

TERM-FORMATION, TRANSLATION, INTERPRETING, LEXICOGRAPHY

ANDREJS VEISBERGS

University of Latvia, Latvia

Abstract. The paper dwells on Latvian terminology of the 21st century. It is coined mostly on the basis of English counterparts. There are many sources of this new terminology: Latvian branch and domain experts, professional EU institutions' Brussels and Luxembourg based translators and terminologists, professional Latvia based translators and terminologists. But numerous terms are coined by random translators, journalists, media representatives, tradespeople, e. g. small shop owners, car dealers, etc. Finally, numerous new nonce terms are coined on the spur of the moment by interpreters, some of which are picked up by their audience and thus gain currency. This leads to a very chaotic terminology scene: often one English term has many established Latvian counterparts (available in official databases), while some terms have none and the English term is used in a grammatically changed or even unchanged form. Still other terms have 'established' Latvian counterparts in the shape of overextended definitions. These terms often breach basic principles of term-formation and contribute to terminological chaos, ambiguity and legal uncertainty. It also makes the work of lexicographers most complicated: dictionaries and databases could standardize terminology, but the descriptive approach to lexicography presumes reflecting lexis that is being used. A ray of hope can be seen in a gradual acceptance of metaphorical terminology.

Key words: terminology, Latvian, term-formation, translators, interpreters, lexicography

INTRODUCTION

Terminology is all around us, it is a typical feature of the modern age. While in the past, general public only occasionally dealt with particular terms outside their own trade, within the domain in which they worked (shoemaker, miller, smith), today we encounter it in media, in supermarkets, in technology sphere that surrounds us.

One should recognize the multidimensional character of terminological entities (Sager, 1990: 1). It affects the theory of terminology and this in turn affects new term formation. Of the dimensions (cognitive, linguistic and communicative) I will dwell mostly on the last two, namely the linguistic – which looks at the existing and dominating linguistic forms as well as possible linguistic forms for naming new concepts, and the communicative dimension – which studies

how terms are used in knowledge transfer to various categories of users and who the recipients in various situations are. Dissemination of terminological data in the form of specialized dictionaries, glossaries or terminological databases is relevant as well.

When referring to Modern Latvian today, it is evident that English is the main contact language, language of borrowing and intermediary language, one could say, a model language, whether conscious or subconscious. It has occupied this position now for approximately 30 years after a centuries-long domination of German and 50 years of Russian supremacy. Thus, today new Latvian terms are usually the result of contact with English.

SPECIALIST AND PUBLIC REALM

Latvian terms (as well as terms in other languages) are very varied, some are used by specialists and experts only, others have a high currency by broad public. Terms are also varied as regards their linguistic form, some are short simple words of the basic language stock with many terminological subsenses, others are lengthy and complicated compounds or compound phrases. Compare **mēnesis** (the Moon) and **radio** on the one hand and **meningoencefalomieleradikuloneirīts** (nerve inflammation) or **transmiokardlāzerrevaskularizācija** (cardiology technique). One should also reckon with imprecise term usage by the general public, e.g. **skrūve** (screw) which may designate **bultskrūve** (bolt) or **koksskrūve** (wood screw).

Term creation should thus be adapted to the expected users of the novel form, taking into account their importance for general or specialist use, expected frequency of use and importance in communication. Thus, a certain balance of the term features should be observed. While creating the frequent and general use terms one should focus on the relative ease and brevity, the specialist terms might need more focus on precision, scope and demarcation of related terms and notions.

The simple existing terms are often the result of words of general stock having naturally developed terminological meanings or the new meanings are assigned by terminologists, e. g. **saule** (the **Sun** and **sun**) as a term of astronomy, or semantic change when a general stock word is provided with another terminological meaning, describing a hitherto non-existent notion, e. g. **aka** (well) being used for a **manhole**. Thus, semantic change is frequently used for terminological innovation.

APPROACHES

There is a contradiction between the **prescriptive** approach to terminology presuming selection of one single correct linguistic form to represent a concept (enhanced by standardization principles), and the **descriptive** approach in

linguistics with regard to the identification of all possible linguistic variants representing the concept. The current trend in the theory of terminology allows for the existence of synonymic expressions and term variations, thus rejecting the narrow prescriptive attitude of the past, which insisted on connecting one concept to one term. Corpora based and field as well as descriptive studies show that term variation for one concept is rife, moreover, frequently there are differently motivated terms regularly used by various groups (Fernández-Silva, Cabré and Freixa, 2011: 100). But it can and does create problems.

