



faculty of social
sciences, arts
and humanities

46/2025

Research Journal
Studies about Languages
pp. 80–102

ISSN 1648-2824 (print)

ISSN 2029-7203 (online)

DOI 10.5755/j01.sal.1.46.39376

LINGUISTICS / KALBOTYRA

Latvian specialised printed lexicographic resources of legal terms: historical, terminological, and user-friendliness perspectives

Received 11/2024

Accepted 06/2025

How to cite: Veckrācis, J. (2025). Latvian specialised printed lexicographic resources of legal terms: historical, terminological, and user-friendliness perspectives. *Studies about Languages / Kalbų studijos*, 46. 80–102. <https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.sal.1.46.39376>

Latvian specialised printed lexicographic resources of legal terms: historical, terminological, and user- friendliness perspectives

Latviški specialieji spausdinti teisės terminų leksikografiniai šaltiniai:
istorinė, terminologinė ir vartotojo patogumo perspektyvos

JĀNIS VECKRĀCIS, Ventspils University of Applied Sciences, Ventspils, Latvia

Abstract

Though the first LSP texts of ten and more pages were produced – in the form of German–Latvian translations – in the 18th century, but the first major legal translations appeared in the early 19th century, the initial terminological endeavours and thus first collections of (potential) legal terms refer to the second half of the 19th century. The first Latvian specialized lexicographic resources of legal terms were produced in early 20th century. The aim of this article is to provide, from an analytic perspective, a historical overview of Latvian specialised printed lexicographic resources of legal terms, paying special attention to the aspects of consistency and quality in terms of their terminological and lexicographic features and correspondence to the needs of potential users. To achieve the goal of this study, the paper provides, by applying the methods of qualitative research, a comparative and contrastive analytical insight into the macrostructural and microstructural features of the main Latvian specialised printed dictionaries of legal terms – the lexicographic publications selected for this paper comprise eighteen bilingual or multilingual dictionaries and glossaries of legal terms. The quality of these terminological resources with regard to their lexicographic features and needs of potential users is in most cases compromised by macro- and microstructural inconsistencies and other shortcomings. Another important issue is the limited amount of terms – most of the editions may be regarded as small-sized compilations of legal terms.

KEYWORDS: specialised lexis, terminology, dictionaries of legal terms, microstructure of dictionaries, macrostructure of dictionaries

Introduction

The preparation and availability of terminological dictionaries has been a rather challenging issue throughout the whole history of Latvian specialised lexicographic

resources – typically, both insufficient availability and shortcomings in their production principles, functionality, and/or contents are emphasised. On the one hand, the process of developing lexicographic resources has generally lacked balance (Bankavs, 2005, p. 20); on the other hand, this lack of balance also has a disciplinary component, as some areas still lack comprehensive dictionaries or online databases of their specialised terms. For instance, there are no unabridged Latvian dictionaries of historical or medical terms; instead, terms are collected in fragmented explanatory (in many cases – monolingual) and/or bilingual and multilingual specialised publications. In this regard, the situation in the area of dictionaries of legal terms is good – at least at its face value. For instance, since the restoration of Latvia's independence, several explanatory and bilingual or multilingual resources have been published. These resources are complemented with online terminological databases, at both national and international levels. In this situation, it is reasonable to assume that the level of diversity these resources contain is predetermined by different professional needs and particular subject areas or other types of specific focus. The user may also expect that, while these resources complement each other, each is designed and prepared in line with best terminological and lexicographic practices, where consistency stands out as a major criterion. However, quality analyses of these Latvian resources is as scarce as it is for lexicographic resources in other areas of terminology and terminography.

The specific character of legal terminology is related not only to the special requirements and features of term creation but also to the intense use of the terminology, where its applications in specialised legal discourse overlap with everyday informal/non-professional contexts. Other dimensions of terminological discussions and assessment of the quality of relevant lexicographic resources include, for instance, historical considerations and the use of terminology in public and private sectors, at national or international level, for educational needs, or in academic inquiries. This has resulted in a diverse profile of agencies and individuals engaged in terminological and lexicographic work, leading to further potential problems related to inconsistencies, emergence of terminological synonyms, and a wide range of various lexicographic resources of different profiles and levels of quality.

The aim of this article is to provide, from an analytic perspective, a historical overview of Latvian specialised printed lexicographic resources of legal terms, paying special attention to the aspects of consistency and quality in terms of their terminological and lexicographic features and correspondence to the needs of potential users, among which law experts and translators represent two important groups. Though mainly a historical overview, the relevance of the finding presented in this article is associated with the constant requirement to ensure, due to potential legal implications, user-friendly preciseness and consistency at the point where legal terminology and lexicography intersect. Significantly, online databases of legal terms illustrate similar issues related to lexicographic and terminological practices. This study is an element of a long-term project aimed at investigating the history of and current state in the area of legal terminology and lexicography. Novelty of this research is associated both with its scope as this is, to our best knowledge, the most inclusive study on Latvian specialised printed lexicographic resources of legal terms and with its main perspective to highlight the most essential shortcomings specifically in terms of user-friendliness.

Methods

To achieve the goal of this study, the paper provides, by applying the methods of qualitative research, a comparative and contrastive analytical insight into the macrostructural and microstructural features of the main Latvian specialised printed dictionaries of legal terms since the 1920s, in view of the fact that no specialised resources of legal lexis existed in the period prior. The analysis also includes a brief general historical overview of the development of Latvian legalese and lexicographic resources, starting from the 19th century. To explain some fundamental principles and best practices applied in specialised lexicographic resources, the initial part of the article includes selected notes on theoretical and practical considerations regarding the production of specialised dictionaries and critical analysis of the end products, with various glossaries and terminological editions.

The lexicographic publications selected for this paper comprise eighteen bilingual or multilingual dictionaries and glossaries of legal terms. It should be noted that this overview does not include a complete list, due to objective limitations. Numerous specific small-size glossaries may be part of various texts pertaining to legal

discourse; for instance, the publication *Latvijas Senāta atziņas par Civillikuma normu piemērošanu* (1938–1940) (Opinions of the Senate of Latvia on the Application of the Provisions of the Civil Law (1938–1940)) includes the glossary *Tēzēs lietoto svešvārdu, vecvārdu un svešvalodā lietoto terminu un izteicienu skaidrojumi* (Explanations of Foreign Words, Obsolete Words and Terms and Expressions Used in the Theses) (Terihova, 2018, p. 378–388).

A brief insight into the typology, structure, and critical discourse of dictionaries

Results and Discussion

The diversity of dictionaries, including specialised dictionaries, is determined by at least three main features that differentiate them – appropriate range, perspective, and presentation (Malkiel, 1962, in Béjoint, 1994, p. 33–34). Latvian terminologist and lexicographer Juris Baldunčiks outlined the typology of dictionaries and indicated that the primary type is monolingual explanatory dictionaries, of which specific sub-types exist. For instance, encyclopaedic dictionaries explain phenomena and objects instead of words themselves. According to the selection of lexis, typical lexicographic sources are general¹ (including unabridged) and specialised² dictionaries; Baldunčiks noted that alongside traditional printed dictionaries, numerous databases of various levels of elaboration and complexity exist (Baldunčiks, 2012a, p. 6–7).

A useful classification was also provided by Reinhard R. K. Hartmann (2001); the parts of this typology relevant for the present study are:

- 1 The distinction by language results in *monolingual dictionaries*, *bilingual dictionaries* (including bidirectional dictionaries), and *multilingual dictionaries*.
- 2 The distinction by size (e.g., *unabridged dictionary*, *concise* (also: *compact*) *dictionary*, *pocket dictionary*, *vest dictionary*, *mini-dictionary*).
- 3 Specialised ‘segmental’ dictionaries³ according to the scope of lexical coverage (e.g., *dialect dictionaries*, *etymological dictionaries*, *synonym dictionaries*, *slang dictionaries*).
- 4 The complexity of lemma result in dictionaries such as *dictionaries of abbreviations* or *dictionaries of collocations*; special cases include *index* and *concordance*.
- 5 Dictionaries for native speakers and foreigners (incl. *learner’s dictionaries*).
- 6 The distinction by age of users results in specific types of dictionaries, e.g., the *children’s dictionary* and the *school dictionary*⁴ (Hartmann, 2001, p. 71–74).⁵

Terminological resources of a discipline include terminological dictionaries, databases, encyclopaedic editions, scientific publications, textbooks, manuals, glossaries, bulletins, and so on. Terminological resources may be classified based on their content into: (1) translator-oriented dictionaries; (2) explanatory dictionaries; and (3) descriptive resources, including academic publications and technical literature (Balčiņš, 2008, p. 19–20; 21–26).

An essential aspect to consider is related to the two levels of dictionary structure: the macrostructure (commonly called *nomenclature*; a rough equivalent of *wordlist*) is the complete set of entries arranged in a particular

¹ The macrostructure of a dictionary can be called *general* if it includes all, or a representative section, of the elements of a lexicon, even the obsolete and archaic, and also all of its varieties in synchrony, and if it has all parts of speech as entry words; a general macrostructure provides a ‘complete’ programme of information in each entry (Béjoint, 1994, p. 37–38).

² A specialised macrostructure is restricted to one variety, a dialect, technical jargon, slang, etc., or to one type of entry word: verbs, adjectives, etc. (Béjoint, 1994, p. 37–38).

³ In Latvia, terminological dictionaries account for about 30% of all dictionaries; most of the terminological dictionaries are multilingual, and about a third of the terminological dictionaries are published in the legal sector (Peina, Helviga, 2021, p. 286–287).

⁴ Hartmann argues that more specific criteria for dictionary production should be considered in the context of learning needs; for instance, various perception patterns would imply the need to provide different dictionaries for adult and young learners (Hartmann, 2001, p. 74). Indeed, the level of creative techniques used to achieve engagement and understanding could be fundamentally dependent on the target audience; e.g., (colour) illustrations are more necessary and, thus, appropriate in children’s dictionaries.

⁵ See also types of reference works (Hartmann, James, 2002 [1998], p. 148). Another extensive classification was suggested by the bibliographical list of the dictionaries published in Latvia in the period 1991–2010 (Šmite, 2012, p. 193–247).

order, and the microstructure of separate entries (Rey-Debove, 1971, in Béjoint, 1994, p. 11).

The macro- and microstructural aspects also include several perspectives:

- 1 macrostructure represents the overall list structure which allows to locate information;
- 2 base structure of dictionaries, which includes formal comment (grammar, pronunciation) and semantic comment (definition, etymology, usage);
- 3 the technique of nesting by indicating several words or phrases related to the headword, including run-on entries, such as derivatives, which are denied headword status and are provided in subentries of a related word or phrase;
- 4 the elements of cross-reference structure (mediostucture) may include (main) entries (basic reference unit in a dictionary), which typically start with headwords.

However, in dictionary production there are issues of a more complex nature that also need to be addressed. In cases of polysemy and diverse context-determined uses of a word, aside from the issue of there being several meanings, it is also necessary to consider, for instance, the more widespread and rare, more general or specialised, and more 'core' or 'secondary' senses of a word, and the respective labelling to mark these differences, and also convey information on how to perceive the order of senses included in an entry and the respective labels (Hartmann, 2001, p. 92).

