

THE LATVIAN TRANSLATION SCENE AT THE BEGINNING OF THE 20th CENTURY

ANDREJS VEISBERGS

University of Latvia, Latvia

Abstract. The first decade of the 20th century was a period of huge advances and expansion in the Latvian translation scene. New, contemporary authors' works became available to Latvian readers. The Latvian readership was consciously being integrated into general European literary trends. It was also a heyday of periodicals that published numerous translations, including numerous novels. There are countless parallel translations even reaching double digits. Translations included various genres and the traditional Latvian interest in plays was obvious. German was gradually losing its dominant positions as both a source and intermediate language, Russian was advancing. This period also saw a change of generations among translators, and with the new generation women became visible in translation scene. Practically all Latvian writers were also active translators. The translation method changed from localisation to a fidelity mode with a tendency towards foreignisation. Frequently translations now had prefaces and explanations by the translators. Translated literature now ranged from serious classical works to modern ones and from pulp literature to high quality creations. The quality of translations was also very varied. The expansion of translation and the cultivation of new domains went hand in hand with the development of the Latvian language itself.

Key words: translation history, Latvian, censorship, Russification, publishers, orthography

INTRODUCTION

When analysing the Latvian translation scene, we can see a number of relatively distinct periods, each with its own characteristics. In the 20th century they are delineated by sociopolitical events: revolutions, wars and occupations. The period before the First World War is in this sense very distinct with a marked increase in book and especially periodical publishing, a huge growth in translations and a burgeoning interest in world culture. In contrast to previous periods, there is a particular interest in the quality of the originals and of the translations.

This period of Latvian literary links with other cultures and languages has been studied extensively as regards specific languages, and limited to fiction: Swedish (Stepiņš, 1983), Danish (Stepiņš, 1989), Norwegian (Burima, 2007), Finnish (Jundze, 2002), German (Vāvere, 1971; Kalnačs, 2005) and Hungarian (Gudriķe, 1999). However, these studies focus on the originals, their ideas and contribution to the development of Latvian literary thought. Issues of translation quality, translation language and the general translation scene have so far not been studied.

The choice of translations shifts from the entertainment genre to information and insight into literary processes, the works translated are more and more recent, thus introducing Latvian readers (and authors) to contemporary European trends and processes. Convergence with European standards fosters variety and democratisation in literature (Klekere, 2017).

This is promoted by an extensive and broad literary criticism that offers comprehensive and occasionally highly detailed information about the literary processes abroad and their potential importance for Latvian culture. The greatest Latvian poet and translator of the period, Rainis, puts this into words in a letter to the publisher Gulbis in 1909:

Something new and great can grow only from the absorption of the cultural universe. By devoting half of my life to translating the whole library of classics, I wanted to give the Latvian nation the foundation and opportunity to create something new and great of its own. (*Literārais*, 1961: 249; translation here and further mine).

This is a clear formulation of the defective stance: the need to absorb missing elements from others (Robyns, 1994). In translation criticism the quality and language of translations (which is gradually improving) does not attract sufficient attention. The emphasis is first and foremost on the ideas of the originals and the correctness of Latvian.

Āronu Matīss's index of translated fiction works, including periodicals (*Latviešu*, 1902) provides a certain snapshot of the translation scene before 1902: 1467 foreign writers of whom 759 are Germans, 241 Russians, 97 French, 58 English, 34 Polish, 9 Estonians, 3 Lithuanians. This shows the trend of the end of the 19th century. It should be pointed that Āronu Matīss was aware that the index was incomplete and requested information on translations, localisations, authors and translators to be sent to him as the availability of information was in a very 'sorry state' (Āronu Matīss, 1900: 3).

The beginning of the 20th century saw a change in the literary polysystem: the rapid growth of Nordic and Estonian translations, more Russian translations and a lower proportion from German, which hitherto had completely dominated the translation scene, as well as interest in other literatures. German, though, remained the dominant source and intermediary language.

THE SOCIOECONOMIC SITUATION AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY

The beginning of the 20th century saw fast economic development in the territory of Latvia as well as rapid social change. Astounding industrial growth turned Riga into the third city in the Russian Empire as regards the number of industrial workers. It was the fourth largest producer of goods and the largest export port of the Empire. Latvians, hitherto country people, poured into Riga and other towns. Thus, while in 1867 Latvians constituted 24 percent of Riga residents, by 1897 their proportion had reached 45 percent (Plakans, 1997: 71). The old system of social stratification was collapsing, the number of Latvians owning property growing fast. However, political power in the Baltic provinces remained in the hands of Russian governors, while the German barons retained their privileges and owned huge landed estates. There were no political parties and local elections were limited in scope. Latvians were still oppressed by the German (and in the east Polish) landlords, who controlled the land, as well as the Russian bureaucracy which had been implementing an active policy of Russification since the late 19th century. However, more and more Latvians managed to obtain a good education. The general educational level compared to Russia's was high: literacy was around 90 percent, similar to Estonia and Finland and the highest in the Empire. Only in eastern Latvia was it around 50 percent (Bērziņš, 2000: 287). This is important when considering reading habits. It should be also noted that many educated Latvians could read texts in German and Russian in addition to Latvian translations.

RUSSIFICATION

The last decades of the 19th century saw a severe Russification campaign in government institutions, the courts and education (Baltiņš, 2019: 97-102). There was a massive influx of Russians and an exodus of Latvians to Russia (landless peasants were offered land, and intellectuals could get good jobs in Russia). There was a gradual top-down Russification of the education system (Staris, 1987: 178-200) with elementary education largely in Russian from the beginning of the century. Latvian was retained only for religious education and minimal instruction in the native language. From 1898 school libraries were allowed to spend government money on books in Russian only (Plakans, 1997: 72). School Russification abated after the 1905 revolution, but started anew in 1913.

But these developments could not stop the increasing use of Latvian and of publishing. This, together the remarkable popularity of theatre, went some way towards compensating for the restricted use of Latvian in official communication. Latvians were metamorphosing from an agricultural and patriarchal society into a modern nation with its own particular culture. Patriotic, democratic and social democratic ideas were spreading fast, disseminated by *the New Current* (*Jaunā*

strāva) activists and their newspaper *Dienas lapa* (1886). More conservative ideas of nationalism were voiced by the *Riga Latvian Society* (*Rīgas latviešu biedrība*). *The New Current* movement disappeared when the newspaper was closed down and around 60 of its activists imprisoned or exiled to Siberia.

The unresolved national, social and political issues made the 1905 revolution a potent one. It involved not only the landless peasants and workers but a broad swathe of society and of the Latvian intelligentsia. A certain liberalisation followed the revolution, leading to an explosion of new periodicals, while many Latvian literary figures and translators had emigrated, learning the culture and language of their new countries of residence. The cultural horizons of the nation broadened exponentially.

CENSORSHIP

Censorship was at its most severe at the beginning of the century and it included translations. The Russian Empire had a system of pre-censorship: texts were scrutinised before printing and decisions depended on the censor's individual personality and views (Veinberga, 2018: 162). Until 1895, censorship had been comparatively relaxed about socialist literature and ideas. But when workers' associations and strikes started (Plakans, 1981: 258), censorship grew in severity: 'a mood close to panic prevailed in Latvian literary circles', as more was banned than allowed (Limane, 2004: 36). At the turn of the century censors were particularly on the lookout for socialist, Marxist and anarchist ideas, often even detecting them in economic texts where they did not exist (Apiņis, 2004: 35). There were various ways of circumventing censorship, such as changing the names of authors, avoiding taboo terms like 'socialism' (Valters, 1969: 184) or 'the agrarian question' (Deglavs, 1926), or by publishing outside Latvia, for example in St Petersburg.

Censors even took objection to fiction, for example, performances of both Jānis Vidiņš's and Rainis's translations of Schiller's *William Tell* were banned. They forbade performances of several plays by Gerhart Hauptmann. Some were allowed after the revolution but *the Weavers* (*Audēji*) was forbidden altogether, and was published abroad (Vāvere, 1971: 39). Translations of works by Frank Wedekind, Garlieb Merkel, Ibsen and Tolstoy were banned – even though Tolstoy was allowed in Russian. Publication of *War and Peace* was allowed only in 1903, in connection with his 75th birthday. Performances of Goethe's *Egmont* were banned (Kalniņš, 1965: 103). Once a translator was considered unreliable by the censors his translations were also suspect, this was the reason why many of Rainis's translations were ascribed to Aspazija (Gudriķe, 1989: 10).

The activities of various religious denominations were neither allowed nor forbidden by law, but censors interfered in the publication of religious literature by Baptists and some other denominations. These bans were contested in court and eventually repealed. By contrast, the Orthodox church was supported, and its religious writings extensively translated into Latvian.

Censorship was not limited to banning publications. Repressive measures often followed. Thus, the translator Edvarts Treimanis was imprisoned for six months for publishing the Latvian writer Veidenbaums (Kalniņš, 1965: 301); the editor of the newspaper *Dienas Lapa*, Jānis Pliekšāns–Rainis, was arrested and held for two days for publishing forbidden texts in 1895. In 1897 the Minister of the Interior suspended the newspaper for eight months and its editors Rainis and Pēteris Stučka, likewise the literary critic Jānis Jansons-Brauns, were exiled to Vyatka in Russia for five years in 1899. Many literary figures, publishers and translators (such as Kārlis Jēkabsons, Miķelis Valters, Andrejs Birkerts, Antons Austriņš, Dāvids Golts (Zeltiņš), Augusts Golts, Fricis Roziņš-Āzis, Ernests Arnis, Kārlis Krūza, Jānis Roze, Rūdolfs Jēpe, Jānis Jankavs, Pauls Dauge, Juris Kosa/Mauriņš, Pauls Skrābāns, Linards Laicens, Augusts Melnalksnis, Akuraters and Apsesdēls) were imprisoned and exiled after the 1905 revolution. Kārlis Skalbe fled with his wife and was imprisoned on return. Rainis and his wife Aspazija escaped to Switzerland. A major publisher, Jānis Ozols, and the poet and translator Jūlijs Dievkociņš were shot.

The revolution achieved a certain liberalisation: among the moderate concessions in the *October Manifesto* was the freedom of speech and the press. Post-censorship was now instituted instead of the pre-censorship used previously. The censor could now stop sales of a work, but only after the ban had been confirmed by the courts. This meant the banned works could actually be spirited away and disseminated. Thus, many formerly banned works could be published. Numerous periodicals could be established in the more liberal atmosphere and a wider range of issues debated. Various loopholes in the application of the law could be found in the moot censorship situation (Zvirgzdiņš, 2018). Thus, the censors confiscated Miķelis Valters's book on the ethnic issue, *Mūsu tautības jautājums (Our Issue of Nationalism)*, in 1914 but failed to eradicate it (Treijs, 2012: 45). Statistics show that 96 Latvian books were banned in the period between 1906 and 1913 (Apīnis, 2004: 42).

THE FOUNDATION LAID IN THE 19TH CENTURY

In order to understand the situation at the beginning of the 20th century it is necessary to evaluate the achievements of the 19th (Apīnis, 1991). Translations of serious classics and well-known contemporaries began to appear at the end of the century. The Neo-Latvians' idea that other nations' experiences and achievements should be employed in shaping Latvian culture and nation was bearing fruit. 'The nineties were a proud and messy time, when for the first time the cultural sources of Western Europe were thrown open to the Latvian nation' (Klaustiņš, 1908: 124-124). Despite Russification the current of Western intellectual life was becoming ever more important for Latvians (Zeiferts, 1903).

The number of Latvian titles published was growing fast. While slightly more than 30 books were published in 1856, the year 1860 saw already around

60 (Apinis, 1977: 162), 105 in 1875, 144 in 1885 (ibid.: 240) and 259 in 1895 (ibid.: 297). Despite increasing Russification, Latvians had grown accustomed to reading in their own language in the second half of the century. Literacy and publishing statistics both testify to this.

The last decades of the century were still dominated by sentimental and adventure stories, translated from German with the traditional long titles. Thorough localisation often makes it impossible to determine what is a translation and what an original writing, for example, Ernests Dinsbergs and Ansis Leitāns took a totally free approach to the original (which could today be interpreted as a very advanced approach to the target audience within the *scopos* theory). However, the late 19th century also saw longer translations, for example, extended sentimental novels. As regards serious literature there were many translations of Heine, the brothers Grimm, Goethe, Schiller, Sudermann, Peter Rosegger, and numerous didactic stories by Franz Hoffmann. Latvian readers also had access to numerous Russian translations, with works by Turgenev, Lermontov, Pushkin, Chekhov (around 20 titles including the collected works), Tolstoy, Gogol, Nekrasov (in periodicals) and, at the end of the century, Gorky and Dostoyevsky (two novels). At the end of the century Scandinavian translations became popular alongside the traditional German and growing Russian menu. The early Nordic translations were exclusively done via German. English literature (Vilsons, 1971) was represented by Kipling, Dickens, Scott, Milton, Shakespeare, Byron, Hardy, Burns, Twain, Kipling. French literature was represented by translations of Maupassant, Zola, Daudet and Mérimée, and four novels by Verne, adapted and simplified. There were many translations of Polish authors such as Henryk Sienkiewicz and Adam Mickiewicz. The end of the century saw particular attention paid to Goethe, who was seen as a benchmark of the Europeanness that Latvians should strive for (Vecgrāvis, 2002). There was an abundance of translations of Goethe, both good and bad. There were also attempts to translate *Faust* (Zālītis, 1999). Jēkabs Māsēns and Kārlis Jannaus translated *Faust* before Rainis, but their translations remained unpublished. Rainis's translation of the *Prologue* appeared in the periodical *Mājas Viesa Mēnešraksts* in 1896, the rest followed in the subsequent editions in 1897. The book was published in 1898 (Note 1) and the translation was immediately recognised as an innovative landmark and a brilliant accomplishment. Rainis was deemed to be a 'congenial translator' (Note 2). In the 20th century Ansis Gulbis published Goethe's works translated by Rainis and Aspazija in seven instalments in 1903-1904.

