

Andrejs Veisbergs

Latvian and Lithuanian Lexicography- Historical Comparison (17th to 20th century)

Abstract

Latvian and Lithuanian lexicography started with multilingual dictionaries at approximately the same time (German-Latvian dictionary in 1638 and a trilingual Polish-Latin-Lithuanian dictionary in 1620). Dictionaries were mostly compiled by non-native pastors and priests. The bilingual/multilingual tradition was retained for the following two centuries and can be easily explained by the primary need for contact with peoples and texts of the other languages important in the region at the time. The dictionaries grew in scope and precision. The living folk language really appeared in dictionaries only in the second half of the 19th century when dictionaries were made mostly by native philologists.

The iconic national works were developed in the early 20th century during the independence period. Latvian (Muehlenbach's) dictionary (1923-1946), in fact, is a Latvian-German dictionary, it possessed a strong purist tendency and was mostly folk sources based. Lithuanian iconic dictionary, notably larger, took a whole century to accomplish under various editorial principles. Bilingual dictionaries with the main contact languages dominated in the dictionary scene.

The Soviet period produced normative monolingual desktop type dictionaries, as well as many bilingual dictionaries of various type to serve the needs of multilingual communication. Thus for the Baltic nations the term "dictionary" is mostly associated with a bilingual one.

End of the 20th century sees the development of the electronic resources which no doubt will hold the future. The Baltic dictionary scene has been and is vibrant and unexpectedly well developed for these small nations.

Introduction

The two Baltic nations and languages share many similarities and as many differences. These include kindred languages for Latvian and Lithuanian, while different early history - German and Lutheran dominance in Latvia, while Polish and Catholic dominance in Lithuania. Yet also part of Lithuanian populated territory (Lithuania Minor/Eastern Prussia) was under the German dominance and much of the early Lithuanian dictionary work took place there. Eastern part of Latvia shared Catholic and political affiliation with Lithuania and in the 19th century suffered under similar Russification policies when in the rest of Latvia there was a fast surge of economy, education, literacy and nationalism. It should be pointed out that majority of local people were illiterate until the 19th century. Since the beginning of the 20th century both nations had a similar history. The numerous parallel and amazingly similar processes testifying to the common space of knowledge (Wissensraum). Partly this can be explained by a coordinated activities of the Churches, also well connected German elites.

This paper looks mostly at key general tendencies and key lexicographic works. There are numerous others that cannot be mentioned for lack of time and space. There are also valuable dictionary manuscripts in both languages that are important for linguistic studies of the period. However their restricted availability for general public (they were at best utilized by later lexicographers) means they had a limited impact on

language development. In Lithuanian case they were occasionally even spread rewritten by hand thus having slightly wider circulation.

Background

The first dictionaries were preceded by the early written monuments which came into being as a result of Reformation ideas that the Word of God should be preached in a language that is understandable or communication with God could proceed individually via the written word and naturally in a language closer to the human. Counter-reformation and Catholic backlash also seems to have helped, as a situation of competition between the churches (Tägepera 2010:7) via the texts in native language contributed to more translation and writing. Serious religious literature calls for a broader choice of vocabulary, abstract notions, certain curtailment of dialects and varieties, normativization of the language which are precursors of literary language. This contributed to the development of writing in the Baltic languages, formation of grammars and dictionaries. A parallel technological process that assisted dissemination of writing was the establishment of the print shops in the Baltic area. The first was set up as early as in 1522/25 in Vilnius by Francysk Skoryna. Nicolaus Mollin(us) established a print shop in Riga in 1588. In Latvian the Catholic Catechism was published in Vilnius in 1585, Luther's Small Catechism in Königsberg in 1586/7, the New Testament in 1685, the Old Testament in 1689 and the full Bible in 1694, translated by Ernst Glück printed in Riga. In Lithuanian Luther's Small Catechism, extracts from Gospels and the epistles of the Apostles and eleven hymns were published in Königsberg in 1547 (translated by Martynas Mažvydas), some other extracts were published in 1579, the New Testament only in 1701, the Bible, translated by team of Lithuanian protestants, was published in Koenigsberg in 1735. (An early Bible translation by Bretkūnas/Bretke 1579-1590 remained unpublished).

17th century

17th century, after the turmoil of war ceased in 1629, was a stabilizing one in the former territories of Livonia (Latvia and Estonia). They were under the Swedish crown which introduced an orderly management, promoted education – local language schools were set up.

Latvian

In 1675 the Swedish government gave permission to establish a second, so called Royal publishing house, in Riga (J.G. Wilcken) which became most important by publishing the Bible translation (Ta 1689). In 1667 another printshop was established in Jelgava (Mitau). Meanwhile Catholic books were published in Vilnius and Braunsberg. Basic Latvian schools proliferated. End of the century saw the first Swedish laws translated by Depkin in 1696, who also compiled small dictionaries.

It is usual to date Latvian lexicography from 1638 when the first dictionary, preceding Grammar (1644), was published (Mancelius 1638). Most of the territory was under the Swedish crown (Latgale was under Poland) and the conditions were favourable for spiritual and cultural development. Latvians at that time were the peasant nation and the official cultural sphere was fully in the hands of non-Latvian governors, German clergy and landowners. This had lasted for about 400 years since the territory came under the German crusaders and bishops. The dominant powers had changed (and will change) from time to time – Danes, Poles, Swedes, Russians came and went hardly

affecting the Latvian language scene as their sole interest was the territory and to some extent the nobility. The German nobility, however, retained its positions until the end of the 19th century. It was to develop the link between the church and the peasant nation, between the German speaking clergy and Latvian-speaking people that the first dictionaries were actually created. The quality of Latvian used by the German clergy in the beginning was not high – Mancelius – the author of the first dictionary, also a professor of theology and rector in Tartu for a time, also at writer-cum-translator in Latin, German and Latvian -- tells a story in his handbook on biblical plots “Lettisch Vade mecum” (Mancelius 1631) that after a sermon a Latvian commented, “Who knows what that German cat is saying” (a wordplay on *kaķis* (cat) and *katķisms* (catechism)). One can see elements of colonial or missionary language field work in the early dictionaries and grammars.

The first dictionary was a German-Latvian book (Mancelius 1638), containing about 7000 words, often several Latvian synonyms are provided to the German word. Naturally Gothic script was used. A slash was used to separate words of both languages as well as synonyms. The second part is a thematic lexicon containing about 4000 somewhat random items about 51 topics. Though this part seems to be hastily put together, many of these words and expressions are not in the first part. The third part consists of 10 parallel conversation pattern chapters, called “Phraseologia Lettica” (Mancelius 1638). This division of the macrostructure is to be noted as it tended to repeat in some other later dictionaries.

