

SEMANTIC CHANGE IN LATVIAN UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF ENGLISH

ANDREJS VEISBERGS

University of Latvia, Latvia

Abstract. The impact of English as a global language upon Latvian has been growing exponentially in the last 20 years. It results not only in traditional borrowing and loans, but affects also the sphere of semantics – native Latvian words and earlier loans modify and change their meanings under the influence of English. Latvian linguistics for about 100 years has preferred to ignore or condone semantic change, though it has always been rife. The paper views semantic change as reflected in new meanings, broadening and narrowing of meaning, connotational change, conceptual recategorization and idiom loans. The study is based on a corpus of around 800 lexical and phraseological units that have undergone a change in the last two decades. Though some of the change may seem unnecessary, redundant and even confusing, there seems to be no way resisting, as it is the result of a massive impact of language contact which envelops all layers of lexis and styles.

Keywords: English, Latvian, semantics, borrowing, loans, change, connotation, conceptual recategorization.

INTRODUCTION

The corpus of this study consists of around 800 lexical and phraseological units of Latvian that have undergone semantic change in the last two decades – since the impact of English grew exponentially. All words under discussion have at least 5 separate source occurrences in the corpus, thus nonce use is excluded. The lexical and phraseological units were selected from mainly popular texts (magazines, newspapers, internet news texts). Overt translations were avoided (which does not exclude the possibility of covert ones). As a result the linguistic units under the study are representative of the language, they are not peripheral, or strictly terminological units, but rather central for the modern Latvian language wordstock. The meanings were compared to the traditional ones, as reflected in standard Latvian lexicographical sources – dictionaries of Modern Latvian and dictionaries of Foreign Words.

ENGLISH EXPANSION

Today the English language with its various modes of existence – as mother tongue, second language, foreign language, lingua franca, its territorial and social variants, individual variants, feeble „desperantos”, etc. – is the only global

language. It naturally dominates the linguistic community of mankind which consists of numerous less advanced, less spread languages. Not being the dominant language in terms of native speakers, the power of English lies in its importance as a second language. Some describe the advance of English as linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992), linguistic oppression, others as a promise for the future leadership on the globe (Bennet, 2004) or as an ideal mode of communication between the more and more globalized citizens of the world where it has achieved the hegemonic critical mass. Still others view it as an inevitable, but benevolent *lingua franca*, however, influencing other languages (House, 2002, 2004). It should be noted that the spread of global English historically and comparatively has been least based on direct brutal, military or religious imposition, central decrees. It is boosted by the economic might of the native backyards (once the UK, now the US). English has spread mostly through natural agreement, and often as a result of a conflict of other languages where it has been the (seemingly neutral) third party. Thus in India, the spread of English was and is determined to a large extent by the fractious state of the local languages. Even within the EU, the crucial advent of English started not with the joining of the UK and Ireland in 1973, but with the accession of Scandinavian (1995) and the Central and East European countries (2004). The apparent consensual acceptance of English as a *lingua franca* (Wright, 2004: 157) makes it not only a globalized language but also a medium and channel of globalization. Also the language industry – dictionaries, textbooks, electronic tools – apart from the financial gain (in the early first decade of the 21st century amounting to 11 billion a year in the UK alone (Phillipson, 2006: 74)) – multiplies its initial power position. The global diffusion, high prestige and economic value of English make it very attractive, e.g. Latvian schoolchildren and their parents rank the usefulness of knowing English higher than that of their mother tongue (Latviešu ..., 2010).

Whatever the reasons for the predominance of English, it occupies not only the central role as a means of international communication (Crystal, 2003), but also leaves an increasing effect on the other languages per se. This can take various ways, the simplest and most evident being English loanwords in different languages (see Görlach, 2001, 2002, 2003), as well as in many other less direct and obvious forms. This is fostered by a change in the type of language contacts. If formerly language contacts were either direct, where a mixing of people speaking various languages took place, or indirect – mostly through translations, which led to the borrowing of new terms, cultural or exotic words, then today the boundary between these two types has become very blurred. Even people living in relatively monolingual countries are frequently in contact with other languages through media, the internet and all-pervasive translations. While in the past translations were usually distinguishable, today most of them pass without being recognized as such. These are texts on international matters (politics, economy), texts on popular international culture (cinema, music, football, celebrities), recipes, cookbooks, travel descriptions and guides, international and European laws transposed, contracts (legal concepts and language in general for most nations are borrowed from Latin, continental or Anglo-Saxon systems), localization

of software, advertizing, films, dubbed, voice over, subtitled according to the tradition, TV dubbed and subtitled, TV shows, games franchises, usage instructions, labels (food, equipment, medicine), education books, reference books, encyclopedias, fiction translations and covert translations, to mention just a few.

In the Latvian case it has been estimated that about 70% of texts that an average Latvian consumes are translations (Ločmele and Veisbergs, 2011). This cannot but leave an imprint on the native language. The blur or fusion of translations and original texts makes it hard to delineate them, unless for specific reasons. It is not a totally new phenomenon. Koller points out that the total of written texts in German has always consisted of both original texts and translations without the two having been clearly marked off from each other. Translations always result in adaptations of the linguistic systems that either incorporate the source language features or redefine the features of TL to fit the new communicative task – and they become a norm (Koller, 2000: 113). It is the proportion, the scale and the omnipresent media that have changed.

There have been many attempts to discern and enumerate the types of motivation for using, borrowing and adopting foreign elements (Baldunčiks, 1989: 11), to differentiate between, what some call, the needed loans and meanings (filling the lacunae) and the ornamental, idiosyncratic reasons for using them, often branded as unnecessary. Meier, discussing German loans in English, suggests that

the line between need and prestige, however, can be somewhat obscure, given the tendency for foreign words to belong to a more „educated register”. Indeed I would submit that, by virtue of its foreignness, a word attains greater saliency and thus, to some extent, is imbued with greater expressive power, a power concordant with both need and prestige. (Meier, 2000: 169).

However, frequently the early and later users never think of their linguistic activity, frequently subconscious interference is at play, followed by replication on a mass scale, boosted today by the ubiquitous media.

