Studi Interdisciplinari su Traduzione, Lingue e Culture

42

Studi Interdisciplinari su Traduzione, Lingue e Culture

Collana a cura del Dipartimento di Interpretazione e Traduzione (DIT) dell'Alma Mater Studiorum – Università di Bologna, sede di Forlì.

La Collana, fondata nel 2004, raccoglie le pubblicazioni scientifiche dei suoi afferenti e degli studiosi che operano in ambiti affini a livello nazionale e internazionale.
A partire da una riflessione generale sul tradurre come luogo di incontro e scontro tra lingue e culture, la Collana si propone di diffondere e rendere disponibili, a livello cartaceo e/o su supporto elettronico, i risultati della ricerca in molteplici aree, come la linguistica teorica e applicata, la linguistica dei *corpora*, la terminologia, la traduzione, l'interpretazione, gli studi letterari e di genere, il teatro, gli studi culturali e sull'umorismo.

Le pubblicazioni della Collana sono approvate dal Dipartimento, sentito il motivato parere di almeno due esperti qualificati esterni.

Il/la responsabile della Collana è il/la Direttore/rice del DIT, cui si affianca un comitato scientifico internazionale che varia in relazione alle tematiche trattate.

Cosmopolitanism, dissent, and translation

Translating radicals in eighteenth-century Britain and France

Patrick Leech

Bononia
University Press

Bononia University Press
Via Ugo Foscolo 7 – 40123 Bologna
tel. (+39) 051 232 882
fax (+39) 051 221 019

www.buponline.com
email: info@buponline.com

ISSN: 2283-8910
ISBN: 978-88-6923-496-5

Grafica: Alessio Bonizzato

Prima edizione: maggio 2020

Contents

Acknowledgements

This book is the culmination of work carried out in different moments over many years and has benefitted from the generous time and assistance of many people. From amongst the most obvious of the debts I have incurred I would like to try to mention at least a few.

Many of the themes presented here were the subject of papers given at conferences of which I would like to mention the following: *France, Grande-Bretagne, Irlande: Transferts culturels et parcours des savoirs au siècle des Lumières,* Laboratoire de Recherche sur les Cultures Anglophones (LARCA), Université Paris Diderot, 18-20 Septembre 2008; *Protest and Dissent in Translation and Culture*, Department of Anglophone Cultures and Literatures, University of Social Sciences and Humanities (SWPS), Warsaw, 11-13 May 2017; *"A Host Of Tongues": Multilingualism, Lingua Franca and Translation in the Early Modern Period*, Lisbon, 13-15 December 2018; *La traduzione come atto politico/Translation as Political Act/La traduction comme acte politiqu*e, Department of Political Science, University of Perugia, 9-11 May 2019; *Enlightenment Identities/Lumières et identités*, 15th International Congress on the Enlightenment/15e Congrès International des Lumières, 14-19 July 2019, Edinburgh. I would like to thank the organisers of all these conferences for their invitations and the opportunity to present parts of this work, and the participants for the questions raised. Some of the research presented in Chapter 3 will be

published in a volume resulting from the *Protest and Dissent* conference (Agnieszka Pantuchowicz, Anna Warso (eds.), *Protest and Dissent. Conflicting Spaces in Translation and Culture*. Berlin: Peter Lang). Some of the material used in Chapter 4 has appeared in *mediAzione* no. 24 (2019) and is forthcoming in *Storia e Politica* (1/2020) and *Materiales de Filosofía del Derecho* (2020)

I would also like to thank the different people who have read and commented on parts of the text or the text in its entirety. The blind referees provided very helpful advice and comments, and I hope that I have used their comments wisely. I would like to thank in particular Federico Zanettin, Lilla Maria Crisafulli and Francesca Piselli for their useful comments on particular parts of the text, both in terms of content and expression. Many thanks also to Sam Whitsitt who generously read and commented on earlier drafts of the work. Chris Rundle has offered important support and guidance on the history of translation. Danio Maldussi generously gave his assistance with the quotations from French. I would also like to thank Thomas Casadei and Raffaella Tonin for their encouragement of the project. Thanks also to Daniele Negretti of the University of Bologna and Mattia Righi of Bononia University Press for their help in the preparation of the final text. The libraries that I worked in over the years are havens of cosmopolitanism, all providing windows on the world of scholarship. I am very grateful to the Biblioteca Ruffilli of the University of Bologna (Forlì), and in particular Letizia Montanari and Antonella Ragazzini for patiently providing me with material available only from other libraries.

Work on this topic began long ago in 2008 during a fellowship at Dublin City University and I especially grateful to Michael Cronin for the invitation and the generous hospitality. Thanks also to my colleagues at the Department of Interpreting and Translation, in particular but not exclusively those in the English section. Finally, my family has been supportive of this work from the beginning and I thank them for their patience. This book is dedicated to my friend and mentor, Fred Whitemore.

