

KOMPARATĪVISTIKAS
ALMANAHS

JOURNAL OF
COMPARATIVE STUDIES

DAUGAVPILS UNIVERSITY
ACADEMIC PRESS "SAULE"
2023

Kačāne I., Hasan A. M. (red.) *Komparatīvistikas almanahs Nr. 16(45)*. Daugavpils: Daugavpils Universitātes Akadēmiskais apgāds "Saule", 2023, 174 lpp. [https://doi.org/10.59893/jcs.16\(45\)](https://doi.org/10.59893/jcs.16(45))

Kačāne I., Hasan A. M. (eds.) *Journal of Comparative Studies No 16(45)*. Daugavpils: Daugavpils University Academic Press "Saule", 2023, 174 p. [https://doi.org/10.59893/jcs.16\(45\)](https://doi.org/10.59893/jcs.16(45))

EDITORIAL BOARD

Ilze Kačāne, Daugavpils University, Latvia – editor-in-chief
Aveen Mohammed Hasan, University of Duhok, Kurdistan-Region-Iraq – editor

Elisa Bizzotto, Luav University of Venice, Italy
Jian-bang Deng, Tamkang University, Taiwan
Stefano-Maria Evangelista, University of Oxford, United Kingdom
Sonia F. Farid, Cairo University, Egypt
Tatiana Filosofova, University of North Texas, USA
Rolf Füllmann, University of Cologne, Germany
Benedikts Kalnačs, University of Latvia, Latvia
Ervand Margaryan, Russian-Armenian (Slavonic) University, Armenia
Kristina Mullamaa, University of Tartu, Estonia
James M. Nyce, Ball State University, USA
Iřēna Saleniece, Daugavpils University, Latvia
Anita Stašulāne, Daugavpils University, Latvia
Geoffrey Swain, University of Glasgow, United Kingdom
Sylvia Janina Wojciechowska, Jesuit University Ignatianum in Krakow, Poland

The publication of the Journal has been approved at Daugavpils University Science Council meeting on December 4, 2023, Minutes No 11.

Lay-out: RA Drukātava

All papers in the Journal are anonymously peer-reviewed.

ISSN 2255-9388 (print)
ISSN 2592-8279 (online)

© Daugavpils University, 2023

DAUGAVPILS UNIVERSITY



INSTITUTE OF HUMANITIES
AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

JOURNAL OF
COMPARATIVE STUDIES

NO 16 (45)

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	6
PAOLA BRUSASCO On Pedagogic Uses of Literary Machine Translation: A Case Study Based on the Language Pair English – Italian	10
EVITA BADINA, ŽANS BADINS Translation Policy of Anglophone Literature in Soviet Latvia from the 1940s to the 1960s: A Comparative Perspective	32
RAMA ISLAM Female Identity in Diaspora Society: Nilanjana in Taslima Nasrin’s “French Lover” and Nazneen in Monica Ali’s “Brick Lane”	58
JIHAN ZAKARRIYA Ecofeminist Theology and Fundamentalisms within the Arabic Context	84
MERLINA KOSENI, ENKELEJDA CENAJ Overcoming Prejudice in Society through Gadamer Philosophical Hermeneutics	110
ENKELEJDA CENAJ, MERLINA KOSENI Customary Rights in Albanian Society and Issues Related to Gender (Kanun of Leke Dukagjini and Kanun of Luma)	126
BEATRIZ MATAFORA, KRISTĪNE KAMPMANE, ANASTASSIA ANTON Education Divide: Civic Learning and Intended Political Participation among Youth in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania	144

TRANSLATION POLICY OF ANGLOPHONE LITERATURE IN SOVIET LATVIA FROM THE 1940S TO THE 1960S: A COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

EVITA BADINA

Evita Badina, Dr. philol., researcher
Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences
Daugavpils University, Latvia
e-mail: evita.badina@du.lv
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9604-3464>

ŽANS BADINS

Žans Badins, Dr. philol., researcher
Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences
Daugavpils University, Latvia
e-mail: zans.badins@du.lv
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3270-3419>

Dr. philol. Evita Badina is a researcher at the Centre of Cultural Research at Daugavpils University Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences, Latvia, and a docent of the Department of English Studies at the University of Latvia. From 2020 to 2023 she participated in the project “Postdoctoral Research Aid” (project “Literary and Political Discourse of Translations in Totalitarianism: Anglophone Literature in Soviet Latvia” application No. 1.1.1.2/VIAA/3/19/452). The Postdoctoral research project was supported by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF). Her scientific interests comprise the phenomenon of translated literature in totalitarian and post-totalitarian regimes, translation policies, Anglophone literature, and its translation into Latvian during the Soviet occupation of Latvia.

Dr. philol. Žans Badins is a researcher at the Centre of Cultural Research at Daugavpils University Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences, Latvia, and a docent of the Department of Languages and Literature at Daugavpils University, Latvia. He is the author of more than 70 scientific articles. His research interests are related to literary science (Russian emigration literature, Latvian reception in Russian literature, comparative literary studies) and culture studies (traditional culture, intangible culture, border culture, Old Believer culture, youth subculture). He has participated in national and international projects, among others, “Cultural Heritage and Identities of European Future” (CHIEF), funded by the European Union Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation programme (2018–2021). He is a co-founder and one of the leaders of the Student Erudite League at Daugavpils University.

ABSTRACT

The present study aims to compare the translation policies of Anglophone literature during the Soviet occupation period after World War II. The study focuses on the translations of Anglophone literature texts into Latvian during the first two decades of the Cold War under the rule of Joseph Stalin and Nikita Khrushchev.

The results allow us to conclude that during the Soviet occupation of Latvia, the introduction and reception of Anglophone literature evolved, transitioning from purely ideological dominance to a more diverse selection of authors and genres. In the first years of Soviet occupation, the Latvian book market was flooded with the literature of predominantly ideological content by Soviet, primarily Russian, authors translated into Latvian. Western literature, including Anglophone literature, was published cautiously and limited to translations of classics and progressive authors. With the change in power in the 1950s, the number of works by Anglophone writers translated into Latvian gradually increased, and more diversity in the choice of authors and genres was observed. However, these works were still carefully censored as they were written by authors from Western bloc countries. All stages of the reception process were controlled, and authors and their lives and works were presented to the public in a biased, ideologically determined way. It was particularly true for living writers.

