WORD-FORMATION PATTERN BORROWING IN LATVIAN

ANDREJS VEISBERGS

University of Latvia, Latvia

Abstract. English as the main contact language during the last three decades has affected Latvian word-formation patterns, patterns of use and patterns of convention. This is pattern borrowing, in addition to phonological borrowing which is also rife. Part of this contact-induced change can be viewed as structural impact, part as a shift in conventions. Previously rare stylistic means – idiom transformations, nonce compounding, conversion, derivative adjectives and new linguo-stylistic devices, such as native blends or compound phrases – have proliferated. These imported patterns have found a niche in the Latvian linguistic system and are now used in various speech domains. They have become part of the Latvian language and usage. In general we can view these shifts as an enhancement of Latvian's inherent linguistic potential rather than the contact-induced change of traditional patterns.

Key words: Latvian, English, pattern, borrowing, contact-induced

INTRODUCTION

'Traditional histories present the language as changing largely in response to internal linguistic pressures' (Romaine, 1999: 4), but today we often observe that the prime mover of change is a language contact. Code-mixing and code-switching take many forms, affecting individuals (Muysken, 2000), nations and languages in general. Language change proceeds at various speeds and on various levels, driven by both internal and external factors. Ignoring some, while discussing others, is not logical. Often the two processes are complementary and a clear delineation of the two causes seems impossible, but it remains worth looking at. The heterogeneity (Muehleisen, 2010) of change should be recognised. Contact may spark off developments that then acquire their own momentum.

As English began to replace Russian as the main contact and intermediary language for Latvian, it brought not only direct linguistic influence in the form of various types of loans, but also certain readjustments in the linguistic patterns and conventions of Latvian itself. The agent of this change seems to have been English, and the primary vehicle was translations from English. Since these shifts were rapid and relatively recent it is possible to track them with some precision.

1 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF LATVIAN

Throughout the last 800 years, Latvian has been under the influence of various dominant languages: 700 years under increasing German influence, about 200 years under strong Russian influence and the last 30 years under that of English. This last period actually started as early as the 1970s, during Soviet times, and was noted early by the Latvian linguist Rūķe-Draviņa (1977: 93). Briefer and occasional influence from Polish, Swedish and other languages has been less relevant. Some English words were borrowed via German and Russian in earlier centuries, but towards the end of the 20th century we saw a huge impact affecting various subsystems of Latvian, stimulated by globalisation, media developments and certain backwardness in Latvian itself (the result of 50 years of partial isolation under Soviet occupation).

German contributed the most to the development of Latvian for centuries, as both dominant contact and intermediary language. Indeed, it was German pastors and gentlemen scholars who determined how Latvian should be written, transferring many German language patterns, and who did most translations until the 19th century. However, German influence ended abruptly after the Second World War. Although a large number of mostly elderly Latvians speak German, it has practically no direct or indirect influence upon Latvian today. The only renaissance of German loans occurred in the media, where a considerable number of loans, e.g. *zapte [Saft (jam)], tante [Tante (aunt)], ome [Oma (granny)], veša [Wäsche (linen)], riktīgs (richtig (real)], bišķi* [bisschen (a bit)] resurfaced in the face of official condemnation. They had survived in colloquial Latvian through a century of linguistic ostracism, testifying to the fact that prescriptivism is not omnipotent even under a totalitarian system.

When Latvia was step by step annexed into the Russian Empire (the 18th and 19th centuries) Russian gradually became a language of administration on a par with the traditional German. After Latvian independence in 1918, Russian and German were the main minority languages among the population. After the Soviet occupation of 1949, Russian became the *de facto* primary official language alongside Latvian and increasingly ousted Latvian from various spheres of use. Deliberate Russification brought the percentage of Latvians in the population down from the traditional 80to 52 per cent in 1988 (*Latviešu…*, 2007: 125). Russian influence on Latvian was powerful as it was in fact the only direct and indirect contact language, taught heavily in schools and dominating the official media, the administration and a range of other fields. Russian lost its position as the dominant contact language around 1990 with the collapse of the Soviet Union and Latvia's reorientation towards the West. However, it still has an effect. Most Latvian speakers know Russian, and it is still the main live-contact language in most Latvian towns, where Russian-speakers constitute about half of the population. Access to the Russian media, and to Russian-language Latvian media, contribute to its influence. Accordingly Russian mostly affects Latvian vocabulary at the colloquial and substandard levels where loans

are common, but its influence on literary and written Latvian is less pronounced today. Though the position of Latvian has gradually improved, the language hierarchy has changed and asymmetric bilingualism is precluded to a great extent (Hogan-Brun, 2005: 273–282), many Latvians still feel wary of Russian. This has strengthened English (as the third language is usually a winner).

The change of the main contact language from Russian to English happened very fast in the early 1990s, and is clearly visible from the proportion of books translated into Latvian. After the swift change in early 1990s, the new balance has been relatively stable.

1985: 209 books translated; 140 from Russian, 9 from English (proportion 15:1),

1995: 598 books translated; 61 from Russian, 293 from English (proportion 1:5),

2000: 653 books translated; 68 from Russian, 392 from English, (proportion 1:6),

2005: 679 books translated; 68 from Russian, 359 from English (proportion 1:5),

2010: 638 books translated; 55 from Russian, 390 from English (proportion 1:7),

2015: 742 books translated; 68 from Russian, 391 from English (proportion 1:6).

The share of general translation volume from English would seem to be similar.

2 REVITALISATION OF LATVIAN

There are many processes affecting the development of Latvian today, among them its status as an official language, which strengthens its position and revitalises many domains, such as the linguistic landscape (outdoor signage, titles, advertisements), education, product descriptions, instruction manuals, etc. Latvian has reconquered a large number of areas where it had all but disappeared: military, maritime, legal, foreign affairs, etc. Its use has expanded fast in many fields, such as administration, medical treatment, pharmacology (medicine inserts are now in Latvian), information science and EU matters. Latvian is one of the EU's official languages. Latvia's accession to the European Union required the translation of all EU law, and the translation process made a significant contribution to the general development of the language and the spread of terminology. Terminology development and extensive borrowing in these areas therefore advanced rapidly. New language professions have matured: interpretation (restricted to tour guides and foreigners prior to independence), computer linguistics, human language technologies, sociolinguistics and lawyer-linguists.

