

**Predictors of pluricentricity:
lexical divergences between Latvian Russian and Russian Russian**

1. Background

1.1. Introduction

When I moved into a room in a university dormitory in Moscow, I was given an inventory — a list of all the objects in the room for which I was responsible. To my surprise, the inventory contained the word *карниз*, which to me meant ‘exterior window sill’² — at least that was how people in Riga, where I grew up, used it. The window did, of course, have an exterior sill, but it seemed very strange to include it in the inventory. It transpired that in “mainland” Russian *карниз* can mean ‘curtain rod’— something that I, a native speaker of Russian, never knew.

This was not the last unexpected discrepancy between my lexicon and that of the standard Russian. The word *мусорник* in Riga is the most common name for a waste container of any type. In mainland Russian it simply does not exist³. Moreover, it is not present in the dictionaries, whereas in Latvia it is used by everybody, including well-educated speakers.

The divergences turned out not to be limited to everyday speech. Working as a translator, I discovered that the insurance term *самориск* (lit. ‘self-risk’, US ‘deductible’, UK ‘excess’) exists almost exclusively in Latvian Russian. It is a relatively official term, used by insurance companies, banks and business journalists, but hardly known in Russia, where the same notion is called *франшиза*.

The more examples I encountered, the more I became sure that these phenomena deserve a linguistic description. It might be useful both for practical purposes — should the need to codify the regional norm arise — and theoretical purposes — to estimate how far Russian has moved on the scale of pluricentricity.

1.2. Pluricentric languages

A pluricentric language is a language with two or more standard varieties, each of which can be ascribed to one centre, usually a country (Ammon 2005: 1536). Examples of pluricentric languages are English (centres being Britain, the USA, Australia etc.), Portuguese (Portugal, Brazil), Swedish (Sweden, Finland) and so on. Russian is not usually considered a pluricentric

¹ University of Bergen, Department of Foreign Languages; e-mail alexander.berdicevsky@if.uib.no. This work was carried out as part of the project “The Future of Russian: Language Culture in the Era of New Technology”, supported by the Norwegian Research Council and the University of Bergen.

² It is also sometimes called *window ledge*.

³ Neither mainland Russian nor Latvian Russian is fully monolithic, thus very few statements about lexical units in this chapter are meant to apply to **all speakers** of a certain variety of Russian.

language. Clyne (1992: 3) mentions Russian as an example of a major monocentric language⁴, Ammon (2005: 1541) states that Russian could have been included in the list of pluricentric languages, if Russian and Belarusian were considered a variety of the same language. Mechkovskaya (Мечковская 2005: 59) uses the term *polynational* in a similar way and states that Russian as a polynational language is in the early stages of its history. That brings us to the question of what stages this history might have.

Ammon (Ammon 1989: 90) offers a scale of endonormativity/exonormativity, where a language L in a country C can be considered anything from fully endonormative to fully exonormative. The criteria are the existence of a codex, or a source of prescriptions (dictionaries etc.) and models (model speakers, model writers and texts generated by them). Ammon mentions the following rough distinctions:

- (1) full endonormativity (both the codex and the models entirely from within C);
- (2) predominant endonormativity (the codex entirely from within, the models in part from outside C);
- (3) semi-endonormativity (the codex as well as the models in part from within and in part from outside C);
- (4) predominant exonormativity (the codex entirely from outside, the models in part from within C);
- (5) full exonormativity (both the codex and the models entirely from outside C).

If we compare L in C (Latvia in this case) to L in country M (“metropolitan country”, Russia in this case), one more condition has to be met so that positions (1) to (4) can be used at all. While Ammon does not state that explicitly, there have to be **differences** between codices from within and from outside, as well as between models. Otherwise it can hardly be said that L in C is endonormative.

Bearing this condition in mind, I will argue in the present chapter that, as it pertains to the lexicon, the Russian language in Latvia on Ammon’s scale is somewhere near position (4), with a slight shift towards position (3). Latvia, in Ammon’s terms, is therefore something between rudimentary centre and semi-centre (Ammon 1989: 91). It is important to remember, however, that my analysis and conclusions are restricted to lexicon and do not touch upon other language levels.

The choice of lexicon as a primary goal of investigation is not random. First, lexicon is often the first domain to be influenced in a situation of language contact (see for example Winford 2003). Second, it is also often the first to be codified by the authorities. Third, quite a few studies have been published in recent years that show that the lexicon of the Russian language is less homogeneous than it is often considered to be, and that many regional divergences from the standard codified norm cannot be viewed as mere errors (see next section for references). The present study is meant to contribute to this line of research, and to expand it, taking it more actively beyond the borders of the Russian Federation.

⁴ Note that the situation was quite different in 1992.

1.3. Regionalisms in Russian

Russian dialectology has always focused more on rural varieties of Russian rather than on urban ones, and urban lexicon has rarely been studied. It would be wrong to say that studies of urban speech are totally absent: see for example a brief list in Ахметова 2008 and a list of older studies in Семёнова 1977. However, authors of such studies often focused on vernacular speech (просторечие), implicitly or explicitly assuming that **standard** Russian is uniform everywhere.

An explicit statement that this might not be the case can be found in Беликов 2004a. Belikov shows that accepting the point of view stated above leads to the claim that even in Moscow model speakers very often do not know the lexical norm (notable lexical differences exist between Moscow and St Petersburg, and the most authoritative explanatory dictionaries are published in the latter)⁵. The same holds true not only for Moscow and St Petersburg, but also for other Russian cities: speakers of all kinds of status and education happen to use **regionalisms**. Regionalisms are lexical items used in some regions which are either absent in standard dictionaries, or have different meaning or status. Regionalisms may be found even in texts which are supposed to have the highest possible status — all kinds of official documents, including federal legislation (Беликов 2009).

The ideas roughly described above have been actively developed for several years now within the “Dictionary of Russian cities” project⁶. An important methodological rule accepted by those who work on the dictionary is to verify all the claims quantitatively, using internet search engines in the most simple cases (see Ахметова 2008, Беликов 2004b, Беликов 2006, Беликов, Ахметова 2009).

This line of research is not restricted only to cities in Russia: Беликов 2007, for example, is completely devoted to “foreign Russian”. However, Russian language in Latvia deserves even closer attention.