The other two Latvian dictionaries of the 17th century were multilingual: Polish-Latin-Latvian (Elger 1683) published in Vilnius, and a small 1000 word German-Latin-Polish-Latvian ((supposedly) Dressel 1688). Elger was also a translator of Latin hymns and German songs and his dictionary is worth noting mainly because it creates an early link between Latvian and Lithuanian lexicography – it is in fact based on Sirvydas 3d edition (1642) supplemented by the Latvian part – with 14 000 entries much larger than *Letus*. This does not seem to be a case of early plagiarism (or copying (Cormier 2010: 133) or piracy, which was rife until the 20th century (Landau 2001: 43)), but most likely a concerted attempt by the Catholic Church or Polish rulers to spread their influence. Published in Vilnius and representative of the Eastern (Polish dominated) variety of Latvian, it introduced the Latin script into Latvian, but had many mistakes, including those copied from Mancelius. This dictionary, however, did not contribute to further development of Latvian lexicography as it would be German dominated. Two rather important manuscripts were compiled by Langius and Fuerecker. It is difficult to pass criticism on these first lexicographic attempts. There are many obvious mistakes, there is clearly a strong German interference in the description of Latvian lexis, both on the lexical and grammatical levels. Trying to figure out the complexities of Latvian patterns and dialects was certainly not an easy task and it can be supposed the first compilers did as much as one could reasonably expect.

Lithuanian

Lithuanian early history differs from that of Latvian. Most of its territory never came under a German dominance, but after early (12th and 14-15th century) adoption of Christianity it was in a powerful union with Poland until the end of the 18th century when it was absorbed by Russia. Hence there was a Lithuanian elite and clergy which, however, tended to become Polonized. Similar to Latvian the early dictionaries were

compiled for the practical needs of the German protestant pastors in Lithuania Minor (East Prussia) so as to be able to communicate with the Lithuanian peasant population of the region. This region after Prussia's joining to Brandenburg in 1618 and the following wars gradually became more German dominated. Yet this is where the first Lithuanian grammar "Grammatica Litvanica" was published in Latin in 1653 by Daniele Klein, followed by a shorter German version the following year. His dictionary manuscript was not, however, published and is lost. Some other German Lithuanian dictionary manuscripts were compiled, but remained unpublished.

In Lithuania proper dictionaries were needed for the Catholic priests working in Jesuit schools and not knowing the Lithuanian language. Yet these would be compiled by native Lithuanians, so they would have a better grasp of the language. Thus 1620 or 1629 saw the first edition of Polish-Latin-Lithuanian "Dictionarium Trium Linguarum" by Sirvydas (1642). A single copy has survived with the initial pages missing, which is why the year of the first publication is not clear. The compiler used Polish, Latin and Greek dictionaries as sources and supplied Lithuanian part also by coined neologisms for the missing items. The first edition has more than 8000 entries, with about 6000 Lithuanian words. The second edition (1631) was thoroughly reworked, but has not survived. The third edition (Sirvydas 1642) published after Sirvydas' death reached 14 000 entries (10 000 Lithuanian words), about one fifth of the items of the first edition have been removed. The dictionary saw two more editions (1677 and 1713), its material was much copied in later lexicographical works. It also served as a prototype for Elger's Latvian dictionary (Elger 1683).

18th century

Latvian

In the 18th century Latvia was ravaged by the great Northern War, plague and changing masters, the territory was frequently split and the atmosphere was not conducive to writing and educational issues. Pietism (Moravian movement) with its home-education drive might have contributed to some increase in literacy as it again clashed with its competitor – the official church. It also led to a manuscript culture (Apinis 1987). Apart from religious texts calendars (since 1757), practical advice on economic aspects of peasant life, occasional educational texts on geography, history texts appeared. Among these a medical periodical -- P.E Wilde's "Latviešu ārste" [Latvian Doctor] 1768-69 stands out. The Latvian translation was done by Lange, who was also an editor of the Latvian Bible 2nd edition in 1739 and a notable lexicographer. The first Latvian quarterly journal appeared in 1797, but had a limited readership. Practically all texts had German sources. The second half of the century spelled a genuine interest in Latvian culture by a segment of the local and foreign elite. J. G. Herder who resided in Riga from 1764 to 1769 was attracted to Latvian folksongs and published them in his "Volkslieder" (1779) and its second edition "Stimmen den Voelker in Liedern" (1807). His impact would be even greater a century later, when Neolatvians implemented his ideas of the recovery of national individuality and political identity through the rediscovery of folklore. Another German enlightener Merkel (1797) described in detail the position of the semi-serf Latvian population, for the first time calling them a "Volk" in his "Die Letten". This was a new development as so far they had been viewed as locals, peasants, a class or stratum, but not a people/nation. His book, however, remained largely unknown for the Latvians themselves, whose literacy at the end of the century is judged to have been between 33-60% (Plakans 1995:68)

18th century Latvian dictionaries (including several unpublished manuscripts) were also made by non-Latvians, they gradually improved in scope and depth. 1705 saw a new edition of Dressel's dictionary with some corrections, possibly done by Depkin. Elvers (1748) German-Latvian dictionary contained about 8000 words, partly replicating Mancelius.

Lange's (1777) dictionary, written about 20 years earlier, had already 15 000 entries in its German-Latvian part and 10 000 entries in the reverse part, also providing information on regional use, borrowings, biblicisms and toponyms. The dictionary is strictly alphabetic. Lange did some cleansing of mistaken forms and Germanisms that had accumulated in the previous dictionaries and manuscripts. This is emphasized in the preface. The dictionary has a grammatical marking system, words from religious texts, not heard in the folk language, are marked as biblicisms. This dictionary showed many previously unrecorded folk language words, the existence of which was unnecessarily doubted by Stender.

However the centre-piece of the century is Stender and his dictionary. Stender was a rationalist, enlightener and educator as well as the greatest authority of the time on issues of the Latvian language. Apart from the dictionary (which was an authoritative one for almost a hundred years), Stender was the author of numerous translations, localizations and original writings (altogether about 30). Thus his activities can be viewed as symbiotic -- translating enlightening information with didactic goals and in parallel expanding the Latvian lexis. As such he was to some extent the creator not only of the translation texts, but also of the Latvian language as such. No wonder that usually this century is called Stender's century (Latvia 1967: 506).

Stender's first Latvian-German (!) dictionary (Stender 1761) was a trial attempt for his notable dictionary later. It was an appendix to his grammar. The dictionary had about 4000 words. Within the general list of words there are also (proper) first names. Latin script is used for Latvian words for the first time in the Germanic tradition (it might have been a deliberate choice, or a way of better visual separating of the language texts (Latin script was often used for Latin texts in German books). Yet this choice was retained in the big dictionary. The dictionary also contained 137 Latvian proverbs and sayings, part of them from previous dictionaries.

The notable "Lettisches Lexicon" (1789) had 1178 pages, 7000 words in the Latvian-German, 14 000 German -Latvian part. Stender retained Latin script for Latvian, established the principle of nesting, highlighting the idioms and derivatives. The dictionary also pursued the tradition of appendices containing toponyms, personal names, names of birds, fishes, insects, plants, trees, fungi. When making use of previous dictionaries Stender prudently marks those items unknown to him with the initials of the previous lexicographers. This dictionary was extensively used in the 19th century and its material consequently entered the following big ones.