Openness and democracy brought about a noticeable change in language-use norms and conventions: a more colloquial style of language (Nītiņa, 2004) in most media and a freer use of substandard lexis in print (formerly taboo). It would be impossible to say whether this is a transfer of English conventions and thus a contact-induced change (Thomason, 2007:41), or the result of what could be called the democratisation of language and naturally more democratic speech conventions. There is a confusion or blend of styles in many media. This shift applies to both written and oral language and across all classes and levels of education.

3 GLOBALISATION AND TRANSLATION

In a globalised world a growing proportion of information originates outside the country, and is consequently received and exchanged directly from a different language or through translation. Thus globalisation (Wright, 2004) leads to a huge growth in translation volumes in countries where the local language is buoyant, legally promoted and considered intrinsically valuable. These processes presume both direct and translated contact encompassing texts on international matters (politics, economics), texts on popular international culture (cinema, music, football, celebrities), recipes, cookbooks, travel descriptions and guides, international and European laws transposed, contracts (most countries borrow legal concepts and language from Latin, or from the continental and Common-Law systems), software localisation, advertising, films (dubbing, voice-over or subtitled), TV (dubbed and subtitled), TV shows, game franchises, instruction manuals, labelling (food, equipment, medicine), education books, reference books, encyclopaedias, fiction translations and covert translations, to mention just a few. In the case of Latvian it has been estimated that about 70 per cent of the texts 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. Translations always result in adaptations of the linguistic systems, which either incorporate source language features or redefine features of the target language to fit the new communicative task, and become the norm. It is the volume and proportion, the scale and the omnipresence of the media that have changed (Koller, 2000). Most modern texts are characterised by a hybridity which extends in the global village not only to translations and translated texts but also to most original and natural texts. We live in a translated world where international mass culture competes and interacts with local forms. While stressing the hybrid character of modern media and intercourse, we by no means seek to suggest this is something new. Borrowing linguistic elements, ideas and memes has a long history in Latvian, suffice it to mention the Bible translation, which had a profound impact on the word-stock, idiom stock and metaphoric thinking of the people (the Bible translation of 1689 was the first long text in Latvian, and codified its written norms). These are complemented by direct contact with another language. Companies and their branches operating in another language, pop music, the internet, satellite TV, original soundtracks in subtitled films, broadcasts, sports, etc. all increase linguistic interference and mentally affect the natural norms and conventions of speech and text. English is today the dominant language in all spheres affecting the development of Latvian.

4 LINGUISTIC CHANGE

Change is a normal phenomenon in a living language. However, it is usually difficult to distinguish between internal development and contact-induced

change in a developed language functioning in a variety of spheres and registers, and to measure them. Even clearly contact-induced change can be the result of massive foreign-language pressure, but may also be a response to a language's need to fill some gaps and lacunae. Some changes, characteristic of Latvian today, are outlined further below.

4.1 PRONUNCIATION

No specific phonetic transformations have been observed in Latvian in the last decades, although the influence of English had led to some international abbreviations being pronounced as in English: GPS [dzhi: – pi: – es], CV [si: – vi:] instead of using the Latvian letter-names. No doubt this is the result of oral language contact. Anglicisation has even extended to some purely Latvian acronyms: *OCTA* is usually pronounced [okta], not [otsta].

4.2 RESPELLING OF PROPER NAMES

In Latvian, foreign proper names are normally transcribed so as to render the original pronunciation as closely as possible in Latvian spelling. The rules of transcription have been changed many times, the latest changes being mainly due to the arrival of a new main contact language. Some proper names have been respelled, as they were previously distorted by Russian as an intermediary language, thus the German general *Hoth* was *Gots* (transcription of the Russian *Got*) all through the Soviet years, even in native Latvian texts. Some respelling is due to changes of form in the source language *Kalkuta (Calcutta) > Kolkata (Kolkata), Ļvova (Lvov) > Ļviva (Lviv).* Some spelling has changed because the source language is better-known, whereas Russian used to be relied on, e.g. the American state of *Maine* used to be *Mena* in Latvian but is now *Meina*. English as the main intermediary language now also dictates the spelling of proper names of exotic languages in Latvian.

4.3 DEVELOPING FULL PARADIGMS

Many native Latvian words, especially metaphoric transfer nouns tend to develop short verb forms: *nūjot* (to do Nordic walking, from *nūja*, stick), *diegot* (to floss teeth with a thread, from *diegs*, thread), *ēnot* (to shadow a person, from *ēna*, shadow), *pūķot* (to fly a kite, from *pūķis*, kite). Both older and newer borrowings demonstrate the same tendency, even full paradigms: *nostaļģija* (nostalgia) – *nostalģēt* (to be nostalgic); *prezidents* (president) – *prezidentūra* (presidency) – *prezidentāls* (presidential) – *prezidēt* (to preside); *prezentācija* (presentation) – *prezentēt* (to present); *žūrija* (jury) – *žūrēt* (to judge); *komunikācija* (communication) – *komunikators* (communicator) – *komunikatīvs* (communicative) – *komunicēt(ies)* (to communicate). This tendency conforms to the norms of Latvian but it can seem unusual at first sight. In some cases English conversion may have sparked a need for a new part of speech in Latvian, and in some cases the new form is a loan of the international word used in English.