1.4. Russian language in Latvia

In 2000, when the last national census was held, the total population of Latvia was 2 377 383. 37% of the population were native speakers of Russian, and 81% claimed knowledge of Russian (the corresponding numbers for Latvian are 58% and 79%).

Most of the Russians living in Latvia now are those who arrived during the Soviet period and their descendants. Many of Latvian Russians, however, especially in the eastern region, are earlier settlers, mostly Old Believers and their descendants.

The only official language in Latvia is Latvian (Official Language Law 1999). All other languages, except the Liv (Livonian) language (a nearly extinct Finno-Ugric language considered indigenous and entitled to special protection), are considered foreign.

⁵ Following the same logic, in St Petersburg model speakers often lack a knowledge of orthoepic norm (since orthoepic dictionaries are mostly published in Moscow).

⁶ <http://lingvo.ru/goroda/>

Despite its lack of official status, the actual role of Russian in Latvia is rather close to that of the official language. Apart from being the mother tongue for 37% of the population, it is also often used in communication between Latvians and Russians. There are newspapers in Russian, both national and regional, as well as online news portals and broadcasters.

The websites of private companies usually have both Latvian and Russian versions, and the same holds true for many state institutions (though they are not obliged by law to produce Russian versions). For example, out of 14 ministries three have Russian versions of their websites, and so does the Cabinet of Ministers. Russian versions are usually quite detailed, although the quality of language differs greatly — from nearly perfect to rather negligent.

Documents in Russian can in some cases be used by the police and the courts (Диманте 2007: 320). Education in Russian takes place at all levels, from primary to higher. Teaching materials in Russian are published within Latvia, including Russian-language schoolbooks. Russian–Latvian and Latvian–Russian dictionaries are also being published.

There is no official body in Latvia responsible for standardizing Russian language. It is clear from the above, however, that there are model speakers/writers, and that there is at least some codification, if teaching materials and bilingual dictionaries may be viewed as one. The question is whether there are differences between Latvian Russian and Russian Russian which would show that models and codex do not entirely follow the metropolitan norm.

It is easy to predict that some innovations will arise amid close contact with a superstrate language and relatively weak contact with the mainland, and lexicon would be particularly exposed to the influence.

Some differences are described in Диманте 2006, Ключко, Лигута 2004, Кузнецов 2000, not only lexical, but phonetical, morphological and syntactical as well⁷. Dimante and Klochko and Liguta mostly describe those differences which arise in colloquial speech, and label them as deviations from the norm. Kuznetsov, however, gives some examples of regionalisms arising in more prestigious varieties of language, and asks the question «Можно ли считать местные представления о нормах — нормами?»⁸ (Кузнецов 2000: 78) without providing an unequivocal answer.

In this study, I restrict myself to those lexical regionalisms which have high status in Latvian Russian: those that arise in official terminology and are actively used by professionals and the authorities.

1.5. Scope and structure of the present study

As is pertains to regionalisms, three important oppositions can be noted.

First, regionalisms can be placed on the status scale based on the variety of language to which they belong. For example, the Latvian borrowing *ринда* ('queue', instead of *очередь*) can be heard in colloquial speech, but hardly ever appears in newspapers. The Latvian borrowing *анлиецибя* ('certificate', usually used as an ironic name for the certificate of the knowledge of Latvian language granted after passing the state examination, instead of *удостоверение* or

⁷ Many facts observed by Avina (Авина 2003) in the Lithuanian language hold true for Latvian as well.

⁸ "Is it possible to consider local views of the norm as the norm?" (*Unless otherwise stated, the translations are those of this article's author*).

сертификат) is very common in colloquial speech and rather common in newspapers (although usually in quotation marks), but this word is unlikely to be found in documents, or in high speech. *Самориск* (see 1.1.), however, is completely unmarked, and can be used anywhere, including official documents. Respectively, *ринда* is placed near the lower end of the scale, *апиециба* — higher, and *самориск* near the higher end. Such “official” regionalisms will be the focus of my interest. This phenomenon has received little attention in literature, while it is of importance in understanding the status of Russian in Latvia in relation to mainland Russian.

Second, regionalisms may be divided into those which are names of endemic realia (and have no equivalent in mainland Russian) and those which are not. I will focus on the latter. This opposition seems to be binary, but in fact some cases turn out to be borderline (see for example the case of *счёт сделки* in section 3).

Third, speakers might be aware that the word they are using is unusual, or they might not be. It is often difficult to determine whether they are. In case of *апиециба* they almost certainly are — this is an ironic use of a foreign word, while in the case of *самориск* they most likely are not (the same holds true for most of my examples, and this will be discussed in section 4).

The work is actually a description and a quantitative analysis of 22 official regionalisms encountered in Latvian Russian. In section 2 I describe the materials and methods used, in section 3 I present the results, and in section 4 I conduct a concluding discussion.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Sources of regionalisms

Most of the examples come from my experiences working as a translator (two of them entered the “Dictionary of Russian cities”). The studies mentioned above, discussions on the web⁹, the materials of the “Standardized Translation of Latvian Realia”¹⁰ dictionary, and focused analysis of different documents in Latvian Russian were also used.

2.2. Qualitative and quantitative verification

Each lexical item discussed in the paper was checked in at least two ways: in Google (to check whether the supposed official regionalism was **official** in Latvia) and in the Integrum database (to check whether it was a **regionalism**).

Integrum is a database of the Russian-language media, which includes regional and foreign media as well. While a Google search allows one to see whether a lexical item is indeed encountered in official contexts (websites of state institutions, or business companies, or other model texts), it is not very well suited to quantitative analysis. I am therefore making an assumption that the frequency of a lexical item in the Latvian press will reflect how common it is in Latvia, and shall rely on Integrum’s output.

Integrum returns the number (the exact number, unlike internet search engines) of documents in which the query was encountered. In order to check the endemism of a lexical item, one has to find the ratio (R) of the number of found documents from Latvia (LV) to the total number of

⁹ This discussion was a particularly useful source — <http://www.politika.lv/508/did/6084/>

¹⁰ <http://realijas.venta.lv/>

found documents (T) and compare it with the default ratio. The default ratio would be the ratio (R_c) of the number of all the documents from Latvia (LV_c) to the number of all the documents in the database (T_c). I estimate LV_c as $7.2 \cdot 10^5$ and T_c as $5.2 \cdot 10^7$, R_c then being 0.014.

