

## **Economic Terminology in Latvian Cultural Discourse**

Transferring of various terms and research methods from social sciences to the humanities and vice versa is rife nowadays. In case of economics and culture this phenomenon takes place mostly at theoretical than at practical level. It has been caused not so much by theoretical finding, but became the supervention of displacements, penetration with mutual influence, getting inside of different fields of social life and activity. Our language reflects this concepts transferring process by adopting respective notions and terms.

The most characteristic examples of economics penetrating into cultural sphere and having impact on it are such terms as *cultural capital*, *cultural goods*, *cultural resources* etc. In fact, the opposite movement is evident as well. There are a big number of different issues about *business culture*, *culture of consumption*, *the art of selling*, *the art of asset management* and so on. Such transferring of concepts and terms is not formal or outward phenomenon. It has its base at people consciousness and it is one of the traits of modern society. It is noteworthy that culture often is judged using economic approach i.e. measuring contribution of culture not only for an economy but for a person too.

This process moves very fast in the post-Soviet spaces within which also Latvia is. The most interesting matter is inclusion and functioning of economic concepts and terms in cultural domain, as well specific features of these concepts appearing because of the new sphere of application.

Functioning of economic terms has its specific character in cultural domain that is determined by specificity of the *culture* concept. Probably the main specific feature is abstractedness of this concept. Terms in economics have fairly definite content that don't motivate arguments about it. At the same time the concepts of *resources*, *product*, *good*, *capital* etc. become rather indeterminate when ones are transferred to the cultural domain. Such terms as *cultural resources*, *cultural product*, *cultural goods*, *cultural capital* are metaphors. We have to operationalize our abstract thinking and use a lot of figures of speech for reasoning in cultural economics.

Both *culture* concept and economic terms in culture can be studied taking into account the findings of cognitive science. Analysis of the Latvian cultural discourse makes possible to identify and evaluate as the changes of public perception and attitude to culture, so expansion of economic thinking in cultural domain. The field of investigations can be documents of cultural politics, legislation, documents of local authorities, documents of cultural institutions, speeches of cultural workers, academic papers, texts in mass media, presentations at conferences and seminars etc.

First of all we need to analyze figurative thinking concerning *culture* concept. The case of culture personification seems very interesting. In accordance with the cognitive linguistics, personification is one of the most obvious ontological metaphors. In the contemporary Latvian scientific tradition, personification is explained as ascription of human qualities and competencies to animals, objects, and abstract concepts. At the same time the definition of personification formulated in Latvia in the pre-WW2 period was broader and even corresponding to the cognitive science. The analysis of the main current Latvian cultural political document *The Main Postulates of the Cultural Policy for 2006 – 2015* shows various ways how the concept *culture* is personified. Various metaphors can be defined, for example *culture as a living being*, *culture as a subject*, and further extension *culture as a creative subject* and *culture as an economic subject*. Public attitude to culture as to *child* that needs to be cared for is changing to perception of culture as *capital*. It can be noted that the clearer the economic assessment of culture is the weaker personification of culture becomes.

The term *cultural capital* combines two issues from different social fields. Nowadays capital is one of the most important categories in economics. The main capital characteristics are: it is limited, convertible, can be stored and has liquidity, creates added value. All of these features can be applied to cultural field as well. French researcher Pierre Bourdieu carried out the sociological conception of cultural capital that represents the collection of non-economic forces such as family background, social class etc. Cultural capital can transfer to economical capital and bring profit to its owner. In such case cultural capital can be defined as an asset, which embodies stores or provides cultural value in addition to whatever economic value it may possess. The stock of cultural capital give rise over time to a flow of services which may be consumed or may be used to produce further goods and services. The term *cultural capital* is still not widely used and often is misunderstood in Latvia. There are two of the most popular interpretations of the term: (1) public funds for the cultural sector, and (2) cultural heritage that has an economic value.

The same difficulties are with such terms as *resources*, *product*, *goods (commodities)*, which point at production characteristics in creation of cultural values. A meaning of these terms isn't unequivocal and clearly defined or formulated. The difference in the terms interpretation appears both in original Latvian texts and in the text of various European documents translated to Latvian. It should be noted that no one of these terms is included to any dictionary in Latvian.

The term *cultural resources* has at least four interpretations, such as (1) digital resources with cultural content, (2) economic resources that have a cultural i.e. symbolic value, (3) cultural resources in its sociological sense and (4) resources as provisions of cultural activity. The term *cultural product* can be used for marking the results of a cultural activity. The question remains whether such a product becomes a commodity or not. Not every one of cultural products can be interpreted as a *commodity* but only one that comes to a market. The concept of *cultural goods* has its narrow and broad senses. In the former case, these are cultural objects, and the term is applied to regulate the export of such objects. In the latter case, it can be every good that has been produced by creative approach, has a cultural value and causes an intellectual property.