4.4 NEOLOGISMS

There are numerous neologisms in Latvian and much discussion about them. Their formation is mainly evaluated retrospectively (Skujiņa, 1999) and the discussion is usually held within the traditional dichotomy of foreign (implicitly undesirable) versus native formation. Latvian terminology tends to produce nonce-words: long, transparent, definition-like compounds that are unwieldy in everyday use (Veisbergs, 2007b). Tauli's fundamental principle (Tauli, 1968) that the length of the word should be in inverse proportion to its frequency of use is recognised in theory: "preference is given to a shorter variant of a term" (Skujiņa, 2005: 129), but in practice new terms are frequently long compounds. They come into competition with the direct loans that they were supposed to replace, and often lose the battle, unless they have been incorporated into Latvian legislation and thus forced upon the official media, such as *noziedzīgi iegūtu līdzekļu (nelikumīga) legalizācija* (legalisation of illegally obtained assets, i.e. money laundering), *plašsaziņas līdzekļi* (broad communication means, i.e. the mass media). The short loan translations of these coexist in informal speech: *naudas atmazgāšana* (literally: money laundering), *mēdiji.* Experience shows that successful native coinages are short: *ietvars* (framing), *saziņa* (media, communication), *aprūpe* (care, maintenance), *pieeja* (access, approach), *aprite* (circulation), *zīmols* (brand), *dators* (computer) while the long ones never really catch on: *koku gāšanas, atzarošanas un sagarumošanas mašīna* (tree felling, branch cutting and sawing machine, i.e. *harvester*), *krāslodīšu šaušanas sacensība* (coloured-ball shooting competition, i.e. *paintball*), *elektroniskais surogātpasts* (electronic surrogate mail, i.e. *spam*), *ieiet sistēmā, izmantojot paroli* (to enter the system using a password, i.e. *to log in*). Often these overlong counterparts are spurned and borrowings or loan translations preferred: *harvesters, peintbols, spams, ielogoties.*

4.5 CONNOTATIVE CHANGES

Some words have undergone denotational, connotational or frequency and paradigm change, mostly for sociopolitical reasons. Towards the end of the 20th century, for example, many pre-war words regained their old connotations, thus *kungs* and *kundze* (Mr and Mrs) replaced the Soviet *biedrs* (comrade). Today *biedrs* has acquired an ironical tinge. The Soviet system used the state media to impose a negative ideological slant on many words (it is of course open to speculation whether everybody accepted them): *kosmopolītisks* (cosmopolitan), *pilsonisks* (civic, i.e. bourgeois), *spekulācija* (speculation), *militārists* (military). This is largely gone. Some words have changed their meaning in the new political order: *brīvības cīnītājs* (freedom fighter), *mežabrālis* (forest brother), *partizāns* (partisan), *bandīts* (bandit), *atbrīvotājs* (liberator). Just as the Soviets decreed that Latvian *žīds* (Jew) was a term to be avoided because of its negative connotations in Russian and substituted *ebrejs* (Hebrew), the EU's politically correct influence has replaced *čigāns* (gypsy) with *Roma* in official texts. Connotational change, though contact-induced, can be viewed as less linguistic than ideological or cultural.

4.6 DIRECT ENGLISH IMPACT

Not only is English now the primary means of international communication (Crystal, 2003), but it also has an increasing effect on other languages *per se*. The influence of English in the form of around 2000 full loans (Anglicisms in the narrow sense) in Latvian until the 1980s has been thoroughly covered by J. Baldunčiks's (1989) exhaustive monograph and dictionary. Today English, with its various modes of existence (as mother tongue, second language, foreign language, lingua franca), is the only global language. Some describe the advance of English as linguistic imperialism (Phillipson, 1992) or oppression, others as a portent of future global leadership (Bennet, 2004) or as an ideal mode of communication between the ever more globalised citizens of a world where it has achieved hegemonic critical mass. Still others view it as an inevitable but benevolent *lingua franca*, influencing other languages asymmetrically (House, 2002, 2004). The global diffusion, high prestige and economic value of English make it very attractive: Latvian schoolchildren and their parents rank English as more useful than their mother tongue (*Latviešu…*, 2010).

In addition to being a source of loans (full loans, semi-loans, loan translations, calques) and some other changes on an individual basis, English affects Latvian patterns of word formation (Ločmele and Veisbergs, 2011), textual norms and conventions (the use and spread of innovations, wordplay, phraseological transformations) (Veisbergs, 2007a), and changes in the frequency and scope of nonce use (see next section).

Direct English impact on Latvian wordstock today can be seen in the following forms:

- traditional loans (with the usual phonetic, spelling and grammatical adaptations): *kūls* (cool), *fīlings* (feeling), *čarts* (chart), *meils* (mail), *lūzers* (loser), *feiss* (face), *tops* (top), *čats* (chat). These tend to be used in colloquial use. Their frequency of use is very high in colloquial language although their number is not huge. They are mostly short words of Germanic origin.

- Some unassimilated colloquial loans, e.g. exclamations: *kamon* (come on), *kūl* (cool), *vau/vow* (wow?), *okei* (OK), *bla bla bla*, *kreizī* (crazy).

- Thousands of neoclassical borrowings, in fact internationalisms, are often attributed to English: *politkorektums* (political correctness), *komitoloģija* (comitology), *interfeiss* (interface), *interoperabilitāte* (interoperability), *eksponenciāls* (exponential), *reciklēt* (to recycle).

- Latvian derivations or clippings of English loans: *kompis* (computer), *tīnis* (teenager), *fīča* (feature), *fīls* (feeling), *topiņš* (top), *čiksa* (chick), *superīgs* (super).

- Replacement of older loans with new ones: *prevencija* (prevention) < *profilakse*, *audits* (audit) < *revīzija*, *urināls* (urinal) < *pisuārs*; *personāls* (personnel) < *kadri*; *animācijas* (animation) < *multiplikācijas*; *enzīms*

(enzyme) < *ferments*. The new ones are always English, the older ones were generally internationalisms borrowed from Russian, occasionally from German.