Keywords: Soviet Latvia, translation policy, censorship, Cold War, Soviet propaganda

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary Latvian discourse, the concept of “Soviet Latvia” refers to a historical, cultural, and political era associated with the liquidation of Latvian statehood and the period of occupation. Following its annexation in 1940, Latvia became part of the Soviet system and therefore subject to Soviet ideology, which was remarkably intolerant towards Western ideas and realities. The concept of “Soviet Latvia” is marked by dynamic shifts, usually associated with changes in power in the USSR and shifts in the course of the Communist Party.

The occupation of Latvia in the summer of 1940 completely changed all spheres of life in the Latvian society, including translation policy. Among the most significant events of the period, one can mention mass repressions, collectivisation, the political reform of de-Stalinization, intensified persecution of religion, the launch of the first space satellite and the first manned flight into space, the emergence of the Berlin Wall, the corn-planting movement, and the Cold War rivalry between the USSR and the USA, resulting in a complicated and severe control implemented by various power institutions such as the Central Committee of the Communist Party, General Directorate for the Protection of State Secrets in the Press (Glavlit), and the Committee for State Security (KGB) in different areas of human life. In the Soviet Union, Glavlit (1922–1991), the main censorship body, functioned to eliminate any undesirable printed materials and ensure the correct ideological interpretation of every published item. As Siddiqi notes, “Glavlit [...] was the largest and most formalized instrument for censorship, reflecting both the bureaucratic logic of rationalism and the fundamental belief that the state had at its disposal the tools to adequately regulate the circulation of information. In that sense, Glavlit was an institutional manifestation of the aspiration for stability in the control of information” (Siddiqi 2021, 1053).

In other Soviet Socialist republics and some socialist bloc countries, the information flow was controlled and censored by the local versions of Glavlit. A Polish scholar, Kamila Kamińska-Chelminiak, points out that the “Burden of setting up the censorship apparatus in Poland was almost fully borne by the employees of the Soviet censorship — Glavlit [...] — who for several months of their stay in Poland, [...], formed the foundations of the new office. The mechanism of operation of the new office was to be modelled on the Soviet one” (Kamińska-Chelminiak 2021, 246). In Latvia, the main Soviet censorship body was

established on August 10, 1940, and called LGLP – the Main Literature Authority of the Latvian SSR (Veisbergs 2014, 33). The importance of these versions of Glavlit cannot be underestimated – they were influential censorship institutes that, among others, controlled all publishing issues. Soviet ideology, propaganda, and censorship comprised a powerful construct aimed at manipulating and controlling public opinion, restricting access to information, and presenting it in a highly biased way. Authorities also paid close attention to original and translated literature introduced to the Soviet reader.

In the Soviet Union, a complicated and turbulent attitude towards foreign literature existed due to geopolitical, sociocultural, and ideological reasons, including Latvia, which was part of the USSR for almost fifty years (1940–1941; 1944/45–1991). Specific priorities concerning the choice of foreign languages acceptable for translation were set. First, these were foreign languages of Soviet satellite countries (e.g., Poland, the German Democratic Republic, and Czechoslovakia). Secondly, in foreign languages of non-communist countries where the Communist movement was quite active, authors positioned themselves as real communists or friends and supporters of the Soviet Union (e.g., France and Italy). In turn, English-speaking countries were considered dangerous. Although many works by Anglophone authors were translated, including the classics (Shakespeare, Swift, and Dickens) and so-called progressive writers who were loved and praised by the Soviet authorities (such as Dreiser, London, and Cronin), the status of many authors whose views were or could become controversial or unacceptable to Soviet ideology, especially contemporary authors like Steinbeck and Hemingway, was unstable. English represented the language of the Soviet Union's main ideological opponent, particularly during the Cold War.

METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH MATERIAL

The present study focuses on translation from a socio-political perspective, specifically examining how this helps to reveal changes in the politics and ideology of the USSR, how manipulative mechanisms of oppressive power functioned, and what attitudes or shifts in attitudes were expected and/or demanded from society. During the Soviet rule in Latvia, manipulations in the interests of power were observed on different levels: (a) in the selection of texts

for translation, (b) in publication choices made by publishers and others in power, (c) in the strategies used in the process of translation, and (d) in the intended impact on the recipients of the translation. One manifestation of Soviet ideology can be observed in how translations are supplemented with paratextual elements like prefaces, afterwords, and other interpretive aids that contextualize the text.

The Soviet authorities regularly coordinated and strictly controlled all stages of the reception process of Anglophone literary texts to ensure an ideologically appropriate acceptance of the works. The governmental supervision of the publication of each text was strict, and the reception process was well-planned and organized, comprising all necessary activities of pre-publishing, while-publishing, and post-publishing stages. Soviet censorship officials ensured and controlled the mediation of reception from its initial phase, which consisted of the editorial work on the text and paratext (including dedications, forewords, prefaces, afterwords, postscripts, packaging, summaries on the back cover, and blurbs) to the final phase. A French sociologist Gisele Sapiro defines the following mediation ways of reception in the after-publication stage: "After publication, reception is mediated by interpretations and strategies of appropriation/ annexation of the work by agents (individuals and institutions), be they professionals (critics, peers) or amateurs, belonging to the literary field (journals, juries, academies, circles) or to other fields such as the political, the legal, the medical, the psychoanalytical, be they organizations (censorship, association, morality leagues) or private gatherings (such as reading clubs)" (Sapiro 2016, 324).

The present study considers the specifics of translation policy based on the material from the archives of the Soviet Latvian Writers' Union, the Latvian State Publishing House, and the main Soviet censorship body of Latvia – LGLP. The data collected from online Latvian Library resources and services (National Digital Library of Latvia and Periodicals) and the books – Latvian publications of Anglophone authors – are also analysed. In the present study, a perspective on translations from an external standpoint holds greater significance when discussing the results obtained from analysing the accompanying materials of the translations, such as reviews in periodicals and supplements included in the book editions (forewords, afterwords). When examining the latter, French theorist Gérard Genette's ideas on paratextual material are taken into account. It involves considering additional informative text added to the translations, such as

forewords, afterwords, or blurbs on the dust jackets of the books, as paratextual elements known as peritext, specifically prefaces (Genette 1997, 161). Genette uses this word “to designate every type of introductory (preludial or postludial) text, authorial or allographic, consisting of a discourse produced on the subject of the text that follows or precedes it” (Ibid.), noting that the postface is “considered a variety of preface” (Ibid.). The terms “paratext,” “paratextual,” “peritext,” and “preface” are used based on Genette’s theoretical framework as represented in his “Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation” concentrating on preface as a paratextual element taking the corpus of translated texts for granted. Within the context of Soviet ideological control and a well-organized censorship apparatus, the preface became an integral element in the regime’s propaganda web aimed at Sovietizing the Latvian nation and a secret key, both literally and metaphorically, for encoding messages for those capable of reading between the lines.