Both from the perspective of those who create dictionaries and of those who use them, an important initial point of reference is the fact that lexicographic sources are still viewed by educated intellectuals as an authoritative and concise source of verified and valid information (Baldunčiks, 2012a, p. 7). Thus, dictionaries form the current framework for language norms, use, and possibilities (Veisbergs, 2011, p. 80). They also represent 'tools' for self-teaching and imply an element of didactic purpose (Béjoint, 1994, p. 18). Therefore, the aspect of quality stands out as a fundamental criterion. Quality assurance itself is achieved through various procedures. An obvious initial requirement is a competent task-group of people who create the dictionary – though, as indicated in this study, in some cases the actual representation of a potentially ideal model (for legal dictionaries, it would typically imply the engagement of competent lawyers, terminologists, and lexicographers) is insufficient. The factors contributing to the quality of dictionaries also include dictionary research and dictionary criticism. The most typical activities associated with these tasks include: 1) arrangement and planning of new dictionaries; 2) critical evaluation of published dictionaries; 3) identification of the needs and competence levels of users; 4) inquiries into the history of lexicographic sources and research; 5) studies on the cultural and historical roles of dictionaries; 6) classification of dictionaries; 7) systematic record-keeping of lexicographic and metalexicographic literature; and 8) development of general lexicographic theories (Wiegda, 1998, in Baldunčiks, 2012a, p. 9).

The quality of dictionaries is further influenced by objective driving forces and limitations. A major constraint is the availability of funding, an essential precondition for lexicographic work, which is time consuming and requires long-term engagement of several specialists. Moreover, lexicographic efforts are not assigned a similar level of importance as, for instance, publications in top-ranking academic databases, leading to potential disadvantages for academics engaged in the creation of dictionaries. Other driving forces and limitations include overlapping areas of (terminological) use; new term creation procedures (for instance, the process is not always based only on the contributions of specialists and linguists); the dynamic nature of the use of terms, which implies the importance of immediate solutions and universal access; and the potential capacity of term creation, which depends on the number of language users (Veisbergs, 2006).

An important fact to note is that printed dictionaries are no longer the most popular source of terminological information, which highlights the importance of multilingual online terminological databases, for instance, the Latvian National Terminology Portal [LNT portal] (termini.gov.lv), available since 2018, and IATE, the EU's terminology management system (iate.europa.eu), which has existed for 20 years.⁶ Consequently, the development of terminological work and specialised terminological resources should mainly be considered in the context

⁶ However, Dace Liepiņa points out that younger generation users may also easily refer to considerably less reliable sources of terminology (Liepiņa, 2019, p. 71).

of online databases. However, this does not mean that criticism of printed dictionaries would be inappropriate or outdated. Moreover, many of the principles apply equally to terminological databases. Insights into printed dictionaries are also essential in the context of historical inquiries.

Though critical reviews of dictionaries or databases⁷ in Latvia are rare, they could make a considerable contribution towards improved quality (Baldunčiks, 2012a, p. 10). Instead, linguists have tended to engage in severe ‘dictionary bashing’, which in many instances has followed from the assumption that dictionaries should be a basis for lexicological theory, demonstrating an insufficient understanding of the difficulties associated with dictionary compilation (Béjoint, 1994, p. 176–177).

Critical comments about published general explanatory dictionaries suggest additional points of reference in terms of ensuring quality; we have only included those requirements that also apply to specialised dictionaries, being: (1) clearly defined criteria for word selection and their consistent application; (2) identification and inclusion of new words (including during the dictionary production process, which may extend over several decades), which in the case of terminological editions would be specialised lexicon; (3) etymology of foreign words and pure loanwords; (4) elaborate additional references that explain in detail the nuances of use; (5) use of diverse text resources to identify and record variants and synonyms; (6) avoidance of unimportant details and extensive schemes, which cause avoidable complexities for dictionary users; (7) consistent criteria for separating specific meanings; (8) avoidance of wordiness; (9) definitions and explanations according to a consistent framework that prioritises the indication of the most essential features (e.g., function); (10) avoidance of including explanation from previous dictionaries without critical consideration; (11) acknowledgement of the fact that special importance should be assigned to a reasonable amount of illustrative quotations that help to understand use-related nuances; (12) when a revised edition of a dictionary is published, inclusion of examples that illustrate the corrections, newly included words, and those words which have been excluded; (13) avoidance of the use of an unexplained word or unexplained meaning in an explanation of another word (Baldunčiks, 2012b, p. 113–122, 130–143).

The above notes illustrate the importance of correct identification of, for instance, lexical (identical) synonyms, variants, and paronyms within microsystems of parallelisms subject to the interplay of the semantic and formal aspects of words. In terms of the semantic aspect, which can be further divided into the categories of lexical semantics, conceptual semantics, and grammatical semantics, it may be indicated that: (1) variants correspond to all three semantic categories; (2) synonyms may be conceptually identical but lexically and grammatically different; and (3) paronyms are conceptually and lexically different but identical as to their grammatical meaning – homonyms, by contrast, are different in terms of all three semantic categories (Freimane, 1993, p. 83–84; Urbanoviča, 2011, p. 57–60). A typical feature of Latvian paronyms – pairs of loanwords exist (Urbanoviča, 2011, p. 14). Thus, for instance, the Latvian terms *reabilitācija* (rehabilitation), which is used in law, and *rehabilitācija* (rehabilitation), which is used in medicine, are paronyms (ibid., p. 93). Synonyms are more related to the stylistic aspect of words, and variants and paronyms to the normative (standardisation) aspect (ibid., p. 86). Clear identification of the relevant classification has important practical implications, including with regard to the content of dictionary entries. For instance, in legal dictionaries, paronyms “daudzpusējs” (e.g., “daudzpusēja vienošanās” – multilateral agreement) and “daudzpusīgs” (e.g., “daudzpusīgas intereses” – multiple interests) could be explained by providing illustrative examples.

With regard to the main methods of concept presentation in dictionaries and databases, two main approaches are indicated: the onomasiological or concept-oriented approach, which is commonly applied in terminological dictionaries⁸; and the semasiological or meaning- and word/term-oriented approach, though crossings of boundary lines or even disappearance of the distinction between onomasiological⁹ and semasiological dic-

⁷ In 2024 (in the period July–October) the State Language Centre and the Terminology Commission conducted, with the aim of further functional improvements, a survey on the LNT portal to identify usage patterns and evaluate its functionality.

⁸ It is also viewed as the most important aspect when the history of terminology is studied (Baldunčiks, 2024 [2009], p. 133; Baldunčiks, 2024 [2016], p. 301); it results, for instance, in several designations of the same concept (Baldunčiks, 2024 [2014], p. 228).

⁹ However, when applied to electronic term databases, the concept-oriented approach often leads to unnecessary repetition of information (Karpinska & Liepiņa, 2022, p. 56).

tionaries are also acknowledged (Hartmann, 2013, p. 383; Geeraerts, 2013, p. 487; de Schryver, 2013, p. 550; Mayer, 2013, p. 1462). Meanwhile, it has been noted that only an integrated system of onomasiological and semasiological inner and outer access structures, cross-referencing structures, and a consistent distribution of linguistic data, including semantic definitions, would allow dictionary users to access particular readings of words in the foreign language (cf. Rothenhöfer, 2013, p. 416).

Within a dictionary entry, the concept being communicated should be at the centre of attention, and further informative elements include the term, its definition, synonymy, and equivalence relations (Mayer, 2013, p. 1461–1462).¹⁰ However, no standard minimum terminological entry exists (*ibid.*, p. 1465). For translation-oriented entries, the necessary microstructural elements include: term, subject field, definition, synonyms, short forms, degree of equivalence, context, alternative spellings, notes, transliteration, and illustrations (COTSOES, 2002, p. 3).

In Latvia, studies about dictionaries of legal terms (e.g., Štekerhofa, 2016; Karpinska, 2018; 2019; Karpinska & Liepiņa, 2022) are as rare as critical reviews; typically, the quality aspect is considered within a broader discussion of lexicographic issues. Laura Karpinska provided detailed theoretical insights into the translator's perspective on the context of the structure of bilingual dictionaries and suggested a classification of the bilingual Latvian-English-Latvian dictionaries (LELDs). For example, they may be dictionaries for reception or production, or they may be monofunctional (e.g., only for Latvian users) or bifunctional dictionaries (Karpinska, 2019, p. 40).¹¹

An essential classification of equivalents was provided by Arleta Adamska-Sałaciak:

- 1 semantic or cognitive equivalents that are established lexical items in the target language (TL);
- 2 explanatory or descriptive equivalents provide explanations of a source language (SL) item into the TL when an established equivalent is not available;
- 3 translation(al) or insertable equivalents are related to contextual usage of an SL item – they present a translation of this item that can be inserted in the TL text;
- 4 functional or situational equivalents are also related to contextual usage of an SL item, but the grammatical category of the equivalent can differ from the SL item or it can be an idiom with different wording (this type is not often applied in dictionaries of legal terms) (in Karpinska, 2019, p. 38–39).

However, we would argue that first, this classification is likely to be not applicable to terminological editions where the primary group of equivalents would represent terms, and second, though various types of equivalents may also be included in terminological dictionaries, it is essential to clearly separate (for instance, by providing labels) explanatory equivalents from those equivalents which represent [official] terms.

An essential general conclusion is the need to align the information provided by dictionaries of legal terms with the needs of dictionary users (Karpinska & Liepiņa, 2022, p. 53), which implies that a project involving a new terminological resource (printed or electronic) or elaboration of an existing resource, should include a detailed survey of potential users, among which translators of legal texts stand out as an important target group. Karpinska and Liepiņa (2022) concluded that electronic dictionaries raise a question as to the reliability of lexicographic resources that typically suggest many equivalents that cannot be used interchangeably as each possesses a specific legal meaning; the absence of more detailed explanations regarding the differences among equivalents presupposes that these lexicographic sources are most suitable for users with excellent competence levels, otherwise substantial errors are possible. This means that the current quality of online terminological databases, which often present all the potential variants of equivalents collected from published printed dictionaries, implies the need for the users of the databases to engage in extensive further research into terms' specific area- or context-determined use in legal texts. However, these same issues, as illustrated by the observations in this paper, largely also apply to printed dictionaries.

Another important aspect is ensuring that terminological resources retain the genuine character of terminological compilations – they should represent authoritative collections of terms, and any other contextual, historical,

¹⁰ Even more so than in the lexicographic context, the concept-driven approach is important in the term creation process, specifically to change the focus from the terminological models of the donor language, which in the Latvian context is now typically English.

¹¹ For more detailed explanations of the lexicographic terms see Hartmann & James, 2002.

or user-related elements of information, however important and useful, should preferably be separated from the terminological equivalents. This requirement should also be considered in the context of the current terminological processes, where the continuous flow of large amounts of new concepts and terms, spontaneity, and respective inappropriate recommendations and solutions are typical features, leading to numerous synonyms and parallel forms (Petrova, 2009, p. 106). For instance currently, the first three Latvian equivalents for the term *database* currently suggested on the LNT portal (*datu bāze*)¹² are misleading – the preferred equivalent is the compound term *datubāze*; however, it has no label that would assist the user in identifying its correct use.

A brief insight into the Latvian printed lexicographic resources of legal terms

Though the first LSP texts of ten and more pages were produced – in the form of German–Latvian translations – in the 18th century, the first major legal translations appeared in the early 19th century and first terminological endeavours and, thus, first collections of (potential) legal terms appear in the second half of the 19th century.¹³ In the next section of this paper we provide a brief, yet analytic insight into the main printed lexicographic sources of Latvian legal terms.

A glossary of foreign words and their explanations was collected in a half-year supplement to the magazine *Pēterburgas Avīzes* (Petersburg's Magazines); it also included some (potential) legal terms in their modern or early forms: *aktas* (acts; now in Latvian: akts); *appellācija* (appeal; now in Latvian: apelācija); *arrestants* (detained/arrested person; now in Latvian: apcietinātā persona), *affozija* (association; now in Latvian: asociācija); *atēstats* (certificate; now in Latvian: atestāts); *infanzija* (body, authority; jurisdiction; now in Latvian: instance); *kaffazija* (cassation; now in Latvian: kasācija); *konstitūcija* (constitution); *kriminals* (criminal); *protokols* (protocol, minutes); *representants* (representative; now in Latvian: pārstāvis); *ziwils* (civil) (PA, 1862, V–VII). A similar, though more elaborate, glossary was included in a supplement to the magazine *Baltijas Vēstnesis* (BV, 1875, No. 23, p. 1–4).

