

**Liepājas Universitāte**  
**Humanitāro un mākslas zinātņu fakultāte**

# **VĀRDS UN TĀ PĒTĪŠANAS ASPEKTI**

**Rakstu krājums**  
**20 (1)**

**Fonētika, gramatika, leksika, stilistika**  
**Vārda diahroniskais un areālais aspekts**

Johana (Jāņa) Langija 400. dzimšanas dienai  
un viņa vārdnīcas 330. jubilejai veltīts rakstu krājums

**Liepāja 2016**

*Vārds un tā pētīšanas aspekti* : rakstu krājums, 20 (1). Red. kolēģijas vadītāja Benita Laumane. Krājuma atb. red. Gunta Smiltiece. Liepāja : LiePA, 2016. 244 lpp. ISSN 1407–4737

## REDAKCIJAS KOLĒGIJA

**Benita Laumane**, Dr. habil. philol. (Liepājas Universitāte)  
redakcijas kolēģijas vadītāja

**Gunta Smiltiece**, Dr. philol. (Liepājas Universitāte)  
rakstu krājuma 20 (1) atbildīgā redaktore

## REDAKCIJAS KOLĒGIJAS LOCEKĻI

**Aleksejs Andronovs**, Dr. philol. (Sanktpēterburgas Valsts universitāte, Krievija)

**Juris Baldunčiks**, Dr. philol. (Ventspils Augstskola)

**Māris Baltiņš**, Dr. habil. med. (Valsts valodas centrs)

**Maija Brēde**, Dr. philol. (Latvijas Universitāte)

**Trevors Gārts Fennels**, Dr. philol. (Flindersa Universitāte, Austrālija)

**Audrone Kaukiene**, Dr. habil. human. (Klaipēdas Universitāte, Lietuva)

**Ieva Ozola**, Dr. philol. (Liepājas Universitāte)

**Diāna Laiveniece**, Dr. paed. (Liepājas Universitāte)

**Linda Lauze**, Dr. philol. (Liepājas Universitāte)

**Dzintra Lele-Rozentāle**, Dr. philol. (Ventspils Augstskola)

**Liene Markus-Narvila**, Dr. philol. (LU Latviešu valodas institūts)

**Jānis Sīlis**, Dr. philol. (Ventspils Augstskola)

**Inguna Skadiņa**, Dr. comp. sc. (Liepājas Universitāte,  
Latvijas Universitātes Matemātikas un informātikas institūts)

**Dzintra Šulce**, Dr. philol. (Liepājas Universitāte)

**Kazimiers Župerka**, Dr. habil. human. (Šauļu Universitāte, Lietuva)

## Redaktores piezīme

Visi krājumā ievietotie raksti ir anonīmi recenzēti.

Vecās ortogrāfijas atveidē pamatos ir saglabātas rakstu autoru lietotās zīmes.

Rakstu krājums izdots ar Valsts pētījumu programmas *LETONIKA – Latvijas vēsture, valodas, kultūra, vērtības* projekta „Latviešu valodas pētījumi 21. gadsimta zinātnes kontekstā” finansiālu atbalstu.

Krājuma izdošana apstiprināta Liepājas Universitātes Humanitāro un mākslas zinātņu fakultātes Domes sēdē (protokols Nr. 2; 2016. gada 1. novembrī).

Tehniskā redaktore

Anita Helviga

Redaktores kopsavilkumiem svešvalodā

Sofija Bauere (angļu valodā)

Linda Gaile (vācu valodā)

Redakcijas kolēģijas adrese:

Liepājas Universitāte

Humanitāro un mākslas zinātņu fakultāte

Kūrmājas prosp. 13 Liepāja LV 3401

Tālrunis: (371)63483781,

e-pasts: [balti@liepu.lv](mailto:balti@liepu.lv)

Fakss: (371)63483779

© Liepājas Universitāte 2016

Jurgis PAKERYS (Vilnius University)

## MORPHOLOGICAL ADAPTATION OF ADJECTIVAL BORROWINGS IN MODERN LATVIAN<sup>35</sup>

### AIZGŪTO ĪPAŠĪBAS VĀRDU MORFOLOĢISKĀ ADAPTĀCIJA MŪSDIENU LATVIEŠU VALODĀ

**Keywords:** adjectival borrowings, morphological adaptation, suffix addition, suffix substitution, suffix truncation.

**Atslēgvārdi:** aizgūtie īpašības vārdi, morfoloģiskā adaptācija, formveidošanas afiksu pievienošana, piedēkļu pievienošana, piedēkļu aizstāšana, piedēkļu saīsināšana.

#### Kopsavilkums

Šajā pētījumā aizgūtie īpašības vārdi latviešu valodā tiek analizēti no morfoloģiskās adaptācijas viedokļa. Tiek piedāvāta piecu adaptācijas veidu tipoloģija: 1) nulles adaptācija (aizgūvums morfoloģiski nav adaptēts, piemēram: *bordo* < franču *bordeaux*, *top* < angļu *top*); 2) formveidošanas afiksu pievienošana (piemēram: *forš-s* < vācu *forsch*, *interaktīv-s* < angļu *interactive*); 3) derivatīvā piedēkļa pievienošana (aizgūvums dabū piedēkli, bet tam ir tikai adaptēšanas, nevis vārddarināšanas funkcija, piemēram: *ekt-īg-s* < vācu *echt*, *kūl-īg-s* < angļu *cool*); 4) derivatīvo piedēkļu aizstāšana (tiešās vai agrākās donorvalodas piedēklis aizgūvumā tiek aizstāts ar latviešu valodas izskaņu, piemēram: *rikt-īg-s* < vācu *richt-ig*, *ģener-isk-s* < angļu *gener-ic*); 5) derivatīvo piedēkļu saīsināšana (tiešās vai agrākās donorvalodas piedēklis aizgūvumā tiek saīsināts vai izlaists, piemēram: *bilingv-s* < *bilingv-āl-s* < angļu/vācu *bilingu-al*).

Pētījuma dati tika iegūti no *Terminu un svešvārdu skaidrojošās vārdnīcas* (TSSV-ē), *Latviešu valodas slenga vārdnīcas* (Bušs, Ernstsone 2009) un no izmēģinājuma aptaujas ar Latvijas Universitātes studentiem 2015. gadā (kopumā 49 respondenti).