1. Introduction: translating radicals

In July 1765, the materialist philosopher Paul Henri Thiry d'Holbach, known as "Baron d'Holbach", German-born but resident in Paris, undertook a trip to London. There is little information about his activities there, whom he met, what he read, or what his impressions were. But it is likely that when he returned, in September of the same year, his luggage was full of volumes and pamphlets written by English deists, atheists, materialists or republicans, some of whom well-known, such as John Toland and Anthony Collins, others less so, at least to a French readership, such as the "Independent Whigs" John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon (Wickwar 1968: 72-73). These writings were to form the basis for an impressive rush of translations in the following years. In the period 1766 to 1773, d'Holbach published, anonymously, translations into French of 13 works by these philosophical, political or religious radicals, accompanying them with a number of his own works (also anonymous), including a major synthesis of his philosophical materialism, *Système de la Nature* (1770). Paris, France, and francophone Europe were suddenly flooded with a wide range of radical philosophical works, many of which carried the specification "traduit de l'anglais" and the indication of "Londres" as the place of publication, although they were actually printed in Amsterdam (Kozul 2010; 2016; Hammersley 2010a: 123-129). Such was the attack on the orthodox clerical establishment that Diderot wrote to his mistress, Sophie Volland, that it seemed to be "raining bombs

in the house of the Lord" and that "every day when I get up, I look out of the window to see if the great whore of Babylon is not already pacing the streets, her great cup in her hand" (cit. in Furbank1992: 292).

It is surely significant that one of the most sensational publishing ventures of the Enlightenment,[1] taking place in what is traditionally seen as its very heart, Paris, and at a moment in which this philosophical and literary moment was at its height, was essentially an event concerned with translation. The centrality of translation to the Enlightenment has come to the fore in the work of Fania Oz-Salzberger (1995, 2006, 2014), and turns our attention once again to its transnational and cosmopolitan characteristics, of which the translations of Baron d'Holbach are one more example. But we may also look at them in the broader historical context of a host of similar translations, over a longer period, of radical philosophical, religious or political writings. The early years of the century saw, for example, a number of French Protestant exiles from Catholic and absolutist France in the Low Countries and in England engaged in translating literature associated with the early Enlightenment, mostly from English to French. In the period after d'Holbach's translations, both in pre-revolutionary and revolutionary France, some radicals deeply involved in the reform or revolutionary movements in America, Britain and France were similarly involved in translating radical literature. Finally, the 1790s in Britain saw a host of translations into English explaining and relating the events of revolutionary France to an anglophone readership.

The task of the present volume is to explore these translations, and the translators who carried them out, arguing that they did so within a shared cosmopolitan space of radicalism or "dissent". In particular, I will attempt to chart how radical movements in the eighteenth century relied heavily on translation as a means of consolidating their positions by reaching out to similar experiences and traditions in other cultures. This exploration will be articulated across four principal areas which give the structure to

[1] I will use the term "the Enlightenment" rather than "Enlightenment" throughout, although most commentators today are sceptical of the notion of the "unity of the Enlightenment project" (Conrad 2012: 1004). The historian J.G.A. Pocock admits that he has "less trouble with the word 'Enlightenment' than with the word 'the,' which I have come to mistrust as an exceptionally dangerous tool in the historian's vocabulary" (2005: 105).

the book. Chapter Two will look at Huguenot translators, mainly working between English and French, within the framework of a radical Protestant world view antithetical to the religious and political orthodoxies of eighteenth-century Europe. Chapter Three will explore translation in the Radical Enlightenment, following the distinction between a "radical" and "moderate" Enlightenment put forward by Jonathan Israel (2001, 2006, 2012), looking in more detail at the case of d'Holbach but extending the analysis to other examples as well. Chapter Four will move forward to the translational activity of certain figures customarily known for their political activity in the revolutionary period rather than for their work as translators. The final two chapters will look at those involved in the task of bringing the French revolutionary experience to England through translation. First, however, this introduction will attempt to locate this exploration, in terms of methodology and focus, within discussions relating to the three key words of the title: cosmopolitanism, dissent and translation.

Translation and translators

The examination of the ways in which radical movements of the eighteenth century relied on translation will give priority to the study of the translators themselves, the "translating radicals" of the title. The analysis will thus adopt a methodology which focuses not on the analysis of the translated texts, what descriptive translation studies terms the "primary text product", but on paratextual information such as prefaces, "advertisements" and notes (see Batchelor 2018; Elefante 2012; Genette 1987), and on "extra-textual material" (Munday 2014: 65-66; Toury: 1995: 4-6), much of it in secondary literature, relating to the biographies and work of those who produced the texts, the translators. Given this focus, it may be useful to consider some of the approaches to translators, rather than translation and translated texts, which have been put forward in the field of translation studies in recent years.

The study of the translation of literary texts has, since around the 1980s, focused above all on locating translation within cultural systems (see in particular Even-Zohar 2012 [1978]; Toury 1995). As a development of this, increasing attention has been focused first on the ways in which literary texts were changed or "manipulated" in order to

exercise a particular function within a "target" culture (Hermans 1985), and subsequently, in an attempt to explore in more detail the contexts provided by the cultures towards which they were translating, to the translators themselves. This "turn" towards translators was put forward forcefully in particular by Douglas Robinson (1991), who argued that the act of translation involved a dialogic engagement on the part of a translator with both the source text and the target text, but which resulted in a significant "turn" towards the latter. In this, Robinson was elaborating the importance that descriptive translation studies awarded in general to the target culture,[2] and may be seen as a decisive move towards a reader-centered approach and away from the tendency to look at translation as an act of fidelity to, subordination to or respect for an original (Simeoni 1998: 7-12). Robinson's particular intervention, however, reoriented attention away from cultural systems representing, in one way or other, the "target" culture towards the actual act of translation and the person who carries it out.