- English semantic loans tend to affect old Latvian words or older borrowed internationalisms, aligning the new meaning with the polysemy of their English counterparts, e.g. *vīruss* (virus), *pele* (computer mouse), *zālīte* (grass, marijuana), *attīstītājs* (developer), *laineris* (liner), *zaļais* (green in the political sense). These calques are usually terms and are widespread where Latvian is undergoing rapid development, e.g. computer science: *aplikācija* (application); economics and politics: *iesaldēt* (freeze), *pārkarst* (overheat), *klasificēts* (classified, secret), *shēma* (criminal scheming). Some words have also broadened their scope: *pieredze* from *past experience / knowledge* to *present experience / feelings / living through / participation*; *izaicinājums* from *direct challenge* to *challenge* in the English sense; *produkts* from *farming produce* to *anything produced*. In some cases this has led to undesirable semantic hypertrophy (Baldunčiks, 2015). Similarly many formerly abstract words have developed new broad and multifaceted direct meanings: *autoritāte* (authority), *aktivitāte* (activity), *prasmes* (skill), *varas* (power), and have become countable nouns (see section 5.6).

- Compound calques and semi-calques: *eksvīrs* (ex-husband), *ugunsmūris* (firewall), *sierburgers* (cheeseburger), *vēstuļbumba* (letter bomb), *viedkarte* (smart card).

- Meaning imposition and change; change of meaning in monosemantic words: reshaping them semantically (ousting the traditional meaning) under the influence of English is as yet rare. The word *drastisks* (drastic), formerly meaning *rough, playful, carefree* tends to be used more and more with the English meaning of *radical, sharp*. *Kritisks* (critical, difficult) is now frequently used for *very important*. *Dramatisks* (dramatic, drama) formerly *connected with plays, emotional* is now used in its English sense of *sudden, striking*. *Klasificēts* (classified) is used almost solely as *secret*.

- Borrowing of idioms: 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: *ziepju opera* (soap opera), *skelets skapī* (skeleton in the cupboard), *iešaut sev kājā* (to shoot yourself in the foot), *bumba ir laukuma otrā pusē* (the ball is in the other court), *nākt ārā* (to come out), *likt/turēt visas olas vienā grozā* (to put all your eggs in one basket). Many other idioms are often used as occasional insertions, some English phrases replace formerly stable Latvian ones: *vienas nakts sakars* (one-night stand) tends to oust *gadījuma sakars* (random relation).

- Midclippings: loss of syllables in Latvian words (older borrowings) under the influence of English: *optimalizēt* > *optimizēt* (to optimise), *aktivizēt* > *aktivēt* (to activate), *minimalizēt* > *minimizēt* (to minimise), *implantāts* > *implants* (implant). These midclippings can also be viewed as re-borrowed shorter forms.

- Morphological changes in older loans (usually not of English origin), usually taking the form of changed derivational suffixes to align with the English ones: *sociālekonomisks > socioekonomisks* (socioeconomic), *homoseksuālists > homoseksuālis* (homosexual), *katastrofāls > katastrofisks* (catastrophic); sometimes prefixes are also affected *pirmsinsulta > preinsulta* (pre-insult), *novators > inovators* (innovator).

Though the above occasionally acquire systemic character (such as the last two cases), these changes mostly occur on an individual lexeme basis.

5 PATTERNS AND CONVENTIONS

Studies of contact-induced changes generally focus on lexis, rather than morphology, syntax and conventions. However, some studies have shown that high-intensity contact can affect not only word-formation morphology but also inflectional morphology (Gardani, 2015). The term *patterns* needs some explanation (*Latviešu…*, 2013; Navickaite-Klišauskiene, 2016). Nowadays, linguistic patterns are mostly discussed with regard to computational linguistics-pattern recognition. However, patterns can also be viewed in a broader sense as productive paradigms of word-formation, structures and use, as common and reproducible rules of use with formal and semantic features. "Pattern borrowing" can be opposed to phonological borrowing: 'MAT-borrowing involves replication of morphological material and its phonological shape from one language to another. PAT-borrowing includes replication of patterns only, not the form, to another language' (Sakel, 2007: 15). PAT borrowing therefore means loan translations and calques. Replication of patterns, shifts of patterns, transfer of patterns thus illustrate the impact of a contact language. Apart from singular (though very numerous) effects, the impact of English on Latvian extends far beyond separate words. These deeper changes are often less noticeable but also more comprehensive, encompassing new patterns and new Latvian norms. We can distinguish between various types of norms, among them conventions and expectation norms. For example, if there are two second-person forms of address (the polite and the informal one) and one of them gains in popularity while the other recedes, we can talk of a change of convention, or expectancy norm. Using the language in either the old or new way does not breach the actual language norm, but does breach the dominant conventions. Similarly, the use of a plural for a noun formerly used only in the singular would be a breach of convention or expectancy norm, even if the language has both numbers and any noun can theoretically be used in both. When such changes of convention occur under the influence of another language we can speak of a foreign-induced shift in conventions.

5.1 CONVERSION

Latvian word classes are formally distinguishable, as each of them has a distinct set of inflectional markers (endings). Thus, when a lexeme is shifted to another

part of speech, it also changes from one inflectional paradigm to another: *melns* (*adj.* black), *melni* (*adv.* blackly), *melnis* (*n.* a black horse), *melnot* (*v.* to blacken). Conversion (Nītiņa, 1985) is thus limited by the flective nature of the language. Full conversion is thus rare, mostly affecting isolated historical cases in peripheral word classes: some nouns and some verbal forms have been adverbialised, e.g. *augšā* (in the upper part > up), *pilnā* (in the full > full), *laukā* (in the field > outside). These are stable historical conversions in Latvian. A more frequent pattern is the use of the definite ending to nominalise adjectives and participles: *labais* (the good), *vecāki* (older > parents), *nelabais* (the ungood > the Devil), *kaulainā* (the bony one > Death), *lielie (the big > the rich, the grown-ups), baltais* (the white > vodka), *mīļākais* (the most loved > lover), *ievainotais (wounded > the wounded), sabiedrotais (allied > ally), dzeramais (drinkable > drink),* etc. No particular changes have been noticed in these groups. Theoretically there are also wide possibilities for contextual nominalisation, but this is rare. However, there has of late been an increase in contextual nominalisation, e.g.