LATVIAN AS A RECEPTOR LANGUAGE

In the last 800 years Latvian has steadily been under the influence of different dominant languages – 700 years under an increasing German influence, about 200 years under a strong Russian influence and the last 20 years under that of English. Briefer and occasional influences of Polish, Swedish and other languages have been comparatively less relevant. One lexeme exemplifies the main drift of dominant languages – **leduslācis (from German Eisbaer (ice bear)) > baltais lācis (Russian belij medved (white bear)) > polārlācis (polar bear).**

The English influence in the form of full loans (anglicisms in the narrow sense) in Latvian until the 1980s have been thoroughly studied by J. Baldunčiks (1989)

in an exhaustive monograph/dictionary. English loans for a longer time (since the first adoptions at the end of the 18th c.) were borrowed from German, later in the 20th century also from Russian. Needless to say, English often functioned as a re-exporter of loans from more exotic languages, e.g. **džungļi/dšungļi** < **jungle**.

In English the word had been borrowed from Hindi **jangal**, at the end of the 18th century. In Latvian the word was borrowed presumably from German **Dschungel**. The first instances are noted, according to Baldunčiks (1989), already at the end of the 19th century – **purvos un džunglājos** (Baltijas Vēstnesis, 1899: 155, 2). Soon the word appeared in dictionaries: **Džungela – silājs ar mežiem un purviem Rītindijā**. (Lībknēhts, 1908: 59).

Similarly **pidžama** < **pyjamas**, was borrowed in English in the 1800s from Persian **pay jamah**. The word **pyjama** is noted in German in 1915 and appears in Latvian (Baldunčiks, 1989) after the First World War: **Pyjamos no mazgājama zīda** (Kurzemes Vārds, 1924. 28), **Viengabalaina pidžama** (Elegance, 1925: 26, 14), **Pidžāma –vaļiņš, viegls rīta vai vakara uzvalks** (Ozoliņš, 1926: 124).

In the 20s and 30s of the 20th century there were also direct contacts between English and Latvian resulting in the adoption of many full loans: **hīts (heat)**, **džezs (jazz)**, **buči (boots)**, **stends (stand)**, **seksapīls (sex-appeal)**, **nokauts (knock-out)**, **džemperis (jumper)**, **pulloveris (pullover)**, **vikends (week-end)**; occasional calques and semicalques – **naktsklubs (nightclub)**, **faivoklok tēja (five o'clock tea)**. Semantic shifts, however, were not noticeable.

During the Soviet period most anglicisms were borrowed via Russian, occasionally carrying some elements of the latter language – **džinsi (jeans)**, **čipsi (chips)**, **klipši (clips)**, etc.

Towards the end of the 20th century English became the main direct contact language of Latvian and accordingly the intermediary language for many, often, more exotic loans, e.g. **graffiti** < **Italian graffito**, < **graffio [a scratch]** borrowed in English in the middle of the 19th century. The new meaning in English, however, appears in the second half of the 20th century. The word appeared in Latvian in the 80s of the 20th century. Similarly, numerous semi-terminological words have been borrowed of late, e.g. a multitude of exotic massage types, mostly borrowed from English.

In summary, the full loan corpus from English consists mainly of neoclassical words, many exoticisms, some proper “anglicisms” and many colloquial English words, part of which can be viewed as nonce-words used to add stylistic piquancy. Semantic change under the impact of English, however, is less prominent and obvious and has hardly been studied in Latvian at all.

TERMINOLOGY: LOANS AND ANGLICISMS

Borrowing from English occurs in various shapes. One of the main drives behind language change is the change in reality that creates an onomasiological need (Geeraerts, 2010: 41): a new meaning/nuance is needed/felt as needed, and it can

be achieved by creating/borrowing a new word (onomasiological innovations provide new words together with the meanings needed/wanted), or by adapting an extant lexeme (semasiological innovations insert the new meanings in the existing words). Even when there is no change in reality that needs to be worded, but there is a wish for a new wording (prestige, vogue or other reasons), the same mechanisms apply. In the case of English induced effect the result is sometimes described as an “anglicism”, but there can be a narrow, broad and very broad understanding of the term.

The narrow understanding would comprise only full loanwords with unchanged or changed spelling and/or pronunciation, as well as with a possible change of meaning in the loan. ‘An anglicism is a word or an idiom that is recognizably English in its form (spelling, pronunciation, morphology, or at least one of the three), but is accepted as an item in the vocabulary if the receptor language’ (Görlach, 2003:1). This would exclude code switches, quotations and similar occasional occurrences, nonce insertions as well as various semantic loans (calques in various forms), also similar occasional semantic deviations (what Paul (1920:75) described already in 1880 as *okkasionelle Bedeutung*), as well as other imported features in the receptor language (see further).

The broad understanding would go much further, e.g. Gottlieb defines an anglicism as ‘any individual or systematic language feature adapted or adopted from English, or inspired or boosted by English models, used in intralingual communication in a language other than English’ (Gottlieb, 2002: 129). Stretched still further one can establish and view English impact on supra-lexical levels as well, e.g. English has affected Latvian word formation patterns (import of patterns (Ločmele, Veisbergs, 2011)), textual norms and conventions (use and spread of innovations, wordplay, phraseological transformations) (Veisbergs, 2007a), advertising patterns (Ločmele, 2010), the frequency and scope of colloquial and nonce use (Brēde, 2011), the “internet language” (Silis, 2009: 172).

Finally, there is a view that the English interference and dominance in language contacts creates semantic chaos and sets up communicative barriers within the target language community. The proponents of this view deplore English impact and try to curtail it as much as possible. Others consider that this impact leads to a general standardization/homogenization of languages with a consequent loss of cultural uniqueness (Munat, 2004:115). Still others think that the change adds stylistic enrichment, nuances, fills gaps in the receptor language. It might be worth referring here to the endless “hard word” discussions in the 16th century Britain, where the situation can be viewed as similar as to the scale of influx of foreign material. Despite the collateral estrangement of the English wordstock by the Romanic and Latin loanwords, they enriched and refined the linguistic means of expression (Scheler, 1977:104).

Thus, borrowing can be viewed as an enrichment and refinement of linguistic means of expression, an activation of linguistic potentialities of the language under the influence of another language/culture (Veisbergs, 2007a). Whatever the views, the phenomenon exists, it can hardly be controlled or affected, and deserves investigation.

As this paper is dedicated mostly to semantic change, a brief overview of the various types of English impact will follow – all of which can be viewed as anglicisms. However we will not use the term “anglicism” for semantic change as the broad meaning of the former is very blurred and might cause confusion.

ENGLISH IMPACT

English (including the so-called Neoclassical words coined in English) impact on Latvian today can be seen in the following forms and conventions:

- Traditional full loans with the usual/necessary phonetic, spelling and grammatical adaptations: **friks (freak)**, **filings (feeling)**, **čarts (chart)**, **meils (mail)**, **lūzers (loser)**.
- Unassimilated full loans.

