of this paper. The results of the survey and authors' conclusions represent the subjective opinions of both respondents and authors and cannot be taken as prescriptive and mandatory. Their sole aim is to provide microlevel insight into the current state of professional language of the field.

Term 1: *SUPPORT* (Fr. *Support*; It. *Supporto*; Ger. *Träger*). Definition: *A structure on which a plaster or a ground with a subsequent paint layer, or just a paint layer, are*

17 The authors remind the reader that these internationalisms, already firmly grounded in Serbian, are also written in Cyrillic, not just in Latin alphabet.

18 A. Vuletić and A. Orašanin, “On Translating Some Applied Arts Terms from Serbian into English: An Explicative Analysis”, paper to be published in journal *Nasleđe* No 49 (FILUM) in a 2021 edition.

applied. Its function is to provide a more or less even substratum for the painting, to carry it, and to give it physical stability.¹⁹

Serbian terms – pre-existing solutions identified by the authors in professional oral and written discourse are: *nosač*, *nosilac* and *trager*. Orthographic-grammatical intervention undertaken by the authors upon the existing solutions: removal of the term *nosioc*, incorrect in Serbian (the change of *l* into *o*: nouns derived from verbs which denote an actor have the suffix *-lac* in Nom. and *-laca* in Gen.pl.).²⁰ 15 respondents (75%) opted for the term *nosilac* and 3 (15%) for *nosač*. None of the respondents chose the term *trager*. Additional suggestions provided by the respondents were: *osnova* (1 resp. – 5%) and *noseća podloga* (1 resp. – 5%).

The monolexemic Serbian terms, firstly *nosilac* and then *nosač* (which more frequently denotes an object, tool or device in Serbian) – terminologically established general lexemes with long-term presence in conservation language – are candidates for the Serbian term of choice in this case. In accordance with the survey results, we assume that the Germanic word *trager* is an oral-discourse, jargon occasionalism of ephemeral nature. However, the semantic potential of the suggested bilexeme *noseća podloga* has inspired us to suggest the term *noseća struktura* as one of the terms qualifying for the final choice.²¹

Term 2: *SPOLVERO* (Fr. *Poncif*; It. *Spolvero*; Ger. *Spolvero-Methode*). Definition: *Design technique producing an outline by dabbing a cloth sack containing a dark powder, such as charcoal, onto the surface of a pierced sheet of paper or parchment.*

Serbian terms – pre-existing solutions identified by the authors in professional oral and written discourse are: *praškanje*; *spulverisanje*; *spulver metoda*; *spolvero*. 10 respondents (50%) opted for the term *spolvero*, 3 (15%) for the term *spulver metoda*, 1 (5%) for *spulverisanje*, 2 (10%) for *praškanje*, while 3 (15%) did not choose any of the provided. Additional suggestions provided by the respondents: *spolvero tehnika* (1 resp. – 5%). The comments left: one respondent chose one of the offered terms, but noted that it is a technique also known as “*prenošenje crteža preko rupica*”, while another wrote that it is “*izrada sinopije (pomoću kalka)*”. In accordance not only with the majority of votes given by the respondents, but also with the fact that the internationalism *spolvero* is used as a standard term in many other languages, we see no obstacle to it becoming the official professional term in Serbian. *Spulverisanje* and *spulver metoda* seem to us to be a kind of idiolectic variation – a deviation from the original *spolvero*, therefore eliminating themselves from the standardisation framework. In our opinion, the only possible additional solution in this case, alongside *spolvero*, could be *tehnika spolvero* (better than *spolvero tehnika*)²² due to an extra layer of designatory-discursive precision.

Term 3: *KEYING* (Fr. *Piquetage*; It. *Martellinatura*; Ger. *Aufhacken*). Definition: *Mechanical roughening (e.g. hammering, scoring, scraping) of a surface in order to prepare for an additional layer of plaster.*

19 NB: all the terms about to be presented, provided in four languages and accompanied by their definitions in the English language, have been taken verbatim from *EwaGlos*.

20 М. Пешикан, Ј. Јерковић и М. Пижурица. *Правовис српскога језика (измењено и допунљено издање)*. Нови Сад, 2010, т. 36b (6), 51.

21 The translations of the term *support* as cited in B. Vukićević, *Dictionary of Visual Arts and Crafts*, Beograd, 2018, 364, are: 1. *podrška* 2. *nosilac (slike i dr.)* 3. *podloga*.

22 М. Пешикан, Ј. Јерковић и М. Пижурица. *Правовис српскога језика (измењено и допунљено издање)*. Нови Сад, 2010, 442.

Serbian terms – pre-existing solutions identified by the authors in professional oral and written discourse are: *hrapavljenje*; *piketaža*. Both *hrapavljenje* and *piketaža* received 4 votes each (20%), while 6 respondents (30%) did not choose either of the offered. Additional suggestions provided by the respondents: *pikovanje* (5 resp. – 25%) and *okljucavanje* (1 resp. – 5%). The comments left by 2 respondents state that *pikovanje* is indeed tied to ‘*hrapavljenje površina*’ (roughening of a surface), but not always with a purpose of preparing for the addition of and better binding between layers of plaster, as defined by the term *keying*, because sometimes it is done for an aesthetic appeal of the exterior, especially of facades. The branching of the number and usages of Serbian lexemes in this case is pretty obvious. Each of them comes with its pros and cons. *Piketaža* is a Romance language term, unambiguously following the standardised French form, so there is no semantic deviation there. But it is, nevertheless, an internationalism not widely used and this could potentially influence its overall (non)transparency. *Hrapavljenje* is a solid equivalent, but its wider semantic field of general and multi-vocational origin somewhat weakens the status of a word in narrow field of use. Also, the respondents have themselves pointed out the potential problem related to the use of *pikovanje*. There needs to be a further reassessment of the possibility of introducing a less familiar and not really established term such as *okljucavanje* (unless it is fully synonymous with *pikovanje*), which seems monosemic and “of Serbian origin”. In any case, only a solid connection between the definition and the denotation could lead to a final choice among the offered signifiers.

