Translation

The Enlightenment was the first attempt of Europe's Republic of Letters to conduct a cosmopolitan conversation without a "universal" language. In this respect, Latin was gone. By the early eighteenth century, important philosophers such as René Descartes and John Locke were being read in their native tongues or translated into other vernaculars. The Latin writings of Baruch de Spinoza, Samuel Pufendorf, and Isaac Newton were soon to stamp their unique marks on Enlightenment thought mostly through translations.

From Universal Language to Lingua Franca

Eighteenth-century philosophers writing in their own languages reached new audiences and benefited fellow thinkers through translation: David Hume, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and Cesare Beccaria are seminal cases who reached broad European audiences. Imaginative literature written in living languages was diffused mostly in translation: in the mid-eighteenth century, the British authors Alexander Pope, Henry Fielding, Samuel Richardson, and Edward Young stamped their mark on the Continent through translations into French, German, and other languages. By the end of the century, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, and Friedrich Schiller began to acquire their European reputations in similar ways. Classical, medieval, and Renaissance authors, including Homer, Dante, and Shakespeare, made an impact on the Enlightenment through new translations, which themselves often ignited heated theoretical debates. It was largely through successful translations that Cervantes inspired literary circles in Copenhagen, Pope's works traveled to Saint Petersburg, William Robertson made his mark on German historiography, and Voltaire found readers in Budapest. Modern European languages obtained a new wealth of literary, scientific, and philosophical idioms. Toward the end of the century, national cultures were consciously being constructed, enriched, and even challenged to originality by means of translations. The theater, moving from a nomadic to a city-based existence and taking on national aspirations, was a great consumer of translations. Other Enlightenment institutions—journals, reading societies, and clandestine clubs—enabled translated books to mobilize new social and intellectual energies.

Europe's vernaculars had gathered strength as literary languages (and, in some cases, as scientific and philosophical languages) since the sixteenth century. Translations steadily multiplied from Latin into French, Italian, Spanish, English,

and German, and to a lesser degree between these languages. Awareness of the complexities of translation and attempts to theorize it made parallel progress. By the early eighteenth century, the Latin scaffolding gave way and translations between vernaculars gained ascendancy for the first time in European history. After 1750, most scientific texts were no longer translated into Latin for international readership.

Other changes occurred in the balance of prominence among the modern languages. While French retained its cultural lead, other languages moved up and down the scale. English blossomed into continental recognition dramatically around 1750, becoming for the first time in its history a major origin-language in Europe's literary traffic. German, too, experienced an epochal transformation, rising to the position of a major host-language for new translations; by the end of the century, it was also an origin-language of great importance. Italian and Spanish, in contrast, lost their earlier prominence in both respects. By the end of the eighteenth century, newly awakened literary languages in central, northern, and eastern Europe launched ambitious projects of translation that led to the construction of their own national literatures in the century to come. Although quantitative data can be difficult to assemble, statistics from English, French, and German publishing suggest that translations rose to unprecedented levels in terms of number, diversity, speed of publication, and geographical diffusion. Translated texts were part of a general transformation of the European book industry. Their translators and publishers were members of a new social stratum of literati, a growing species of cultural mediators.

Translation was not indispensable for the diffusion of Enlightenment texts and ideas. Europe may have lost its universal language, but it gained a lingua franca. French was the cosmopolitan language of the well-bred, well-read and well-traveled throughout the century. Most French books received in non-Francophone parts of Europe were read in the original. The *Encyclopédie* of Diderot and d'Alembert reached the farthest outposts of the European Enlightenment, from Moscow to Lisbon, without the mediation of translators. French-language editions of Enlightenment works were regularly published even in non-Francophone countries. Adam Smith read his French mentors in their own tongue, members of the Enlightenment circle in Milan devoured Voltaire and Diderot in French, and Catherine II of Russia plagiarized Montesquieu in the original. If the Enlightenment could be conducted in French (as some historians have pretended it was)—or, when need be, in English, a language well understood by Voltaire and studiously perused by Lessing—then why was translation a crucial vehicle of diffusion?