DISCUSSION I: THE STALIN ERA

The reign of Joseph Stalin lasted almost three decades, from 1924 to 1953. Latvia came under the sphere of Soviet influence after being occupied in 1940 and reoccupied in 1944/45. The occupation meant the loss of Latvia’s foreign policy, and many of the republic’s internal processes were dictated by the ideology emanating from Moscow. Soviet ideology and culture promoted the idea of two worlds – the camp of capitalism and the camp of socialism:

Since the formation of the Soviet republics, the states of the world have split into two camps: the camp of capitalism and the camp of socialism. There, in the camp of capitalism, there is national enmity and inequality, colonial slavery and chauvinism, national oppression and pogroms, imperialist atrocities.

Here, in the camp of socialism, there is mutual trust and peace, national work and equality, peaceful coexistence and fraternal co-operation of peoples. (“Deklaracija...” 1922)

As a part of the USSR, Latvia automatically moved from the “camp of capitalism” to the “camp of socialism” based on the Soviet paradigm.

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE USSR AND THE WEST IN THE STALIN ERA: POLITICAL AND CULTURAL DISCOURSE

Political attitudes towards foreign countries during the Stalin period directly influenced the translation strategy. One of the most important ideologies of the Stalinist period was the transition from the idea of a world revolution to building socialism in a single country. In 1936, the mention of the World Soviet Socialist Republic was removed from the Stalinist Constitution of the USSR (Grickiv 2012). During the 1920s and 1930s, Soviet military intelligence regarded Great Britain as the principal military enemy of the USSR, which, for economic and political reasons, could go to war against the USSR only at the head of a broad coalition of states bordering the USSR (“Orientirovochnyj...” 2015). Therefore, censors gave special attention to translations of Anglophone literature, including fiction.

After the end of World War II, former members of the anti-Hitler coalition found themselves on opposite sides of the Iron Curtain, as Winston Churchill formulated it in his Fulton speech (Churchill). The Second World War was replaced by the Cold War. The concept of the Cold War lies in the political, economic, and ideological confrontation of the two systems, balancing on the verge of an armed clash. On March 12, 1947, the US presidential administration proclaimed the Truman Doctrine, providing American military assistance to countries where the “communist threat” loomed (The Truman). The United States became the main ideological and political opponent of the USSR in the world. It is worth noting that America was also part of the Anglophone world, and pressure on the translation industry did not ease.

The rivalry between the USSR and the USA was primarily of a military-political nature. However, both sides sought to avoid an open conflict due to uncertainty about its possible outcome (Dukes 2016, 5). As a result, other areas became the arena of the struggle, including science, sports, and art. Hence, in the cultural sphere, the relations between the USSR and the West were also marked by ideological differences and cultural clashes. The Soviet Union’s promotion of socialist realism, censorship, and state control of the arts clashed with the Western values of artistic freedom, individualism, and market-based culture. The cultural exchanges between the two sides were often subject to political manipulation and propaganda, as both sought to promote their worldview and discredit the other. The persecution of dissidents and non-

conformists in the USSR was one of the most visible examples of this cultural conflict.

TRANSLATION POLICY IN THE STALIN ERA

To expedite the Sovietization process of the Latvian nation, immediately after the Soviet occupation in 1940, “the USSR developed [...] a system of cultural surveillance of Latvian SSR, including a tool for controlling literary processes – the Soviet Latvian Writers’ Union” (Burima 2018, 555). One of the Union’s crucial tasks was “to fight against all kinds of reactionary ideological influences” (Ibid.), which in the 1940s were mostly represented by Western culture. The translator section was founded, and they “decided at their meetings what works would be translated from foreign languages of the Western and other countries in the world, assessing whether they do not contain banned topics and lexis inappropriate for Soviet people” (Ibid., 556). It was expected and demanded that literature published in the Soviet Union would propagate the positive sides of the socialist system and criticize highly negative aspects of the capitalistic system.

The choice of literary works to be published was limited and extremely selective. Foreign authors and their texts deemed “appropriate” for reading were selected with the utmost caution. As an obvious consequence, a variety of source languages fell off, especially in the first years of occupation: “Russian immediately became the main source language, and Soviet literature turned into the mainstay of fiction translation. [...] German was almost completely ousted [...] Other languages were minimized: Western literature was reduced to progressive authors only [...]” (Veisbergs 2014, 33–34). Ideological tasks set upon foreign texts were the same as for Soviet literature: to help Latvian readers build a new – socialist – life, to create a positive outlook on socialism, to disclose all the negative sides of the capitalist system, to make society active in defending the principles of socialism and in fighting against the dangers of capitalism.

Unsurprisingly, translations from the Russian language prevailed as being more secure, more consistent with Soviet ideology, and already approved by the Party. Sovietization targeted numerous spheres of human life, including art. Soviet authorities were aware of the power of influence of all artistic expressions. Referring to Epp Annus: “The Stalinist era, with a highly circumscribed model for acceptable art, Socialist Realism,

repositioned the art sphere inside the sphere of politics. Art became a political tool to serve the Socialist worldview, under the direct oversight of the Communist Party” (Annus 2018, 1). Therefore, foreign authors were selected very carefully, considering many factors: the country they were from, the political and economic system in the country, and the writers’ beliefs and worldviews. The Latvian professor and specialist in translation studies, Ieva Zauberga, outlines the tendencies related to foreign literature in the later period of the Soviet occupation (the 1960s and 1970s) and states that foreign works that did not oppose the Soviet course or that concentrated on injustices of capitalism were highly appreciated, and their authors canonized (Jack London, John Goldsworthy, Theodor Dreiser, Archibald Joseph Cronin). However, the situation was more complex with contemporary authors as one could not predict their public announcements or literary works (Zauberga 2016, 37). The research results demonstrate that the same tendencies are also well presented in Soviet Latvia of the 1940s and 1950s.