Term 4: *LEVELLING COAT* (Fr. *Gobetis*; It. *Rinzaffo*; Ger. *Ausgleichsputz*). Definition: *A single or multi-layered coat for architectural surfaces to compensate for irregularities in the masonry.*

Serbian terms – pre-existing solutions identified by the authors in professional oral and written discourse are: *izravnavajući premaz*; *izravnavajući sloj*; *nivelišući sloj*. Orthographic-grammatical intervention undertaken by the authors upon the existing solutions: incorrect form *izravnjavajući*, which showed up in corpus, was corrected into the appropriate adjectival form *izravnavajući*. Out of the three offered calques in Serbian, the first – *izravnavajući premaz* – was not chosen by any of the respondents. *Izravnavajući sloj* received 11 votes (55%) and *nivelišući sloj* received 4 (20%), while one respondent (5%) stated they were unfamiliar with the concept and the terms offered. Additional suggestions: *ravnajući sloj* (4 resp. – 20%). Comments left by one respondent: *gletovanje*, *nivelacija*.

Ravnanje, *izravnavanje* and *nivelisanje* are the key communicative segments of the English terminological designatum and its definition. The lexeme *premaz* (spread, daub) in one of the identified term equivalents was probably used to avoid the word *sloj* (layer/coat), because *izravnavajući premaz*, according to the definition, could be applied in multiple layers/coats. This, however, does not mean that it does not add a new coat as a result of the process.²³ In short, following the respondents’ answers and other positive aspects of this term, *izravnavajući sloj* is a contender for a spot in standardised language. The authors wish to add that, due to formal-functional reasons (the economy and ease of pronunciation above all else, alongside the retention of source semantics), the term *ravnajući sloj* should not be discarded from final considerations.

²³ Definition of *coat*: 3: a layer of one substance covering another. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/coat>. [accessed 15 May, 2021]

Term 5: VARNISH (Fr. Vernis; It. Vernice; Ger. Firnis). Definition: A solution of a binder in a solvent, applied for aesthetic or protective purposes as a thin, transparent coating, as a final layer over a painting.

Serbian terms – pre-existing solutions identified by the authors in professional oral and written discourse are: *zaštitni sloj*; *firnis*; *firnajs*; *lak*; *zaštitni premaz*; *varniš*. This term's high frequency of use in conservation practice has surely played a part in its pronounced form dispersion. Out of the six offered solutions, 7 respondents (35%) opted for *zaštitni sloj*, while the same number went with *lak*. A somewhat lesser number (4 resp. – 20%) chose *zaštitni premaz*, while the terms *firnis*, *firnajs* and *varniš* were chosen by no one. Additional suggestions: *zaštitni lak* (2 resp. – 10%). Comments left by respondents: one added the word *lakiranje* although they also chose one of the offered solutions.

We assume that the terms *firnis*, *firnajs* and *varniš* are simply colloquial vocational forms used in oral discourse and therefore not seen fit to be options for the standard professional language. The lexeme *lakiranje* is a semantic representation of a process and not of a solution described by the definition, thus it is also removed from the race. On the other hand, the difference in perception of concepts *sloj* and *premaz* among our respondents is much more vivid than the perception of the concept *zaštitni*, an adjective that the majority of them (even as part of *zaštitni lak*) considers to be a denotational backbone and has absolutely no issues with. The only problem is that the definition of the term does not exclusively talk of painting's protection, but also of the aesthetic reasons for using the solution. This brings us to a more precise formulation such as *zaštitno-estetski premaz/sloj/lak*. The tripartite form of the term, approaching the realm of paraphrasing, could eventually lead us to simply opt for *lak*.²⁴

Term 6: POULTICING (Fr. Compresse; It. Applicazione di un impacco; Ger. Kompressenanwendung). Definition: Application of a dense mass (as an absorbent pad) made of inert materials (cellulose fibers, clays such as attapulгите, sepiolite, etc.) mixed with a liquid, usually water and/or solvents and applied to a surface to be cleaned, consolidated, etc.

Serbian terms – pre-existing solutions identified by the authors in professional oral and written discourse are: *pulpiranje*; *oblaganje pulpom*; *kompresiranje*. 8 respondents (40%) opted for the term *oblaganje pulpom*, 3 (15%) for *pulpiranje* and 4 (20%) for the term *kompresiranje*. 3 respondents (15%) did not choose any of the provided options. Additional suggestions provided by respondents: *postavljanje pulpe* (1 resp. – 5%) and *postavljanje kompresa* (1 resp. – 5%).

By considering the respondents' answers and carefully reading the formulation defining the denotatum, we come to a conclusion that the term *oblaganje pulpom* is a rather good choice. This is not only because it received the majority of votes, but also because at its core, the Serbian word *oblaganje* means application, i.e. placing and spreading. It also comes from the root word *oblog*, meaning something applied for alleviation (of pain and wounds) and curing, and in this case "curing" pertains to the cleaning and consolidation of a surface being covered by pulp. While *kompresiranje* draws us to a multi-vocational nature of the term, *pulpiranje* remains a potential second choice which, in our opinion, could be used aside from *oblaganje pulpom*.