If a regionalism does not exist in mainland Russian, or has a different meaning, or has different status (slang, archaic or vulgar, for example), then this should affect its frequency, and R should then notably differ from R_c . See next section for a discussion of what is a notable difference.

Integrum's output is noisy. First, Latvian regionalisms may be used in the mainland press as well — when writing about Latvia. This is ignored: all such occurrences were not included into LV. Second, due to search engine imperfection, some documents are included in the output twice (this affects both LV and T). Third, words which have several meanings (one of them regional) tend to give a less clear picture: if we do not filter out the irrelevant meanings, T is larger than it should be, and R is smaller. Fourth, in some cases homonymy with proper names can occur.

In order to deal with the latter two problems, queries that contained not just the lexical item but also a certain context were sometimes used. In some cases, when the output was small (and errors were more likely to distort the final result), a full manual check of all the occurrences was performed to deal with the latter three problems. The former is reported as *query* in the column “correction” in Table 1 (the exact queries used each time are not reported for the sake of brevity), the latter — as *manual*.

All the searches were performed in August-September 2010.

2.3. Statistical verification

In quantitative studies, the most common way to confirm that the observed results are real and worth noting is significance testing, or calculating the probability that results could have occurred by chance. Significance testing answers the question “is the observed effect (likely to be) random?” This method, however, has important limitations. First, it does not say anything about how large the effect is. Second, when we are dealing with language corpora, we actually know that the result is never random, since language is not random (see Kilgarriff 2005 for detailed argumentation). Large samples (and we have rather large samples here) can make effects visible, even if they are very small or trivial.

Significance testing for my data (one-sample proportion test with continuity correction) shows that all the differences between R and R_c are significant ($p < 0.001$ in all the cases). However, it shows the same for very many words which are not regionalisms at all, including the most common words (the conjunction ‘and’, for example). The reason is described above: language is not random, and large samples show that there is some effect. We know nothing, however, about what this effect is, how large it is and whether it is important (since it arises for almost every word, it most likely is not).

One way to deal with these problems is to use another measure — effect size (ES) — which shows how large the effect is. In behavioural sciences it becomes more and more common to report ES (APA 2010), and in linguistics this trend is also present (Perry 2005: 224).

Cohen (Cohen 1988: 181) proposed the following measure for ES when comparing proportions:

$$h = 2 \arcsin \sqrt{p_1} - 2 \arcsin \sqrt{p_2}$$

In our case p_1 is R, p_2 is R_c .

This measure can be larger than 1. Cohen proposes the following very rough guidelines: effect is called *small* if $h > 0.20$, *medium* if $h > 0.50$ and *large* if $h > 0.80$.

Since p_2 is always equal to R_c , we know the maximum possible value of h in our study ($h_{\max} = 2.90$). For the sake of clarity I normalize h and report $h_n = h/h_{\max}$. Cohen's guidelines then transform to 0.07, 0.17 and 0.28. Note, however, that they are not meant to be universal (besides, they were designed for behavioural sciences). A better guideline might be derived from the fact that when counting ES for non-regionalisms h_n is never larger than 0.10.

2.4. Codex analysis

Section 2.2. describes the analysis of the production of model writers. However, it is also interesting to consider whether regionalisms can be found in the codex. To check this, all the regionalisms and their translations into Latvian were looked up in all the large Latvian–Russian and Russian–Latvian dictionaries published after the collapse of the USSR (except for reprintings of the older dictionaries), as well as in the electronic dictionary *Letonika.lv*, and in the AkadTerm, the terminology database of the Terminology Commission of the Latvian Academy of Sciences.

3. Results

The findings are summarized in the table 1. RU is the number of documents from Russia, $type$ is a type of innovation. Examples of use (reproduced without any corrections) and more detailed descriptions are provided for some items below. They also contain an analysis of different types of innovations.

#	Vocable	R	LV	RU	T	h _n	correction	closest mainland analogue	meaning	type
1	абсолювент	1.00	4	0	4	1.00	manual	выпускник	graduate	borrowing
2	акцептировать (проект)	0.67	4	0	6	0.58	query+manual	одобрять, утверждать	approve, accept	borrowing, expansion
	акцептовать (проект)	0.50	6	6	12	0.46	manual			
	акцептирование (проекта)	1.00	2	0	2	1.00	manual	одобрение, утверждение	approval, acceptance	
	акцептование (проекта)	1.00	1	0	1	1.00	manual			
3	волость	0.24	10806	28612	44918	0.27	none		small adm.-terr. unit	restoration
	волостной	0.17	1946	7209	11498	0.21	none		pertaining to that unit	
	волостной суд	0.43	125	160	288	0.41	none		court of that unit	
4	годовая декларация о доходах	0.76	135	28	178	0.65	none		annual income declaration	quasi-calque
5	капитальное общество	0.80	4	0	5	0.68	query+manual	хозяйственное общество	business, business company	calque
	общество капитала	1.00	23	0	23	1.00	query+manual			
6	народное голосование (референдум)	0.28	225	500	814	0.30	none	референдум	referendum	quasi-calque
7	нежизненное страхование	0.67	4	2	6	0.58	manual	страхование, не связанное с жизнью	non-life insurance	calque
8	обхозяйствовать	1.00	44	0	44	1.00	manual	управлять хозяйственной деятельностью	manage	calque
	обхозяйствование	0.96	270	6	281	0.86	none	управление хоз. деятельностью	management	
	обхозяйствователь	1.00	16	0	16	1.00	manual	управляющий хоз. деятельностью	manager	
9	оплаченный капитал	0.35	183	294	529	0.35	none		paid-in capital	quasi-calque
	оплаченный основной капитал	0.90	631	44	704	0.77	none		share capital	
10	перенятие	0.64	1215	485	1896	0.56	none		taking-over	quasi-calque

Table 1. Official regionalisms (see continuation on the next page)