Savāktais materiāls liecina, ka: 1) nulles adaptācija latviešu literārajā valodā ir ļoti reta, bet slengā sastopama diezgan bieži (līdz 46 % aptaujas atbilžu), tikai jāatzīst, ka daļu no tām formām varētu arī interpretēt kā koda maiņas gadījumus (un nevis kā

---

<sup>35</sup> This article is one of the outcomes of the research project *Morphological adaptation of adjectival borrowings in the Baltic languages*, funded by a grant (No. LIT-9-7) from the Research Council of Lithuania. Parts of this investigation were presented during the 6<sup>th</sup> Congress of Latvian Studies (Latvian Academy of Sciences, Rīga, September 11, 2015), The 12<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Balticists (Vilnius University, Vilnius, October 28–31, 2015), and the 20<sup>th</sup> conference *The Word: Aspects of Research* (Liepāja University, Liepāja, December 2–3, 2015). I would like to sincerely thank the audiences of these conferences for their questions, comments, and discussion. The pilot questionnaire project of slang borrowings would have not been possible without the help of Andra Kalnača, Gunta Kļava, Ilze Lokmane, Jānis Valdmanis, and the students of the University of Latvia. Their help is greatly appreciated, *liels jums paldies!* Many sincere thanks also to Aleksej Andronov, who has made a number of very useful suggestions, to Caitlin Keenan, for editing the English of my article, and to Gunta Smiltņiece for correcting the Latvian summary. Needless to say, all possible errors and misinterpretations are mine.

leksiskos aizguvumus); 2) formveidošanas afiksu pievienošana ir izplatīta ne tikai literārajā valodā (58 % leksēmu), bet arī slengā (apmēram 48 % leksēmu slenga vārdnīcā, vairums no tām ir aizguvumi no vācu un krievu valodas, retumis (9 % aptaujas atbilžu) formveidošanas afiksi tiek pievienoti arī aizguvumiem no angļu valodas); 3) piedēkļa pievienošanu svešvārdos bez vēsturiska pētījuma pierādīt ir grūti, jo šie vārdi latviešu valodā varēja ienākt ne tikai tieši, bet arī ar citu valodu starpniecību, kur piedēkļi jau bija pievienoti, bet latviešu valodā tie tika tikai aizstāti ar savām izskaņām, piemēram, sal. *jonogēn-isk-s*, vācu *ionogen* un krievu *ionožen-n-ый* (*ионожен-н-ый*); no otras puses, slenga aizguvumus no vācu un angļu valodas jau var drošāk interpretēt kā adaptētus, pievienojot piedēkli *-īg-* (sal. piemēram, iepriekš); 4) piedēkļu aizstāšana ir plaši sastopama svešvārdu jomā (vismaz 47 % īpašības vārdu ar izskaņu *-isk-s*), bet slengā šo adaptācijas veidu var konstatēt tikai aizguvumos no vācu valodas, kur latviešu izskaņa *-īg-s* aizstāj vācu *-lich* vai *-ig*); 5) vērojama tendence piedēkli *-isk-* izmantot, adaptējot literārās valodas aizguvumus un parasti tos iekļaujot attieksmes adjektīvu grupā, bet piedēkli *-īg-* pievienot slenga (vai sarunvalodas) aizguvumiem un tos ierindot kādības adjektīvu grupā; 6) aizgūto īpašības vārdu piedēkļu saīsināšana vai izlaišana latviešu valodā parādās reti.

## Introduction

This paper applies a five-facet typology to the problem of morphological adaptation of adjectival borrowings in modern Latvian and compares the adaptation strategies employed by Latvian to those adopted by the genetically closely related Lithuanian (Pakerys forth. b). Section 2 presents a general overview of available strategies for adjective adaptation, each of which is then discussed in more detail: zero morphological adaptation (Section 3), addition of inflectional affixes (Section 4), addition of derivational suffix (Section 5), substitution of the existing derivational suffix (Section 6), truncation of the existing derivational suffix (Section 7).

The data were collected from the *Explanatory Dictionary of Terms and Borrowings* [in Latvian] (TSSV-е)<sup>36</sup>, the *Slang dictionary of Latvian* (Bušs, Ernstson 2009), and a pilot questionnaire on adjective adaptation conducted in 2015 with 49 students (predominantly female) from the University of Latvia (Finno-Ugric studies, BA, 2nd and 3rd year; Teaching of Latvian language and literature, BA, 3rd year; Translation studies, MA, 1st year). The questionnaire included 21 sentences of Latvian retrieved from the Internet,<sup>37</sup> each of which contained an adjective with borrowed English stem. Respondents filled in the empty adjective slots with their

<sup>36</sup> The majority of borrowings included in this dictionary can be qualified as “internationalisms” – that is, words that have been borrowed into at least three languages of different language groups and which typically contain roots and other morphemes of Greek and Latin origin (cf. <http://termini.lza.lv/term.php?term=internacionālisms&lang=LV>).

<sup>37</sup> Google search service was used (<https://www.google.lv>).

preferred forms, selected from a provided list (or, if necessary, with an alternative preferred form). The list of forms included orthographically adapted and non-adapted forms with both indefinite and definite inflections, as well as forms with the productive adjectival suffixes *-īg-* and *-isk-*<sup>38</sup>. For example, in the case of the borrowing of English *cool*, the following sentence was presented, along with an accompanying list of possible forms for the borrowed word:

*triks ar gaisa burbuļiem*  
*(cool, kūl, cool(ai)s, kūl(ai)s, coolīgs, kūlīgs, coolisks, kūlisks)*  
 ‘A cool trick with air bubbles’<sup>39</sup>

The English adjectives included in the questionnaire were selected from a number of subtypes: 1) items used most frequently as adjectives and not nouns in English (*awesome, awkward, cool, crazy*<sup>40</sup>, *cute, fancy, hot, smart, super*); 2) items used as either adjectives or nouns (*fake, vintage, old(-)school*); 3) denominal adjectives in *-y* (*freak-y* < *freak*, *funk-y* < *funk* ‘a music style’, *trendy* < *trend*); 4) nouns that can be used attributively (*brand, glamour, hacker, hipster, loser, steampunk*)<sup>41</sup>. This last category could be interpreted as adjectives by the Latvian respondents or interpreted as nouns and used in the genitive.

As far as I know, no previous studies have specifically focused on adjectival borrowings in Latvian; however, important notes can be found in, e. g., Endzelīns 1951, 366; MLLVG I 1959, 226, 286–287; Laua 1981, 132; Skujiņa 1982, 171, 177–178; Freimane 1993, 95; Blinkena 2002, 171 (with further references); LVG 2013, 266.