²⁴ This solution also shows up in B. Vukićević, *Dictionary of Visual Arts and Crafts*, Beograd, 2018, 392.

Term 7: CRACK (Fr. *Fissure*; It. *Frattura*; Ger. *Riss*). Definition: *A discontinuity in an architectural surface or wall painting, resulting in a visible separation of one part from another, that extends through one or more layers.*

Serbian terms – pre-existing solutions identified by the authors in professional oral and written discourse are: *pukotina*; *krakelura*; *fisura*; *fraktura*. 15 respondents (75%) opted for the term *pukotina*, 4 (20%) for the term *krakelura* and 1 (5%) for the term *fisura*. Comments left by respondents: one stated that *fisura* is a “surface crack or scratch” and that *fraktura* is “something that has deep cracks”, something that is ‘broken’.

In this case, we have a concomitance of three lexemes in Serbian which fully semantically correspond to the term *crack*: *pukotina* as a lexeme of Serbian origin, *fisura* as coming from Romance languages (French) and *fraktura* also being of Romance origin (but from Italian). As it is widely accepted that terminological synonymy and doublets (or triplets) are not welcome in standardized professional lexicon, it is required to choose one of the three. The term *pukotina* is well-established, formally and functionally accepted and actively used in professional conservation communication, so we would agree with the majority of the respondents and select it as a standardized option in Serbian. Regarding the term *krakelura*, it is not fully synonymous with *pukotina*. In fact, it is its hyponym. *Krakelura*, or *craquelure* in English, is a network of fine minor cracks (specific to secco paint layers).²⁵ So it is a (sub)type of cracks (*pukotina*). We have a similar situation with the terms *statička pukotina* (*static crack* – a crack which is caused by a change in the distribution of the static charge/load of the masonry structure)²⁶ and *mikropukotina*, or *sićušna pukotina* (*hairline crack* – a minor, individual discontinuity that is visible on the surface).²⁷

Term 8: FLAKING (Fr. *Ecaillage*; It. *Scagliatura*; Ger. *Abschuppen*). Definition: *The detachment of small, flat, thin pieces of outer stone layers or other surfaces (e.g. mural paintings). Flakes are smaller than scales.*

Serbian terms – pre-existing solutions identified by the authors in professional oral and written discourse are: *ljuskanje*; *ljuspanje*; *flejking*; *skaljatura*; *ljuštenje*. 12 respondents (60%) opted for the term *ljuspanje*, 2 (10%) each for *ljuskanje* and *ljuštenje*, while the terms *skaljatura* and *flejking* were not selected by anyone. Additional suggestion made by 4 respondents (20%): *podljuspavanje*.

The respondents’ answers tell us that lexemes *skaljatura* (of Latin and Italian origin) and *flejking* (of English origin) are most likely examples of vocational jargon occasionalism, of hapax, and that the morphological potential of Serbian is strong enough to form its own source-material terms in this case. Although rather similar in form and function (which may have been the source of some confusion to our respondents), the terms *ljuspanje* and *ljuštenje* are both semantically and practically distinct. *Ljuštenje* (*peeling* – the partial detachment of a superficial layer which often looks like a detached coating that has been applied to its surface)²⁸ is a hypernym for concepts of *listanje* (*scaling* – the detachment of surface layers of stone parallel to the stone surface (like fish scales); these are larger than flakes (flaking))²⁹ and

25 A. Weyer et al (eds.), *EwaGlos – European Illustrated Glossary of Conservation Terms for Wall Paintings and Architectural Surfaces* (2nd revised digital edition). Petersberg, 2016, 208.

26 Ibid. p. 202.

27 Ibid. p. 206.

28 Ibid. p. 190.

29 Ibid. p. 192.

ljuspanje (flaking). Overall, both general and professional Serbian dictionaries agree that the Serbian equivalent for *flake/flaking* is *ljuspa/ljuspanje*, and not *ljuskanje*.³⁰ In line with the cited dictionary entries, definitions of terms in *EwaGlos* and the majority view of the respondents, it is clear that the term *ljuspanje* is a precise, well-established and therefore the best terminological solution in Serbian. As for the suggestion of *podljuspavanje*, we assume that this lexeme could be very useful in further semantic and grammatical proliferation of the term *ljuspanje*, in the sense of some special kind or subcategory, type and form of *ljuspanje*.

Term 9: *RISING DAMP* (Fr. *Remontée capillaire*; It. *Umidità di risalita*; Ger. *Aufsteigende Feuchte*). Definition: *Dampness in the lower part of buildings resulting from capillary rise of ground water.*

Serbian terms – pre-existing solutions identified by the authors in professional oral and written discourse are: *kapilarna vlaga*; *uzlazna vlaga*; *uzlazna kapilarna vlaga*. 18 respondents (90%) opted for the term *kapilarna vlaga*, 2 (10%) for *uzlazna kapilarna vlaga*, while no one selected the lexeme *uzlazna vlaga*. Comments left by 5 respondents are almost identical – *kapilarna vlaga* (rising damp) is the damp which spreads from bottom to the top (and therefore does not need the addition of *uzlazna* – upward), and 6 respondents noted that this is a very well established term in Serbian conservation terminology.

The results of the survey, additional comments on the frequency of use, stable perception and acceptance of the term *kapilarna vlaga* within the Serbian conservation community, alongside the pleonastic nature of the lexeme *uzlazna kapilarna vlaga* and other criteria for terminology choices established earlier on in this paper, all lead towards a firm conclusion that *kapilarna vlaga* remains an adequate solution in Serbian.