The answer touches on the very nature of Enlightenment's social geography. French was not Latin, and the writers and the reading publics that made the

backbone of Enlightenment culture were not Latinists. Many of the works conveying Enlightenment ideas could be written only in vernaculars; this was especially true of popularized science and philosophy, national histories, new imaginative literature deeply stamped by local landscape and idiom, travel books, and ethnography. Moreover, not all Enlightenment readers knew French, and many of its authors could not write it. Finally, even thinkers with a reasonable knowledge of other languages found translations easier to digest and to quote: Hume reportedly read Beccaria in the Italian original, but also in the abbé André Morellet's French translation.

Some seminal moments in the intellectual history of the eighteenth century therefore involved epoch-making translations of full texts or effective selections: we note Voltaire's quotations from Locke in his *Lettres philosophiques* (1734), his translation of Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, and his dissemination (which included the translation, chiefly by Mme. du Châtelet) of Newton's *Principia Mathematica*; the last, a classic case of variegated diffusion, brought Newton's ideas, via a network of retranslations, excerpts and popularizations, to a vast French-reading public. A similar case in the German Enlightenment is Johann Lorenz Schmidt's important rendering of Spinoza's *Ethics* in 1744.

Thanks to translations, the Republic of Letters could slowly evolve in some parts of Europe into an embryonic democracy of letters, where numerous people could read, but only one language. Having survived the loss of its universal language, Enlightenment thought became increasingly sensitive to linguistic and cultural differences and ever more dependent on translation. In this evolving scene, French was a crucial but temporary mediator, and under its dwindling shade, Europe's world of learning and literature reached multilingual maturity.

From a broad perspective, Enlightenment translation was a story of success. Not just the share of translations in Europe's ever-growing book industry and markets but also the increasing centrality of the very idea of translation are vital to an understanding of eighteenth-century European history. Enlightenment's fundamental ideas—progress, freedom of thought, universal humanity, and critical reasoning—proved highly translatable. Although formidable differentials were on the horizon, Europe's cosmopolitan legacy stood the first test of multilingual modernity.

Theories of Translation

Two approaches to linguistic theory underlie Enlightenment theories of translation. Descartes's rationalist theory of language assumed a universal similarity among all human languages, and therefore that all languages are, in principle, intertranslatable. Another rationalist strand, represented by Beauzée's

article “Langue” in the *Encyclopédie*, derived all European languages from one “primitive language,” typically Hebrew. As the eighteenth century progressed, however, a particularist approach came to predominate. D'Alembert noted that languages “cannot all be used to express the same idea,” and he pointed out “the diversity of their genius.” The differences among languages—ancient and modern, European and extra-European, and even within Europe's boundaries—were increasingly acknowledged.

A decisive starting point for the Enlightenment debate on translation was the seventeenth-century French paradigm that subjected all translation to the aesthetic values and literary canons of the host (receiving, or “target”) culture. Beginning with Nicolas Perrot d'Ablancourt's translations in the late seventeenth century, such texts were dubbed “the beautiful unfaithful.” Original texts, primarily the classics, were to be translated into pleasant, smoothly readable, and stylistically familiar target texts. All aspects of the original—length and structure, verse and meter, terminology and metaphor, ideas and opinions—were fair objects for transformation.

Enlightenment discussion of translation was launched by important commentaries on the translator's art by several translators from ancient Greek and Roman, notably John Dryden in England and Anne Marie Dacier in France. Their ideas of the nature of translation paved the way for debates on language, truth, aesthetic values, and cultural differences that all went well beyond the scope of translation theory. Dryden distinguished between the two extremes of “metaphrase” (literal translation), and “imitation” (denoting the “excesses” caused by abandoning the original text); he rejected both in favor of a temperate, midway “paraphrase.” Dacier, renowned translator of classical authors including Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, and Horace, presented a theory of translation in the introduction to her famed rendering of the *Iliad* (1711). She called for a reserved faithfulness to the original spirit, preferring “noble” translation of the author's sense to “servile” verbal literalism, and subjecting translation to cultural differences, underlined by her abhorrence of some of Homer's images and characterizations.

Dryden and Dacier were followed by a line of self-reflective translators, many of them gifted writers and Enlightenment figures in their own right, who regarded translation as an important means of diffusing aesthetic standards and seminal ideas. Alexander Pope echoed Dryden's formula in the Preface to his translation of the *Iliad* (1715–1720), which drew directly on Dacier's French rendering. In his entry on translation for the *Encyclopédie*, Jean le Rond d'Alembert drew his readers’ attention to the difficulties inherent in translation, voicing a preference for thoughtful “imitation” rather than literal rendering. The abbé Prévost applied Dacier's refined discrimination to contemporary English literature: “I have

suppressed English customs where they may appear shocking to other nations," he wrote in his translation of Richardson's *Pamela*.

