Domesticating the opinions of an enlightened foreigner: William Cooke Taylor's framing of Gustave de Beaumont's *Ireland. Social, Political and Religious* (1839)[1]

Patrick Leech, Università di Bologna

Citation: Leech, Patrick (2020) "Domesticating the opinions of an enlightened foreigner: William Cooke Taylor's framing of Gustave de Beaumont's *Ireland. Social, Political and Religious* (1839)", *mediAzioni* 27: A31-A52. http://mediazioni.sitlec.unibo.it, ISSN 1974-4382.

1. Introduction

Literary scholarship and translation studies have for some time concentrated attention on what was once seen as marginal: the paratextual features of texts. Features such as cover, blurb, preface, notes and so on, the way that texts are "packaged", are now recognized as fundamental in the ways that texts present themselves to their readers. (Genette 1987; Chartier 2014: 135-149). Translation is no longer conceptualised as a neutral, value-free activity but instead an intricate process which depends to a high degree on the particular position of the translator (Hermans 1985; Lefevere 1992; Bassnett and Bush 2006). Within this framework, some studies have focused on the paratextual features of translated texts as vehicles for the translator's "voice" (Hermans 1996; Tahir-Gürçağlar 2002; Elefante 2012; Pellatt 2013; Batchelor 2018; Belle and Hosington 2018).

[1] This article benefitted in particular from the international conference entitled Gustave de Beaumont. *L'Irlanda, la schiavitù, la questione sociale nel XIX secolo*, held at the Dipartimento di Studi Politici of the Università di Torino on 23-24 October 2008. The papers presented gave rise to the collection of essays edited by Manuela Ceretta and Mario Tesini (2011). I am very grateful to Manuela Ceretta for the invitation to participate in the conference.

The notion of the choice of an appropriate packaging as a means by which a translated text can be made acceptable to its new implied readership may be particularly cogent with respect to the translation of a nineteenth-century text on Ireland, entitled in its original form *L'Irlande: sociale, politique et religieuse* (1839), written by the French writer and critic, friend and collaborator of Alexis de Tocqueville, Gustave de Beaumont. The translation of this work into English, which appeared in the same year, was carried out by William Cooke Taylor (1800-1849) an Irish liberal journalist and historian living in London. Packaging Beaumont's work in English was imperative: a text highly critical of Britain's treatment of Ireland needed to be justified to a potentially hostile Anglophone readership. As one nineteenth-century commentator put it, many English people, "the moment the very name of Ireland is mentioned…bid adieu to common feeling, common prudence and common sense, and…act with the barbarity of tyrants and the fatuity of idiots"[2]. Ireland's violent and rebellious history, and in particular the legacy of the 1798 insurrection, was a bitter history for an English readership to include in its own dominant narrative. National histories, as we know, are based on forgetting as well as remembering[3], and to remind Britain of the critical situation of "John Bull's other island" in George Bernard Shaw's phrase, required particular attention.

Even the most careful analyses of translation strategies as they emerge in the actual translations of texts, as Anthony Pym has pointed out (2009: 37), do not always and consistently reveal the context and motivations behind a translation. Where they are present, paratextual, or more precisely "peritextual" features (Batchelor 2018: 12) such as prefaces and notes, can provide another opportunity to reveal the orientation of the translator. This is certainly the case with William Cook Taylor's translation of Beaumont's *Ireland*, which offers to the reader (and to the later historian) both a "Translator's Preface" and numerous notes which make explicit his attempts to justify and contextualise Beaumont's narrative. They

[2] Sydney Smith, quoted in Taylor's "Introduction" to William Samson's *Memoirs* (1832: xvii).

[3] According to Ernst Renan, "…the essence of a nation is that all individuals have many things in common, and also that they have forgotten many things" (1990 [1882]: 11). Work on the ways in which national identities are constructed through historical narrative is, of course, extensive. See in particular Hobsbawm and Ranger (1983), Anderson (1983) and Bhabha (1990).

are a useful example, in other words, of how paratexts can provide "what texts don't tell" (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2002). This packaging was not, as we shall see, an attempt to soften Beaumont's denunciations of the iniquities of British rule in Ireland but rather a forceful legitimation and reinforcement of these criticisms. Despite these denunciations, the translation, paradoxically perhaps, may be seen as part of Taylor's own belief in the need for the history of Ireland to be recognized as an important, although dissonant, part of Britain's grand narrative, an important component of the union between Britain and Ireland[4]. Taylor's translation of Beaumont's text, and his paratextual packaging of it was, for him, a vehicle for this cultural and political objective.