This orientation is central to our exploration of the motivations and actions of the translators we shall be looking at. First of all, it takes as its starting point the thoughts, perspectives and activity of the translator himself or herself, going against received notions of the "invisibility" of the translator perceived as a someone who merely provides a transparent "window" back onto an original text (Venuti 1995). It suggests, instead, an "extroverted translator", protagonist of his or her own translation activity (Robinson 1991: xv-xvii, 197; 203-209), and re-orientates research towards the "agency" of translators as conscious and pro-active agents in the translation process,[3] and not only the product or the process (Delisle and Woodsworth 2012: xv).

The active role of the translator, in this reading, would seem to be particularly appropriate, as we shall see, in the case of d'Holbach and the other translators presented in this volume, who, despite the invisibility resulting from their anonymity, had a strong political and cultural

[2] See for example, Toury (1995: 6): "Translators may therefore be said to operate first and foremost in the interests of the culture into which they are translating."

[3] For the notion of "agency" in translation studies, see in particular Milton and Bandia (2009); Tymoczko (2007: 44; 189-201); Dam and Korning Zethsen (2009); Chesterman (2009).

commitment behind their translation activity. But there is an important proviso to be made at this point. Much work on translation takes as its primary attention translators in the sense of professionals who dedicate their main energy and resources to this activity. This is a consequence, clearly, of the present-focus of much work on translation and in particular the concern for research which can impact on translator training. But as an assumption regarding the history of translation, it is rarely appropriate. In the case of Renaissance translators, for example, as Peter Burke pointed out, only a relatively small number of translators can be considered "professional" in the sense of devoting their main energies to translation (2005: 17). In the case of the translators considered below, most were committed writers, journalists and activists, and perhaps only one, Pierre Coste, could be truly thought of as a translator in the sense of someone dedicated professionally to this activity. Baron d'Holbach, for example, was a proficient linguist and prolific translator, but he is principally known not for his translations but for his contributions to Denis Diderot's *Encyclopédie*, his hosting a radical salon where his "coterie" met weekly from around 1750 to 1770, and for his materialist and atheist philosophy (Furbank 1992; Kors 1976). His activity as a translator has only emerged recently (Kozul 2016). Explorations of translators in the past need to appreciate that they were rarely professionals, that translation was for many only "one leg of a multifarious career" (Pym 2009: 33), and that as a consequence attention needs to be focused not only on translation but on the wider context within which the translator was working.

Sociological perspectives on translators have used categories such as "habitus" and "cultural capital" derived from the work of Pierre Bourdieu. The notion of "habitus" can be useful as it focuses attention on the determinants of the context of the translator, although, as Davide Simeoni points out, whereas Bourdieu uses the notion to flesh out the national environments of agents, translators work within an international milieu of editors, publishers, and readers which is "shaped significantly by cross-cultural habituses" (1998: 20; see also Sayols 2018). The role of this intercultural environment, as we shall see, is important also for an elaboration of the way in which these subjects can be seen to operate in a cosmopolitan context. "Cultural capital" is usually understood to mean the prestigious cultural baggage that intellectuals make use of in order to

be able to enhance their social standing. While this may be useful when looking at translators of iconic or high-status texts,[4] the radical or dissenting translators we will be looking at were above all translating marginal, oppositional and controversial works which were far from mainstream and unlikely to be generally accepted as cultural capital goods. But cultural capital understood more widely as the possession or accumulation of cultural competences that can in some way later be converted into an economic equivalent (Bourdieu 1984) may be a useful key to the activity of a particular group of translators, the Huguenot emigrés we will look at in Chapter Two. These Huguenot translators, as we shall see, were able to forge literary careers in England by caring for and developing their particular cultural and linguistic capital.

The premise that translators are necessarily concerned with developing specific linguistic and cultural competences as part of their activity leads us towards a consideration also of the nature of this figure as necessarily an "in-between" one, a cultural mediator inhabiting a border area between cultures and shaped by this "cross-cultural" habitus. The binary focus of much work in translation studies on relations between source and target texts and source and target cultures may obscure, to some extent, the very particular frontier space often inhabited by the translator. Anthony Pym in particular has insisted on the need to appreciate translators as figures who do not necessarily exhibit a primary allegiance to the language and culture towards which they translate but who instead may have "multiple allegiances" (2009: 25) which should be taken into account if we are to fully understand their motivations and in general their translation choices (both in terms of texts chosen and specific linguistic choices in the activity of translation itself). Translators are often "out of place" in Peter Burke's phrase, and as such "take advantage of their liminal position" to the extent that they may be termed "amphibians" (2005: 23). Their "out of place" status, moreover, suggests that we "accept discontinuity" between the translators and cultures, precisely because they are operating in "those mixes, along those fringes, in those exiles, because of the social interculturality they were born into or had imposed upon them by forced displacement" (Pym 2009). As we shall see, most of the translators looked

[4] See, for example, Lefevere's discussion of the translations of Virgil's *Aeneid* (1998).

at in this study were "out of place" in one way or other, with personal life-histories which, either by necessity or by choice, involved residence in a country other than that of their birth.

