

# DEVELOPMENT OF LATVIAN- ENGLISH-LATVIAN DICTIONARIES OF LEGAL TERMS (1991–2017)

---

LAURA KARPINSKA  
University of Latvia, Latvia

**Abstract.** The study presents an insight into the development of the Latvian-English and English-Latvian dictionaries of legal terms published in Latvia since regaining of independence in 1991 when the need of the English language grew dramatically in comparison with the Soviet period. Bilingual dictionaries of legal terms help to establish terminological equivalents, but this task is more difficult if both languages are linked to different legal systems, for instance, the common law and civil law system as it is in the case of English and Latvian. The aim of this study is to give an insight into the development of the Latvian-English-Latvian dictionaries of legal terms published in Latvia since regaining of independence. The lexicographic material selected for analysis comprises the five dictionaries of legal terms published in this period. The analysis focuses on such aspects of the dictionaries as their volume, target user group, complexity of entry structure and uniformity of dictionary structure. The analysis reveals some typical features of the Latvian-English-Latvian dictionaries of legal terms as well as their development that is related to increase in the number of headwords, complexity of the microstructure and lexicographic solutions applied in order to tackle the problem of non-equivalence.

**Key words:** bilingual dictionary of legal terms, monofunctional dictionary, mono-/bidirectional dictionary, target user group, headword, macrostructure, microstructure

## INTRODUCTION

Bilingual dictionaries of legal terms play an important role in the process of establishing terminological equivalents but it is a challenging task to compile these dictionaries in situations when both languages of the bilingual dictionary represent different legal systems. In the case of Latvian-English and English-Latvian (Latvian-English-Latvian) dictionaries these are the common law and civil law systems.

Even though many monolingual, bilingual and multilingual specialized dictionaries have been published since the beginning of the 1990s, Tarp (2012: 118–119) describes the situation in this branch of lexicography as ‘rather disappointing’ emphasizing the fact that despite the significant number of dictionaries published during this period, their quality is often far from satisfactory since there is very little improvement, especially in the printed

dictionaries. Many of the specialized bilingual dictionaries are characterized by Tarp (*ibid.*: 119) as ‘virtually word lists with equivalents and almost nothing else’, namely, the entries of these dictionaries do not include relevant additional (also extralinguistic) information necessary for selection of the most appropriate equivalent that is vital for both text comprehension and production purposes, thus, the genuine needs of the users are often overlooked or even ignored. Bergenholtz and Tarp (1995: 64) note that bilingual dictionaries of legal terms can vary considerably in their quality and amount of information provided. If the user is less experienced in the field of law, the compilers should provide more information on the differences between the legal systems.

The aim of this study is to give an insight into the development of the Latvian-English and English-Latvian dictionaries of legal terms published in Latvia since regaining of independence in 1991 up to the present day. Thus, the lexicographic material selected for this analysis comprises all the Latvian-English-Latvian dictionaries of legal terms published since 1991, namely, two English-Latvian dictionaries and three dictionaries combining both directions (English-Latvian and Latvian-English) in one volume.

Since the first Latvian-English-Latvian dictionary of legal terms was published only after the regaining of independence in 1991, a brief review of the dictionaries of legal terms published in Latvia before this period, will be provided. The first Latvian dictionary of legal terms (*Civiltiesību terminoloģijas vārdnīca*) was compiled in 1937 by Būmanis who was a lawyer and translator. This small multilingual dictionary, which comprised terms of The Civil Law of Latvia supplied with equivalents in Latin, German and Russian, started the tradition of Latvian legal lexicography that from then on has been predominantly multi- and bilingual. It was followed by another multilingual bidirectional dictionary (*Juridiskās terminoloģijas vārdnīca*) published in Riga in 1942. This wartime dictionary, compiled by Lauva and Blēse, was characterized by an unbalanced macrostructure (its one part was Latvian-German-Russian but the other German-Latvian). During the period of Soviet occupation, a bilingual Latvian-Russian-Latvian dictionary of legal terms (*Juridisko terminu vārdnīca*), edited by Grīnbergs, was published in Riga in 1970. It should be noted that all these dictionaries are rather small (ranging from nearly 1200 headwords in Būmanis’ dictionary up to slightly over 8000 Latvian headwords in Grīnbergs’ dictionary) and have somewhat overgeneralized titles that do not reveal their multilingual content. Due to the considerable time gap and changes in the political system, these dictionaries could not have served as relevant lexicographic sources of the Latvian-English-Latvian dictionaries of legal terms, however, as their predecessors, they may have had at least some impact on the structure and content of these dictionaries.