> – *Bet mēs... Valters Krūms centās iebilst. – Nekādi* **mēs** *vai* **beti.**
> *(Aleksandrs. Neredzamā divīzija. Riga, 1993: 288)*

> Gloss: – But we... Valters Krūms wanted to object. – No **we's** or **buts.**

It seems impossible to quantify the spread of conversion, especially in informal texts and speech. It is also not clear whether it is the result of a general relaxation of conventions, a more colloquial style in standard language, or the subtle influence of English, where conversion is widespread.

Formerly there used to be a group of adjectives of international origin (Skujiņa, 1993:99) that were used also as nouns (or vice versa): *aktīvs, kolektīvs, reljefs, analogs, hibrīds, deficīts, kolorīts, potenciāls, memoriāls, veterinārs, kuriozs, normatīvs.* Most of these homonyms had parallels in the foreign source languages (Russian, German), and thus could be viewed as a result of borrowing.

In the last few decades, numerous conversions of this kind have arisen or expanded their usage based on the English model: English-induced conversion: *nekrofīls* (necrophile), *homofobs* (homophobe), *rusofobs* (rusophobe), *ambients* (ambient), *pedofīls* (paedophile), *kontraceptīvs* (contraceptive), *kompozīts* (composite), *veterinārs* (veterinary), *normatīvs* (normative). These cases of conversion can, of course, be viewed as borrowings of individual nouns or as adjectives parallel to already existing forms.

5.2 DERIVATIVE ADJECTIVES

Another pattern that has spread under the influence of English is non-declinable derivative adjectives formed from the genitive of a noun (Latvian *ģenitīveņi* (*Latviešu…*, 2013: 214)). Normally a prefix is used for derivation: *aiz-, bez-, pēc-, priekš-, pirms-,* etc. A high share of these today are negative attributes formed on the basis of nouns in the genitive case, by applying prefixes *ne-* (non) or *bez-* (without). Traditionally, Latvian formed negative adjectives by means of

the prefix *ne-* plus an adjective. The new coinages rarely have the nominative form (e.g. *nediskriminācija, nerezidents*), so in a way they are circumfixed derivations. The pattern existed earlier, under Russian influence, and was considered unwelcome. Now, however, there has been an avalanche of them, both borrowings and loan translations: *nedzīvnieku* (non-animal), *nedzīvības* (non-life), *nepiena* (non-milk), *nepārtikas* (non-food), *netarifu* (non-tariff), *nefinanšu* (non-finance), *nekapitāla* (non-capital), *nediskriminācijas* (non-discriminatory), *neslīdes* (non-glide), *nerezidentu* (non-resident), *nezinātnes* (non-science), *netiesas* (non-court), *nelīguma* (non-agreement). The latest edition of the Latvian-English dictionary (Veisbergs, 2016), compiled on the basis of parallel corpora, includes around a hundred of these, although hundreds of such formations with high usage frequencies were found. This seems to be the result of the widespread English pattern and is common in technical, legal and EU texts. Similar patterns can be seen in loans with English affixes *-less* (usually Latvian prefix *bez-* 'without'), extra- (Latvian prefix *ārpus-* 'outside'), *-free* and *non-* (Latvian prefix *bez-* 'without': *ārpusbudžeta* (extrabudgetary), *ārpuszemes* (extraterrestial), *ārpusdzemdes* (in vitro, extra-uterine), *ārpusšūnu* (extra-cellular), *ārpusskolas* (extracurricular), *ārpusģimenes* (extra-familial), *ārpustiesas* (extra-judicial); *bezkvotu* (quota-free), *bezprocentu* (interest-free), *beznodokļu* (duty-free), *bezoglekļa* (carbon-free), *bezsēklu* (seedless), *bezlietus* (rainless), *bezdimensiju* (non-dimensional), *bezkaulu* (boneless), *bezmērķa* (aimless), *bezsatura* (without content, vacuous). It is interesting to note that the last two words are gradually ousting the traditional standard adjectives of the same meaning *(bezmērķīgs, bezsaturīgs)*.

5.3 BLENDING

Blending as a pattern used not to exist in Latvian, although a few English blends were borrowed as root words, e.g. *smogs (smog), motelis (motel)*. Blending became more common in the 1990s with the importation of semi-transparent English blends containing well-known international elements: *bolivuda* (Bollywood), *vidiots* (vidiot), *lukanomika* (Lukashenko economics), *seksperts* (sexpert), *kokakolonizācija* (Cocacolonisation). It is characteristic that they mostly contain proper names, which facilitates understanding. Local nonce blends have proliferated in parallel with them.

More Latvian blends gradually appeared, usually containing proper-name components: *ļeņineklis [Ļeņins piemineklis]* (Lenin monument), *Latvegasa [Latvijas Lasvegasa]* (Latvia's Las Vegas], *Zaķutēka [Zaķusalas diskotēka]* (Zaķu island discotheque), *ceļarāma [Latvijas ceļa panorāma]* (the Panorama of the Latvian Way Party); *Putinočets [Putins Pinočets]* (Putin Pinochet), *Putlers [Putins Hitlers]* (Putin Hitler). The last two examples are often used in Russian as well. These blends are not in frequent use, but were not unique nonce uses either.

These were followed by even more unique and genuinely Latvian blends:

> *sliktenis [slikts liktenis]* (bad fate),
>
> *satīstība [satīties attīstība]* (wrapping/inward development),

> *taksobuss [taksometrs autobuss]* (taxi bus),
>
> *Ģimnastrāde [ģimnāzija estrāde]* (grammar-school podium),
>
> *ekomobilis [ekoloģisks automobilis]* (ecocar),
>
> *Gastronauts [gastronomija astronauts]* (gastronomy astronaut),
>
> *Šķirolucionārs [šķirot revolucuionārs]* (waste-sorting revolutionary),
>
> *Sekretūta [sekretāre prostitūta]* (secretary prostitute) [might have been affected by Russian *sekretutka*].