The number of stable loans of this category is small, yet there are numerous non-use cases): **wow** (sometimes misspelt), **OK**, **fuck**:

Korngolds, kas kādreiz biedēja un likās “vai!”, izrādās “wow”. (Diena, 11.5.2011)

Reakcija ir – wow, bet acīs redzēju “kāpēc.. (Diena 7.6. 2010)

Latvijas ekspozīcijā nākuši klāt un teikuši – wow,... . (Diena, 23.9.2008)

- Neoclassical borrowings

These constitute the largest share of loans: **politkorektums (political correctness)**, **komitoloģija (commitology)**, **interfeiss (interface)**, **interoperabilitāte (interoperability)**, **eksponenciāls (exponential)**.

- Latvian derivations, clippings of English loans

Derivatives of loans are rife: **fakucis (fucker)**, **fakains (fucking)**, **kompis (computer)**, **tīnis (teenager)**, **fiča (feature)**, **fanot (to be a fan)**, **veikot (to wakeboard)**, **snovot (to snowboard)**.

- Midclippings

Loss of syllables in Latvian words (older borrowings) under the influence of English is frequent: **optimizēt < optimalizēt (optimize)**, **minimizēt < minimalizēt (minimize)**, **implants < implantāts (implant)**.

- Morphological change

Morphological changes in older loans (usually not of English origin) that usually take the form of change of derivational suffixes aligning with the English ones: **inspicēt > inspektēt (inspect)**; **novators > inovators (innovator)**, **sociālekonomisks > socioekonomisks (socioeconomic)**, **abreviatūra > abreviācija (abbreviation)**, **homoseksuālists > homoseksuālis (homosexual)**, **katastrofāls > katastrofisks (catastrophic)**, sometimes prefixes are also affected **pirmsinsulta > preinsulta (pre-insult)**.

- Ousting/replacement of older loans with new ones:

prevencija (prevention) < profilakse, **audits (audit) < revīzija**, **urināls (urinal) < pisuārs**; **personāls (personnel) < kadri**; **animācijas (animation) < multiplikācijas**; **enzīms (enzyme) < fermentis**.

- Untraditional morphological patterns

Negative attributes formed on the basis of nouns in the genitive case (instead of the usual for Latvian negative adjective-based attributes) are now rife (the early cases came under the Russian influence in the 50s, but remained few). These are both borrowings and native words (presumably loan translations): **nerezidentu, netarifu, nefinanšu, nekapitāla, nedzīvnieku, nevaldības, nedzīvības, nepārtikas, nepiena, neslides, nezinātnes, netiesas, nelīguma.**

- Conversions

Cases of English-induced conversion are growing: **nekrofilis (necrophile), poligēns (polygenic), kontraceptīvs (contraceptive), kompozīts (composite), homofobs (homophobe), ambients (ambient), pedofils (pedophile).** Conversion, though theoretically existing in Latvian (naturally limited by the flective nature of Latvian) was a rare word-formation pattern, usually applied in specific word classes or a few isolated historical cases. The new samples of conversion are generally borrowings, and all of the adjective-noun type.

- Blends

Growth in use of blends has been noted. Blending was a nonexistent word-formation pattern in Latvian in the past. A few English blends were borrowed as root words, e.g. **smogs (smog), motelis (motel).** Today, however, nonce blending is rife and affects also native words. Some of the former nonce words have gained wide usage and have entered the Standard Latvian lexicon, e.g. **nacbols (nacionālais boļševiks – National Bolshevik).** Systemic novelty has even broken into the traditionally conservative stronghold of Latvian – that of terminology. If **kaplete (kapsula tablete, capsule tablet)** can be viewed as an imported blend, then, for example, the more genuinely Latvian **mēstule (mēslu vēstule, junk e-letter), atkritne (atkritumu atvilktnē, waste(recycle) bin)** serve as a proof that the expansion of new word-formation patterns has been extended to all styles and registers of the language.

- Compound phrases

Compound phrases of the occasional/nonce type: *‘Izrādās, lai popularizētu Parīzes **tur-noteikti-vajag-būt** objektu...’* (Diena, 23.02.2001) (*It turns out that to popularize a Paris one-must-be-there object*) were nonexistent in Latvian before the 90s and the hyphenated compound phrase model was certainly imported. They are always of nonce-character in Latvian. The short hyphenated compounds (unusual in the past in Latvian) have become rife and are not of nonce character: **e-pasts (e-mail), e-pārvalde (E-government), i-banka, (internet bank).**

- Change of plural / singular system

This has affected nouns (internationalisms and native) that were used only in the plural or singular in Latvian (Baldunčiks, 2005), they have developed the full paradigm now. New plurals and singulars are usually connected also with shifts in meaning: **prasmē/s (skill/s), tehnoloģija/s (technology/ies), politika/s (policy/ies), kompetence/s (competence/ies), kvalitāte/s (quality/ies),**

aktivitāte/s (activity/ies), vara/s (power/s), ekonomika/s (economy/ies), debate/s (debate/s). The phenomenon has affected even some native words **baile/s (fear/s), baža/s (concern/s).**

- Borrowing of idioms (which can include elements of semantic shift)

guļošais policists (sleeping policeman), skelets skapī (skeleton in the cupboard), iešaut sev kājā (to shoot yourself in the foot), biznesa eņģeļi (business angels), bumba ir laukuma otrā pusē (the ball is in somebody's court), justies ne savās čībās ((feel) in somebody's shoes), nākt ārā (to come out), likt/turēt visas olas vienā grozā (put all one's eggs in one basket).

- Compound calques and semicalques (which often include elements of semantic shift)

These are usually nouns of popular and terminological character: **ziepju opera (soap opera), e-pasts (e-mail), vēstuļbumba (letter bomb), viedkarte (smart card).**

- Semantic loans

Semantic loans tend to affect mostly old Latvian words (rarely) or older borrowed internationalisms aligning the new meaning with the polysemy of their English counterparts, e.g. **vīruss (virus), pele (mouse), zālite (grass), attīstītājs (developer), laineris (liner), zaļais (green), pīlārs (pillar), arhitektūra (architecture), sūkāt (suck), rullēt (rule).**

- Meaning imposition (meaning substitution)

Change of meaning in monosemantic words – reshaping them semantically (ousting the traditional meaning) under the influence of English is as yet rare, e.g. **klasificēts (classified)** is used almost solely as *secret*.