When the statehood of the Republic of Latvia was restored in 1991, the principle of continuity stipulated that the Republic of Latvia established in 1918 had been restored, accordingly, also its legal system and the Constitution of 1922 were reinstated. Thus, it was necessary to re-structure or establish new state

institutions and adopt new laws to update the legal system. It was attempted to eliminate the Soviet heritage as soon as possible and speed up the transition to the renewed legal system, however, the reform process was impeded by various obstacles. For instance, Balodis et al. (2013: 51) observe that the reorganization of the court system took a considerable amount of time 'since it was impossible to create judiciary appropriate for a democratic state overnight'. It is also important to note that already at the beginning of the 1990s Latvia had acceded to various instruments of international law but, since many of them had not been translated in Latvian, there was an urgent need for translation of these and many other international documents that increased the demand for Latvian-English-Latvian dictionaries of legal terms.

The first Latvian-English-Latvian dictionary of legal terms (*A dictionary of legal synonyms: Latvian-English-Latvian*) was published in 1993. The rest of the dictionaries, which differ considerably in size as well as macro- and micro-structural complexity, have been published since the year 2000 (in 2000, 2001, 2006 and 2008). Legal terms, alongside with terms from other fields, can also be found in some online multilingual lexical databases, for example, *AkadTerm* and *EuroTermBank*. However, since these are not dictionaries, and their treatment of the headwords is usually limited to the provision of TL equivalents, they will not be analysed in this study.

In order to describe the typical features of the Latvian-English-Latvian dictionaries of legal terms, compare them and trace the development of this lexicographic branch in Latvia, the analysis will be performed according to a uniform set of criteria that focuses on such issues as the basic publishing details of the dictionaries, their volume, the target user group, the type of bilingual dictionary, entry structure, and a comparison of both parts of the bidirectional dictionaries.

## THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The theoretical background of the study comprises a review of several metalexigraphic issues relevant for the analysis of the selected lexicographic material.

The size of a dictionary can be expressed in quantitative terms, namely, it is often linked to the number of headwords the dictionary contains, but it should be noted that the compilers or publishers of the dictionary may have different approaches to entry counting that can lead to indication of different number of entries in dictionaries of similar volume. Svensén (2009: 25–26) observes that sometimes deliberately vague terms like *words*, *references* or *words and phrases* can be used instead of the more typical and transparent *entries*, *lemmas* or *headwords*. It is also possible that derivatives and compounds are counted as entries even though they are presented as secondary headwords or even run-on derivatives without a proper lexicographic treatment. Landau (2001: 109) describes entry

counting in dictionaries as ‘clouded by the deliberately confusing nomenclature used by many dictionary publishers, eager to tout their books as bigger than their competitors’, however, he also notes (*ibid.*: 110) that this problem is more widespread in American lexicographic tradition. Another possible way of describing a dictionary from a quantitative point of view is to attempt to determine the density of dictionary that can be achieved by dividing the number of lines in each entry by the number of headwords (Svensén, 2009: 27), but it appears to be less convincing than a comprehensive description of the entry structure. Thus, it can be inferred that the number of entries, which is related to the macrostructure of the dictionary, can be considered while describing the size of the dictionary but it has to be approached with caution and should be combined with a deeper insight into the microstructural peculiarities of the dictionary.

Dictionaries are usually compiled to meet the needs of a particular user group, but often the group is quite varied and comprises experts and semi-experts in the concrete field – students, translators, etc. Specialized bilingual dictionaries mostly try to cater for the needs of a wider group of potential users with quite varied levels of competences. Two types of competences should be taken into account when compiling specialized bilingual dictionaries – the intended user competence of the concrete LSP and their foreign-language competence. The competence of the users in both cases may vary from low to high level, thus, the users require different kind of encyclopaedic and linguistic information that should be provided in the dictionary entries (Bergenholtz and Tarp, 1995: 20–21). To serve its purpose, a bilingual dictionary of legal terms ‘should provide a minimum of encyclopaedic information to enable the user to compare the legal systems of the countries in question and to choose the correct equivalent’ (*ibid.*: 64). It is also suggested that additional encyclopaedic notes (supplemented with the necessary cross-references) should be provided to present ‘a systematic, comprehensive description of the legal systems involved’, for instance, figures presenting the court systems of the relevant countries (*ibid.*: 65).