Basic science and research publications in the mid-19th century were limited to schoolbooks (plus a number of books on geography and practical agriculture) but this changed towards the end of the century (Zanders, 2013: 333). The 1890s saw a diversification of translations. There were anthologies, collected works, selections, encyclopaedias and almanacs. Although German works retained their dominance, there was also an increase in translations from other languages. This was to a large extent a conscious process, since Jēkabs Velme, editor of *Austrums*, had pointed out that Latvians had grown so accustomed to German literature as

to be unable to understand products from other nations (Zanders, 2015: 204). The situation had to change.

It was normal not to pay the translator for periodical publications in the late 19th century, the translator just received a free copy of the newspaper or magazine. This meant that many potential translators with a good knowledge of languages and feel for style found other occupations, while translation work came into the hands of amateurs who did not care for quality: ‘The fee, half a kopeck for a 40-character line, came into being only around 1900’ (Melnalksnis, 1944: 2). The rudiments of translation criticism also emerged.

The second half of the 19th century saw the end of the long period when translations into Latvian were done by non-Latvians, mostly German pastors. Now the translators were native Latvians, some were gifted, others were poor amateurs. There was a change of generations around the turn of the century, with many productive translators dying around this time: Kārlis Stālbergis, Kārlis Krons/Croon, Vensku Edvarts, Berģu Jānis, Dinsbergs, Heinrihs Alunāns, Klāvs Ukstiņš, a.o.

But the following translators remained active also after the turn of the century: Fricis Adamovičs, Ādolfs Alunāns, Heinrihs Alunāns, Apsīšu Jēkabs, Jānis Asars, Andrejs Augstkalns, Bebru Juris, Ernests Birznieks-Upītis, Rūdolfs Blaumanis, Juris Brīvkalnieks (Georgs Freibergs), Kārlis Brīvnieks, Fricis Brīvzemnieks, Augusts Deglavs, Diženajo Bernhards, Jēkabs Dravnieks, Jēkabs Duburs, Jānis Aleksandrs Freijs, Krišjānis Goldmanis, Jānis Iņķis, Jēkabs Janševskis, Klāra Kalniņa, Matīss Kaudzīte, Jānis Kļaviņš, Lapas Mārtiņš (Rujenietis), Jēkabs Lautenbahs, Jānis Lauva, Teodors Lejas-Krūmiņš, Līgotņu Jēkabs, Jēkabs Māsēns, Mednieks Jorģis (Haralds Jēgers), Augusts Melnalksnis (Melnais Alksnis), Krišjānis Nātra, Ludvigs Pauls, Ērmanis Pīpiņš-Vizulis, Jēkabs Purkalītis, Jēkabs Rempēters (Liekais), Riemelis, Fricis Roziņš-Āzis, Jānis Rucelis (Sobolietis), Augusts Saulietis, Matīss Siliņš, Sniegonis (Ādolfs Ģērsons), Andrejs Stērste, Jānis Straume (Vaidelotis), Andrejs Sturms, Sudraba Edžus, Edvarts Treimanis-Zvārgulis, Antons Tullijs, Valdis (Voldemārs Zālītis), Late Veibele, Veismaņu Jānis (Pavasaru Jānis), Jānis Vidiņš, Kārlis Vilķers (Zvanpūtis), Mārcis Ziraks, a.o.

TRANSLATIONS IN EARLY 20TH-CENTURY PERIODICALS

1 TRANSLATIONS IN MAGAZINES

The most prominent feature of the 1900–1914 period was the abundance of translations in periodicals. It is sometimes characterised as an inundation, never seen before or since. As pointed out above, the tradition had already started earlier: the first Latvian literary magazine *Pagalms* (1880/81–1884, editor Lautenbahs) had published the Grimm brothers’ fairy tales translated by Apsīšu Jēkabs, occasionally attributed to the translator (Stepiņš, 1970: 24), as well as

poetry by Ovid and Heine, stories by Beecher Stowe, Turgenev and Lucian with commentaries by the translators Georgs Freibergs and Juris Brīvkalniēks. This magazine was followed by *Rota* (1884–1888), and *Austrums* (1885–1906), published in Moscow, Jelgava, Rīga and Cēsis offering a good selection of Goethe, Pushkin and Lermontov as well as various novels in instalments. *Mājas Viesa Mēnešraksts* (1895–1905, editor Pēteris Zālīte) published extensive translations, modern and classical, and numerous translated plays.

After pre-censorship was abolished, it became easier to establish periodicals. While previously this sphere had been dominated by a few relatively thick magazines covering a broad range of topics, the new periodicals tended to target their readers with a clear ideological or literary position. Many though were short-lived, others were stopped after the revolution: *Apskats* (1902–1905), *Vērotājs* (1903–1923), *Kāvi* (1905–1906), *Ziemas Naktis* (1906–1907), *Pret Sauli* (1906), *Dzelme* (1906–1907), *Svari* (1906–1907), *Stari* (1906–1908, 1912–1914), *Zalktis* (1906–1909), *Rīts* (1907), *Vārpas* (1908), *Tekas* (1909/10–1915), *Mājas Viesis* (1909–1910), *Izglītība* (1909–1911), *Domas* (1912–1915), *Vārds* (1912–1913), *Druva* (1911/12–1914) and *Skatuve un dzīve* 1913–1915). The instability was, of course, to some extent also determined by the limited readership, which made the enterprise unprofitable. However, some, like *Druva*, published numerous high-quality translations.

The authorities monitored publications attentively, thus *Rīgas avīze* (6. 2. 1900) referring to the Stolipin's circular about the compulsory registration of associations mentions the Russians' distrust of Latvians. This supposedly stems from the activities of such new papers as *Vārpas*, *Dzīve*, *Jaunā Dienas lapa*, while 'the proper Latvian movement has always been moderate, anti-revolutionary and friendly towards the government and State'. The newspapers and magazines mentioned had published unwelcome translations extensively.

2 TRANSLATIONS IN NEWSPAPERS

There were several well-established Latvian newspapers at the turn of the century, among them the first newspaper in Latvian *Latviešu Avīzes* (1822–1915) as well as *Mājas Viesis* (1856–1910) (Zelče, 2009), *Tēvija* (1884–1914) and *Baltijas Vēstnesis* (1868–1906, 1917–1920) (Grigulis, 1992: 58-66) linked to the *Riga Latvian Society*. After its closure it was followed by the largest circulation *Dzimtenes Vēstnesis* (1907–1917), with an extensive literary supplement carrying translations, criticism, informative articles of the literary scene abroad. A similar one was *Balss* (1878–1907), also with a supplement. A progressive socialist newspaper was *Dienas lapa* (1886–1905, 1913–1914), which used various titles in order to elude the censors: *Jaunā Dienas Lapa* (1905–1906), *Mūsu Laiki* (1906–1907), *Jaunā Dienas Lapa* (1907), *Mūsu Dzīve* (1907), *Baltija* (1907), *Rīgas Apskats* (1907–1908) and *Jaunā Dienas Lapa* (1908–1918). Each newspaper carried a novel in instalments.

As with magazines, new newspapers sprang up after liberalisation: *Rīgas avīze* (1902–1915), *Spēks* (1905), *Dzimtene* (1905–1906), *Dienas apskats* (1905–1906), *Darbs* (1906), *Latvija* (1906–1915), *Jaunais laiks* (1911–1930), *Jaunākās Ziņas* (1911–1940), *Lūdums* (1913–1919). For many the circulation figures were high: 75,000 for *Dzimtenes Vēstnesis* (1913) and 80,000 for *Jaunākās Ziņas* (1914) (Bērziņš, 2000: 496–497). In total there were 59 periodicals in Latvia on the eve of the First World War, most of them magazines.

Periodicals published numerous translations, a lot of poetry (rarely in book form), stories, essays, plays and novels. Thus, an average of two German novels were published in book form annually, but 3–4 in periodicals during this period (Daukste-Silasproģe, 2005: 584–5). Occasionally, translations in periodicals were republished in book form later. Translations in periodicals often omitted the translators' names or used undecipherable pseudonyms (*Latviešu*, 1902: Vii) and the titles frequently had been changed beyond recognition.

As there was stiff competition between the numerous periodicals, they tended to attack competitors for real or perceived mistakes and errors. *Mājas Viesa Mēnešraksts* and *Mājas Viesa literāriskais pielikums*, for example, published numerous translations. This was not to the liking of competitor *Baltijas Vēstnesis*, which kept finding fault with its rivals, usually pointing out language mistakes in the translations (Melnalksnis, 1944: 2).

BOOKS IN THE 20TH CENTURY

The book industry expanded fast in the first decade of the century and there was rapid growth of printing shops. In 1910, there were 79 printing shops, 45 of them in Riga, and most of them belonged to Latvians which was new development compared to the 19th century (Karulis, 1967: 116). Books were published not only in Riga and Jelgava, but also in minor towns, like Cēsis, Liepāja, Valmiera, Kuldīga, Limbaži and Piebalga.

Translations tended more and more to be of contemporary works about contemporary life and problems. Although the tendency towards Romanticism persisted and there was the traditional devotion to translating plays, gradually Latvians could read more contemporary works, as well as scientific literature. However, the Latvian writer and translator Kārlis Skalbe commented in 1908 that Latvians still remained the 'calendar-reading nation' and calculated that the number of 'people of culture' was around one thousand (Skalbe, 2002: 363–365). Calendar circulation indeed was in the tens of thousands, while book impressions usually hovered around 1000–2000.

The new century started with an ambitious work, indirectly pointing towards the trend of translations: an extensive anthology of world literature (Note 3), edited by Teodors Lejas-Krūmiņš and offering sample translations and information on foreign writers. It was also marked by yet another translation of Ibsen's *Nora* in book form, thus starting the series of Ibsen's plays which were

so popular at this time: Ibsen's *Nora* had been translated eleven times by 1902 (*Latviešu*, 1902: 89).

There was more translation than original writing and the quality was varied. This was recognised by the *Riga Latvian Society* in its review published in *Mājas viesis* (Note 4): 'The list of translations shows that they outnumber originals. Next to the works of genius there are third-rate productions, and the world of eternal ideas is invaded by coarse jokes and vulgarity'. The experts reported that banal plays were still localised by the elderly actors, but there was a demand for these plays. They listed authors and works that should be translated and it was stressed that translations should be from the original languages.

Apart from books in Latvian, books in other languages were also published in Latvia, mostly in German, Russian and Estonian. After the ban on Lithuanian was rescinded in 1904, Lithuanian books were also published in Latvia, reaching 15 titles in 1905 (*Ivbule*, 2006: 71).

The number of Latvian titles published was stable at the beginning of the century, above 200 books annually. During the last decade of the 19th century the number had fluctuated between 100 and 200. The peak was reached around 1910. Statistical data in previous studies have been unreliable, offering higher figures. It is possible that they include other types of printed material: sheet music, posters, programmes, newspaper supplements, books in other languages, etc. Thus, Plakans gives the following figures: 181 in 1884 and 822 in 1904 (Plakans, 1996-1997). Karulis suggests 731 in 1902, followed by 931 in 1903 and 822 in 1904 (Karulis, 1967: 121). Bērziņš gives 869 for 1913 (Bērziņš, 2000: 501). These are the figures generally quoted.

Our figures are based on Latvian National Library bibliography database (Online 1) and are much lower. Of course, some books may have been lost but the figures are as follows: 99 in 1884, 192 in 1892, 177 in 1894, 237 in 1900, 245 in 1901, 234 in 1902, 280 in 1903, 292 in 1904, 252 in 1905, 256 in 1906, 295 in 1907, 398 in 1908, 371 in 1909, 416 in 1910, 213 in 1911, 301 in 1912, 203 in 1913, 285 in 1914, 62 in 1915.

About half the books were fiction and the majority were translations. Some translations had been published by newspapers earlier. Thus, when permission was finally given to translate Tolstoy's *War and Peace* in 1903, the newspaper *Baltijas vēstnesis* gave it to Dievkociņš, but when he fell behind the deadlines it was given also to Jānis Rucelis. At the end of the year the novel appeared in book form with the translators' initials and a note that the first two chapters were translated by Dravnieks and the rest by pastor Rucelis (Note 5).

THE PUBLISHERS

Since the spectacular growth of Riga much of the publishing moved over from the traditional printing town of Jelgava to Riga at the end of the 19th century. Pūcišu Ģederts was the biggest publisher at the end of the 19th century, followed

by the newspaper publisher *Dienas lapa* (Peile, 1970: 64) and Augusts Golts. Henrihs Alunāns, the first Latvian publisher of scale, established in 1867, continued publishing in Jelgava and was active until 1914. Jānis Aleksandrs Freijs (a baptist pastor) started publishing in 1885 and continued producing numerous small-scale religious, spiritual and didactic works. His production is said to have exceeded 800 titles (Tervits, 1999: 81), but we can be sure of only around 300. One of the biggest publishers at the beginning of the century was *Ozola apgāds* in Cēsis (1895–1906) (around 200 titles) but he specialised in originals.

In its turn the *Useful Book Department of Riga Latvian Society* (*Rīgas latviešu biedrības Derīgu grāmatu nodaļa* (RLB DGN)) focused on the systematic translation of foreign literature, reference and science books. It was established in 1886 and operated as a subscription system, the books costing 10-25 kopecks. In contrast to the Latvian Society, it was more liberal, produced various educational books on foreign countries and even published Gorky's works of socialist orientation in 1901. The RLB DGN published around 15 titles a year. Each year it planned to publish a quality play in a new translation (Zanders, 2004: 73). Its series *Writers of other nations* (*Citu tautu rakstnieki*) was clearly aimed at expanding knowledge: the books contained biographies and information on the authors' other works. From 1907 the editor of the series was Lejas-Krūmiņš, who insisted on quality and translated himself. He turned out *Northerners' novelettes* in 1907, *Southerner's novelettes* in 1908, *Slavic stories* in 1911, *the New German novelettes* in 1913. The DGN series published a total of 25 titles containing works of 89 writers in the period from 1894 to 1915. DGN published translated fiction (for example, *King Lear* translated by Rainis in 1900) as well as books on geography, foreign countries, physics and other sciences. Pēteris Bērziņš started large scale publishing in the last decade of the 20th century. Dravnieks continued to publish various books, many translated by himself.