While semantic change can be observed in a few of the above, the frequency and volume of semantic change is proportionately larger, yet these loans are less perceptible than other types of loans.

SEMANTIC CHANGE

Half a century has passed since Ullmann (1962) delved into the complicated processes of semantics and semantic change. Since then studies of semantic change have grown in size and depth branching out from the historical-philological semantics that focused on individual word change histories. Via structuralist and generativist semantics, cognitive semantics, prototype theory, conceptual metaphors and frame semantics we have come to a broader, but also somewhat diffused view that meaning is in a flux, it is renegotiated and modulated, thus continuously contributing to lexicogenesis. Many traditional categories are moot, thus broadening of the meaning often blends with new meanings (see further), change of distribution affects collocation, etc.

The difficulty of differentiating between nuance and sense (Brown, 2010) is noted by lexicographers and computer linguists. This leads some linguists to

suggest that word senses might in fact exist only relative to a task (Kilgarriff, 1997: 91). Word meanings are protean in nature; words appear to exhibit (often significant) variation in their semantic contribution across utterances (Evans, 2009: 65). This complexity can be seen in the monumental “Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary” (2009) that groups conceptually almost 800 000 words in 236 400 categories and subcategories) and diachronically creates a most complex, not to say, fantastic pattern. As Jean Aitchison phrases it, ‘word meanings cannot be pinned down, as if they were dead insects. Instead, they flutter around elusively like live butterflies’ (Aitchison, 1994: 39-40). But it is worth a try. Within traditional semantics broadening and narrowing, amelioration and degradation of meaning are the typical categories, as well rhetorical classifications like metaphor and metonymy, euphemism and dysphemism. Yet they do not cover all changes and often overlap as well (e.g. within euphemization generalization and metaphorization are rife).

LATVIAN SEMANTIC CHANGE CONTROVERSY

In Latvian semantic studies one can often observe a discrepancy between what happens in the language and what the linguists suggest. Semantic change as a phenomenon has been widespread, it has also been registered in Latvian since the beginnings of the written records. Its broad spread can be seen also in the wealth of Latvian folksongs (around 500 000 quadruplets) which are extremely metaphoric. When German scholars started elaborating written Old Latvian in the 17th century, translating religious texts, new terms and notions were needed. Semantic change was frequently resorted to as the means of nomination. As written/literary Latvian in the 16th-19th century was largely formed and enhanced by non-Latvian, German-speaking elites, they consciously and subconsciously imposed German semantic structures when dealing with Latvian lexicon, adding and extending the meanings to cover the numerous new concepts. This is obvious in early grammars, dictionaries and texts/translations. The same was done since the mid 19th century by native Latvian writers, translators and lexicographers who boosted the lexis (often also with Russian as a model or source), e.g. Latvian **daba** (**nature**). The old meaning of the word has survived, and reflects the meaning segment of *human/animal nature/ character/behavior*. The much broader, basic meaning of today appears in G.F. Stender’s use, when translating German **Natur**, having both meanings in his *Augstas gudrības/zinātnes/grāmata no pasaules un dabas* (1774):

Tā daba, ko Mācītāji (zinātnieki) NATURE sauc, ir tā iekšķīgā būšana un tie dzīvi spēki, kas iekš visām lietu lietām pēc savas kārtas (savā veidā) iraid. (Stenders, 1796: 187)

For some time it was a bookish term/meaning until Valdemārs/ Brīvēznieks registered it in the dictionary (Valdemārs, 1872: 457) as a translation of Russian **природа** (having also both meanings). Thus, imposition of a new and foreign

meaning on a native word (or earlier loan) was a frequently used pattern. Similarly **balss (voice)** gained the meaning of *vote*,

However, at the beginning of the 20th century, as a result of the drive of some native linguists against the broad German (and Russian) element in the language, the attitude towards semantic change turned to a rather suspicious and hostile one. This attitude continued for about a century¹, though gradually changing from largely negative to regretfully accommodating – usually designated as struggle against alien calques.

The negative trend was set by the trailblazing founders of native Latvian linguistics Mīlenbahs and Endzelins, who condemned foreign language imposed/induced semantic change. In the second part of their *Latviešu gramatika* (1907) (written by Mīlenbahs) calques are described as *Germanisms* (*ģermānisms*) (46), *fruit of the German language* (*vācu valodas auglis*) (119), *weeds* (*nezāle*) (126), *alien fruit* (*svešauglis*) (195), *stifling in the fetters of German and Russian* (*smakšana vācu vai krievu valodas valgos*) (95), *being in the German yoke* (*atrašanās vācu jūgā*) (202). One could ironically observe that the harsh, dysphemic characterization is very metaphoric, in a way symbolizing the need for and power of figurative language. Yet, while it is pointed out there that the word **viduvējs** (average) is used in the wrong meaning similar to Russian *posredstvennij* and German *mittelmaessig* (Endzelins, 1907: 27), their own dictionary (ME) 30 years later suggests the following meanings for **viduvējs**:

1. *vidējais (the middle one)*
2. *mittelmaessig (average).*

Apparently the mistake had become the norm, incidentally the first meaning does not exist in Modern Latvian at all. The word had undergone extension of meaning and then narrowing, thus, undergone a full change.

Mīlenbahs did admit that ‘language habits like any habits are strong, so strong that even language *mistakes* can become indispensable’ (1907:115). This, however, suggests a purist and prescriptive approach to the issue of *mistakes*.

Laua located calques between native and borrowed language elements stating that the sample, according to which a calque is formed, is alien, but the language means are native (Laua, 1981: 135). Perhaps it should be noted that the language means should not be native in the etymological sense – new meanings can be formed in borrowed words as well. Laua differentiated between morphological, semantic and phraseological calques and stated that semantic loans, like morphological loans, were felt as long as they were new, then one got used to them (*ibid.*). Again one could point out that some semantic and morphological loans are felt as loans even after decades of intensive use.

¹ Study of semantics and semantic change generally remained in the philological stage and new ideas, though occasionally alluded to, were mostly relegated to the individual, occasional and stylistic sphere (metaphors) (Veisbergs, 2007b,c), but not to the lexicosemantic system of the language as such. The few exceptions to this tendency related to specific domains (Trumpa, 2007, 2010; Ikere, 1992, 2010).

Laua did concede that calques enrich the semantic structure of the word, yet also pointed out that loans could be troublesome/disturbing (*traucējoši*), not every loan was welcome and only those could be “recognized” for which there was a need. She admitted that there were many controversies, as it was not always easy to determine the language development tendencies (ibid.: 138). One could comment that it is perhaps the borrowing and the loans themselves that determine these tendencies and developments.