Specialized dictionaries can be divided in culture-dependent and culture-independent since the subject matter that is treated in these dictionaries can be either culture-dependent (it has developed differently in various geographical areas, countries and the related languages) or culture-independent (there are no relevant differences determined by the geographical location of the country). The field of law is a typical example of culture-dependent subject matter due to the variety of the legal systems and their distinct development in various geographical areas and countries. The specialized dictionaries dealing with the field of law ask for a culture-dependent treatment of the presented information, for instance, a description of the field-related cross-cultural differences in the front matter of the dictionary. The cross-cultural differences in culture-dependent bilingual dictionaries are related to difficulties in the selection of equivalents, namely, full correspondence of the meaning of the headword and equivalent is very rare; often the apparent similarity of meaning may turn out to be misleading; a complete lack of TL equivalent is often encountered; due to cross-cultural

differences, several equivalents are necessary to reveal the use of the term in both legal cultures. The existence of multiple equivalents determines the difficulty or even impossibility of the use of word-list reversal as the means of headword list building for a culture-dependant specialized bilingual dictionary (Bergenholtz and Tarp, 1995: 60–63).

The functions of the bilingual dictionary are largely determined by the intended users of these dictionaries and their needs. The major functions of a specialized bilingual dictionary are related to foreign-language text reception (or translation from L2 to L1) and production (or translation from L1 to L2) that are linked to the encoding and decoding needs of the users (Bergenholtz and Tarp, 1995: 23–24). Kromann et al. (1991: 2713) provide a brief insight into the distinction between monofunctional and bifunctional bilingual dictionaries. A monofunctional bilingual dictionary compiled for some language pair is compiled to cater for the needs of the speakers of one of these languages, while a bifunctional bilingual dictionary attempts to cater for the needs of the speakers of both languages. The distinction between monofunctional and bifunctional dictionaries is also closely linked to the active-passive dichotomy of the bilingual dictionaries that has been discussed by various scholars (e.g. Ščerba, [1940] 2003: 42; Zgusta, 1971: 299; Adamska-Sałaciak, 2006: 30; Svensén, 2009: 16), though the terminology applied in these studies varies. The discussions of the active-passive dichotomy of bilingual dictionaries highlight the fact that two active (or encoding) dictionaries and two passive (or decoding) dictionaries are necessary for each language pair to meet the needs of both speech communities, but in most cases only two dictionaries are compiled, and they usually focus only on one of the two speech communities.

The intended user group is often indicated in the front matter of the dictionary, thus, implicitly referring also to the type of bilingual dictionary. However, only a careful analysis of the microstructure of the dictionary (paying special attention to the metalanguage used and whether information is provided on the headword or the equivalents) helps to detect if the bilingual dictionary is mono- or bifunctional, namely, it is targeted at the users of only one or both speech communities (Karpinska, 2015: 179–180). Atkins and Rundell (2008: 41–43) note that the easiest task for lexicographers is to compile a decoding dictionary that is targeted at one speech community, a somewhat more difficult task is to compile an encoding dictionary for one speech community, but the possibility of a successful combination of a decoding and encoding dictionary for two speech communities is highly improbable. To illustrate the point, it is mentioned that such elements of the microstructure of an encoding dictionary (where information is provided primarily on the equivalents) as the part of speech label, information that helps to select the right equivalent and the contextual use of the equivalents, is not necessary for a user who might use it for decoding purposes.

Bergenholtz and Tarp (1995: 25–28) review the problems related to the attempts to produce specialized bilingual dictionaries that try to combine

several functions. As one of the obstacles for production of a dictionary targeted at two speech communities is mentioned the metalanguage that in the ideal variant should be L1 for each of the user groups. It is suggested that such longer texts as the user's guides and encyclopaedic notes can be provided in both languages, and some standardised international abbreviations can be used for labels. Though, it is also emphasized that a combination of several functions is more difficult for dictionaries of such culture-dependent subject fields as law, especially if each language is linked to a different legal system.

## METHODOLOGY

The lexicographic material selected for analysis comprises all the printed Latvian-English-Latvian dictionaries of legal terms published since 1991, namely, two English-Latvian dictionaries and three bidirectional dictionaries combining both directions (Latvian-English and English-Latvian) in one volume. The full title of each dictionary (if the title is provided only in Latvian, its English version will be presented in square brackets) and its abbreviated form will be presented on the first mention of the dictionary, further on abbreviations will be used to refer to the dictionaries.

The selected dictionaries will be reviewed in chronological order and described according to the following set of criteria:

- the title, publisher, author(s), year and place of publication,
- the approximate number of headwords,
- the intended user group and the type of bilingual dictionary,
- description of various macro- and microstructural aspects of the dictionaries (sample entries will be presented for illustration),
- comparison of both parts of the bidirectional dictionaries.

The framework of analysis is based on the research conducted by such scholars as Ščerba (2003 [1940]), Zgusta (1971), Kromann et al. (1991), Bergenholtz and Tarp (1995), Hartmann (2001), Adamska-Sałaciak (2006), Atkins and Rundell (2008) and Svensén (2009). The set of criteria for analysis is partly based on the lists of criteria for dictionary analysis presented and applied in Svensén (2009: 483–484) and Karpinska (2015: 105ff.).