New publishers started up alongside the existing ones, and some of them were to become most important for Latvian publishing. *Gulbja izdevniecība* was established in 1903 (the books were also printed in St Petersburg, where censorship was laxer). Oskars Jēpe started publishing in Cēsis in 1905. Birznieks-Upītis established *Dzirciemnieki* (1908–1914) that published Latvian originals and numerous translations of Tolstoy, Gogol, Chekhov, Maupassant and other well-known writers.

Andrejs Jesens established the *Youth Library* (*Jaunības bibliotēka*) series in 1908/1909. It soon became *Jaunības tekas* (1909–1915) and published several translated stories. Parallel to that, his publishing house *Jesens apgāds* was established in 1910. He also established the *General Library* (*Vispārīga bibliotēka*) series (1912–1914) which sold small booklets, mostly of translated works, for 3 kopecks. Jesens's publications did not generally name the translator.

Finally, two publishers established in 1912 would have a remarkable future after the war: *Valters un Rapa* and *Jānis Roze*.

On the other hand, many publishers were very short-lived. Dievkociņš established the series *the New Library* (*Jaunā bibliotēka*), but only published two titles (Ķuzāne, 1980: 204): one was by him and the other translated by Edvarts Treimanis-Zvārgulis. Some series were published by more than one publisher, for example, the *Drama Library* (*Dramatiskā bibliotēka*) was issued by Rihards Millers, Augusts Golts and Pēteris Saulītis.

A particular place in publishing and translation is occupied by Ansis Gulbis (1873–1936) and his *Universal Library* (*Universālā bibliotēka*). He was fascinated by the literary achievements of Dravnieks and Andrejs Pumpurs in his early days, was later supported by Rainis and entered publishing around the turn of the century (Zanders, 2015: 373). Gulbis moved to St Petersburg in 1900 working for a Swiss trade company. There he established a publishing house in 1903 and announced subscriptions for various collected works, starting with Goethe, translated by Rainis and Aspazija (Note 6). Rainis was both the editor and translator for Gulbis. Publishing in St Petersburg was cheaper, and the censors were easier to deal with. He turned out six or seven booklets a month for the low price of 10 kopecks.

After the revolution his activities slackened as he felt insecure since he had published works of Marx and Karl Kautsky during the revolution. However, in 1911 he established the *Universal Library* series with far-reaching goals. The idea was borrowed from the German *Universal-Bibliothek* (*Verlag Philipp Reclam*, 1867) that specialised in classics. Rainis, living in exile in Switzerland, was again engaged as the editor and main translator. He wrote: ‘Latvians must become a cultural nation, and the only way to achieve that is by capturing the universal, the whole of world literature for themselves’ (Rainis, 1985: 410). Accordingly, he drafted a system of works to be published, focusing on world classics and introducing Latvians to European culture. The list included works by Ibsen, Goethe, France, Heine, Hauptmann, Nietzsche, Wilde, Shakespeare, Pushkin, Gogol, Tolstoy, Turgenev, Lermontov and Hauff, and important science books such as Darwin’s *On the Origin of Species*. At first, Rainis planned to translate everything himself, but he later dropped the idea and looked for other high-quality translators. He was merciless in his criticism, finding even Kārlis Skalbe not professional enough. Like *Reclam Verlag*, the series was started by Goethe’s *Faust*. In the first two years around 100 booklets were published, and over 200 before the outbreak of war (Karulis, 1977: 159). The print runs were large. Apart from Rainis, major translations were done by Aspazija, Jānis Jaunsudrabiņš, Kārlis Skalbe, Aleksandrs Būmanis a.o. The booklets were small, in yellow softcovers, and in a dense print, but they were cheap (10 kopecks). Rural schools received free copies. Parallel to these, separate translations by Rainis were published in quality editions (20–40 kopecks). The series offered a hitherto unprecedented overview of foreign writing to the Latvian reader, only some of the books had been translated before (Goethe, Nietzsche, Gogol).

The First World War interrupted this undertaking. However, Gulbis resumed publishing in Riga in 1918 and many of the earlier translations were republished.

TRANSLATIONS

Translated literature fostered an evolution in Latvian literary taste (Daukste-Silasproģe, 2015: 232) and served as a conduit of modernity. Translations appeared both in books and periodicals. Poetry was mainly published in periodicals, and extensively in *Mājas viesā literāriskais pielikums* and *Mēnešraksts*, *Austrums* and *Dienas lapa*. Periodicals in this period to a large extent served as book substitutes, as they carried numerous short story and novel translations. The era of extensive periodical translation in fact ended with the First World War. The choice between publishing in periodicals or book form to some extent also determined the approach to translation and its quality: translations in periodicals were frequently abridged and cut, passages were deleted to meet layout and space requirements, translations were more superficial, and the translator was frequently not identified.

Almost simultaneous publication of different translations of the same work was a frequent phenomenon both in periodicals and book form. In some cases, it seems the translators and publishers simply did not know what the other was doing. In other cases, it was deliberate, to demonstrate the translator's ability and mastery. Thus, Vilis Plūdons's translations of Lermontov's poems were followed by Dievkociņš's, who thought he could do better (Kuzāne, 1980: 156).

Parallel to the quality works, easy reading continued to be published in free translations and with the traditional long titles (Note 7). Broader knowledge of other languages than German meant that more works were now translated from the original languages. Use of German as an intermediary language decreased, while that of Russian in this function was on the increase. However, German still was the main conduit for foreign works. Thus, while Adamovičs was translating Shakespeare from English (*Julius Caesar*, *Macbeth* and *Richard III* in 1902) (Note 8), Rainis was translating *King Lear* (Note 9) from a German text at least at first, as the English original could not be obtained. The above-mentioned *Julius Caesar* is notable also for its translator's preface and historical introduction and extended paratexts providing information on Shakespeare, Ancient Rome and its leaders. There were also footnotes with various explanations, occasionally referring to Russian and French sources. Footnotes are also provided in the text of the play. Thus, it can be considered an academic translation.

The dominance of German works was gradually decreasing. At the end of the 19th century, English and French translations constituted around 4–5 per cent, Russian about 8–9 per cent and German around 70 per cent (Apīnis, 1977: 314). The number of Russian translations grew partly because of Russification and an improving command of Russian among educated Latvians, partly because so many great Russian writers were active during this period. It should be noted that the Russian originals translated were generally of higher quality than the German ones (Novērojumi 1905: 232); although pulp literature did also exist in Russian, it was rarely translated.

The tradition of translating plays continued on a large scale. Ibsen tops the list with 13 plays, he is the most popular foreign playwright of the period of 1900–14. Every year four to eight German plays were translated. Hauptmann was the most popular with eight plays published, and several more staged (Daukste-Silasproģe, 2005: 611). Some translators specialised in drama and a special series *the Small Theatre (Mazais teātris)* (1901–23), vol. 1–9, was translated and edited by Lejas-Krūmiņš. Translations and performances of foreign plays attracted extensive criticism and analysis.

Various almanacs, anthologies and collections were published. Thus, Ermanis Pīpiņš-Vizulis met the new century with a collection *the Harvest of Other Nations (Cittautu raža)* 1899–1901 in two volumes, where Ozols involved the best translators (Note 10). See also LejasKrūmiņš' series above. Plūdons translated a collection of 55 contemporary German poets (Note 11). Occasionally the plans fell through, for example, Jānis Kārstenis (Šmits) offered Gulbis a manuscript of contemporary Russian poetry, but for various reasons it was never published (Sproģe, 2002: 23).

Specific foreign authors were extensively translated sometimes. Towards the beginning of the century there are numerous Hungarian translations: Móric Jókay and Kálmán Mikszáth, the novels are translated both in book form and in periodicals such as *Baltijas vēstnesis*, *Dienas lapa*, *Rīgas avīze*, *Tēvija*, *Austrums* and *MV mēnešraksts*, in the latter often without the translator's name. Some works, like Jokaji's *Zilacīte*, appear in newspapers as well as book form (with a translator's preface) (Note 12). Some Mikszáth's stories were translated several times with different titles, there are often elements of localisation.

There was a gradual growth of translator's or editor's paratexts, thus when a translation of Arthur Bernède's book about Paris life was published it was introduced by an editor's preface stating that the book had had 25 impressions in Paris and should be perceived as a warning about the depravity of French modern civilization, that one 'should fear and flee' (Note 13).

Translators and publishers reacted to the political issues of the time, thus there are numerous translations from German (Note 14) dealing with the Boer Wars (1880–1881, 1899–1902) around the turn of the century.

1 TRANSLATIONS FROM GERMAN AND RUSSIAN

Translations from German were as yet dominant, especially in the domains of poetry, romantic stories and plays, and pulp literature. Some extremely popular authors of the period are today generally forgotten, for example, the Austrian writer Peter Rosegger whose stories about peasant life in the mountains virtually inundated the periodicals. A similar interest in Frank Wedekind (two translations of one novel in one year (Note 15)) subsided after 1910. Periodicals dwelled at length on what was happening on the German literary scene, for example, Thomas Mann's *Buddenbrooks (Budenbroki)* even though the works discussed had not usually been translated. There was a great deal of interest in

naturalism. German ideas, German culture and German views on what should be translated from other languages are strongly dominant. Although there was already an established focus on Goethe, Schiller and Kleist, more and more contemporary literature appeared, centring on city life and problems, women's experiences, socialism and aesthetic issues. Plays of Hauptmann and Sudermann were frequently translated, staged and discussed. Every year around half a dozen German plays were translated, totalling 68 in the period under discussion. Poetry was rarely published in books but dominated in periodicals. Similarly, short stories abounded in periodicals (Daukste-Silasproģe, 2005: 581). There were also twice as many German novels published in periodicals as in books (Daukste-Silasproģe, 2005: 585).

Merkel's *the Latvians* (*Latvieši*) was finally translated and published more than a century after the German edition, as well as his other works (Note 16). The demand for *the Latvians* was huge, the first impression of 5000 sold out immediately and 5000 more were printed. Merkel's *Wannem Ymanta* (*Vanems Imanta*) (Note 17) was translated twice (Būmanis and Lizete Erdmane) in a single year. Another earlier translation by Birznieks-Upītis had been banned by the censors (Apīnis, 2004: 35). *New German Novels* (*Jaunas vācu noveles*), compiled and translated by Lejas-Krūmiņš (Note 18), as well as Plūdons's anthology of *Modern German Poetry* (*Modernā vācu lirika*) appeared in 1913. With the beginning of war in 1914 German translations virtually stopped.

Translation from Russian was growing fast, led by Tolstoy: 55 titles in the period, and again there were parallel translations even in one year (Note 19) and numerous repeated editions despite censorship objections to several of his works (Apīnis, 2004: 37). A great number of Tolstoy titles were published in the two years following his death in 1910. Gorky scores 23 translations in the period, Chekhov 15 and Pushkin 8. There were also several translations of less-known authors like Leonid Andreyev and Vsevolod Garshin.

Some works were translated several times: Upītis translated Gogol's *Revident* for Gulbis although there was an 1871 translation by Alunāns. Fricis Brīvēznieks's translation of *Taras Bulba* was republished after half a century (Note 20). Gogol's *Dead Souls* (Pīpiņš-Vizulis' 19th century translation) was slightly edited and published again.

This period was characterised by an interest in contemporary Russian poetry, especially attractive to Latvian poets and translators disposed towards decadence (Sproģe, 2002). The translated poetry was published mostly in the magazines *Stari* and *Dzelme*. Viktors Eglītis was prominent among the translators, having published a collection of translations and numerous translations in periodicals, especially in *Mājas Viesa Mēnešraksts*. Antons Austriņš, Edvarts Virza, Kārlis Jēkabsons and Kārlis Krūza also produced numerous translations. Some translations suffered an unfortunate fate: the magazine *Dzelme* started publishing Bryusov's novel *the Fiery Angel* translated by Dambergs and retitled *My Biography* (*Mana biogrāfija*) in 1907, but it was cut short abruptly. In 1908

the magazine *Stari* made a fresh attempt with a translation by Austriņš, but it was abridged and was soon abandoned. In the first instalment it was promised that translator's explanatory notes would be provided at the end of the novel. In the second instalment some translator's footnotes appeared, but this was also the end of the publication effort. Many technical, legal and government texts were translated from Russian as well. The period also saw the continued translation of the traditional simple and cheap plays (*spēļu/joku lugas*) (Note 21) and pulp literature (Note 22).

2 LITERATURE OF THE BALTIC NEIGHBOURS

Translations from Lithuanian were rare at the end of the 19th century, for several reasons. First, printing in Lithuanian was forbidden in tsarist Russia. Although the ban was lifted in 1904, inertia continued up to the First World War. Second, Lithuanian literature had a very strong religious slant which seemed anachronistic to Latvians. As late as 1909, out of the 155 books published in Lithuania, 125 were religious (*Latvieši*, 2008b: 550), corresponding to the 80 per cent religious publications in Latvia a century earlier. In the period before the First World War not a single translation from Lithuanian appeared in book form. Some short stories and poems as well as a couple of plays appeared in the periodicals. This is quite paradoxical considering that the languages are close and there were even proposals to create one united country circulating during the War.