Two further discussions in the study of translation are also pertinent. The first relates to translation and cosmopolitanism. Lawrence Venuti, following Antoine Berman, has argued that the extent of the "openness" of a translation to a foreign culture depends on the linguistic strategy adopted. In his view, translation strategies can be either "domesticating", when all traces of the language of the foreign text are erased, or, instead, "foreignizing", when there is always a "remainder" in the final translated text, which thus "manifests in its own language the foreignness of the foreign text". The "foreignizing" strategy represents openness to the contaminating influences of the foreign culture and language and thus a cosmopolitan disposition (Venuti 1998: 11; see also 1995: 17-20; Berman 1984).[5] Esperança Bielsa similarly sees the issue of textual strategy as "the key to the cosmopolitan vision", crucial if a translation is to "open up in writing a certain relation with the Other, to fertilize what is one's Own through the mediation of what is Foreign" (2016: 11-12). But if the "foreignness" of the language of a text can be one index of its cosmopolitanism, this does not preclude other ways of measuring this elusive characteristic, ways which focus instead on social and historical context. D'Holbach's translations, for example, did not foreground the need to familiarize a domestic readership with elements of a foreign culture but instead were aimed at spreading or consolidating a (minority) philosophical and religious position across different cultures and languages. The indication "traduit de l'anglais" may have fed into a general "anglomania" (Grieder 1985) in France in this period and given a further legitimacy to these radical opinions, but the overall intention was clearly to propagate his own radical world view. The transnational and radical context and intent of the act of translation, in this case as with many others we shall look at, would seem to guarantee some measure of cosmopolitanism irrespective of the textual strategy adopted.

[5] Berman in particular follows notions put forward by the Romantic philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher, see Giacobazzi (2017). For criticisms of Venuti's binary approach to translation, see for example Baker (2007) and Merkle (2010).

Finally, it is worth distinguishing between approaches to the history of translation which focus on the activity of translation itself and the ways in which this activity evolves or changes over time, and those which instead attempt to identify ways in which translation functions in a particular historical context. General works on translation history or its appropriate methodologies (for example, Delisle and Woodsworth 2012; Pym 1998) have opened up the exploration of the specific contexts in which translation takes place, but the greater the focus on the context, the more the questions raised and methodologies used will adhere to that context. In other words, we must distinguish between two radically different approaches, one which focuses on translation as "a historical object in its own right" and another which instead looks at translation as a way of "interpreting other historical subjects" (Rundle 2014). The former involves comparing and contrasting a variety of examples of translation across different contexts. The latter, instead, identifies a specific historical context and looks at the ways in which translation was significant within the terms of this context. This requires an interdisciplinary approach which is more open to other methodologies and which responds to a series of questions raised by the particular problems arising from this historical context (Rundle 2012). It is this interdisciplinary approach to translation which has been used in the present work, where translation is looked at as a window on and index of the specific historical object of cosmopolitan radicalism in eighteenth-century Britain and France. Before embarking on this translational journey through the eighteenth century, however, we will discuss in a little more detail, the notions of cosmopolitanism and dissent in the eighteenth century and the ways in which they may provide a framework for our exploration of translation and translators.

Cosmopolitanism, Enlightenment, and translation

Cosmopolitanism may be seen as inversely related to the dominance of the idea of the nation. In the context of globalisation and the consequent weakening of nations in the early twenty-first century it is not surprising that increasing attention has been paid to the ways in which the world can no longer be understood according to an unreflective assumption of the dominance of the paradigm of the nation state. The sociologist Ulrich

Beck, amongst many other critics, has formulated a strident critique of what he sees as a "methodological nationalism" which still dominates our conceptual and disciplinary categories, a methodology which "equates society with nation-state societies […], assumes that humanity is naturally divided into a limited number of nations" and still "governs the sociological imagination" (Beck 2007: 217).

Exchanges with others across cultures and national borders, of course, are of particular interest to those who study translation, the form in which many of these encounters take place.[6] It is not necessarily the case, however, that these encounters lead to a greater sense of international solidarity or sense of cosmopolitan belonging. Encounters with practices and symbols of other cultures may not of themselves lead to a greater openness to foreign cultures but instead, on some occasions, constitute an opportunity to close ranks within what is imagined to be a pristine, discrete national culture. Travel can broaden the mind and involve openness to different cultures but it can also lead to a sort of cultural retrenchment; migrants can use cultural encounters to open and deepen relations with host cultures or live the experience of migration as simply one of earning money away from home (Bielsa 2016: 46) . In this sense, studies have distinguished between the description of cosmopolitanism as a state or a theory, and cosmopolitanism as an ideal and a willed phenomenon.[7] This "critical cosmopolitanism" involves a conscious opening to otherness, a "conceptualization of the social world as an open horizon in which new cultural models take shape" or as "a cultural medium of societal transformation that is based on the principle of world openness" (Delanty 2006: 27). Critical cosmopolitanism can be imagined, in Anthony Appiah's terms, as a conversation between strangers during which what is important is not the exchange of information or the persuasion of the interlocutor but "the sort of imaginative engagement you get when you read a novel or watch a movie or attend to a work of art that

[6] Despite this, few writers on cosmopolitanism make any specific reference to translation. An exception is Peter Van de Veer: "Translation is the activity in which the cosmopolitan in his [sic] open engagement with the other has to excel …" (2002: 167).

[7] For a discussion of different ways in which cosmopolitanism can be conceived, see Vertovec and Cohen (2002).

speaks from some place other than your own" (Appiah 2006: 84), a practice of engagement with the ideas of others in which the crucial characteristic is the process, the practice of conversation itself, rather than the product or result of consensus across difference.

This prescriptive notion of critical cosmopolitanism as a willed phenomenon may be useful in our exploration of the purposeful translations of eighteenth-century radicals. A focus on cosmopolitanism and "world openness", moreover, is far from out of place in any consideration of the eighteenth century. Although what has been termed the "long eighteenth century" may have been the period in which some national identities were being "forged" (Colley 1992), it was certainly not one of established nation states or national cultures (see, for example, Bayly et al 2006). Indeed, some scholars have argued that for some areas of historical inquiry, the primary space for historical investigation is not the nation but a transnational space, sometimes conceived of as imaginary, sometimes physical.