Term 10: *INJECTION OF GROUT* (Fr. *Coulis d'injection*; It. *Iniezione di boiaccia*; Ger. *Injektion*). Definition: *Adhesion of layers or fragments of mortars, plasters or renders with the injection of a fluid and fine-grained mortar (grout) inside small spaces, cracks and pores.*

Serbian terms – pre-existing solutions identified by the authors in professional oral and written discourse are: *injektiranje*; *injektovanje*; *ubrizgavanje*. Orthographic-grammatical intervention undertaken by the authors upon the existing solutions: Serbian Cyrillic versions *injektovanje* (ињектовање), *inektovanje* (инектовање) and *injektiranje* (ињектирање) have been corrected to *injektovanje* (ињектовање) and *injektiranje* (ињектирање).³¹ 15 respondents (75%) opted for the term *injektiranje*, 3 (15%) for *ubrizgavanje* and 1 (5%) for *injektovanje*. Additional suggestion left by 1 respondent (5%): *inektiranje*. A comment made by one respondent: “*injekciona masa* can be used as a noun.”

There seems to be little controversy when it comes to this term, seeing that the majority opted for the loan word *injektiranje*, already the standard term in other languages. Although a case could be made for *ubrizgavanje*, seemingly interchangeable with *injektiranje*, because both denote an action of using a needle to apply

30 flake n. 1. *ljuspa*, *ljuspica* (of skin/paint), in: B. Hlebec (ur), *Standardni rečnik englesko-srpski sa gramatikom*, Standard English-Serbian dictionary with notes on Serbian grammar, Beograd, 2012, 314; flaking = *ljuspanje*, in: B. Vukićević, *Dictionary of Visual Arts and Crafts*. Beograd, 2018, 147.

31 М. Пешикан, Ј. Јерковић и М. Пижурца. *Правовис српскога језика (измењено и допунјено издање)*. Нови Сад, 2010, 330.

something (in this case adhesive) between layers or into a mass, it is, however, a term used primarily in medical contexts as syringes and needles, after all, do come from medical practice. *Ubrizgavanje* is a term also well-known to engineering and we find it in wide use in automotive and other engine industries where oily lubrication is injected in small doses to prevent friction. The source semantics of both terms correspond to the same mode of application, but pragmatically it is prudent to use a different lexeme if the contexts even hint at a possibility of a wider meaning. Therefore, it is understandable if the conservation-restoration community prefers to use a word already recognizable at international level, and to additionally distance itself from other professions where *ubrization* pertains to more than just adhesives. Additionally, the comment left by one respondent further speaks in favour of this choice, since it is morpho-phonologically much more practical to work with the word *injekcija* and all its derivatives. The alternative term for *injekciona masa* ('injection material') would be *masa za ubrizgavanje*, more of a paraphrase than a term, and we have already established that economy of language is one of the main criteria when forming terminology.

Term 11: *GROUND* (Fr. *Préparation*; It. *Preparazione*; Ger. *Grundierung*). Definition: *The first preparatory coat applied to an image carrier, to build a fine surface for the painting.*

Serbian terms – pre-existing solutions identified by the authors in professional oral and written discourse are: *preparatura*; *osnova*; *podloga*; *grund*. 12 respondents (60%) opted for the term *podloga*, 5 (25%) for *preparatura*, 3 (15%) for *osnova*, and none for *grund*. There were no additional suggestions or comments made.

Here we have a case of preference being given to a word of Serbian origin, while dictionaries may also lean in favour of loanwords.³² The majority of respondents marked *podloga* as a term of their choice, a term already in decades-long use in the field and seemingly uncontroversial. However, the fact that a quarter went with *preparatura* (Italian origin) does point to a possible recognition of a need for differentiation between the two. Namely, despite the word *nosilac* corresponding to *support* to denote the type of material upon which an artist applies colour (canvas, glass, paper, wood, etc.), in general Serbian *podloga* is often used with that sense. In scientific and professional language, *nosilac* and *podloga* are two distinct concepts, but there is undoubtedly an overlap with general language, which may be the reason why some would prefer to use the corresponding word of Romance origin. Additionally, some sources³³ state that in fact *podloga* is a hypernym and relates to the base of a painting, i.e. it is both the support and the first, protective, preparatory coating that is applied onto it. In other words, *osnova* would be the Serbian for *preparatura*, leaving us with a hierarchy of terms – *podloga* consisting of *nosilac* and *osnova/preparatura*. *Preparatura* can also be a gerund in Serbian, referring to 'the act of preparing sth', rather than the preparation (material) itself, so we could argue whether *osnova* is a better option. There is no need for two loanwords referring to the same concept and the word of Germanic origin – *grund* – was not a term of choice for any of the respondents, as the art lexicon in Serbian developed under the heavy influence of Romance terms (though German was far from disregarded).

³² Two translations are cited for the term *ground*: *podloga*, *preparatura*; in: B. Vukićević, *Dictionary of Visual Arts and Crafts*. Beograd, 2018, 173. See also footnote 34.

³³ Materijalni elementi slike, see: *podloga*. Blog run by Biljana Janković, academy-trained painter and art professor, <https://slikarskatehnologija.wordpress.com/slika/> [accessed on 13/4/20]

However, it is not unheard of in Serbian, as lexicographical publications include it among loanwords and with the meaning we are discussing here.³⁴

We can conclude that despite the majority of votes going to *podloga*, further discussion should be had on why *osnova*, as an alternative to the Italian *preparatura*, got the third place in this survey and we could question whether it is deservedly so.