The dictionaries, however, often retained also the mistaken stock of the previous works. One can trace many German elements in Latvian grammar, collocation patterns and phrases, not characteristic of Latvian - and that apart from the undeniable German influence that must have already existed in the language (Zemzare 1961). Lexicography thus followed the general development of Old Written Latvian, which,

though lacking a strong normative code, had emerged as a unified language with norms different from those of colloquial speech (Rūķe 1977: 30). Generally Latvian dictionaries from the beginning tended to be separate linguistic products usually not published together with grammars.

Lithuanian

Lithuanian-Polish Union in the 18th century was gradually falling apart, the central government losing its power, the territory crossed by foreign armies, ravaged by famine and plague. Polonization of the elites grew -- administration and education proceeded in Polish. Apart from a small grammar (1737) the Lithuanian texts were solely religious. Only Sirvydas 5th edition (Sirvydas 1713), was republished in Lithuania Proper.

Most of Lithuanian language description was done in Prussia. Lithuanian books for schools and churches were discussed in various committees, as it was noticed that the variant used was departing from the language spoken by peasants. This was especially true after publishing the New Testament in 1701. Lithuanian origins and relationship with German and Polish were viewed by Ruhig. As a result of the discussions The New Testament was translated again and published several times. Around this time native Germans started to dominate in Lithuanian language study. The Bible was finally published in 1735 (Biblia 1735) Some Prussian laws and secular texts were also translated, followed by the first native writing -- Donelaitis "Metai" written in the 1760s. Several valuable dictionary manuscripts have been retained, several were re-written by hand and circulated.

Haack's "Vocabularium Litthvanico-Germanicum et Germanico-Litthvanicum" (1730) is viewed as a comparatively poor attempt, though it boasted having all words of the Bible which explains its aim -- it was meant for Halle seminary students and contained about 5000 words.

Ruhig's dictionary (1747) published in Koenigsberg was a more systematic book and in addition to religious terms had many folk words. It is symptomatic that the Lithuanian -- German part had 192 pages (around 5700 words) while German-Lithuanian part - 424 pages (around 20 000 words). This tendency -- that foreign language -- Lithuanian part is always larger than the other direction did not change for a long time. Based on Sirvydas, Haack and well supplemented, it had many synonyms in the German-Lithuanian part, derivatives were nested with the root word. The author tried discerning loans, e.g. pointing out that slavisms were not Lithuanian words

The latter was further improved by Mielcke (1800) "Littauisch-Deutsches und Deutsch-Littauisches Woerterbuch" which expanded the wordstock, including new words from various manuscripts, 300 proverbs (not all of Lithuanian origin) and materials from Donelaitis "Metai". Four forewords to the dictionary (including one by Immanuel Kant) praise Lithuanian and advocate its development.

19th century

19th century for the Baltic nations is the time of emancipation, modernization and Awakening. The Latvian Awakening is fast and radical in all aspects, Lithuanian developments are delayed until the beginning 20th century. The general thrust is to turn the local languages from spoken peasant idiom into a language of culture, with developed writing system, literary language and literature going hand in hand with

Western trends. The language issue was in the core of national identity, liberation and progress.

Latvian

At the end of the 18th century all modern day Latvian territory had step by step come under the Russian Empire, yet the German elite held its positions. After an early abolishing of serfdom peasants in Latvia were given surnames, could acquire property and migrate. In a way the value of peasants was rising, not only as free workforce, but also in the sense that their souls were sought after – the Orthodox Church offered an alternative to traditional German Lutheranism, Romanticism offered an alternative to culture being solely a German product. From the forties the school system comprised most of the population. There was a fast growth in literacy, reading habits turned from intensive (a couple of religious texts at home) to extensive (various texts of secular character). More reading material became available in Latvian – calendars, magazines. When the first Latvian newspapers appeared in 1822 (edited at first by another enlightening Latviophile Watson) they were often read collectively in pubs (Zelča 2009). The German elite established cultural societies with a task of looking into Latvian (1817, 1824). Practically all Latvian literature had German sources and German authors/translators, even when the original was in a different language.

Two parallel languages or two variants of one language coexisted -- the Old Written Latvian and the spoken folk language. The peasant people were speaking one language at home and another in communication with the non-Latvian governors in the official spheres -- the court, the church, the administration, the manor. The written language of their German writers codified the latter variant, supplementing the impact of church books, calendars and the Bible. The dictionaries reflected predominantly the first.

The first half of the 19th century does not bring much new in lexicography. There is the first Latvian-German dictionary aimed at Latvians by A. J. Stender (1820) (son of G. Fr. Stender) reflecting the developing opinion of the German elite, that the local population perhaps should not be ignored, but instead educated and Germanized. The relatively small 3000 word dictionary is mostly based on Stender senior dictionary, with small deviations.

There is also a novel and interesting book of supplements and amendments to G. Fr. Stender's dictionary (Wellig 1828) which apart from the above provides suggestions to future lexicographers. These advise against indiscriminate copying of previous materials without checking them. There is also a call to involve larger numbers of people in collection work. The book was intensively used by later dictionary compilers.

Finally, there is a multilingual dictionary (Kurmin 1858) that after almost two centuries represents the Latgallian variant again. The dictionary is based on Elger's and Sirvydas 5th edition (1713), contains about 13 000 entries. Its task was to ease learning of Latvian by the Catholic priests. The author used Polish orthography, the dictionary has, however many mistakes and imprecisions.

The situation changed in the middle of the 19th century when the so-called Latvian national awakening started, lead by Neo-Latvians (nationally aware Latvians who

refused to be Germanized, as former well-to-do and educated people tended to do). By the end of the century the population was generally literate (Švābe 1958: 470), apart from the Latgale region and seasonal Russian workers in bigger towns. Latvian organization mushroomed, first Latvian song festival was convened in Riga in 1873. Like many other Germanic aspects, the German element (mainly direct loans) in the language was viewed as alien and to be fought and purged. Publishing of Latvian books, magazine and newspapers boomed, thus new titles published rose from 181 in 1884 to 822 in 1904 (Plakans 1995: 101). Even more important - national literature and writing quickly passed from the German pastors into the hands of Latvians, e.g. the percentage of works in Latvian authored by native Latvians rose from 3% in 1844 to 51% in 1869 (in just 25 years!) (Schmidt 1992: 89). The same occurred in publishing houses and editorships - they passed into the hands of Latvians (Karulis 1967: 85). Latgale being territorially part of Russia proper, however, was subject to the same language restrictions as Lithuania in the second half of the century which delayed its development. Latvian nationalism in its struggle against German domination sought support from Russia and for a time succeeded. Yet in the last decades Russification policies (administration, schooling and religion) thwarted flirtation with the unpredictable ally who attempted to introduce Cyrillic also in Latvian. Yet the Latvian-Russian closer contact spilled over also into lexicography.