Several glossaries, in many cases in an unstructured form, were published in *Magazin*;¹⁴ for instance, a collection of rare/unknown Latvian words (*unbekannte Wörter*) and a small glossary (83 entries) of legal specialized lexis pertaining to legal country house purchase agreements which may be regarded as the first term bulletin in Latvian. Both lists were collected by Pēteris Zēvalds (*Peter Seewald*) (ca. 1838/1839–1910), a schoolteacher in Jelgava (Mitau), and both contained terminological lexis. (Balčiņš, 2021, 14–15).

In 1878, *fvefchu wahrdu grahmata* (Book of Foreign Words) (SVG, 1878), the first Latvian dictionary of foreign words, was published; it also included a number of loanwords used in law discourse, many of which are still part of the modern Latvian legal vocabulary. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, this book was followed by several dictionaries of foreign words (for a full list see Zemzare, 1961; Banga et al., 1995).

Due to the amount limitations this article does not include an overview of the Latvian explanatory dictionaries of legal terms (JTVU, 1997; JTV, 1998; KTV, 1998; KTSV, 1999; VTVJT, 2001; LTV, 2004; JTSV, 2005; TSVCT, 2011; TSVCT, 2012; TSVGBT, 2016; TSVLT, 2016).

Bilingual dictionaries of legal terms

In 1923, Paul Keußler published *Deutsch-Lettisch Vokabularium für jurisdische Terminologie* (German-Latvian Glossary of Legal Terminology) (PK, 1923, p. 74–113; approx. 2000 headwords). The introductory part of the edition – which was intended as a textbook – provided a brief insight into the general position of Latvian legal

¹² Source: <https://termini.gov.lv/atrast/database>

¹³ It should be noted, however, that in Europe Latin dominated the legal discourse, including legal education, until the 18th century when the increased prestige of national languages challenged the position of the Latin language and promoted translation. The initial endeavours to standardise legal terminology date back to the 19th century – more precisely, 1850, when the first dictionary of legal terms *Juridisch-politische Terminologie für die slawischen Sprachen Österreichs* was published in Vienna, Austria; it included an extensive introduction (see further Zirdziņa, 2005, 202–204).

¹⁴ A periodical (1828–1936) published by the Latvian Literary Society (Lettisch-Literärischen Gesellschaft), which primarily addressed the educated Latvian elite, focusing on scholarly studies of the Latvian language and ethnographical research (Daija, 2017, 55).

terminology. The author described it as a state of becoming (*in Stadium des Werdens*) and outlined a classification of three groups of Latvian legal terms: (1) long-standing terms (e.g., *slepkavība* (murder) and *zādzība* (theft)); (2) recent terms that already possess a stable status in legal discourse (e.g., *vainīgums* (guiltiness)); and (3) unstable recent terms (p. III–IV). The German author himself represented the multicultural environment of legal discourse in Latvia in the 1920s, at which time some professors at the University of Latvia did not possess sufficient Latvian language skills to publish their works in Latvian (Štekerhofa, 2016, p. 187). However, the glossary illustrated and summarised the previous two decades of the development of Latvian legal terminology (see further Štekerhofa, 2016, p. 184–185, 188–190).

In 1935, Aleksandrs Būmanis published his *Romiešu tiesību chrēstamtija* (*Reader of Roman Law*), which included a Latin-Latvian glossary (RTH, 1935; approx. 2100 entries; p. 87–128). For most entries, a simple structure is used: the Latin word and one or several Latvian equivalents. Some entries, though, are more elaborate and include several delineated meanings and typical word collocations. The glossary may still be regarded as a valuable resource; however, it includes entries that may hardly be associated with legal discourse (e.g., *calx* – *kaļķi* (lime) (p. 91); *digitus* – *pirksts* (finger) (p. 98); *lapillus* – *akmentiņš* (a small stone) (p. 108)).

During the Soviet occupation, draft legal terms were collected and published in Bulletins No. 10 (B10, 1951, p. 1–15) and No. 13 (B13, 1953, p. 1–8) of the Terminology Commission of the Academy of Sciences of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic (LSSR). Bulletin No. 10 included nine small Latvian-Russian sections: theory and history of state and law; state law; administrative law; judicial system; international law; criminal law and criminal procedure; civil law and civil procedure; labour law; agricultural legislation; and law of kolkhozs.¹⁵ When compared to the 1942 dictionary, some changes may be observed, for instance, the emergence of politically determined terms (e.g., *кулак* – *kulaks*, *budzis* (kulak¹⁶) (B10, 1951, p. 2)) and preference for compounds (compare: *правоспособность* – *Rechtsfähigkeit* – *tiesību spēja* (CTV, 1937, 70) and *правоспособность* – *tiesības spēja* (Bulletin No. 10, p. 3)). Some of the lexis may be calques from Russian; for instance, *общегосударственный* – *vispārvalstisks* (country-wide) (B10, 1951, p. 4). In this case, however, it may not be seen as a solely Soviet-time impact since the 1940s, when Russian became the main language and also the main reference in terminological work, as, according to periodika.lv, the compound *vispārvalstisks* was already in active use in early 1920s. Nevertheless, the structure of the compound itself *vispār+valstisks* can hardly be regarded as the preferred option in the context of the Latvian language, which suggests that a multi-word term could be considered (e.g., *общегосударственный розыск* – *valsts mēroga meklēšana* (KODV, 2007, p. 300)).

Bulletin No. 13 featured a list of draft terms of international law. Legal terms were also included in Bulletin No. 48 (B48, 1980, p. 128–156), which presented draft terms of criminalistics in a bidirectional structure (Latvian–Russian and Russian–Latvian). The introductory part indicates that this collection complements the 1970 dictionary of legal terms.

In 1970, *Juridisko terminu vārdnīca* (JTV, 1970; 8267 headwords), a bidirectional Latvian–Russian and Russian–Latvian Dictionary of Legal Terms, was published. This book was compiled by a group of authors, with the chief editor Oto Grīnbergs. It includes information about the authors of the dictionary and provides general notes on the sources of terms – the above-mentioned Bulletins of the Terminology Commission, scientific literature and legal acts of the Soviet Union, the LSSR, and of unspecified foreign countries. The authors note that the terms were discussed and approved by the Terminology Commission. The indicated target audience is students of law and academic staff in higher education institutions, members of judicial and prosecution institutions, translators, and journalists. The main structural elements are nests consisting of at least three terms, including the headword. The headword could be a single-word or multi-word term. A nest may also include compound terms, which are indicted according to their alphabetic location. Synonyms are indicated alongside each other (e.g., *valststiesībnieks*, *valststiesību zinātnieks*) and according to their alphabetic location, including a cross-reference (JTV, 1970, p. 8–9). No index is provided.

¹⁵ Administrative unit of Soviet collective farming.

¹⁶ Kulaks – a term which was also used in the pre-Soviet period; however, this became an important concept under the Soviet rule and referred to a part of Soviet society, mostly farmers, which was arbitrarily designated by the State and which was subject to arbitrary and, in many cases, severe sanctions and, to some extent, to the so-called purges.

When compared to the draft terms presented in the bulletins, several changes and updates may be observed, both in the Latvian entries (e.g., *valdīšanas forma* – *форма правления* (Bulletin No. 10, p. 3) and *форма правления* – *pārvaldības forma* (form of administration) (JTV, 1970, p. 489)) and in the Russian entries (e.g., *Vissavienības* – *Всесоюзный* (Bulletin No. 10, p. 4) and *Vissavienības* – *общесоюзный* (literally: all union) (JTV, 1970, p. 124, 132).

Predictably, the dictionary includes several politically preconditioned entries; for example: *sociālistiskā īpašuma aizsardzība* – *охрана социалистической собственности* (protection of socialist property) (p. 17) and *padomju iekārta* – *советский строй* (Soviet structure, regime) (p. 71).

An interesting observation may be made regarding the entry *atskaite*; *pārskats* – *отчет* (report) (JTV, 1970, p. 37). The Latvian word has often been viewed as an unnecessary calque from the Russian word *отчет* – *atskaite*;¹⁷ and it has sometimes also been seen as an illustration of interference during the Soviet period. According to periodika.lv and gramatas.lndb.lv, the National Digital Library of Latvia, the word *atskaite* was first used in Latvian in the pre-Soviet time, no later than in 1926 (e.g., *darbības planu un atskaite* (literally: plan of actions and reports) (LZ, 1926, No. 39, p. 4)¹⁸ and *[f]ahdfchas padomju atskaite jau beigusēs* (literally: reports of the village councils have been completed) (KC, 1929, No. 9, p. 3)). Significantly, both instances were identified in pro-Soviet newspapers; thus, there is a potential impact of translation from Russian. Moreover, the 1942 dictionary only provides one equivalent, *pārskats*, for the Russian term *отчет* (JTV, 1942, p. 121). It should be noted that the term *pārskats*¹⁹ and its terminological synonym *ziņojums* (both: report, statement), are currently preferred as modern terms.

A comparative perspective raises, among others, the question of how producers of new lexicographic sources treat the previous collections; specifically, whether they consult them. For instance, the 1970 edition features *agnāti* (*radinieki vīriešu līnijā*)²⁰ for *агнаты* (*родственники по мужской линии*) (literally: the line of male relatives) (JTV, 1970, 14) but one of the most recent legal dictionaries provides the following entry: *agnate* – *radinieks* (*pa vīriešu līniju*) (ALJTV, 2008, 40). The foreign word *agnāts(-i)* has had an impressive presence in various general-type and specialised Latvian lexicographic publications (e.g., PSG, 1906, 6; SV, 1912, 10; ALV, 1924, 44; JTV, 1942, 8; ATV, 1994, 42; SDTV, 2000, 8; VTJVT, 2001, 218). While the foreign word *agnāts* may have been excluded from the equivalents provided in the 2008 edition due to its rare use in legal texts, the users of this dictionary may be surprised to learn that the Latvian syntax of the entry resembles the Russian unit more explicitly than the entry used in the Latvian Soviet-time source (compare: *по мужской линии* – *vīriešu līnijā* (JTV, 1970, 14) – *pa vīriešu līniju* (ALJTV, 2008, 40)).

A peculiar edition is *Latviešu-angļu-latviešu juridisko terminu vārnīca* (Latvian-English-Latvian Dictionary of Legal Synonyms) (LALJTV, 1993), which was published in 1993 and was the first Latvian-English-Latvian dictionary²¹ of legal terms published after Latvia restored its independence (see also Karpinska, 2018, p. 79–81). The introduction specifies that 12 professionals were involved in the production of the dictionary (though their level of engagement is unknown); these included nine lawyers, one accountant, and one professor of *saimnieciskās tiesības* (LALJTV, 1993, p. X), an area which under this specification is not known in Latvia – we assume that company law or *uzņēmējdarbības tiesības* might have been implied. An interesting aspect is that the Latvian title refers to legal terms (*juridiskie termini*) instead of the legal synonyms mentioned in the English title. The authors make repeated references to the extensive work of *translation* (our emphasis) rather than provision of terminological equivalents (term translation typically implies calquing or direct borrowing). The introduction also features many other colloquial lexical items and references. It is clearly stated that the main target audience is translators.

¹⁷ See, for instance, the explanation here: <https://www.valodaskonsultācijas.lv/lv/questions/99>.

¹⁸ The verb *atskaitīt* (deducēt, count off) was already being used considerably earlier, in the late 18th century.

¹⁹ The word *pārskats* was used in Latvian no later than in 1862: *Pahrskats wiffu 1861 gadda [...] draudfes dfimmufchu, laulātu un mirrufchu* (PA, 1862, No. 4, p. 31).

²⁰ See also other variants, including other syntactic constructions, e.g., *агнаты* – *Agnaten* – *vīriešu līnijas mantinieki* (ZTV, 1922, 7) and *agnāti* – *radinieki no tēva puses* (SV, 1999, 28).