Freimane (1993: 371-372) insists that new meanings can either enrich the language or pollute it (*piesārņot*) depending on their conformity to the semantic system which is most difficult to establish. She concedes that many loans criticized by Endzelīns are being used today, have entered the dictionaries; this inflicts a great responsibility on lexicographers, a moral duty (?A.V) to do the utmost in order to check the usage. She provides long lists of both old and new calques that are undesirable.

Finally, Ščucka (2009: 121) in a more conciliatory and realistic mood, points out that many unliturgical calques have with time been recognized as literary, this is the result of respecting language use; such change of norms can be seen in the case of semantic and derivative loans.

As it can be seen, semantic loans have been viewed as dangerous (in a way worse than the obvious full loans), subversive elements undermining the “spirit” and natural tendencies of the language. Of course, these prescriptive views did not translate seriously into the language development and affect the process of borrowing (especially in colloquial language) as such, but to some extent limited the reflection of semantic change in dictionaries.

Nevertheless, a glimpse at the real language situation shows that even in the most regulated sphere of Latvian – terminology, semantic shifts are rife: numerous simple Latvian words have various terminological meanings: **acs** (**eye**) is widely used in anatomy, zoology, agriculture, textiles, archeology, physics, construction, etc. Also terms are recognized to have been created as a result of broadening, e.g. **nokrišņi** (**precipitation**) was attributed not only to *liquid particles but also solid (dust)* (<http://www.vvk.lv/print.php?id=709>).

TYPES OF SEMANTIC CHANGE

1. NEW MEANINGS

When viewing the new or changed meanings one can see several types of meaning change. The first is the most straightforward case when a word develops a new meaning under the effect of another language – in our case English. The Latvian word can be a native Latvian word, an established early borrowing from another language, or an earlier loan from English, e.g. **pele** (**datorpele**) < (**computer**) **mouse**. These calques are usually terms and the change affects the denotative meaning of the words. Usually it can be clearly discerned as a different

meaning and would be clearly marked in dictionaries as a new meaning. Semantic borrowing of this type is especially rife in those spheres of Latvian which undergo fast development, e.g. computer science: **pasts (mail)**, **vēstule (letter/mail)**, **sērfot (to surf)**, **atslēga (key)**, **irbulis (stylus)**, **tīmeklis (web)**, **ikona (icon)**, **trojas zirgs (Trojan horse)**, **tārps (worm)**, **vīruss (virus)**, **ugunsmūris (firewall)**, **aplūkājuma (application)**;

economics, politics, social domains: **pārkarst (to overheat)**, **sadegt/izdegt (to burn out)**, **klasificēts (classified/secret)**, **akadēmiķis (academic)**, **shēma ((criminal) scheme)**, **nopludināt (to leak (information))**, **vabole (bug, VW beetle)**, **regulators (regulator)**, **ēna (shadow)**, **retorika (rhetoric)**;

food **pasta (pasta)**, **starteris (starter)**, etc. *Ēdienkartes mazāk interesantā daļa šķīta starteri – dominē pazīstami Vidusjūras salāti.* (Diena, 14.01.2005)

Retorika (rhetoric)

The traditional Latvian meanings were 1. “*the art of speech, science of art of speech* and 2. *use of language for effect*” (Svešvārdu..., 1999: 683). The new and broad meaning is “*discourse, talk, the style of speaking, tonality*”.

Arābu retorikā bieži tiek minēta Alžīrijas un Dienvidāfrikas koloniālā pieredze.. (Diena, 02.05.2003)

Visticamāk ECB nepārsteigs. Iespējams, ka retorika pagaidām nemainīsies. (Dienas Bizness, 01.03.211)

Rullēt (to rule)

The new meaning of **rullēt (to roll)**, is the result of a stranger development. The English colloquial **to rule (to be excellent, superior)** was transferred to Latvian not as a full loan (**rūlēt**, some samples of early loans), but superimposed on an old Latvian loan from German **rullēt (to roll)**. As such it quickly passed from slang into colloquial.

pēdējā all star spēlē tie liela daļa old'u pārnāca mūsu tima. īst neatceros kapēc..ā. tapēc, ka mēs rūlējām ...jap. thats it.(Online 1)

Lidojošo dunču nams (2004) jau rullēja kā Viņa Majestātes Kases grāvējs. (Klubs Exclusive, Winter, 2005: 44)

Rullē, Latvija, paģiras būs svētdien! (Sestdiena, 07.10.2006)

Jaunā hokeja komanda īsti nerullē. (Privātā Dzīve, 18.04.2006)

Pūderis/pulveris (powder (snow)).

Two loans are competing for this meaning: **pūderis** from English, **pulveris** from German. In fact, also **pūderis** in Latvian is a German loan, yet this meaning is borrowed from English.

Pārsteidzoši, bet ir ļoti daudz vietu, kur pūderis ir fantastisks, – Japānā, Vaiomingā, Kalifornijā, Aļaskā. (Klubs, 9, 2004:33)

..nav sniega, un man patīk pa labu pulveri vizināties. (Online 2)

A real change of meaning (loan-shifts, meaning imposition) in monosemantic words under the influence of English is relatively rare: **klasificēts (classified)** is used almost solely as *secret*. The word **drastisks (drastic)**, formerly meaning *rough, playful, carefree* tends to be used more and more in the English meaning of *radical, sharp*. **Kritisks (critical, difficult)** is now frequently used for *very important*. **Dramatisks (dramatic, drama)** – *connected with plays, emotional* stands to be used in the English meaning of *sudden, striking*.

Darba režīms – visai drastisks (Diena, 01.03.2011)

..lai kāpums nebūtu tik drastisks (Diena, 10.12.2007)

..seko dramatisks nozares kritums (Diena, 07.09.2011)

Nākotnē gaidāms dramatisks saslimstības pieaugums (Diena, 09.03.2011)

Kritisks darbaroku trūkums (Diena, 14.09.2011)

2. BROADENING/NARROWING

Broadening/narrowing of meaning is more difficult to pinpoint, as the first often tends border on a new meaning (the lexicographer would have a problem deciding (Brown, 2010), sometimes the change involves elements of conceptual change, sometimes the shift is barely perceptible.