### **Strategies for morphological adaptation**

Latvian adjectives morphologically mark case, number, gender, definiteness<sup>42</sup>, and grade of comparison<sup>43</sup>; cf. the minimal set of features

<sup>38</sup> In one case (borrowing of English *freaky*), forms with the suffix *-ain-* were added due to their frequency of use.

<sup>39</sup> In the original sentence, the form *Kūlīgs* was used (<http://spoki.tvnet.lv/video/Kuligs-triks-ar-gaisa-burbuliem/235291>, November 28, 2010).

<sup>40</sup> From a synchronic point of view, the relation of *crazy* to the noun *craze* does not seem to be relevant.

<sup>41</sup> I should have included genitives as options in the list of possible forms; this was an oversight in the pilot questionnaire.

<sup>42</sup> Definiteness in Latvian can be expressed by the morphological forms of adjectives (LVG 2013, 375, 383–384, 395–396).

<sup>43</sup> Some subclasses of adjectives block the expression of grade and definiteness; see, e. g., MLLVG I 1959, 468–469; LVG 2013, 373, 407–408. For instance, borrowings and other relational adjectives with the suffix *-isk-s* are usually not graded, while borrowings ending in *-āl-s*, *-ār-s* are only used in the positive grade (with the exception of occasional forms of *optimāls* ‘optimal’ that are illogical from the etymological point of view; cf. Latin superlative *optimus*).

(case, number, gender) expressed by, e. g., the suffix *-a* in (1), and the maximal set of features (+ degree of comparison and definiteness) expressed by, e. g., the (optional) prefix *vis-* and suffixes *-āk-* and *-ā-* in (2):

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>(1) <i>Īs-a</i><br/>short-NOM. SG. F<br/>'A short meeting'</p>                             | <p><i>satikšanās</i><br/>meeting-NOM. SG. RFL</p> |
| <p>(2) <i>Vis-īs-āk-ā</i><br/>SUPERL-short-CMP-NOM. SG. F. DEF<br/>'The shortest meeting'</p> | <p><i>satikšanās</i><br/>meeting-NOM. SG. RFL</p> |

We might expect borrowed adjectives to be able to express all these features, but some adjectival loans function without inflectional affixes. I will refer to this outcome as **zero morphological adaptation**, below; cf. (3) and (4), where English *crazy* can be used either in its original (3) or adapted orthographic form (4):

- (3) *Iešāvās prātā crazy ideja*<sup>44</sup>  
'a crazy idea came to the mind'
- (4) *Tāpēc radās neliela kreizī ideja [..]*<sup>45</sup>  
'This is why a little crazy idea was born'

Note that this use might also be interpreted as word-level code switching; the boundary between code switching of this type and non-inflected borrowing is not entirely clear and requires a more detailed separate study (see also Baldunčiks 1987, 19–23).

In a language with inflection classes, an obvious step in morphological adaptation is to supply the borrowed stem with inflections and assign it to an appropriate class. Latvian adjectives, unlike nouns, are declined according to just one pattern and no inflection classes are distinguished<sup>46</sup>, so all adjectives that receive inflection show the same pattern; cf. Latvian *absolūt-s* 'absolute', *kūl-s* 'cool', *krut-s* 'very good, etc.' which reflect Latin *absolut-us*, English *cool*, and Russian *krut-oj* (*крут-оū*) respectively. I will refer to this type of adaptation as **addition of**

<sup>44</sup> <http://cosmo.lv/forums/topic/173991-ziemassveetki-nav-vairs-taalu/> (November 26, 2014).

<sup>45</sup> <http://board.lv.ikariam.gameforge.com/board12-ikariam/board15-idejas-un-priekšlikumi/board162-spēle/board151-noraidītās-spēles-idejas/27080-jauni-resursi/> (July 1, 2014).

<sup>46</sup> The masculine/feminine and indefinite/definite inflections differ, but they occupy the cells of the same inflectional paradigm, just as singular/plural inflections do; see, e. g., MLLVG I 1959, 431–434.

**inflectional affixes**, below. Note that, if the donor language it self has inflectional affixes<sup>47</sup>, these affixes are replaced during the process of adaptation; cf. further discussion on the replacement of derivational suffixes, below. In some cases, the inflectional affixes of the recipient language are added to existing donor inflections (that is, not replaced). Compare the Latvian nom. sg. m. *rižij-s* ‘red(-haired)’ < Russian *ryž-ij* (*рыж-ий*) (where Russian *-ij* (*-ий*) already marks nominative singular masculine) and a shorter version without the donor inflection, *riž-s* (Bušs, Ernstsone 2009, 405).

Other adaptation strategies involve derivational morphology (cf. Pakerys forth. a). First, a native derivational affix can be added to the borrowed stem; I will refer to this type of adaptation as **addition of derivational suffix**, below (prefixes are not involved in this process in Latvian). For example, the English adjectives *cool*, *crazy*, *unisex* can be rendered in Latvian as the suffixed forms *kūl-īg-s*, *kreiz-īg-s*, *uniseks-īg-s*<sup>48</sup>, but these forms cannot be interpreted as having been derived through addition of the suffix *-īg-*, because there are no corresponding base words in Latvian. Instead, we simply recognize morphological adaptation of loans as a secondary function of some derivational affixes (in this case, the suffix *-īg-s*).

In certain instances, a Latvian derivational suffix may directly replace the existing suffix on the borrowed form. For example, Latvian *elast-isk-s* and *elast-īg-s* ‘elastic’ correspond to German *elast-isch*, which ultimately goes back to Latin *elast-ic-us*, cf. also Polish *elast-yczn-y*, Russian *elast-ičn-uj* (*эласт-ичн-ый*), etc. This type of adaptation will be referred to as **substitution of derivational suffix**, below<sup>49</sup>. This process has been described in a number of works: MLLVG I 1959, 226, 266, 287; Endzelīns 1951, 366; Laua 1981, 132; cf. also Baldunčiks 1987, 24 on the substitution of morphemes in borrowings. However, in some cases, the authors do not qualify this process as a substitution, but only associate the suffix *-isk-s* with certain suffixes in Russian (*-(e)sk-ij* (*-(e)ск-ий*)) or German (*-isch*) (MLLVG I 1959, 226, cf. also the wording on *-īg-s* on p. 287 and Laua 1981, 132). Endzelīns uses the term “imitation” to describe

<sup>47</sup> This is evident especially in the case of, e. g., Russian, and much less so in the case of English, because it only has grade marking affixes.