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The first Latvian-English-Latvian dictionary of legal terms published after regaining of independence was entitled *A dictionary of legal synonyms: Latvian-English-Latvian / Latviešu-angļu-latviešu juridisko terminu vārdnīca* (LELD1). It was published by 'American Bar Association' in Riga in 1993, but it is claimed that it was edited in the USA, Chicago. This lexicographic project was initiated by the representatives of American Bar Association who were working in Latvia

shortly after it had regained independence. The dictionary was edited by Stacie O. Condrell and William K. Condrell, assisted by a group of translators and lawyers.

The number of headwords is not indicated. Thus, the entries were counted using a method that is quite often used in lexicography: a set of pages with various density of main entries is selected; the average number of entries per page is calculated and then multiplied by the number of pages in the main body of the dictionary. It revealed that there are approximately 4000 headwords in each part of this bidirectional dictionary.

Since translators of legal texts are mentioned as the target user group of the dictionary and such front matter components as the contents, introduction and list of abbreviations are presented in Latvian and English, at least in theory, it might have been intended as a bifunctional dictionary targeted at both speech communities. Therefore, a closer inspection of the entries is necessary to determine the type of this bilingual dictionary. The following entries from both parts (Latvian-English and English-Latvian) of the dictionary illustrate its entry structure:

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>apvainot valsts noziegumā, dienesta</b>               | • impeach ( <i>to</i> )  |
| <b>pilnvaru pārsniegšanā</b>                             |  |
| <b>arbitrs</b>   | • arbitrator   |
| <b>atteikties no</b> ( <i>tiesībām, prasībām, utt.</i> ) | • waive ( <i>to</i> )  |
| <b>abduction</b>   | • aizvešana<br>• nolaupišana ( <i>sievietes, bērna</i> )                                   |
| <b>abolish</b> ( <i>to</i> )                             | • atcelt ( <i>ar normatīvu aktu</i> )<br>• likvidēt  |
| <b>adverse witness</b>                                   | • liecinieks, kura labās attiecības<br>ar pretējo pusi liek apšaubīt<br>liecības patiesumu |
| <b>court; federal –</b>                                  | • tiesa; federālā ( <i>ASV</i> ) –   |

The study of the entries reveals that the microstructure of this dictionary comprises very few components – the Latvian headwords and equivalents in both parts of the dictionary are occasionally supplied with labels (mostly regional, e.g. *ASV*) as well as specifiers and collocators (e.g. *ar varu, sievietes, bērna*), the grammatical information that is provided for the English headwords and equivalents is limited to the indication of the infinitive marker *to*. The fact that specifiers and collocators are given in Latvian and the scanty grammatical information found in the dictionary is provided only for the English headwords and equivalents, reveals that despite the bilingual front matter, the dictionary is monofunctional and intended to meet the needs of Latvian users only.

Both parts of this bidirectional dictionary are similarly structured, however, even a quick look at the entries reveals that there are many explanatory equivalents in the English-Latvian part of the dictionary and, accordingly, occasional *explanatory headwords* in its Latvian-English part. It discloses that the list of headwords in the Latvian-English part of the dictionary is the result of word-list reversal. The fact that this method of macrostructure building has been applied, at least to some extent explains why specifiers and collocators are occasionally provided not only for the equivalents but also for the headwords (e.g. **atteikties no** (*tiesībām, prasībām, utt.*)). This approach reminds of insufficient editorial control rather than a carefully considered lexicographic solution.

[*Latvian-English, English-Latvian dictionary of legal terms*] / *Latviešu-angļu, angļu-latviešu juridisko terminu vārdnīca* (LELD2) was published by 'Kamene' in Riga in 2000, its second edition in 2009 by 'Multineo'.

The dictionary comprises approximately 2300 headwords (3200 in the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition) in each part. Latvian users (entrepreneurs, lawyers, students) are mentioned as the intended user group of this dictionary. The title of the dictionary is provided only in Latvian, thus, it is obvious that it has been intended as a monofunctional dictionary.