Estonian was a different story: the similar historical development in the Lutheran German-dominated space and the role of the Dorpat University in the formation and education of Latvian intellectuals was of importance. Thus, the first translation from Estonian dates from 1856 (Note 23). There were many translations of Kreutzwald's writings. At the end of the 19th century Estonian short stories were frequent, mostly translated by Lapas Mārtiņš (Note 24), who also wrote numerous informative articles on Estonian literature and life. Augusts Gailits joined him in early 20th century: he was half-Estonian and regularly wrote on Estonian literary affairs in *Dzimtenes vēstnesis*, focusing on the similarity of processes in both countries. Short stories and poetry translations were frequent in periodicals. Two Estonian plays were performed in 1914, but they were not published (*Latvieši*, 2008a: 222). It is notable that the Estonian epic *Kalevipoeg* was translated also by Rainis, fragments were published in 1904.

3 NORDIC LITERATURE

Interest in Nordic literature first arose at the end of the 19th century, no doubt stimulated by the similarity of mentality and living conditions. As interest grew, it came to dominate the Latvian literary polysystem in the 1920s-30s. Scandinavian sources on agricultural topics (see further) were also translated, usually with some adaptation. The beginning of the century saw a serious interest in Finnish literature, resulting in five books and around 130 other publications (Jundze, 2002: 212), mostly short stories. This was the most productive period

of translations from Finnish into Latvian. The works were mostly descriptions of farmers' lives and, although it was usually stated that the works were translated from Finnish, they were in fact translations via German or Russian. As Finland was also part of the Russian Empire some translations of the 1905 Revolution period reflect the protests of the time. Translators either muted or strengthened the revolutionary fervour depending on the situation, for example, Juhani Aho's staid content is occasionally toned up by emphasising the struggle between darkness and light. Many translators were amateurs, and the works were freely abridged, but some were translated by quality translators: Birznieks-Upītis, Aspazija, Gailits and Austriņš. Moreover, some works were translated several times, not with the aim of achieving higher quality but simply because nobody knew what had already been done. The record goes to a short story by Aho that sported 10 translations with 5 different titles by 1917 (Jundze, 1994: 19). Aho and Johannes Linnankoski were very popular, with novels published in periodicals and one (Aho's) in book form.

The Danish link continued with Andersen's fairy tales (Daukste-Silasproģe, 2002). *RLB DGN* produced nine collections translated via German by Apsīšu Jēkabs in 1911–12. Noteworthy is the first real translation of the 18th century Danish-Norwegian (Borum, 1979: 20) classic Ludvig Holberg's *Jeppe of the Hill, or the Transformed Peasant* (*Žūpu Bērtulis*) (Note 25) done by Augusts Melnalksnis. The localisation of the same work entitled *Lustes spēle* by Jaunais Stenders had been extremely popular for many decades, as is noted in the translator's preface. Contemporary Danish authors translated include Holger Drachmann, *Martin Andersen Nexø*, Herman Bang and *Karin Michaëlis*.

Swedish literature was very popular: around 40 stories by Strindberg (Kalnačs, 2002) as well as his plays, and these were direct translations from Swedish (Note 26). While in the 19th century Strindberg had been present in periodicals, several books were published before the war. Lagerlöf had around 100 translations in periodicals and 8 books. Hedenstierna, who had been most popular, was gradually losing his position: 70 publications and one book of stories.

Norwegian literature had been known since the end of the 19th century, mostly from stories and poems of Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson in newspapers and magazines and an occasional book. Five books of his works were translated in the period before the war. But the real focus in the 20th century was on Ibsen, with 13 works published. *Nora* appeared in book form in 1900, translated via German by Treimanis-Zvārgulis (Note 27). This was after 10 other translations. Ibsen's plays were translated by prominent Latvian literary figures Rainis, Blaumanis, Degļavs, Atis Ķeniņš, Jēkabsons, Ligoņņ Jēkabs and Jānis Akuraters. The earlier translations are via German, but originals were used after the 1905 revolutions, when several Latvian writers had escaped to Norway. Moreover, these translations remain perfectly readable today (Burima, 2007: 462).

The second focus was on Hamsun (Burima, 2002: 333). The year 1900 saw Jānis Straume's translation of *Victoria* in the *Tēvija* literary supplement. The same

year the novel was translated by Jānis Asaris and published in *Dienas Lapa*. Next it was published as a book, translated by the aspiring young translator Roberts Kroders (Note 28). It is noteworthy that the original had been published only recently, in 1898. Hamsun's *Famine* was published in an abridged version in *Mājas viesā literārais pielikums* in 1903, and in 1904 as a book in Valmiera (Note 29). Later it was also translated by Kārlis Skalbe. In 1906 *Stari* published the novel *Pan*, translated by Jaunsudrabiņš. In 1910 it was published translated by Straume. Kārlis Skalbe produced several other translations of Hamsun's works.

4 OTHERS

As regards English literature, translation of Shakespeare continued: six titles, some of which are earlier translations. Walter Scott had three in the 19th century, the beginning of the 20th saw four more novels, but then he disappeared. His books were translated by Deglavs and Paegļu Mārtiņš. But the Latvian reader gained access to contemporary English writers as well: three novels by H.G. Wells (in one of which he was called an American writer) (Note 30), and works by Galsworthy (Note 31), Jerome K. Jerome (Note 32). Also, two titles by Hardy: *Jude* (Note 33), and *a Pair of Blue Eyes* (*Zilās acis*) in a periodical and in book form (Note 34).

However, the greatest interest was in Oscar Wilde (Note 35): six books and numerous publications in magazines. This was the result of interest in the concept of decadence (Kačāne, 2015). Several of his essays and fairy tales were translated by Cemeru Zande (Brūniņš), Arturs Bērziņš, Upīts, Jānis Grīns, Jānis Stakalders, Leons Paegle, and others, generally via German and Russian. Many of the shorter works were translated several times, with various titles and often without translators mentioned. The magazines of a decadent disposition also published Wilde's programmistic works: *Stari* published *a Florentine Tragedy* (*Florentiskā traģēdija*) in 1907, translated by Fricis Bārda, *Skatuve* published *Salome*, translated by Fricis Jansons in 1907, *Latvija, Literārais pielikums* published *De Profundis* in 1910, translated by Jānis Ezeriņš.

Stories by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle were published in periodicals (starting with 1898), in instalments (Note 36), and adaptations of Sherlock Holmes stories were made for the theatre. There were two editions of another *Robinson Crusoe* (*Robinsons Krūziņš*) in a new translation (translator unknown) (Note 37). It was again not the real *Robinson* but, in comparison with the early translation and its many subsequent abridged variants (Veisbergs, 2017: 62), a much more complex, informative and didactic work with a religious twist. The book had an appendix describing the stages of the development of the human race and relating them to the activities in the novel. The translation provided didactic subtitles and footnotes explaining various exotic and scientific terms. Two novels by Jack London and some translations of Mark Twain stories introduced Latvians to contemporary American literature.

French was represented by four Jules Verne titles in free translation, Anatole France's stories in books and magazines, some novels and a play by Victor Hugo

(Note 38), Gustave Flaubert's stories, two novels by *Emile Zola* and one by *Prosper Mérimée*.

Polish literature was dominated by four books by Stanislaw Przybyszewski, plus four translations of Henryk Sienkiewicz's works, the most outstanding being *Quo vadis?* (*Kurp eji*) translated by Aspazija, and two by *Bolesław Prus*. Italian literature was represented by five titles, Hungarian by five, Spanish by four, Romanian by three, Bulgarian by two, as well as works from Japanese, Arabic and Chinese (Note 39). Thus, we can see that the range of works translated in the pre-war decade significantly expanded the cultural horizons.

RELIGIOUS BOOKS

A large number of religious books were published in this period: translations, adaptations, books for congregations, explanations of the Bible, introductions to other non-Christian religions and several catechisms. The Bible and the New Testament were published regularly. Many books were written and translated by the Baptist activist and publisher Pēteris Lauberts. Charles Sheldon's book, for example, was published twice (Note 40). Even greater was the activity of another Baptist publisher, Jānis Freijs, who himself translated most of the numerous books he published, though it is not stated in the translations. His wife Ludmilla also translated and is usually named. The precise number of books published is uncertain as many were reprinted, but we can be sure of around 300 and more (the Baptist historian Tervits mentions 850 (Tervits, 1999: 81)). There were several collections of Bible stories for children.

Latvia learnt of more exotic trends and religions when Buddhist teachings appeared in Riga at the beginning of the century (Note 41) (Kuzāne, 1980: 202). Magazines published articles about Oriental religions. In 1902, *Dienas Lapa* (23.12.1902) reported that Olcott's teaching in Germany had reached 35 editions, a brief outline was provided. In 1908 Olcott's *Buddhist Catechism* was published in Latvian, translated by the Latvian writer Deglavs (Note 42), who was not particularly interested in religions: either the book seemed interesting to him or he was in dire need of money (he was writing his voluminous book *Riga* at the time).

With censorship easing, other denominations such as the Seventh Day Adventists were also publishing more. The religious newspapers *Avots* (1905–15) and *Kristīgs Vēstnesis* (1906–14) started operating, publishing many translated texts.

MARXIST LITERATURE IN TRANSLATION

Marxist literature was published in Latvia and abroad. The Latvian Marxist printers moved to London in 1901 and to Berne in 1903. Marxist ideas were given voice in the magazine *Auseklis* in the USA (1898–1901). After the revolution,

ensorship relaxed, and several Marxist texts were published in Riga (Note 43). It is noteworthy that the social-democratic trend dominated in translated literature. Not a single work of Lenin was published, Marx and Engels have only three titles between them (Note 44), but Kautsky around 20 (published in Brussels, Berne, England and St Petersburg, but most often in Riga). The French Marxist Paul Lafargue scored around 10 translations, including parallel ones (Note 45). These were usually translated from German adaptations.

SCIENCE AND REFERENCE TRANSLATIONS

There are many translations on practical economics and agriculture (Note 46), as well as adapted translations, often based on Scandinavian texts (Note 47). The ever-broadening fields of information and language demanded reference literature and terminology development. This led first of all to encyclopaedias, which are naturally based on translating information from other encyclopaedias and texts. Thus, Encyclopedia (*Konversācijas vārdnīca*) was started in 1903/4. Ninety instalments were published, but the war interfered with the final ones, and it was finished by RLB DGN when the 99th instalment was published in 1921. There was the idea of printing it in the new spelling, but that has yet to be done. Scientific literature mostly focused either on general issues (Note 48) or academic literature. Many were adapted or derived works (Note 49). Among the most important were Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* (Note 50) and books on chemistry, philosophy, law, politics, geography and art (Note 51). Many of these were published by RLB DGN, which was acutely aware of the need to cultivate science in order to educate and to apply Latvian to a wider range of domains.

POPULAR SCIENCE TRANSLATION

Newspapers and magazines abounded in popular science translations on various topics, but there were plenty of books as well. Numerous works were dedicated to women's position in society (Note 52), emancipation, marriage and sex lives (Note 53). Pāvils Strautzelis, a doctor, published many books on medicine, some were translations from German and Russian, other adaptations of German texts.

With the beginning of the First World War (1914) there was a sharp drop in publishing: 285 titles in 1914 and only 62 in 1915. As the front approached Riga, printing shops closed or were evacuated, and after the Germans captured Riga publishing virtually stopped. In the early months of the war, it was mainly aggressive propaganda booklets with expressive titles that were printed. Occasionally it was not stated that the booklet was a translation or the translator's name was omitted (Note 54).

TRANSLATORS

Many translators of this period were also prominent Latvian writers and poets: Blaumanis, Deglavs, Apsīšu Jēkabs, Anna Brigadere, Jēkabs Janševskis, Birznieks-Upītis, Bārda, Plūdons, Jaunsudrabiņš, Andrievs Niedra, Akuraters, Kārlis Skalbe, Rainis, Aspazija, Zeltmatis, Ezeriņš. Translation enabled them to earn their daily bread while honing their skills and often establishing their genre and style. Rainis frequently referred to translations he did in order to earn some money. Jaunsudrabiņš also stated,

I must note that I have more often than not earned my daily bread by translations. By and large I chose what to translate, but occasionally some were commissioned. I consider it a more honourable way of earning money than going churning out pot-boilers. Every work has to mature to some extent and, if it is pulled into daylight too early, it has shortcomings and redundancies. (Jaunsudrabiņš, 1957: 96)

Frequently the publishers were also translators, thus the brilliant lexicographer and publisher Dravnieks translated German, Russian, Italian, English and Norwegian writings (Labrence, 1984), Jesens translated numerous works, usually not mentioning the translator, at other times using the pseudonyms Rutks, Rūķis and Birzgalietis. The publisher Arturs Bērziņš translated seven plays and three novels. Similarly, Pīpiņš-Vizulis was both translating and publishing. The long-established publisher Alunāns was still translating pulp fiction at the turn of the century.

As stated above, many translators from the late 19th century were still productive in the run-up to the war. Most of them were good or excellent Latvian writers as well. Lapas Mārtiņš (pseudonym Rujeniets) was very productive, mainly translating trivial novels from German, especially in the newspaper *Baltijas Vēstnesis*, but he also specialised in Estonian literature and later also Scandinavian writing. Paegļu Mārtiņš (Atrimps) was similarly productive, translating Verne, Sienkiewicz, Pushkin, Scott, Gorky and Tolstoy. He often stuck to the now obsolete free method of translation (Note 55). The Latvian poet Plūdons translated Nietzsche's *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* that saw several editions (Note 56), but also plays and a lot of poetry. Jēkabsons started an active translation career at the very end of the century, with works of Whitman, Tolstoy, Lermontov, Molière, Ibsen, Maeterlinck, Krilov, a. o. Birznieks-Upītis had numerous translations, often unidentified as such, especially in Jesens's editions (Egle, 1972: 156-157). Jaunsudrabiņš had several translations in periodicals, many again not identified, but also four in book form. Akuraters had high quality translations of Wilde (Note 57), Ibsen and Maeterlinck. Lejas-Krūmiņš had already established himself in the 19th century as a sophisticated expert in foreign literature and produced a wide range of high-quality translations in periodicals and book form (see above), similar to the writer Treimanis-Zvārgulis (Zvārguļi Edvards). Upītis started his translator's career in this period and greatly expanded it after the war.