Several specific features characterize the phenomenon of Anglophone literature in Latvia during the Stalin years. Firstly, due to ideological causes, a comparatively small number of Anglophone titles were translated and published compared to the literature translated from Russian. Secondly, the preference was given to contemporary progressive writers who had declared their socialist views or demonstrated their anti-imperialistic position. In the initial years of Latvia’s occupation (1940–1941; 1944/45–1949), 35 titles authored by 25 Anglophone writers were published, predominantly featuring progressive perspectives. Of these, 14 were contemporaries, and 4 were non-contemporaries considered active opponents of the capitalist system, social commentators, or supporters of revolutionary activities. From contemporary progressive authors, the names of Richard Aldington, Archibald Joseph Cronin, John Boynton Priestley, and Upton Sinclair can be mentioned. Non-contemporary authors allowed for publishing were Ethel Lilian Voynich, Mark Twain, Jack London, and Theodore Dreiser (partly a contemporary (died in 1945) but is known for his socialist fiction and essays written before).

Some Anglophone works, or fragments translated into Latvian, appeared in periodicals or collections, but this seemed to be the exception rather than the rule. For example, the translation of Ernest Hemingway’s novel “To Have and Have Not” was serialized in one of the Latvian entertainment magazines –

“Atpūta” [Leisure] – from January to April 1941, before the Soviet Union was involved in World War II (Hemingvejs 1941). Another example refers to the collection devoted to the Elections to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on February 10, 1946, in which stories by authors of different countries were included, and the main criteria were either the glorification of the Soviet political system or criticism and satire of the election procedure in capitalist countries. In the collection, the Anglophone segment is represented only by progressive authors and social commentators, such as the writer and journalist (known as muckraker) Samuel Hopkins Adams; the novelist, writer, journalist, political activist, and politician Upton Sinclair; the American writer and lawyer Thomas Sigismund Stribling; the novelist and journalist Theodor Dreiser; and the writer, humorist, entrepreneur, publisher, and lecturer Mark Twain. The titles themselves are indicative: for instance, “Freedom of Speech” by Sinclair, “Running for Governor” by Twain, and “The Sound Wagon” by Stribling (Rudzītis 1946).

In general, Anglophone literary texts were chosen with extreme caution because their authors came from the capitalist world. Especially after World War II, when the world was split into two opposing camps – socialism and capitalism – the former wartime allies (American and British nationals) became the USSR’s main political and ideological opponents. In Soviet Latvia under Stalin, Anglophone authors’ books entered the publishing market with precautionary measures. Reviews were published in newspapers and literary magazines to ensure the “correct” reading and understanding of the text that would correspond to Soviet ideology. Thus, the Anglophone works approved by Soviet censorship were preceded or accompanied by high critical acclaim in the press, praising what had to be praised in Soviet literature of that time: a sound criticism of the capitalist system and a positive attitude towards the socialist political course. For example, in the literary monthly “Karogs” [The Flag], a Latvian reader finds out that the:

Latvian publication of the novel “The Financier” has appeared at the right time. For us, who currently see the United States and its official leaders as the vanguard of world reactionary forces and as instigators of a potential new world war, it is important to understand the power structure of these reactionary leaders, the emergence and essence of American monopolies, trusts, and banks. Theodore Dreiser expertly

portrays this. Secondly, it is no less important for us to recognize that there were and still are talented and strong-willed individuals in America who are critical of America's reactionary forces and who know how to expose their horrors and fight against them. Through his literary works, including "The Financier," Theodore Dreiser has demonstrated this. [...] Dreiser's "The Financier" serves as a weapon for us in Latvia against the bourgeois theories of the "land of great opportunity" for every hardworking person, a land where everyone attains happiness without socialism. "The Financier" dismantles these beliefs. (Niedre 1948, 479)

Similarly, in the foreword to O. Henry's collection of short stories, the reviewer writes: "As a keen and critical observer, O. Henry perceives many social contradictions, flaws, and injustices within the capitalist system. His gaze is particularly fixed upon the big speculators and stock market financiers, whom he regards as the most despicable plunderers" (Pārupe 1946, 3).

In some instances, Soviet readers were reminded that the writers hailed from the enemy's camp. Consequently, even in their best works, some remarkable drawbacks remained unacceptable and uncharacteristic of a "New Soviet Person." These drawbacks include a lack of fighting spirit, readiness to surrender and tolerate hardship, and the absence of a positive worldview or clear directions for active opposition: "In demonstrating his successes in the field of pamphleteering, ruthlessly attacking bourgeois democracy and openly criticizing the Labour government, Aldridge, like Shaw, falls short in his conclusions. He retreats into the shadow of utopian "economic democracy" when faced with the cardinal problem of resolving the issue of England's future path" (Viktorovs 1948, 5).

DISCUSSION II: THE KHRUSHCHEV TIME

The reign of Nikita Khrushchev, which lasted over ten years (1953–1964), is often associated with the Thaw period. This era was named after the story of the same name by Ilya Ehrenburg, published in the May 1954 issue of "Znamya" [The Banner] magazine (Shubin 2008). The Thaw primarily affected the internal political life of the USSR. There was a condemnation of Stalin's personality cult and repressions, the release of political prisoners, and the liquidation of the GULAG. This period can be seen as a shift from a totalitarian dictatorship to a softer form, an increase in

freedom of speech, and a relative liberalization of political and public life. However, the apparatus of censorship became more developed and multi-level. Referring to the Latvian scholar Briedis, at the beginning of the 1960s “Glavlit was still overseeing the process of censorship, but this process was now much more complex, with interaction between all levels of the censorship hierarchy” (Briedis 2010, 182). Annus states that “The post-Stalin years significantly eased the strict subordination of art to politics [...], yet the relationship between art and politics retained much of its complexity” (Annus 2018, 2). The isolationist policies of the Stalinist era were replaced by a time of greater creative freedom and openness to the Western world. In 1955, leaders of the UK, the USA, the USSR, and France met in Geneva for the first time since the Potsdam Conference. On July 28, 1957, the VI World Festival of Youth and Students opened in Moscow, attended by 34,000 people from 131 countries under the slogan “For Peace and Friendship”. Finally, in 1959, Khrushchev visited the USA as the head of the Soviet government.