The analysis of the microstructure of the dictionary reveals that in the Latvian-English part of the dictionary all the headwords are supplied with equivalent(s) and a definition in Latvian:

**advokāts** (attorney, barrister, solicitor, advocate) – jurists, profesionāls un neatkarīgs advokatūras pārstāvis, kas, sniedzot personām juridisko palīdzību, to uzdevumā piedalās lietu izskatīšanā tiesā un pirmstiesas izmeklēšanā kā aizstāvis un pārstāvis, kā arī veic citas juridiskas darbības

This microstructural feature, apart from underlining the fact that the dictionary is intended to meet the needs of Latvian users, also places it in a special subcategory of bilingual dictionaries that combine the features of both translation and explanatory dictionaries (a bilingualized or semi-bilingual dictionary). However, in the English-Latvian part only equivalents are provided:

**attorney, barrister, solicitor, advocate** – advokāts

No grammatical description has been given for the English headwords and equivalents that might confuse the user. What is more, an occasional lack of correspondence in word class can be observed between the headword and its equivalent(s), for instance, in this entry the headword is a noun, the equivalent a verb, but the analytical definition starts with a noun phrase:

**apsūdzības celšana** (to bring a charge) – kriminālprocesuāla darbība, kas izpaužas lēmuma par saukšanu pie kriminālatbildības sastādīšanā un uzturēšanā personai, par kuru savākti pietiekami pierādījumi [...]



Often more than one TL equivalent is provided in this dictionary, but they are not supplied with specifiers, collocators or usage labels, which could help the user to choose the right equivalent:

**apsūdzētais** (accused, appellee, culprit, defendant) – procesa dalībnieks, pret kuru pirmstiesas izmeklēšanā prokurors pieņēmis lēmumu par saukšanu pie kriminālatbildības

The English-Latvian part of this dictionary also contains entries which reveal that the headword list in this part of the dictionary most likely is the result of word-list reversal, for example:

**claim, declaration, demand, bill** – prasība

A typical feature of this dictionary is that both its parts are structured differently with a focus on the Latvian-English part (the active part of the dictionary for the intended user group) where a definition of the headword has been provided. However, it should be noted that the definition offers only encyclopaedic information that is not likely to help the user to select the most appropriate TL equivalent.

*The Civil Law of Latvia – glossary of terms: Latvian-English, English-Latvian / Latvijas Republikas Civillikuma terminu vārdnīca: latviešu-angļu, angļu-latviešu* (LELD3) was published in Riga in 2001 by the Translation and Terminology Centre.

Each part of this bidirectional dictionary contains approximately 900 headwords. The headwords and their equivalents in this dictionary (glossary) are limited to the terms found in the Civil Law of Latvia and its English translation, which distinguishes it from the other dictionaries discussed in this study.

The dictionary is presented as a study aid for Latvian students of law and social sciences. However, even though it is intended as a monofunctional dictionary catering for the needs of one speech community, its preface and user's guide are provided in both languages.

The basic entry structure of this dictionary is mostly limited to the headword and one or two equivalents. The English headwords and equivalents are not supplied with any grammatical description. Since the dictionary is intended for Latvian audience, at least some basic information (e.g. an indication of the part of speech) might have been provided to avoid confusion, especially when the headwords have homonyms that belong to different parts of speech, for instance in these cases both headwords are nouns, but verbs would have the same form:

**action** – izsole

**delay** – nokavējums, novilcinājums

A specific microstructural feature of this dictionary is the fact that in both parts of the dictionary some of the headwords (the important terms used in

the Civil Law of Latvia) have been supplied with definitions and references to the corresponding sections of the law:

**darba līgums** (2178.p.) – *Ar darba līgumu viena puse uzņemas strādāt otrai darbu par atlīdzību.* – employment contract

**affinity** (§ 215) – *The relationship of one spouse to the kin of the other spouse is called affinity.* – svainība

On the whole, both parts of the dictionary are similarly structured, only the inclusion of some longer phrases in the word list of the English-Latvian part of the dictionary (e.g. **agent for an undisclosed principal, at the proper time, conduct court proceedings**) reveal that the word-list reversal has been applied to build the headword list in this part of the dictionary.

[*English-Latvian dictionary for translators of legal terms*] / *Angļu-latviešu vārdnīca juridisko tekstu tulkotājiem* (ELD4) was compiled by Oļģerts Eglītis and published in Riga by Eglītis un Partneri (a company offering translation services) in 2006.

This is the first monodirectional dictionary of legal terms published during this period. Latvian users (translators of legal texts and lawyers) are mentioned as the target user group of the dictionary and it is obviously intended as a monofunctional dictionary compiled to meet the needs of this user group. The choice of Latvian as the metalanguage and the fact that the title, preface and list of abbreviations are provided in Latvian underline the monofunctionality of this dictionary.