Among the very productive translators who are not known as great Latvian writers we should mention Mārcis Zīraks (with a feminine pseudonym Ziemciešu Marija (Gudriķe, 2004)) who produced more than 100 translations, mostly in periodicals, but only 3 in book form. His translations are well done, and he was also considered a most careful editor and outstanding proofreader. Diženajo Bernhards was very productive, among his translations there were voluminous amounts of pulp literature (Note 58), but also works by Ibsen, Conan Doyle, Emerson and Heine, and literature of Ancient Greece and Rome (Note 59). The translations were mostly done via German and Russian. Straume was extremely productive at various kinds of translation, as was Eduards Rudzītis/Rudzīts. At the end of the period Roberts Kroders started translating Russian and English literature. He was to become one of the most productive professional translators in the post-war period.

A new development was the influx of women into translation, something that had not occurred before. Most of the women translators were wives or partners of Latvian writers and usually the two started translating together (Note 60). Prominent examples are Late Veibele, Angelika Gailit (wife of the writer Haralds Eldgasts), Marija Emilija Kalniņa (Stalbova) (wife of the writer Viktors Eglītis), Luīze Skujeniece (wife of the writer Vensku Edvarts), Anna Jansone (wife of the writer Jānis Jansons-Brauns), Anna Rūmane-Ķeniņa (wife of the writer Atis Ķeniņš), Biruta Skujeniece, Elza Stērste (Naurēnu Elza) (wife of the writer Edvarts Virza), Klāra Kalniņa (wife of the politician and author Pauls Kalniņš), Ludmila Freija (wife of Jānis Freijs), Lilija Lejas-Krūmiņa (wife of the translator Eduards Lejas-Krūmiņš), Lizete Erdmane-Skalbe, the first translator directly from Norwegian (Burima 2002: 341) (wife of the writer Kārlis Skalbe) and Aspazija (wife of Rainis).

Apart from the above there were many new translators, many of whom stayed in the profession also after the First World War: J. Akots, Andrejs Andersons, Apsesdēls, Ernests Arnis, Antons Austrīņš, Augusts Baltpurviņš, Jānis Bankavs, Augusts Barčs, Fricis Bārda, Beisotu Jūlijs, Pēteris Bernards, Frīdrihs Bernevics, Arturs Bērziņš, Jānis Bērziņš-Ziemelis, Kārlis Bērziņš, Pēteris Bērziņš, Andrejs Birkerts, Irma Bresovska, Fricis Būcens, Jānis Buševics, Aleksandrs Būmanis, Zande Brūniņš, Indriķis Cīrulis, Pēteris Cīrulis (Zundu Pēteris), Valdemārs Dambergs, Aleksandrs Dauge, Pauls Dauge, Valts Dāvids, Vilis Dermanis, Kārlis Ducmanis, Rūdolfs Egle, Viktors Eglītis, Haralds Eldgasts, Kārlis Ezerietis, Jānis Ezeriņš, Ludmilla Freija, Aleksandrs Freimanis, Angelika Gailit, Fricis Garais, Jānis Grīns, Jānis Jankavs, Anna Jansone, Edvards Jansons, Fricis Jansons, Jānis Jansons-Brauns, Jēkabs Jansons, Paula Jēgere-(Freimane), Kārlis Kasparsons (Jurmalnieks), Jānis Kārstenis (Šmits), Jānis Kleinbergs, Augusts Kokalis, Kristaps Koškis, Jānis Kovaļevskis, Roberts Kroders, Kārlis Krūza, Kārlis Ķebis-Viesturs, Atis Ķeniņš, Linards Laicens, Pēteris Lauberts, Līgotņu Jēkabs, Roberts Makstis, Juris Mauriņš (Kosa), Fricis Mierkalns, Arveds Mihelsons (Rutku tēvs), Vilis Plūdons, Andrejs Priedkalns, Prinduļu Pauls, Eduards Ramats, Pāvils Rozītis (Ilgvars), Anna Rūmane-(Ķeniņa), Vilis Segliņš, Kārlis Skalbe,

Lizete Skalbe (Erdmane), Pauls Skrābāns, Alfrēds Skroderis, Biruta Skujeniece, Skuju Frīdis (Gotfrīds Milbergs), Jānis Sproģis, Elza Stērste (Naurēnu Elza), Kārlis Štrāls, Voldemārs Teikmanis, Andrejs Upīts, Jānis Vainovskis, Augusts Vārna-Vārtniņš, Vārpuļu Indulis (Vasilis), Edvarts Virza, Edvards Vulfs, Zeltmatis, Alfrēds Ziediņš, Kārlis Zvingevičs a.o.

However, the highest quality translations were by Rainis, occasionally in collaboration with Aspazija, as in the case of *Faust*. Aspazija produced only individual works of classics (Note 61), Rainis produced whole series according to his own plans: Goethe's *Egmont* (*Egmonts*), *Prometheus* (*Prometejs*), *Iphigenia in Tauris* (*Ifigēnija*), Dumas's *the Count of Monte Cristo* (*Grāfs Monte Kristo*), Shakespeare's *Anthony and Cleopatra* (*Antonijs un Kleopatra*) and *King Lear* (*Karalis Lirs*), Pushkin's *Boris Godunov* (*Boriss Godunovs*), Hamerling's *Amor und Psyche* (*Amors un Psiche*), Lessing's *Nathan the Wise* (*Natans gudrais*), Schiller's *William Tell* (*Viljams Tells*), *Mary Stuart* (*Marija Stjuarte*) and *the Robbers* (*Laupitāji*), Hauptmann's *Hannele* (*Hannele*) and *the Sunken Bell* (*Nogramušais zvans*), Ibsen's *the Feast at Solhaug* (*Svētki Solhaugā*), Lermontov's *Demon* (*Dēmons*), Heine's *William Ratcliff* (*Wiljams Ratklīfs*), *Bimini* (*Bimini*), *Clavigo* (*Klavigo*), *the Brother and Sister* (*Brālis un māsa*) *Torquato Tasso* (*Torkvato Taso*) and *the North Sea* (*Ziemeļjūra*), Georg Büchner's *Danton's Death* (*Dantona nāve*), Byron's *Cain* (*Kains*) and Calderón de la Barca's *the Mayor of Zalamea* (*Zalameas tiesnesis*) and numerous separate poetry translations. He also started translating Marx's *Das Kapital*.

THE QUESTION OF QUALITY

The quality of translations varied greatly. Some translations of this period (although containing an occasional odd, strange or old-fashioned word) can be read today as samples of good Latvian (Akuraters, Rainis, Jaunsudrabiņš, Kārlis Skalbe, Plūdons), while others are heavy, and full of German and Russian barbarisms and constructions.

Being the editor of *Universālā bibliotēka*, Rainis paid great attention to the issue of translation quality, he was often critical and frequently refused to publish bad translations. Rainis wrote to Gulbis: 'You have many translators who do not know anything, neither Latvian nor any other skill' (Zanders, 2015: 237). He regularly advised younger translators even on individual words and terms (*Literārais*, 1957: 294).

The quality in periodicals is much lower, and works are frequently cut and abridged to fit the format, or with the idea that some parts are not important. Newspaper editors were so overloaded with work that 'they had no time to read through the manuscripts and edit them. Editors of fiction were happy enough to read the title of the work and the names of the author and the translator. And if the translator was known to them, the translation was passed on to the printers. The proofreader was as lax towards the text and the language as the editor,

in order not to create extra work for the type-setters' (Melnalksnis, 1944: 2). Although translators did not work for free in the new century, Rainis noted that 'translation does not pay' (*Literārais*, 1957: 297).

TRANSLATION METHODS

The beginning of the 20th century spelled the end of the old-style localisation strategy with elements of adaptation. Translations became more precise, more faithful to the original; fidelity was now considered important, translators were not afraid of foreignisation strategy. On the other hand, free translation obtained a new artistically creative meaning. Localisation and adaptation occasionally remained in translations of light and trivial plays, and elements of localisation could be observed in science texts, but this was more a question of adapting the content to the reader's supposed level of competence. Some works were still translated as abridged and free summaries, but this was usually stated (Note 62).

This change of method was a gradual and natural one, without theoretical substantiation. It was also often determined by the goal of translation (even when not stated). Thus, light entertainment literature was often translated in a free manner and abridged, with sophisticated or cultural terms omitted. By contrast, if the goal was to enrich the reader's knowledge and extend the expressive boundaries of Latvian, the issue of language use received more attention. Rainis had an even broader view of the purpose of translation: he was only 22 when musing on the state of Latvian literature, he recognised that only translated literature 'can bring new nourishment, new ideas, and aspirations to avoid uniformity, to make our original literature fresh and spiritually alert' (*Literārais*, 1957: 42). In 1912 he wrote: 'I have to keep translating, not for the sake of money, but to exercise the language. Originals never exercise the skilful use of language as well as translations do' (Rainis, 1986: 436). He also called for a collection of Baltic and Estonian theoretical papers on translation issues as a source of knowledge transfer similar to the way Latvian farmers were copying the Danish farming experience.

TRANSLATION CRITICISM

Translation criticism was abundant, discussions of foreign literary works could be found in most newspapers and magazines. However, attention was mostly focused on the contents of the original: critics reminded readers of the significance of the work and what Latvian readers and writers could learn from it, thus perfectly reflecting the defective stance. As regards the translations themselves critics tended to focus on two aspects: first, there were regular complaints that pulp literature should not be published and second, there were frequent complaints about the quality of Latvian in translations. Serious discussion of translation methods, quality analysis, and comparisons of the original with the translation

were extremely rare. Occasionally there were generalised statements, as when Zeiferts suggested that Goethe's poetry had often been made pedestrian and base in Latvian (Zeiferts, 1904: 1327-1329). Translation criticism usually amounted to a concise positive or negative statement, an example being Rainis's translation of *King Lear*: 'a better translation than this of *King Lear* could hardly be produced' (Zālītis, 1901: 187).

However, occasionally criticism was more extensive, thus Upīts, when commenting on Pāvils Rozītis's translation of Wilde's works, complained: 'not a single thought of Wilde's can be grasped, not a single distinguishing characteristic of Wilde's portrayal of reality can be felt in the translation. The translation is the work of the downright bungler from beginning to end, from the first line to the final full stop, and a disfigurement of the Latvian language' (Upīts 1909: 6). Upīts enumerated the obvious mistakes and then appealed to the publishers, stressing that such translations would be difficult to sell.

Ezeriņš (who himself translated two plays by Wedekind) compared two translations of Wedekind's *Spring Awakening* (*Pavasara atmošanās*), by Paegle and Alfrēds Gruzītis, in 1908. This was a rare approach, even though parallel translations abounded. His comments were not complimentary: 'Here we see simple ignorance of German and Latvian'. Ezeriņš thought that Gruzītis has a Germanic style of Latvian, while Paegle departed from the original by playing with the style. Both translations had inexplicable deletions. 'Paegle's translations could still be considered satisfactory'. But turning to another drama translation of Wedekind, *Music* (*Mūzika*) published by *Mēnešraksts*, he exclaimed: 'OK, it has no style, so be it! But the translators should know the Latvian language! Cannot we, the readers, demand something slightly more seriously refined?' (Ezeriņš, 1908: 2).

In an article entitled *Ibsen's Plays in Latvian Translation* (1909), Zeltmatis pointed out that Latvians now already had excellent translations of plays by Shakespeare, Schiller, etc. but alongside these there were frequently poor translations of plays. For example, the translation of *Rosmersholm* was 'utterly useless'. Zeltmatis warned theatres not to stage it in this version. He insisted that it was advisable for the translator to know Norwegian, to be able to translate from the original, or 'at least to follow it' (Zeltmatis, 1909). Similarly, he commented that 'several works have been totally mutilated', the translations were useless and without corrections unworkable, the translator Anna Bergmane 'has a poor command of the language from which she translates, and an equally poor command of our own language' (Zeltmatis, 1912: 1027). Similarly, Arturs Bērziņš stated that it was 'mostly amateurs that translated plays' (Bērziņš, 1910: 175).

LANGUAGE ISSUES

As can be seen from the above, there was a huge emphasis on the correct use of language. The turn of the century was a period of intense language modernisation and expansion into new spheres and domains. Taking into account the prolonged

German influence on Latvian, and the total dominance of German as a source and intermediary language in translations, Latvian was indeed rather Germanic and suffered from huge German interference. However, literary Latvian had freed itself from German constructions (Kažoku, 1893: 18) by the beginning of the 20th century and approximated to natural spoken Latvian. A multitude of neologisms, terms, clippings and derivatives had been created.

But the Russification which reigned in schools led to an increased Russian influence in the language of translators, since the new generation had studied in 'Russian schools'. Thus, an expert commented: 'It is strange that the same people who laugh about German weirdness consider Russian weirdness in our texts to be a sign of education. In general, our language is being disfigured from both ends: from the retrograde one, that considers Glück's Bible translation the most elegant example of Latvian beauty, and from the pseudoprogressive one that brings in new forms and words; this pseudoprogressive end of the nation now wants to introduce novelties that totally contradict our language's spirit, that are literal translations from Russian and mutilate our language' (Bračš, 1910).

Russification did indeed affect quality of Latvian both directly (schools and authorities) and indirectly (in the absence of literature and science books people looked for Russian sources). Kārlis Skalbe formulated it as follows: 'they read everything in Russian, thought in Russian and when speaking Latvian scattered Russian phrases [...] transferred concepts directly from Russian newspaper editorials into the columns of progressive Latvian newspapers, the hasty translations were full of Russian language forms and Russian words' (Skalbe, 2002: 231). Describing the situation in the editorial office Melnalksnis wrote, 'in the memories of the family of the old editors this epoch is remembered among older editors as the 'farrowing period' since the Russian verb *otnestis* ('to refer to') was translated as *atnesties* ('to farrow') no less than ten times in 100 lines, the translator being misled by the similarity between the two words. It was only due to the avuncular admonitions of Veismaņū Jānis and caustic remarks by Rūdolfs Blaumanis about the real meaning of 'farrowing' that this malady in translations ceased' (Melnalksnis, 1944: 2).