Most dictionaries of the second half of the 19th century were produced by the Latvian speakers and accordingly tended to reflect the spoken folk language more. Waldemar's Russian-Latvian German dictionary (Kreewu 1872) was innovative in many ways. It was aimed at Latvians learning Russian and Russians learning Latvian. His dictionary had a team of compilers who introduced much of the folk element, coined new words, as well as introduced many borrowings (preferring Greek and Latin) not only for new notions but also to substitute many German loans. German was used mainly to explain these Latvian neologisms. Waldemar used Latin script for Latvian. The dictionary established the polysemy principles and had a separate chapter with 2500 historical, mythological and geographical words. In the 2nd edition (Kreewu 1890), the German part was dropped as many neologisms had taken root, some borrowings were removed as dictionaries of foreign words had appeared. This dictionary had several editions. In 1879 a reversed dictionary -- Latvian-Russian-German (Lettisch 1879) was produced with 13,000 Latvian entries, again improving and modernizing the language material.

The last serious work of Old Latvian tradition -- Ulmann's "Lettisches Woerterbuch" (1872) (Latvian-German, 20,000 words), was aimed mostly at German readers and had so far the most exhaustive number of entries in Latvian. It used Latin script for Latvian, was historical, contained no invented items, included many dialect words, with some etymological elements, phrasal examples, avoided some Germanisms (the letters f, h), included the most widespread neologisms (supplied by Kronvalds) and all in all was a rather descriptive and traditional dictionary (though several Latvians were among its compilers, such as Neikens). In a way it crowned the German contribution and was its last major work, yet it served as a basis of the large iconic dictionary of Latvian in the 20th century. Published in the same year as Waldemar's, it was a competing product. The national, social and professional strife between the German and Latvian editors and their dictionaries generally was beneficial, bringing together the Old Latvian and New Latvian and improving the end products.

The reverse German- Latvian dictionary started by Ulmann and others was finished by Brasche (Lettisches 1880). It contained 35 000 words and has a somewhat uncoordinated wealth of general words, dialect words (especially of Kurland), borrowings, archaisms. Brasche had some years before published a smaller dictionary, generally considered to be old-fashioned.

Other types of dictionaries started to appear, testifying to the growth of language contacts. The development of the national language, together with the spread of newspapers and international contacts created a need for books of foreign words (Mekons 1878 (2,000 entries), Dravnieks 1886 (5,000 entries)). The opening of the wider world and the wish to demonstrate the national intellectual and linguistic potential of Latvia, as well as the Russification of schools, spelled a need for encyclopedias. Encyclopedias (according to the German pattern called Konversation dictionaries) became popular at the end of the 19th century, e.g. Dravnieks' "Konversācijas vārdnīca" (1891-1898) (unfinished, until letter K)), was patterned on Meyer's Hand-Lexicon des allgemeinen Wissens (Kleine Meyer), some entries were just translated, and another (Konversācijas 1906-1921) both in the Gothic script. This culminated in the monumental Latviešu Konversācijas vārdnīca (21 vol., 1927-1940). In all of these, despite the political anti-German drive, one can see the influence and pattern of German lexicographic ideas of the time, namely Brockhaus dictionaries with their strong emphasis on personalities (differing from Encyclopedia Britannica with its more subject-oriented approach).

Waldemar (1881) also produced a multilingual pocket Marine dictionary in Russian, English, French, German, Italian, Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, Latvian, with Dutch and Spanish supplements, based on one of the existing (English, Dutch?) books, where his contribution was Russian and Latvian.

Towards the end of the 19th century the two language variants blended together and one could speak of Standard Modern Latvian. However the struggle waged against German and later Russian dominance and its influence in the language also transferred purism in the language to the making of the dictionaries.

Lithuanian

From the beginning of the 19th century Lithuania proper was split and divided administratively within the Russian Empire. Russians gradually suppressed Vilnius university as a centre of Lithuanian education, started a Russification campaign and from 1864 to 1904 banned Lithuanian writing in education and publishing. Some of texts were spread in manuscript form, but printing moved across the border to East Prussia and even the USA, a book smuggling industry was set up. The variety of dialects and variants was daunting. So were various grammars and smaller dictionaries in manuscript form.

In Prussia peasants, freed from serfdom earlier, became mobile and with increasing Germanization gradually were assimilated. Most Lithuanian schools were closed already in the 30ies. As Lithuanian looked likely to disappear an interest appeared in recording it, thus in 1879 "Litauische literarische Gesellschaft" was established by prominent linguists, however, interested mostly in recording its archaic character and place within Indo-European studies. This trend found reflection also in dictionaries. Nesselmann's (1851) Lithuanian-German dictionary seriously expanded its folk language component. The dictionary had about 35 000 words excerpted from previous

dictionaries and manuscripts, also new ones collected by his assistants. The dictionary had a strange nesting principle, first come vowels then consonants according to an Old Indian grammar traditions (Sanskrit alphabet) close to Nesselmann's heart

A three volume Kurschat's/Kursaitis' (Kurschat 1870 - 1883) German-Lithuanian (724 plus 392 pages) and Lithuanian-German dictionary (530 pages) was both a scientific and practical dictionary, compiled in about 30 years, having both written and spoken language material of the 19th century. It achieved precision also on Lithuanian intonations which had been a regular stumbling block in previous dictionaries. The words unknown to the author were provided in square brackets – among which there were many mistaken ones. Its German-Lithuanian part had many neologisms, also phraseology. The dictionary was most useful for the following lexicographers.

The living Lithuanian folk language appeared in its full in a trilingual explanatory dictionary by Juška (Litovskij 1897) which, however, partly remained in a manuscript form (3 volumes were published, the third after World War 1, reaching letter K) and all posthumously. The manuscript of the dictionary contained about 30,000 words and is a mirror of the Lithuanian spoken language of the second half of the 19th century, containing not only 'nice' words, but also vulgarisms and borrowings. The chief deficiency in the dictionary is the sometimes erroneous indication of the position of stress and the failure to establish vowel length. Juška had prepared several other manuscripts, among them Latvian-Lithuanian-Polish, but died in 1880.

The language ban (which meant Russification started about 20 years earlier than in Latvia) in combination with lower literacy lead to belated awakening. Nationalism was maintained mainly by church (Pistohlkors 1990: 24) and secular writing was delayed. As a result much of the lexicographic work and the iconic dictionary could start only with Lithuanian independence.

20th century

In the 20th century the two Baltic states had a similar historic background, they achieved independence after World war one, started active nation building processes which involved iconic lexicography works – national projects associated with names of lexicographers. They were then occupied by the Soviet Union, Nazi Germany, Soviet Union again and broke free in 1991. The language issue was important and very sensitive all through these 50 years as the mainstay of national identity. The soviet period with all its terrors and losses (emigration of linguistic experts, Russification, iron curtain, ideological constraints affecting dictionaries) cannot be viewed as a total cultural and lexicographic desert – there was massive publishing and many dictionaries were compiled. Dictionary making was usually centralized under one or several specialized publishers.