Zaudētājs (loser)

The Latvian word initially tended to have the meaning of a *particular loser in a game, debt, transaction*. Under the general and broader meaning of the English word – initially and still today carried by the full loan – **lūzeris (loser)** which has only the meaning of a *loser in life/dropout, failure*, the Latvian word has extended its meaning to a somewhat specific but also general *failure*.

Impotence (impotence)

The medical term formerly designating the *erectile dysfunction*, has adopted under English influence the general meaning of *impotence*:

Izrādi raksturo vecišķums, amatieriskums un radoša impotence (Diena, 04.06.2002)

The secondary meaning of **spekulācija (speculation)** which was a philosophical term has broadened to a general *“reasoning based on inconclusive evidence; conjecture or supposition”*.

Tas veicināja spekulācijas, ka inflācija Vācijā un eirozonā kopumā pašlaik ir sasniegusi savu maksimumu.... (Dienas Bizness, 26.06.2001).

Instruments (instrument)

The first meaning (*“manual” tool*) has become more generalized and broad, including *law, decree, means, tool* – anything that would achieve the intended result. The meaning of *“the EU legal instrument”*, however, may be viewed as a separate meaning. Meanwhile the word **rīks (tool, instrument)** which used to be a synonym, has developed a new narrower, computer-related meaning which tends to override all others.

Integrētais CASE rīks GRADE. 2005, (www.zb.rtu.lv)

Analysing similar cases of broadening, Baldunčiks talks of semantic hypertrophy of the basic equivalent (pamatekvivalenta semantiskā hipertrofija) (Baldunčiks, 2010: 69), meaning that the Latvian equivalent to the basic meaning of English assumes the other meaning/s of the English equivalent. There is a substantial number of such cases: **administrēt (to administrate, to arrange, to rule, to conduct)**, **attīstība (development, construction, design, planning)**, **izaicinājums (challenge)**, **pieredze (experience, feelings, participation, knowledge)**:

administrēš ..finansējumu.. (Diena, 2002, 294, 5)

*Sekmēt vecpilsētas iekšpagalmu labiekārtošanu un attīstību. (2005, www.cesis.lv)
..viena no astonām sadaļām ir veltīta tieši parka **attīstībai**. (30.06.2003. www.politika.lv/)*

*Saules aptumsums dod neticamu **pieredzi**. (LTV1)*

A subgroup generally featuring broadening of meaning comprises words that have undergone ideological change. The change of the political system lead to the normalization of some Soviet, ideologically narrowed terms, e.g. **oportūnists (opportunist)**, where the meaning of *political (allegedly anticommunist deviation) opportunism* dominated. This change includes also certain amelioration of the formerly ideologically pejorative meaning. Similarly distorted terms, like **internacionālists, nacionālists, kosmopolīts, revizionists** have undergone the same change. **Pagrīdnieks (underground-er)** which had associations with *political underground activist* only, now has broadened to denote generally clandestine, sometimes avant-garde activities.

*..noteikti ir dažas labas **pagrīdnieces**, kas pilna, bet tik un tā saglabā savu vietu pagrīdē. (Veto Magazine, 2009, No. 12: 12)*

3. CONNOTATIONAL CHANGE.

There are elements of connotational change also in the previous group – leading towards broadening and neutralization of previously ideologically negatively intoned words. Yet the standard cases of connotational change are usually those of degradation or amelioration, mostly caused by sociopolitical change of the system, e.g. after the political change at the end of the 20th century, many prewar words regained their old connotations, like **kungis (Mr)** and **kundze (Mrs)**. The Soviet system imposed its ideological stereotypes (one can of course speculate whether everybody accepted them, but the official media of course did impose and propagate them): **kosmopolitisks (cosmopolitan)**, **pilsonisks (civic was bourgeois)**, **spekulācija (speculation)**, **tirgus (market)**. A connotational, partly denotative change has affected the synonymic subset **brīvības cīnītājs (freedom fighter)**, **mežabrālis (forestbrother)**, **partizāns (partisan)**, **terrorists (terrorist)**, **bandīts (bandit)**.

Also similarly to the way the Soviets decreed that **žīds (Jew)** in Latvian is an abusive term (as in Russian it had a negative connotation) and substituted it

by **ebrejs (Hebrew)**, the euphemistic, politically correct influence from English (and the EU) has substituted in official texts **čigāns (Gypsy)** for **Roma**. **Čigāns** has been officially degraded.

The formerly negatively intoned word **militārists** has changed to a neutral connotation, because of the English meaning of the noun **military**.

*..bijis arī personālais **militārists** Jānis Ločmelis (Diena, 23.08.2011)*

*22 gadus jauns students, **militārists**, kura hobijs ir sports un dejošana (Diena, 25.08.2009)*

*Bija ieradies Hamlets, kura tēvs bijis **militārists**, un vāra lielus sūdus (Diena, 03.04.2008).*

4. CONCEPTUAL RECATEGORIZATION

Strictly speaking, conceptual recategorization is not just a lexical phenomenon, but predominantly—as the term says—a conceptual one. This means that because a referent or a set of referents is given the membership of another category, it naturally also receives its designation.

For example, the notion of town and city may vary in countries of different size and at different times (see Goerlach, 1997: 135). Of course, one can view re-categorization in a very broad sense, e.g. **kopija (paper copy)** since the invention of a photo-copier has partly changed its category from a manual work to an automatic process. **Tuša (ink)** now would be mostly associated with its new dominant meaning **skropstu tuša (mascara)** though the old meaning is still extant. Similarly, **tampons (tampon)** now would carry the meaning of *hygienic tampon* as the first one (no doubt imposed by active advertising). **Telefons (phone)** has mostly changed its category since the invention and predominance of mobile phones, it is fast approaching that of a computer, though the more modern ones tend to have other names – **i-pods, androids**. Many things normally considered inedible in the past now have moved to the category of edible in Latvian: **kreses (cress)**, **spargēļi (asperagus)**, **bambuss (bamboo)**.

Tracing the use of **happy** has shown us a shift from ‘under conditions to be valued’ and ‘creating conditions to be valued’ through ‘under conditions actually valued’ to ‘valuing the conditions one is under’. The conditions themselves have changed, too: from success to lasting harmonious human relations and enjoyable moments (Diller, 2008a, b).

An interesting case is **burbulis (bubble)**. Since the crisis/recession the dominant meaning seems to be of the borrowed image: *the bubble has burst* (banking, real estate, speculation). The English **bubble** could have been **pūslis (bubble)** and **balons (balloon)** in Latvian, the latter would actually correspond more to the metaphoric image, yet, perhaps, because of the first dictionary meaning for **bubble** it assumed the Latvian equivalent **burbulis**.