²¹ Laura Karpinska reasonably notes that despite the bilingual front matter, the dictionary is monofunctional and intended to meet the needs of Latvian users only (Karpinska, 2018, p. 80).

Stacie and Bill Condrells, authors of the edition, note that the objective is to provide translation assistance for typical complex cases related to English legal lexis; as an example, the word *reasonable* is indicated (LALJTV, 1993, p. XI). Given the claim, it is worth considering the actual assistance available in the dictionary.

- 1 *reasonable* – *atbilstošs, saprātīgs; taisnīgs, nepārspīlēts, piemērots; saprāta vadīts, saskaņā ar veselo saprātu; nepārmērīgs* (ibid., p. 2.133)
- 2 *reasonable care* – *atbilstoša, pienācīga, parasta piesardzība jebkuros apstākļos, kuras neizmanošana ir vienkārša neuzmanība* (ibid., p. 2.25)
- 3 *beyond reasonable doubt (US crim. law)* – *saprātīgi neapšaubāms, ārpus saprātīgām šaubām (pienācīgi augstas ticamības pierādījumu daudzums) (pierādījumu standarts krim. ts.)* (ibid., p. 2.54)

At first glance, the user may assume that the various options provide sufficient material for application in various multi-word terms, legal idioms, and contextual uses. However, the information may also become a source of confusion and give rise to potential translation errors. For instance, an initial concern could be related to the consideration of whether each and every option actually applies to their valid use in specific legal contexts, as suggested by the specialised character of the edition. For instance, likumi.lv,²² the most complete and authoritative Latvian online resource of primary and secondary legal acts, lists fewer than ten uses of (*ne*)*pārspīlēts* (literally: (not) exaggerated). Furthermore, most of these are included in debate- and discussion-related papers, thus indicating that the word is not typically used in formal legal contexts. No instances of use are encountered in likumi.lv for *saprāta vadīts* (literally: driven by common sense) or *saskaņā ar veselo saprātu* (literally: in accordance with common sense).

The equivalent for the multi-word term *reasonable care* is even more confusing. It is provided in the form of a sentence with a subordinate clause, thus suggesting a definition instead of a terminological unit, but the different function of this information is not labelled. It should be noted that similar unfavourable practices can also be observed in other legal dictionaries: *reasonable care* – *gādība vai piesardzība saprāta robežās* (literally: caring or prudence within reasonable limits) (ALJTV, 2008, p. 105), an equivalent whose syntactic structure suggests that it cannot be a term but is rather an explanation.

For comparison, two English-Russian specialised dictionaries provide the following elaboration of the entry: *reasonable care* – *разумная степень заботливости или осторожности* (literally: a reasonable level of care or caution) (АРПЮС, 2005, p. 120) and *reasonable care* – *разумная, достаточная забота, осторожность* (literally: reasonable, sufficient care, caution) (АЮР, 2014, p. 67). Again, if evaluated syntactically, they cannot be regarded as terms. Instead, a general English-Russian online database suggests equivalents structured more in line with the terminological criteria: *reasonable care* – (*law*) *разумная степень заботливости* (literally: reasonable level of care); *разумная степень осторожности* (literally: reasonable level of prudence); and *разумная забота* (literally: reasonable care).²³

The entry *beyond reasonable doubt (US crim. law)* illustrates an approach of unstructured and randomised additional information being provided for some items, while other, no less specific legal terms (e.g., *domicile* (LALJTV, 1993, p. 1.35)) are included without any explanation.

In 1993, *Krievu-latviešu juridisko terminu vārdnīca* (Russian-Latvian Dictionary of Legal Terms) was published (KLJTV, 1993). The authors are not indicated, except a note that the copy editor was J. Alfejeva (KLJTV, 1993, p. 2). It is claimed that the edition represents the largest collection of Latvian-Russian legal terms. Though not specifically stated, the dictionary is actually a reprint of the Russian-Latvian part of the 1970 dictionary; the few updates are mainly related to specific Soviet terms that are excluded from the 1993 edition.

In 1994, the dictionary *Juridisko terminu vārdnīca (latviešu-krievu/krievu-latviešu)* (Latvian-Russian and Russian-Latvian Dictionary of Legal Terms) was published (JTV, 1994; approx. 20,000 terms). The chief editor of the volume was Jānis Vēbers, professor of law; other authors were also members of the academic staff of the

²² Source: likumi.lv.

²³ Source: <https://www.multitran.com/m.exe?l1=1&l2=2&s=reasonable%20care>.

University of Latvia. It is indicated that the terms included in the dictionary were approved by the Terminology Commission of the Academy of Latvia (JTV, 1994, p. 4). The indicated target group includes lawyers, employees of law enforcement and public institutions, and business organisations. Though Aina Blinkena, a distinguished Latvian linguist and consultant, remarks that the dictionary is an important contribution in both qualitative and quantitative terms, the bilingual perspective of only covering the Latvian and Russian terms may seem questionable in view of the fact that, since 1991, when Latvia restored its independence, the country faced an enormous inflow of English texts and terms and English instantly became an important contact language, which was an altogether new phenomenon in the linguistic landscape of Latvia.

Blinkena also notes that the dictionary is based, first, on the 1970 bilingual edition, and second, on the terms included in Bulletin No. 48 (see above), and third, on the terms used in the Civil Law of 1937. Several new terms are also covered (e.g., *brokers* (broker), *dīlers* (dealer) etc.).

An analysis of the items in the criminalistics glossary in Bulletin No. 48 and the 1994 dictionary indicates that only a selection of the Bulletin items are included among the dictionary entries. For instance, the dictionary includes a new entry *atvēršana – открытие* (opening) (JTV, 1994, p. 37) but does not include the Bulletin item *atvērumi (lappušu) – разворот* (spread) (B48, 1980, p. 129).

Another illustrative example is related to the term ‘*noļīgums*’ (contract, agreement). The headword *noļīgums* features only a cross-reference *sk. vienošanās* (see *agreement*) in the 1970 dictionary (JTV, 1970, p. 142); the 1994 dictionary includes the headword *noļīgums*, with the following microstructure: *darba noļīgums – трудовое соглашение* (employment contract); *valūtas noļīgums – валютное соглашение* (JTV, 1994, p. 143). The 1994 entry *darba noļīgums – трудовое соглашение* may cause confusion when considered alongside the entry *darba līgums – трудовой договор* (ibid., p. 51). Moreover, *darba noļīgums* is not, quite reasonably, included in the 1970 edition; also, it is used neither in the Civil Law of Latvia, nor in other legal acts or labour law documents, to our best knowledge. The entry is better elaborated on in the 1970 edition, as it also includes two Russian variants *трудоу договор* (также *трудоу соглашение*) (JTV, 1970, p. 52).

Another bilingual dictionary of legal terms (*Angļu-latviešu, latviešu-angļu juridisko terminu vārdnīca*) was published in 2000 (2nd edition in 2009 (JTV, 2009); 3200 terms). As noted by Karpinska, who provides a detailed analysis of the macro- and microstructure of the dictionary, this edition could be placed in a special subcategory of bilingual dictionaries that combine the features of both translation and explanatory dictionaries (a bilingual or semi-bilingual dictionary) (Karpinska, 2018, p. 81).

In 2001, the bidirectional *Vācu-latviešu / latviešu-vācu juridiskā vārdnīca* (Latvian-German / German-Latvian Legal Dictionary) was published (2nd edition in 2003 (JV, 2003)). The number of entries or headwords is not indicated; however, this remains the largest unabridged bilingual German-Latvian collection of legal terms.

A specific feature of this dictionary is its detailed introduction, where the background and the rationale of the dictionary are explained. For instance, the authors specify the new areas of law (e.g., financial matters, taxation, copyright, environmental protection, criminal law) that are covered in the second edition; they also explain that the changes in the macrostructure, for instance, the concepts of European law, constitutional law, administrative law, and civil law that were presented in a separate section are integrated into a uniform structure in the expanded 2nd edition (JV, 2003, p. XIII). The elaboration work is also illustrated by the substantially increased size of the dictionary published in 2003.

The authors explain that several concepts used in German may sometimes have only one equivalent in Latvian. For some concepts, a new term was created;²⁴ in some instances, descriptive equivalents are provided. Different legal traditions and backgrounds are indicated among the reasons that motivated the authors to include particular definitions and explanations (ibid., p. XIV). These considerations are reflected in the microstructure of the dictionary entries (they include nouns, verbs, and adjectives used in specialised legal literature, as explained in the introduction (ibid., p. XV)), which are elaborate and complex: they provide one or several

²⁴ Unfortunately, the Latvian text of the introduction includes several misspellings (*neloģisms* (literally: illogism) is used twice (instead of “neoloģisms” (neologism) (JV, 2003, p. XIV)); and terminological equivalents are called *tulkojumi* (translations) several times (ibid., p. VI, XIII, XIV).

equivalents, references to legal acts, definitions, and explanatory notes, which may be the reason why entries have no specific labels.²⁵ Many entries possess a nest structure with run-on items (multi-word terms associated with the headword, legal idioms, etc.).

The specific bilingual legal dictionary, *Latvijas Republikas Civillikuma terminu vārnīca (latviešu-angļu / angļu-latviešu)* (Glossary of Terms of the Civil Law of the Republic of Latvia) (see also Karpinska, 2018, p. 82–83), is intended as a study aid for Latvian students of law and social sciences. This edition, which was published in 2001 (CTV, 2001; approx. 900 headwords) by the Translation and Terminology Centre (now the State Language Centre) is associated with several issues. No updated version of the glossary of the terms has been issued, although the Law itself has undergone several amendments. During the conference *Development Indicators of the Latvian Terminology in the Context of Content and Technologies*, which took place at the National Library of Latvia on October 4, 2024, Artūrs Krastiņš, Acting Head of the State Language Centre, noted that the translation of the Civil Law is a text that is under continuous revision and elaboration to ensure improved translation quality and to incorporate the new wordings of the Civil Law. This implies that the glossary does not include the updated and accepted English equivalents of the Latvian terms, nor the terms used in the amended parts of the Law. For instance, the Latvian text of the Civil Law features the term *statūti* (Section 417);²⁶ the respective equivalent used in the English translation is *articles of association*²⁷ – a term not included in the glossary.

The English equivalents provided in the glossary for the Latvian term *biedrība* are *partnership* and *company* (CTV, 2001, p. 16). The glossary does not include the headwords “apvienība” (union, association) and “sabiedrība” (society, company, public). However, the Latvian text of the Law and its English translation present the following uses: *personu apvienības* (Section 1407) – *associations of persons*; *sabiedrība* (Section 2262) – *partnership* (this equivalent could be indirectly inferred based on the equivalent for multi-word terms, such as *sabiedrības biedrs* – *member of the partnership*) (p. 49). In Section 1110, the term *sabiedrība* is used, with its English equivalent – *public*; meanwhile the English equivalent for *peļņas sabiedrība* (Section 417) is *profit company*, although the term *company* is not included in any of the suggested multi-word terms of the glossary. Sub-clause 4 of Section 2262 features the Latvian term *biedrība* and its English equivalent *association*. These instances indicate that the glossary would need substantial revision and updating by expanding the list of headwords and respective collocations (multi-word terms).

Angļu-latviešu Eiropas Savienības terminu vārdnīca (English-Latvian Dictionary of European Union Terms) was published in 2004 (ALESTV, 2004; approx. 3000 terms). The necessity of the dictionary arose from Latvia's joining of the European Union in 2004. The Latvian index in the final part of the book ensures the bidirectional function of the dictionary. A brief introduction is provided, which explains the microstructure of entries. For instance, nests consisting of headwords, secondary items, and cross-references may be used; definitions (labelled *Def.*) and explanations (labelled *Skaidrojums* (explanation)) also include references to their sources. For headwords, a comma separates synonyms (e.g., *immunity* – *imunitāte*, *neaizskaramība* (ALESTV, 2004, p. 95)), a semicolon separates terms with minor differences in their meanings (e.g., *breach, case of irregularity, infringement, trespass* – *pārkāpums*; *pārkāpšana* (ibid., p. 33)), but several meanings are represented in the form of a list; Arab numbers are used (e.g., *convention* – 1. *konvencija*; 2. *konvents* (ibid., p. 50)).