Latvian

The beginning of the 20th century saw extensive activity by the most prolific Latvian lexicographer, Dravnieks, who created the modern German-Latvian, Russian-Latvian, English-Latvian and Latvian-Russian bilingual desktop dictionaries used by learners and translators with the Latvian public as their target audience. These were actively used and

republished many times. Yet there was a real shortage of dictionaries for the new nation, a fact pointed out by an eminent Latvian publisher (admirer of German Meyer and his encyclopedias) and future publisher of the large encyclopedia (Gulbis 1903).

The Iconic Latvian Dictionary of Latvian

The Latvian project was started by Muehlenbach -- a notable and well-known linguist of the time in early 1880ies. In the beginning he focused on supplementing Ulmann's 1872 "Lettisches Woerterbuch". As a result the dictionary was designed as a bilingual translation book with explanations in German and examples in Latvian. Muehlenbach, though considering the dictionary compiler "a biographer of words", had a strong view against those words he considered unwelcome, which fully accorded with the ideas of Neo-Latvians and their followers.

He appealed several time for public to send missing and new materials -- as the dictionary was based on Ulmann's it was easy to check what was missing.

Muehlenbach died in 1916 and the finishing work was entrusted to Endzelīns (by now Latvian linguist number one, who had advised Muehlenbach on etymological and other issues). He called on people to participate, published 68 lists on unclear words in a Ministry monthly, received suggestions from about 1000 people. In 1928 local words were collected by experts in 29 places in Latvia. Public involvement was a rather novel phenomenon, never repeated in Latvian lexicography after. In a short introduction, containing several caveats Endzelīns (Endzelins 1923) explains that he has not checked all the material Muehlenbach had collected, introduces some minor orthographical changes, points out that he has "thrown out" rarer borrowings which should be reflected in some "dictionary for practical use", thus subtly outlining his understanding of the aim of this dictionary. Folk language (Latvian *dainas*, fairy tales, proverbs etc) and spoken language form the backbone of the dictionary. Also the early texts are represented, there is a multitude of localisms and dialectal words. Special attention was paid to words of Baltic origin (comparative studies in mind).

The microstructure of the entry contains intonation patterns (shown in the headword), in many cases etymology, senses and their translations in German (extended rather than equivalents), samples of use suggested by the authors and rather extensive citations from the corpus with an emphasis on the regional dialects and provenance, phraseology and idioms – the latter in most cases are provided within the citations without being highlighted as set phrases. The dictionary contains many archaisms marked with a cross. Towards the end of the dictionary occasional pictures appear for difficult words – fence types, knots, etc. – a notable development testifying to an open mind.

The dictionary "Muehlenbacha Latviešu valodas vārdnīca" was published between 1923 and 1932 (Muehlenbacha 1923-1932) in folios, then in 4 big volumes (77 175 entries). Yet new information was being added to the corpus. Together with E. Hauzenberga Endzelīns compiled two extra volumes of supplements and corrections, published from 1934 to 1946 (55 543 entries) (Endzelīns 1934-1946). Thus altogether the dictionary contains 132 718 entries and covers 5480 pages (the figure was certified only after it was digitalized (A.V.)). 60 years were spent on this dictionary and it luckily escaped soviet ideological influence (Cf. Lithuanian). Begun as a one-man work it turned into a three-people work with some public support. The dictionary

was published in the new spelling (as Latvia underwent an extended orthography reform from the Gothic script to Latin (1908 - 1937).

The purpose of the dictionary can be partly seen in its double title: in Latvian it says "Dictionary of the Latvian language" in German – "Lettisch-Deutsches Woerterbuch". It seems the authors were actually killing three birds with one dictionary. They compiled the most comprehensive stock of Latvian for the time, they used German for explanations -- so one could use it as a bilingual dictionary (mostly aimed in this function at non-Latvians) and they put Latvian in the framework of comparative linguistics internationally (due to the ancient Indo-European roots). As such it was reviewed and acclaimed by A. Meillet, M. Niedermann, R. Trautmann, K. Būga and other celebrities of Indo-European comparative studies and lexicographers. It had certainly achieved the external goal. At home it became and remains a monument of "correct/good" Latvian, though during its appearance some linguists (Ducmanis) found it not Latvian enough. Of course one can see some irony in the fact that the iconic Latvian work is mostly composed in German.

The dictionary has a wealth of dialect deviations and does not shun rude words, yet on the issue of borrowings it is clearly prescriptive in the sense that loans are mostly omitted. The purpose of this defensive stand is clear, it reflects the traditional *Weltanschauung* of the Latvians -- even in independent Latvia the linguistic pressure from the two major contact languages (having also considerable minorities) was felt as dangerous and polluting.

The interwar period saw the publishing of the monumental 21 volume *Latviešu Konversācijas vārdnīca* (1927-1940), in Latin script) still unsurpassed, though the last 2-3 volumes were not published due to Soviet occupation in 1940. This retained the German pattern of the earlier encyclopedias .

Relatively large bilingual dictionaries in the traditional language pairs were published – new or new editions of old German, Russian, English, but new languages were added – French- Latvian (1931), Latvian - French (1941), Latin-Latvian (1928), Lithuanian-Latvian (1929). Among specific dictionaries Latvian-Lithuanian-Polish dictionary (Avots 1935, 1937) published for agricultural workers reflected the needs of agricultural labourers from these countries in the 30ies. There were also numerous new dictionaries and new editions of foreign words dictionaries, spelling, terminological and conversational dictionaries published. Statistics sheds some light on the market demand and offer: thus between 1900 and 1966 (including reprints) 20 Latvian/German, 18 Latvian/Russian, 17 Latvian/English, 28 spelling and 19 dictionaries of foreign words were published.

The soviet times

The normative and purifying aims of dictionary compilation outlived Endzelins. Even as late as 1970ies when the first fully monolingual Latvian dictionaries were compiled – "Latviešu literārās valodas vārdnīca" (1972- 1997) in 8 volumes (80 000 entries) and a desktop "Latviešu valodas vārdnīca" (1987) (25 000 entries) (further editions in 1998, 2005), their necessity was explained by laying emphasis on the normative and prescriptive function of such dictionaries (Veisbergs 2000). These dictionaries dwelled on the lexis of the last 100 years. The big dictionary offered a thorough semantic and grammatical analysis of words. Together with the purism pervading

Latvian linguistics and Soviet ideological straightjacket constraints (emigree Latvian sources avoided, last minute word deletion because of their use by the “wrong” authors), avoidance of colloquial, slang and substandard lexis, regionalisms, terminology and archaisms (which now included many “bourgeois” terms), these dictionaries failed to reflect the real state of the language and offer as uncertain material for judging the language of the period as those of the previous centuries. Both monolingual dictionaries were aimed much more at philologists, linguists and editors than at the general public which cared mostly for bilingual books. Both had large editorial boards, and similar to the general trend (Bejoint 2010: 221) carry no associations with a particular lexicographer or linguist. Today they look very much as a reflection of soviet time official texts with an abundance of Orwellian Marxist-Leninist parlance. In vain would one look anywhere for the most usual Latvian colloquial form of greeting since 60ies “čau”. (The first dictionary where this word appeared was Latvian-English dictionary (Latvian 1997).