<sup>48</sup> *Kūlīgs*, *kreizīgs* are listed in Bušs, Ernstsone 2009, 248, 255, *uniseksīgs* is attested in Internet use, cf. *Visas smaržas lielākoties šķīta uniseks-īg-as* ‘All scents mostly seemed [= smelled] unisex’, <http://www.sekodegunam.lv/mad-et-len-zuduso-smarzu-meklejoj/> (August 5, 2014).

<sup>49</sup> Note that “derivational” refers to the main use of the suffix in the donor language, but in many cases it can be also employed for the morphological adaptation of the loans in that language as well. So, to be precise, in some cases one could speak of the replacement of the adaptational suffixes.

such suffixal replacements as, for example, when Latvian *-isk-s* corresponds to German *-isch* in *polit-isk-s*: *polit-isch* ‘political’. Similarly, in MLLVG I 1959, 266, it is correctly noted that some of the adjectives are borrowed as lexical units (and not actually derived in Latvian), with foreign suffixes replaced by Latvian *-isk-*; cf. *partej-isk-s* ‘related to, member of (political) party’ < German *partei-isch* or Russian *partej-n-yj* (*napmeŭ-n-ыŭ*)<sup>50</sup>.

In rare cases, **truncation of derivational suffix** of the donor (or pre-donor) language occurs, but this process seems to occur primarily at later stages of adaptation. For example, a direct comparison of German *kalendar-isch* ‘calendric’ and Latvian *kalendār-s* seems to indicate truncation of German *-isch*; however, it is probable that German *kalendar-isch* was first rendered as *kalendār-isk-s* in Latvian (suffix replacement, *-isk-s* for *-isch*) before the suffix-less variant came into use (note that Latvian has a group of nouns that are also used as adjectives; see a short note on this type of conversion in Section 4). A better example of possible truncation is *bilingv-s* ‘bilingual’ alongside *bilingv-āl-s* (< English/German *bilingual*), where *-āl-* seems to have been deleted; see also Skujiņa 1982, 171) on the tendency to use shorter forms without *-āl-*, cf. *hipoid-āl-s* ‘hypoid’, *koloid-āl-s* ‘colloid(al)’ alongside *hipoīd-s*, *koloīd-s*.

The complexity of the adaptation strategies discussed above can be tentatively arranged along the following continuum: zero morphological adaptation < addition of inflectional affixes < addition of derivational affix (followed by addition of inflectional affixes) < substitution of the derivational suffix (followed by addition of inflectional affixes) / truncation of the derivational suffix.

### **Zero morphological adaptation**

Borrowings that undergo no morphological adaptation at all are quite rare in the standard register. TSSV<sub>e</sub> lists about 10 indeclinable adjectives ending in *-i* (*haki* ‘khaki’, *mini*, etc.) or *-o* (*bordo* ‘dark red’, *mono*, *retro*, *stereo*, etc.); cf. also Veisbergs 2013, 66, who notes that the group of non-adapted loans from English (of various word classes) is overall quite small. Non-adapted adjectives not listed in the TSSV<sub>e</sub> include *rozā* ‘pink, rose-colored’ and (colloquial) *lillā* ‘purple, violet’ (LVG 2013, 408; Veisbergs 2013, 59).

The slang dictionary lists 16 items that are either adjectives or usable as adjectives, borrowed mostly from English (*kreizi/kreizī*, *OK*, *oldskūl*,

---

<sup>50</sup> I would like to thank Aleksej Andronov for drawing my attention to the possibility of borrowing from Russian.



*super, top, topless* < *crazy, OK, old-school, super, top, topless*<sup>51</sup>) and Russian (*sepkij* ‘tough’, *čiki* ‘good’, *firmennyj* (фирменный) ‘brand’, *paġelo* ‘good’, etc. < *sepkij* (ценкий), *čiki* (чику), *firmennyj*, *podelu* (поделу) (idiomatic PP), and rarely from German (*ziher* ‘good, reliable’ < *siher*). A single mixed phrase *očeņgud* ‘very good’ (Russian *očen’* (очень) ‘very’ + English *good*) is also attested in Russian (*očen’ gud* (очень гуд) ‘very good; very well’<sup>52</sup>), suggesting that this phrase could have been transferred as a unit directly from Russian to Latvian. At first blush, the occurrence of Latvian indeclinable adjectives borrowed from Russian is striking in comparison to Lithuanian, where such instances are very hard to come by; however, this finding must be verified in further studies.

Non-adapted borrowings were used quite frequently in the pilot questionnaire, accounting for 45.9 % of all responses (463 out of 1008). Of these, 71.3 % (330) were written in the original spelling (*cool, fake, funky, smart* vs. *kūl, feik, funkī/fanki/fankī, smārt*, etc). Compared to Lithuanian, Latvian youth seems to choose non-adapted adjectival borrowings less frequently (45.9 % vs. 59.33 % of responses), but the share of orthographically non-adapted forms is quite similar (71.3 % in Latvian vs. 76.87 % in Lithuanian).

LVG claims that indeclinable adjectives lack comparative-grade forms and that intensity must be marked by lexical means (as in *maigi rozā* ‘gently pink’) (LVG 2013, 408); note, however, that grade can also be expressed by the intensifiers *vairāk* (comparative) and *visvairāk* (superlative), cf.:

(5) *otrā daļa bijusi vēl vairāk kreizī*  
 ‘the second part reportedly was even more crazy’<sup>53</sup>

(6) *Šuvis, manuprāt, ir visvairāk cool no visiem latviešu filozofiem!*  
 ‘Šuvis, to my mind, is the coolest of all Latvian philosophers!’<sup>54</sup>

#### **Addition of inflectional affixes**

Simple addition of adjectival inflections to the borrowed stems occurs in 58 % of the lexemes in TSSV<sub>e</sub> (875 out of 1 505 adjectives). This frequency is striking in comparison to Lithuanian, where only 14 % of borrowings display this technique: cf. Latvian *abrazīvs* ‘abrasive’, *agrārs*

<sup>51</sup> Some of these forms, of course, could have come into Latvian indirectly through other contact languages.

<sup>52</sup> Cf.: *Očen’ gud mašina* (Очень гуд машина) ‘very good car’, <http://vladivostok.drom.ru/chrysler/300c/13446995.html> (March 19, 2015).

<sup>53</sup> <http://forums.delfi.lv/read.php?f=98&t=20499&a=2> (January 24, 2010).

<sup>54</sup> <http://foto.delfi.lv/picture/1180130/> (March 18, 2010).