The linguistic aspects of term formation are of interest not only to terminologists and subject field specialists, but also to translators and interpreters, in particular, when the latter due to a shortage of dictionaries and glossaries in less widely used languages are obliged to go beyond the call of duty as a translator and become namers and/or neologists. This is especially true of secondary term creation. As we know, primary term formation is quite often spontaneous and erratic, whereas secondary formation is more frequently subject to rules and can be planned and tends to be more orderly. Secondary term creation normally is the result of transferring knowledge to another linguistic community in which a corresponding term needs to be created. Besides secondary term creation can occasionally take the form of updating the system, 'rebaptism of a term' (Anastasiadi-Symeonidi, 2001), e.g. traditional **telephone** is now referred to as **fixed telephone**, **fixed lines**, etc. following the appearance of the **mobile telephone**, which in turn has changed several names – **cellphone**, **cellular phone**, **smartphone** a. o. and is now often called by mobile platform names: **iphone/aifons**, **android/androids**, or trade names.

Standardization, commonly known from the technical and technological fields, has been extended to engage the theory of terminology as well, providing for interlingual rules or guidance for the procedure of term formation (e.g. ISO 704: 2000; ISO 1087 1: 1999 and ISO 1087 2: 2001) at least for the Indo-European languages, even though they are based primarily on the structures of the English language. The aim of the systematization of these principles is to achieve transparency and consistency in term creation.

RULES

When approached in a systematic and institutional way, terminology creation in Latvia is supposed to follow certain principles. Normally one can discern certain stages in introducing new terminology: identification of the need for a new term, production/formation, confirmation by some authority, publishing (paper, digital), possible production of definition (a very laborious process, sometimes omitted when the parallel terms in other languages are offered) and occasional modification (unwelcome) (Baltiņš, 2007: 401-402).

Since Latvian mostly acts as a receiver of new terminology, the general principles of its management lean towards the prescriptive approach (Zauberga, 2016: 66) that is usually characteristic of the process of secondary term formation (systemic and coordinated).

There follow the usual recommendations for term production:

- 1) Terms should correspond to the rules, norms of the language (possibly euphonious and non-ambiguous).
- 2) Terms should be used systematically.
- 3) Terms should **define a concept**.
- 4) Terms should be precise and accurate, **and one per notion**.
- 5) Terms should be relatively independent from text.
- 6) Terms should be **brief**.
- 7) Terms should be monosemantic (within the domain).
- 8) Terms should be stylistically neutral.
- 9) Terms should allow good derivation.
- 10) Once a term is accepted, we should avoid trying to change or improve it.

Not all recommendations are absolute, and practice shows that some of them are contradictory, e.g. briefness and defining are often impossible to combine. It seems that it is impossible in most situations to produce a perfect term fitting the 'golden rules', but this is where the type of term (specialist versus public domain) comes back into discussion. When creating the first, one could focus more on defining and describing, when creating the second the focus could be on brevity.

Since most of modern terminology in Latvian is produced when translating or comparing Latvian with a source language (SL) (usually English), the secondary term-creation principles have been elaborated along the lines of Latvian being the target language (TL) (Borzovs, Ilziņa, Skujiņa, Vancāne, 2001):

- 1) One term in the SL should correspond to one term in the TL.
- 2) Different terms in the SL should have equally different equivalents in the TL.
- 3) A polysemic term in the SL should have a corresponding equivalent in the TL with an equally wide span of meaning.
- 4) A TL term in back translation should correspond to the same SL term.
- 5) When creating a neologism, one has to consider how it fits into the corresponding term system, its similarity to close and analogous terms; it is also desirable that the neologism be easy to use and provide a base for derivation.
- 6) When resorting to borrowing, one must check how it fits into the semantics, phonetics and morphology of the TL.
- 7) In the case of synonyms when one term is international and the other is of Latvian origin, the latter is preferable.