The soviet period however saw many new bilingual dictionaries, covering not only the traditional contact languages like English, Russian (amazingly despite the oppressive role and dominance of Russian, its lexicography in Latvia was somewhat lagging behind German and English), German, but adding Estonian, Italian, Lithuanian, Polish, Spanish. Mostly monodirectional meant for the Latvian user. Also such specialized lexicographical works as frequency dictionary, several bilingual idiom dictionaries, a derivational dictionary, a couple of spelling dictionaries (never popular in Latvia) and bulletins, many terminological dictionaries, dialect dictionaries, a dictionary of synonyms, dictionary of Anglicisms in Latvian, etc.

In the 60ies a three volume Latvian Soviet Small encyclopedia (regional) *Latvijas* (1967). Even in the soviet times it was criticised for having little information on Latvia. This was to be mended in the new 10-volume Latvian Soviet Encyclopedia (*Latvijas* 1981). Yet the result was unsatisfactory – while general information was fairly well covered, though ideologically slanted, and technically it was a step forward, when it came to cultural issues the information was biased and cleansed, with numerous unimportant soviet functionaries taking enormous space. Information concerning Latvia constituted less than a quarter of the total volume. Two notable encyclopedias were published abroad by émigré experts (*Latvju* 1955), *Latvju* 1983).

The last decade of the century witnessed a collapse of the centralized dictionary making system, for a time reprints of the older ones were mainly taking place. Then the new production started with a focus on Scandinavian languages - mid scale Swedish, Danish, Norwegian, Finnish dictionaries, new large French and Lithuanian dictionaries. Also dictionaries of etymology, idioms, dialects, spelling, pronunciation, toponyms, abbreviations, numerous various scale terminology dictionaries and foreign name spelling dictionaries (Latvian uses transcription for rendering foreign proper nouns), several dictionaries of toponyms, new dictionaries of foreign words have been produced.

The idea of right and wrong language has haunted Latvian linguistics, culture and lexicography since the middle of the 19th century, that is since the real beginnings of national awareness. Dictionaries in Latvian history have always been very much the symbol of the official and approved on the one hand, and the desired and correct on the other. The modern age has broken the old stereotypes – dictionaries have broken

out of the reign of purism. This has been reflected first and foremost in the sphere of bilingual dictionaries which have always been the important product. Notably, no large monolingual projects have been carried out since the soviet dictionaries. All larger past works have been digitalized.

The radical change however would come by means of a national corpus that would in quantitative terms show what the language is really like. Yet the postmodern mobility with its mix of styles, freedom of internet chats, influx of English (Veisbergs 2007), tearing of the barriers has in many ways sharpened the feeling that language is out of hand. Even the corpus issue (there is an initial corpus of a few million words) has been delayed to some extent by the unwillingness to see the real reflection of the language which in fact is functioning extremely well.

Lithuania

Many needed projects in Lithuanian were delayed because of the language ban which was revoked only in 1904, e.g. an attempt to start an encyclopedia in 1883 never received permission and it could be started only after the First World War. The first volumes of the Lithuanian encyclopedia appeared only in 1933 (*Lietuviškoji* 1933) and it was not finished due to the Soviet occupation - reached only J. Yet Lithuanian emigrees in the US after the Second World War accomplished a monumental 36-volume encyclopedia (*Lietuvių* 1953-1969) and a 6 volume one in English (*Encyclopedia* 1970-1978). A particular trait of the Lithuanian lexicography is also the strong American diaspora impact -- English-Lithuanian dictionaries started as emigree products, e.g. a bidirectional Lithuanian-English Dictionary published in the USA (Lalis 1905).

The iconic dictionary

As a result of the historical conditions, the iconic work of Lithuanian lexicography could start only with Lithuanian independence after World War I, when Lithuanian became the official language of the country. It was clear that a major dictionary was needed to show the vitality and functionality of the native language. A card index for a dictionary had been started by Kazimieras Būga, a renowned Lithuanian linguist of the time already in 1902. Būga in 1920 was asked by the government to compile a large dictionary that would include all words used in Lithuanian, their histories, etymologies, dialects, proper names (rivers, lakes, family and local names). This spelled the beginning of a long and tortuous project, reflecting the political and historical shifts Lithuania was to undergo in the 20th century. Būga, who died in 1924, managed to collect about 600 000 citations, write a long introduction for the dictionary and edit 2 fascicles - 82 pages until *anga*. Many of the old citations compiled were in other languages. Besides literary vocabulary, Būga's dictionary comprised dialectal words, Old Lithuanian text words, proper nouns and borrowings. The latter were criticized as this was not in line with the purification of the Lithuanian language. Būga protested, insisting that a dictionary should be a mirror of the language and nobody is at fault if the image is not exactly what one wishes to see. Būga often provided definitions not only in Lithuanian, but also Polish, Russian, German, Latvian, Latin and Greek. He justified this by saying that he had no time to translate all the explanations and used the language of his source – thus it would have been a multilingual book.

The first printed fascicle had a five-page introduction, eleven pages of explanations of abbreviations and signs, thirty-five pages containing a popular study of Lithuanian

stress and intonation and twelve pages on the Lithuanian language, people and their nearest relatives. The dictionary comprised also dialect words, Old Lithuanian text words, proper nouns and borrowings. The latter were criticized as this was not in line with purification of the Lithuanian language. Būga protested insisting that every dictionary should be a mirror of the language and nobody is at fault if the image is something one does not wish to see. The dictionary also included non-existent words from scholarly literature caused by misprints or mistakes. These are preceded by a little cross and their creation is explained, e.g. the preposition and prefix **ad* carries an explanation that all citations are mistakes, apparently for *ant* 'on,' in others for *at-* 'to'. Būga often provided definitions not only in Lithuanian, but also in Polish, Russian, German, Latvian, Latin and Greek. He justified this by lack of time to translate all the explanations and used the language of his source.

After Būga's death the project was put on the backburner for 6 years, then Juozas Balčikonis was appointed editor of the dictionary in 1930. He was well acquainted with the project taking care of the financing issues. He found Būga's card index lacking words from literature and scanty dialectal lexis. These were to be supplemented, yet nothing from contemporary press was to enter the dictionary. Being short of material Balčikonis apart of his staff tried involving public, he persuaded Ministry of Education to demand that Lithuanian language teachers turn in 5 slips of words a month and other teachers 1 slip. Before the Second World War this provided half a million slips, his staff provided another half a million which together with Būga's 600 000 was a substantial corpus.

Balčikonis also rejected proper names, word histories and explanations in foreign languages. Though in doubt about entering foreign words in general, finally those found in the old texts and those frequently used were considered acceptable. Regionalisms and "barbarisms" (unwelcome borrowings) were not included. Dated and inappropriate words were preceded by x (numerous!!).