‘agrarian’, *civil-s* ‘civil’, etc. vs. Lithuanian suffixed forms in *-in-*: *abrazyv-in-is*, *agrar-in-is*, *civil-in-is*. On the other hand, cf. also Latvian *adekvāt-s* ‘adequate’, *asociāl-s* ‘asocial’, *banāl-s* ‘banal’, etc., which correspond to the non-suffixed Lithuanian forms *adekvat-us*, *asocial-us*, *banal-us*, etc.; see also some correspondences of suffixal adaptation in sections 5 and 6 below.

47 of the adjectives listed in TSSV<sub>e</sub> have variants with the suffix *-isk-*; cf. *aerob-s* ‘aerobic’, *erogēn-s* ‘erogenous’, *ident-s* ‘identical’ alongside *aerob-isk-s*, *erogēn-isk-s*, *ident-isk-s*, etc. It is likely that many of these adjectives were adapted by suffix replacement at an earlier stage of Latvian (see Section 6) but these affixes were eventually dropped; see, e. g., a note in Freimane 1993, 95 on desemantization of the suffixes. The data currently available to me are too limited to do more than speculate on this topic; a further historical study could shed more light on this process. Latvian also has a productive conversion pattern in which borrowed indefinite masculine adjectival forms of the adjective are homonymous with nominal forms (e. g. *minerāl-s* ‘mineral’; see Skujiņa 1982 and Skujiņa 2002, 98–99 for more details). It seems likely that this pattern also supports non-suffixed versions of adjectival borrowings even if the corresponding nouns are not used in the lexicon.

Later (neo-)classical borrowings from English gain adjectival inflections (*interaktīv-s* < *interactive*) and may be modified phonologically to fit in with other borrowings that share the same Latin-origin suffixes. Consider, for instance, *eksponenciāl-s* < *exponential* (Veisbergs 2013, 66), where the sequence *-tial* is rendered as *-ciāl-* in keeping with *eksistenciāl-s* ‘existential’, *konfidenciāl-s* ‘confidential’, etc. Note, however, that in some of these cases, the suffix is replaced instead (cf. Section 6): for instance, *ģener-isk-ās* (*zāles*) < *gener-ic* (*drugs*)<sup>55</sup> follows the pattern Latin/Greek *-ic-/ik-* > German *-isch* (or French *-ique*, etc.) > Latvian *-isk-* (cf. *autent-isk-s* ‘authentic’, *barbar-isk-s* ‘barbaric’, etc.)

In the 90 borrowed adjectives listed in the slang dictionary, 48 % (43 lexemes) show added inflections. 15 of these adjectives are earlier loans from German (*fein-s* ‘good, etc.’, *forš-s* ‘very good, etc.’ < *fein*, *forsch*, etc.), while 21 are from Russian. As noted earlier, 10 of these have Latvian inflections added to the Russian ones; cf. *ahujenij-s* ‘great, etc.’, *ģikij-s* ‘wild’ < Russian (nom. sg. m.) *ochuenn-uj* (*охуенн-ый*), *dik-ij* (*дик-ий*)<sup>56</sup>. If we assume that the feminine (nom. sg.) form of the Russian

<sup>55</sup> Source: *EuroTermBank* (<http://www.eurotermbank.com>). The pronunciation of the first consonant is latinized.

<sup>56</sup> In one case, the vowel /o/ in the source is changed to /e/ for a reason not quite clear to me: *blatnej-s* ‘criminal’ < Russian *blatn-oj* (*блатн-ой*). Cf. the existence also of the adverb *blatnēj-i*, which suggests the addition of the adjectival suffix *-ēj-* to the

adjective (in *-aja*) is the particular form on which the Latvian borrowing is based, the last vowel (*-a*) seems to have been reinterpreted as a Latvian inflection (= *-a*) and the rest (*-ja-*) assigned to the stem: *bezrazmernaj-a* ‘without a size; one size’ < *bezrazmern-aja* (безразмерн-ая), *graņonaj-a* ‘ridged (about a glass)’ < *granĕn-aja* (гранĕн-ая). In 8 cases, the Russian inflections have been replaced by Latvian ones (sometimes with definite marking); cf. *borz-ais* ‘bad’ (def.), *krut-s* ‘very good’ (indef.), *moĕn-ais* ‘very good’ (def.), *riž-s* ‘red (-haired)’ (indef.) < *borz-oj* (борз-ой), *krut-oj* (крут-ой), *moĕĕn-yj* (моуĕн-ый), *ryž-ij* (рыж-ий), etc. alongside longer variants that keep the Russian inflection *-ij* intact: *borzij-s*, *moĕņij-s*, *rižij-s*).

Among the English borrowings, the most straightforward case of adaptation is *kūl-s* ‘very good’ < *cool*. The other instances are more complicated. For example, *flak-s* ‘drunk’ may reflect (British) English slang *flako*, (as suggested in Bušs, Ernstsone 2009, 155); in this case, the final vowel must have been replaced by the Latvian inflection (as in some indeclinable nouns; cf. the variants *barok-o/barok-s* ‘baroque’, *flaming-o/flaming-s* ‘flamingo’, see LVG 2013, 368). The adjective *fakīn-s* ‘fucking’ perhaps was also initially adapted by the addition of inflection (*fakin-s*<sup>57</sup>), with the sequence /in/ later reinterpreted as the (currently unproductive) Latvian adjectival suffix *-īn-* (as in *tāl-īn-s* ‘distant’: LVG 2013, 267). On the reinterpretation of final phonemes of borrowings as Latvian suffixes, see Kalnaĕa 2004, 28–29; for adjectives sharing the same root, cf. also *fak-ain-s*, *fak-an-s*.

The data collected in the pilot questionnaire confirm a significant difference between the Lithuanian and Latvian adaptation of borrowings: the addition of inflections to such words in Lithuanian is extremely rare, while in Latvian it is attested in 9 % of responses (91 forms in total); cf. (nom. sg. f. indef.) *awkward-a*, (nom. pl. m. indef./def.) *feik-i*, *-ie*, (nom. pl. f. indef.) *kjūt-as*, (nom. sg. m. def., indef.) *kūl-ais*, *-s*, (nom. sg. m. def.) *oldskūl-ais*, etc. < *awkward*, *fake*, *cute*, *cool*, *old-school*. This contrast could be related to the fact that conversion of N/Adj borrowings is quite widespread (see above) and still expanding in Latvian (possibly under the influence of the English model (Veisbergs 2013, 67, 99), although the

---

borrowed stem; if that is the case, <e> in *blatnejs* could perhaps be a misspelling for <ē>.