2. Gustave de Beaumont and William Cooke Taylor

Gustave de Beaumont (1802-1866) was an enlightened member of the French upper class, a close friend and collaborator of the better-known Alexis de Tocqueville. The latter is renowned above all for his perspicacious sociological analysis of the young American republic, *Democracy in America* (1835/1840), the result of a visit that Tocqueville and Beaumont made to America in 1831-32. Tocqueville translated this experience into a sociological account; Beaumont instead produced a work of fiction, a polemical anti-slavery historical novel entitled *Marie, ou de l'esclavage aux États-Unis* (1835)[5]. Tocqueville's work aimed above all at presenting the advantages of the representative institutions and constitutional traditions of Anglo-American society to his French readership. It was also, however, concerned to trace the limits of these institutions, and this was the focus too of Beaumont's novel, which focused on the plight of those not

[4] Ireland had been a separate kingdom with its own parliament until 1801 when the Act of Union abolished this parliament and Ireland became part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

[5] The novel was reprinted several times in France. An American edition in translation was only published over a century later (Garvin and Hess 2006: viii; Tesini 2011: 23;). Their visit also provided the material for a joint report on the prison system in America, *Du système pénitentiaire aux États-Unis et de son application en France* (1833), for which see Noto (2011).

included in them such as the native Americans and the slaves of the south (Garvin and Hess 2006)[6].

In 1833, Beaumont and Tocqueville travelled again, this time to Ireland, with a similar objective of being able to relate to French readers the situation of this country in the period after the union with Great Britain in 1801. Beaumont returned without Tocqueville in the summer of 1837 and two years later published the result of his investigations, *L'Irlande sociale, politique et religieuse* (1839). The work was instantly a success in France and was awarded the prestigious Montyon prize (Garvin and Hess 2006: viii)[7]. The analysis of Irish society demonstrated painstakingly the limits of the British liberal regime, and concluded, in the words of the introduction to the latest edition, that "Ireland was to the United Kingdom what slavery was to the United States" (Garvin and Hess 2006: x-xi). Beaumont argued, in particular in the long "Historical Introduction" with which he prefaced his analysis of contemporary Ireland, that there was as a substantial gap in Irish society between the Anglo-Irish aristocracy, the "Ascendancy", and the majority Irish Catholic population. This gap had its origins long ago in the Norman Conquest but had been exacerbated during the land confiscations of the seventeenth century and the period of the political dominance of the Ascendancy during the eighteenth century. The seventh edition of *Irlande*, published in 1863, brought this analysis up to date with a preface denouncing the inequalities of land ownership under the Union, which, Beaumont argued, had led directly to the Famine of 1845-49.

In same year as the appearance of the French original, the English translation of Beaumont's text appeared in London, the work of William Cooke Taylor[8]. Taylor

[6] Mario Tesini argues that there is a strong relation between Tocqueville's sociological analysis and Beaumont's novel, and that the documentary material in the novel, in particular, can be linked to the theoretical framework of Tocqueville's work (2011: 21-22). See also Guellec, for whom the two authors were in agreement in their condemnation of slavery (2011: 71-72), and Chignola (2011).

[7] A Montyon prize had already been awarded jointly to Beaumont and Tocqueville for their work on the penitentiary system (Garvin and Hess 2006: vii).

[8] For brief biographical accounts of the life of William Cooke Taylor, see Maume (2005) and Matthew (2004).

was born and brought up in Youghal on the south coast of Ireland in 1800 from a Protestant manufacturing family. He graduated from Trinity College, Dublin, in 1825, before moving to London in 1829 where he became a publicist for the Whig cause, contributing in particular to the liberal review the *Athenaeum*. His involvement with Liberal politicians and their links with the nascent industrial system in Britain led him to become active on behalf of the Anti-Corn Law League[9]. In 1842, probably commissioned by the liberal politician Richard Cobden, he conducted a survey of the "factory system", published as *Notes of a Tour in the Manufacturing Districts of Lancashire* (1842), and brought out a *Hand Book of Silk, Cotton and Woollen Manufactures (*1843*).*

Taylor did not, however, neglect the history of his native Ireland, publishing a *History of the Civil Wars in Ireland* (1831) at the height of the agitation in Britain in favour of parliamentary reform. The volume was republished in America in 1837 with a preface and a long addition by way of conclusion by William Sampson (1764-1836), the exiled Irish rebel involved in the 1798 uprising. Sampson's preface may have been repayment for Taylor's own substantial introduction to the first English edition of Sampson's *Memoirs* (1832) which appeared some 25 years after its original publication in America. An introduction to the memoirs of an Irish rebel like Sampson was an indication of Taylor's wish to put forward the Irish perspective on the country's turbulent relationship with Britain, apparent also in his *History*. His vindication of Sampson and, by implication, the 1798 rebellion, was based on a condemnation of the oligarchical regime which governed Ireland in the eighteenth century, as he made clear: "it is not possible, in these scanty limits, to give even a faint outline of the many illegal oppressions and tyrannical outrages committed by the magistrates during this unhappy period" (Taylor 1832: xvi). It was a denunciation which substantially coincided with that expressed later by Beaumont, as we shall see. In 1847, at the height of the Irish famine and the Irish movement for parliamentary representation, and shortly before his death from cholera in Dublin in 1849, Taylor published another work supporting the Irish

[9] The Anti-Corn Law League argued for the repeal of the Corn Laws, a system which fixed the price of corn. The system was seen as protecting the interests of the landowning classes by keeping the price of corn high when the new industrial entrepreneurs were trying to keep wages low.

cause, his *Reminiscences of Daniel O'Connell* (1847). As well as acting as a publicist for the causes of free trade and manufacturing of English liberal society, then, Taylor made a series of attempts to narrate the particular situation of Ireland to his English readers, and his translation and presentation of Beaumont's work must be seen in this context.