For most translators, except the literary masters, language quality did not matter much: they strove to get the message across and to do it fast. In contrast, Rainis already wanted to create a new language by 1912, one that would be able to express everything: 'we have to organise and recreate Latvian in such a way as to be able to express lofty thoughts. Otherwise, culture is hampered by insufficiency of language' (Rainis, 1986: 430). 'No nation can obtain a Universal Library while it has not prepared its language for universal literature and while the main writings of universal literature have not been translated' (Rainis, 1985: 410).

This reformative approach of Rainis was not to the liking of the leading linguists of the time, thus Milenbachs was very critical of Rainis's translation of *Faust*, insisting that his use of language was too free and not always normative,

also the tendency to clip was viewed as negative. Rainis responded by condemning the linguists for rigidly sticking to outdated norms and developed a lasting dislike for linguists. Amazingly, the editor of the newspaper, Pēteris Zālīte, who failed to understand who was right in the polemic, turned for judgement to the eminent Baltic German old-school researcher of Latvian, August Bielenstein. He produced a short statement saying that Rainis's language was brilliant, but neither Latvians nor the Latvian language were ready for translations of high literature (Aspazija, 1979: 79).

Years later, Rainis announced triumphantly that he had come out as the winner in this battle:

Yes, my new Latvian was victorious; it has become not only the modern literary language that the writers use, it has also become the official language. My language rejuvenation principles, including clipping, have become the leading principles in recreating and developing Latvian, a process that was necessary when Latvia became a state. (Rainis, 1925: 90)

Terminology commissions have created many new terms using principles that were condemned in the past. The new language is a fact, it has won, the loser is the one who resisted it, and he has lost by all the rules of tragedy. (Rainis, 1925: 90)

Andrievs Niedra, a Latvian writer of the old school, while appreciating many of Rainis's achievements, was somewhat critical of his language. He stated that Rainis departed from the traditional 'peasant's language', being aware that the new age called for a 'faster' language. He also stated that Rainis developed his new language through translations, and to some extent deplored this, as it was allegedly based on German and Russian models (Niedra, 1930).

While linguists today see the point of both sides (Baltiņš, Druvieta, 2015), we do speak of 'pre-Rainis language' (Veidemane, 1999: 77). This, of course, does not mean that Rainis's translations were faultless: there were occasional literal transfers, clumsy and Germanic constructions and inconsistent spellings, all very much dictated by the fact that Rainis often translated works piecemeal and each fragment was published immediately, so he lost sight of the work as a whole (Gudriķe, 1989: 19).

ORTHOGRAPHY ISSUES

There was much controversy as regards Latvian spelling in general and even more in the wake of the orthography reform, very much reflected in translation criticism. The Germanic spelling system was frequently confusing, with one and the same author, title, publisher or name spelled in several different ways. Thus, *Baltijas Vēstnesis* wrote: 'Orthography issues constitute a genuine burden for our linguists and writers: each tends to write in his own orthography' (Iekšzeme, 1898: 1).

In addition, some names would be written in Latin characters in the middle of a Gothic text.

The driver of reform was the Academic Committee of Riga Latvian Society (*RLB Zinību komisija*) (Volfarte, 2009) which had in general paid much attention to language issues by deliberately publishing research and translations in various domains (Blinkena, 1996). By the turn of the century, spelling had been slightly simplified: the use of double consonants curtailed, use of *h* for signifying long vowels also limited. An Orthography Committee was established in 1908 under the aegis of the Academic Committee that included the well-known linguists Kārlis Mīlenbachs, Jānis Endzelīns, etc. It drafted a proposal for new principles of spelling (Kļaviņa, 2008). The new spelling, and Latin script, was accepted by the Society on 18 June 1908. Curiously (or symbolically) the Riga Latvian Society House burned down the next day.

The new orthography became part of school curriculum in 1909. But periodicals and books were slow to accept it: the newspaper *Zemkopis* adopted it only in part, some schoolbooks appeared in a mixed script, like *Latvian Literature*, which carried quotations and text samples in the old orthography (Note 63). Newspaper advertisements and headlines were often printed in the new orthography, but the rest in Gothic with Germanic spelling. The year 1910 saw the first Latin-script Latvian encyclopaedia, in two volumes. The war delayed the transition even more. The newspaper *Latvijas Vēstnesis* adopted the new script in 1920, the newspaper *Rīts* in 1934 and the rest only in 1938. Most pre-war translations stuck with the old script.

CONCLUSIONS

The pre-war period was an epoch of huge advances and expansion in the Latvian translation scene. New, contemporary authors' works became available to Latvian readers. The Latvian readership was consciously being integrated into general European literary trends. Publishing in Latvia 'went through all stages of development in a very short period and at the beginning of the 20th century approached the level of the cultured nations of the world' (Labrence, 1984: 112).

It was also a heyday of periodicals that published numerous translations, including numerous novels. There are countless double translations of the same works, some parallel translations even reaching double digits. Translations included various genres and the traditional Latvian interest in plays was very obvious. So was the focus on agricultural literature. The translation method changed from localisation to a fidelity mode with a tendency to foreignisation. German was gradually losing its dominant positions as a source and intermediate language, Russian was advancing, so was also the scope of other languages. This period also saw a change of generations among translators, and with the new generation women became visible in translation scene. Frequently translations now had prefaces and explanations by the translators.

Translated literature now ranged from serious classical works to modern ones and from pulp literature to high quality creations. Naturally, the quality of translations was also very varied. The expansion of translation and the cultivation of new domains went hand in hand with a preoccupation with the development of the Latvian language itself. The outbreak of the First World War halted this unprecedented growth, but so much had been achieved that a columnist and future Prime Minister Marģers Skujenieks could state in 1913: 'now that articles on most varied scientific fields are being composed in Latvian, now that the classics of the great nations have been translated and an encyclopaedia published, now objections against the language are unfounded and only attest to the objectors' own ignorance of Latvian' (Skujenieks, 1913: 81-82).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was supported by the National Research Programme project 'Latvian Language' (No VPP-IZM-2018/2-0002).

NOTES

- Note 1. *Fausts: traģedija no Ģetes*; tulkojuschi Aspasija un Rainis. Rīga: Ernsts Plates. 1898; *Fausts: pirmā un otrā daļa no Ģetes*: tulkojuschi Aspasija un Rainis. Rīgā: Drukats un apgahdats Ernsta Plates tipo-litografija. 1898.
- Note 2. Grāmatu raskats. *Jaunibas tekas*, 1923, nr. 10 (pp. 317-318).
- Note 3. *Pasaules rakstneeziba: zittautu scholaiku eevehrojamako rakstneeku sazerejumu paraugi stahstos, nowelēs un skicēs: (ar ihsām biografiskām-literariskām peezihmem)* latweescheem pasneedsis Lejas-Kruhmņsch. Rīgā: Orłowska apgahdibā, 1899–1901
- Note 4. *Mājas viesis* 11.08.1910. (pp. 749-753).
- Note 5. *Karsch un meers: romāns*. Ļews Tolstojs. J. D., (wehlak) J. R. Pirmās daļas pirmās diwas nodaļas tulkojis J. Drawneeks, turpinājumu un beigās – mahzitajs J. Ruzelis.
- Note 6. *Johanna Wolfganga fon Ģētes raksti*. J. Raiņa un Aspasijas tulk. Pēterburga: A. Gulbja apgādibā. 7. sēj. 1903.
- Note 7. *Alpu kalnu deewene, jeb, Bez zihniņa naw uswaras*: romantisks stahsts no E. Wener. brihwi tulkojis Abaweetis. Rīga: W. Schneiders. 1901.
- Note 8. *Julijs Zesars. Behdluga peezos zehleenos no Wiljama Schekspira*. Rīgā: RLБZK Derīgu grahmatu apgahd. Nodaļa. 1897.
Wiljama Schekspira Richards III: behdluga 5 zehleenos. Tulkojis Fr. Ad. Rīga: Apgahdajusi Rīgas Latweeschu beedribas Derīgu grahmatu nodaļa. 1902.
- Note 9. *Wiljama Šekspira Karalis Lirs*: traģēdija 5 cēlienos. Tulkojis J. Rainis. Rīga: apg. Rīgas Latviešu Biedribas Derīgu grāmatu nodaļa. 1900.
- Note 10. *Zittautu Rascha*. Sakahrtojais Wisulis. Cēsis: J. Ozols. 1899–1901.
- Note 11. *Modernā Wahzu Lirika*. Pludoņa tulkojumā. Pēterburga. A. Gulbja apgahdibā. 1913.
- Note 12. *Rīgas Avīze* 1911, nr. 2-55.

- Silazite*: Romans iz Ungārijas rewoluzijas laikeem (1848–1849 g.). No Maurus Jokaija. Tulk. M. Birsgaleetis. Ar apgahdataja preekschwahrdū. Rīga J. Misiņa apg. 1911.
- Note 13. *Baudu viesuļos: skati iz franču aristokrātijas dzīves (masāzistes piezīmes)*. A. Berned. Tulkojusi B. Et. Rīgā: M. Akmens. 1910.
- Note 14. *Transwales warone Kruegera Wilhelmina, jeb: Kimberlejas asinsdimanti: wehsturisks romāns is Angļu-Buhru kara burtnizās*. Atstahstijis O. P. Rīga: M. Jakobsons. 1900.
Buhru asinis, jeb, netaisnais karsch Transwalā. Romāns iz Angļu-Buhru kara. Pehz Fr. Meistera latviski attehlojis Semsarits. Rīga: J. A. Kukurs. 1902.
- Note 15. *Pawasara atmoschanās: behrnu traģēdija*. Franks Vedekinds. Pehz diwdesmita wahzu isdewuma tulkojis A. Grusits. Rīga: O. Schagars. 1908.
Pawasara atmoschanās: behrnu traģēdija. Franks Vedekinds. Tulkojis L. Paegle. Valmiera: P. Leepa.
- Note 16. *Latweeschi, sewischķi widsemneeki filosofiskā gadu simteņa beigās*. no G. Merkeļa; tulkojis Aleksandrs Buhmanis. Sw. Peterburga: A. Gulbja apg. 1905.
Brihwee latweeschi un igauņi: peemiņas raksts 1820. gada 6. janwarī Rigā noswinetajeem brihwibas swehtkeem no G. Merkeļa, tulkojis Aleksandrs Buhmanis. Pēterburga: A. Gulbja apgādībā, 1905.
- Note 17. *Wanem Imanta. latveeschu teika*. No G. Merkeļa. Tulkojis Aleksandrs Buhmanis. Sw. Pēterburgā: A. Gulbja apgahdībā. 1905.
Wanems Imanta: latveeschu teika no Garlieba Merkeļa. Erdmaņu Lisetes tulkojums. Zehsis: J. Osols, 1905.
- Note 18. *Jaunas wahzu noweles. Lejas-Krūmiņa sakopojumā*. Rīga: RLB Derīgu grāmatu nodaļa, 1913.
- Note 19. *Dsihwais mironis*: drama seschos zehleenos un diwpadsmīt ainās. L. N. Tolstojs. Tulkojis Arturssiņsch. Rīga: isdewis J. Brigaders, 1911.
Dsihwais mironis: drāma 6 cēlienos un 12 bildēs. No L. N. Tolstoja. Tulkojis A. Būmanis. Pēterburga: A. Gulbis, 1911.
- Note 20. *Tarass Buļba*. Kriewiski no N. Gogoļa. Latviski tulkojis Fr. Brihwzemnieks. Teodora redakzijā. Rīgā: Brihwsemneeka komisijas isdewums, 1912.
- Note 21. *Jaunais dakteris: Joku luga ar dziedāšanu 2 cēlienos*. No J. A. Fredro. Latviski tulkojis K. Brīvnieks, 2. izd. Jelgava: H. Allunans, 1907.
- Note 22. *Kasanowa, pahrdroschais raibu peedsihwojumu meklētājs un pasaules leelakais Don Schuans: wiņa sensazionalee peedsihwojumi un zeļojumi pa wisām semem, ka ari wiņa ļoti interesanta behgschana no Wenezijas swina kamerām: sensazijas romāns, sarakstīts pehz wiņa ļoti interesantajam, deenas grahmatahm*. no Luidschi Grafa. Rīga: J. Ansons, 1913–1914. 51 burtnīca.
Luis Dominiks Kartuschs, pahrdroschais laupitajs un wiņa peedsihwojumi: Romans no Gwido Felsa. Rīga: Sabeedriba preeksch tautas, literaturas un mahkslas, 1913–1915. 107 burtnīcās.
Ahrsts-laupitajs saukts 'Sarkanais Sahtans' un Pragās Bendes Meita Melnā Marija: vēsturīgs romāns. no Guido fon Felss, latviski no Prinduļu Paula. Rīga: A. Kazaks, 1913.
- Note 23. *Kreicvalds Fr. R. Pasaule un dauds no ta, ko pasaulē atrohnam*. Tērbata: H. Laakmanis. 1-5. d. 1852-1855. Tulkojis Šulmanis 2. izdevums, 1856.
- Note 24. *Nauda*. Eduarda Vildes stāsts iz igauņu tautas dzīves. L. Rūjenieša tulkojumā. Rīga 1894.