#	vocable	R	LV	RU	T	h _n	manual check	closest mainland analogue	meaning	type
11	подходный налог с населения	0.85	2513	364	2949	0.73	none	налог на доходы физических лиц	personal income tax	restoration, calque
	подходный налог с предприятий	0.80	1807	241	2271	0.68	none	налог на прибыль организаций	corporate income tax	
12	присяжный адвокат	0.64	803	87	1258	0.56	none	адвокат	lawyer, advocate	calque
13	продекан	0.67	65	17	97	0.58	none	заместитель декана	vice dean	borrowing
14	регула	0.88	86	3	98	0.75	query	постановление, норматив	regulation	borrowing
15	рефлектант	0.96	23	1	24	0.86	manual	абитуриент	prospective student	borrowing
16	самориск	1.00	33	0	33	1.00	manual	франшиза	deductible, excess	calque
17	сениор	0.72	288	96	399	0.62	query	пожилой человек	senior	borrowing
	сениорский	0.67	6	2	9	0.58	manual	относящийся к пожилым людям	of/for the seniors	
18	спорт (школьный предмет)							физкультура	sports	calque
	учитель спорта	0.75	12	4	16	0.64	manual	учитель физкультуры	sports teacher	
19	счёт сделки	0.97	28	0	29	0.87	query+manual	счёт эскроу, (банковский) аккредитив	escrow account	calque
20	таксация (налогообложение)	0.48	678	n/c	1411	0.45	none	налогообложение	taxation	borrowing, expansion
	таксационный год	1.00	76	0	76	1.00	none	фискальный год	taxation year	
	год таксации	0.98	366	5	372	0.91	none			
21	товарищ (заместитель)							заместитель	deputy	restoration
	товарищ председателя	0.33	256	507	784	0.34	none	заместитель председателя	deputy chair	
22	хабилитированный	0.96	276	12	289	0.85	none		habilitated	borrowing
	хабилитация	0.50	5	5	10	0.46	manual		habilitation	

Table 1 (continued). Official regionalisms

Абсолвент/Абсольтвент

(1) Среди абсольтвентов второй студии (1946–1949) были такие выдающиеся личности, как Харийс Лиепиньш, Вия Артмане, Эдуард Павулс и Валентин Скульме¹¹ (website of the Dailes theatre)

This is a borrowing from Latvian *absolvents* (fem. *absolvente*). Despite the spelling *абсольтвент* in the example, the spelling without a soft sign is more popular (no occurrences for *абсольтвент* in *Integrum* from Latvia, although quite a few from Lithuania — it seems there already is a distribution of spelling variants between these two countries).

¹¹ “Among the graduates of the second studio (1946–1949) were such outstanding individuals as Harijs Liepiņš, Vija Artmane, Eduards Pāvuls and Valentīns Skulme”.

In most cases described below, there are obvious factors which account for the emergence and the establishment of a regionalism. In this case, however, the reason is unclear. This might explain why it is (still) rather rare in comparison with most of the other regionalisms.

Акцентировать/Акцентовать/Акцентирование/Акцентование

(2) *После рассмотрения Строительное управление города Риги принимает решение акцентовать/не акцентовать строительный проект*¹² (website of the City Development Department and Riga City Construction Board of the Riga City Council)

The word *акцентировать* actually exists in standard mainland Russian in two terminological meanings: chemical (*акцентировать электрон* — ‘accept an electron’) and financial (*акцентировать вексель* — ‘accept/honour a bill’). In Latvian Russian it is used in a wider sense: to approve an application, particularly a construction project. *Проект* is not the only word that can be combined with *акцент(ир)овать/акцент(ир)ование*: *заявление* (‘application’), *продление* (‘prolongation’), *поручение* (‘errand’), *ремонт* (‘repair’) and others can as well, but *проект* was chosen as the most salient.

As can be seen from the table, however, similar examples can be found in Russia as well: the financial meaning is being extended (probably under English influence) to other similar contexts. In Latvia this process is proceeding more quickly, due to Latvian influence (*akceptēt/akceptēšana*) and a general lack of standardization in Latvian Russian. The regionalism is thus classified as a result of both the calquing and the polysemy expansion.

Волость

(3) *Центр создан в селе Муцениеки Ропажской волости в расстоянии 17 километров от Риги, в бывшей военной базе Советской армии*¹³ (website of the Office of Citizenship and Migration Affairs)

Волость has existed in Russian as the name for an administrative-territorial unit since the 11th century. In the 19th and early 20th centuries it was the lowest unit, consisting of several villages and surrounding territories. The Latvian analogue was *pagasts*¹⁴ (the old borrowing from Russian *погост* — ‘cemetery’). In 1929 the unit *волость* was abolished in the USSR (Latvia became part of the USSR in 1940). After Latvia regained its independence, *pagasts* were reintroduced, and the official translation into Russian was *волость*. In Russia, some regions (e.g. Pskov region) have also been using *волость* as an administrative unit since 1993 (other regions use different terms, e.g. *сельсовет* — ‘village council’).

Thus, the concept of ‘волость’ currently exists both in Russia and in Latvia, but its importance and relative frequency are much higher in Latvia, where it is used nationwide. The Integrum data

¹² “After due consideration the Riga City Construction Board takes the decision to accept/not to accept a construction project”

¹³ “The Centre has been set up in the village of Mucenieki in Ropažu pagasts, 17 km from Riga, at a former Soviet Army military base”.

¹⁴ The translations into English recommended by the Ministry of Regional Development and Local Government are *rural territory* and *pagasts*, by “Standardized Translation of Latvian Realia” dictionary — *civil parish*.

do not show this very clearly, since in mainland newspapers there are numerous uses of this word in its historical sense, referring to the administrative unit in tsarist Russia. The results are more convincing, however, in the case of *волостной суд*.

We are dealing with a rather rare corollary of language contact here: the “extinct” word was restored in a foreign variety of Russian due to the influence of the Latvian language (and, as a matter of fact, the Latvian authorities).

Годовая декларация о доходах

People living in Russia submit annual declarations in the same way that people living in Latvia do, but usually say just *декларация о доходах* (R is 0.04 for that item, rather close to R_c : $h_n=0.06$), or *декларация о доходах за такой-то год* (‘income declaration for the year n’), if it is necessary to specify. It might be the case that *годовая декларация о доходах* becomes popular under the influence of the Latvian *gada ienākumu deklarācija* (‘annual income declaration’), but it would be strange to label this phenomenon as a calque: the item does exist in mainland Russian, and hardly as a result of calquing. I term this kind of regionalism (lexical items that exist in Russian and cannot thus be called calques, but that likely gain frequency due to the influence of the analogous item in Latvian) **quasi-calques**.