While *imunitāte* and *neaizskaramība* are two synonyms of the same term (the foreign word and its native Latvian variant), we would argue that *pārkāpums* and *pārkāpšana* are not terminological synonyms. In these instances, the *-ums* form (“pārkāpums”) is typically preferred in terminological use.

Some entries may raise the issue of applicability when considered in the context of other lexicographic sources of legal terms. For instance, for the term *assent procedure*, one equivalent is provided: *pozitīva atzinuma procedūra* (literally: procedure of a positive opinion)²⁸ (ibid., p. 25). However, IATE, the terminological database

²⁵ There are, however, a few exceptions; for instance, the plural grammatical form is labelled with *(Pl.)* in German entries.

²⁶ Source: <https://likumi.lv/ta/id/225418-civillikums>.

²⁷ Source: <https://likumi.lv/ta/en/en/id/225418-civil-law>.

²⁸ The same equivalent is also suggested in ALJTV, 2008, p. 63.

that is currently the number one source of European Union (EU) terms for EU translators, suggests another equivalent, *piekrišanas procedūra* (consent procedure),²⁹ thus making it the standard choice in the context of translation of EU texts. However, when compared with the term *consent procedure* and its definition, which is also included in the IATE entry and for which the Latvian equivalent is the same (*piekrišanas procedūra*),³⁰ we may point out the following considerations in favour of a specific Latvian term for *assent procedure*: first, the definitions of *consent procedure* and *assent procedure* imply that the former is a more general concept, while the latter is a specific arrangement; second, good terminological practice recommends assigning different denominations (terms) to different concepts; third, the variants that are already available illustrate that it is possible to assign two different Latvian terms to two different English concepts; and fourth, the multi-word equivalent *pozitīva atzinuma procedūra*, though consisting of three elements, still possesses appropriate qualities for its use as a legal term. More importantly, this instance, which represents variations in the sources of legal terms, is an illustration of those situations when cooperation between Latvian agencies engaged in terminological work and EU translation services would be necessary to agree on one terminological equivalent that could prevent inconsistent practice and confusion.

In 2006, *Angļu-latviešu vārdnīca juridisko tekstu tulkotājiem* (English-Latvian Dictionary for Translators of Legal Terms) was published (VJTT, 2006; approx. 2000 headwords; compiled by Oļģerts Eglītis). As the main function of the edition is to serve translation needs, the information is provided in Latvian (except for some instances where the metalanguage is English (Karpinska, 2018, p. 84)) and in line with an approach of including any potentially useful information. Consequently, the microstructure of specific headwords may differ to a considerable extent, compare:

- (1) **language reservation – valodas atruna** (VJTT, 2006, p. 34)
- (2) **requisition – rekvizīcija** (ibid., p. 46)
- (3) **reference** – 1) **atsauce** (ja runa ir par atsaukšanos uz kādu publikāciju, standartu, dokumentu u. tml.); 2) **atsauksme** (ja runa ir par kāda darba vērtējošu raksturojumu [...]); 3) **etalon-, bāzes...** (ja runa ir par atsaukšanos uz kādu vienumu (bāzes, pamata objektu, parādību, procesu, īpašību utt.), pēc kura tiek skaitīts, vērtēts, normēts u. tml. ..., piem., *reference value* latviski ir etalonvērtība jeb bāzes vērtība) (TK 17.12.2001. lēm. prot. Nr. 6/1024) (ibid., p. 45)
- (4) **regulation** – 1. **regulējums**; 2. **noteikums**; 3. **nolikums**; 4. **priekšraksts**; 5. **regula** (EK tiesību akts); (Satiksmes ministrijas pārstāvim atšķirīgs viedoklis; Satiksmes ministrijas dokumentos tiek lietots atveidojums “noteikumi”). Satiksmes ministrijas viedoklis ir pilnīgi pamatots, jo arī galvenos valsts tiesību aktus angļiski runājošās valstīs dēvē par *laws* (likumi) un *regulations* (noteikumi). Diemžēl lingvistiskā ērma regula lietojums latviešu valodā ir plaši nostiprinājies, un tulkiem nākas to lietot. 6. **noteikumi** (ja runa ir par valsts tiesību aktu): Regulation No. 452 – Noteikumi Nr. 452. (ibid., p. 45)

The units (1–3) are marked in green (as explained in the introduction, this colour marks the terms confirmed by the Terminology Commission) but only one of them also includes a reference to the decision of the Commission. The microstructures also show many other inconsistencies. For instance, the English item (*reference value*) in the explanatory part of unit (3) includes intratextual gloss (italics); a similar item in unit (*Regulation No. 452*) has no specific marking. Unit (4) also includes a comment regarding the opinion expressed by the Ministry of Transport; the comment itself contains informal lexis (*lingvistiskais ērms* (literally: linguistic freak)) and a reference to *tulki* (interpreters; more likely, the term “tulkotājs” (translator) should have been used)). These features compromise the quality of the dictionary, although this remains the only bilingual edition of legal terminology with a clear emphasis on translation needs.

²⁹ Source: <https://iate.europa.eu/search/result/1728705716044/1>.

³⁰ Source: <https://iate.europa.eu/search/result/1728705338461/1>.

Angļu-latviešu juridisko terminu vārdnīca (English-Latvian Dictionary of Legal Terms) (ALJTV, 2008; approx. 40 000 headwords and secondary headwords, compiled by Aldis Daugavvanags and Nadežda Kļimoviča³¹) was published in 2008 and is the largest printed lexicographic source of Latvian legal terms. The indicated target group and the structure of the edition suggest that it is intended as a monofunctional and monodirectional dictionary for Latvian users. The headword or secondary headword is supplied with one or several equivalents; the entries may include labels, collocations, and explanatory notes, and the dictionary also features numbered senses (see further Karpinska, 2018, p. 84).

Though the number of entries is impressive, this dictionary is still far from providing an exhaustive collection of legal terms. For instance, the term “trade secret”³² cannot be found under the headword *trade* (ALJTV, 2008, p. 455–456), nor the headword *secret* (ibid., p. 415).

Karpinska notes that the entries include explanatory equivalents and condensed encyclopaedic information (Karpinska, 2018, p. 85); however, we would add that an essential shortcoming is the lack of respective labels, which would separate these elements from terms.

To illustrate the issue, an entry (see (1)) and a subentry (see (2)) are included:

(1) **libelant** 1. prasītājs; 2. persona, kas iesniegusi pieteikumu par konfiskāciju (*saskaņā ar likumu par pārtikas produktiem un ārstniecības vielām neievērošanu*³³) (ALJTV, 2008, p. 315)

(2) **mass-media libel** ~ paskvila, kas izplatīta ar plašsaziņas līdzekļu starpniecību (ibid., p. 315)

Both units include the descriptive equivalents *persona, kas iesniegusi pieteikumu par konfiskāciju* (literally: the person who made the application for confiscation) and *paskvila, kas izplatīta ar plašsaziņas līdzekļu starpniecību* (literally: a libel distributed via the media). This is also indicated by their syntactic structure: according to good terminological practice, terms are not typically formed by including subordinate clauses. Such elements in a terminological resource can be useful for translators, as they suggest a possible solution. However, as they are not labelled as being different from terms, confusion may arise, an issue which would compromise the quality of any terminological dictionary. Moreover, descriptive equivalents may represent an intermediary situation when a proper term has not yet been created (on-the-spot versions could be “konfiskācijas pieprasītājs persona” or “konfiskācijas pieprasītājs” (literally: the person requesting the confiscation) and “medijpaskvila” (literally: media-libel), respectively).

We would also argue against Karpinska’s favourable evaluation that the microstructure of this dictionary is uniform (Karpinska, 2018, p. 85) – consistency should imply the same approach to designing the lists of several equivalents or senses, where the first item is typically the most frequently used and/or the most important equivalent/sense.

To illustrate this issue, the following entry is included:

(3) **liability** 1. pienākums; 2. atbildība; 3. *pl.* saistības, parādi vai naudas [finanšu] saistības; **to incur** ~ atbildēt, būt atbildīgam (*par ko*) (ALJTV, 2008, p. 314)

Furthermore, the entry includes an extensive nest structure of various secondary headwords (multi-word terms), collocations, and legal idioms associated with *liability*. However, the most confusing aspect of this entry is the sequence of the primary equivalents. The first Latvian equivalent is *pienākums* (duty, responsibility, obligation) but none of the further secondary items of the entry includes *pienākums*, which may provide sufficient pragmatic evidence that the term is practically never used in the sense of ‘duty, responsibility’. The equivalents

³¹ Both compilers of the dictionary are lawyers; no linguists are indicated as members of the taskgroup.

³² For instance, see BLD, 2009, p. 1633–1634; ODL, 2003, 504.

³³ It should be noted that the additional explanation *saskaņā ar likumu par pārtikas produktiem un ārstniecības vielām neievērošanu* (literally: in accordance with the laws on foodstuffs and medical substances non-compliance) is provided in an awkward Latvian syntax.

provided for *liability* on the LNT portal³⁴ also do not include “*pienākums*”. Consequently, the entry represents shortcomings of the dictionary both as a source of reliable bilingual terminological information and as a user-friendly edition that can prevent confusion of users of various competence levels.

The entries of this dictionary also highlight the importance of illustrative examples that can help the users identify and understand the application of the various equivalents of the same source-language term. For instance, the term *law* is given the following Latvian equivalents: 1. *tiesības* (rights; law); 2. *likums* (law as a primary legal act); 3. *vispārīgās tiesības* (general rights); 4. *tiesas procedūra* (court procedure); and 5. *justīcija, juristi* (justice; lawyers) (ibid., p. 294). Though the equivalents are clearly different (we would, however, argue that some other important equivalents are missing, for instance, “*tiesību norma*”³⁵ (legal norm), which is listed within the entry’s microstructure, and “*tiesību akti*” or “*tiesību aktu kopums*” (law as a the whole body of legal acts)), no examples of how each of the equivalents would apply in a specific context are provided.

Furthermore, the entry also features misleading information; for instance, *within the law* – *likuma robežās; likuma ietvaros* (ibid., 295) (instead, the locative “*likumā*” would be preferred) and *working law* – *darba tiesības* (labour rights); *darba likumdošana* (labour legislation) (ibid., 302). First, authoritative sources suggest that the main English term is *labour law* (BLD, 2009, p. 952); second, in Latvian, *likumdošana* refers only to the legislative function of a parliament but in the specific item the ‘product’ or the legal acts are implied; thus, for instance, “*darba tiesību akti*” would be a more appropriate equivalent. As the entry also features the term *labour law* (ALJTV, 2008, p. 299), the term *working law* is altogether irrelevant.

Multilingual dictionaries of legal terms

A major product of the work of the Terminology Commission, formed in 1919, was *Zinātniskās terminoloģijas vārdnīca*, the first Latvian dictionary of scientific terms, which was published in 1922 (ZTV, 1922). This trilingual edition (Russian-German-Latvian) includes a small section devoted to legal terminology (105 entries). The criteria for selection are unclear – while it may seem that the aim was to include specific terms (for instance, basic terms like *likums* (law), *noteikumi* (regulations) or *rights* (*tiesības*) were not included), the section still features a number of primary legal lexis, for example: *lieta* (case, matter) (ibid., p. 4); *mantojums* (inheritance) and *lēmums* (decision) (ibid., 5); *īpašums* (property, estate); and *spriedums* (judgement, verdict) (ZTV, 1922, p. 6). However, it also provides specific and useful terms; for instance, we see that the historical variant of the modern Latvian legal and business term *valdījums* (possession) was *walneežiba*. This word was already included in the general 1872 Russian-Latvian-German dictionary, though with a different meaning and in its derived form with a prefix (*администрация* – *pahrwalneežiba*³⁶ – *Administration*) (KLVV, 1872, p. 1).