Term 12: *RENDER* (Fr. *Enduit*; It. *Intonaco per esterni*; Ger. *Außenputz*). Definition: A protective and/or decorative coat (possibly in multi layers), which is applied to exterior architectural surfaces.

Serbian terms – pre-existing solutions identified by the authors in professional oral and written discourse are: *malter*; *mort*; *spoljašnji malter*. 10 respondents (50%) opted for the term *spoljašnji malter*, 3 (15%) for the term *malter*, none for *mort*, while 2 respondents (10%) gave no answer. Additional suggestions left by respondents: *završni sloj* (3 resp. – 15%), *dekorativni malter* (1 resp. – 5%), *malterisanje* (1 resp. – 5%). Comments left by respondents: one wrote for *render* that “it could also denote being painted over; coat is a layer spread over,” while another noted that “it could mean *malter*, but based on the definition it could also mean another material.”

The respondents’ answers were rather split, but the term of choice for 50% of them was *spoljašnji malter*, which the authors agree seems to be the most adequate solution. If we look at the standard in Italian, it is obvious that in Serbian we have a translation equivalent, a literal translation that offers a more precise reference than the monolexeme *malter*. *Malter* can be confusing due to being the standard translation for *mortar*, a material used for binding bricks/blocks/stone (and sometimes used decoratively). Also, as one respondent dutifully noted, *malter* is a kind of material, but other formulations and materials can be used for rendering as well. The suggested *završni sloj* may run the risk of sounding too vague, though if we were using it in a specific context, we agree that it would be properly understood and yet would leave enough space for further explaining what formulation or material was being used on the surface. We advise that more attention be paid to this suggestion, and with a larger number of respondents we could discover the frequency of its use in the field. We discard the suggestions *dekorativni malter* – since it eliminates the ‘protection’ aspect of the term, and *malterisanje* – because, aside from again posing the same *malter* dilemma, it is a gerund and denotes action while the corresponding term *render* does not and instead focuses on the material.

Term 13: *PLASTER OF PARIS* (Fr. *Plâtre de Paris*; It. *Gesso di Parigi*; Ger. *Modellgips*). Definition: A white, fine, inorganic and quick-setting powder that is made by heating gypsum to 120–180 °C in dry conditions (calcinated gypsum). It is composed of hemihydrate as well as impurities originating from the natural source, such as anhydrite.

Serbian terms – pre-existing solutions identified by the authors in professional oral and written discourse are: *gips*; *pariski gips*. Orthographic-grammatical intervention undertaken by the authors upon the existing solutions: *pariški gips* – incorrect form of the possessive adjective derived from a toponym³⁵. 11 respondents (55%) opted for the term *gips*, 5 (25%) for *pariski gips* and 2 (10%) chose neither of

34 Грунд = 1. слик. основна боја слике, подлога. 2. грунт [= земљишни посед, земљиште, имање]; ин: И. Клајн и М. Шипка, *Велики речник сјџраних речи и израза*, Нови Сад, 2006, 308.

35 М. Пешикан, Ј. Јерковић и М. Пижурца. *Правойис срјскоја језика (измењено и дојуњено издање)*. Нови Сад, 2010, 405.

the provided. Additional suggestions made by respondents: *modelarski gips* (1 resp. – 5%) and *gips poluhidrat* (1 resp. – 5%).

We cannot pretend that the issue with *gips* has not been bothering translators for a very long time. However enticing the idea of simply using a monolexeme *gips* is (as 55% of our respondents have shown in their answers), there simply has to be a clear distinction between the kinds of material used for different purposes if a term is to be nominated for a scientific standard. Dictionaries recognise this need and offer a plethora of options,³⁶ though surprisingly enough they skip the term *pariski gips*, which some of our respondents did recognise as a viable solution (probably based on personal experience in the field). Perhaps the term *pariski gips* is too literal a translation from French/Italian/English, but if the material is named so in three of the art's major languages, it is proof enough of it being an internationalism. The whole debate surrounding this term is too wide to be expounded on in this paper, but with the initial insight we obtained we are ready to join constructive discussions on the issue.

Term 14: *WHITEWASH* (Fr. *Badigeon*; It. *Imbiancatura*; Ger. *Tünche*). Definition: *A white surface coating for architectural surfaces. (Usually a mixture of slaked lime and water, but chalk, gypsum or white clay are also possible main components, sometimes enhanced with an extra binder like casein, tallow or glue and white pigments or white fillers.)*

Serbian terms – pre-existing solutions identified by the authors in professional oral and written discourse are: *kreč*; *beli premaz*. 8 respondents (40%) opted for the term *beli premaz*, 4 (20%) for the term *kreč*, and 2 gave no answer. Additional suggestions made by respondents: *krečni premaz* (4 resp. – 20%), *krečno mleko* (1 resp. – 5%) and *bela impregnacija* (1 resp. – 5%).

As is the case with *plaster of Paris* and *render*, *whitewash* is likewise a source of much debate and a whole plethora of words and phrases used to denote it.³⁷ Again we have a situation where a coating of a sort has a specific purpose and appearance, but the formulations used to obtain it may differ. This leads to the emergence of solutions such as *beli premaz* and *bela impregnacija* and up to a point – *krečno mleko*, which lend a more descriptive character and correspond to the English and Italian focusing on the quality of ‘whiteness’, too. The word *kreč* found its way into 45% of the answers, either as a monolexeme or as part of a billexeme. This means there is a palpable need to retain some reference to the chemical property in the term, but in a way that avoids saying just *kreč*, as elements and formulations other than *lime* can make up *whitewash*. Confusion should be avoided at all costs, since in Serbian we already have a terminological pairing of (živi) *kreč* (*lime* in English) and *gašeni kreč* (*slaked lime* – which is what *whitewash* may consist of).