The number of headwords is not indicated but the entry counting reveals that the dictionary comprises about 2000 headwords. However, the dictionary excels with a broad scope of microstructural elements and rich entry contents. The English headword can be supplied with one or several Latvian equivalents, specifiers, collocators, labels, examples, cross-references and various explanatory notes (often providing useful encyclopaedic information):

**arbitration board** – šķīrējinstiūcija; šķīrējtiesa; šķīrējtiesas kolēģija: *Termins arbitration board apzīmē nevis šķīrējtiesu kā instiūciju (sk. arbitration court), bet gan konkrēto attiecīgās šķīrējtiesas izveidoto sastāvu [...]*

**barrister** (pamatā AK) zvērināts advokāts (=attorney-at-law). *Barrister* pamatā tiek lietots AK. Sal. solicitor – zemāka līmeņa advokāti/juristi

**blue chip** – “blue chip”; augstākās kategorijas- (visbiežāk par vērtspapīriem/ akcijām/ uzņēmumiem): visbiežāk lietots frāzēs “blue chip shares”, “blue chip stocks”, “blue chip equities”, “blue chip companies”. “Blue Chip (zilais kauliņš) Termins, kas apzīmē prestižas ražotāja akcijas. Amerikāņu termins, kas radies no zilās krāsas uz pokera kauliņa ar vislielāko nominālu.” [...]

Even though the metalanguage of the dictionary is Latvian, the author has chosen to present some of the definitions and explanatory glosses in English. This approach seems to have been based on the assumption that the occasional use of English as the metalanguage will not cause any difficulties to the intended user. What is more, these shifts of metalanguage seem to be determined by the source of information (e.g. *Black's Law Dictionary* in the second sample entry) rather than some well-founded editorial decision:

**budget forecast** – budžeta prognoze; Ar aprēķiniem noteikts uz faktiem pamatots budžeta posteņu kopsummu un tā izpildes paredzējums

**buy out** – atpirkt; pārpirkt; izpirkt (visbiežāk par akcijām, daļām, uzņēmumiem) – The purchase of all or a controlling percentage of the assets or shares of a business (BLD)

The sources of the English terms and their Latvian equivalents included in the dictionary are indicated using different colours, for instance, the terms confirmed by the Terminology Commission are presented in green, but the ones suggested by the author of the dictionary in black. Occasionally, some translations that are viewed as wrong and could cause confusion are presented in red, crossed out and commented on to warn the user:

**certificate of good standing** – izziņa par uzņēmuma likumīgu reģistrāciju un darbību; izziņa par sabiedrības likumīgu pastāvēšanu (...) Tulkojuma variants “~~labas reputācijas apliecība~~”, kas nereti parādās dokumentu tulkojumos latviešu valodā, ir nepareizs. [...]

Even though comparatively few headwords have been included in this dictionary, the lexicographic treatment of these terms is thorough – this dictionary, apart from the Latvian equivalents, provides much more detailed information about the meaning and usage of the selected terms than any other dictionary published in this period.

[*English-Latvian dictionary of legal terms*] / *Angļu-latviešu juridisko terminu vārdnīca* (ELDS) was compiled by Aldis Daugavvanags and Nadežda Kļimoviča and published by Avots in Riga in 2008.

It contains approximately 40 000 headwords and phrases (most likely the secondary headwords have also been counted), thus being the most recent and the largest English-Latvian dictionary of legal terms. It is intended as a monofunctional dictionary since Latvian users (students, translators and entrepreneurs) are indicated as its target group.

Many entries in this dictionary have a tiered structure containing secondary headwords that are presented in a condensed form. This dictionary also has numbered senses. The headword or secondary headword is supplied with one or

several equivalents, occasionally also specifiers, collocators, labels, collocations and explanatory notes. The metalanguage of the dictionary is Latvian, revealing that this dictionary is compiled to meet the needs of Latvian users only. The following entry presents a typical set of microstructural components found in this dictionary:

**abolition** **1.** atcelšana; likvidēšana; **2.** *amer.* verdzības atcelšana; **3.** abolīcija, kriminālvajāšanas pārtraukšana tiesā (*līdz sprieduma pasludināšanai*)

~ **of checks** kontroles atcelšana

~ **of discrimination** diskriminācijas likvidēšana

~ **of restrictions** ierobežojumu atcelšana

**progressive** ~ pakāpeniska atcelšana

Various types of equivalents have been applied in this dictionary. One or several semantic or cognitive equivalents (often partial) are provided if available:

**admeasure** iemērīt, sadalīt, izdalīt (*zemes gabalu*)

To overcome the problem of non-equivalence, explanatory equivalents (sample entry 1) and translational equivalents, that are related to contextual use of the SL item (sample entry 2), have been used:

(1) **capias ad satisfaciendum** lat. [...] **2.** tiesas pavēle par parādnieka arestu un ieslodzīšanu cietumā pēc tiesas lēmuma un līdz pat brīdim, kad tiks apmierināta pret viņu iesniegtā prasība

(2) **body** **1.** iestāde; organizācija; **2.** grupa; kolēģija; [...]