Three of these areas may be mentioned as they form the backdrop to the present work. First, the "Republic of Letters" has no significance if explored within the confines of one state but is premised on the notion of a virtual cosmopolitan European space, although articulated in specific local spaces such as coffee houses, printing shops, academies, libraries and the private residences of its protagonists (Goldgar 1995). Its transnational character, moreover, makes communication across different languages through translation, a key and under-researched characteristic.[8] The Enlightenment, too, though located in the popular imagination in the Parisian salons, was clearly a European-wide phenomenon. Porter and Teich's useful promotion of attempts to locate the Enlightenment within "national contexts" (1981) may have been necessary to wrest it from a

[8] Latin as a lingua franca traditionally provided a common transnational code through which correspondence between philosophers and scientists could take place. But, particularly as the seventeenth and eighteenth-centuries progressed, this communication began to take place increasingly in French. Whereas Hobbes, for example, was translated immediately into Latin and probably read in Latin in continental Europe, by the time Locke's *Essay on Human Understanding* was published (1690), the translation into French by Pierre Coste, as we will see, was probably the key text for its reception in Europe.

Paris-centred dominance and their work has led to an increasing appreciation of the contribution to Enlightenment thought in other areas such as Scotland and Naples (Robertson 2005) and London (Porter 2000). But this cannot overshadow the fact that the Enlightenment was without doubt a transnational phenomenon which developed precisely through its extensive articulations and as such, as has already been pointed out, was one in which translation played an important, if somewhat undervalued, part.[9] Finally, a good case has been made out for the "Atlantic" as a useful geographical and historical object of study in the eighteenth century; a full understanding of the events and movements which can be observed in its constituent parts (Britain, France, the Americas, Africa, and the Caribbean) requires assuming the whole Atlantic space as the unit of inquiry. Attention is thus shifted to looking at "interactional spaces rather than places enclosed by borders" (Delanty 2014: 382), rather than attempting to tell separate national stories of, for example, the slave trade, commerce and intellectual exchange and subsequently trying to fit these into an Atlantic "context" (Bailyn 2005; see also Armitage 2002). In the same way, events which are crucial and indeed iconic to national identity, such as the American and French Revolutions, have been productively seen, in a different perspective, as emanations of a transnational "Atlantic" revolution spanning the ocean (Palmer 1959; Godechot 1965; Israel 2017; O'Malley and Van Renen 2018).

All of these cosmopolitan and transnational areas of historical study imply a focus on human encounters which of necessity involved communication across languages and cultures. Our discussion below, will, it is hoped, pinpoint some areas in which a specific focus on translation within these cosmopolitan eighteenth-century contexts may contribute to understanding the complex nature of these encounters more fully. The focus on the movement of texts and ideas will be contextualised by an exploration of the cosmopolitan perspectives of many of the protagonists

[9] Recent work has stressed the extent to which Enlightenment was indeed a global phenomenon, and one involving complex and contested relations between European and non-European cultures which go beyond the notion of a supposed "diffusion" from centre to periphery of Enlightenment thought (Conrad 2012).

involved, from the Huguenot translators of the early eighteenth century, to the translators of radical works from English at the height of the Enlightenment, to those involved in the reform or revolutionary movements of the later part of the century. The translations of these figures will be considered in the overall context of their transnational and cosmopolitan activities as engaged radicals or revolutionaries.

Dissent and translation

This volume will explore some of the translations of writers, journalists and radicals promoting what we may term a dissenting or oppositional view with regard to certain political orthodoxies of the eighteenth century. It is necessary, as part of this introduction, to spend a few words on what is meant by dissent, and how this can be traced, in its multiple forms, throughout the period. First, however, we shall look at some of the ways in which, on a more general level, certain features of dissent can be linked to translation.

Some recent work in translation studies has shifted attention away from textual analysis to a full description of the contexts of translation, exploring the ways in which translation can occur in specific historical or sociological conjunctions. Some of this has focused on the way in which translation may be part of political activism. Edited collections by Gentzler and Tymoczko (2002) and Tymoczko (2010a), for example, have brought together a number of different instances in which translation is clearly part of a larger activity of political dissent. The relations between dissent and translation have also been explored by Mona Baker (2015), who has documented the translation activity of radicals involved in the revolutionary movement in Egypt in 2011. Her volume showed importance of translation as a political tool in the hands of those fighting for human rights and political reform there, and argues that to contest dominant powers whose authority rests on hegemonic ideologies, it is necessary both to translate oppositional experience and writing, but also, through translation, to reach out to other worlds as figurations of democratic regimes and to create solidarities between these worlds.

These approaches may serve as a useful backdrop to the discussion of translators as an integral part of the eighteenth-century radicalism in Europe presented here. We will see, for example, how Huguenot

translators sought to promote the ideals of English political and philosophical liberties to a francophone readership dominated by Catholicism and Absolutism; how Baron d'Holbach and others looked to Britain as an example of philosophical radicalism and political liberty; how revolutionaries in France were concerned to use American or British experience, in particular, in their translations, in order to legitimate their own radical agendas; and in the 1790s, how English radicals aimed to illustrate the virtues of revolution and republicanism as exemplified in the French Revolution. All these imaginings were, we might say, "horizontal" and synchronic, in contrast to many other accepted forms of radical figuration based on nostalgia for a pristine past, for example in the myth of the subjection of a free Saxon population by the "Norman Yoke" (Hill 1958) or to a utopian future. For our purposes here, it is important to indicate that this reaching out to contrasting (better) polities in the present, may require an act of translation.