*Neticu, ka nekustamo īpašumu biznesa **burbulis** pārplīsis. (Klubs, October, 2005: 57)*

5. IDIOMS

Finally, as stated above, semantic borrowing affects also idiom stock. Many English idioms have been assimilated in the last two decades and are part and parcel of the idiom stock of Modern Latvian appearing both in translated and original texts (see above). Many other idioms are often used as occasional insertions, frequently set apart by inverted commas or italics, e.g.

Gulošais policists (sleeping policeman)

Proti, 2002.gadā līdzekļus tam diezin vai izdošoties atrast, tāpēc maz ticams, ka «gulošais policists» pie skolas tiks ieviests agrāk par 2003.gadu. (Diena, 21.03.2002)

Nākt ārā (to come out)

Prieks arī, ka elektroniskajā mūzikā cilvēki vairs neslēpjas tikai savos datoros – viņi paceļ galvas un „nāk ārā”. (Veto Magazine, 2009, No. 12: 36)

Biznesa eņģelis (business angel)

Paredzēts, ka pasākumā piedalīsies privātie investori, riska kapitāla investori, sēklas kapitāla investori, biznesa eņģeļi u.c. (Diena, 29.10.2009)

Taču ir vērts mēģināt ar savu biznesa plānu pārliecināt arī kādu biznesa eņģeli vai riska kapitāla fondu. (Diena, 04.08.2009)

Šie speciālisti var būt gan mentori, gan sweat equity investori, gan biznesa eņģeļi – LIAA ir pieņemamas dažādas sadarbības formas. (Diena, 18.07.2008)

Tie parasti ir investīciju fondi, brīvie investori jeb tā dēvētie biznesa eņģeļi, kuri vēlas atbalstīt kādu jaunu biznesu un gūt peļņu.. – "Biznesa eņģeļi" – uzņēmēji, kuriem ir brīvie līdzekļi investīcijām. (Diena, 15.11.2004)

These idiom loans affect the traditional meanings of the Latvian components (**policists**, **eņģelis**, etc.)

An interesting case is presented by the connotational change in the translation loan **butterflies in one's stomach**, a rather neutral idiom in English. While in English the meaning is *a nervous feeling in one's stomach. (*Typically: get ~; have ~; give someone~.) Whenever I have to speak in public, I get butterflies in my stomach. She always has butterflies in her stomach before a test. It was not frightening enough to give me butterflies in my stomach, but it made me a little apprehensive, e.g.*

*This week's mystery comes courtesy of Mrs MD, from Hertfordshire, who reports that recurrent episodes of diarrhea (attributed in the past to an irritable bowel) are invariably preceded by a strong tingling sensation on the inside of her left wrist, along with "a feeling of **butterflies in the stomach** and a general lowering of the spirits". (Daily Telegraph, 03.03.2006)*

*Nick is now in a state of panic over what is meant to form a substantial part of his retirement fund. "I am very, very worried about my money," he says. "I have **butterflies in my stomach** when I think about it." (The Guardian, 07.10.2008)*

In Latvian, however, the translation loan has established a most positive connotation and is associated solely with the state of being in love, e.g.

taureņi vēderā

Viņi viens otram iepatikās. Vai sajūtas ir tādas pašas kā sievietei, iemīloties vīrietī, – tauriņi vēderā, trīsas, nespēja domāt ne par ko citu, lūpas nemitīgi viegli smaida. "Jā. Un arī siltums ķermenī pārņem," Dzintars ironiski nosmej. (Sestdiena, 02.06.2007)

Es domāju, īstā mīlestība ir tad, kad tauriņi vēderā un liekas – ja sāksi elpot, viņi aizlidos uz visām pusēm! (Diena, 31.03.2010)

CONCLUSIONS

The impact of English results not only in traditional borrowing and loans, but affects also the sphere of semantics – native Latvian words and earlier loans modify and change their meanings under the influence of English. The paper views the change from a novel point of view as reflected in new meanings, broadening and narrowing of meaning, connotational change and conceptual recategorization, idiom loans.

Though some of the change may seem unnecessary, redundant and even confusing and testifying to the erosion of language stability, there seems to be no way of resisting it, as it is the result of a massive impact of language contact which envelops all layers of lexis and styles. The fact that Latvian linguistics for about 100 years has preferred to ignore or condone semantic change (though it has always been rife) does not contribute to understanding the change either. Many changes are characteristic of the traditional meaning development of Latvian lexis, some of the changes are of nonce character and transitory. Finally, these processes depend not so much on the linguistic particularities of the languages involved, they reflect the change of the modern society and its cultural paradigms. The postmodern fragmentation, haste, sloppiness and clichés inevitably penetrate also the seemingly stable and logical link between the word form and meaning.

REFERENCES

- Aitchison, J. (1996) *Words in the Mind*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Baldunčiks, J. (1989) *Anglicismi latviešu valodā*. Rīga: Zinātne.
- Baldunčiks, J. (2005) Neparasts daudzskaitlis mūsdienu zinātnes un izglītības valodā. *Anglicismi latviešu valodā*. In A. Veisbergs (red.) *Latviešu valoda. Robežu paplašināšana* (pp. 6-12). Rīga: VVK
- Baldunčiks, J. (2010) Angļu valodas ietekmes desmit izpausmes veidi mūsdienu latviešu valodā (pp.62-73). In *Linguistica Lettica*, 19
- Bennet, J., C. (2004) *The Anglosphere Challenge. Why the English-speaking Nations Will Lead the Way in the Twenty-first Century*. London: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Brēde, M. (2011) Adapted Forms of Lexical Borrowings in Latvian. In A. Veisbergs (ed.) *Contrastive and Applied Linguistics* (pp.100-120). Rīga: DCLTI
- Brown, S., Travis, R. and Palmer, M. (2010) Number or nuance: Which factors restrict reliable word sense annotation? In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC'10)*. Valetta, Malta.