RELATIONS BETWEEN THE USSR AND THE WEST IN THE KHRUSHCHEV TIME: POLITICAL AND CULTURAL DISCOURSE

During de-Stalinization, Latvian national communists came to power in the Latvian SSR. They advocated limiting migration, maintaining the status of the Latvian language, and restricting the scale of industrialization in the republic. Khrushchev’s secret speech (February 25, 1956) caused rapid changes in society. A new and unexpected situation arose in the leadership of the party, which until then had been accustomed to unconditional obedience (“Khrushchev...” 2016). The process of de-Stalinization in society had assumed such proportions that it had gone further than the initiators of the event expected. In the summer of 1956, political prisoners’ mass release and rehabilitation finally began. Tens of thousands of people returned from detention and exile to Latvia. Most of those who were killed or died during the terror were rehabilitated.

The criticism of the “Cult of personality,” the beginning of the rehabilitation of the repressed, and the results of the 20th Congress radically changed the atmosphere in the country and the situation in literature, art, and science (Naumov 1996). A considerable number of literary and popular science monthlies began to be published, and symphonic music by composers banned at the

beginning of the century, such as Prokofiev and Shostakovich, began to be played. Solzhenitsyn's novel "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich" made a significant impact. A whole constellation of literary and cinematic works appeared that took a completely different look at wartime events. However, the confrontation between the two irreconcilable systems continued, reaching its climax during the Cuban Missile Crisis.

TRANSLATION POLICY IN THE KHRUSHCHEV TIME

In 1961, the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union took place, where the Moral Code of the Builder of Communism was adopted along with the slogan "Communism in 20 years". This set the program for forming and developing new members of the communist society, which was activated and supported throughout the decade using all the levers of power, including literature.

The authorities in the Soviet Union paid close attention to the propagandistic mission of printed material. The role of books in the process of creating a new society in the USSR is undeniable. In the Soviet ideological struggle against the "rotten" capitalist way of life and "aggressive" imperialism, literature was an efficient weapon of propaganda and counter-propaganda. It was postulated that the USSR was the most-read country in the world. One of the slogans propagating reading among school children was "A book is the best present". The importance of books in the life of a Soviet citizen was regularly emphasized and reminded. Reading was considered an activity of the utmost importance for Soviet people of any age.

In the 1950s and 1960s, the promotion of reading was actively carried out in Latvia through printed propaganda. For instance, in one of the 1966 issues of the monthly "Jaunās Grāmatas" [The New Books], the editorial addressed the readers with the slogan "A Soviet person cannot live without books, without reading" (Vējāns 1966, 1). Another article in the same monthly, titled "A Person with a Book", emphasized the importance of books: "One of the most beautiful images of our homeland is a person who comes towards us with a book in their hand raised high" (Sudrabkalns 1967, 5). Books are often referred to as friends, comrades, or even soldiers, as seen in the quote: "Thinking about the great anniversary, books, written by manly, brave hands, line the shelves like faithful soldiers in their battle line" (Vējāns 1967, 2).

Translated literature was a crucial mouthpiece for Soviet ideology and propaganda. In Latvia, translation was particularly significant, accounting for more than half of all published fiction:

What is stated in the party program project regarding literature, [...] applies not only to original works by writers-authors but also to writers-translators, especially in our republic. Here, translated literature in terms of volume surpasses half of all published fiction. Translators, in their translations, have the responsibility to provide Latvian readers with the most ideologically valuable and artistically outstanding works that have emerged in Russian literature, Russian Soviet literature, literature of other Soviet nations, as well as literature from around the world. ("Pielikums..." 1961, 92)

The provided quote also indicates translation choices in Soviet Latvia that prioritized Russian literature, Russian Soviet literature, and literature from other Soviet nations.

Considering translation from a socio-political perspective reveals how the USSR's politics and ideology changed and how the manipulative mechanism of oppressive power functioned. In the Khrushchev era, the regime authorities continued their quantitative (collectivization of agriculture, socialist industrialization) and qualitative (values of the Soviet system) policies to impose a socialist way of living and thinking on the Latvians, making them grow into the Soviet system and accept the identity of a New Soviet Person. It is worth noting that the "Soviet power tended to control all aspects of an individual's life, including the private life and leisure time" (Bleiere 2015, 160).

Regarding the relationship between literature and power, Briedis observes that "In the early 1960s, the reins of censorship tightened" (Briedis 2010, 130). According to the Latvian scholar, a special regulation was implemented that allowed only individuals with higher education to be hired by censorship institutions (Ibid., 129), forming a new generation of censors who were more educated, ideologically demanding, and obedient to Moscow officials. These new censors controlled all information to which society had access. "During the 1960s, a mechanism of information control was developed that remained for the most part unchanged until the end of the 1980s. The relationship between the texts and their controllers became more sophisticated" (Ibid., 182). In the Soviet Union, Glavlit eliminated any unwanted printed

materials and ensured the correct ideological interpretation of all published items.

In the Khrushchev era, the number of works by Anglophone writers translated into Latvian increased, with 86 titles appearing, including repeatedly published works. On average, eight books per year were published, compared to five books per year in the previous period under Stalin's regime. Furthermore, there was more diversity in the choice of authors and genres available to Soviet readers, who could now read detective stories, adventure literature, and science fiction in Latvian. For example, although the Latvian translation of Arthur Conan Doyle's detective novel "The Hound of the Baskervilles" appeared in 1903, it was only retranslated and published during the Soviet period in 1957. This meant that Latvians could read the novel for the first time, as literature translated and published before the Soviet occupation mainly was banned and eliminated from shops and libraries due to Soviet policy. A thematic book series titled "Adventure and Science Fiction" was launched from 1958 to 1966. It featured works by Latvian and many Soviet Russian writers and publications by foreign authors. For instance, Mayne Reid's "Osceola the Seminole" (1960), James Fenimore Cooper's "The Deerslayer" (1962), and Herbert George Wells' "The Time Machine" (1963) were among the books published in the series.

However, it should be noted that despite the evident growth of Anglophone literature published in Latvian during the Khrushchev era, these were still works written by authors from Western bloc countries and, therefore, were subjected to thorough censorship at all stages of the reception process. The authors and their works were presented to the public in a biased, ideologically determined manner, particularly for living writers. Ideology is evident in the incorporation of paratextual materials. The study of prefaces uncovered specific patterns that aim to facilitate an "appropriate" comprehension of a Western author and their work.