The German Enlightenment launched its debate on translation with the competing approaches of Johann Christoph Gottsched (1700–1766) and his Swiss opponents, Johann Jakob Bodmer (1698–1783) and Johann Jakob Breitinger (1701–1776). Their debate, triggered by Bodmer's German translation of Milton's *Paradise Lost* (1732), shows the unique relevance of translation to the core of German aesthetics and literary theory. Gottsched aspired to submit all translations to "enlightened" standards of style. In terms largely similar to those of prevalent French theory, he claimed that translators ought to adapt original texts, if necessary, by various techniques to meet the demands of contemporary German literature. Breitinger retorted by defending the particular features of origin languages and demanding the visibility of original "thoughts." His line was radicalized by Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock (1724–1803) and especially by Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803). The latter hailed the "gravity center" (**Schwerpunkt**) of all historical cultures and, by extension, the sanctity of their languages and the inviolability of original texts. Yet popularization, the Enlightenment's most common paradigm of diffusion, kept the host-oriented approach in the foreground. "If you want to influence the masses," wrote Goethe, "simple translation is always the best."

The common denominators of Enlightenment theories of translation should not, however, be obscured. It was widely accepted that a translator might take liberties in syntax, vocabulary, and structure. In commercial enterprises, such liberties were aimed at accommodating the publishers' demand to attract readers in the host language, especially French, by appealing to their tastes. More reflective and independent translators, less dependent on the whims of the market, professed taking poetic liberties to transmit the author's voice as well as possible.

At the close of the eighteenth century, Alexander Tytler published his *Essay on the Principles of Translation* (1791), in which he attacked Dryden's approval of paraphrase and the ensuing liberties taken by eighteenth-century translators. Departing from the mainstream eighteenth-century creed, Tytler requested a rigorous loyalty to the original text in matters of vocabulary, style, and ideas. His own translations of Petrarch from Italian (1784) and of Schiller from German (1792) exemplified the new standards. Tytler heralded the onset of a (mostly German-inspired) Romantic emphasis on the integrity and vocal uniqueness of origin languages. Herder's theoretical works and new German translations of Homer (by Voss), Dante and Shakespeare (by Schlegel) and Cervantes (by Tieck) marked a culmination of the "faithful" strand of Enlightenment translation theory, shifting it from the author's "spirit" to his very words. Romantic

translators turned from the Enlightenment not so much in their poetic shift (which flowed from an important undercurrent of Enlightenment thought itself) as in their abandonment of Enlightenment texts as candidates for translation.

Geography of Translation: Centers and Major Trajectories

Europe's great centers of translation were Paris, London, and (from about 1760) Leipzig and environs; the last was also a hub of circulation through its book fair and its academic, literary and journalistic connections. Important secondary centers of multilingual translation included Zurich, Amsterdam (and other Dutch cities), and Hamburg. Other cities producing significant numbers of translations into the local language included Lisbon, Naples, Dublin, Edinburgh, Copenhagen, Stockholm, Berlin, and Saint Petersburg. The seven hundred publishers of translated works counted by Bernhard Fabian in the German lands worked in small towns as well as larger cities.

Several centers merit attention not necessarily for the volume of translations they produced but for their cultural significance as trend-setters. An industry of publication and translation developed in Leipzig, issuing translations not only into German but also into French and several other languages, even into the nascent modern Greek. It was also a bastion of translation theory, with Gottsched and his circle in residence. Zurich, home to Gottsched's theoretical opponents Bodmer and Breitinger, was a multilingual nucleus of the Swiss network of cultural mediation, both French-German intermediary and English-German. By midcentury, the Zurich publishers were among the first to insist on the merit of direct translation between the origin and the host languages. Hamburg became another meeting point for French, English and German; its geographic and economic orientation gave it a unique advantage for becoming an Anglo-German intermediary. It was a major gateway for importation of new English books into the Holy Roman Empire. Especially in the last four decades of the century, the speedy arrival of new books from Britain (notably the central writings of the Scottish Enlightenment) was followed by prompt publication of German translations.