Term 15: *SALT EFFLORESCENCE* (Fr. *Efflorescence saline*; It. *Efflorescenza di Sali*; Ger. *Salzausblühung*). Definition: *An accumulation of a white powder or crystals, made up of soluble salts, on an architectural surface or mural painting. The migration of soluble salts and water evaporation lead to salt crystallisation on the surface. When hard and compact it is referred to as a “salt crust”.*

36 Plaster of Paris = *vajarski gips*, *modelarski gips*, *građevinski gips*, *štuko gips*; in: B. Vukićević, *Dictionary of Visual Arts and Crafts*. Beograd, 2018, 173.

37 Whitewash = 1. *krečno mleko* 2. *beljenje*, *krečenje* 3. *kreč u prahu*; in: B. Vukićević, *Dictionary of Visual Arts and Crafts*. Beograd, 2018, 408.

Serbian terms – pre-existing solutions identified by the authors in professional oral and written discourse are: *cvetanje soli*; *cvetanje soli na površini*; *eflorescencija soli*. 9 respondents (45%) opted for the term *eflorescencija soli*, 8 (40%) for *cvetanje soli* and none for *cvetanje soli na površini*. Additional suggestions made by respondents: *isoljavanje* (2 resp. – 10%) and *kristalizacija soli na površini* (1 resp. – 5%).

We are of the opinion that the final decision on the Serbian term, considering all the already laid out criteria, has to be made without losing sight of a term related to this one – *subflorescence (saline)*, which denotes an accumulation of salt underneath the wall surface. Thus we could have *eflorescencija soli*, as chosen by the majority, alongside *subflorescencija soli*. Both of these terms are aligned with standardised language solutions and signifiers in other languages that were cited, making them acceptable for official use in Serbian. These scientific Greco-Latin words have a good match in the ‘field’ term *cvetanje soli*, also well-received by the survey respondents. Certain Croatian scientists use the term *podcvjetavanje (soli)*³⁸ in place of *subflorescence* or *cvetanje soli ispod površine*, so this could also be a suggestion for the terminology pairing (*cvetanje soli – podcvjetavanje soli*). The final word regarding the choice between the ‘scientific-theoretical’ (*eflorescencija soli*) and the ‘field-vocational’ option (*cvetanje soli*) remains with the conservation community, seeing that both options are valid. As a final comment, the term *kristalizacija soli na površini*, suggested by a respondent, seems a rather long and inadequate option in comparison with the abovementioned ones, while the other suggested term – *isoljavanje* – could encounter issues with further semantic-morphophonological distribution as relates to *cvetanje soli ispod površine*.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This ‘small-scale research’ aimed to draw attention to the need for initialising a language standardisation process in the field of conservation-restoration of wall paintings and architectural surfaces. More importantly, it aimed to provide concrete terminology solutions for the field in Serbian, while relying on the already standardised ones in other languages and on the cooperation with field experts and linguists. Our work analysed and commented on dozens of possible Serbian formal correspondents and translation equivalents encountered in practice as matches for the lexemes in the standardised multilingual *EwaGlos* dictionary. We have come to a conclusion that the language of the field in question is rather abstruse, unsystematic, rich in numerous idiolectic terminology doublets and variations; there is a terminology interference between vocational (‘field’) and scientific (‘textbook-theoretical’) lexicons. The analysed Serbian terms are mostly mono- and billexemic and are formed by way of appropriating general lexis, by loaning foreign words and by loan translating (forming calques).

The authors are fully aware of the complexity of research such as this, and of the limitations of this allotted space when covering all its aspects, including its failings. A macro model of research would entail the participation of a more numerous and institutionally stronger pool of researchers devoted to it. On the part of linguistics, that would include the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, more precisely –

³⁸ See, for example: B. Matulić, *Temeljni pojmovi konzervacije i restauracije zidnih slika i mozaika (Basic terms of conservation-restoration of Wall paintings and Mosaics)*, Split, 2012; K. Hraste, „O stanju hrvatskog konzervatorsko-restauratorskog nazivlja u praksi, na primjeru nekoliko vrsta naslaga na kamenu“, u: *Godišnjak hrvatskog restauratorskog zavoda* 6/2015, Zagreb, 2015, 207–220.

its Institute for the Serbian Language and the Committee for the Standardization of the Serbian Language, along with Serbian philological faculties and scientific translator associations.³⁹ As for the conservation-restoration professional-scientific community, it would include eminent institutes for the protection of cultural monuments at state, provincial and municipal levels, museums, associations of conservators and restorers, domestic branches of international professional associations, higher level educational institutions which offer conservation and restoration as a study programme. Aside from all of them, it would entail the participation of state institutions, such as the Institute for Standardization of Serbia and first and foremost – the Ministry of Culture and Information, the umbrella institution of national guarantee for projects of this kind. Without such an encompassing approach, applied terminological research is practically impossible. Not to mention language policy and strategic language planning (along the international–national–individual lines),⁴⁰ which they are an integral part of.