Капитальное общество/Общество капитала

(4) *Государственные предприятия и предприятия самоуправлений преобразуются в общества капитала...* (Website of the Register of Enterprises)¹⁵

(5) *...и которое из регистра предприятий внесено в коммерческий регистр как капитальное общество...*¹⁶ (ibid.)

The hyperonym for a stock company and a limited society in mainland Russian is *хозяйственное общество*. In Latvian it is *kapitālsabiedrība*, which is being calqued by Latvian Russian either as *капитальное общество* (lit. ‘capital society’) or *общество капитала* (lit. ‘society of capital’). It is interesting to note that these two variants can be encountered at the website of one and the same institution (thus showing the lack of standardization in Latvian Russian).

Народное голосование

(6) *В соответствии с решением Сейма народное голосование об участии Латвии в Европейском Союзе будет происходить 20 сентября этого года*¹⁷
(website of the Central Election Commission)

Народное голосование is a quasi-calque from Latvian *tautas nobalsošana* ‘referendum’. This is a quasi-calque, since the expression *(все)народное голосование* exists in Russian. It can mean ‘referendum’, but the official term in Russia is *референдум*, and *народное голосование* can be used to denote any popular vote.

¹⁵ “State enterprises and local authority enterprises are transformed into businesses”.

¹⁶ “...is taken from the Register of Enterprises and listed in the Commercial Register as a business”.

¹⁷ “In compliance with decision of the Parliament of Latvia /Saeima/ the referendum on membership of Latvia in the European Union will take place on 20th of September of this year” (Translation by the Central Election Commission)

Нежизненное страхование

(7) *В Латвии это самый большой оплаченный основной капитал среди компаний нежизненного страхования...*¹⁸ (website of the insurance company Gjensidige)

This is a calque from the Latvian *nedzīvības apdrošināšana*, which, in turn, is a calque from the English *non-life insurance* (and/or similar expressions in other European languages). Mainland Russian has also been influenced by English, but that has resulted in another lexical item, *страхование «нежизни»* ('insurance of non-life'). The difference is that here *non-life* is translated as a noun, in Latvian Russian — as an adjective (Latvian does not have relative adjectives, so this opposition is irrelevant for the Latvian expression). Besides, *нежизни* is almost always written in quotation marks, and the term in general has somewhat lower status than *нежизненное страхование* in Latvia.

Обхозяйствовать/Обхозяйствование/Обхозяйствователь

(8) *...в середине декабря были заключены также договоры на обхозяйствование вредных для среды предметов и отходов электрического и электронного оборудования*¹⁹ (website of the Latvian Railway Concern)

These are calques from the Latvian *apsaimniekot*, *apsaimniekošana*, *apsaimniekotājs*. The verb *apsaimniekot* corresponds to the verb *manage* in a rather broad sense: to manage a building, a territory, to manage waste etc. There is no one-word analogue in Russian — actually, even a multi-word analogue is not obvious: *обслуживать*, *управлять*, *управлять/заниматься хозяйственной деятельностью* are partial synonyms. Obviously, this lack of an analogue is an important factor in the stabilization of this regionalism.

Оплаченный капитал/Оплаченный основной капитал

(9) *Hansabanka теперь имеет наибольший оплаченный основной капитал в банковском секторе Латвии*²⁰ (website of Swedbank, former Hansabanka)

It is not clear why these lexical items are used more frequently in Latvia than in Russia (especially the latter). Linguistically the frequency of these items might be accounted for, at least partially, by the influence of the Latvian words *patatkapitāls* and *apmaksātais patatkapitāls*, thus they are classified as quasi-calques.

Перенятие

¹⁸ “This is the largest paid-in share capital among Latvia’s non-life insurance companies”

¹⁹ “In mid-December contracts were signed for the management of objects that are harmful to the environment and waste from electrical and electronic equipment”.

²⁰ “Now "Hansabanka" has the largest paid-up shared capital on the banking sector of Latvia” (Translation by Swedbank)

(10) *Право на перенятие полномочий*²¹ (State Administration Structure Law, from website of the Cabinet of Ministers of Latvia)

The word *перенятие* exists in mainland Russian and is present in dictionaries, but, as we can see, its frequency in Latvia is unexpectedly substantial. This is a quasi-calque from the Latvian *pārņemtāna*.

Подходный налог с населения/Подходный налог с предприятий

(11) *Подходный налог с населения на доходы от хозяйственной деятельности, если они не являются объектом подоходного налога с предприятий, рассчитывает и налоговые зачисления в бюджет осуществляет плательщик...*²² (website of the State Revenue Service)

These are calques from Latvian: *iedzīvotāju ienākuma nodoklis* and *uzņēmumu ienākuma nodoklis* respectively. However, the former is most likely itself an older calque from Russia, since in the USSR the exact official name for this kind of tax was *подходный налог с населения*. The name used for corporate income tax varied at different times, one example being *подходный налог с предприятий и хозяйственных органов кооперативных и общественных организаций*. It was not used very often in that form, however, so the Latvian term for this kind of tax is most likely a reconstruction by analogy with personal income tax, and the same then holds true for Latvian Russian. Note that the resulting nomenclature is more regular than in standard Russian.

Присяжный адвокат

(12) *Статья 4 закона устанавливала, что в Латвии адвокатами могут быть и практиковать могут только присяжные адвокаты и помощники присяжных адвокатов Латвии*²³ (website of the Constitutional Court)

This is a calque from the Latvian *zvērināts advokāts*. All the attorneys are sworn attorneys, both in Russia and in Latvia. However, the expression *присяжный адвокат* is almost never used in Russian (for the most part the non-Latvian occurrences do not come from Russia; Estonia is the main source), people say just *адвокат*. In tsarist Russia the term *присяжный поверенный* was used in the same sense.