- 8) If a term is already established in practice, it remains unchanged, unless there are serious reasons against it.
- 9) Terms that are in everyday use have stricter requirements: they need to be short, precise, euphonic, easily comprehended. Rarely used terms are treated with more permissiveness.
- 10) None of the above principles are absolute.

One could generally agree with the above, though perhaps too much emphasis has been put on the SL, namely English, e. g. point 3 almost presupposes imitating corresponding English polysemy. English model should not necessarily be the only one to inspire Latvian term makers and excessive alignment might be even harmful, e. g. copying English **maidenhair (fern)** into **jaunavības matu pāpārde**, would be rather comical while the accepted variant **adiantpāpārde**, based on Latin **Adiantum aleuticum subpumulum**, is a good solution.

Also as convincingly demonstrated by Temmermann (2000), outside certain normative contexts, intralingual monosemy and perfect interlingual correspondence turn out to be remarkably rare in terminology.

TERM CREATORS

The methods of term formation in Latvian are generally the same as elsewhere: creating new forms, using existing forms, borrowing and a mix of the above three. It is worthwhile looking at the different term creators and their logic and input. They roughly fall into the following categories: non-experts (civil servants, traders, journalists, etc.), experts, professional translators, interpreters and terminologists. Each of the above categories proceed from their own needs and understanding of the process.

The category of non-experts overlaps with translators, since most of them try their hand at term creation because of the need to transfer foreign terms and concepts. This leads to *journalation* – a mix of journalism translation done in a hurry (Aslanyan, 2021: 175). Much terminology is created by distributors and traders (no doubt often they involve better or worse quality translators). While high-price items (e.g. auto industry) might have high class translators and elaborate terminology, when it comes to simple merchandize, even the name of the item might be wrong, not to say anything about the instructions for use. Also, do-it-yourself type of supermarkets, offering thousands of trinkets and small items often pay little attention to correct terminology. The same refers to internet shops which often seem to use *google translate* for localizing their products in Latvian. An interesting sample of this can be seen when introducing the name **tonometrs** in *google* search. While the Latvian image page show numerous pictures of cheap **blood pressure monitors** or **tensiometers** (Latvian **asins spiediena mēritājs**), the English page of **tonometer** shows the sophisticated **eye pressure meter**. Where this deviation originated from is unknown.

The category of experts and professionals in their turn usually keep to the professional jargon which abounds in direct loans from English. Thus, the accepted medical Latvian term for English **bougie** (a thin, flexible surgical instrument for exploring or dilating a passage of the body) seems to be a direct loan **buzis** or **buža**. Latvian Thesaurus (*Tezaurus*) for some reason offers only the plural form **buži**, which would suggest the masculine **buzis** in singular. The term is not registered in the *Termini* database, nor in *IATE*. The *Glosbe* database offers many translations that are used: **dilatācijas tapīna** (dilation pin), **dilatators** (dilator), (**vairākpakāpju**) **buža** (multistage bougie), **medicīniskiem nolūkiem paredzētas izplešanās zonde** (dilation probe meant for medical purposes). I have asked a couple of doctors what the singular form of the term might be, and they failed to provide a coherent answer. At the same time the term is widely used and has even undergone derivation: **bužēšana** (bougeing), **bužēt** (to bougie) thus apparently satisfying the practical needs. The other option is a loan translation in case the SL term is a transparent compound or a reasonable metaphor. Such terms are frequently coined by osteopathy practitioners who do not have an approved terminology (Kalinina, 2021).

Similar developments can be observed in the forest industry, thus **Harvester and Harwarder** are transferred as **hārvesters and hārvarders** and are widely used. Here, Latvian terminologists have stepped in and produced a torturous definition-like term: **mežistrādes vairākoperāciju koku gāšanas, atzarošanas un sazarumošanas mašīna** (multioperational forest exploitation machine for tree felling, delimiting and bucking). It is clear that no one would use such a contortion, so a shorter variant has been offered: **vairākoperāciju mežistrādes mašīna** (multioperational forest exploitation machine). This might be used in official written texts, but not in everyday speech by workers. A possible improvement has appeared as **meža kombains** (forest combine), but the short direct loans still dominate the professional talk.