Gradually some of the more frequently used blends entered what could be called standard stock, e.g. *cūkmens [cūka betmens]* (pig Batman) [a media image of a nature polluter], with a high frequency of use. This systemic novelty has even broken into the traditionally conservative stronghold of Latvian terminology. If *kaplete* (*kapsula tablete,* capsule tablet) can be viewed as a semi-transparent imported blend, then, for example, the genuinely Latvian blends *mēstule (mēslu vēstule*, junk email*), atkritne (atkritumu atvilktne*, recycle bin*)* serves as proof that this new word-formation pattern has expanded into all styles and registers of the language.

There are also some semi-affixes frequently used in coining new blends and compounds. While most Latvians have forgotten *Watergate* or have never heard of it, various *-gates* are widely used for instances of corruption in Latvia, and so *-geita* has become a semi-affix: *Jūrmalgeita* (Jūrmala = seaside town), *digitālgeita* (digital-gate), *pedofīlgeita* (paedophile-gate). No doubt the process is enhanced by the frequent foreign *-gates* encountered in English.

Similarly various *-holics* are popular: *darbaholiķis (workaholic), karjerholiķis (careeraholic), seksaholiķis (sexaholic), sniegaholiķis (snowaholic), saulesholiķis (sunaholic)*. While some could be viewed as semicalques of English partial blends (*workaholic*), others are obviously native. And so is *-krātija* (-cracy): *bandokrātija* (gangocracy), *ētokrātija* (ethicocracy), *netokrātija* (netocracy). Thus blends in Latvian demonstrate a cline of linguistic items from phonological loans to pattern-induced native creations.

5.4 SHORT, HYPHENATED ABBREVIATED COMPOUNDS

Hyphenation is rarely used in Latvian, and the pattern of *initial letter plus hyphen plus full word* is a novel phenomenon. For a long time the borrowing *T-shirt* was avoided for purely this reason: there was no precedent. Finally a semiloan of *T-shirt (T-krekls)* was accepted, promptly followed by the Latvian loan translation of *e-mail*: *e-pasts*. The next was *i-banka* (internet bank) but this was monopolised in a non-hyphenated form by one of the leading banks of the time for its internet domain (www.ibanka.lv). Thus *i-banka* had a barrier to its spread because of the possible ambiguity and a full compound *internetbanka* is normally used. But some years later native formations started to proliferate, dominated by *e-*coinages (electronic-), e.g. *e-aptieka (e-chemist), e-aukle (e-nurse), e-baznīca (e-church).*

Some of these were naturally loan-translations, e.g. *e-cigarete (e-cigarette)*, but the majority are native formations using the imported pattern. Today there are more than 100 Latvian formations of this type in frequent use.

Coinages with *i-* are less popular, perhaps because *i-* can confusingly signify both *internet* and *information*: *i-deja* (i-dance), *i-grāmata* (i-book), *i-karte* (i-map), *i-mode* (i-fashion), *i-veikals* (i-shop), *i-sabiedrība* (i-society).

Other letters in such constructions are rarer: *t-krekls/T-krekls* (T-shirt), *t-bode (t-shop* making T-shirts), *p-serviss* (fast-food outlet serving pasta).

5.5 COMPOUND PHRASES

Compound phrases and phrasal compounds of the occasional or nonce type (*on-the-spot creations, will-she-or-won't-she-get-the-guy comedy*), which are quite popular in English, were most unusual in Latvian before the 1990s, and this model is imported. There are a few unique cases of use of such formations dating back to the 19th century, no doubt influenced by a language contact (Bergmane, Blinkena, 1986). It is interesting to note that English translations into Latvian do not normally retain this pattern. The author of this paper has not encountered a single use of this pattern in serious Latvian translations of fiction (even if the source texts have them) while it is quite frequent in original writings. The reason might be that translators have been taught that the pattern is not a Latvian norm. In this way, this innovation bypassed the usual first stage (translation), and was simply borrowed as a technique for native Latvian material.

There were probably several reasons why this pattern was borrowed: novelty and imitation of course, but also the possibility of condensing meaning into a brief attention-grabbing expression, as in English. It usually, but not exclusively, uses attributive phrases, which provide the writer with an almost unlimited stock of novel and graphically obtrusive expressive modifiers. These expressions appear mainly in newspapers and magazines.

> *Rūdītais **lai-ar-kādi-vēji-pūš** politiķis Nikolajs …* (*Diena,* 1994)
>
> *Gloss: The weathered, let-any-winds-blow politician Nikolajs*

> *tā sniedz cilvēkiem priekšstatu par **realitāti-aiz-realitātes**.* (*Grāmatu Apskats,* 1994)
>
> *Gloss: It gives people an idea of the reality-behind-reality.*

> *Ar demokrātisko **divtūkstoš-un-cik-tur-balsošanu** izšķirtos ...* (*Diena Izklaidei,* 1999)
>
> *Gloss: With democratic two-thousand-and-what-not-voting it would come to*

> *Izrādās, lai popularizētu Parīzes **tur-noteikti-vajag-būt** objektu.* (*Diena,* 2001)
>
> *Gloss: In order to popularise the must-be-there sight of Paris.*

*Cars bija tikai peška, **te-viņš-bija-te-viņš-zuda** cars.* (*Una*, 2005)

Gloss: The tsar was just a pawn, a now-you-see-him-now-you-don't tsar.

*Reikjavīka ir arī pretstats ierasti idilliskajam **ai-cik-sireāli-pasakaina-šī-Islande** redzējumam.* (*Kultūras Diena*, 2007.)

Gloss: Reykjavik is also a contrast to the idyllic-oh-how-surreal-and-fairylike-Iceland-is vision.