The multilingual publishing history of the Dutch Republic preceded the Enlightenment by a century and more and also pioneered the abandonment of Latin publication. Amsterdam was a center of translation into French as well as Dutch, thanks to the influx of erudite Huguenots after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685). Demand for translations into Dutch nevertheless grew rapidly. Elsewhere, translations were commissioned by rulers and by scholarly institutions. Catherine the Great set up a commission to explore, propose, and perform a wide-ranging translation project from European languages into

Russian. A translation seminar was launched at the University of Moscow a decade later. Several other universities and academies were particularly important for intercultural mediation. At Göttingen, Anglophile professors and students came in touch with British colleagues and with English books. The University of Copenhagen, where Swedes, Finns, and Icelanders encountered the latest trends in European literature, educated several leading translators.

The history of eighteenth-century translation is primarily the drama of two languages: French, Europe's almost unrivaled lingua franca, and English, a newcomer to the cosmopolitan scene that rose to challenge French in essential areas of cultural creativity. The interplay between French and English was complex and subtle. The French Enlightenment owed its early flowering to Voltaire's and Montesquieu's discovery of English politics, literature, science, and philosophy. The French language became a vehicle for transmitting English authors into other major European languages. After 1750, however, British influence began to vie with French and in some respects overcame it. From the perspective of the late German Enlightenment, for example, French was no longer the magnanimous mediator of English style and ideas, but their vanquished adversary. Direct translations from English were now the rule, and French mediation was abandoned or held in suspicion.

Almost every important Enlightenment work not originally written in French was translated into it. Around the mid-eighteenth century, interest in France shifted from "beautiful" translations of classical texts to modern works, literary and scientific. English was the main origin language, though only a handful of English works had been translated into French during the seventeenth century, compared with some five hundred in the eighteenth. Voltaire's role as pioneering intermediary between English and French cultures was coupled with Diderot's keen interest in English literature and in cultural aspects of translation. Shakespeare, Pope, Richardson, and Hume were initially read on the Continent in French translation more than in any other language, including the original English. Translations into French from Italian were significantly fewer, among them Antoine de Rivarol's rendering of Dante's *Divine Comedy* and Morellet's translation of Beccaria's *Dei delitti e delle pene*. Toward the end of the century, German became an important origin language.

By contrast, translations *from* French into other European languages marked the lines where the formidable strength of French culture overtook the considerable expanse of the French language. The profusion of translations from French, beginning in the early Enlightenment with Bayle and especially Fénelon, peaked with the writings of Voltaire, Montesquieu, and Rousseau. Among the most popular were Montesquieu's *Lettres persanes* and Voltaire's *Candide* and *Zaïre*. Beside numerous reprints of the original French editions, these works were

repeatedly translated into Italian and German, followed by many other European languages. More scholarly works, such as Montesquieu's *L'esprit des lois*, were less frequently translated. No full translation was made of the *Encyclopédie*, widely circulated in Europe in the original French. Another channel of French predominance, unique to the eighteenth century in its popularity, was the "secondary translation" of texts initially translated into French, most often from English, and retranslated into an array of other languages, including Portuguese, Polish, Russian, Swedish, and Hungarian.

It was a mark of the maturity and independence of German culture when, during the second half of the century, secondary translation was largely abandoned in favor of direct and more source-oriented renderings. The change of the tide was marked by direct German translations of Shakespeare's plays. Edward Young's *Conjectures on Original Composition* (1759) was translated into German soon after its original publication. Shakespeare and Young, far removed from the rules of French classicism, paved the way for an era of fruitful British-German cultural exchange that defiantly circumvented France. The last four decades of the century saw a tide of prompt, well-informed, and intensely discussed German publications of translated English poetry, drama, and novels, as well as a broad range of theoretical texts in moral philosophy, aesthetics and political economy. Translations from English into German, though never outnumbering the French, left all other languages far behind. More than any other European culture, the German Enlightenment transformed its literary standards under the guidance of translated texts. The British inspiration was not just a matter of rearranging the translated canon but of rethinking what translation (and all writing) must perform. The English and Scottish influences make it clear that objection to French classicism was by no means an anti-Enlightenment approach: imagination and sentiment were at home in the aesthetic theory of Young, Blair, and Burke, all avidly read in German.