Professional translators form a significant term creator group, this includes those working for the EU institutions and those in Latvia. The specific role of professional translators includes several characteristics. By and large translators usually are not experts in the particular terminology field, so they often do not fully understand the concepts involved. The standard/default reaction to a term by a translator is to find it in termbases or translator tools without thinking much about it (ten Hacken, 2013: 251). When a standard equivalent seems to be missing, translators look for samples and precedents and choose the ones that seem dominant (occasionally perpetuating wrong ones) or reasonable. Translators have their schedules and deadlines and cannot spend much time researching the issue at length. In case of absence of Latvian terms, translators will tend to go by the model of the SL and will either coin a direct loan or attempt a loan translation, or occasionally create a compound with definition elements.

To illustrate the main approach here follow the renderings of the widespread fish variety of **rat-tail**, also **grenadier** (Latin **Macrouridae**). The Latvian database *Termini* offers **melnplankumainā makrūrziivs**, but **garaste** (long-tail), **makrūrziivs** (macrour-fish) for **rat-tail**. In the translations of EU texts the following Latvian equivalents dominate: **žurkaste** (rat-tail), **strupdeguņa garaste**, **apaļdeguņa garaste**, **Argentīnas makrurons**, **makrūrziivs**, **zilais makrurons**, while the non-EU translators have stuck mostly with **grenadieris**.

With regard to the treatment of terminology, interpreters differ from translators first and foremost by being more context dependent (Zauberga, 2005: 113). In a way interpreters are going by Firth's maxim 'You shall know a word by the company it keeps' (Firth, 1957: 11). While translators generally use the official or dominant term, and have the opportunity of checking, the interpreters' goal is to ensure professional communication and transfer of knowledge in the given event. Professional interpreters, of course, are supposed to be well-versed in terminology issues, also prepared for the current assignments by using terminology databases and other sources. There is a variety of quality criteria that are given prominence by the users of interpreting services – all seem to consider sense consistency, logical cohesion, and correct terminology to be of top importance (Kurz, 2001: 398). Conference users claim that the interpreter's knowledge of terminology is very important (Donovan, 2002: 9). Interpreters might protest about the latter, saying that clarity and logical cohesion are much more important, but the clients' wishes cannot be ignored.

However, every professional interpreter knows that even extensive preparation for terminologically saturated meetings (not all conferences are such) does not solve all issues, the hit rate of prepared terminology often does not exceed 10 per cent of the new terms that an interpreter has to cope with. But the unknown terms that appear in source speech are somehow to be transferred into target speech. This includes several possibilities: something can be found in the meeting materials (if there are such), something is picked up during the meeting while listening to the delegates, something can be ascertained during the breaks by asking the delegates, but much has to be invented on the spur of the moment. This is where the interpreter becomes an on-the-spot terminologist, creator of new terms in the target language. While in the foreign language these would mainly be wrong or imprecise ones, in the mother tongue, e. g. Latvian, which perhaps, does not have the equivalent, these could be not only nonce creations, but might become neologisms and gradually fully-fledged terms. There are contributing factors to such development, e. g. if the term does not exist in Latvian the Latvian delegates hearing it might find it handy (might even think it is the correct, the approved one) and pick it up. Even more, they might spread it further in their offices and domain use. And in other meetings they might use it and thus consolidate its position with the interpreters. Thus, a randomly created term may quickly acquire circulation.

A sample of interpreters dealing with terminology: **sunset clause**. In the absence of Latvian counterpart interpreters generally tended to use a short descriptive, hyperordinate designation **beigu klauzula** (end clause) or loan translation **saulrieta klauzula** (sunset clause). Later terminologists and translators stepped in and produced a great variety of ever longer and more explanatory/transparent equivalents: **pārskatīšanas klauzula**, **turpināšanas klauzula**, **turpināmības klauzula**, **darbības beigu klauzula**, **termiņa beigu klauzula**, **termiņa izbeigšanās klauzula**, **pants darbības turpināšanai**, **pārbaudes klauzula par darbības beigu termiņu**. However, in the end everybody returned to the metaphorical loan translation **saulrieta klauzula**.

For interpreters, terminology is less stable, occasionally fashionable (Zauberga, 2003: 238) and more adaptable, e.g. taking into account a multitude of descriptive Latvian counterparts for English **opt-out** – **nepiemērošana**, **izvairīšanās**, **atteikšanās**, **atbrīvojums** – an interpreter might opt for the direct loan – **optauts**.