3. The "Translator's Preface" to *Ireland. Social, Political, and Religious*

Publishing the translation of a historical and sociological analysis of Ireland by the French critic, whom he probably met in Dublin during the latter's stay there (Garvin and Hess 2006: xiv), could not be a neutral activity. Beaumont's fierce criticism of Britain's role in Ireland clearly needed a strong supporting structure, a determined, explicit accompaniment to the text which could bolster its arguments with its new readers. Rather than play the part of the transparent, invisible translator, in fact, Taylor chose to emerge as the purposeful mediator, presenter and supporter of Beaumont's work. He did this by means of a carefully worded "Translator's Preface" and through abundant notes to the first part of the text, the "Historical Introduction".

The preface begins by justifying the translation of a work by a foreign traveller. In a thinly-veiled criticism of the complacency of the English, Taylor argues that sometimes a view from the inside can be limited, like the snail who believes his shell to be the "finest palace in the universe" (Beaumont 2006 [1839]: 3). The present work could show the real Ireland from an independent perspective, that of an "enlightened foreigner, unconnected with the political parties that divide the nation" (*ibid.*: 3). "To see ourselves as others see us", Taylor continues, is as difficult for societies as it is for individuals, but for this very reason indispensable. This is particularly the case, if we look at Ireland, because "in no other part of the world have all circumstances, small and great, connected with the moral, social, and political condition of the country, been so studiously and so grossly misinterpreted" (*ibid.*).

The first lines of Taylor's "Preface", then, indicate clearly that his concern is to present a work which can confute these misrepresentations. This critical voice of

Gustave de Beaumont, he says, merits attention for two reasons. First, the book had been written by a particularly competent author: “the Translator need only mention M. de Beaumont’s works on the United States to prove his competency as a political observer” (*ibid.*). This had been borne out, moreover, by the “extraordinary success which the present work has already had on the Continent, [which] is evidence that his testimony respecting Ireland will guide the opinions of the great part of Europe” (*ibid.*). The second relates to Britain’s particular status as a new world leader, a position which brought with it a duty to listen to the opinions of foreigners: “the political supremacy of the British Empire rests so much on public opinion for its support, that nothing by which that opinion may be changed or modified can be neglected with impunity” (*ibid.*). The criticisms of the workings of the British economy and society on what may be seen as its outer margins, in Ireland, were such as to risk compromising Britain’s reputation abroad, and were worth paying attention to for this reason. The “Translator’s Preface” then, frames Beaumont’s book as an important foreign view of Ireland, one which attempts to redress the tendency in Britain to misrepresent Irish history and Irish affairs.

The rest of the preface is dedicated to justifying the translator’s interventions in the text. First, he points out that his translation omits some of the “long and minute explanations respecting the details of British law and administration which are unnecessary for English readers” (*ibid.*). But he also indicates, importantly, that although he has provided copious notes to the “Historical Introduction”, this was not continued with the rest of the text as he wanted to “keep intact its most characteristic and important feature, its being the record of opinions formed by an enlightened statesman, whose views are obviously beyond all suspicion of being warped by prejudice or passion” (*ibid.*: 4). This is an interesting admission in that it implies that the notes the translator added to the “Historical Introduction” may instead have been the result at least of passion, if not prejudice. The notes, in fact, reveal a translator’s voice which is often full of passion and is essentially a partisan vindication of Beaumont’s own denunciations, and the preface clearly anticipates this for a careful reader. It is to these notes that we shall now turn our attention.

4. Taylor's notes to *Ireland. Social, Political, and Religious*

The first aspect to point out regarding the notes is their number. The "Historical Introduction" covers a long 249 pages in the original edition, around 40,000 words, and this introduction contains 203 notes, 104 of which are followed by the abbreviation "Tr." indicating that they are additions by the translator. As well as the "Translator's Preface", then, Taylor makes his own presence as the English translator and the mediator of this text for an Anglophone readership apparent on more or less every page. The notes appear side by side with Beaumont's own, which, with one or two exceptions, are restricted to indications of his source material.

The first of Taylor's footnotes, seemingly innocuous, clearly announces the translator's presence. In the main text Beaumont explains that the four historical provinces of Ireland, Leinster, Ulster, Munster, and Connaught each "had each a separate king" to which the translator adds that in fact "there was a fifth king in Meath" (*ibid.*: 8, note 5)[10]. Beaumont's competence to analyse historical and contemporary Ireland, the note implies, needs adjusting by the native informant, the translator, with small corrections like this to what is essentially an outsider's account. An apparently minor addition, the note functions in fact to justify and legitimate, from the start, the position of the translator as a competent mediator, one whose voice is authoritative and knowledgeable. This simple explanatory or exegetical note (Sardin 2007: 4-7), then, has an important rhetorical and textual function with regard to subsequent interventions: given the tendentious and explicit nature of many of the later notes and their reinforcing of Beaumont's arguments[11], it is important for the reader to have had the opportunity to recognize and appreciate the translator's specific competence.