Translations of Enlightenment texts into English remained predominantly from French. Toward the end of the century, however, German became a major source language for both direct and secondary translations, first in eastern and northern European cultures and later in the west. Klopstock's poetry was translated into Icelandic, and *Hamlet* was indirectly translated into Polish and Hungarian via a German translation.

Direct translations between more minor languages were relatively few, most notably between Italian and Spanish. Italian also served as a mediator for indirect Spanish translations of such works as *Ossian*. Translations from non-European languages were similarly sparse, but of great importance. The *Arabian Nights*, translated into French by Antoine Galland in the early eighteenth

century, inspired the Orientalist fables of Montesquieu and Voltaire. The Qur'an was translated into English by George Sale in 1734.
At the receiving end, the host languages were diverse: Russian, Portuguese, Italian, Greek, Finnish, and Croat are but a sample. These languages were, in various degrees, affected by the translated texts and influenced by new literary standards and ideas. Translation, the tool of a new Enlightenment cosmopolitanism, eventually became the medium (and target) of new linguistic self-awareness and cultural nationalism.
In Italy, where Latin remained the language of science and theory longer than in other parts of Europe, interest in French culture rose dramatically at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and translations in Enlightenment context gathered pace in the second half of the century. Voltaire, Diderot, d'Alembert, and Rousseau made important contributions to Italian intellectual history both in the original French and in Italian translations. British sources were important to two leading groups of the Italian Enlightenment. In Milan, the journal *Il Caffé* was modeled on the *Spectator*, and its contributors, Pietro and Alessandro Verri and Cesare Beccaria, quoted extensively from English and Scottish works with a special emphasis on Hume's philosophy, politics, and history. In Naples, political economists read Scottish works in French translations.

Types of Books, Authors, and Disciplines Translated

The Enlightenment translation market was different from all predecessors in its appeal to a new and broad readership comprised of women and men, aristocrat and bourgeois, readers of high erudition and basic literacy. This expansion of audiences brought to the fore novels, plays, poetry, geography, ethnography, and travel books, as well as philosophy in the Enlightenment vein, history, art theory, and popular science. All these categories, along with medicine and theology, are represented in the list of translations from French and English into German cataloged for the Leipzig Easter book fair in the peak era of 1765–1785. New translations of the classics reached audiences not versed in Latin and served Enlightenment authors for quotation and discussion. Even an excellent Latinist like the Scots philosopher Adam Ferguson preferred to quote, when possible, from a good contemporary translation such as Elizabeth Carter's rendering of Epictetus, rather than use the original.
Enlightenment translations of poetry include several shining exceptions in the history of this particularly untranslatable genre: those of Alexander Pope (especially the *Essay on Man*), Edward Young's *Night Thoughts*, and Macpherson's *Ossian*. Drama, in verse and prose, was widely translated and often fiercely adapted to host cultures. The newly discovered Shakespeare, followed by plays

of the German Sturm und Drang movement and Schiller, transformed European stages and inspired numerous imitations.

The popularity of translated philosophical works can be attributed to the popular and witty style of the philosophes, but also to the relative accessibility of the more demanding works of Hume and Kant. An early landmark of the vernacular turn was the decision of the editors of Spinoza's complete works, published posthumously, to issue Dutch translations alongside the Latin originals; French and German versions soon followed. By the mid-eighteenth century, some philosophical works, such as Locke's *Some Thoughts Concerning the Education of Children* (1693, with five German translations during the eighteenth century) and Hume's *Enquiry concerning Human Understanding*, did well in translation. British political philosophy, notably Locke's *Two Treatises of Government* (1690), fared better in French than in German. Scottish moral philosophy, aesthetic theory, and historiography were far more successful in German translation than were Scottish discussions of politics. Political economy became popular during the last phase of the Enlightenment, with James Stewart's *Oeconomy* a bestseller in German translation.