The final term creator group are terminologists, of which in Latvia there are not many. They generally collect, discuss and weigh terms produced by the above categories and approve them in working groups/commissions. When meeting numerous terms for one notion they have a dilemma – can they change the terms that someone has produced and are used (the EU corrigendum procedure is extremely cumbersome) or should they leave the things as they are. Besides various terminology sources are covered by copyright and cannot be arbitrarily removed from the term base *Termini*.

There seem to be two overwhelming problems in Latvian terminology, namely, a multitude of terms for one notion (which is the right one?) and overextended terms, that people hate using.

MULTITUDE OF TERMS

Let us first discuss the multitude issue. It has plagued Latvian terminology in some spheres for decades (Veisbergs, 2020) Some variation of terminology is inevitable and recognized as a fact today (Kerremans, 2013). But when the scale of variety precludes judgement, we have a problem. Thus, the comprehensive English term **learner** has the following Latvian counterparts: **skolēns**, **mācēns**, **māceknis**, **mācāmais**, **apmācāmais**, **kursants**, **students**, **mācību subjekts**, **izglītojamais**. Some of these have been specially created, others are well-known words, none seems to correspond fully to the English counterpart, they are either narrower, or more specific, or very technical. And translators as well as users are perplexed.

One might expect that terms of narrower scope might fare better. Not at all. **Antifouling** (anti-fouling paints are used to coat the bottoms of ships to prevent sea life such as algae and molluscs attaching themselves to the hull). The *Termini* database offers two alternatives: **pretnosēdumu** (antisedimentation),

pretapaugšanas (antigrowth). IATE offers one: **pretapaugšanas**. But in translations one finds 23 Latvian counterparts of which 3 tend to dominate: **pretsārņojuma** (antipollution) and the above **pretapaugšanas**, **pretnosēdumu**. The other 20 make sense, they are transparent and could be considered reasonable and usable, some are quite sophisticated and would not have been created by incompetent people: **antiveģetatīvs** (antivegetative), **alvorganisks** (alvoorganic), etc.

OVEREXTENSION

The second problem, referred to already above, is overextension of terms. While it would not be a criminal issue with specialized terms, like chemical compounds or pharmaceutical products, it does become a problem with frequently used public domain terms. Thus, *tickler* reproduced as **reģeneratīvā uztvērēja atgriezeniskās saites spole** (the feedback/inductance coil of the regenerative receiver) could pass (though I am quite sure experts would use the short and slangy **tiklers**).

But the database Termini offers for the simple English **paramedic** an unbelievably torturous phrase in Latvian: **medicīnisko palīdzību sniegt spējīgs policijas vai militārdienesta darbinieks** (a police or military employee capable of offering medical aid). The reason might be that Latvian **paramediķis** is 'engaged' in the meaning of **paraprofessional**. However, such a clumsy term is hopeless for the public realm. Something shorter could have been offered.

Latvian **mirušā cilvēka ķermenis** (the body of a dead person) for the English **corpse** is certainly unwelcome. Especially because there is a direct equivalent **likis** – a word that everybody knows and uses. But these are far from the worst: the Latvian equivalent for **de-icing management** is **gaisa kuģu virsmu atbrīvošanas no ledus un sniega organizēšana** (organizing of relieving airship surfaces of ice and snow); the gymnastics term **Ono vault – pēc lieliem apvēzieniem uz priekšu atvēzienā pārtvert vienu roku virstvērienā un, pagriežoties par 180° kārienā jauktā tvērienā, pārlidojums, pārejot kārienā** which one must read at least three times to locate the kernel word – the subject in the Nominative case (**pārlidojums**).

Such a term might be useful for a specialized gymnast studying a manual of vaults, knowing the 8 other terms invoked in the definition and learning. It certainly is out of place for general public, both in a radio or TV broadcast, or in a written text.