It is particularly noteworthy that two Latvian–Russian dictionaries (Kalniņa 2002, Kalniņš 2004) translate *zvērināts advokāts* as *присяжный адвокат*. This is a rare example of differences entering the codex (although these dictionaries are rather the periphery of the codex: they are neither the largest nor the most authoritative).

Продекан

²¹ “Right to Take Over of Authorisations” (translation by the Cabinet of Ministers)

²² “Personal income tax amounts on income from business activities that are not an object of taxation with corporate income tax shall be calculated and paid into the budget by taxpayers” (translation by the State Revenue Service)

²³ “Article 4 of the Law determines that only advocates, admitted under oath (sworn advocates) and sworn advocate assistants shall be allowed to act and practice as advocates in Latvia”. (translation by the Constitutional Court)

(13) *Продекан Юридического факультета Латвийского Университета, ассоциированный профессор Д.юр. Янис Лаздиньш (стоит, справа) после этого торжественного мероприятия тоже станет присяжным адвокатом*²⁴
(website of the Supreme Court)

This is a borrowing from the Latvian *prodekāns*. One of the reasons why it pushes the original Russian terms out is that *заместитель декана* (lit. ‘deputy dean’) is too long and the shortening *замдекана* is informal.

Регула

(14) *Регула Европарламента и Совета № 2037/2000 «О веществах, разрушающих озоновый слой» от 29 июня 2000 года) определяет порядок, в котором требования Монреальского протокола выполняются странами-участницами Европейского Союза*²⁵ (website of the the Latvian Environment, Geology and Meteorology Centre)

Регула is a borrowing from Latvian which denotes the regulations issued by the authorities of the European Union. Such regulations of course play a much more important role in Latvia than in Russia, but there is no obvious reason why they should receive a special name.

Рефлектант

(15) *Рефлектант имматрикулируется на программу обучения приказом ректора*²⁶ (website of the Baltic International Academy)

This is a borrowing from Latvian *reflektants*. AkadTerm (AkadTerm) offers the Russian translation *рефлектант* for this word. This time the regionalism is found at the very heart of the local codex.

Самориск

(16) *Клиенту желательно помнить, что в полис может быть включен самориск, с учетом которого компенсация при страховом случае не выплачивается либо клиенту надо будет компенсировать его из своих средств до ремонта объекта*²⁷ (website of the SEB Banka bank)

This is a calque from Latvian *pašrisks*, which, in turn, could be a calque from Scandinavian (Swedish *självrisk*, Norwegian *selvrisiko*), since Scandinavian companies own a large share of the Latvian insurance market.

²⁴ “Prodean of the Law Faculty, University of Latvia associated Professor Dr. iur. Janis Lazdins (standing on the right) after this event also will become a sworn advocate” (translation by the Supreme Court)

²⁵ “Regula Nr. 2037/2000 „On Ozone Layer Depleting Substances” of the European Parliament and the European Council of the 29th of June, 2000 defines the order of fulfillment of the Montreal Protocol requirements by the European Union memberstates” (translation by the Latvian Environment, Geology and Meteorology Centre)

²⁶ “An applicant can be immatriculated to the education program by order of the rector”

²⁷ “The client should remember that the policy might include a deductible for which no compensation is paid, or to the extent of which, the client has to cover repair costs from his own funds” (translation by the SEB Banka bank)

Самориск has two obvious advantages over the mainland *франшиза*: first, it has a very clear inner form, second, it is not homonymous (*франшиза* can also mean ‘franchising’).

Сениор/Сениорский

(17) *Особые возможности для сениоров*²⁸ (newspaper of the Latvian Language Agency “Atslēgas” #34, 11.05.2006)

Сениор (sometimes spelled *сеньор*) is a borrowing from the Latvian *seniors*. This regionalism is shorter than the mainland analogue *пожилой человек*: besides, in Russian it sounds euphemistic and polite.

Спорт (учитель спорта)

(18) *...и в 55 лет должны уходить на пенсию тренера и учителя спорта*²⁹ (website of the Latvia Trade Union of Sports and Tourism)

The word *спорт* (‘sport’) exists of course in mainland Russian, but not as the name of the school subject which since Soviet times has been called *физкультура* (shortening from *физическая культура*, lit. ‘physical culture’). The query *спорт* returns too many examples for analysis, so *учитель спорта* was used.

Счёт сделки

(19) *Счет сделки гарантирует нашим клиентам дополнительную безопасность при различных видах сделок купли-продажи*³⁰ (website of the Aizkraukles Banka bank)

This is a calque from the Latvian *darījuma kants*. There exist many similar banking services, which can be different in different countries. The situation can be briefly described as follows: in Latvia, escrow accounts for private customers are offered by all the banks and are relatively popular. In Russia, the same service is not always available to private customers, and is in any case less popular, and so there is no single uniformly accepted name. The most precise name would be *счёт эскроу*, but this is usually used when speaking about the UK banking service. The name (*банковский*) *аккредитив* ‘(bank) letter of credit’ is sometimes used about the same service offered by some Russian banks. Originally, *аккредитив* implied that a customer takes a loan, i.e. the bank pays its own money first (it never does in the case of *счёт сделки*). In Latvian Russian, *аккредитив* is used in this very way. In mainland Russian, however, this distinction has been partially lost, and *аккредитив* can be used as a synonym to the Latvian Russian *счёт сделки*.

Таксация/Таксационный год

²⁸ “Special opportunities for seniors”

²⁹ “...and at the age of 55 coaches and sports teachers should retire”

³⁰ “An escrow account guarantees our customers additional security of purchase and sale transactions” (translation by the Aizkraukles Banka bank)

(20) *Таксационный год обычно совпадает с календарным годом, но он также может и не совпадать, если иначе не предусмотрено уставом компании*³¹
(website of the Investment and Development Agency of Latvia)

The main meaning of the word *таксация* in modern mainland Russian is ‘forest valuation’, and the term is used mostly in forest management. However, the more common meanings of ‘price fixation’ and ‘estimate’ are also present both in dictionaries and in speech, though much more rare. The meaning ‘imposition of taxes’ is not present in dictionaries and very rare in speech. The same is true of the adjective *таксационный*.

In Latvian Russian, however, the latter meaning is very common, especially when denoting a taxation period/year, obviously under the influence of Latvian *taksācijas gads*. This can be demonstrated by the unusually high incidence of the word *таксация* itself, but even more clearly by the queries *таксационный год* и *год таксации*.