Works in the natural sciences were translated sporadically, often with an emphasis on practical manuals such as agriculture, gardening and beekeeping. The most important single theoretical text was Newton's *Principia Mathematica*, mediated on the Continent by Voltaire and translated into French largely by Gabrielle-Émilie du Châtelet (1756). Translation was also instrumental in the spread of popularized Newtonianism; Francesco Algarotti's *Newtoniamismo per le dame* (1737) promptly made its way to Newton's homeland as *Sir Isaac Newton's Philosophy Explain'd for the Use of the Ladies* (1739). Medicine was highly translatable: a lavish edition of Smellie's *Anatomy* was produced in Nuremberg, and the Göttingen publishers Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht launched a broad translation project of British medical works and translated the *Transactions* of the Royal Society of Edinburgh.

Beyond the realm of books lay that of periodical publications. The most translated and copied Enlightenment periodicals were Steele and Addison's *Tatler* and *Spectator*, eagerly read, emulated, translated, and pirated by German and Italian writers in the early and middle decades of the eighteenth century.

The most interesting question is not who were the most translated authors, but who were the authors most effective in translation. Seen in this light, it was British authors—from Shakespeare to Smith, from Newton to Hume and from Addison to Burke—who made the greatest impact on Enlightenment theory and art through the medium of translation.

Economics of Translation: Print Culture, Distribution, Rights, and Piracy

The two prime movers of eighteenth-century translation were the publishing house and the independent translator. Such publishers as Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht in Göttingen and Philip Erasmus Reich of the house of Weidmann in Leipzig put great efforts into preliminary research, selection, commissioning, supervising, editing, and marketing translated works. The Société Typographique de Neuchâtel (STN), of which the fullest documentation has survived, exemplifies these efforts in its own modest translation project from German into French.

Copyright legislation was in its infancy in Britain and in France, and no protection was given in regard to international publishing, including translations. Book piracy in the form of unauthorized reprints (of both originals and translations) was widely practiced in areas such as southern Germany, Switzerland, Austria, and Ireland. When it came to translations, piracy was the norm all over Europe. Even when authors were given notice of translation, earnings were not forthcoming. In general, although the Enlightenment emphasis on literary fame heralded a new concept of intellectual property, few publishers of translations upheld the new notion of copyright.

Translators were most often employed on a freelance basis. More rarely they were "in house," or even partners. A select few, such as Dryden, could obtain good pay for their work. Pope, in his prime, earned some £4,000 for his *Iliad* and a similar sum for his *Odyssey*. Although many translations were commissioned by publishers on pure economic grounds, others were created as a gentlemanly pastime or a scholarly effort.

Large publishers used an international network of correspondents reporting on new books worthy of translation, readers' preferences, and the reception of recent translations. A few firms employed consultants, at times translators themselves. Publishers often advertised translations and marketed them through catalogs and correspondence with book traders. Royal and imperial protection was at times obtained for selected books. In several parts of Europe, translation was encouraged by learned institutions, such as Arcadia, the Roman Academy of Letters, which produced important new Italian versions of the classics.

One measure of a translation's success was the number and spread of reprints, pirated editions, and retranslations. Many of the English translations of French Enlightenment works published in Dublin were reprints from London publishers; the Basle house of Tourneissen specialized in reprints; Shakespeare's plays, Richardson's novels, Pope's poetry, and certain works by Hume and Smith were retranslated into the same language, sometimes within less than a decade.

In physical terms, translated books tended to have good design and typography, sometimes replete with engraved title pages and illustrations, but inferior paper and binding. Editions could run to some 1,000 copies; few translations reached more than two editions.

Translators

Some of the Enlightenment's greatest contributors were enthusiastic and prolific translators, among them Voltaire, Pope, and Lessing. The caliber of its translators at times foretold and affected a book's success in translation: the earliest translations of *Clarissa* into German and French were made by two renowned men of letters, Johann David Michaelis and Prévost, respectively. Lessing translated Hutcheson's *System of Moral Philosophy*. Macpherson's Ossianic poetry was translated into Polish (via the French) by the renowned poet Ignacy Krasicki, and into Italian by the famed Melchiorre Cesarotti.

Beyond the celebrated names, however, labored thousands of little-known translators in several dozen cities and towns, carrying out the massive labor of Europe's growing translation industry. Some worked anonymously, and others had only their initials printed on the book's title page. Among them were university professors, freelance lecturers and students, clerics, clerks, and minor government employees. Many of them were struggling self-employed literati.