These terms generally come from experts who seem to use English lexicographic sources and transfer/translate the definition as the Latvian term, e. g. **bank reconciliation – bankas ierakstu saskaņošana ar klienta datiem** (coordination of banking records with client data). It generally results in people opting for a direct loan **rekonsiliēšana**. The extended terms are clumsy for translations and impossible for interpreting. Thus, the extended **money laundering**

counterpart in Latvian **nelikumīgi/noziedzīgi iegūtu līdzekļu (noziedzīga) legalizēšana** (unlawful legalization of illegally gained means) becomes increasingly cumbersome and long in textual use. Compare:

In February 2019, the FATF identified Cambodia as a jurisdiction having **strategic AML/CFT deficiencies** for which Cambodia has developed an action plan with the FATF.

FATF 2019. gada februārī konstatēja, ka Kambodža ir jurisdikcija, kurai **nelikumīgi iegūtu līdzekļu legalizēšanas un teroristu finansēšanas novēršanas jomā ir stratēģiskas nepilnības**, attiecībā uz kurām Kambodža sadarbibā ar FATF sagatavojsi rīcības plānu.

The contorted term does not yield to derivation easily either, thus **money launderer** becomes **tas, kas nodarbojas ar nelikumīgi iegūtu līdzekļu legalizāciju** (the one who deals with legalization of illegally gained means) instead of the simple **naudas atmazgātājs** (money launderer). The metaphorical **laundromat** accordingly becomes **nelikumīgi iegūtu līdzekļu legalizācijas krāpnieciska shēma** (a fraudulent scheme of legalization of illegally gained means) and so forth.

The same hazardous approach was started with the fashionable term **greening**. The Latvian equivalent proposed was **klimatam un videi labvēlīgāka prakse** (practice beneficial to the climate and environment). Fortunately, it was noticed that numerous phrases and compounds with **greening** (greening taxes, greening payments) did not yield to normal use and a metaphorical neologism **zaļināšana** (greening) was created.

SOLUTIONS

Latvian terminology seems to suffer from an overemphasis of the criterion of the notion description in term creation. This is not a problem for specialist terminology of rare and specialized occurrence and use, but it is for public use terms. Terms used in everyday language should focus on brevity and understandability. Here metaphors are most welcome, being brief and capacious. One should not underrate the ability of grasping and understanding of metaphors – like notions they are mostly universal (Gibbs, 2007; Pamies, 2009: 29), besides ‘the human conceptual system is heavily metaphorical in nature’ (Kövecses, 2015: ix). So are the cognitive conceptualization processes (Mischler, 2013). As pointed out above Latvian terminology seems to suffer from fear or opposition to metaphors, as pointed out by Načisčione (2003, 2011, 2019), which seems to be totally self-imposed. The argument of some terminologists that figurative/metaphorical terms are not welcome since figurativeness is generally nationally marked and might not be grasped at all or might leave room for interpretation is not

very convincing. Some other concerns about metaphorical terms tend to focus on the possibility of breeding polysemy and not being precise. These should be viewed in each concrete case and on balance with the loss of metaphor. 'Loss of a metaphor is not justified if a metaphorical loan translation is possible because loss severs associations, inhibits perception and recognition of the term, hence hindering its back translation and interpretation' (Načisčione, 2019: 556). Fortunately, the prescriptivist rules are gradually receding, and viability of metaphor seems to be understood and taking ground (Karpinska and Liepiņa, 2022b: 69).

Thus, instead of the various extended terms for **credit holidays – kredīta atmaksāšanas atlikšana uz vēlāku laiku** (postponing of credit repayment for a later time), **pagaidu atbrīvojums no nodokļu maksāšanas** (temporary dispensation of tax payment) the loan-translation **kredīta brīvdienas** seems preferable from all points of view. Its full contents can be more thoroughly explained in a preamble or footnotes. The term has gained currency.

Besides the issue of backtranslation should be mentioned, since it is often hard to guess what the English counterpart might be like for the lengthy Latvian paraphrase. It does not always mean exact copying of the SL model, like **deep fake – dziļviltojums**. One can depart from the exact model; thus, **booster vaccine** was rendered as **balstvakcīna** (support/prop vaccine), **QR (quick response) code** as **kvadrātkods** (square code). Both neologisms gained ground fast.

In this respect it is interesting that the novel term **greenwashing** (the process of conveying a false impression or providing misleading information about how a company's products are more environmentally sound) has been rendered as **zaļmaldināšana** (greenmisleading). One could speculate if the **money laundering** term had been accepted as a calque **mazgāšana/atmazgāšana** (laundering), one could have created **zaļmazgāšana** (greenwashing).