The comparative study of the first three decades of the Soviet rule in Latvia, from the 1940s to the 1960s, has revealed a remarkable peculiarity. During the 1940s and the early 1950s (under Stalin's power), numerous translations of works by Anglophone authors were published in Latvian without any preface. In total, 48 titles by Anglophone authors from America, Britain, Australia, and Ireland were published, and only 15 of them (31%) contained additional information about the author and their work. Furthermore, most of these prefaces were found in publications from the early 1950s. Of the 35 titles published in the

1940s, only eight (23%) included a preface. However, in the subsequent three years of the 1950s, more than half of the 13 titles published (54%) included a preface. Over time, the situation changed, and from the 1950s onwards, more Latvian publications of Anglophone literature began to include introductory or concluding information about the authors, their lives, views, and work. As was customary in the Soviet Union, this tendency was dictated from “above” as Professor Veisbergs puts it: “The new guidelines determined by the Resolution of the Central Committee of the CPSU of June 4 1957 stated that Western translations should carry long introductions and annotations, to help Soviet readers understand what was right and wrong” (Veisbergs 2020, 139). These guidelines stated that Western translations should include lengthy introductions and annotations to help Soviet readers understand the context.

During the Khrushchev Thaw, ideological indoctrination of society took a new turn. Prefaces and reviews in periodicals were seen as providing the correct direction for Soviet readers. 86 works (including republished titles) by British, Irish, American, British-American and Australian authors were translated into Latvian and published. Out of these, 50 works (58%) were supplemented with additional informative text such as a foreword, afterword, or blurb on the dust jackets of the books. In some cases, these were small sheets of paper found on the inner side of the cover. Notably, this indicates that these leaflets were manually glued after all book copies were published. It was common in the USSR for corrections to be made in the printed edition due to censorship demands or restrictions. Some of the prefaces are mere translations from the Russian editions previously published in the Soviet Union, while others are prepared by Latvian authors, including writers, poets, translators, reviewers, or members of the editorial board of the publishing house, who provide information about the author and their work.

In prefaces, one can discover openly expressed negative attitudes and criticism towards the capitalist system and a positive and supportive outlook on the socialist political course. They emphasize the author’s progressiveness, while also condemning their insufficient fighting spirit, inactive social position, or propensity for decadence. The necessity of reading for every member of Soviet society is complemented by direct indications and guidelines on how to read and understand the text. It highlights what to look for in the book written by a Western author and its significance in the life of a Soviet person: “The novel

[R. Aldington's "All Men are Enemies"] is significant because it [...], convincingly criticizes bourgeois society and truly portrays the tragedy of the lost generation" (Šmulovičs 1964, 492).

Another common strategy is a description of horrors and cruelties inherent in the capitalist system. During the Cold War, society cultivated an image of the political enemy—the imperialist West, primarily represented by the USA. "[...] the Soviet Cold War culture had produced and disseminated an array of patterns, tropes, images, and words, devised to wage rhetorical war" (Norris 2020, 519). The reviewers spare no sharp epithets and employ colourful metaphors, referring to capitalists and capitalism as "degenerate spokesmen of the capitalist system" (Bauga 1961, 224), "these morally degraded creatures" (Ibid.), "predator morality" (Ibid.), "the nailed heel of capitalism" (Rambeka 1960, 289).

A specific technique involved comparing the United States, the main ideological enemy of the Soviets during the Cold War period, with Hitler's Germany. This practice was common in the Soviet Union during the 1950s and 1960s. For instance, Latvian political caricatures from that time equated the "Made in USA" sign with the German swastika, suggesting that both symbols could easily substitute for one another (Badina et al. 2021, 134). It was stated that after World War II, the "American ruling forces are increasingly leaning towards fascism", ("Romāna ..." 1962) reminding Soviet readers of the corrupt state system and aggressive politics in the United States, drawing parallels with Nazi Germany.

As a mandatory reminder, the fantastic opportunities and achievements of the socialist system are highlighted, along with an appeal to Soviet readers to be prepared to fight for a better future for all of humanity against the enemies of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, it encourages them to celebrate the course of the Communist Party.

One integral aspect of many prefaces is using the term "progressive" when characterizing Anglophone authors and their literary works. For instance, we often see phrases like "the great English progressive writer H. J. Wales" (Zālīte 1963, 356), "the outstanding American satirist and progressive realist writer Mark Twain" (Solomonovs 1955, 170), and "Archibald Cronin, who can rightfully be considered a progressive writer" (Bauga 1961, 225). In the Soviet Union, "progressiveness" is regarded as the most suitable and acceptable label for foreign authors whose works are allowed for publication. The use of the term "progressive" seems

to have become an automatic reaction in the context of Western (foreign, English, and American) literature.

Additionally, the reader is cautioned and reminded that regardless of the progressiveness of an author from a capitalist bloc country, their writings are characterized by significant drawbacks, which are unacceptable for a Soviet person. These drawbacks include a lack of fighting spirit, reluctance to actively and even aggressively resist capitalism, tolerance towards imperfections and negative aspects of the bourgeois lifestyle, and disbelief in the power of the working class: "Doris Lessing has not yet delved into the portrayal of active struggle in her work; she has not been able to capture the driving force within a nation oppressed by colonialism" (Jarmolinska 1961, 305).

To summarize, it is crucial to note that all the prefaces examined aimed to ensure the ideological education of society. Furthermore, they served as unique mechanisms for Western authors to secure publication. However, what sets these texts apart is that they were not solely written to appease censors and provide Soviet readers with the correct understanding of an author and their work, along with a mandatory set of ideological slogans and phrases:

A curious way of fighting conventions and therefore promoting new forms and literary subjects is the intentional disguise of the translated literary texts as patriotic or socially oriented by equipping them with misleading prefaces and reviews, as well as with biographies of their authors. (Kamovnikova 2019, 34)

In 1960, when the Latvian publication of Edgar Allan Poe's short story collection was released, the renowned Latvian poet and translator of Poe, Vizma Belševica, mostly avoided the typical cliché techniques in her preface. There is no mention of "progressive writer" or "Soviet reader," although "the self-satisfied bourgeoisie" is still present. What is remarkable is Belševica's skilful evasion of certain controversial aspects of Poe's biography and creative writing. To maintain the image of an author permitted for publication in Soviet Latvia, the translator chooses not to focus on specific details of his life, such as Poe's heavy drinking or his marriage to his 13-year-old cousin. Instead, she writes that Poe "has been subjected to so much hatred and slander that literary scholars have not yet been able to fully establish the true details of his biography" (Belševica 1960, 6). Without clearly defining the

American author's literary affiliations, Belševica criticizes what was expected to be criticized in Soviet literary science. She negatively reviews Romanticism and Gothic literature, emphasizing that "In his work, Poe managed to avoid almost all the typical weaknesses of romanticists" (Ibid., 9–10).