5.6 CHANGE OF PLURAL / SINGULAR SYSTEM

As regards the typology of morphological borrowing, words borrowed in several paradigmatic forms are rare, a coexistence of borrowed and native paradigms in the receptor language is strange from the point of view of language economy. This type of borrowing is called Parallel System Borrowing (PSB) (Kosmann, 2010). The Latvian case is simpler: the English singular/plural pattern is imposed on Latvian nouns in a pattern move. This has affected nouns (internationalisms and native) that Latvian used only in the plural or singular (*plurale, singulare tantum*). Many have now developed full paradigms. This started under the influence of English with some specific international and EU terms, reflecting English meaning and English grammar, e.g. *prasme* (skill, ability) was used only in singular denoting an abstract quality. The plural form arrived with the EU educational translations which talk about various skills. An identical process happened later with the term *kompetence* (competence), which also developed plural forms. *Aktivitāte* (activity) underwent an identical process. These were followed by *debates* (singular added), *risks* (plural added), *autoritāte* (plural added), *kvalitāte* (plural added), *tehnoloģija* (plural added), *politika* (plural added), *efekts* (plural added), *taktika* (plural added), *stratēģija* (plural added), *emocijas* (singular added), *ekonomika* (plural added). The pattern change then spread to purely Latvian words (and ancient borrowings). Some were definitely loan-translation transfers, e.g. *vara/s* (power/s), but many do not seem to have a link to English, e.g. *baile/s* (fear/s), *baža/s* (concern/s), *sacīkste/s* (competition/s), *dusma/s* (anger), *brille/s* (spectacles). It seems English influence has sparked off a general trend of standardising Latvian number categories. Generally the old meaning is retained in both numbers, but occasionally the new form (sg. or pl.) comes with a new meaning, e.g. *autoritāte* used to mean the abstract quality of *authority*. The new sense refers to a *person with authority, a boss,* and this can be used in the plural as well. Some of the above examples can also be explained by extralinguistic processes, e.g. the growing frequency of one-parent families necessitates a singular noun: from standard Latvian *vecāki* (parents) to *vecāks* (parent). The process is somewhat obstructed by the polysemy of the converted form *vecāks* = older).

5.7 EXTENSIVE USE OF WORDPLAY

Changes of textual convention constitute an even broader understanding of pattern, in fact a mega-pattern. Wordplay involves various means and patterns

with the aim of language play, its degree is a subjective issue and frequency is impossible to calculate. However, its volume has increased many times over.

Changes of textual conventions (going far beyond mere wordplay; the standard CV format has changed, as has the style used for cookbook recipes) can be viewed in terms of discussions between minor and major cultures and languages in translation theory, where an asymmetrical cultural exchange takes place. As suggested by Toury (1995), dominant cultures tend to impose their own linguistic and cultural conventions when translated into minor language cultures. Minor cultures willingly or unwillingly absorb the dictum of the more pervasive or prestigious cultures, modifying their conventions according to the changing situation, the hegemonistic pressure from the prestigious languages, etc. As linguistic processes are less consciously rationalised than many others, they reflect the essence of the cultural processes more clearly (Hymes, 1983:24).

English speech conventions presume a much more frequent use of idiomatic transformations in certain text types than in Latvian (e.g. newspaper and magazine headlines). In this sense, conventions would come very close to what can be called expectancy norms, the breaking of which would create a certain unease. Expectancy norms and conventions, however, are not set in stone; they are flexible and depend not only on tradition and popular perceptions, but also on cultural evolution, on the effect of contact with other languages and the sociolinguistic situation. Wordplay, though occasionally used during the Soviet period, was generally not frequent and censors viewed it with suspicion. The watchful eye of state censorship suspected any innovations and even metaphors without prior approval, branding them dangerous and reactionary, as can be seen in a prominent East German textbook on style:

> Heute, wo die Lehren von Marx und Lenin der Menscheit den Weg in die Zukunft weisen, ist eine dem Expressionismus ähnliche Behandlung des Wortmaterials als reaktionär einsuschätzen

> (Faulseit and Kuehn 1975:174). Today when the teachings of Marx and Lenin show mankind the road to the future, such Expressionism-like treatment of word material is to be evaluated as reactionary (Translation mine A.V.)

They are now commonplace and it is hard to state whether the growth is an imported feature or a native, natural development due to more relaxed conventions and a more playful attitude to language.

Latvian has enormously increased its occasional, contextual (Veisbergs, 1997) and instantial (Naciscione, 2010) use of idioms to create wordplay, both in translated and native texts. This can be viewed as a serious shift in idiom usage conventions. Phraseology is no longer a stock of hackneyed phrases but a great source of innovation.

Graphic nonce wordplay has become commonplace, including paronymic substitution of letters or sounds, e.g. *migrorajons*: substitution of a letter

in *mikrorajons* 'micro-district', which results in a blend, *migrants' district*; *valdības sastārdīšana* 'government de/composition', from *valdības sastādīšana* 'composition of the government' and *saārdīšana* 'destroying'. Graphic wordplay is common in advertising. This playful use of nonce words and the nonce use of idioms and wordplay at least partly reflect their spread in English and the general liberalisation of norms and conventions as well as a more playful attitude towards language.

Nonce use at the word level (usually compounds or derivatives) has undergone a similar expansion. Originally, practically all nonce formations could be traced back to their English counterparts, thus they were semi-transparent loans, e.g. *kleptokrātija* (kleptocracy), *eksvīrs* (ex-husband), *jā-ļautiņi* (yes-men), *rašisti* (Russian fascists). But today these are predominantly original coinages, e.g. *smalkaprindisks* (smart-circle), *kultūrdubļi* (culturemud), *kinoštrunts* (cinemarubbish). Some have developed wide currency: *bučmūles* (kiss babes), *smukbučmūlīši* (kiss-babes). Thus, the stagnation of the media language characteristic of the totalitarian period has come to an end (Liepa, 2011). Much play with word-formation devices occurs on the internet (including chat rooms), where its full potential, as well as the resourcefulness of amateurs, can be seen. Thus we have seen how foreign-induced patterns have activated the latent structural and semantic features of the Latvian language: usually by first affecting translations (both acknowledged and unacknowledged) and ultimately affecting even original texts (in the media, the electronic media, chat rooms), thereby breaking away from the conservative and rigid use of lexical and idiomatic material that pertained before.