- Note 25. *Schupu Behrtulis ('Jeppe')*: *joku luga peezos zehleenos iz daņu semneeku dsihves XVIII gadusimtenī*. Tulkojis Meln. Alk. Jelgava: H.Allunana grahmatu pahrdotawas apgahdibā, 1911.
- Note 26. *Prezeti ļaudis, 2: izlasīti stāsti* no Augusta Strindberga; no swedru walodas tulkojuse A. Janson. Pēterburga: A. Gulbis, 1912.
- Note 27. *Nora: skatu luga 3 cēlienos* no Henrika Ibsena. Iz vācu valodas tulkojis Ed. Treumans (Swahrgulis). Cēsis; Rīga; Vecpiebalga: J. Ozols. 1900.
- Note 28. Hamsuns K. *Viktorija: Weenas mihlestibas stasts*. Tulk. R. Kroders. Valmiera: Apg. P. Leepa.
- Note 29. Hamsuns K. *Bads*. Latviski no E. Jansona un A. Austrīņa. Valmiera. P. J. Leepa, 1904.
- Note 30. *Pasauļu zihņa*. Ameriķaņu rakstnieka H. Welsa romāns. tulkojis Daugaweetis. Izdewis Aug. Lahzis, Rīgā, 1912.
H.Velsa *Pehz 800,000 gadeem. Fantasijs*. Latviski no X. Zehsis: Behrsiņa un Sariņa apgahdeens. 1911.
H.D. Wels. *Astes swaigsnes deenās: nākotnes romāns*. Latviski tulkojis J. Upīts. Kuldīga: Ķurzemnieka apgādibā (n.d.).
- Note 31. *Zihņa: drama 3 cehleenos* no Dschona Galswortija. tulkojis Fr. Rosiņsch. Rīga: Elza Zirnit, 1913.
- Note 32. Dzcheroma K. *Dzcheroma*. Par cilweku, kursch sahka greizus ceļus staigat. *Pēterburgas Avīžu literārais pielikums*. 3.10, 1904.
- Note 33. Hardijs Tomass. *Judass Neeewehrojamaiss*. Rīga: apg. D. Seltiņsch, 1903.
- Note 34. *Silās azis: Romans diwās daļās*. No Tomasa Hardija ('Tesas' un Judas nepasihstamaiss' autors). Liepāja: sab. 'Leepajas Atbalsis' isd. 1913. Pirms eespeests 'Leepajas Atbalsis' peelikumā 1913.
- Note 35. *Zilweka dwehsele un sozialisms*. Oskars Uailds. Tulkojis Haralds Eldgasts. Rīga: E. Ehķis, 1908.
Estetiskais manifests; Swejneeks un wiņa dwehsele. Oskars Uailds. Tulkojis Pawils Ilgwars (Pawils Rosits). Valka: Rausks, 1909.
- Note 36. *Slawenais pasaules slepenpolizists Scherloks Holmes*. 34 burtnizas. Rīga: L. P. Wihtols, 1907–1914.
- Note 37. D. Defoe. *Robinsons Kruhsinsch*. Tulkots pehz G.A. Grabnera wahzu isdewuma, sastahdita ar wairaku pedagogu un mahzitu wihru palihdzibu. Rīgā: RLB DGN, 1901.
- Note 38. *Mantas racēji: komēdija trijos cēlienos ar epilogu*. no Hugo. Jelgava: Sadzīve, 1913.
- Note 39. *Japaņu tautas pasakas*. Tulkojis K. Behrsiņsch. Zehsis: Apgahdajis un rakstos eespeedis J. Osols, 1904.
Arābiešu pasakas. tulkots no Slogu Alberta. Liepāja: Ukstiņš, 1900.
- Note 40. *Wiņa pehdās: 'Ko gan Jesus darihtu?'* angliiski Čarlza M. Šeldena. Tulkojis P. Lauberts. Jelgava: P. Lauberts, 1909, 1912.
- Note 41. *Buda, seno indusu praviētis*. No Platona Ļebedewa. Tulkojis Meln. Alk. Rīgā: A. Baltkāja grahmatu tirgotawa, 1908.
- Note 42. *Budistu katķisms*. No Henrija S. Olkota (Olcott). Latviski līdz ar aizrādījumiem un paskaidrojumiem no Augusta Deglawā. Rīga: apgādājis T. Pagast, 1908.
- Note 43. Fr. Engelsa *Ģimenes, ihpaschuma un walsts zelschanās*. Rīga: M. J. Baļķiša apg., 1907.

- Franču Lielās revolūcijas priekšvakarā 1789. gadā*, Kārlis Kautskis. Rīga: M. Precenicka apgāds, 1907.
- Sozialisma katķisms*, pehz H. Kweltscha un Belfort-Beksa Ahsis. Peterburgā: apg. Apiņu Jahnis. 1907.
- Anarchistiskais komunisms: izwilkums iz 'La Conquête du Pain'* P. Kropotkins. Ņujorka: Ņujorkas Latw. Anarchistu - komunistu grupa 'Brihwiba', 1911.
- Note 44. *Komunistu Manifests*. Londona: Vakareiropas Latvijas sociāldemokrātu savienība. 1900.
- Note 45. *Kapitala ticība*. Rīga: Progress, 1905.
- Kapitala ticība*. Londona: Sociāldemokrātu bibliotēkas apg. 1900.
- Pola Lafarga *Teika par Adamu un Eevu*. Tulk K. Meln. Rīga: A. Gulbis, 1906.
- Pols Lafargs. *Teika par Adamu un Ievu*. Tulk. K. Meln. Rīga: Rozentāls, 1906.
- Note 46. *Praktiski aizrādījumi purvu kultivēšanā: Zviedru purvu kultivēšanas biedrības 23 gadus ilgje novērojumi*. Jalmars fon Feiļitcens. tulk. J. Plaude. Valmiera: P. Skrastiņa tipogr., 1913.
- Note 47. *Daņu lopkopība: ar 4 sihmejumu peelikumeem*, pehz Danijas paraugeem sastahdijis K. Schmidts. 2. izdevums. Rīga: Rīgas lauksaimneezības Zentralbeedriba, 1913.
- Baltijas Drawneeks*. pehz J. M. Rotha u.c. avotiem sarakstijis Fr. Bernewits, Walles draudzes mahzitajs un bišķkopības beedribas preekšneeks. Rīga: Rīgas Latviešu Biedrības Derīgu grāmatu nodaļa, 1900.
- Pašmācība: akadēmijas zinības kungu drēbju piegriešanas mākslā*. Pēc Karava (Carré) sistēmas parauga sastādijis Otto Bērziņš. Rīga: J. Krūmiņa druk., 1911.
- Note 48. *Dabas sinibu wehsture: pirmā daļa*. no profesora Sigmunda Gintera; tulkojis K. Swingewitchs. Pēterburga: A. Gulbis, 1912.
- Daba: dabas sinatnisku rakstu krahjums: ar 216 sihmejumeem tekstā un leelu mehnessha karti*. Sakopojis R. Makstis. Rīgā: D. Seltiņa isdewums, 1913.
- Frederick'a Winslow'a Taylor'a *Sinatniskas rihzības prinzipi*. autorisets tulkojums H. Simsona. Rīga: Apgahdajis A. Gulbis. 1912.
- Note 49. *Pasaules sihditaji kustoņi*. pehz angļa W. T. Kerbija 'Manuals of the World' sastahdijis J. Widiņsch. Rīgā: Drukajis un apgahdajis Ernsts Plate. 1909.
- Note 50. *Sugu izselschanās dabiskas izlases zeļā: ar Darwina biogrāfiju, paskaidrojumiem un ģihmetni* no Tscharlisa Darwina. no angļu valodas tulkojuši W. Dermanis un W. Teikmanis. Pēterburga: A. Gulbja apgādībā, 2 sēj., 1913.
- Note 51. *Profesora Lassar-Kohna Ķimija ikdeenischkā dsiwē: wispahrsaprotami preekschlasijumi*. Latwiski no J. Asara. Rīga: Rīgas Latviešu Biedrības derīgu grāmatu nodaļa, 1909–1912.
- Eewads tagadnes filosofijā*. A. Rils, tulkoja Fr. Bārda. Rīga: E. Ehķis. 1908.
- W. W. Bitners *Nietzsche un wiņa darbi*. Tulkojis Abaweetis. Leepas apgahdībā. Walmeera, 1909.
- Рожков, Николай Александрович *Lekzijas. No patwaldības pee tautas paschwaldības*. 1908.
- Raihesbergs, N. *Strahdneeku jautajums agrāk un tagad*, 1905.
- Wispahreja wehleschanas teesiba Wakar-Eiropā*. Водовозов, В., 1905.
- Politisks noziegums krievu likumos*. P. Stučka. Londona. 1900.

- Proletariāts: skati un studijas.* no Wenera Sombarta. tulk. J. Jansons. Pēterburga: A. Gulbis, 1913.
- Pār Transhimalaju.* no Svena Hedina; no vācu valodas tulkojis O. H. Rīga: Gaisma, 1913.
- Rafaēls: biogrāfiski-kritisks apcerējums* no Eschena Muenza, no franču valodas tulkojis J. Bērziņš. Pēterburga: A. Gulbis, 1913.
- Māksla un īstenība.* W. Bölsche. Tulk. R. Makstis. Rīga: Zeltiņš. 1913.
- Note 52. Klara Zetkina Seeweete un viņas ekonomiskais stahwoklis: tulkojums. Tulkojis K. Duzmanis Rīgā: 'Kulturas'apghadībā, 1910.
- Note 53. *Dzimumu kopdzīve un viņas kļūdas.* F. Schoenenbergers un W. Siegerts. tulkojis Homo. Rīga: E. F. L. Bomiša apg., 1907.
- Vīrietis un sievietē: kādai jābūt vīrieša attiecībai pret sievieti un viņas nākamo bērnu.* angliiski no E. Šeperda; latviski tulkojis A. Gruzīts. Shepherd, E. R. (*Wihreetis un seeweete*) Rīga: J. Pipe. 1907.
- Zilweks un viņa dsimums, jeb pamahzījumi par fisisko mihlestību, dabas noluhku, mihlestības baudischanu, eņņemschanu, gruhntneezību un satureschanos.* pēc Dr. J. F. Albrechta, tulkojis Aleksander Bahrenbergers. Liepāja: K. Ukstiņš, 1900.
- Schuks W. N. *Dsemdeschana bes sahpem.* Tulkojis A. Grusits, zem P. Strautseļa redakcijas. Rīga: R. J. Pīpe, 1913.
- Note 54. *Łwowa eņņemschana un Austreeschu armijas sakauschana Galizijā.* Ar autora atļauju tulkojis Paegļu Martiņsch. Rīga: Rīgas Awise, 1914.
- Wahzeeschu breesmu darbi.* Rīga, 1914.
- Kankarainā Austrija kā tautu žņaudzēja.* A. Uljanovs. Tulk. J. Akots. Rīga: Oreon, 1914.
- Bruņotais kulaks Wilhelms II.* A. Uljanovs. Ar autora atwehli tulkojis Rutku Tehws. Rīga: Argus, 1914.
- Slawenais gaisa lidotajs shtaba kapitans P.N. Nesterovs un viņa waronigā bojā eeschana Otra Tehwijas kara 1914. g. 26. aug. no J. Osola.* Rīga: J. Stabulneeks, 1914.
- Note 55. *Baltais ģenerālis: vēsturiska novele no pēdējā krievu-turku kara,* no krievu valodas brīvi tulkojis Atrimps. Rīga: D. G. Babkins, 1900.
- Note 56. Fr. Ničšes *Tā runāja Saratustra: grahmata preeksch wiseem un neweena.* 1.–4. d. Pluhdoņa tulkojums. Rīga: P. Saulit gr. tirgotawas ihp., 1908.
- Tā runāja Saratustra: grahmata preeksch wiseem un neweena.* no Friedricha Nietzsches; tulkojis Pludons. *Tā runāja Zaratustra: grāmata priekš visiem un neviena.* 3., caurlūkotais un pārlabotais izdevums. Pēterburga: A. Gulbis, 1913.
- Note 57. *Salome: traģēdija 1 zehleenā.* No Oskara Uailda. Tulkojis J. Akuraters. Pēterburga: A. Gulbja apghadībā. 1912.
- Note 58. *Waras upuri, jeb Giselas ehrrkschu ceļsch: romans* no Leontines Beck. Tulkojis Dischenajo Bernhards. Zehsis: J. Behrsinsch, 1911-12.
- Note 59. *Greeķu un romeeschu teikas.* A.J.G. Andrea, Otto Hoffmann. Latviski no B. D. tulkojis Dischenajo Bernards. Rīga: apg. J. Missiņsch, 1909.
- Sapņu tehli, dseemas un romanzes.* Heinrich Heine. latviski no Dischenajo Bernharda. Limbaži: apg. un rakstos speedis J. Mellkiss, 1904.
- Note 60. *Harca ceļojums.* Heinrichs Heine. Tulkojusi Lisete Erdman; dzeju tulkojums no K. Skalbes. Rīga: K. Bērziņš, 1907.

- Note 61. *Kurp eji? Quo vadis?: romāns diwās daļās* no Henrika Senkjewitscha. Latviski tulkojuse Aspazija. Rīga: Ernsta Plates tipolitogrāfija. 1909.
- Note 62. *Zelojums uz mehnesi: peeauguschai jaunībai pahrstrahdats* no Schila Verna. brihwi tulkojis Atrimps. Rīga: J. A. Silbermans, 1901.
- Note 63. *Pludoņa Latvju literatūras vēsture, sakarā ar tautas vēsturisko attīstības gaitu. Vidusskolu kurss*. Jelgavā: L. Neimaņa izdevums, 1908.