It was only in 1941 that the first volume (A and B) of the Lithuanian Academic Dictionary was published (Lietuvių 1941), however, the soviet occupying powers did not allow its distribution. This was allowed by the Germans when they drove the soviets out. Balčikonis also finished editing the 2nd volume that appeared in 1947 (Lietuvių 1947) in two versions (the second purged by soviet censors of the language of those Lithuanians who had fled to the West). Nevertheless in 1949 the dictionary was criticized for its "reactionary clerical phraseology" – and after lengthy discord and friction, the 3d, politically correct, volume appeared only in 1956 under a new editor, full of quotes from Marx, Lenin and Stalin (but without a reference to the latter, as the political stance had again changed). Also the first two volumes were re-edited and republished, according to the new instructions (Lietuvių 1968, 1969).

Apart from ideological shifts serious editorial changes occurred in the 50ies as well. Balčikonis was criticized for a tendency to view all aspects of the standard language by the laws of the folk language, a stance against the evolving and new written language models. He could not accept the ideological change and the new editorial demands and left. Further editors did not carry clear personal views and editing became somewhat anonymous. The new changes involved: illustrative material now started with sentences from contemporary (meaning – soviet) texts, prefixed words were alphabetized under the unprefixed ones, parallel forms and dialectal words were put under the most common form, borrowings were supplied with origins (while

internationalisms were not), some historical and connotational meanings, as well as transitivity were marked, participial adverbs were put under the verbs from which they were derived. Apart from the ideological changes, the new policies could be viewed as reasonable and user friendly.

In this form the dictionary under various editors slugged on, saw collapse of the Soviet Union and was finished in 2002 spanning a full century since its inception. Initially 4 volumes had been planned, in 1946 the talk was of 8, in 1976 when 10 volumes had been produced, 15 were planned, finally there were 20 volumes (Lietuvių 1968-2002) with about 22 000 pages, half a million headwords, 5 million citations from 1547 to 2001. Supplements are being compiled and the dictionary accessible in a digital form online (www.lkz.lt). Desktop dictionaries were made in parallel with this project, the most modern being Dabartinės (1973, 2002) which also has an on-line version (<http://www.autoinfo.lt/webdic/>).

However for a typical Lithuanian a dictionary is first and foremost a bilingual dictionary. End of the century offered a great number of dictionaries and a great number of languages covered. Apart from the traditional ones these included also Japanese, Italian, Spanish, Latin, Polish language pairs. There is a multitude of terminological dictionaries and glossaries, e.g. Computer, Textile, Agricultural, Roads, Hunting, Sports, Engineering, Law etc. terms.

Similar to Latvian the Small Lithuanian Soviet Encyclopedia (Mažoji 1966-1971) was published in 3 volumes dealing with only Lithuania-related topics. Similar to Latvian Lithuanian Soviet Encyclopedia (Lietuviškoji 1975/6- 1985) was published later in 12 volumes.

The soviet period, especially after Stalin's death, saw rather massive investment into Lithuanian-language studies. Numerous specialized dictionaries were compiled. However, a typical Lithuanian dictionary is first and foremost a bilingual dictionary. English–Lithuanian dictionaries started as emigree products, but today there is a choice of bilingual Lithuanian dictionaries of traditional languages like English, German, Russian, Polish, French, Latvian, and new ones including Japanese, Italian, Spanish, and Latin. Numerous specialized dictionaries have been compiled, such as those focusing on verbal associations, curse words, nicknames, proper names, first names, place names, hydronyms, mistakes, reversal, dialects, spelling, punctuation, frequency and a multitude of terminological dictionaries.

Conclusions

Latvian and Lithuanian lexicography are characterized by a similar early development (despite a different language contact situation). There is a clear dominance of bilingual/multilingual dictionaries compiled to serve the needs of the clergy in the main contact language pairs and triples. While in Latvia this was predominantly a German–Latvian combination, in Lithuania it was Polish–Latin–Lithuanian (Catholic tradition) and German–Lithuanian (Protestant tradition) combinations. The German contribution, thus is dominant in Baltic language lexicographies. Latvian had a large number of early dictionaries, while Lithuania proper had to suffice with one for a long time (however, of better quality). Later, with the countries' incorporation into Russia, Russian became another dominant language in the bilingual lexicography. Lithuania's lexicographical development was seriously hindered by the language ban imposed by the tsarist authorities. End of the 19th century saw lexicography move into the hands of the native speakers resulting in an influx of folk language in dictionaries and concerted attempts to stabilize the language (writing, spelling,

alphabet, variants). A variety of dictionaries appeared. After achieving independence iconic projects of a different scope and timescale were started; elements of language engineering can be observed in prescriptivism and purism of various types (xenophobic, anti-colloquial, ideological). The large iconic projects are lead by wellknown archetypal linguists. The Soviet period produced both normative monolingual desktop type dictionaries in both nations, as well as many bilingual dictionaries of various type to serve the needs of multilingual communication. Thus for the Baltic nations apart from the iconic works that general public knows, but rarely use, the term “dictionary” is mostly associated with a bilingual one. End of the 20th century sees the development of the electronic resources which no doubt have the future. Older dictionaries are digitalized, work on corpora is extensive, descriptivism has taken the upper hand. The Baltic dictionary scene has been and is vibrant and unexpectedly well developed for these small nations.

Bibliography

Apīnis Aleksejs (1987) *Neprasot atļauju*. Rīga: Liesma.

Avots M. (1935, 1937) *Praktiska latvju-lietuvju-poļu vārdnīca lauksaimniekiem un laukstrādniekiem*. Rīga: Logs.

Béjoint Henri (2010) *The Lexicography of English*. Oxford University Press.

Biblia, tai esti Wissas Szwentas rasztas Seno ir Naujo Testamento (1735) Konigsburg: Hartungo sp.

Cormier M.C. (2010) New Perspectives on Seventeenth- and Eighteenth- Century European Lexicography. *IJL*. 23/2, pp. 133-135.

Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas (1973; 2002) Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas.

Dravnieks J. (1886) *Svešu vārdu grāmata*. Jelgava: H. Alunāna apgāds.

Dressel Georg (1688) *Vocabularium in vier Sprachen, teutsch, lateinisch, polnisch un lettisch*. Riga.

Elger Georg (1683) *Dictionarium polono-latino-lottavicum*. Vilnae: typ. Acad. S. I.

Elvers Caspar (1748) *Liber memorialis Letticus*. Riga.

Encyclopedia Lituanica (1970-1978) Boston.

Endzelīns J. (1923) Priekšvārdi. Muehlenbacha K. *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca*. Rīga. 4. lpp.

Endzelīns J., Hauzenberga (1934-1946) *E. Papildinājumi un labojumi K. Mīlenbaha Latviešu valodas vārdnīcai*. R., 1-2. sēj.

Gulbis Ansis (1903) Par mūsu grāmatu tirdzniecību. *Rīgas Avīze*. No.158.

Haack (Hakas) Friedrich Wilhelm (1730) *Vocabularium Litthvanico-Germanicum, et Germanico-Litthvanicum*. Halle: Druck. S. Orban.

Karulis Konstantīns (1967) *Latviešu grāmata gadsimtu gaitā*. Rīga: Liesma.