The regionalism is thus classified as the result of both the calquing and the polysemy expansion.

Товарищ (товарищ председателя)

(21) *Планируется, что это будут Президент страны Валдис Затлерс, Президент министров Валдис Домбровский и товарищ председателя Сaeйма, председатель Юридической комиссии Винета Муижниецe*³² (website of the Supreme Court)

This is another example of restoration: *товарищ* (lit. ‘comrade’) in the meaning ‘deputy’ existed in tsarist Russia and was calqued by Latvian: the word *biedrs* ‘camrade’ acquired the same meaning. In the USSR this term was abolished, and the words *товарищ* and *biedrs* were both used as a default form of address. These uses were abolished after the collapse of the USSR. In Latvia *biedrs* meaning ‘deputy’ was then restored, and entered Latvian Russian as well.

It would not make any sense to search just for *товарищ*, and *товарищ министра* returns too many historical contexts. Thus, the query *товарищ председателя* was used.

Хабилитированный/хабилитация

(24) *1999г. – хабилитированный доктор педагогических наук*³³ (CV of the Minister for Education and Science Tatjana Koķe, website of the Cabinet of Ministers)

It is difficult to state the exact source of this borrowing: while the Latvian *habilitēts/habilitācija* has certainly played the major role, these words already existed in Russian, borrowed either from German (where this notion is most relevant) or other

³¹ “The taxation year usually coincides with the calendar year, but it may not coincide, unless otherwise specified in the company statutes”

³² “It is planned that it will be the President Valdis Zatlers, the President of Ministers Valdis Dombrovskis and assistant of the chair of Saeima, the Chair of Legal Commission Vineta Muizniece” (translation by the Supreme Court)

³³ “1999 – Habilitated Associated Professor in Pedagogical Sciences” (translation by the Cabinet of Ministers)

European languages. The variant *габилитированный/габилитация* is extremely rare (but it is dominant in Lithuania).

In mainland Russian the analogue for *габилитированный доктор наук* (the highest academic degree) is simply *доктор наук*. In Latvian Russian that would mean the lower degree, which in mainland Russian is called *кандидат наук* (lit. ‘candidate of sciences’). These differences between the systems make the regionalism necessary: since the lower degree, according to the European tradition, is just *доктор*, the higher degree has to receive another name.

4. Discussion

The analysis has shown that there is partial endonormativity in Latvian Russian, both in model writers and in codex. 22 lexical divergences were described.

4.1. Reasons

There are various reasons why these innovations emerge and become stable, replacing the mainland analogues. The most fundamental reasons, relevant to all the examples, are the influence of Latvian and the general lack of standardization of Russian in Latvia, making it more open to innovations. A third important reason, relevant to almost all the examples, are lexical gaps. When the Soviet Union collapsed, neither Latvian nor Russian had any names for many of the concepts that quickly became of importance. Both languages have filled the gaps, but in the case of Russian in Latvia the influence of Latvian on the choice of fillers was often larger than the influence of mainland Russian.

Other reasons are less general. There might be no good single-word analogue in mainland Russian (*обхозяйствовать, продекан*), or the mainland analogue may be less “convenient” (for example, it may have a less clear inner form and/or be polysemous, as in the case of *самориск*), or the regionalism might sound more polite (*сениор*), or the concept may be less relevant and/or less known in Russia (*счёт сделки, народное голосование*: referenda happen more often in Latvia than in Russia), the nomenclature system might differ (*габилитированный доктор*: the simple *доктор* fills another slot in the system and thus cannot be used). All these factors undermine the suitability of the mainland analogue and help the regionalism to establish itself.

4.2. Types

Types vary from common and well-known calques and borrowings to rarer polysemy expansions and quasi-calques and even more exotic restorations. In many cases several processes are in progress at the same time, so the regionalism is classified into several types.

Note that the influence of Latvian is very direct in cases of borrowings and calques, less so in cases of quasi-calques (since it does not create a new term, but just helps to increase the frequency of the existing one). In the case of restorations, Latvian acts as a conservation medium, preserving the older Russian variant and then restoring it to modern Latvian Russian. The important feature of polysemy expansions is that they take place in Russia as well, which might lead to a similar result in mainland Russian in the future.

4.3. Attitudes and awareness

As has already been mentioned, when Russian speakers in Latvia use these items, they are usually unaware that they are regionalisms. In this case there is no reason to speak about their attitudes towards these words: they perceive them as perfectly normal.

In some cases, however, people notice that something is “wrong” with their Russian. See the following tweet by a lawyer from Riga (Ushakov is the current mayor of Riga and a native speaker of Russian):

(24) *бесит новояз "обхозяйствовать". Даже б.журналист Ушаков забыл слово "обслуживание".*³⁴

However, on the website of the same person’s law firm, the term *счет сделки* is used without any irony³⁵.

When regionalisms are visible, the attitude towards them is often negative, as in the above example. This depends on the regionalism in question: hardly anyone objects to *воласть*, whereas *абсолвент* is severely criticized. In general, borrowings and calques receive the most negative attitude, restorations — less so. These issues might, however, require separate research with a more detailed analysis.

4.4. Conclusion

Weiss (Вайс 2009: 258), in stating that legal language may be different in different countries, even if they share the same language (as Germany, Austria and Switzerland do), notes: «Вполне возможно, что в будущем подобное расщепление претерпит и русский язык закона, если, скажем, в Прибалтике будет он опять допущен в качестве языка законодательства и судопроизводства»³⁶.

The main claim of this chapter is that while Russian has not been granted this status, the split has already happened.

References

AkadTerm: Akadēmiskā terminu datubāze AkadTerm. <http://termini.lza.lv/term.php>.

Ammon 1989: Ammon, U. Towards a Descriptive Framework For the Status/Function (Social Position) of a Language Within a Country. In Ammon, U. (ed.) *Status and function of languages and language varieties*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 21–106.