CONCLUSION

Latvia's occupation disrupted the country's natural development and cultural landscape. Writers, like many other artists, faced the harshest censorship. The Soviet Latvian Writers' Union, speaking on behalf of the collective "we," turned into a body fighting dissent. Western culture was primarily regarded as bourgeois and reactionary in relation to Soviet culture. In the 1940s, the selection of foreign literature was highly restricted and selective, emphasizing the promotion of the positive aspects of the socialist system and criticism of the negative aspects of capitalism. Art became a political instrument, serving the socialist worldview under the direct control of the Communist Party.

Due to geopolitical interests, particular attention was given to Anglophone literature during the Stalinist period in Latvia. A meticulous selection process took place, resulting in only progressive writers being allowed to be translated, openly expressing their socialist views or demonstrating an anti-imperialist stance. Particular emphasis was placed on reviews and critical responses in newspapers and literary journals, aiming to assist, or rather impose, readers with interpreting texts following the spirit of Soviet ideology. The publication of translations of English-language literature in Soviet Latvia in the 1940s and 1950s became an example of careful selection and ideological control by the authorities.

During the Khrushchev era, the translation and publication of English literature in the Latvian language noticeably increased, offering Soviet readers a broader choice of authors and genres. The average number of books published yearly rose from five under the Stalinist regime to eight. This shift allowed Soviet Latvian readers to explore detective novels, adventure literature, and science fiction, which had previously been limited due to Soviet policies. Despite this growth, it is essential to acknowledge that these translations underwent thorough censorship throughout the entire process, and the authors and their works were presented with prejudice under ideological influence.

During the Khrushchev Thaw, the tradition of writing ideological commentaries with propagandistic intent continued. The paratextual elements preserved the same strategies inherited from the previous period. They called upon readers to actively resist capitalism on the ideological front. In addition to describing the horrors and cruelty of the capitalist world, the prefaces introduced a new propagandistic tendency – drawing parallels between the United States of America and Nazi Germany- to evoke a sense of outrage among Soviet readers.

The paratextual material aimed to shape the ideological upbringing of society while simultaneously serving as a facade for the publication of Western literature. However, it also employed deceptive tactics to promote new forms and narratives, disguising translated works as patriotic or socially oriented. The prefaces were carefully crafted to deceive the authorities and, at the same time, provide Soviet readers with captivating examples of foreign literature, all within the framework of ideological conformity.

Soviet ideology and ideological orientations, established and endorsed by the party apparatus, are vividly manifested in the paratextual material used to frame English-language literary texts. Prefaces and reviews often reveal openly expressed negative attitudes and criticism towards the capitalist system while exhibiting a positive or supportive view of the socialist political course. Emphasis is placed on the author's progressiveness, albeit accompanied by condemnation of their perceived lack of combativeness, inactive social stance, or inclination towards decadence. The necessity of reading for every member of Soviet society is complemented and reinforced by direct instructions and guidelines on how to read and understand the text, what to perceive in it, and what significance the book written by a Western author holds in the life of a Soviet individual. In the Soviet ideological struggle against the "decaying" and "rotten" capitalist way of life and "aggressive" imperialism, literature was regarded as an effective propaganda tool.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The research has been implemented thanks to the financial support from ERDF ("Literary and Political Discourse of Translations in Totalitarianism: Anglophone Literature in Soviet Latvia"; application No. 1.1.1.2/VIAA/3/19/452).

REFERENCES

1. Annus, E. (2018). "Between Arts and Politics: A Postcolonial View on Baltic Cultures of the Soviet Era." In: Annus, E. (ed.) *Coloniality, Nationality, Modernity: A Postcolonial View on Baltic Cultures under Soviet Rule*. London, New York: Routledge, 1–13.
2. Badina, E., Badins, Z. and Kovzele, O. (2021). "The Soviet Image of the USA in Latvian Satirical Journalism of the 1960s: Textual and Visual Code." *Journal of Comparative Studies* 14 (43), 118–145.
3. Bauga, A. (1961). "Par autoru un viņa romānu." In: Kronins, A. *Ziemeļu gaisma*. Rīga: LVI, 223–225.
4. Belševica, V. (1960). "Dižais Amerikas vientuļnieks." In: Po, E. A. *Stāstu izlase*. Rīga: LVI, 5–11.
5. Bleiere, D. (2015). *Eiropa ārpus Eiropas... Dzīve Latvijas PSR*. Rīga: LU Akadēmiskais apgāds.
6. Briedis, R. (2010). *Teksta cenzūras īsais kurss: prozas teksts un cenzūra padomju gados Latvijā*. Rīga: LU Literatūras, folkloras un mākslas institūts.
7. Burima, M. (2018). "Strategies of the Writers' Unions in the Soviet Bloc Countries in Converting the Mutual Literary Canon: Rainis – 1965." In: *5th International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on Social Sciences and Arts: SGEM 2018 Conference Proceedings* 5, 6(2), 555–562.
8. Churchill, W. "The Sinews of Peace" ('Iron Curtain Speech'). *Speeches 1946–1963: Elder Statesman*. Available at: <<https://winstonchurchill.org/resources/speeches/1946-1963-elder-statesman/the-sinews-of-peace-iron-curtain-speech-audio/>> (accessed May 2023).
9. "Deklaracija ob obrazovanii Sojuza Sovetskikh Socialisticheskikh Respublik i Dogovor ob obrazovanii Sojuza Sovetskikh Socialisticheskikh Respublik, 30 dekabreja 1922 g." (1922). Available at: <https://www.1000dokumente.de/index.html?c=dokument_ru&dokument=0004_uni&object=translation&l=ru> (accessed May 2023).