[10] Here we will refer to the notes according to the numbering in the recent edition of Beaumont's *Ireland. Social, Political, and Religious* (2006) edited by Tom Garvin and Andreas Hess. The notes in the original 1839 edition were without numbering but did indicate whether they were notes inserted by Beaumont (in which case they were unmarked) or whether they had been added by the translator.

[11] There are only one or two exceptions to this. Note 43, for example, is what might be described as a "meta" note, commenting on the translation itself: Beaumont's use of a secondary source for

We may divide Taylor's notes, which provide a constant refrain at the bottom of the page, according to the following themes: the Ascendancy, the fundamental injustice of British rule, the issue of disproportionate violence on the part of the state, and the causes of Irish rebellion.

4.1 The Ascendancy

Beaumont's analysis, as we have mentioned, singled out the oligarchy of the Anglo-Irish "Ascendancy" for particular criticism, and this position is substantially supported throughout by Taylor. Beaumont traces the independence of this oligarchy from the crown back to the feudal regime in Ireland: the original Norman conquest of Ireland was quickly superseded by "feudal anarchy" (Beaumont 2006 [1839]: 16). Taylor adds in a note that this involved impositions of "coyne and livery", or food and pay for the feudal retainers which was "one of the most ruinous oppressions to which the cultivators of the soil were subject" (*ibid.*: note 30). Taylor's insistence on the responsibilities of the Ascendancy class even lead him to contradict Beaumont in some places. According to the latter, the introduction of English law to Ireland was opposed not only by the populace, who "naturally felt no disposition to take the new law of the conqueror" (*ibid.*: 20) but also by the kings of England. For Taylor, instead, opposition to the new English law came above all from the Ascendancy:

> Mr Beaumont is not quite justified in ascribing the opposition to the introduction of English law either to the Irish people or the English monarchs; both frequently evinced much anxiety for such a consummation, but they were baffled by the local ascendancy. (*ibid.*: 20, note 40)

This apparent divergence between author and translator is, however, in reality a reinforcement of Beaumont's own overall judgement. The Ascendancy, in fact, as we have already noted, was the principal culprit for Beaumont regarding the inability of the colonial project to build bridges with the conquered population and slowly construct a consensus. This "bad aristocracy" is a prime focus of criticism

---

the Statute of Kilkenny is substituted with a quotation from the original act itself (Beaumont 2006 [1839]: 22).

also in the main text of Beaumont's work, following the "Historical Introduction"[12]. This inability, for Beaumont, but for Taylor as well, constituted the dark side, the outer limits of English liberalism and in this, the Irish were in the same position as the native population and indeed the slave population in America (Melonio 2011).

Taylor's reinforcement of this condemnation of the Ascendancy dovetails in other notes with his support for the nineteenth-century reform movement, and in particular the Great Reform Bill of 1832. The oligarchical management of local politics through corporations, for example, which Beaumont indicated as a practice which discriminated against Catholics, is described by Taylor as depending on "rotten boroughs", using the language of the later reform movement (Beaumont 2006 [1839]: 61, note 114)[13]. Commenting in a subsequent note on Beaumont's denunciation of the corruption of the Irish Parliament in the eighteenth century, Taylor mentions "rotten corporations" which "trafficked in boroughs, receiving in return places in the customs or excise for themselves and their children" (*ibid.*; 95, note 169). This view of the corruption of the Irish parliament put forward by Beaumont is reinforced also in a note in which the translator says that Beaumont might think his account unbelievable, but that "every one acquainted with the history of the country must be aware that the systematic corruption both of the Irish Lords and Commons is understated" (*ibid.*: 96, note 170). Although the historical focus is on the eighteenth century, Beaumont and the notes by his English translator here indicate that the theme of corruption, particularly in context of the struggle for political reform, was also strongly felt in the mid-nineteenth century[14].

[12] Chapter Two of the first part of the subsequent analysis is entitled "A Bad Aristocracy Is the Primary Cause of All the Evils of Ireland. The Faults of This Aristocracy Are, That It Is English and Protestant" (Beaumont 2006 [1839]: 249).

[13] A "rotten borough" was the term used to indicate electoral constituencies controlled by a small number of electors who thus also controlled access to political power, both local and national.

[14] On the importance that the notion of corruption for Beaumont, see Drolet (2011).