<sup>57</sup> Attested online, cf. *neviens fakins moders nebija fakinā onlainā fakinas 40 minūtes* ‘no fucking moderator was fucking online for fucking 40 minutes’ at <http://www.gign.lv/forum/topic/48319-tf2-6x6-runāšanas-tēma/?page=3#comment-507254> (October 25, 2010).

phenomenon certainly predates the period of intensive influence of English on Latvian)<sup>58</sup>.

### **Addition of derivational suffix**

Morphological adaptation of internationalisms by the addition of a derivational suffix is quite rare, and in most cases the interpretation is not entirely secure. For example, in comparison to their possible German source words, the adjectives *eutrof-isk-s* ‘eutrophic’, *jonogēn-isk-s* ‘ionogenic’, *kancerogēn-isk-s* ‘cancerogenic’, *kriminogēn-isk-s* ‘criminogenic’, *polifāg-isk-s* ‘polyphagous’, *poligām-isk-s* ‘polygamous’, *polimēr-isk-s* ‘polymeric’ may have undergone adaptation via the addition of the derivational suffix *-isk-*; the German equivalents of these terms are suffixless: *eutroph*, *ionogen*, *kanzerogen*, *kriminogen*, *polyphag*, *polygam*, *polymer* (cf. also *alkāl-isk-s* ‘alkalic’ alongside French *alcali* and *delart-isk-ā komēdija* alongside Italian *commedia dell’arte*). However, without conducting a detailed historical study, it is impossible to be sure that a contact language such as Russian did not serve as a mediator in at least some instances. In that case, these forms would be instances of suffix replacement rather than suffix addition; cf. Russian *ionogen-n-yj* (ионоген-н-ый), *alkal-ičesk-ij* (алкал-ическ-ий), etc. Note also that the English versions of these terms also have suffixes: *eutroph-ic*, *polygam-ous*, *alkal-ic* (cf. German *alkal-isch*), etc.

The slang dictionary lists 8 items (9 % of borrowed adjectives) that may have been adapted by the addition of a derivational suffix; in all cases, the suffix is *-īg-*, never *-isk-*. The cases of borrowing from English and German are the easiest to interpret: English *cool*, *crazy*, *super* (perhaps mediated by Russian *super* (супер)) > *kūl-īg-s*, *kreiz-īg-s*, *super-īg-s*; German *echt* > *ekt-īg-s* ‘true, etc.’ The Russian example *borz-īg-s* ‘unkind’ has a number of possible interpretations. First, it could have been adapted by addition of the suffix *-īg-* (< Russian *borz-oo* (борз-оо)), but this is not typical for Slavic borrowings in Latvian. Second, it could be derived from the borrowed adjective *borz-ais* (cf. also a longer form with *-ij-* which would have to be truncated in the derivation: *borzij-s*) or from the borrowed verb *borzīt* ‘talk impudently; be angry’. Deverbal derivation in *-īg-* is more frequent and perhaps is more probable in this case (see MLLVG I 1959, 278–283 on de-adjectival and deverbal formations in *-īg-*).

The pilot questionnaire data show that borrowed forms with suffixes are quite frequent: 41 % (413 responses). However, many of these adjectives are (or can be interpreted as) derived from borrowed nouns; thus,

---

<sup>58</sup> Cf. also a short discussion on Latvian *urbān-ais* (*dizains*) as a translation of English *urban* (*design*) vs. *urbān-isk-s* at <http://www.a4d.lv/lv/plaukts/latvijas-architektura-88/comments/> (April 23–May 5, 2010).

to arrive at the minimal number of adaptations, forms with possible derivational bases (like *brend-īg-s* ‘brand’, *feik-īg-s* ‘fake’, *trend-īg-s* ‘trendy’ along side nouns like *brend-s* ‘brand’, *feik-s* ‘fake’, *trend-s* ‘trend’, etc.) have to be excluded. Doing so decreases the number of secure adaptations to 10.81 % (109 responses in total), which is still more than twice as many as in Lithuanian (4.65 %). In the majority of cases, the suffix *-īg-* was used (104 responses), while *-isk-* was very rare (5 responses); cf. *kūl-īg-s*, *cool-īg-s* (<*cool*, 21 responses), *fens-īg-s*, *fenc-īg-s*, *fanc-īg-s* (<*fancy*, 12 responses), *hot-īg-s* (<*hot*, 10 responses), *kjūt-īg-s* (<*cute*, 6 responses), etc. vs. *kjūt-isk-s* (2 responses), *hot-isk-s* (1 response), etc.

The popularity of suffix *-īg-* most likely stems from its high degree of productivity in comparison to other Latvian derivational adjectival affixes (see, e. g., Blinkena 2002, 186 on the productivity of this suffix). As an adaptation device, *-īg-* explicitly marks the word class of the stem and assigns the borrowing to the class of gradable qualitative adjectives (vs. usually non-gradable relational adjectives adapted with the suffix *-isk-*<sup>59</sup>). Latvian also seems to demonstrate a tendency towards complementary distribution of adaptation suffixes according to register: *-isk-* is reserved for the standard use (internationalisms), while *-īg-* prevails in non-standard (slang/colloquial) use. This pattern will be discussed further in the next section<sup>60</sup>.

### **Substitution of derivational suffix**

The substitution of derivational suffixes is especially common in Latvian internationalisms. There are 602 adjectives in *-isk-* in TSSV<sub>e</sub> and only 8 of them could be argued to have been adapted by suffix addition while the rest (594 lexemes) seem (at least theoretically) to have been adapted by suffix substitution. There is a complication here, however: some of these borrowed adjectives have corresponding borrowed nouns, and it is possible that those borrowed nouns served as their derivational bases in Latvian. To estimate the lowest approximate number of adaptations, about

---

<sup>59</sup> See notes and references in Footnote 9. In some cases, adjectives with borrowed stems and the suffix *-isk-* can be interpreted as qualitative gradable adjectives. For example, a test search on *google.lv* (March of 2016) shows that *arha-isk-s* ‘archaic; old fashioned’ and *krit-isk-s* ‘critical’ are used in the comparative and superlative grades. A separate investigation is needed to estimate the extent to which borrowings in *-isk-* are used as qualitative gradable adjectives. (Cf. also a note in LVG 2013, 373.)

<sup>60</sup> Note that in the colloquial use, *-isk-* and *-īg-* are not actually clearly differentiated compared to the suggested standard use: *-īg-* is expected to mark a rather permanent abstract property, while *-isk-* should express a more temporary one; (see a discussion in MLLVG I 1959, 253–254 and cf. also LVG 2013, 266), which also notes a trend toward the synonymous use of the two suffixes.