A few translators understood their profession as an art, or even a vocation of religious intensity, and undertook close correspondence with authors, but relations between translators and authors were usually prosaic, and most often nonexistent. Few translators had any personal contact with the authors they translated or any business connection with the original publisher of the work.

Eighteenth-century book reviewers were keenly aware of the merits and deficiencies of translators. Some publishers, like STN, took pride in the exceptional quality of their translations. Historians now attempt to measure "good" against "bad" translations as indicators of the success of a particular book or edition. Inadequate translation is sometimes blamed for the obscurity of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* in its early German edition (1776–1778), and a brilliant second translation by Christian Garve, with an enlightening preface (1794–1796), is seen as a key factor in Smith's somewhat belated German success.

Women translators, not unknown in previous times, broke new ground in the Enlightenment. Aphra Behn and Anne Dacier dared to tackle the classics. Dacier, whose work inspired Pope's own translation of Homer, was derided for her gender by some of his critics. Elizabeth Carter provided a first complete English rendering of Epictetus (1749–1752). Charlotte Brooke published the first collection of translated Gaelic poetry from Ireland (1789). The prolific Dutch

writer Betje Wolff found time to translate twenty-three works from English, French, and German.

Cross-Fertilization of Literary Forms and the Rise of Modern National Cultures

The cultural dominance of France meant that French translations were typically host-oriented, and most translators willing and even eager to adapt the origin texts to French grammatical, semantic, and aesthetic standards. For a German Enlightenment author like Friedrich Nicolai, such adaptations, even of his own work, were a necessary tool for the broad dissemination of Enlightenment ideas. He nevertheless warned of the French tendency to expect all books to be "dressed *à la française*" and to "merely admire themselves in us" (Freedman, p. 96). Even as Nicolai wrote this in the 1770s, however, change was in the air. Adam Ferguson, visiting Voltaire in Ferney in the same period, was congratulated by the aged philosophe for "civilizing the Russians" through his translated history and philosophy books, but Enlightenment translations did not follow Voltaire's imperative. Rather than universally spreading the Voltairean idea of Reason or the Scottish idea of historical progress, translations increasingly encouraged the birth of modern national literatures and cultures. While strong national literatures, supported by late Enlightenment ethnography and anthropology, paid growing respect to source languages and origin cultures, secondary or nascent national literatures were fiercely host-oriented, adapting translated texts to their needs. Translations thus played an important part in the birth of modern literature in Polish and Rumanian. The literary modernization of two ancient languages, Greek and Hebrew, was substantially fed by translations. Translators—and some publishers—were among the first to notice new intercultural sensitivities. The late Enlightenment opposition to French cultural domination was shared by German, Dutch, and Scandinavian mediators of texts. At the same time, the map of translations highlighted cultural hierarchies and unequal exchanges: "Klopstock, our more than Milton…[is] wholly unknown to Your country, or, what is still worse, quite disguised in the most abominable translation," wrote a German translator to his English correspondent. Since Milton was at that time a household name among literate Germans, the injustice seemed great.

Shifts of political loyalty were also reflected in translation trends: Americans read French works in translations, mostly imported from London and Edinburgh, that enhanced their sense of cultural autonomy and supported political radicalization. In *The Rights of the British Colonies Asserted and Proved* (1764), James Otis translated and quoted passages from Rousseau's *Contrat social*,

buttressing anti-English political sentiments. Revolutionary pamphleteers followed the same example, using Montesquieu and other French writers alongside Rousseau.

Translations enabled cultural shifts of emphasis though the discovery of fringe cultures. Macpherson's Ossianic pseudo-translation, despite the bitter controversy over its authenticity, opened a new horizon for Celtic literature; translations appeared from Welsh into English by Evans Evans, and Charlotte Brook compiled an anthology of translations from Irish Gaelic poetry (1789). In Germany, enthusiasm for Celtic and Nordic sources and emphasis on the integrity of origin languages dovetailed with conscious cultural patriotism. Translation could be recruited to bolster the German literary revival by making a large pool of the best world literature available to local readers and writers. Finally, translation could also channel cultural hostility and self-centeredness. As such, it took two forms: a negative attitude to translations, or a brusquely instrumental attitude to languages and texts of origin. Toward the end of the century, a new undertone of national defiance crept into even the linguistically open Dutch culture. Dutch literati engaged in a prolonged debate on the merits of their culture's openness to an “all-engulfing ocean of translations” (Baker, 398). In Poland, translations were seen as building blocks of a new national culture and free adaptations were made, at times dropping all reference to the original texts and masquerading as originals. Stylistic “improvement” and the exchange of prose and verse were frequent.