Konversācijas vārdnīca (1906-1921) Vol.1-4. Rīga: Rīgas Latviešu biedrības Derīgu grāmatu nodaļa.

Konversācijas vārdnīca (1891-1898) Jelgava: Draviņ-Dravnieka apgādība.

Kreewu-latveeschu-wahzu wardnize (1872). Moskva.

Kreewu-Latweeschu wahrniza (1890) Jelgawā.

Kurmin J. (1858) *Słownik polsko łacinsko łotewski, ułożony i napisany przez xiędza Jana Kurmina*. Wilno.

Kurschat (Kursaitis) Friedrich (1870- 1883) *Wörterbuch der littauischen Sprache*. Halle: Weisenhaus.

Landau S. I. (2001) *Dictionaries. The Art and Craft of Lexicography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lange Jacob (1777) *Volstaendiges deutsch-lettisches und lettisch-deutsches Lexicon*. Mitau.

Lalis Anthony (1905) *A dictionary of the English and Lithuanian Languages* 1905. Chicago: Lietuva.

Latvia (1967) Ed. by J. Rutkis. Stockholm: LNF.

Latvian-English dictionary (1997) Ed. by A.Veisbergs. Rīga: EAI.

Latviešu Konversācijas vārdnīca (1927-1940) vol. 1-21. Rīga: A. Gulbja apgāds

Latviešu literārās valodas vārdnīca (1972-1997) Rīga: Zinātne.

Latviešu valodas vārdnīca (1987) Rīga: Avots.

Latvijas padomju enciklopēdija (1981- 1988) vol.1-10. Rīga: Galvenā enciklopēdiju Redakcija.

Latvijas PSR mazā enciklopēdija (1967-1970) vol.1-3. Rīga: Zinātne.

Latvju enciklopēdija (1950-1955) vol. 1-3. Stokholma: Trīs zvaigznes,

Latvju enciklopēdija (1983-1990) vol. 1-4. Rockville : Amerikas Latviešu apvienības Latviešu institūts. (Vol. 5. 2006)

- Lettisch-Russisch-Deutsches Woerterbuch* (1879) Moskva.
- Lettisches Woerterbuch von Ulmann und Brasche. Zweiter Theil* (1880). Riga u. Leipzig.
- Lietuviškoji Enciklopedia* (1933) Kaunas: Spaudos Fondas.
- Lietuviškoji tarybinė enciklopedija* (1975/6- 1985). vol. 1-12. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Lietuvių enciklopedia* (1953-1969) Boston.
- Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* (1941-2002) T.1-20. Vilnius.
- Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* (1941) Vyr. red. J. Balčikonis. T.1. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutos.
- Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* (1947) Vyr. red. J. Balčikonis. T.2. Kaunas: Valstybine enciklopedijų, žodymų ir mokslo literatūros leidykla.
- Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* (1968) J. Kruopas. T.1. Vilnius: Mintis.
- Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* (1969) Vyr. red. J. Kruopas. Vilnius: Mintis.
- Litovskij slovarj A. Juškeviča s tolkovaniem slov na russkom I polskom jazikah.* (1897) St. Petersburg.
- Mancelius G. (1631) *Lettisch Vade-mecum*. Riga.
- Mancelius G. (1638) *Lettus. Das ist Wortbuch*. Riga: Gerhard Schroeder
- Mancelius G. (1638) *Phraseologia Lettica*. Riga: Gerhard Schroeder
- Mažoji lietuviškoji tarybinė enciklopedija* (1966-1971) vol.1-3. Vilnius: Mintis
- Mekons F. (1878) *Svešu vārdu grāmata*. Rīga.
- Merkel Garlieb Helwig (1797) *Die Letten, vorzüglich in Liefland, am Ende des philosophischen Jahrhunderts, Ein Beytrag zur Völker- und Menschenkunde*. Leipzig.
- Mielcke (Milkus) Christian Gottlieb (1800) *Littauisch-Deutsches und Deutsch-Littauisches Wörterbuch*. Königsberg: Verl. Hartungschens Hofbuch druckerey,
- Muehlenbacha (1923-1932) *Latviešu valodas vārdnīca* (1.–4) Rīga.
- Nesselmann Georg Heinrich Ferdinand (1851) *Wörterbuch der Littauischen Sprache*. Königsberg: Gebrüder Bornträger.
- Pistohlkors G. von (1990) Die historische Voraussetzungen fuer die Entstehung der drei baltischen Staaten. In Meissner B. (ed) *Die baltischen Nationen: Estland, Lettland, Litauen*. Cologne.

Plakans Andrejs (1995) *The Latvians. A Short History*. Stanford: Hoover Institution Press.

Rūķe-Draviņa Velta (1977) *The Standardization Process in Latvian. 16th Century to the Present*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

Ruhig (Ruigys) Philipp (1747) *Littauisch-Deutsches und Deutsch-Littauischen Lexicon... und Grammatik*. Königsberg: Verl, J. H. Hartung,

Schmidt Alexander (1992) *Geschichte des Baltikums. Von den alten Goettern bis zur Gegenwart*. Muenchen: Piper.

Sirvydas Konstantinas (1642/1713) *Dictionarium Trium Lingvarum* [4th/5th ed.]. Vilnae: typ. Acad. S. J., 464 p. (1st ed. 1620 or 1629)

Stender A. J. (1820) *Wahzu Wallodas- un Wahrdu-grahmata*. Jelgawa.

Stender G.F. (1761) *Neue vollstaendigere Lettische Grammatik*. Braunschweig.

Stender G.F. (1789) *Lettisches Lexicon*. Mitau.

Švābe Alfrēds (1958) *Latvijas vēsture 1800 -1914*. Stockholm: Daugava.

Ta Swehta Grahmata jeb Deewa Swehtais (1689) Riga: J. G. Wilcken.

Tāgepera Reins (2010) Alberts, Mārtiņš un arī Pēteris: viņu loma latviešu un igauņu nāciju izveidē. *Akadēmiskā dzīve/Academic Life*. Rīga: LU. 3-12.

Ulmann C.C. (1872) *Lettisches Woerterbuch*. Riga.

Weisbergs Andrejs (2000) Latvian Bilingual Lexicography – Tradition and Change. *Lexicographica*. Series Maior. Band 103. Tuebingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. pp. 27-33.

Weisbergs Andrejs (2007) Occasional and Systematic Shifts in Word-formation and idiom use in Latvian as a result of translation. In: Munat, Judith (ed.), *Lexical Creativity, Texts and Contexts*. Vol.58. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 239-263.

Waldemar X. (1881) *Karmannij russko-anglijsko.. Moskva*.

Wellig Arnold (1828) *Beitraege zur lettischen Sprachkunde*. Mitau.

Zelča Vita (2009) *Latviešu avīžniecība. Laikraksti savā laikmetā un sabiedrībā 1922-1865*. Rīga: Zinātne.

Zemzare Daina (1961) *Latviešu vārdnīcas*. Rīga: Latvijas PSR Zinātņu Akadēmijas Izdevniecība.