I think that metaphor and calque approach is most reasonable, moreover the metaphor should not be a precise, exact replacement of the source language metaphor and the structure of the word or phrase.

LEXICOGRAPHY REFLECTIONS

Since we now have numerous terms that often breach the basic principles of term-formation, since there is some terminological chaos, ambiguity and legal uncertainty, one could look at the lexicographer to establish order: dictionaries and databases could standardize terminology. But it is not so simple.

First, lexicographers are not in charge of databases, they are their users. Like translators in many cases, lexicographers are also not experts of the terminological domains and are frequently dealing with terms whose meaning they may even not fully grasp (Adamska-Sałaciak, 2014).

Second, the descriptive approach to lexicography and language in general presumes reflecting lexis and terms that are being used (not censoring the language, not imposing one's view and subjective feelings). Which means, if there are 5 or 8 Latvian equivalents for an English term in databases (e. g. **accountability – atbildība, atbildīgums, uzskaitāmība, izkontrolējamība, pārskatatbildība**) and various texts and various parallel corpora, the lexicographer most likely will introduce the English equivalent in 5 or 8 Latvian – English dictionary entries. Which will be prudent for the lexicographer, handy for the user, who will be able to find it when looking for the English equivalent. If the user is knowledgeable, he or she might make the right choice (Karpinska, Liepiņa, 2022a: 63). But, and it is a big BUT; it will solidify, even codify the chaos as even the most descriptive dictionaries in fact become prescriptive when used.

CONCLUSIONS

It should be pointed out that a good term involves a balance between prescriptive rules of term-formation on the one hand and the needs of their users on the other hand, as well as a balance between the application of the many term formation rules themselves. This refers also to endless suggestions of new and better terms for the ones that are in use.

Coining of metaphorical terms is likely to gain greater traction, partly to limit the spread of cumbersome definition-like terms and partly in order to satisfy the general public need for recognizable terms and backtranslation ease.

Terminology is there to optimize communication not only among professionals but also general public. Though created by various groups of people involved it should be to some extent standardized, thus its creators should be able to come to some consensus on the main aspects of term creation.

REFERENCES

- Adamska-Sałaciak, A. (2014) Bilingual lexicography: translation dictionaries. *International Handbook of Modern Lexis and Lexicography* (pp. 1-11). Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.
- Anastasiadi-Symeonidi, A. (2001) Αναβαπτισμός (Rebaptism). Proceedings of the 3rd Conference *Hellenic Language and Terminology* (pp. 63-77). Athens.
- Aslanyan, A. (2021) *Dancing on Ropes. Translators and the Balance of History*. London: Profile Books.
- Baltiņš, M. (2007) Terminrades process pēdējo piecpadsmit gadu laikā: Pagātnes mantojums un nākotnes perspektīvas. In I. Druvieta, A. Veisbergs, M. Baltiņš (red.) [*Latvian in 15 years of independence. Linguistic situation, attitude, processes, tendencies*] (pp. 401-439). Rīga: Zinātne.
- Borzovs, J., Ilziņa, I., Skujiņa, V., Vancāne, I. (2001) Sistēmiska latviešu datorterminoloģijas izstrāde [Systemic Development of Latvian Computer Terminology]. *LZA Vēstis*, [LZA News], 55 (1/2): 83-91.