REFERENCES

- Apinis, A. (1977) *Latviešu grāmatniecība*. Rīga: Liesma.
- Apinis, A. (1991) *Grāmata un latviešu sabiedrība līdz 19. gadsimta vidum*. Rīga: Liesma.
- Apinis, A. (2004) *Latviešu grāmatniecība un cenzūra līdz 1918. gadam*. L. Limane, A. Apinis (red.) *Cenzūra un cenzori latviešu grāmatniecībā līdz 1918. gadam* (11.-54. lpp.). Latvijas Nacionālā bibliotēka. Reto grām. un rokr. nod.; Rīga: Latvijas Nacionālā bibliotēka.
- Āronu Matīss (1900) Atgādinājums un lūgums. *Baltijas Vēstnesis* 9.5: 3.
- Aspazija (1979) Dr. Bilenšteina vēstule. *Raiņa un Aspazijas gadagrāmata 1980. gadam*. RAF (78.-79. lpp.).
- Baltiņš, M., Druviete, I. (2015) Rainis un pārmaiņas latviešu valodā: pretrunīgais mantojums. I. Daukste-Silasproģe (red.) *Rainim 150* (25.-34. lpp.). Rīga: LULFMI.
- Baltiņš, M. (2019) Latviešu valodas statuss Latvijā pirms Pirmā pasaules kara. A. Veisbergs (ed.) *Valsts valodas komisijas Raksti X 'Valoda un Valsts'* (87.-107. lpp.). Rīga: Zinātne.
- Bērziņš, A. (1910) Mūsu dramatiskā rakstniecība. *Jauna Raža*. 12. Teodora sakopojumā (163.-178. lpp.). Rīgā: D. Zeltiņa apgahdībā.
- Bērziņš, V. (2000) (red.) *20. gadsimta Latvijas vēsture. I. Latvija no gadsimta sākuma līdz neatkarības pasludināšanai 1900–1918*. Rīga: LVIA.
- Blinkena, A. (1996) Latviešu literārā valoda 19. gs. 80.–90. gados. *Baltistica*, XXXI: 241-247.
- Borum, P. (1979) *Danish Literature*. Copenhagen: Det Danske Selskab.
- Bračš, A. (1910) Mātes valodas nozīme. *Latviešu Izglītības biedrības gada grāmata*. II. Rīgā. 19-32.
- Burima, M. (2002) Knuts Hamsuns. L. Bībere (red.) *Ziemeļu zvaigznājs* (282.-359. lpp.). Rīga: LU LFMI, Zinātne.
- Burima, M. (2007) *Ibsens Latvijā*. Rīga: Norden AB.
- Daukste-Silasproģe, I. (2002) Hanss-Kristians Andersens. L. Bībere (red.) *Ziemeļu zvaigznājs* (17.-64. lpp.). Rīga: LU LFMI, Zinātne.
- Daukste-Silasproģe, I. (2005) Vācu literatūra Latvijā – periodika un grāmatas (1890-1918). B. Kalnačš, I. Daukste-Silasproģe, Z. Gūtmane, J. Vērdiņa, M. Grudule (red.) *Vācu literatūra un Latvija* (556.-626. lpp.). Rīga: Zinātne.
- Daukste-Silasproģe, I. (2015) Rainis un vācu literatūra: saskarsmes punkti. I. Daukste-Silasproģe (red.) *Rainim 150* (223.-243. lpp.). Rīga: LULFMI.
- Deglavs, A. (1926) *Autobiogrāfija*. Kopoti raksti, 1. sēj. Rīga: Jānis Roze.
- Egle, K. (1972) *Atmiņas*. Rīga: Liesma.
- Ezeriņš, J. (1908) Grāmatu plaukts. *Dzimtenes Vēstnesis*, 7.6: 2.
- Grigulis, A., Treijs, R. (1992) *Latviešu žurnālistikas vēsture. No pirmsākumiem līdz Pirmajam pasaules karam*. Rīga: Zvaigzne.

- Gudriķe, B. (1989) *Rainis – pasaules dramaturģijas tulkotājs*. B. Gudriķe (red.) *J. Raiņa Tulkojumi*. 1-4 sēj. (5.-20. lpp.). Rīga: Zinātne.
- Gudriķe, B. (1999) *Ungāru literatūra latviešu valodā*. Rīga: Zinātne.
- Gudriķe, B. (2004) Kā Mārcis Zīraks kļuva par Ziemciešu Mariju. *Letonica*, 10: 126-131.
- Iekšzeme (1898) *Baltijas Vēstnesis* 17.6. 1898.
- Ivbule, D. (2006) Ieskats Latvijas grāmatniecībā (1901-1905): Izdevumi mazākumtautību valodās. *Bibliotēku Pasaule* 35: 65-72.
- Jaunsudrabiņš, J. (1957) *Mana dzīve*. Vesterosa: Ziemeļblāzma.
- Jundze, A. (1994) Somu rakstnieku darbu publikācijas Latvijā 1885.-1917. gadā. Ā. Rožkalne (red.) *Materiāli par latviešu literatūru un pasaules kultūru* (17.-23. lpp.). Rīga: Zinātne.
- Jundze, A. (2002) *Somijas literatūra Latvijā. 1885-2001*. Rīga: Zinātne.
- Kačāne, I. (2015) *Oskars Vailds. Latvijas 'oskariāna'*. Daugavpils: Daugavpils Universitātes Akadēmiskais apgāds 'Saule'.
- Kalnačs, B. (2002) Augusts Strindbergs. L. Bībere (red.) *Ziemeļu zvaigznājs* (183.-212. lpp.). Rīga: LU LFMI, Zinātne.
- Kalnačs, B., Daukste-Silasproģe, I., Gūtmane, Z., Vērdiņa, J., Grudule, M. (2005) *Vācu literatūra un Latvija*. Rīga: Zinātne.
- Karulis, K. (1967) *Latviešu grāmata gadsimtu gaitā*. Rīga: Liesma.
- Karulis, K. (1977) Rainis un 'Universālā bibliotēka'. *Karogs*, 9: 155-159.
- Kažoku, D. (1893) Mūsu rakstu valoda un mūsu tēvu valoda. *Rīgas Latviešu biedrības Zinību komisijas Rakstu krājums*, 8: 16-68.
- Klaustiņš, R. (1908) Aspazija un Veidenbaums kā tipiski jaunromantiķi. *Rakstniecības almanachs 1907. gadam* (124.-130. lpp.). Rīga: E. Ēķis.
- Klekere, I., Limane, L. (2017) Latviešu grāmatniecības profesiju attīstības tendences līdz 1918. gadam: datubāzes 'Latviešu grāmatniecības darbinieki līdz 1918. gadam' analīze. *LNB zinātniskie raksti*. 3. sēj. (114.-129. lpp.). Rīga: LNB.
- Kļaviņa, S. (2008) *Latviešu valodas pētnieki. No kļaušu laikiem līdz savai valstij* (126.-133. lpp.). Rīga: RaKa.
- Ķuzāne, L. (1980) *Jūlijs Dievkociņš*. Rīga: Liesma.
- Labrence, L. (1984) *Jelgavas grāmata*. Rīga: Zinātne.
- Latvieši, igauņi un lietuvieši: literārie un kultūras kontakti. Bibliogrāfiskie rādītāji*. (2008a) Rīga: LFMI.
- Latvieši, igauņi un lietuvieši: literārie un kultūras kontakti* (2008b) Rīga: LFMI.
- Latviešu tulkotās beletristikas rādītājs* (1902) Āronu Matisa sastādīts. Rīga: Apgādājusi RLB Zinību komisija.
- Kalniņš, J. (red.) (1965) *Latviešu literatūras darbinieki*. Rīga: Zinātne.
- Limane, L. (2004) *Cenzūra un cenzori latviešu grāmatniecībā līdz 1918. gadam*. Rīgā: Latvijas Nacionālā bibliotēka, Reto grāmatu un rokrakstu nodaļa.
- Literārais mantojums* (1957) 1. sēj. Rīga: LPSR ZA izdevniecība.
- Literārais mantojums* (1961) 2. sēj. Rīga: LPSR ZA izdevniecība.
- Melnalksnis, A. (1944) Daiļdarbu tulkojumi vecos laikrakstos. *Daugavas Vēstnesis* 18.08.
- Niedra, A. (1930) Raiņa valoda. *Burtnieks*, 7: 597-605.
- Novērojumi par beletristisko literatūru (1905) *Vērotājs*, 2: 229-233.
- Peile, E. (1970) *'Dienas Lapas' loma grāmatu izdošanā*. Rīga: Zinātne.

- Plakans, A. (1981) the Latvians. In: E. C. Thaden (ed.) *Russification in the Baltic Provinces and Finland, 1855-1914* (pp. 207-286). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Plakans, A. (1996–1997) Rusifikācijas politika: latvieši 1855.–1914. gads. *Latvijas Vēstures Institūta Žurnāls*, 1996., Nr. 2., 107.-132. lpp., 1996., Nr. 4., 61.-81. lpp., 1997., Nr. 1., 70.-89. lpp.
- Rainis (1925) Cīņa ap jauno latviešu valodu. *Dzīve un darbi*, 9. sēj. (81.-90. lpp.). Rīga: A. Gulbja apgādībā.
- Rainis (1986) *Kopotī raksti*, 24. sēj. Rīga: Zinātne.
- Rainis (1986) *Kopotī raksti*, 25. sēj. Rīga: Zinātne.
- Robyns, C. (1994) Translation and discursive analysis. In C. Robyns *Translation and (Re)Production of Culture* (pp. 57-77). Leuven: CETRA.
- Skalbe, K. (2002) *Mūža raksti*, 2. sēj. Rīga: Elpa.
- Skujenieks, M. (1913) *Nacionālais jautājums Latvijā*. Pēterburga: A. Gulbja apgādībā.
- Sproģe, L., Vāvere, V. (2002) *Latviešu modernisma aizsākumi un krievu literatūras 'sudraba laikmets'*. Rīga: Zinātne.
- Staris, A. (1987) *Tautas izglītība un pedagoģiskā doma Latvijā līdz 1900. gadam*. Rīga: Zinātne.
- Stepiņš, L. (1970) *Pirmais latviešu literārais žurnāls 'Pagalms'*. Rīga: Zinātne.
- Stepiņš, L. (1983) *Latviešu un zviedru literārie sakari*. Rīga: Zinātne.
- Stepiņš, L. (1989) *Latviešu un dāņu literārie sakari*. Rīga: Zinātne.
- Tervits, J. (1999) *Latvijas baptistu vēsture*. Rīga: Latvijas baptistu draudžu savienība.
- Treijs, R. (2012) *Mikēlis Valters*. Rīga: Jumava.
- Upīts, A. (1909) Grāmatu plaukts. *Dzimtenes Vēstnesis*. 18.4: 6.
- Valters, M. (1969) *Atmiņas un sapņi*. 1. Stokholma: Daugava.
- Vāvere, V. (1971) Par latviešu un vācu literārajiem sakariem XX gs. sākumā. *Latviešu un Rietumeiropas literatūra (literārie sakari)* (11.-60. lpp.). Rīga: Zinātne.
- Vecgrāvis, V. (2002) Gēte – latviešu literatūras eiropeizētājs? Jaņa Poruka viedoklis. G. Grīnuma (red.) *Gēte un Baltija* (208.-215. lpp.). Grīnuma. Rīga: Nordik.
- Veidemane, R. (1999) Rainis kā tulkotājs. G. Grīnuma (red.) *Rainis un Gēte* (77.-81. lpp.). Rīga: Latvijas Gētes biedrība, Nordik.
- Veinberga, S. (2018) Publicistikas attīstība līdz Latvijas valsts neatkarības iegūšanai (1918). *Aktuālas problēmas literatūras un kultūras pētniecībā*, 23: 154-173.
- Veisbergs, A. (2017) the Latvian translation scene: change of canons, shifts of norms. In M. R. Gomes (ed.) *Translation, the Canon and Its Discontents: Version and Subversion* (pp. 56-76). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Vilsons, A. (1971) Latviešu–angļu literārie sakari līdz 20. gs. *Latviešu un Rietumeiropas literatūra (literārie sakari)* (166.-206. lpp.). Rīga: Zinātne.
- Volfarte, K. (2009) *Rīgas Latviešu biedrība un latviešu nacionālā kustība no 1868. līdz 1905. gadam*. Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds.
- Zālītis, V. (1901) Literāriskā hronika. Lugas. *Jauna Raža* (187.-192. lpp.). V. Cēsis: Ozols.
- Zālītis, J. (1999) Gētes 'Fausta' tulkojumi latviešu valodā pirms Raiņa. G. Grīnuma (red.) *Rainis un Gēte* (67.-75. lpp.). Rīga: Latvijas Gētes biedrība, Nordik.
- Zanders, V. (2004) *Rīgas latviešu biedrības izdevējdarbība (1868-1940)*. Promocijas darbs. Rīga: LU.
- Zanders, V. (2013) Nacionālā grāmatniecība gadsimtu ritumā. *Latvieši un Latvija*. 4. sējums. *Latvijas kultūra, izglītība, zinātne* (331.-353. lpp.). Rīga: LZA.
- Zanders, O. (2015) *Etīdes latviešu grāmatniecības trijos gadsimtos*. Rīga: Zinātne.

- Zeiferts, T. (1903) Deviņpadsmitā gadu simteņa pēdējais gadu desmits latviešu rakstniecībā. *Austrums*, 1 (39.-46. lpp.), 2 (87.-93. lpp.).
- Zeiferts, T. (1904) Gētes lirika. *Vērotajs*, 9: 1317-1329.
- Zelče, V. (2009) *Latviešu avižniecība: Laikraksti savā laikmetā un sabiedrībā 1822–1865*. Rīga: Zinātne.
- Zeltmatis (1912) Brands. *Druva*, 8: 1027-1028.
- Zeltmatis (1909) Ibsena lugas latviešu tulkojumā. *Dzimtenes vēstnesis*, 17. 10: 240.
- Zvirgzdiņš, I. (2018) Autors cietumā, grāmata aizliegta: Jūlijs Kroders 'Kā savilkās mākoņi pār Baltijas ciemiem'. A. Vilks (red.) *LNB Zinātniskie raksti 4 (XXIV)* (129.-143. lpp.). Rīga: LNB.

INTERNET SOURCES

[Online 1] Available from https://kopkatalogs.lv/F/?func=find-b-0&local_base=lnc04

Andrejs Veisbergs (Prof., Dr. Habil. Philol.) works at the University of Latvia. He is a Consultant of Oxford English Dictionaries and an accredited European Union interpreter. His research interests include lexicography, idioms, language contacts, translation and interpreting. Email: Andrejs.Veisbergs@lu.lv