In some readings, the very act of translation is a subversive one. Homi Bhabha sees translation as the site where "newness enters the world" (1994: 212-235). Gentzler and Tymoczko see translation as a subversive act which, in introducing the new, seeks to "penetrate reified world views" (2002: xv-xi), to contrast established ideologies and world views with alternative examples of human society. Baker too suggests, as a consequence, that it would be useful to explore "the ways in which translation and interpreting may be embedded in a variety of projects that are set up outside the mainstream institutions of society, with agendas that explicitly challenge the dominant narratives of the time" (2010: 23). In this perspective, the act of translation itself may be a crucial tool for dissent.

If we understand translation as involving the presentation of a different world through a text which declares itself to be originating in a space which is not the same as that of the reader, it may also feed into another way in which dissent has been theorized. Political action may be conceptualised as part of dialogue between different perspectives within a shared space. But what happens when the premises for political dialogue, the shared space, do not exist? Jacques Rancière has argued that the whole notion of a neutral shared space is illusory, that groups and individuals have highly differentiated access to power and public spaces, and that the

"equality premise" that Jurgen Habermas (1989) posits as the basis for political activity conceived of as dialogue is often missing. In this perspective, dissent, as an unequal partner in the political debate, can only function by contesting these public spaces and their agendas, by refusing to take part in a political dialogue with its opposite but instead creating a separate discursive space (Rancière 2010: 7-8; Russell and Montin 2015).

This is not the place to discuss more fully these conceptions of dissent, but in terms of the subject of this volume, the notion that dissenting radicals needed to reach out to their similars in other political cultures is again a useful key to understanding the work of the translators presented below. Many of them were operating within national contexts in which shared political discursive spaces were almost wholly absent (as in absolutist France) or only partially accessible (as in the oligarchic parliamentary democracy of late eighteenth-century Britain). In the absence of a shared discursive space, when the texts involved were proscribed by the censor for example, the act of translation itself becomes a subversive act (Tymoczko 2010b: 3). D'Holbach published his translations of radical materialist philosophy anonymously and clandestinely, in a climate in which numerous enlightenment philosophers and radicals had spent time in prison. The translator of d'Holbach's own materialist and antireligious *Ecce Homo*, George Houston, was tried for libel and imprisoned in London in the 1790s (Dinwiddy 1977). Our exploration of these translators must take account of this oppressive political context and recognize that translation could be a "means of fighting censorship, cultural repression, political dominance, and physical coercion" and an "ethical, political, and ideological activity, not simply … a mechanical linguistic transposition or a literary art" (Tymoczko 2010b: 3).

Beyond a general discussion of what dissent may mean for both political discussion and translation, it is necessary also to be aware of the particular implications of the term in the historical context which is the object of the present study. In terms of the history of seventeenth- and eighteenth- century Britain, the word is customarily used to describe the numerous Christian groups who "dissented" from the principal tenets of Anglicanism and who could only accede to full political rights by the expediency of "occasional conformity". Faced with this exclusion, dissenters in Britain cultivated their own religious and educational

institutions and, moreover, developed a sensibility towards the importance of political rights and the injustices of exclusion *within* the realm rather than outside it, as in the case of the French Huguenots, whose persecution was such that many left France for Switzerland and the Dutch Republic. The importance of this form of dissent for British radicalism and the way it constituted a fertile context for the reception of the French Revolution will provide a backdrop for the discussion of translation in the final two chapters.[10] The use of the term here will, however, be extended to apply to the many writers, scientists, and philosophers in England and France who were intent on putting forward a world view in opposition to the traditional structures of power and authority. In this, we will follow, if not too strictly, the framework that Jonathan Israel (2001, 2006, 2014) has set up by arguing for the existence of a "Radical Enlightenment" which can be identified as substantially different from the moderate variety and which represented a general move towards modernity.[11]

Israel's work on the Enlightenment, although relying on a dichotomy which some have seen as overdrawn (see for example, Chiswick 2017; Thomson 2013), has the advantage of providing a broad narrative for the whole of the period which forms the basis for the present work. The origins of a Radical Enlightenment are identified in the late seventeenth century with Spinoza and the literary and philosophical production of the Dutch Republic associated with such figures as Pierre Bayle, Jean Le Clerc

[10] One of the best discussions of the dissenting tradition and British radicalism remains that of E.P. Thompson (1963: 28-58). See also Clark (2000: 315-324).

[11] For Israel, the "moderate" version of the Enlightenment "aspired to conquer ignorance and superstition, establish toleration, and revolutionize ideas, education and attitudes by means of philosophy but in such a way as to preserve and safeguard what were judged essential elements of the older structures, effecting a viable synthesis of old and new, and of reason and faith" whereas the radical version put forward a more fundamental view based on deism or atheism and sometimes materialism which "rejected all compromise with the past and sought to sweep away existing structures entirely" (2001: 11). The battle between these two essentially different forms of Enlightenment thought was accompanied by a third force, that of a Counter-Enlightenment "which, as with the Counter-Reformation of the sixteenth century, generated a major reorganization and revitalization of traditional structures of authority, thought and belief" (2001: 7).