- Donovan, C. (2002) Survey of users: expectations and needs. In *Teaching Simultaneous Interpretation into a 'B' Language* (pp. 2-12). Brussels: EMCI in cooperation with European Institutions.
- Fernández-Silva, I; Cabré, M. T. and Freixa, J. (2011) Term choice in an interdisciplinary domain: from cognitive variability to terminological variation. *Societas Linguistica Europaea 44th Annual Meeting. Abstracts*. University of la Rioja Logroño.
- Firth, J. R. (1957) *Papers in Linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Gibbs, R. (2007) Psycholinguistic aspects of phraseology: American tradition. In H. Burger et al. (eds.) *Phraseology. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, Vol. 2. (pp. 819-836). Berlin and New York.
- Kalinina, I. (2021) *Equivalence in Biodynamic Osteopathic Terminology Translation in English, French, Italian, Latvian and Russian. Thèse de doctorat en lexicologie et terminologie multilingues*. Université Lumière Lyon 2, Université de Lettonie.
- Karpinska, L. and Liepiņa, D. (2022a) Latvian-English electronic lexicographic resources of legal terminology. *Baltic Journal of English Language, Literature and Culture*, 12: 48-65.
- Karpinska, L. and Liepiņa, D. (2022b) Metaphorical terms in the Latvian translation landscape. *Lublin Studies in Modern Languages and Literature*, 46 (2): 61-70.
- Kerremans, K. (2013) Improving specialised translation dictionaries on the basis of a study of terminological variation. In M. Thelen and B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (eds.) *Translation and Meaning*, Part 9 (pp. 227-239). Maastricht: UPM.
- Kövecses, Z. (2015) *Where Metaphors Come From: reconsidering context in metaphor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kurz, I. (2001) Quality in the ears of the user. *Meta: Translators' Journal*, 46 (2): 394-409.
- Mischler, J. (2013) *Metaphor Across Time and Conceptual Space*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia. John Benjamins.
- Načiščione, A. (2003) Translation of terminology: Why kill the metaphor? In A. Veisbergs (ed.) *Proceedings of the Third International Riga Symposium on Pragmatic Aspects of Translation* (pp. 102-117). Riga: University of Latvia and Aarhus School of Business.
- Naciscione, A. (2011) A cognitive approach to translating phraseological terms. In J. Szerszunowicz (ed.) *Focal Issues of Phraseological Studies: research on phraseology in Europe and Asia*. Vol. 1 (pp. 268-290). Białystok: University of Białystok Publishing House.
- Načiščione, A. (2019) The role of cognitive theory in translation of metaphorical scientific terms. In V. Lubkina, A. Klavinska and S. Usca (eds.) *Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference Society, Integration, Education*, Vol. 3 (pp. 552-562). Rezekne: Rezekne Academy of Technologies.
- Pamies, A. (2009) National linguo-cultural specificity vs. linguistic globalization: the case of figurative meaning. In J. Korhonen et al. (eds.) *Phraseologie -Global -Areal -Regional* (pp. 29-42). Tübingen: Gunther Narr.
- Sager, J. (1990) *A Practical Course in Terminology Processing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Temmermann, R. (2000) *Towards New Ways of Terminology Description: the sociocognitive approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- ten Hacken, P. (2013) Terms in three perspectives. In M. Thelen and B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (eds.) *Translation and Meaning*, Part 9 (pp. 251-262). Maastricht: UPM.

Veisbergs, A. (2020) Frazeoloģijas jēdzienu un terminu mokrplnā augsme [The torturous development of the concepts and terms of phraseology]. *LNB Zinātniskie raksti*. 6. XXVI (pp. 131-150). Rīga: LNB.

Zauberga, I. (2003) Translators/interpreters as users and contributors to terminography. In A. Veisbergs (ed.) *Proceedings of the Third Riga Symposium on Pragmatic Aspects of Translation* (pp. 231-240). Rīga: University of Latvia and Aarhus School of Business.

Zauberga, I. (2005) Handling terminology in translation. In K. Karoly and A. Foris (eds.) *New Trends in Translation Studies* (pp. 107-117). Budapest: Akademiai Kiado.

Zauberga, I. (2016) *Tulkošanas teorija profesionāliem tulkiem un tulkotājiem* [Translation theory for professional interpreters and translators]. Rīga: LU Humanitāro zinātņu fakultātes Sastatāmās valodniecības un tulkošanas nodaļa.


DOCUMENTS

ISO 704: 2000 Available from ISO – ISO 704:2000 – Terminology work – Principles and methods [Accessed on 9 September 2022].

ISO 1087 1: 1999 Available from ISO – ISO 1087-1:2000 – Terminology work – Vocabulary – Part 1: Theory and application [Accessed on 9 September 2022].

ISO 1087 2: 2001 Available from ISO – ISO 1087-2:2000 – Terminology work – Vocabulary – Part 2: Computer applications [Accessed on 9 September 2022].

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.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6107-2348>

Email: andrejs.veisbergs@lu.lv