The second part of the 19th century and first decades of the 20th century was a period when the search for the most optimal forms of words and their respective meanings, based on conflicting views of the people involved in the process, resulted in several parallel lexical forms and/or variants. Forms and variants of specialised lexis were also unstable and in many cases underwent multiple stages of change where the next form or variant did not easily replace the former ones: for *walneežiba* one more meaning³⁷ was suggested in the 1878 dictionary of foreign words, where it is indicated as a synonym of *godība* and *augftība* (majesty), but a use in the same period suggests that the word *walneežiba* was also interpreted as being close to the modern meaning of ‘possession’: *mahju turretajji wehl arweenu fawas mahjas faweem rekrufchu wezzumâ fahwedameem dehleem tamdeh! us wiņņu wahrdeem nodohd, [...] kurpretti wiņņi pafchi wehl ka ar weenu mahju waldneežibâ [...] pAaleek* (literally: householders still transfer their houses to their sons who are at the age of being recruited, but they retain possession of the houses themselves) (KGZ, 1873, No. 3, p. 13). The circulation of several

³⁴ See <https://termini.gov.lv/atrast/liability>.

³⁵ See *to create new law* – *radīt jaunu tiesību normu* (ALJTV, 2008, p. 295).

³⁶ In modern Latvian: *pārvaldība* (management in the meaning of ‘implementing the managerial, administrative function’).

³⁷ The word was also a grammatical term: *waldījums jeb rekzija ir tahds wahrdu fakopojums, kuŗā weens wahrds fahw atkarâ no otra* (literally: government or recension is a set of words in which one word stands in dependence on another) (Stērste, 1880, 2); in modern Latvian grammar: *pārvaldījums jeb rekcijs* (government or rection) (LVG, 2013, 625).

lexical variants caused confusion, which might be a reason why the creators of the 1922 dictionary of scientific terms did not prefer the modern Latvian form *valdījums* which was used not later than in 1880s: *par magafīnas valdījumu* (literally: for the possession of the device) (MV, No. 47, p. 370) *muifchu, kuŗa tagad wiŗņu kopejs valdījums* (literally: the estate which is their joint property) (MV, 1898, No. 43, p. 3).

The most important collection of legal terms in the 1920s and 1930s was *Civīltiesību terminoloģijas vārdnīca* (Dictionary of Civil Law Terminology) (CTV, 1937; nearly 1200 headwords), a multilingual dictionary that listed Latvian civil rights terms, the respective Latin terms, and also the German and Russian equivalents to the extent practicable by Aleksandrs Būmanis, author of the dictionary, thus providing an insight into the potential impact of borrowing from these main donor languages (see also Liepiņa & Mozere, 2017). A frequently used structural element of the dictionary was cross-references, for instance, *aizņēmējs sk. aizdevuma ņēmējs* and *būve, pārkaŗu sk. pārkaŗu būves tiesība* (CTV, 1937, 13). For the unit *alimenti* (alimony, child support) a cross-reference to *uzturs* (maintenance, alimony, means of support) was included.³⁸

Some units may be illustrations of attempts to suggest Latvian lexis for typical international words – see, for instance: *commendation, mandatum tua gratia – Empfehlung – рекомендация – ieteikums* (recommendation) (ibid., 26). In modern Latvian legalese, the international word *rekomendācija* and its native Latvian homosemic word³⁹ *ieteikums* still compete in both daily and specialised contexts (as a type of legal document); some uses include *Rekomendācija par sakariem ar Ukrainu*⁴⁰ (1995) (Recommendation on relations with Ukraine); *Rekomendācijas “Drošai un veselībai nekaitīgai modern tehnoloģiju lietošanai bērniem”*⁴¹ (2022) (Recommendations for the safe and healthy use of modern technologies for children); *Valsts prezidenta ieteikums*⁴² (1993) (Recommendation of the President of Latvia); *Komisijas 2022. gada 8. decembra ieteikums (ES) 2022/2510, ar ko izveido Eiropas satvaru konceptuāli drošu ķīmikāliju un materiālu novērtēšanu*⁴³ (Commission Recommendation (EU) 2022/2510 of 8 December 2022 establishing a European assessment framework for ‘safe and sustainable by design’ chemicals and materials).

From the critical perspective, the collection featured several peculiar – from the point of a specialised lexicographic source of legal terminology – units; for example, *bailes* (fear) (CTV, 1937, p. 11), *bišķopības servitūts* (beekeeping servitude), and *baznīca* (church) (ibid., p. 12), *ceļotājs* (traveller) (ibid., p. 13), *gadījums* (instance, occasion), and *gads* (year) (ibid., p. 19). However, the most considerable functional shortcoming was the lack of an index,⁴⁴ which limits productive use of this dictionary as a multilingual edition.

In 1942, *Juridiskās terminoloģijas vārdnīca* (Dictionary of Legal Terminology) (JTV, 1942), the first unabridged dictionary of law terms, was published. It consists of a Latvian-German-Russian part and a German-Latvian part, thus marking an unbalanced macrostructure (Karpinska, 2018, p. 75). No introduction is provided to explain the objectives, target audience, and principles applied in the production of the edition.⁴⁵ Similarly, no index is included, though improved functionality is afforded by its bidirectional structure. The trilingual structure of the

³⁸ Interestingly, the word “*uzturīdzekļi*” (it is now a terminological equivalent for “*alimenti*”) was available since not later than 1920s and was typically a synonym of “*uzturs*” (food, nutrients). In modern Latvian “*uzturīdzekļi*” is only used as a term in the meaning ‘alimony’.

³⁹ *Homosēma* (homosemic word) is a native-language word of identical meaning when compared to a foreign word (in many cases these are international words) (for further details on the suggestion to use this term see Grīse, 2005 [1998]).

⁴⁰ Source: <https://likumi.lv/ta/id/209567-rekomendacija-par-sakariem-ar-ukrainu>.

⁴¹ Source: website of the Ministry of Health of the Republic of Latvia; <https://www.vvm.gov.lv/lv/media/10445/download> (accessed 22 September 2024).

⁴² Source: <https://likumi.lv/ta/id/272696-valsts-prezidenta-ieteikums>.

⁴³ Source: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/LV/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:32022H2510> (accessed 22 September 2024).

⁴⁴ It should be noted that the completeness of an index is as important as its inclusion; shortcomings may even be observed in editions devoted to lexicographic theory and practice. For instance, the index entry “macrostructure” in *Tradition and Innovation in Modern English Dictionaries* by Henri Béjoint (1994) includes only two references to the use of the entry in the text: *macrostructure* 11, 13 (p. 273); however, other references would also be needed, e.g. to pages 37 and 38.

⁴⁵ For details about the importance of introductions of bilingual dictionaries, see Sviķe, 2012.

dictionary may be attributed to the political and historical context – the edition was prepared during both the Soviet and Nazi occupations (see further Štekerhofa, 2016, 188).

Though the collection of terms was representative and inclusive, some units may again be regarded irrelevant; for example: *ambulance* (ambulance), *analogs* (*līdzīgs*) (analogue, similar) (JTV, 1942, p. 12), *apgaismīga* (enlightenment) (ibid., 14), *bataljons* (battalion) (ibid., p. 25), *chronika* (chronicle) (ibid., p. 32), *darbnīca* (workshop) (ibid., 35), and *iežogojums* (fence) (ibid., p. 58).

In 2004, the trilingual dictionary *Krievu-latviešu-lietuviešu jūrniecības juridisko terminu vārdnīca* (Russian-Latvian-Lithuanian Dictionary of Maritime Legal Terms) was published (JJTV, 2004). Although the metalanguage of the edition is Latvian, the introduction by Jonas Bergholcs, author of the dictionary, is in Russian only. The indicated target audience of the edition – seamen, students, and academics engaged in the discourse on maritime trade, international public, and maritime law. The author notes that the edition also includes terms of associated areas, for example: economics, technology, philosophy, state and criminal law, etc. (JJTV, 2004, p. 3). The number of headwords is not indicated. An index of Latvian terms is provided. As the dictionary was structured according to the Russian alphabet, the functionality of the edition would be improved by also including an index of Lithuanian terms.

For each Russian headword, typically one Latvian and one Lithuanian equivalent are provided; several multi-word terms are also included in the microstructure of the headword. This simple structure ensures clarity and functionality.

However, some potential issues may arise for users who consult those entries for which several equivalents are provided. For instance, the Russian term *бездеятельность* includes three Latvian equivalents: *bezdarbīgums*, *bezdarbība*, and *pasivitāte* (ibid., p. 21). The Latvian database likumi.lv does not feature any use of the word *bezdarbīgums* (inactivity), as this is not a legal term. The word *pasivitāte* (passivity, passive behaviour) is included in several regulations of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Latvia; however, its conceptual meaning differs from that of the legal term *bezdarbība* (omission).

Legal terms are also covered in *Kriminālistikas un operatīvās darbības latviešu, angļu, vācu un krievu terminoloģijas skaidrojošā vārdnīca* (Explanatory Dictionary of Latvian, English, German, and Russian Terminology in Criminalistics and Investigative Operations), which was published in 2007 (KODV, 2007; approx. 2,000 terms, edited by a group of authors). The dictionary represents a valuable contribution – the authors have provided concise and precise explanations and other elements that ensure diverse functionality and increased user-friendliness, for instance, multilingual equivalents, cross-references, and indices in all four languages, thus effectively making the volume four-directional. The entries are not organised in the form of nests; instead, they consist only of separate headwords. Sometimes, headwords include etymological references (e.g., *competence* (*lat. compete* – ‘*atbilstu, deru, cenšos sasniegt*’) (KODV, 2007, p. 127).

The authors note that the entries include both terms and professional jargon (these lexical items may also be Latvian headwords) used by people engaged in investigative institutions and operations (KODV, 2007, p. 4–5); the use covers not only conversations but also correspondence of official agencies. Another emphasis is the inclusion of up-to-date terms and concepts. Jargon is marked by using quotation marks (e.g., “*chicken food*” (ibid., p. 58), “*figurants*” (ibid., p. 77), and *разборка* (ibid., p. 115).

Conclusion

The first Latvian specialised lexicographic resources of legal terms were produced in the early 20th century. Although the quantitative availability of Latvian explanatory and bilingual and multilingual dictionaries of legal terms is acceptable, the quality of these terminological resources with regard to their lexicographic features and the needs of potential users is, in most cases, compromised by macro- and microstructural inconsistencies and other shortcomings. Another important issue is the limited number of included terms – most of the editions may be regarded as small-sized compilations of legal terms. Lexicographic resources of terms should possess genuinely terminological features; in other words, they should primarily be authoritative collections of terms, and any other contextual, historical, or user-related data should be assigned adequate labels of secondary-level information. The relevance of additional information – for

instance, encyclopaedic information – should be evaluated, and a consistent approach should be taken to the inclusion of information in order to prevent unstructured data being randomly provided for some entries, thus compromising the credibility of the lexicographic resource.

Selection of terms is also an important aspect of the quality of specialised collections of legal terms, ensured by including only those terms associated with legal discourse.

The Latvian dictionaries of legal terms typically do not embody an awareness of the needs of a general user who may not be sufficiently competent to independently discriminate between various types of equivalents included in dictionary entries. User-friendliness would require more detailed labels, for instance, of parallelisms (lexical (identical) synonyms, variants, and paronyms) and, most importantly, clear separation of terminological equivalents from explanatory equivalents for which appropriate terminological variants are not yet created. Currently, most printed (and online) lexicographic resources of legal terms may cause substantial levels of confusion and lead to gross translation mistakes. Generally, terminological resources should include as few variants and synonyms as possible, to avoid confusion and misleading details.