and others. Crucial to the dissemination of this thought was the Huguenot refugee community, whose translators will be the main focus of the first chapter. They constituted an oppositional "dissenting" community whose work in the field of translation was not only motivated by their own competences in different languages (as refugees from absolutist France in the Dutch Republic or in London) but also by their desire to promote their religious and political world views in opposition to the Catholic and absolutist orthodoxy which had expelled them. A prime focus of Jonathan Israel is the central period of the eighteenth century in which, according to his narration, there was a "radical breakthrough" (2012: 648-683) in the heart of the Enlightenment, in Paris. Central to this breakthrough was the translational activity of Baron d'Holbach and others who looked in particular to the English deists and materialists and promoted these works, in translation, as part of a specific dissenting strategy, as we shall see in Chapter Two. Israel also sees a crucial link between the success of the Radical Enlightenment and the origins of the French Revolution, over and above specific political, social or economic factors.[12] For Israel, moreover, the Revolution, as well as the Radical Enlightenment which preceded it had a significant cosmopolitan aspect. It was:

> …a transatlantic phenomenon, an inherent part of the American Revolution and the late eighteenth-century Creole opposition to the royal regime in Spanish America as well as of the Swiss and Dutch democratic movements of the 1780s and 1790s and growing critique of the existing social and institutional order in Britain together with the French Revolution's ideology of freedom and 'basic rights' prior to the rise of Robespierre. (2012: 937)

He goes so far as to say that the Radical Enlightenment was a sort of philosophical revolution which laid the basis for the possibility to envisage a "'république Européenne', and a new kind of world based on equality, democracy, individual liberty and freedom of expression and the press"

[12] For Israel, there was "one particular 'big' cause" of the Revolution "which had no rivals whatsoever when it came to carving out the specific legislation, constitutional principles, new institutions, and the transformed rhetoric of politics – and that is the Radical Enlightenment" (2012: 951).

(2012: 950). This view of an overarching cosmopolitan framework for both the Radical Enlightenment and the revolutionary period brings with it a notion of the importance of communication between these worlds, often by means of translation between English and French. It is not a surprise, therefore, to find that writers, philosophers, and politicians who were real protagonists of the Revolution were themselves heavily involved in, or the object of, translation, as we shall see in the third chapter. Similarly, the French Revolution itself was taken as an example of the success of radical philosophy and politics for those in Britain who dissented from the oligarchic parliamentary regime in England, which was espousing, moreover, a reactionary anti-reform policy in the 1790s in an attempt to forestall agitation and revolt in Britain. Translation from French to English, principally of some of the major texts of the French Revolution, was thus an important reaching out for the radicals pressing for reform in 1790s Britain.

The cosmopolitan radicals who translated, as well as the translation of works written by radical thinkers, both "translating radicals" in the words of the subtitle, are the subject of the present work. Translation must be considered an important part of any approach which puts a cosmopolitan or transnational outlook at the centre of its perspective, and the ways in which a dissenting position with regard to political orthodoxies finds an appropriate cosmopolitan voice also require a specific focus on translation. This focus, within a series of different but related historical and political contexts in the eighteenth century, it is hoped, will provide an example of how this methodological approach, not textual but contextual, can bear fruit within the discipline of translation history, as well as lead to a deepening and widening of our understanding of the development of radicalism in Britain and France in the period.

2. Huguenot translators: cultural capital and the dissemination of radical ideas

One of the most important and best-documented groups of migrants in late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century Europe was that of the French Protestants, the Huguenots. While they had been guaranteed religious and civil rights under the Edict of Nantes (1598) after the Wars of Religion in France, these rights came under increasing attack with the consolidation of the absolutist regime of Louis XIV, culminating in the Revocation of the Edict in 1685. As a consequence, large numbers of French Protestants fled France to join their co-religionists in Switzerland, the Dutch Republic[1] (long tolerant of religious difference), Britain, Ireland and elsewhere (Chappell Lougee 2017; Gwynn 2001; Cottret 1985: 227-256). This highly literate diaspora often boasted linguistic competence in several languages – usually in French, English and Latin, and in some cases also Dutch, or German. It is not unexpected, then, that this group was strongly involved in activities of translation.

There have been a number of studies of Huguenot refugees and their involvement in the circulation of ideas in the early Enlightenment period. Huguenots figure importantly in Paul Hazard's classic *The European Mind (1680-1715)* (1953), particularly but not exclusively in the chapter on

[1] The Dutch Republic, or United Provinces, was a federation of seven Dutch provinces formed as a result of the revolt against Spanish Habsburg rule in 1581.

"Heterodoxy" (1953: 103-121). They constitute an important focus of the impressive overview provided by Anne Goldgar (1995) of the "Republic of Letters" in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, which documents international networks of writers corresponding throughout Europe, in particular, Britain, France, the Dutch Republic and Germany. On a more specific level, two edited collections have brought together research on some of the main Huguenot writers, editors and translators, exploring the different ways they contributed to the "vie intellectuelle" of Europe in this period (Häseler and McKenna 1999, 2002).