Ammon 2005: Ammon, U. Plucentric and Divided Languages. In Ammon, U., Dittmar, N., Mattheier, K. J., Trudgill, P. (eds.) *Sociolinguistics: An International Handbook of the Science*

³⁴ “I am sick of the newspeak *обхозяйствовать*. Even the former journalist Ushakov forgot the word *обслуживание*”

³⁵ <http://www.petrovs.lv/index.php?page=118>

³⁶ “It is very possible that a similar split will also happen in Russian legal language, if it is once again allowed to become a language of legislation and legal proceedings in the Baltic states”

of *Language and Society*. 2nd edition, Vol. 2. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 1536–1543.

- APA 2010: *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association*. 6th edition. Washington, DC.
- Clyne 1992: Clyne, M. Pluricentric Languages — Introduction. In Clyne, M. (ed) *Pluricentric Languages: Differing Norms in Different Nations*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 1–9.
- Cohen 1988: Cohen, J. *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences*. 2nd edition. Hillsdale, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates
- Kalniņa 2002: Kalniņa, I. *Latviešu-krievu vārdnīca: ap 11 000 vārdu = Латышко-русский словарь: около 11 000 слов*. Riga: Avots.
- Kalniņš 2004: Kalniņš, H. *Русско-латышский, латышско-русский словарь: около 22 000 слов = Krievu-latviešu, latviešu-krievu vārdnīca: ap 22 000 vārdu*. Riga: Avots.
- Kilgarriff 2005: Killgarriff, A. Language is never, ever, ever, random. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, Vol 1-2, 263–275. Retrieved at <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.100.6901&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
- Official Language Law 1999: Valsts valodas likums. <http://www.likumi.lv/doc.php?id=14740>
- Perry 2005: Perry, F. L. *Research in applied linguistics: becoming a discerning consumer*. Mahwah, NJ: Laurence Erlbaum Associates
- Winford 2003: Winford, D. *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics (Language in Society)*. Blackwell Publishers.
- Авина 2003: Авина Н. Ю. К исследованию языка диаспоры: лингвистический аспект (на материале русских Литвы). *Русский язык в научном освещении*, №6 (2), pp. 5–13.
- Ахметова 2008: Ахметова М. В. Региональная вариативность терминов, связанных с городской недвижимостью (по материалам электронной базы периодики «Интегрум»). In *Компьютерная лингвистика и интеллектуальные технологии*. Вып. 7 (14). По материалам Международной конференции Диалог 2008. М.: ИПИ РАН, pp. 32–38.
- Беликов 2004а: Беликов В. И. Сравнение Петербурга с Москвой и другие соображения по социальной лексикографии. In *Русский язык сегодня. Вып. 3. Проблемы русской лексикографии*. М.: Ин-т рус. яз. РАН, pp. 23–38.
- Беликов 2004б: Беликов В. И. Yandex как лексикографический инструмент. In *Компьютерная лингвистика и интеллектуальные технологии*. Труды Международной конференции Диалог'2004. М., «Наука».
- Беликов 2006: Беликов В. И. Русское языковое пространство и технический прогресс. In *Русский язык сегодня. Вып. 4. Проблемы языковой нормы* / отв. ред. Л. П. Крысин. М.: ИРЯ РАН. 2006, pp. 62—76.
- Беликов 2007: Беликов В. И. Лексический узус в зарубежном русском и академические словари. In *Русский язык в странах СНГ и Балтии: Международная научная конференция / Отделение историко-филологических наук РАН*. — М.: Наука, 2007. Стр. 412—418.
- Беликов 2009: Беликов В. И. Лексический узус официальных документов и кодифицированная словарная норма. Unpublished, retrieved at http://www.philol.msu.ru/~otipl/new/main/articles/belikov/vib-ofic_uzus.doc
- Беликов, Ахметова 2009: Беликов, В. И., Ахметова, М. В. Статистическая оценка функциональных свойств лексики по материалам интернета. In *Компьютерная*

- лингвистика и интеллектуальные технологии*. Вып. 8 (15). По материалам Международной конференции Диалог 2009. М.: ИПИ РАН, pp. 25–30.
- Вайс 2009: Вайс Д. Судебная экспертиза и вклад лингвиста в интерпретацию закона. In Lunde, I., Paulsen, M. (eds) *From poets to padonki. Linguistic Authority & Norm Negotiation in Modern Russian Culture*. Bergen, 252–274.
- Диманте 2006: Диманте И. Языковая ситуация в Латвии. In *Valoda-2006: valoda dažādu kultūru kontekstā: zinātnisko rakstu krājums XVI /Daugavpils Universitāte. Humanitārā fakultāte*. Daugavpils: Saule, 2006, pp. 243–249.
- Диманте 2007: Диманте И. *Русский язык на территории Латвии: деловой аспект или язык документа*. In *VALODA – 2007. Valoda dažādu kultūru kontekstā. Zinātnisko rakstu krājums XVII*. Daugavpils: Daugavpils Universitātes Akademiskais apgāds "Saule", 2007, pp. 317–323.
- Клочко, Лигута 2004: Клочко Н. Н., Лигута Т. В. Русский язык в Латвии: социолингвистический профиль ситуации. *Вопросы филологии* №2 (17), pp. 101–107.
- Кузнецов 2000: Кузнецов А. М. Перспективы русского языка в Латвии. In *Тартуский университет. Кафедра русского языка. Труды по русской и славянской филологии. Лингвистика. Новая серия. III. Язык диаспоры: проблемы и перспективы*. – Tartu Ülikooli: Kirjastus. – 2000. pp. 77–83.
- Мечковская 2005: Мечковская Н. В. Постсоветский русский язык: новые черты в социолингвистическом статусе. *Russian Linguistics*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 49–70.
- Семёнова 1977: Семенова М. Ф. Из истории языковых взаимоотношений в городе Риге. In *Контакты латышского языка*. Академия Наук Латвийской ССР, Институт языка и литературы им. Андрея Упита. – Рига, «Зинатне», pp. 192–214.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to organizers and participants of the *Russian Language Outside the Nation* conference, without whom this chapter would have never been written, to Martin Paulsen, Ingunn Lunde, Tatjana Russita and Alexander Piperski, who read the manuscript or parts of it and made many valuable comments, to Lars-Eric Christer Johansson, who advised me on statistical methods, to Esther Sheynkman and Nadezhda Kiselyova, who helped me to access some of the publications listed in the “References” section, and to Kyrill Dissanayake, who made my English much less Russian.