When elaborated editions are published, they typically provide no specific information about the essence of the updates, and no examples of newly added terms are provided. Online terminological resources could also include specific sections for newly added or updated terms.

The text-processing aids that can be used for designing indices have become more convenient and less time consuming, implying additional incentives to include these productive parts in every specialised printed terminological resource. A limitation has been, and may remain, related to commercial considerations – indices increase the volume of printed editions and so make them less financially feasible.

To improve the quality of terminological resources, surveys of existing and potential users conducted on a regular basis could provide valuable insights into their shortcoming and inconsistencies.

Consulting previous editions may give rise to quality benefits; a comparative approach might prevent reproduction and multiplication of mistakes and inconsistencies, or the coining of new or elaborated lexical items or syntactic constructions for which more adequate variants are already available.

Another ‘remedy’ could be the selection of an optimal task group of people engaged in the production of printed or online terminological resources; in the area of law, this would ideally include competent lawyers, terminologists, and lexicographers. However, until now this has been a rare practice in Latvia.

Regarding those terms that are used both in national legal discourse and legal texts produced by the EU agencies, improved and consistent cooperation, including addressing inconsistencies in the presentation of terminological equivalents in national and EU-level terminological resources, remains an objective to be attained.

These insights are relevant in further discussion of legal discourse and reliability and user-friendliness of lexicographic sources, including in detailed consideration of these aspects in the context of online databases of legal terms.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article.

References

- 1 Baldunčiks, J. (2012a). Priekšvārds. In Baldunčiks, J. (vad.) Vārdnīcu izstrāde Latvijā: 1991–2010. Rīga: Latviešu valodas aģentūra, 6–15.
- 2 Baldunčiks, J. (2012b). Pārskats par nozīmīgākajām vienvalodas vārdnīcām: skaidrojošās vārdnīcas, svešvārdu vārdnīcas, etimoloģijas vārdnīca, slenga vārdnīca. In Baldunčiks, J. (vad.) Vārdnīcu izstrāde Latvijā: 1991–2010. Rīga: Latviešu valodas aģentūra, 110–193.
- 3 Baldunčiks, J. (2024 [2009]). Latviešu ķīmijas terminoloģijas attīstība 19. gadsimta 50.–70. gados. In Baldunčiks, J. Zinātniskie raksti. Viedokļraksti. Intervijas. Rīga: Zinātne, 132–144.
- 4 Baldunčiks, J. (2024 [2014]). Salikteni ar daļi latviešu rakstu valodā: vēsturisks

- pārskats. In Baldunčiks, J. *Zinātniskie raksti. Viedokļraksti. Intervijas*. Rīga: Zinātne, 224–245.
- 5 Baldunčiks, J. (2024 [2016]). Ieskats latviešu astronomijas terminoloģijas vēsturē. In Baldunčiks, J. *Zinātniskie raksti. Viedokļraksti. Intervijas*. Rīga: Zinātne, 300–315.
 - 6 Baltiņš, M. (2008). Iespiesto terminoloģisko resursu veidi un to salīdzinošs raksturojums. In Laumane, B. (red.). *Vārds un tā pētišanas aspekti*. 25. Liepāja: LiepA, 17–28.
 - 7 Baltiņš, M. (2021). Latviešu literārā biedrība un skolotāja Pēteris Zēvalds savāktais jaunvārdu un mazāk zināmo vārdu krājums (1874). In Smiltnece, G., Lauze, L. (red.). *Vārds un tā pētišanas aspekti*. 12 (II). Liepāja: LiepA, 14–22. <https://doi.org/10.37384/VTPA.2021.25.014>
 - 8 Banga, M., Čakule, G., Kļaviņa, S., Mūrniece, B., Zariņa, S. (sast.). (1995). *Latvijas izdotās latviešu valodas vārdnīcas: bibliogrāfisks rādītājs (1900–1994)*. Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte.
 - 9 Bankavs, A. (2005). Valodu kontaktu atspoguļojums bilingvālajā leksikogrāfijā. In *Valodu kontakti un mijiedarbība. Akadēmiķa Jāņa Endzelīna 132. dzimšanas dienas atceres starptautiskās zinātniskās konferences materiāli*. Rīga: LU Latviešu valodas institūts, 20–21.
 - 10 Béjoint, H. (1994). *Tradition and Innovation in Modern English Lexicography*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 - 11 COTSOES, 2002 – COTSOES Recommendations for Terminology Work. 2nd revised and enlarged edition. Berne: Federal Chancellery.
 - 12 Daija, P. (2017). *Literary History and Popular Enlightenment in Latvian Culture*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
 - 13 de Schryver, G-M. (2013). The concept of simultaneous feedback. In Gouws, R. H., Heid, U., Schweickard, W., Wiegand, H. E. (ed.). *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Supplementary Volume: Recent Developments with Focus on Electronic and Computational Lexicography*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 548–557. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110238136.548>
 - 14 Freimane, I. (1993). *Valodas kultūra teorētiskā skatījumā*. Rīga: Zvaigzne.
 - 15 Geeraerts, D. (2013). The treatment of meaning in dictionaries and prototype theory. In Gouws, R. H., Heid, U., Schweickard, W., Wiegand, H. E. (ed.). *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Supplementary Volume: Recent Developments with Focus on Electronic and Computational Lexicography*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 487–495. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110238136.487>
 - 16 Grīsele, R. (2005 [1998]). Tēv(u)zeme jeb tēvija no valodnieka viedokļa. In Grīsele, R. *Spēkildze*. I. Rīga: Antava, 131–132.
 - 17 Hartmann, R. R. K. (2001). *Teaching and Researching Lexicography*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
 - 18 Hartmann, R. R. K., James, G. (2002 [1998]). *Dictionary of Lexicography*. London, New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203017685>
 - 19 Hartmann, R. R. K. (2013). Mixed dictionary genres. In Gouws, R. H., Heid, U., Schweickard, W., Wiegand, H. E. (ed.). *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Supplementary Volume: Recent Developments with Focus on Electronic and Computational Lexicography*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 381–392. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110238136.381>
 - 20 Karpinska, L. (2018). Development of Latvian-English-Latvian Dictionaries of Legal Terms (1991–2017). In *Baltic Journal of English Language Literature and Culture*. Vol. 8, 74–88. <https://doi.org/10.22364/BJEL-LC.08.2018.05>
 - 21 Karpinska, L. (2019). Specialized bilingual dictionaries as a translation tool: a case study of Latvian-English-Latvian dictionaries of legal terms. In Osuchowska, D., Harmon, L. (eds.). *Contents, Use, Usability Dictionaries from the Perspective of a Translator and a Language Teacher*. Berlin: Peter Lang, 35–48.
 - 22 Karpinska, L., Liepiņa, D. (2022). Latvian-English-Latvian Electronic Lexicographic Resources of Legal Terminology. In *Baltic Journal of English Language, Literature and Culture*. Vol. 12, 48–65. <https://doi.org/10.22364/BJELLC.12.2022.04>

- 23 Liepiņa, D., & Mozere, R. (2017). Contrastive Analysis of the Transfer of Terms in the Translation of the Latvian Civil Law of 1937 from Latvian into English. In *Valoda kultūru kontekstā*. Daugavpils: Daugavpils Universitātes akad. apg. "SAULE", 21–26.
- 24 Liepiņa, D. (2019). Service and disservice of Latvian-English-Latvian legal terminology dictionaries in translation. In Osuchowska, D., Harmon, L. (eds.). *Contents, Use, Usability Dictionaries from the Perspective of a Translator and a Language Teacher*. Berlin: Peter Lang, 63–74. <https://doi.org/10.3726/b15991>
- 25 LVG, 2013 – Auziņa, I., Breņķe, I., Grigorjevs, J., Indričāne, I., Ivulāne, B., Kalncača, A., Lauze, L., Lokmane, I., Markus, D., Nitiņa, D., Smiltņiece, G., Valkovska, B. & Vulāne, A. (2013). *Latviešu valodas gramatika*. Rīga: LU Latviešu valodas institūts.
- 26 Mayer, F. (2013). Models for the representation of terminological data on the computer: Terminological
- 27 databases. In Gouws, R. H., Heid, U., Schweickard, W., Wiegand, H. E. (ed.). *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Supplementary Volume: Recent Developments with Focus on Electronic and Computational Lexicography*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 1461–1479. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110238136.1461>
- 28 Peina, E., & Helviga, A. (2021). Some aspects of the development of contemporary Latvian terminography: Challenges, solutions, opportunities. In *Proceedings of CBU in Social Sciences*, 2, 286–291. <https://doi.org/10.12955/pss.v2.236>
- 29 Petrova, K. (2009). Terminu sinonīmija Eiropas Savienības tiesību aktos. In Rudziša, V. (red.). *Juridisko tekstu tulkošana, teorija un prakse*. Ventspils: Ventspils Augstskola, 106–145.
- 30 Rothenhöfer, A. (2013). New developments in learners' dictionaries II: German. In Gouws, R. H., Heid, U., Schweickard, W., & Wiegand, H. E. (Eds.). *Dictionaries. An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography. Supplementary Volume: Recent Developments with Focus on Electronic and Computational Lexicography*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 414–424. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110238136.414>
- 31 Skujiņa, V. (1999). *Latīņu un grieķu cilmes vārddāļu vārdnīca*. Rīga: Kamene.
- 32 Stērste, A. (1880). *Latviešu valodas mācība, ziztematisks kurss. Otrā un trešā daļa: sintaksa un ortogrāfija*. Rīga un Tērbata: Šnakenburga iespied.
- 33 Sviķe, S. (2012). Informative Value of Introductions to Bilingual Dictionaries: Latvian Practice. In *Economics and Culture*, Vol. 6. Rīga: The University College of Economics and Culture, 269–279.
- 34 Šmite, A. (2012). *Latvijā izdotās vārdnīcas (1991–2010). Bibliogrāfisks saraksts*. In Balduncīks, J. (vad.) *Vārdnīcu izstrāde Latvijā: 1991–2010*. Rīga: Latviešu valodas aģentūra, 192–247.
- 35 Štekerhofa, S. (2016). Pirmo latviešu juridisko vārdnīcu izveides sociāli politiskie nosacījumi: 1923. un 1942. gada vārdnīca. In *Vārds un tā pētīšanas aspekti*. 20 (II). Liepāja: LiepA. 182–192.
- 36 Terihova, Signe (2018). *Latvijas Senāta Spriedumu birojs. Latvijas Senāta atziņas par Civillikuma normu piemērošanu (1938–1940): Latvijas Senāta Spriedumu biroja apkopotās spriedumu tēzes*. Rīga: Tiesu namu aģentūra.
- 37 Urbanoviča, I. (2011). *Paronīmija latviešu valodas paralēlismu sistēmā. Sufiksālā paronīmija. Promocijas darbs*. Rīga: Latvijas Universitāte.
- 38 Veisbergs, A. (2006). *Kurp ej, latviešu valoda?* In *Diena*, 09.06.2006.
- 39 Retrieved October 11, 2024, from <https://www.diena.lv/raksts/pasaule/krievija/kurp-ej-latviesu-valoda-12814434>
- 40 Veisbergs, A. (2011). Latvian Translation and Bilingual Lexicography Scene. *Baltic Journal of English Language, Literature and Culture*, 1, 80–94. <https://doi.org/10.22364/BJELLC.01.2011.10>
- 41 Zemzare, D. (1961). *Latviešu vārdnīcas (līdz 1900. gadam)*. Rīga: LPSR Zinātņu Akadēmijas izdevniecība.
- 42 Zirdziņa, G. (2005). Tiesību aktu tulkotājs – vakar, šodien, rīt. In Veisbergs, A. (ed.) *Valsts valodas komisijas raksti. 1. sējums. Latviešu valoda – robežu paplašināšana*. Rīga: Valsts valodas komisija, 202–216.