20 % (120) of the adjectives in *-isk-* were manually reviewed and marked as possibly derived if they had corresponding nominal bases (including cases with bases ending in *-ij-* and *-ik-*, which were interpreted as truncated; see below). Based on this analysis, at least 56 (47 %) of the adjectives are definitely not derived (e. g. *acikl-isk-s* ‘acyclic’, *artēz-isk-s* ‘artesian’, *drast-isk-s* ‘drastic’, etc.) while an additional 18 (15 %) cannot be derived unless truncation of the base with *-ik-* is assumed (cf. *arha-isk-s* ‘archaic’ < *arha-ik-a* ‘archaic period’) <sup>61</sup>. Another 18 (15 %) adjectives cannot be analyzed as derived if truncation of the bases ending in *-ij-* is not allowed (cf. *alegor-isk-s* ‘alegoric’ < *alegor-ij-a* ‘alegory’) <sup>62</sup>. Thus, overall, it is highly probable that 47 % to 77 % of the adjectives in *-isk-* are adaptations transferred into Latvian by suffix substitution <sup>63</sup>. In reality, this figure maybe even higher: it is likely that many of the adjectives with possible nominal bases were not actually derived in Latvian: in many cases, nouns and corresponding adjectives could have been borrowed independently and only seem related from a synchronic point of view, cf. *alkohol-isk-s* ‘alcoholic’ and *alkohol-s* ‘alcohol’, *aromāt-isk-s* ‘aromatic’ and *aromāt-s* ‘aroma’, etc.

Historically, the earliest replacements seem to be of the German suffix *-isch* (other suffixes are not attested in the data set, but cf. *-ig* and *-lich* below in discussion of slang/colloquial borrowings), which in turn corresponds to (neo-)classical formations in Greek *-ik-* and Latin *-ic-*. Adaptation of later borrowings may be related to the influence of Russian, but without conducting a detailed historical study, no clear cases of such influence can be attested. I also cannot point to cases of direct adaptations via suffix replacement of French adjectives with *-ique*, since such words usually have correspondences in German (with *-isch*) and thus may have reached Latvian via German (or Russian). Proving direct English adaptations via suffix replacement would also require a more detailed study. Possible candidates that replaced earlier longer forms are presented in Veisbergs 2012, 108: *socioekonom-isk-s* (< *socioeconom-ic*), *katastrof-isk-s* (< *catastroph-ic*) replaced *sociāleekonom-isk-s* and *katastrofāls* (cf. German *sozialökonomisch*, *katastrophenhaft*). The proof, in

---

<sup>61</sup> The assumed truncation is itself a borrowed pattern stemming from the quasi-derivational treatment of borrowed (neo-)classical stems; cf. German *archa-isch* alongside *Archa-ik*, etc.

<sup>62</sup> This pattern is also borrowed; cf. German *allegor-isch* alongside *Allegor-ie*. Latvian nouns end in *-ij-a* following the principle that borrowings should be kept close to their Latin/Greek forms (*allegor-ia/allēgor-ia*).

<sup>63</sup> By comparison, the adaptation of borrowings by substitution of the most productive Lithuanian suffix (*-in*, *-is*) covers 61 to 76 % of cases. Here, the lower limit is higher than in Latvian, while the upper limit is very similar.

many cases, could only be found in the chronology of the use of these words – that is, when the influence of English can be clearly established as significant. Otherwise, the possible confound from corresponding shorter German forms (*sozioökonom-isch*, *katastroph-isch*, etc.) is unavoidable. Another possible example of suffix replacement was mentioned in Section 4: *ģener-isk-ās* (*zāles*) < English *gener-ic* (*drugs*).

In very rare cases, other suffixes besides *-isk-* can also be considered as possible replacements; cf. *-īg-* in *elast-īg-s* ‘elastic’ alongside *elast-isk-s* ‘elastic’, with some differences in meaning. The choice of different suffixes is perhaps related to the shades of meaning of *-īg-* and *-isk-*. The other 3 attested adjectives in *-īg-s* are probably inner Latvian derivatives: *efekt-īg-s* ‘spectacular, striking, effective’ (alongside *efektīv-s* ‘effective’) < *efekt-s* ‘effect’ (cf. also Russian *èffekt-n-yj* (эффект-н-ый) vs. *èffektiv-n-yj* (эффектив-н-ый)), *manier-īg-s* ‘mannered, etc.’ < *manier-es* ‘manners’ (cf. German pseudo-deverbal *manier-iert*, see discussion of similar adjectives below; cf. also Russian *maner-n-yj* (манер-н-ый)), *minor-īg-s* ‘sad, related to minor key’ (alongside *minor-s* and *minor-isk-s*) < *minors* ‘minor key’ (cf. also Russian *minor-n-yj* (минор-н-ый)).

TSSV<sub>e</sub> also contains 11 adjectives with the suffix *-ē-t-*, but I could find no examples that were unequivocally interpretable as instances of suffix replacement. Perhaps in a number of cases this actually happened historically, as in the case of *situ-ēt-s* ‘placed’, which corresponds to German (participle) *situ-iert*; it is possible that *-ier-t-* (verbal suffix + participle suffix) was replaced by the Latvian sequence of corresponding suffixes *-ē-t-* (verbal suffix + participle suffix).

In the slang dictionary, at least 22 (25 %) of all borrowed adjectives could theoretically have been adapted by suffix replacement (notably all with the suffix *-īg-*). All the secure examples belong to the earlier layer of language and come from German; for example: *anständ-ig*, *richt-ig* > Latvian *anštend-īg-s* ‘polite, etc.’, *rikt-īg-s* ‘correct, etc.’ It is, of course, possible that the formal similarity of German *-ig* and Latvian *-īg-* also played a role, but *-īg-* is productive in itself, and I do not have data at the moment that would point to earlier adaptation of German adjectives in *-ig* by addition of inflections (the expected result would be something like † *riktig-s*, followed by later lengthening of /i/ so that the adjective would formally look like other native formations in *-īg-s* († *riktig-s* > *riktīg-s*, cf. a note on *fakins/fakīns* in Section 4).

It is also interesting to note that, in some cases,<sup>64</sup> the German suffix *-lich* is segmented incorrectly as *-ich* (misidentified as *-ig* with unvoiced /g/

<sup>64</sup> In the case of the data included in Bušs, Ernstsone 2009, all instances.

in word final position?); for example, German *appetit-lich*, *zimper-lich* > Latvian *apetiit(e)l-īg-s* ‘tasty, etc.’, *cimperl-īg-s* ‘choosy, etc.’