- Crystal, D. (2003) *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Diller, H.-J. (2008a) A lexical field takes shape. In *Anglistik: International Journal of English Studies*, 19 (1): 123–140
- Diller, H.-J. (2008b) *Happy* in changing contexts: the history of word-use and the metamorphoses of a concept (pp. 101-130). In: H. Tissari, A. B. Pessi and M. Salmela (eds.) *Happiness: Cognition, Experience, Language Studies across Disciplines in the Humanities and Social Sciences 3*. Helsinki: Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies.
- Endzelins, J. K. un Milenbahs, K. (1897) *Latviešu gramatika*. Rīga: K. J. Eihmaņa apg.
- Evans, V. (2009) *How Words Mean*. Oxford: OUP.
- Freimane, I. (1993) *Valodas kultūra teorētiskā skatījumā*. Rīga: Zvaigzne.
- Geeraerts, D. (2010) *Theories of Lexical Semantics*. Oxford: OUP.
- Goerlach, M. (1997) *The Linguistic History of English*. Basingstoke: Macmillan
- Görlach, M. (ed.) (2002) *English in Europe*. City: OUP.
- Görlach, M. (ed.) (2001) *A Dictionary of European Anglicisms. A Usage Dictionary of Anglicisms in Sixteen European Languages*. City: OUP.
- Görlach, M. (2003) *English Words Abroad*. City: John Benjamins.
- Gottlieb, H. (2002) Four Germanic dictionaries of Anglicisms: When definitions speak louder than words (pp. 125-143). In *Symposium on Lexicography X*. Tuebingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary* (2009) Vol.1-2. Oxford : OUP.
- House, J. (2002) Communicating in English as a lingua franca (pp. 243-261). In S. Foster-Cohen (ed.) *EUROSLA Yearbook. 2*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- House, J. (2004) English as a lingua franca and its influence on texts in other European languages (pp. 21-48). In G. Garzone and A. Cardinaletti (eds) *Lingua, Mediazione Linguistica e Interferenza*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Ikere, Z. (1992) Vārda “prāts” semantikas diferenciacija (17.-20. gs.). In *Latvijas Zinātņu Akadēmijas Vēstis*, 12: 9-16
- Ikere, Z. (2010) *Translating English Philosophical Terminology into Latvian: a Semantic Approach*. Daugavpils: Saule.
- Kay, C. J. (2004) When ignorance is wisdom: some day-to-day problems of classification (pp. 59-70). In C. J. Kay and J. J. Smith (eds) *Categorization in the History of English*. Benjamins. .
- Kilgarriff, A. (1997) I don't believe in word senses. In *Computers and the Humanities*, 31: 91-113.
- Koller, Werner (2000) Uebersetzungen in Deutsche und ihre Bedeutung fuer die deutsche Sprachgeschichte. In: W. Besch et al. (eds) *Sprachgeschichte: Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und ihrer Erforschung* (pp. 112-129). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Latviešu valodas apguvi ietekmējošie faktori un lietojuma vide* (2010) Rīga: LVA.
- Laua, A. (1981) *Latviešu leksikoloģija*. Rīga: Zvaigzne.
- Lehrer, A. (1985). The influence of semantic fields on semantic change. In J. Fisiak (ed.). *Historical Semantics. Historical Word-Formation* (pp. 283-296). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Libknehts, V. (1908) *Politisku un vispārīgu svešvārdu grāmata*, 2. izd.. Rīga: Apinis.
- Ločmele, G. (2010) Multicultural influences on Latvian advertising. *Vertimo Studijos 3* (pp. 59-71). Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas.
- Ločmele, G., and A. Veisbergs (2011) The other polysystem. The impact of translation on language norms and conventions in Latvia. In B. J. Baer (ed.) *Contexts, Subtexts*

- and *Pretexts. Literary Translation in Eastern Europe and Russia* (pp. 295-316). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Meier, A. J. (2000) The status of foreign words in English: The case of eight German words. In *American Speech*, 75(2): 169-183.
- Munat, J. (2004) A case study in cross-cultural translation. In: *Contrastive and Applied Linguistics* 12: 101-120.
- Ozoliņš, E. (1926). *Svešvārdu vārdnīca*. Rīga: A. Gulbis.
- Paul, H. (1920) *Prinzipien de Sprachgeschichte*. Halle: Niemeyer.
- Phillipson, R. (1992) *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Phillipson, R. (2006) Figuring out the Englishisation of Europe. In C. Leung and J. Jenkins (eds). *Reconfiguring Europe* (pp. 65-86). London: Equinox.
- Roze, L. (1962) *Latviešu valoda pirms simt gadiem; "Pēterburgas Avižu" sabiedriski politiskā leksika*. Rīga: Latvijas valsts izdevniecība.
- Scheler, M. (1977) *Der Englische Wortschatz*. Berlin: Schmidt.
- Silis, J. (2009) *Tulkokojumzinātnes jautājumi*. City: Venstpils Augstskola.
- Svešvārdu vārdnīca* (1999) Rīga: Jumava.
- Ščucka, A. (2009) Kalku apraksts J. Endzelīna un K. Mīlenbaha „Latviešu gramatikā”. *Valodniecība. Latvijas Universitātes Raksti* 746 (pp.113-122). Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte.
- Trumpa, A. (2007) Latviešu un lietuviešu valodas īpašības vārdu semantisko pārmaiņu cēloņi. *Baltu filoloģija* XVI (1/2), (pp.87-96). Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds.
- Trumpa, A. (2010) *Adjektīvu semantiskā diferenciācija latviešu un lietuviešu valodā*. Rīga: LU Latviešu valodas institūts.
- Ullmann, S. (1962) *Semantics. An Introduction to the Science of Meaning*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Veisbergs, A. (2007a) Occasional and systematic shifts in word-formation and idiom use in Latvian as a result of translation. In J. Munat (ed.) *Lexical Creativity, Texts and Contexts* (pp. 239-263). Amsterdam-Philadelphia.
- Veisbergs, A. (2007b) Current metaphors in Latvian politics. *Humanities and Social Sciences. Latvia*, 4 (53): 31-44.
- Veisbergs, A. (2007c) Latviešu politiskā metafora. *Akadēmiskā dzīve*. 44: 14-20.
- Wright, S. (2004) *Language Policy and Language Planning. From Nationalism to Globalization*. Palgrave Macmillan.

INTERNET SOURCES

- 1) Available from <http://www.oup.com/elt/global/> [Accessed September 2, 2011].
- 2) Available from http://irc.lv/qna/kas_ir_j%C5%ABsu_m%C4%AB%C4%BC%C4%81kais_sporta_veids_vai_bie%C5%BEi_san%C4%81k_ar_to_nodarboties[Accessed September 2, 2011].

Andrejs Veisbergs (Dr. Habil. Philol., Prof.) is working at the University of Latvia. He is a Consultant of Oxford English Dictionaries and European Union accredited interpreter. His research interests include lexicography, idioms, language contacts, translation and interpreting. Email: anveis@lanet.lv