4.2 Injustice in British rule

The vision of the Irish oligarchy and the corruption of the Irish parliament in the eighteenth century in Beaumont's account, reinforced, as we have seen, by Taylor's notes, brings us to the related theme of injustice and the misapplication of the law. This is an aspect which the political scientist Cheryl Welch has identified as a particular characteristic of Beaumont's analysis, and one which finds reflection in Taylor's paratext. The misapplication of constitutional rules is, for example, an important part of Beaumont's account of the settlement of Ireland under James I and is corroborated in the accompanying notes. His analysis focuses on the ways in which James I's colonisation was founded on a strategy of searching for legal and formal defects in landholding documents which could justify a subsequent confiscation of land (*ibid.*: 31-32). Taylor's note adds that the head of the "Commission for the discovery of defective titles" was "William Parsons, unprincipled adventurer, on whom craft and crime have conferred an unenviable notoriety" (*ibid.*: 32, note 66). His additions regarding the Earl of Strafford's effective confiscation of land in the province of Connaught in the 1630s are in a similar vein, pointing out that Strafford's own letters ironically relate how he would appear in each town when the inquisition into titles was taking place with "five hundred horsemen as *good lookers on*" and that, in the event of court cases, he would choose "*fit* men to serve on juries" (*ibid.*: 32-33, notes 66 and 67). The liberal conscience in both Beaumont and Taylor finds accurate reflection in these accounts: alongside force and corruption, we are led to observe also a precise and conscious parodying of legal forms. This particular perspective on the appropriation of land, for Welch, prefigures twentieth-century notions of crimes against humanity, one of whose characteristics is precisely that of the violation of recognized and fundamental norms, the transformation of the institutions which apply the law, courts and juries, into instruments of oppression which prolong and intensify harm (2011: 250-251)[15].

[15] Thus Welch focuses on Beaumont's insistence that "courts and juries become weapons of repression rather than neutral arbiters" (2011: 250). It was this "lie of forms" ("menzogna delle forme") she comments, that for Beaumont had the result of "draining the life from free institutions" ("drena ogni elemento di vita dalle libere istituzioni" (*ibid.*: 251).

4.3 Disproportionate violence on the part of the state

This view of Beaumont as a defender of basic legal norms, shared and reinforced in Taylor's notes, can be extended to the disproportionate use of violence on the part of the state. Welch highlights, as an example, a particular passage in which Beaumont relates how the English general, Ludlow, during the Cromwellian repression of the Irish rebellion in 1649, attempted to suffocate some Irish fugitives in a cave (Beaumont 2006 [1837]: 51; see Welch 2011: 257). The whole Cromwellian episode is related in detail by Beaumont (*ibid.*: 37-43) and selected by Taylor for particular comment. He notes how the Leveller army sent from Bristol to Ireland by Cromwell was an army of "fanatics" and "stern enthusiasts" who were asked to think of themselves as the "Israelites proceeding to exterminate the idolatrous inhabitants of Canaan" (*ibid.*: 37-38, note 78). The other particular moment at which vengeful and disproportionate violence was meted out to rebels was the repression of the 1798 rebellion, an event which had taken place only a few decades before the publication of Beaumont's text and Taylor's translation and likely to be still in the memory of some readers. Beaumont relates some of this state violence in detail, referring in particular to Lord Charlemont's *Memoirs* which document how "suspected and accused persons were, without any form of trial, tortured, flogged, and half hanged, in order to extort confessions" (*ibid.*: 112). On this topic Taylor adds in note that "on this repulsive subject it is not necessary to enlarge; but it is sufficient to say, that the torture of the suspected was made the subject of boast in public and was even vindicated in pamphlets" (*ibid.*, note 194). He adds also a reference to the celebrated example of a peculiar form of hanging practised by the English soldiery:

> Prisoners were sometimes strangled by being suspended from the shoulders of tall men; an officer in this Majesty's army, for his services in this way, was honoured with the title of 'the walking gallows'. (*ibid.*: 113, note 197)

We may add here a comment on a further note, which gives us an indication of the climate of violence in which Taylor grew up. When Beaumont makes reference to the Whiteboy rural disturbances of the eighteenth century, Taylor

adds that as a young boy he had inadvertently torn down a warning notice to landlords pinned to a tree. He immediately found himself surrounded by hostile agricultural workers who only left him alone when they found he had acted only out of curiosity (*ibid.*: 74, note143). These notices were standard communicative channels for the intimidatory methods of those responsible for rural violence and resistance to oppressive landlords, in this case those professing to be "Rockites" or followers of Captain Rock[16]. On the one hand, the note functions to establish the first-hand "native" experience of the translator's knowledge of Irish affairs, able to corroborate the perceptions of the "enlightened foreigner". On another level, it testifies to the climate of rural violence in which Taylor grew up in Ireland, one which spanned the rural rebellions of the "Whiteboys" in the mid-eighteenth century that Beaumont was recounting, and the Rockite attacks on landlords of the nineteenth. These episodes sandwiched the particular ferocity of the English repression of the 1798 rebellion: one commentator argues that Taylor "absorbed the local traditions of the horrors of repression in 1798, when suspected rebels were hanged…and many locals were flogged and transported" (Maume 2005: vii). The theme of violence, an important element in Beaumont's account of Ireland, emerges clearly also in Taylor's notes, then, both in relation to the excessive and disproportionate violence of the state and to the underlying climate of violence to which this, as well as the manifest injustices of British rule, gave rise.