The number of historical adaptations produced through suffix replacement may be higher than suggested here, but since a number of the bases of these adjectives were also borrowed, it is hard to tell if formations in *-īg-s* arose in Latvian independently. For example, *ģift-īg-s* ‘poisonous’ could be either an adaptation of German *gift-ig* or an independent formation based on the borrowed noun *ģift-e*, *-s* ‘poison’ (< German *Gift*). The pilot questionnaire was not specifically aimed at investigating suffix replacement and correspondences like English *trend-y* = Latvian *trend-īg-s* cannot be taken as proof of adaptational replacement, given that derivational bases are also available (Latvian *trend-s* < English *trend*).

### **Truncation of derivational suffix**

Truncation of the derivational suffix is very rare. The best candidates come from TSSV<sub>e</sub>; cf. *bilingv-āl-s* alongside *bilingv-s* ‘bilingual’ and *reciprok-āl-s* alongside *reciprok-s* ‘reciprocal’, where the element (etymologically, a suffix) *-āl-* could have been deleted. Cf. English *bilingual*, *reciproc-al*, German *bilingu-al*; note, however, that German *reziprok* is suffixless.

### **Conclusions**

1. Zero morphological adaptation of adjectives is very rare in the standard register, but apparently quite common in colloquial/slang use of recent English borrowings (non-adapted forms account for 46 % of responses in the pilot questionnaire). Some of these uses can be also interpreted as word-level code switching rather than lexical borrowing.

2. Addition of inflectional affixes is very common in the standard register and covers 58 % of borrowings, with some forms also having suffixed (*-isk-*) variants. This strategy of adaptation is also well attested in the slang use, where 48 % of the adjectives (borrowed mostly from German and Russian) are supplied with Latvian inflectional affixes. The data from the pilot questionnaire reveal that the latest borrowings from English are sometimes also adapted by the addition of inflectional affixes, but this is not a frequent technique (9 % of responses).

3. Addition of derivational suffixes is hard to prove without a historical study, because some forms may have been adapted by suffix replacement through mediating languages. In the slang dictionary, up to 9 % of adjectives from German and English are adapted by adding the suffix *-īg-*. In 11 % of responses from the pilot questionnaire, recently borrowed English adjectives were adapted by the addition of the suffix *-īg-*.

4. The substitution of derivational suffixes is widespread in the case of internationalisms. It is highly probable that this type of substitution took



place during the morphological adaptation of at least 47 % of adjectives with suffix *-isk-*. By contrast, in currently available slang data, only the suffix *-īg-* is used. The only clear cases of derivational suffix substitution come from earlier borrowings of German adjectives with the suffixes *-ig* and *-lich*.

5. There is a clear trend towards a complementary distribution of adaptation suffixes. The suffix *-isk-* is typically used in standard borrowings (internationalisms), which are usually assigned to the class of relational adjectives, while the suffix *-īg-* is used in non-standard (colloquial/slang) borrowings, which are assigned to the class of qualitative adjectives.

6. Truncation of the derivational suffix is uncommon and is restricted to a few cases where the segment *-al-* (*-āl-*) may possibly have been deleted.

### Symbols and abbreviations

< – derived/borrowed from

> – borrowed to/developed into

† – unattested form

CMP – comparative

DEF – definite

F – feminine

INDEF – indefinite

NOM – nominative

M – masculine

RFL – reflexive

SG – singular

SUPERL – superlative

### Sources and references

**Baldunčiks 1987** – **Baldunčiks, Juris**. *Anglicismi latviešu valodā*. Rīga : Zinātne, 1989.

**Blinkena 2002** – **Blinkena, Aina**. Īpašības vārds. *Latviešu literārās valodas morfoloģiskās sistēmas attīstība*, I. Rīga : LU LVI, 2002, 140.–242. lpp.

**Bušs, Ernstsones 2009** – **Bušs, Ojārs; Ernstsones, Vineta**. *Latviešu valodas slenga vārdnīca*, 2. izd. Rīga : Zvaigzne ABC, 2009.

**Endzelīns 1951** – **Endzelīns, Jānis**. *Latviešu valodas gramatika*. Rīga : Latvijas Valsts izdevniecība, 1951.

**Freimane 1993** – **Freimane, Inta**. *Valodas kultūra teorētiskā skatījumā*. Rīga : Zvaigzne, 1993.

**Kalnača 2004** – **Kalnača, Andra**. *Morfēmika un morfonoloģija*. Rīga : LU Akadēmiskais apgāds, 2004.

**Laua 1981** – **Laua, Alise**. *Latviešu leksikoloģija*. Rīga : Zvaigzne, 1981.

**LVG 2013** – *Latviešu valodas gramatika*. Red. Daina Nītiņa, Juris Grigorjevs. Rīga : LU Latviešu valodas institūts, 2013.

**MLLVG I 1959** – *Mūsdienu latviešu literārās valodas gramatika*, I. *Fonētika un morfoloģija*. Red. Anna Bergmane, Rūdolfs Grabis, Milda Lepika, Ēvalds Sokols. Rīga : LPSR ZA izdevniecība, 1959.

**Pakerys forth. a – Pakerys, Jurgis**. On the derivational adaptation of borrowings, *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics*.

**Pakerys forth. b – Pakerys, Jurgis**. Morphological adaptation of adjectival borrowings in modern Lithuanian. *Baltistica*.

**Skujiņa 1982 – Skujiņa, Valentīna**. Revidējama vai nerevidējama homonīmija? *Latviešu valodas kultūras jautājumi*, 17. Rīga : Avots, 1982, 163.–178. lpp.

**Skujiņa 2002 – Skujiņa, Valentīna**. *Latviešu terminoloģijas izstrādes principi*. Rīga : Latviešu valodas institūts, 2002.

**TSSV\_e – Terminu un svešvārdu skaidrojošā vārdnīca**. Based on Juris Baldunčiks, Kornēlija Pokrotniece. *Svešvārdu vārdnīca*. Rīga : Jumava, 1999, and a number of terminological sources. Available online: <http://www.letonika.lv/groups/default.aspx?g=1&r=1107>

**Veisbergs 2012 – Veisbergs, Andrejs**. Semantic Change in Latvian under the Influence of English. *Baltic Journal of English Language, Literature and Culture*, 2, 2012, pp. 103–121.

**Veisbergs 2013 – Veisbergs, Andrejs**. *English and Latvian Word Formation Compared*. Rīga : The University of Latvia Press, 2013.