CONCLUSIONS

Apart from various other direct influences, English as the main contact language has affected Latvian patterns: word-formation patterns, and patterns of use and patterns of convention. Part of this contact-induced change can be viewed as structural impact, part as a shift in conventions. The growth in the scope of creativity is evidenced both by the increased use of previously rare stylistic means (idiom transformations, nonce compounding), and by the appearance of new linguo-stylistic devices such as native blends or compound phrases. The latter linguistic patterns, though imported, have found a niche in the Latvian linguistic system and are now used in various speech domains. They have become part of the Latvian language and usage. In general we can view these shifts as an enhancement of Latvian's inherent linguistic potential rather than the contact-induced change of traditional patterns. Language change is not a sign of decay (Aitchison, 1998:221), it is natural for a living language to accommodate the needs of its users while retaining its core heritage.

REFERENCES

Aitchison, J. (1998) *Language Change: Progress or Decay*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baldunčiks, J. (2015) A new trend in the translation of polysemous English words into Latvian: semantic hypertrophy of the basic equivalent. In A. Bloch-Rozmej and K. Drabikowska (eds.) *Within Language, Beyond Theories,* Volume II. (pp. 275–289). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Baldunčiks, J. (1989) *Anglicismi latviešu valodā.* Rīga: Zinātne.

Baltiņš, M. Druviete, I. and Veisbergs, A. (eds.) *Latviešu valoda 15 neatkarības gados* (2007). Rīga: Zinātne

Bergmane A., Blinkena A. (1986) *Latviešu rakstības attīstība.* Rīga: Zinātne.

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.

Crystal, D. (2003) *English as a Global Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Faulseit, D. and Kuehn, G. (1975) *Stilistische Mittel und Moeglichkeiten der deutschen Sprache*. Leipzig: VEB Bibliographisches Institut.

Gardani,F., Arkadiev,P. and Amiridze. N. (eds.) (2015) *Borrowed Morphology.* Berlin/Muenchen/Boston: Walter de Gruyter.

Hogan-Brun, G. (2005) Language in Society across the Baltic Republics: A comparative overview. *Journal of Baltic Studies*, 36 (3): 273–282.

House, J. (2002) Communicating in English as a lingua franca. In S. Foster-Cohen (ed.) *EUROSLA Yearbook,* 2 (pp. 243–261). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

House, J. (2004) English as a lingua franca and its influence on texts in other European languages. In G.Garzone and A.Cardinaletti (eds.) *Lingua, Mediazione Linguistica e Interferenza* (pp. 21–48). Milano: Franco Angeli

Koller, W. (2000) Uebersetzungen in Deutsche und ihre Bedeutung fuer die deutsche Sprachgeschichte. In W. Besch, A. Betten, O. Reichmann, and S. Sonderegger (eds.) *Sprachgeschichte: Ein Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und ihrer Erforschung* (pp. 112–129). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kossmann, M. (2010) Parallel system borrowing: Parallel morphological systems due to the borrowing of paradigms. *Diachronica*, 27 (3): 459–487.

Latviešu valodas apguvi ietekmējošie faktori un lietojuma vide (2010) Rīga: LVA.

Latviešu valodas gramatika (2013) Rīga: LU LVI.

Liepa, D. (2011) *Latvijas preses valoda.* Rīga: LU Latviešu valodas institūts.

Ločmele, G. and Veisbergs, A. (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). John Benjamins.

Muehleisen, S. (2010) *Heterogeneity in Word-formation Patterns.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Muysken, P. (2000) *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Naciscione, A. (2010) *Stylistic Use of Phraseological Units in Discourse.* John Benjamins.

Navickaite-Klišauskiene, A. (2016) Latvian. In P. O. Mueller, I. Ohnheiser, S. Olsen, F. Rainer (eds.) *Word-Formation: An International Handbook of Languages of Europe* (pp. 3107–3123). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Nītiņa, D. (1985) Vārdšķiras un to konversija latviešu valodā. *LPSR ZA Vēstis,* 1: 68–76.

Nītiņa, D. (2004) *Moderna cilvēka valoda.* Rīga: VVA.

Phillipson, R. (1992) *Linguistic Imperialism.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Romaine, S. (1999) Introduction. *The Cambridge History of the English Language,* Vol. 4 (pp. 1–56). Cambridge University Press.

Rūķe-Draviņa, V. (1977) *The Standardization Process in Latvian.* Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell International.

Sakel, J. (2007) Types of loan; matter and pattern. In Y. Matras and J. Sakel (eds.) *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective* (pp. 15–30). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Skujiņa, V. (1999) Terminu modeļi J. Endzelīna caurlūkotajā elektrotehnikas vārdnīcā. *Linguistica Lettica,* 4: 100–109.

Skujiņa, V. (2005) Termins – noturīgais un mainīgais. *Valsts Valodas Komisija. Raksti,* 1. sējums. (128.–135. lpp.). Rīga: VVK.

Stolz, C. (ed.) (2015) *Language Empires in Comparative Perspective.* Berlin/Muenchen/Boston: Walter de Gruyter.

Tauli, V. (1968) *Introduction to a Theory of Language Planning.* Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksells.

Thomason, S. (2007) Language Contact and Deliberate Change. *Journal of Language Contact,* 1: 41- 62.

Toury, G. (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

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: John Benjamins.

Veisbergs, A. (2007b) Jaunvārdi un valodas attīstības virziens. *Baltu filoloģija,* XVI: 133–140.

Veisbergs, A. (1997) The contextual use of idioms, wordplay and translation. In D. Delabastita (ed.) *Traductio. Essays on Punning and Translation* (pp. 155–176). Manchester: Routledge.

Veisbergs, A. (2016) *Jaunā latviešu angļu vārdnīca.* Rīga: Zinātne.

Wright, S. (2004) *Language Policy and Language Planning. From Nationalism to Globalization. Basingstoke:* Palgrave Macmillan.

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