4.4 The causes of Irish rebellion

The legitimation of resistance to unjust rule is another aspect of Beaumont's text which finds support in Taylor's commentary. The prime example of this, as we have seen, was the 1798 rebellion on the part of the United Irishmen. The ferocity of the repression of this rising, and the subsequent closure of the Irish parliament and union with Great Britain, figure heavily also in Taylor's own *History of the Civil*

[16] Rural protests often had a mythic dimension, in this case allegiance to a fictional "Captain Rock", made famous by the poet Thomas Moore's *Memoirs of Captain Rock* (1824). See Kelly (2008: 391-393). On agrarian rebellion and secret societies, see in particular Smyth (1992).

War in Ireland and his introduction to William Sampson's *Memoirs*. In the latter he is explicit in his defence of the United Irishmen, arguing that they had recourse to rebellion only when they had found the avenue to reform blocked by the British government[17].

Taylor's defence of the United Irishmen of 1798 in the notes to Beaumont's text consists principally of a denunciation of the violence of the repression as we have seen. In addition to these, there is a brief note of praise for the aristocratic rebel, Lord Edward Fitzgerald. This United Irishman leader was a "splendid exception", says Taylor, to Beaumont's assertion that the rebellion was "rejected by the aristocracy in a body" (Beaumont 2006 [1839]: 111), and, he adds, was the subject of a biography by Thomas Moore, "perhaps the most interesting piece of biography in any language" (*ibid.*, note 190). However, perhaps surprisingly, Taylor's position on the 1798 rebellion is not elaborated any further in these notes. By contrast, a justification for rebellion can be found in the notes regarding the previous Whiteboy agitations to which we have already referred. While Beaumont's text emphasised both the regularity and the ferocity of the rural terror that the Whiteboys would mete out in their attempts to intimidate local landlords and representatives of government, Taylor is intent also on explaining this response by contextualising it: he asserts that "the simple truth appears to be, that the revolt was caused by the rapacity of the landlords and the tithe-proctors" (Beaumont 2006 [1839]: 72, note 139). His defence of the causes of the Whiteboy movement does not prevent him, however, from relating his surprise and revulsion at the coolness and violence of the movement. In a note in support of Beaumont's account and the orderly and regular (if barbarous) methods of intimidation, he comments on the "utter disregard for human life" and "unmitigated ferocity" of some Whiteboy activists at whose trial he was present (*ibid.*: 76, note 148). If rebellion is portrayed as the result of bad government, then, neither Beaumont nor Taylor were shy of indicating the extent to which violent methods

[17] A note by Taylor to Sampson's *Memoirs* quotes another Irish rebel, Robert Emmet who claimed, during his trial, that the methods of the United Irishmen were at the start peaceful and that it was only "when they saw that they could not accomplish … a redress of grievances by reform [that] they determined in despair to procure it by revolution" (Sampson 1832: 69-70). Recent historiography, instead, emphasises the extent to which the United Irishmen were from the start intent on developing a revolutionary secret society (Curtin 1985; 1994).

had become the norm also in the Irish population, although they were to be understood as testimony to the irreparable splits in Irish society and, indeed, as an underlying justification for rebellion.

5. Conclusion

Taylor's translation of Beaumont's text, as we have seen, involved an explicit and insistent framing. As such it is not an example of the way the translator's voice "insinuates itself into the discourse" but rather of the way it can emerge "into the open as a separate discursive presence" (Hermans 1996: 43). The main text is preceded by a "Translator's Preface" which presents and legitimates the author and argues for the importance of his views, those of an "enlightened foreigner". The text itself is accompanied by over 100 notes which constitute a constant refrain, at the bottom of the page, in which the translator adds, occasionally corrects, and above all corroborates the view of the author.

Much work in translation studies focuses on the relation between the translator or the translation and the two cultures which they mediate. Thus translations have been observed in terms of their functioning to satisfy a need in the home culture (Toury 1995: 23-39), their as "domesticating" or "foreignizing" effects according to the linguistic strategy adopted (Venuti 1995: 16-20; Berman 1984), or alternatively, their inhabiting an "intercultural space" between different cultures (Pym 2009). Taylor's translation of Beaumont is clearly most closely associated with the first of these: his focus is Ireland and its relations with Britain, the readership of the translated text is anglophone, British or Irish, and the political and cultural weight of the text relates to this context. Beaumont's relations to French political culture are nowhere referred to, and only a passing reference is made to the success of the book "on the Continent" (Beaumont 2006 [1839]: 3). The subject matter of the original text, in any case, is connected only implicitly to the French context of the author. It is true that the interest of both Beaumont and Tocqueville in the democratic and liberal experiences of the Anglo-Saxon world can be interpreted in the light of the struggles in France towards liberal reform in the first half of the nineteenth century, as their own involvement in French politics

would testify, but this remains implicit in Beaumont's work and has only emerged fully in recent studies (see Ceretta 2010). The translation thus concerns the context of the target culture: the views of the "enlightened foreigner", through Taylor's insistent corroboration of his views in the paratextual accompaniment, are "domesticated", although given the topic of the work, the external, foreign elements are in any case minimal.