On previous occasions, we have already called attention to the steps that lead to the standardisation of professional and scientific terminology in the field at hand, and we feel it is time they were taken:

“The process of standardisation itself should be threefold if it is to bear any valuable results. The first step is to describe, classify and systematise the terminological fund in the field of conservation [...of wall paintings and architectural surfaces]. The second is to gain support from the state and create conditions for organised teamwork – cooperative efforts of linguists and conservator-restorers. The final, and equally crucial, step is to produce a lexicographic publication – an official volume of references that paints a clear picture of appropriate terminology and its adequate usage.”⁴¹

Once again we underline that the solutions offered in this paper do not represent prescribed terminology forms, but are simply preferences of both survey respondents and the authors in the sense of their potential use as sociolectic, rather than idiolectic lexemes in the Serbian conservation-restoration field. All the results presented and our overall research are valid and fully based on good scientific and research practice, but are, nevertheless, still of subjective nature, making this paper open to criticism, amendments and supplementation, as is the case with any other pioneering research.

Finally, drawing from our overall experience of working on this issue, we conclude that we do indeed have ‘a word for the race’ and, in all probability, the interest to take part in the race itself. However, those willing to run that race are hard to find, yet there are those who will try to trip you at the very starting line, should you wish to even participate in the race. Nonetheless, terminology races are like marathons, and well-prepared and motivated long-distance runners should not find it hard to run and be victorious.

39 J. Filipović i A. Đordan. “Terminology policy in Serbia – Actors and decision makers in Serbian language policy and planning” in *New challenges for research on language for special purposes, Forum für Fachsprachen-Forschung*, vol. 154, I. Simonnæs, Ø. Andersen & K. Schubert (eds.), Berlin, 2019, 67–88.

40 V. Ošmjanski i A. Vuletić, „Individualna višjejezičnost u Srbiji – cilj obrazovne politike i faktor socijalne pokretljivosti” u: *Socijalna politika u Srbiji na raskršću vekova*, V. Ilić (ur.), Beograd, Krim, 2019, 287.

41 A. Orašanin i A. Vuletić, “The glue that holds us together: Challenges of translating conservation-restoration terminology from and into Serbian” in: *Proceedings from the First International Conference SmartArt*. Belgrade, 2020, 492.

REFERENCES

- Argyropoulos**, Vasilike et al. (eds.). *The Conservation Dictionary: A multilingual dictionary of conservation/restoration terminology in printed and digital format*, CGRC, Athens, 2001.
- Art Conservation Terms**. *Glossary of Art Conservation Terms*, CEO, The Conservation Center, Chicago, www.theconservationcenter.com/conservation-services/art-conservation-glossary
- Cabré**, M. T. *Terminology. Theory, Methods and Applications*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia, 1999
- CAMEO Conservation & Art Material Encyclopedia Online**, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, http://cameo.mfa.org/wiki/Main_Page
- Clarke**, Michael. *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Art Terms*. OUP, Oxford, 2010.
- Filipović**, Jelena. and Đordan, Aleksandra, "Terminology policy in Serbia – Actors and decision makers in Serbian language policy and planning" in: *New challenges for research on language for special purposes. Forum für Fachsprachen-Forschung*, vol. 154. Simonnaes, I., Andersen, Ø. & Schubert, K. (eds.), Frank & Timme, Berlin, 2019, 67–88.
- Filipović**, Jelena. and Vučo, Julijana, "Multimodal transdisciplinary approach to cultural heritage preservation: linguistic and cultural landscapes" u: *Jezici i kulture u vremenu i prostoru VIII/2 – Tematski zbornik*, Gudurić, S., Radić-Bojanić, B. (eds.) Filozofski fakultet, Novi Sad, 2019, 347–359.
- Гласник Друштва конзерватора Србије**, свеске 1–42, Друштво конзерватора Србије, Београд, <http://dks.org.rs/scc/izdavastvo/>
- Harris**, Cyril M. (ed.). *Dictionary of Architecture and Construction*, 4th edition, New York, 2006.
- Hraste**, Katarina. „O stanju hrvatskog konzervatorsko-restauratorskog nazivlja u praksi, na primjeru nekoliko vrsta naslaga na kamenu” u *Godišnjak hrvatskog restauratorskog zavoda* 6/2015, HRZ, Zagreb, 2015, 207–220.
- ICOM-CC**. 2008. "Terminology to characterize the conservation of tangible cultural heritage", Resolution adopted by the ICOM-CC membership at the 15th Triennial Conference, New Delhi, 22–26 September 2008. <http://www.icom-cc.org/242/about/terminology-for-conservation/>
- ICOMOS** "Principles for the Preservation and Conservation/Restoration of Wall Paintings, 5th and final draft for adoption at the ICOMOS General Assembly", Victoria Falls, October 2003, see: www.international.icomos.org/victoriafalls2003/wall_eng.htm (also available in French).
- ISO 704**: Principles and methods of terminology, 1987.
- ISO 10241**: Presentation of terminological entries in vocabularies" (new edition 2015)
- ISO 704** "Terminology work: Principles and methods" (latest edition: 2009)
- Клајн**, Иван. и Шипка, Милан, *Велики речник сѝраних речи и израза*. Нови Сад, Прометеј, 2006.
- Matulić**, Branko. *Temeljni pojmovi konzervacije i restauracije zidnih slika i mozaika (Basic terms of conservation-restoration of Wall paintings and Mosaics)*, Naklada Bošković i Umjetnička akademija Sveučilišta u Splitu, Split, 2012.
- Moderna konzervacija**, свеске 1–6, часопис Nacionalnog komiteta ICOMOS Srbija; <http://icomos-serbia.com/>
- Наслеђе**, свеске 1–21, часопис Завода за заштиту споменика културе града Београда; https://beogradskonasledje.rs/casopis-nasledje?_rstr_nocache=rstr527602a3fd196da1
- Nikolić**, Aleksandra, „Terminologija – konzervacija kulturnog nasleđa”, *Diana* 13 2008/2009, Odeljenje za preventivnu zaštitu, Narodni muzej u Beogradu, Beograd, 2008.
- Orašanić**, Aleksandra i Vuletić, Aleksandar, "The glue that holds us together: Challenges of translating conservation-restoration terminology from and into Serbian", *Proceedings from the First International Conference SmartArt*, Faculty of Applied Arts, Belgrade, 2020, 485–495.
- Ošmjanski**, Vera. i Vuletić, Aleksandar, „Individualna višejezičnost u Srbiji – cilj obrazovne politike i faktor socijalne pokretljivosti”, *Socijalna politika u Srbiji na raskršću vekova*, u: Ilić, V. (ur.), Beograd, Krim, Krimski federalni univerzitet i Visoka škola socijalnog rada, 2019.
- Пешикан**, Митар et al. *Правойис срѝскоїа језика (измењено и доуњено издање)*. Матица српска, Нови Сад, 2010.
- Sager**, J. C. *A Practical Course in Terminology Processing*, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia, 1990.
- Trench**, Lucy (ed.). *Materials and Techniques in the Decorative Arts. An illustrated Dictionary*. London, 2000.
- UNESCO**: Glossary http://www.unesco.org/culture/en/natlaws/db/database_glossary_e_2009.pdf. [accessed 10–15 May, 2021]
- Vokić**, D. „O epistemologiji konzervatorsko-restauratorske struke”, *Godišnjak zaštite spomenika kulture Hrvatske* 33/34–2009/2010, Ministarstvo kulture RH, Zagreb, 2010, 23–38.