Practices of translation thus belong both to the rise of Enlightenment and to its demise. Shifts in both the theory and the body of translated texts accompanied the late eighteenth century retreat from universalism and the rise of cultural and political nationalism. Yet continuities are no less important. Voltaire, Rousseau, and Pope were not translated for the use of latecomer Enlightenments, such as the Jewish and other eastern European variants, until the first half of the nineteenth century. Conversely, cultural pluralism, respect for source languages, and sensitivity to “untranslatable” words and semantic uniqueness, often associated with Romanticism, are deeply rooted in the Enlightenment debates on the practice and theory of translation.

Bibliography

Baker, Mona, ed. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London and New York, 1998. A groundbreaking enterprise, good on translation theory and major trajectories, but tending to neglect the material, social, and economic histories of print and translation.Find This Resource

Barber, Giles, and Bernhard Fabian, eds. *Buch und Buchhandel in Europa im achtzehnten Jahrhundert/The Book and the Book Trade in Eighteenth-Century Europe*. Hamburg, 1977.Find This Resource

Beebee, Thomas O. *Clarissa on the Continent: Translation and Seduction*. University Park, Penn., and London, 1990.Find This Resource

Carpenter, K. E. *Dialogue in Political Economy: Translations from and into German in the Eighteenth Century*. Boston, 1977.Find This Resource

Fabian, Bernard. *The English Book in Eighteenth-Century Germany*. London, 1992.Find This Resource

Gargett, Graham, and Geraldine Sheridan, eds. *Ireland and the French Enlightenment, 1700–1800*. New York, 1999. Contains a detailed account of French books translated in Ireland.Find This Resource

Graeber, Wilhelm, and Geneviève Roche. *Englische Literatur des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts in französischer Übersetzung und deutscher Weiterübersetzung: Eine kommentierte Bibliographie*. Tübingen, Germany, 1988. A pioneering study of "secondary translation."Find This Resource

Ischreyt, Heinz. Buchhandel und Buchhändler im nordosteuropäischen Kommunikationssystem (1762–1797). In Barber and Fabian, 1977, pp. 249–270.Find This Resource

Kiesel, Helmuth, and Paul Münch. *Gesellschaft und Literatur im 18. Jahrhundert: Voraussetzungen und Entstehung des literarischen Markts in Deutschland*. Munich, 1977.Find This Resource

Kontler, László. *William Robertson and His German Audience on European and Non-European Civilisations*. *Scottish Historical Review* 80 (2001), 63–89. An innovative analysis of the reception of major Enlightenment texts through translation.Find This Resource

Korshin, Paul J., ed. *The Widening Circle: Essays on the Circulation of Literature in Eighteenth-Century Europe*. Philadelphia, 1976.Find This Resource

Munck, Thomas. *The Enlightenment: A Comparative Social History, 1721–1794*. London, 2000.Find This Resource

Oz-Salzberger, Fania. *Translating the Enlightenment: Scottish Civic Discourse in Eighteenth-Century Germany*. Oxford, 1995. Case study of the translation and mistranslation of historical and political texts.Find This Resource

Price, L. M. *English Literature in German*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1953.Find This Resource

Price, Mary Bell, and Lawrence Marsden Price. *The Publication of English Humaniora in Germany in the Eighteenth Century*. Berkeley, Calif., 1934. Useful, though incomplete, checklist of English-German translations.Find This Resource

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London, 1995.Find This Resource

Ward, Albert. *Book Production, Fiction, and the German Reading Public, 1740–1800*. Oxford, 1974.Find This Resource

Fania Oz-Salzberger

Encyclopedia of the Enlightenment
Edited by Alan Charles Kors
Publisher: Oxford University Press
Print Publication Date: 2002
Print ISBN-13: 9780195104301
Published online: 2005
Current Online Version: 2005
eISBN: 9780195187618

http://www.oxfordreference.com.proxy.bib.uottawa.ca/view/10.1093/acref/9780195104301.001.0001/acref-9780195104301-e-715?rskey=Ai5lgj&result=715