Taylor's translation, in fact, has little to do with the predominant interest of translation studies in the dialectics of the relations between cultures as substantiated in translation. Taylor was not primarily a translator nor did he in any other way demonstrate any particular interest in France or French culture[18]. He was primarily a journalist and historian and the translation of Beaumont's book was, it would seem, his only experience of translating. The motivations that can be found in his work were instead closely related to his own political and cultural objectives, in particular in relation to Ireland. Taylor was an Irish journalist working in London, in the heart of the English metropolis, far from his native Ireland. Like his eighteenth-century predecessor, the Irish writer and English politician, Edmund Burke, his involvement in the liberal or Whig politics of the capital could not eradicate a feeling that these liberal norms were not fully applied in the peripheries of the British state such as Ireland and India. His paratextual intervention into Beaumont's text, a strident denunciation of British rule in Ireland, paradoxically illustrates Taylor's principal political objective, that of strengthening the Union between the two countries. Implicit in these notes, it was rendered explicit in his introduction to Sampson's *Memoirs*:

> The editor…is persuaded that the more intimate the connexion between England and Ireland is made, and the closer the bonds of union are drawn, the better it will be for both countries, and especially for the latter. (Taylor 1832: xvii)

[18] Very few of the large number of Taylor's articles for the *Athenaeum* appear to have had anything to do with France. See Athenaeum Contributor Record on line: http://smcse.city.ac.uk/doc/cisr/web/athenaeum/reviews/contributors/contributorfiles/TAYLOR,WilliamCooke.html

In the same introduction, he made clear how "speaking of '98"[19] was an operation which was full of pain and danger. It was painful because it involved talking about "a history whose characters are written in blood and flame" and dangerous because "the fires still glow beneath the treacherous ashes, and ill bear to be disturbed by a rash hand" (Taylor 1832: x). As we have seen, Taylor had spoken about the rebellion also in his *History of the Civil Wars in Ireland*, in which he presented an account of "the darkest [pages] in Irish history and the lessons to be learned from it" (Taylor 1831: 281). The decision to translate, present and provide a running commentary of Beaumont's *Ireland* was consonant with this Protestant Unionist's desire to preserve and reinforce this "intimate connexion between England and Ireland" through a dispassionate portrayal of the failures of this relationship up to the present. Translation, reinforced by paratext, was a means of reinforcing a reforming minority English view of these relations through a promotion of the views of an enlightened foreign observer.

Works cited

Primary sources

Beaumont, G. de (1835) *Marie, ou de l'esclavage aux États-Unis*, Paris: C. Gosselin.

----- (1839) *L'Irlande – Social, Politique et religieuse*, Paris: Michel Levy Frère.

----- (2006) [1839] Ireland. Social, Political and Religious, trans. W.C. Taylor, eds. T. Garvin and A. Hess, London and Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press.

[19] In 1843, the Irish scholar and poet John Kells Ingram published a poem entitled "Memory of the Dead", also known as "Who Fears to Speak of '98".

Beaumont, G. de and A. de Tocqueville (1833) *Du système pénitentiaire aux États-Unis et de son application en France*, Paris: Fournier Jeune.

Moore, T. (1824) *Memoirs of Captain Rock*. London: Longman and Co.

Sampson, W. (1832) *Memoirs of William Sampson, an Irish Exile*, London: Whittaker, Treater, and Arnott.

Taylor, W. C. (1831) *History of the Civil Wars in Ireland*, London and Edinburgh: Constable and Hurst.

----- (1832) "Introduction" to W. Sampson, *Memoirs of William Sampson, an Irish Exile*, London: Whittaker, Treater, and Arnott, ix-xxxii

----- (1842) *Notes of a Tour in the Manufacturing Districts of Lancashire*, London: Duncan and Malcolm.

----- (1843) *The Handbook of Silk, Cotton and Woollen Manufactures,* London: Richard Bentley.

----- (1847) *Reminiscences of Daniel O'Connell*, Dublin: Fischer, Son, & Co.

Tocqueville, Alexis de (1835/1840) *Democracy in America,* trans. H. Reeve, London: Saunders and Otley.

Secondary sources

Anderson. B. (1983) *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso.

Bassnett, S. and P. Bush (eds) (2006) *The Translator as Writer*, London and New York: Continuum.

Batchelor, K. (2018) *Translation and Paratexts*, London and New York: Routledge.

Belle, M.-A. and B. M. Hosington (eds) (2018) *Thresholds of Translation. Paratexts, Print, and Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Britain (1473-1660)*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Berman, A. (1984) *L'épreuve de l'étranger. Culture et traduction dans l'Allemagne romantique*, Paris: Gallimard.

Bhabha, H. (1990) *Nation and Narration*, London and New York: Routledge.

Ceretta, M. (2010) "L'Irlande de Beaumont entre histoire et politique françaises", *La Revue Tocqueville* XXXI(1): 139-157.

Ceretta, M. and M. Tesini (eds) (2011) *Gustave de Beaumont: la schiavitù, l'Irlanda, la questione sociale nel XIX secolo*, Milano: Franco Angeli.