10. Dukes, P. (1989) 2016. *The Last Great Game: USA Versus USSR*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
11. Genette, G. (1987) 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Transl. by J. E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. Grickiv, B. (2012). *Konstitucija RSFSR 1918 g. i Konstitucija SSSR 1936 g.: Sravnitel'nyj analiz. Chast' 1*. Available at: <<https://web.archive.org/web/20141018090244/http://marksist.bl ox.ua/2012/05/KONSTITUTsiYa-RSFSR-1918-g-iKONSTITUTsiYa-SSSR.html>> (accessed September 2023).
13. Hemingvejs, E. (1941). "Mantīgie un nemantīgie." *Atpūta* 3, 18–22; 4, 18–22; 5, 18–22; 6, 18–22; 7, 18–22; 8, 18–22; 9, 18–22; 10, 18 22; 11, 4–8; 12, 4–8; 13, 4–8; 14, 4–8; 15, 4–8; 16, 4-5.
14. Jarmolinska, T. (1961). "Pēc vārds." In: Lessinga, D. *Burvestība nav pārdodama*. Rīga: LVI, 301–305.
15. Kamińska-Chełminiak, K. (2021). "Polish Censorship during the Late Stalinist Period." *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo universiteta. Istorija* 66 (1), 245–259. <https://doi.org/10.21638/11701/spbu02.2021.115>
16. Kamovnikova, N. (2019). *Made Under Pressure: Literary Translation in the Soviet Union, 1960–1991*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
17. "Khrushchev and the Twentieth Congress of the Communist Party, 1956." (2016). Available at: <<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1953-1960/khrushchev-20th-congress>> (accessed September 2023).
18. Naumov, V. (1996). "K istorii sekretnogo doklada N. S. Hrushhjo va na XX s'ezde KPSS." In: *Novaja i novejšhaja istorija* 4. Available at: <<http://vivovoco.astronet.ru/VV/PAPERS/HISTORY/ANTIST>> (accessed September 2023).
19. Niedre, J. (1948). "Grāmata par Amerikas reakciju." *Karogs* 4, 477–479.
20. Norris, S. M. (2020). "Two Worlds: Boris Efimov, Soviet Political Caricature, and the Construction of the Long Cold War." In: Skrodzka, A., Lu, X. and Marciniak, K. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Communist Visual Cultures*. New York: Oxford University Press, 519–541.
21. "Orientirovochnyj doklad Razvedupravlenija Shtaba RKKa o vozmozhnosti vooruzhennogo vystuplenija protiv SSSR v svjazi s vrazhdebnoj politikoj Anglii (po dannym k 20 ijulja 1925 g.). 20 ijulja 1925 g." (2015). In: Ul', M., Haustov, V. and Zaharov, V.

(eds.) *Glazami razvedki. SSSR i Evropa. 1919–1938 gody. Sbornik dokumentov iz rossijskih arhivov*. Moskva: Istoricheskaja literature, 198–201.

22. Pārupe, L. (1946). "O. Henri." In: Henri, O. *Stāstu izlase*. Rīga: Grāmatu apgāds, 3–5.

23. "Pielikums Nr. 1." (1961). *Latvijas Valsts Arhīvs: Tulkotāju Sekcijas protokoli Nr. 1–9, 2037-1-196*, 86–137.

24. Rambeka, L. (1960). "Par Frensi Bret-Hartu." In: Bret-Harts, F. *Noveles*. Rīga: LVI, 287–289.

25. "Romāna 'Starmeša gaismā' autore." (1962). In: Doda, M. *Starmeša gaismā*. Rīga: LVI, inner side of the cover.

26. Rudzītis, M., ed. (1946). *Dzīves apliecinātāju balsis: Daiļliteratūra PSRS Augstākās Padomes vēlēšanām 1946. g. 10. febr.*, vol. 1, Rīga: Valsts apgādniecību un poligrāfisko uzņēmumu pārvalde.

27. Sapiro, G. (2016). "The Sociology of Reception." In: Schildgen, B. D. and Hexter R. (eds.) *Reading the Past Across Space and Time: Receptions and World Literature*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 321–339.

28. Shubin, A. (2008). *Dissidenty, neformaly i svoboda v SSSR. Tajny sovetskoj jepohi*. Moskva: Veche. Available at: <https://royallib.com/read/shubin_aleksandr/dissidenti_neformali_i_svoboda_v_ssr.html#186828> (accessed September 2023).

29. Siddiqi, A. (2021). "Soviet Secrecy: Toward a Social Map of Knowledge." *The American Historical Review* 126 (3), 1046–1071. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ahr/rhab401>

30. Solomonovs, A. (1955). "Marks Tvens." In: Tvens, M. *Engeļa vēstule un citi stāsti*. Rīga: LVI, 170–173.

31. Sudrabkalns, J. (1967). "Cilvēks ar grāmatu." *Jaunās Grāmatas* 11, 2–5.

32. Šmulovičs, M. (1964). "Pēcvārdi." In: Aldingtons, R. *Visi cilvēki ir ienaidnieki*. Rīga: LVI, 489–493.

33. *The Truman Doctrine, 1947*. Available at: <<https://history.state.gov/milestones/1945-1952/truman-doctrine#:~:text=With%20the%20Truman%20Doctrine%2C%20President,external%20or%20internal%20authoritarian%20forces>> (accessed May 2023).

34. Veisbergs, A. (2014). "Translation Policies in Latvia during the German Occupation." *Vertimo studijos* 7, 31–44.

35. Veisbergs, A. (2020). *Latvian Translation Scene in the 20th Century*. Berlin: LAP Lambert Academic Publishing.
36. Vējāns, A. (1966). "Pavasaris un grāmatas." *Jaunās Grāmatas* 4, 1–2.
37. Vējāns, A. (1967). "Jubilejas gada vērtos stāvēt." *Jaunās Grāmatas* 1, 2–3.
38. Viktorovs, J. (1948). "Priekšvārds." In: Oldridžs, D. *Četrdesmit devītais štats*. Rīga: Latvijas Valsts izdevniecība, 3–13.
39. Zauberga, I. (2016). *Tulkošanas teorija profesionāliem tulkiem un tulkotājiem*. Available at: <https://www.rakstiskatulkosana.lv.lv/fileadmin/user_upload/lu_portal/projekti/rakstiskatulkosana/Tulkosanas_teorija_Zauberga_LAT.pdf> (accessed May 2023).
40. Zālīte, T. (1963). "Herberts Džordžs Velss (1866–1946)." In: Velss, H. D. *Laika mašīna*. Rīga: LVI, 356–362.