~ **of an instrument** dokumenta pamatdaļa, dokumenta pamatteksts

~ **of justice** justīcijas pamatprincipi

~ **of laws** tiesību normu kopums

Encyclopaedic information is provided infrequently and only in a form of short glosses, for example:

**Bench:**

**Common** ~ vispārīgo prāvu tiesa (*Anglijā līdz 1873. g.*)

**Upper** ~ Augšējais sols (*karaļa sola tiesas nosaukums (Anglijas republikas laikā (1649–1660))*)

The microstructure of this dictionary is complex and uniform, resembling the one of a general bilingual dictionary; however, a more insightful presentation of encyclopaedic information might have been expected in a dictionary of this volume and microstructural complexity.

Table 1 presents the summary of findings structured according to the main criteria of analysis of the Latvian-English-Latvian dictionaries of legal terms.

*Table 1 Summary of findings*

| <b>Criteria of analysis / dictionaries</b>   | <b>LELD1</b>                                   | <b>LELD2</b>                                    | <b>LELD3</b>                          | <b>ELD4</b>  | <b>ELDS</b>   |
|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Mono- or bidirectional</b>                | bidirectional                                  | bidirectional                                   | bidirectional                         | mono-directional (E-L)                             | mono-directional (E-L)                              |
| <b>Number of headwords</b>                   | [~ 4000 in each part]                          | ~ 3200 in each part                             | ~ 900 in each part                    | [~ 2000]   | ~ 40 000  |
| <b>Target user group</b>                     | Latvian and English translators of legal texts | Latvian users: entrepreneurs, lawyers, students | Latvian users: students               | Latvian users: translators of legal texts, lawyers | Latvian users: students, translators, entrepreneurs |
| <b>Entry structure</b>                       | headword, equivalent(s)                        | headword, equivalent(s), (definition)           | headword, equivalent(s), (definition) | complex  | complex   |
| <b>Structure of both parts of dictionary</b> | similar  | considerable differences                        | similar                               | -  | -   |

The findings reveal that the first three dictionaries compiled during this period were bidirectional, their both parts were similarly structured (apart from LELD2), but the more recently published dictionaries are monodirectional (ELD4 and ELDS), being also passive dictionaries for the intended user group. The approximate number of headwords is indicated only in three dictionaries, but it tends to increase in the latter part of the period.

Only the compilers of the first dictionary (LELD1) claim that it has been intended as a bifunctional dictionary that would meet the needs of both user groups, however, a closer inspection of the entries reveals that it caters for the needs of Latvian users only. All the other dictionaries are intended as monofunctional and targeted only at Latvian users; there is only some slight variation in the specific subgroups of users: students, lawyers, translators and entrepreneurs are mentioned in various dictionaries.

At the beginning of the period the entry structure of the dictionaries was very limited – it mostly consisted of a headword and one or several equivalent(s); in two dictionaries (LELD2 and LELD3) it was supplied with a definition of the headword in the source language of the dictionary but later in the period (in ELD4 and ELDS) it has become considerably more complex and apart from the equivalents it may contain specifiers, collocators, labels, collocations and various explanatory notes. Only in two dictionaries (ELD4 and ELDS) the entries have numbered senses, but only one dictionary (ELDS) has tiered entries with secondary headwords. Many explanatory equivalents and explanatory notes are used in order to overcome non-equivalence. The grammatical description of the headwords and equivalents is scanty in all the dictionaries, but in some cases (LELD2 and LELD3) it might even confuse and mislead

the user. The encyclopedic information, being of immense importance if both languages of the dictionary represent different legal systems, can be found in all the dictionaries apart from LELD1 but most frequently and efficiently this information is presented in ELD4.

Word-list reversal method has been used while compiling the headword lists of the bidirectional dictionaries but since these dictionaries often provide several partial equivalents, its application is not always successful.

## CONCLUSIONS

A gradual development of various aspects of the Latvian-English-Latvian dictionaries of legal terms can be observed during the selected period. The small bidirectional dictionaries have a very scanty microstructure, but the microstructure of the dictionaries becomes more complex in the monodirectional dictionaries published in the latter part of the period, while a considerable increase in the number of headwords can be observed only in the largest monodirectional dictionary of the period. The grammatical description of the headwords or equivalents provided in the dictionaries is mostly insufficient. The extensive use of explanatory equivalents and encyclopaedic notes in the English-Latvian dictionaries reveals that the compilers have attempted to solve the problem of non-equivalence which is related to the fact that Latvian and English represent two different legal systems. Since 1993 all the Latvian-English-Latvian dictionaries of legal terms have been compiled to meet the needs of Latvian users since the bilingual dictionaries compiled in Latvia are mostly used by Latvian rather than English audience. There is also a distinct tendency towards monodirectionality of the dictionaries of legal terms, namely, the more recently compiled dictionaries are monodirectional (English-Latvian) which serve as passive dictionaries for Latvian users.