List of Sources

Dictionaries and Glossaries

BV – Baltijas Vēstnesis

KC – Krievijas Cīņa

KGZ – Kurländische Gouvernements=Zeitung

LZ – Latviešu Zemnieks

MV – Mājas Viesis

PA – Pēterburgas Avīzes

- 1 ALESTV, 2004 – Švalkovska, A., Līce, S., Veckrācis, J., Liljeberga, K. Angļu-latviešu Eiropas Savienības terminu vārdnīca. Rīga: UNDP Latvia.
- 2 ALJTV, 2008 – Daugavvanags, A., Kļimoviča, N. (2008). Angļu-latviešu juridisko terminu vārdnīca. Rīga: Avots.
- 3 ALV, 1924 – Dravnieks, J. (1924). Angļu-latvju vārdnīca. Rīga: Valters un Rapa.
- 4 ATV, 1994 – Graudonis, J. (1994). Arheoloģijas terminu vārdnīca. Rīga: Zinātne.
- 5 B10, 1951 – Latvijas PSR Zinātņu akadēmijas Latviešu valodas terminoloģijas komisijas 10. biļetens "ZA Latviešu terminoloģijas komisijas pieņemtie valsts un tiesību zinātnes terminu projekti". In Latvijas PSR Zinātņu Akadēmijas Vēstis, Nr. 5(46), Pielikums, 1951, 1–15.
- 6 B13, 1953 – Latvijas PSR Zinātņu akadēmijas Latviešu valodas terminoloģijas komisijas 13. biļetens "Latvijas PSR ZA Terminoloģijas komisijas pieņemtie kriminālistikas terminu projekti". In Latvijas PSR Zinātņu Akadēmijas Vēstis, Nr. 11(76), Pielikums, 1953, 1–8.
- 7 B48, 1980 – Latvijas PSR Zinātņu akadēmijas Latviešu valodas terminoloģijas komisijas 48. biļetens "ZA Latviešu terminoloģijas komisijas pieņemtie starptautisko tiesību terminu projekti". In Latvijas PSR Zinātņu Akadēmijas Vēstis, Nr. 1(390), 1980, 128–156
- 8 BLD, 2009 – Garner, B. A. (ed.) (2009). Black's Law Dictionary. 9th edition. St. Paul: WEST PUBLISHING.
- 9 CTV, 1937 – Būmanis, A. (1937). Civiltiesību terminoloģijas vārdnīca. Rīga: Tieslietu ministrija.
- 10 CTV, 2001 – Latvijas Republikas Civillikuma terminu vārdnīca (latviešu-angļu/angļu-latviešu). Rīga: Tulkošanas un terminoloģijas centrs. 2001.
- 11 JJTV, 2004 – Bergholcs, J. (2004). Krievu-latviešu-lietuviešu jūrnieceības juridisko terminu vārdnīca. Rīga: Avots.
- 12 JTSV, 2005 – Jakubaņecs, V. (ed.) (2005). Juridiski terminoloģiskā skaidrojošā vārdnīca. Rīga: P&K.
- 13 JTV, 1942 – Lauva, J., Blese, H. (1942). Juridiskās terminoloģijas vārdnīca. Rīga: Latvju Grāmata.
- 14 JTV, 1970 – Grīnbergs, O. (sast.). (1970). Juridisko terminu vārdnīca. Rīga: Liesma.
- 15 JTV, 1994 – Vēbers, J. (red.). (1994). Juridisko terminu vārdnīca (latviešu-krievu/krievu-latviešu). Rīga: Rasma.
- 16 JTV, 1998 – Ilgvars, K. (1998). Juridisko terminu vārdnīcai. Rīga: NORDIK.
- 17 JTV, 2009 – Birznieks, J. Angļu-latviešu, latviešu-angļu juridisko terminu vārdnīca. Rīga: Multineo.
- 18 JTVU, 1997 – Skuja, V. (sast.). (1997). Juridisko terminu vārdnīca uzņēmējdarbībai. 2. papildin. izdevums. Rīga: Ekonomisko reform institūts.
- 19 JV, 2003 – Schaffert, I., Niedere, L. (2003). Vācu-latviešu / latviešu-vācu juridiskā vārdnīca. 2. pārstrād. un papildin. izdevums. Rīga: EuroFaculty.
- 20 KLJTV, 1993 – Alfejeva, J. (1993). Krievu-latviešu juridisko terminu vārdnīca. Rīga: Alkor.
- 21 KLVV, 1872 – Krievu-latviešu-vācu vārdnīce. Maskava: Tautas Apgaismošanas Ministrija. 1872.
- 22 KODV, 2007 – A. Kavalieris (red.). (2007). Kriminālistikas un operatīvās darbības latviešu, angļu, vācu un krievu terminoloģijas skaidrojošā vārdnīca. Rīga: Latvijas Policijas akadēmija.
- 23 KTSV, 1999 – Judins, A. Krimināltiesību terminu skaidrojošā vārdnīca. Rīga: RaKa.
- 24 KTV, 1998 – Meikališa, Ā. (1998). Kriminālprocesuālo terminu skaidrojošā vārdnīca. Rīga: RaKa.
- 25 LALJTV, 1993 – Kondrela, O., Kondrels, K. (red.) (1993). Latviešu-angļu-latviešu juridisko terminu vārdnīca. Rīga: American Bar Association.

- 26 LTV, 2004 – Amona, I., Bārenīte, I., Dindue, R., Katlaps, M., Kozlovskā, A., Kusiņš, G., Līdaka, S., Meistere, D., Millere, L., Mīta, D., Ozoliņa, S., Volsone, L., Višņakova, G., Vītoliņa, A., Zicāne, D. Likumu terminu vārdnīca. 2. papildin. izdevums. Rīga: Latvijas Vēstnesis.
- 27 PK, 1923 – Keußler, P. (1923). Handbuch zur Erlernung und Handhabung der lettischen Sprache und deutsch-lettisches Vokabularium für juristische Terminologie nebst einem deutsch-lettischen Verzeichnisse der Güter, Städte, einiger Ortschaften, Flüsse und Seeen Lettlands. Darmstadt: C. J. Winter.
- 28 KV, 3, 1911 – Koverzācijas vārdnīca. 3. sēj. Rīga: Rīgas Latviešu biedrības Zinību komisija.
- 29 LKV, 121, 1927–1928 – Švābe, A., Dišlers, K., Būmanis, A. (red.) (1927–1928). Latviešu konversācijas vārdnīca. 121. burtnīca. Rīga: A. Gulbja apg.
- 30 PSG, 1906 – Politisku svešvārdu grāmata. Mazā bibliotēka. Nr. 2. Rīga: L. Rozentāla druk. 1906.
- 31 ODL, 2003 – Martin, E. A. (2003). Oxford Dictionary of Law. 5th edition. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.
- 32 RTH, 1937 – Būmanis, A. (1937). Romiešu tiesību chrēstamtija. Rīga: A. Gulbja izd., 87–128.
- 33 SDTV, 2000 – Šiļņeva, L. (red.). (2000). Sociālā darba terminoloģijas vārdnīca. Rīga: SDSPA "Attīstība".
- 34 SV, 1912 – Svešvārdu vārdnīca. Rīga: A. Raņķis. 1912.
- 35 SV, 1999 – Baldunčiks, J. (red.) (1999). Svešvārdu vārdnīca. Rīga: Jumava.
- 36 SVG, 1878 – Mekons, Frīdrihs (1878). Svešu vārdu grāmata. Liepāja: V. Niemana drukāt.
- 37 TSVCT, 2011 – Joksts, O., Girgensone, B. (2011). Terminu skaidrojošā vārdnīca civiltiesībās (lietu tiesības, saistību tiesības). Rīga: Drukātava.
- 38 TSVCT, 2012 – Joksts, O., Girgensone, B. (2012). Terminu skaidrojošā vārdnīca civiltiesībās (ģimenes un mantojuma tiesības). Rīga: Drukātava.
- 39 TSVGBT, 2016 – Joksts, O., Girgensone, B., Mihailovs, J. (2016). Terminu skaidrojošā vārdnīca ģimenes un bērnu tiesībās. Rīga: Drukātava.
- 40 TSVLT, 2016 – Girgensone, B., Mihailovs, J. (2016). Terminu skaidrojošā vārdnīca lietu tiesībās. Rīga: Drukātava.
- 41 VJTT, 2006 – Eglītis, O. (sast.) (2006). Angļu-latviešu vārdnīca juridisko tekstu tulkošanai. Rīga: Eglītis un Partneri.
- 42 VTVJT, 2001 – Valters, P. (sast.) (2001). Valsts un tiesību vēsture jēdzienos un terminos. 2. papildin. izd. Rīga: Divergens.
- 43 ZTV, 1922 – Zinātniskās terminoloģijas vārdnīca. Izglītības ministrijas izd. 1922.
- 44 АРПЮС, 2005 – Мамулян, А. С., Кашкнн, С. Ю. (2005). Англо-русский полный юридический словарь. 2-ое изд. Москва: Изд-во Эксмо.
- 45 АРЮР, 2014 – Кошелева, С. В. (2014). Англо-русский юридический словарь (глоссарий). Орел: ФГБОУ ВПО «Государственный университет - УНПК».

Jānis Veckrācis

Santrauka

Latviški specialieji spausdinti teisės terminų leksikografiniai šaltiniai: istorinė, terminologinė ir vartotojo patogumo perspektyvos

Nors pirmieji dešimtys ir daugiau puslapių latviški specialieji spausdinti tekstai – vokiečių-latvių kalbų vertimai – buvo parengti XVIII a., o pirmieji dideli teisiniai vertimai pasirodė XIX a. pradžioje, pirmieji terminologiniai bandymai, taigi ir pirmieji (galimų) teisinių terminų rinkiniai, priskiriami XIX a. antrajai pusei. Pirmieji latviški specialieji teisės terminų leksikografiniai šaltiniai parengti XX a. pradžioje. Šio straipsnio tikslas – pateikti latviškų specialiųjų spausdintų teisinių terminų leksikografinių šaltinių istorinę analitinę apžvalgą, ypatingą dėmesį skiriant jų nuoseklumo ir kokybės aspektams, atsižvelgiant į terminologines ir leksikografinės savybes ir potencialių vartotojų poreikių tenkinimą. Siekiant šio tyrimo tikslo, straipsnyje, taikant kokybinio tyrimo metodus, pateikiama lyginamoji ir gretinamoji analizė apie pagrindinių latviškų specialiųjų spausdintų teisės terminų žodynų makrostruktūrinius ir mikrostruktūrinius bruožus. Tyrimui atrinkti leksikografiniai leidiniai apima aštuoniolika dvikalbių arba daugiakalbių teisės terminų žodynų ir žodynėlių. Šių terminologinių išteklių kokybę, atsižvelgiant

į jų leksikografines ypatybes ir potencialių vartotojų poreikius, daugeliu atvejų blogina makro- ir mikrostruktūriniai neatitikimai ir kiti trūkumai. Kita svarbi problema yra ribotas terminų kiekis, kadangi dauguma leidinių buvo nedidelės apimties teisės terminų rinkiniai.

About the Author

JĀNIS VECKRĀCIS

Dr. philol. in linguistics, Associate
Professor, Faculty of Translation Studies,
Ventspils University of Applied Sciences,
Ventspils, Latvia

Research interests

Terminology, language change, literary
translation, poetics, stylistics

Address

Latvia, Inženieru str. 101a, Ventspils, Latvia,
LV3601.

E-mail

janis.veckracis@venta.lv

Orcid iD

0000-0002-3397-2901