- Vukićević**, Branko, *Dictionary of Visual Arts and Crafts*, AGM knjiga, Beograd, 2018.
- Vuletić**, Aleksandar and Orašanin, Aleksandra, "On Translation of Some Applied Arts Terms from Serbian into English: An Explicative Analysis", paper to be published in journal *Nasleđe* No.49 (FILUM) in a 2021 edition.
- Warburton**, K. "Naming of scientific concepts. Requirements from international terminology standards", ISO Technical Committee 37 Chair presentation, 2009, https://www.itu.int/dms_pub/itu-r/oth/oa/oe/RoAoE0000960011PDFE.pdf [accessed 10–15 May, 2021]
- Weyer**, Angela, et al (eds.), *EwaGlos – European Illustrated Glossary of Conservation Terms for Wall Paintings and Architectural Surfaces* (2nd revised digital edition). Michael Imhof Verlag, Petersberg, 2016.

Александар Ђ. ВУЛЕТИЋ, Александра П. ОРАШАНИН
ТЕРМИНИ ИЗ ОБЛАСТИ КОНЗЕРВАЦИЈЕ ЗИДНИХ СЛИКА И АРХИТЕКТОНСКИХ ПОВРШИНА: ДА ЛИ И МИ РЕЧ ЗА ТРКУ ИМАМО?

Резиме: Потреба за прецизном, поузданом, и самим тим усклађеном и стандардизованом комуникацијом унутар међународне заједнице стручњака који се баве пословима у вези са очувањем материјалног културног наслеђа резултирала је двогодишњим пројектом (2014–2016. године) и израдом Европског илустрованог речника термина из области конзервације зидних слика и архитектонских површина (*EwaGlos – European Illustrated Glossary of Conservation Terms for Wall Paintings and Architectural Surfaces*). Овај једанаестोजезични термилошки глосар, у чијој изради српска научно-стручна конзерваторска заједница није учествовала, представља путоказ – у ком правцу и на који начин се српска струковна терминологија мора развијати, усклађивати и нормирати, пружајући притом шансу (препознату од стране аутора овога рада) лингвистима и делатницима из конзерваторско-рестаураторске струке да заједно дају свој допринос на овом пољу. Предмет овога рада, дакле, јесу изабрани термини из области конзервације зидних слика и архитектонских површина на српском језику, односно селекција, формирање и формално-функционална дескриптивна анализа тих термина, насталих у односу на њихове кореспонденте и еквиваленте дате у илустрованом речнику *EwaGlos*. Циљ овога рада јесте непрескриптивни предлог конкретних термилошких решења у погледу лексичких јединица српскога језика у области конзервације зидних слика и архитектонских површина, заснованих на компетентној истраживачкој, научној, струковној и лингвистичко-термилошкој методологији – преваасходно на међународно прихваћеним препорукама о начинима формирања квалитетне и одрживе термилошке номенклатуре, као и постојећег српског научно-стручног усменог и писаног конзерваторско-рестаураторског дискурса. Такође, циљ рада јесте допринос процесу нормирања и стандардизације апструзне терминологије српскога језика у поменутој области, као и скретање пажње научно-стручној заједници у Србији на потребу да се укључи у међународне лексикографске подухвате као што је *EwaGloss*. Аутори су у раду, поред квантитативне статистичке методе, користили и квалитативне истраживачке методе – контактано-контрастивну, компаративно-дистрибутивну, методу супституције и структурално-функционалну анализу. Сматрамо да су додатне вредности овога рада његова општа корист за српско-енглеску компаративну лингвистику, термилошку лексикографију, филолошки и примењеноуметнички оријентисану наставу, укључујући целокупну конзерваторско-рестаураторску заједницу и све институције које се баве поменутом проблематиком у ужем и ширем смислу.

Кључне речи: терминологија, стандардизација, конзервација, зидне слике, архитектонске површине