Even though the application of corpus evidence has become a must in the modern lexicography, unfortunately, so far corpus data have not been used while compiling the Latvian-English-Latvian dictionaries of legal terms. It is also evident that the future of these dictionaries should not be linked only to the somewhat traditional paper medium since the electronic medium, if applied wisely, offers great advantages which have been convincingly demonstrated by the English advanced learner's dictionaries.

## REFERENCES

- Adamska-Salaciak, A. (2006) *Meaning and the Bilingual Dictionary*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Atkins, B. T. S. and Rundell, M. (2008) *The Oxford Guide to Practical Lexicography*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Balodis, R., Kārklīņa, A. and Danovskis, E. (2013) The development of constitutional and administrative law in Latvia after the restoration of independence. *Journal of*

- the University of Latvia: Law*, 5: 44–119. Available from <https://www.journaloftheuniversityoflatvia.lv/previous-issues/journal-of-the-university-of-latvia-no5/> [Accessed on 2 December 2017]
- Bergenholtz, H. and Tarp, S. (eds.) (1995) *Manual of Specialised Lexicography. The Preparation of Specialised Dictionaries*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Būmanis, A. (1937) *Civiltiesību terminoloģijas vārdnīca*. Rīga.
- Grinbergs, O. (ed.) (1970) *Juridisko terminu vārdnīca*. Rīga: Liesma.
- Hartmann, R. R. K. (2001) *Teaching and Researching Lexicography*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Karpinska, L. (2015) *English-Latvian Lexicographic Tradition: A Critical Analysis*. Berlin/Boston: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kromann, H.-P., Riiber, T. and Rosbach, P. (1991) Principles of bilingual lexicography. In F. J. Hausmann, O. Reichmann, H. E. Wiegand and L. Zgusta (eds.) *Wörterbücher. Dictionaries. Dictionnaires. International Encyclopedia of Lexicography*, Vol. 3 (pp. 2711–2728). Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Landau, S. I. (2001) *Dictionaries. The Art and Craft of Lexicography*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lauva, J., Blēse, H. (1942) *Juridiskās terminoloģijas vārdnīca*. Rīga: Latvju grāmata.
- Svensén, B. (2009) *A Handbook of Lexicography. The Theory and Practice of Dictionary-Making*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ščerba, L. (2003 [1940]) Towards a general theory of lexicography. In R. R. K. Hartmann (ed.) *Lexicography. Critical Concepts*, Vol. 3: *Lexicography: Lexicography, Metalexigraphy and Reference Science* (pp. 11–50). London/New York: Routledge.
- Tarp, S. (2012) Specialised lexicography: 20 years in slow motion. *Iberica*, 24: 117–128.
- Zgusta, L. (1971) *Manual of Lexicography*. The Hague-Paris: Mouton.

## DICTIONARIES ANALYSED

- Apinis, M. (ed.) (2000) *Latviešu-angļu, angļu-latviešu juridisko terminu vārdnīca*. Rīga: Kamene.
- Apinis, M. (ed.) (2009) *Latviešu-angļu, angļu-latviešu juridisko terminu vārdnīca*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Rīga: Multineo.
- Condrell, S. O. and Condrell, W. K. (eds.) (1993) *A Dictionary of Legal Synonyms: Latvian-English-Latvian/Latviešu-angļu-latviešu juridisko terminu vārdnīca*. Rīga: American Bar Association.
- Daugavvanags, A. and Kļimoviča, N. (2008) *Angļu-latviešu juridisko terminu vārdnīca*. Rīga: Avots.
- Eglītis, O. (2006) *Angļu-latviešu vārdnīca juridisko tekstu tulkotājiem*. Rīga: Eglītis un Partneri.
- The Civil Law of Latvia – glossary of terms: Latvian-English, English-Latvian/Latvijas Republikas Civillikuma terminu vārdnīca: latviešu-angļu, angļu-latviešu* (2001) Rīga: Tulkošanas un terminoloģijas centrs.

**Laura Karpinska** (Dr. philol., Assist. prof.) is currently working at the University of Latvia. Her research interests include lexicography, lexicology and corpus linguistics. Email: [laura.karpinska@lu.lv](mailto:laura.karpinska@lu.lv)