Chartier, R. (2014) *The Author's Hand and the Printer's Mind*, trans. Lydia G. Cochrane, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Chignola, S. (2011) "Il «fait étrange» dell'aristocrazia della pelle. Beaumont, Tocqueville, su libertà e schiavitù", in M. Ceretta and M. Tesini (eds) *Gustave de Beaumont: la schiavitù, l'Irlanda, la questione sociale nel XIX secolo*, Milano: Franco Angeli, 85-106.

Curtin, N.J. (1985) "The transformation of the Society of the United Irishmen into a Mass-based Revolutionary Organisation, 1794-6", *Irish Historical Studies* XXIV(96): 463-492.

----- (1994) *The United Irishmen. Popular Politics in Ulster and Dublin 1791-1798*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Drolet, M. (2011) "L'*Irlande* di Gustave de Beaumont ed i timori in materia di corruzione e delle forme di governo", in M. Ceretta and M. Tesini (eds) *Gustave de Beaumont: la schiavitù, l'Irlanda, la questione sociale nel XIX secolo*, Milano: Franco Angeli, 160-179.

Elefante, C. (2012) *Traduzione e paratesto*, Bologna: Bononia University Press.

Garvin T. and A. Hess (2006) “Introduction: Tyranny in Ireland?” in G. de Beaumont [1839] *Ireland. Social, Political, and Religious*, London and Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press, v-xv.

Genette, G. (1987) *Seuils*, Paris; Editions du Seuil.

Guellec, Laurence (2011) “*Marie*, romanzo? Le lezioni letterarie di Gustave de Beaumont”, in M. Ceretta and M. Tesini (eds) *Gustave de Beaumont: la schiavitù, l'Irlanda, la questione sociale nel XIX secolo*, Milano: Franco Angeli, 71-84.

Hermans T. (ed) (1985) *The Manipulation of Literature. Studies in Literary Translation*, London and Sydney: Croom Helm.

----- (1996) “The Translator’s Voice in Translated Narrative”, *Target* 8(1): 23-48.

Hobsbawm E. and T. Ranger (eds) (1983) *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kelly, R. (2008) *Bard of Erin. The Life of Thomas Moore*, Dublin: Penguin.

Lefevere, A. (1992) *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*, London and New York: Routledge.

Matthew, H. (2004) “Taylor, William Cooke (1800–1849), Historian and Journalist”. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Available online at: https://www-oxforddnb-com.ezproxy.unibo.it/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-27094 (accessed 16 March 2020).

Maume. P. (2005) “Introduction”, in W. C. Taylor *Reminiscences of Daniel O’Connor* [1847], Dublin: University College Dublin Press, vii-xxiv.

Melonio, F. (2011) “Riflessioni su una categoria imprecisa: il ‘liberal-nazionalismo’ del XIX secolo”, in M. Ceretta and M. Tesini (eds) *Gustave de Beaumont: la schiavitù, l'Irlanda, la questione sociale nel XIX secolo*, Milano: Franco Angeli, 31-54.

Noto, A. (2011) “La prigione possibile. Tocqueville, Beaumont e la stesura del *Système pénitentiaire aux États-Unis*”, in M. Ceretta and M. Tesini (eds) *Gustave de Beaumont: la schiavitù, l'Irlanda, la questione sociale nel XIX Secolo*, Milano: Franco Angeli, 55-70.

Pellatt, V. (ed) (2013) *Text, Extratext, Metatext and Paratext in Translation*, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.

Pym, A. (2009) “Humanizing Translation History”, *Hermes - Journal of Language and Communication Studies* 42: 23-48.

Renan, E. (1990) “What is a nation?” trans. M. Thom, in H. Bhabha (ed) *Nation and Narration*, London and New York: Routledge, 8-22.

Sardin, P. (2007) “De la note du traducteur comme commentaire: entre texte, paratexte et prétexte”, *Palimpsestes* 20. Available online at: http://journals.openedition.org.ezproxy.unibo.it/palimpsestes/99 (accessed 07 March 2020).

Smyth, J. (1992) *Men of No Property: Irish Radicals and Popular Politics in the Late Eighteenth Century*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Tahir-Gürçağlar, Ş. (2002) “What Texts Don’t Tell: The Use of Paratexts in Translation Research”, in T. Hermans (ed) *Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues*, Manchester: St. Jerome, 44-60.

Tesini, M. (2011) “Gustave de Beaumont, l’amico di Tocqueville”, in M. Ceretta and M. Tesini (eds) *Gustave de Beaumont: la schiavitù, l'Irlanda, la questione sociale nel XIX secolo*, Milano: Franco Angeli, 13-30.

Toury, G. (1995) *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Venuti, L. (1995) *The Translator’s Invisibility. A History of Translation*, London: Routledge.

Welch, C. (2011) *“Les injustices révoltantes*: Gustave de Beaumont e la preistoria dei crimini contro l’umanità”, in M. Ceretta and M. Tesini (eds) *Gustave de Beaumont: la schiavitù, l'Irlanda, la questione sociale nel XIX Secolo*, Milano: Franco Angeli, 13-30.