Jens Häseler's introduction to the second of these collections proposed a useful three-point classification of the motives which brought Huguenot refugees to translate:

> Ils traduisent premièrement pour gagner leur vie, deuxièmement pour server la cause de leur doctrine et troisièmement en tant qu'intermédiaires culturels entre l'aire culturelle française, voire francophone, et la culture de leurs pays d'accueil. (Häseler 2002: 19)

The first motive, that of earning a living, may seem banal but it is worth bearing in mind that the activity of translation which we are examining takes place in a specific material context, that of the needs and ambitions of a group of religious refugees fleeing from persecution. The Revocation of the Edict of Nantes signalled the end of an uneasy period of toleration, and introduced a series of highly discriminatory laws against Protestants, who were no longer able to worship in public, give public witness to their faith, occupy professions, have access to state offices, and were excluded from inheritance. Land and property could be inherited only by Catholic heirs and in their absence passed directly to the French state. This state of discrimination lasted throughout the eighteenth century until the Edict of Tolerance, introduced immediately before the French Revolution, in 1787, to some extent mitigated this legislation. Estimates indicate that around a fifth of the total Huguenot population of France emigrated towards the end of the seventeenth century – to northern Italy, Switzerland, the German states, Holland, Britain and Ireland (Banks 2017: 3).

This exclusion of the Huguenot population in France and in its diaspora from primary channels of livelihood – rent from land, public office, the exercise of a profession – put them in the classic position of intermediaries, who exploit their "in between" status as a primary means of subsistence. Some Huguenots were directly involved in commerce, to the extent that they contributed in a substantial manner to international trade links (Gwynn 2001: 414-418); others became involved in the growing industry of the circulation of ideas through saleable commodities such as books and reviews. The Huguenots who found themselves in London after 1685, moreover, also constituted an important market for French books and periodicals (Swift 1990). Their linguistic and cultural skills as well as their extensive international relations through the network of Huguenot academies and clerics, were ideally placed to exploit this new world. The "primary" motive of Huguenot intellectuals in their decision to attempt to make a living out of translation needs to be understood in this framework: that of a group of well-educated exiles using their cultural and linguistic capital to their full extent, given their effective exclusion from other more traditional channels of income.[2]

The second motive suggested by Häseler was an ideological one: "serving the cause of their religion" (2002: 19). Religious controversy had dominated debates throughout the seventeenth century in Britain, and became particularly animated in the 1680s when the possibility of the accession to the throne of a Catholic monarch, James II, led first to a movement to exclude him from succeeding his brother, Charles II, and later to the invitation to the Protestant William of Orange to accede to the throne and the "Glorious" Revolution of 1688. The political and religious context was not merely an English one: the example of the absolutist state of Louis XIV on the other side of the channel, and in particular its increasing reliance on confessional orthodoxy, leading to the effective expulsion of the Huguenot Protestant minority, was ever present (Kishlansky 1996: 266-286). In this context of political and religious conflict, translation played a small but not insignificant part. Gilbert Burnet, for example, theologian, historian and supporter of the Williamite monarchy, installed as Bishop of Salisbury by William in 1689 and known

[2] For the notion of cultural capital, see Bourdieu (1984).

in particular for his apology for the Glorious Revolution, the *History of My Own Times* (1734), and for the "standard Protestant" account of the Reformation (Clark 1956: 379-380) also used translation as a means of promoting the Williamite-Protestant cause. In 1678 he issued a translation of excerpts from a history of the French wars of religion by François Eudes de Mézeray and extracts from another Huguenot controversialist Jacques Auguste de Thou. These texts documented various massacres of Protestants and were prefaced by his own comments on the possibility that Protestants in England could be "at the mercy of Men, whose Religion will … set them on to commit the most Treacherous and Bloody Massacres" (cit. in Dodds 2011: 76). In a similar manner, the anonymous translator of the pamphlet by Michel Le Vassor, *The Sighs of France in Slavery. Breathing after liberty* published in both French and English in 1689, framed the translation with comments warning the English readership of how England might have appeared if James II had remained on the throne (Onnekink 2011: 203-4). The political context of such translations, in the period of the reign of James II and before his deposition in the Glorious Revolution and substitution by William of Orange was paramount. Both the French and English editions of Jean Claude's *Account of the persecutions and Oppressions of the Protestants in France* (1686) were burned by the public hangman and the translator into English was arrested (Gwynn 1977: 831).

The translations of the Huguenot refugee community thus responded to the orientations of an effective, if widespread, group of highly literate writers and intellectuals opposed to the Catholic and absolutist monarchies of France, Spain, and Austria. Hugh Trevor-Roper has gone so far as to argue that Huguenots constituted a "third force" in Europe, occupying in a sort of virtual space (but with an important physical base in the Dutch Republic) between the Catholic absolutist countries and the northern Protestant ones. This identity as a third force, Trevor-Roper argues, was reinforced by their shared knowledge of and use of French (Trevor-Roper 1987: 4-5). As we shall see, this critical and dissenting voice is often identifiable in their choices of which works to translate, either in extract form in reviews or in printed volumes. Translation may have been an important means of sustenance, but for many it also had an important ideological, cultural and political function.

Third, as we have seen, Häseler identifies the position of Huguenots as "cultural intermediaries" as an important determinant in terms of their activity as translators. In Britain, their status as migrants, granted the position of "denizens" (that is, foreigners living within England) inevitably conferred upon them the position of "strangers within the realm" as Bernard Bailyn and Philip Morgan (1991) have termed migrants in another context. It was a vulnerable position, but also one which could be exploited by trading in foreign goods, services, and ideas. As cultural and economic intermediaries, straddling different European national cultures, the Huguenots in Britain and elsewhere can be seen as historical examples of Ulrich Beck's "globally empowered individuals", part of "transnational actor-networks and movements" which he sees as fundamental to a cosmopolitan, as opposed to a national, world view (Beck 2007: 289). From another perspective, they could be seen as "subject transfers" in Anthony Pym's term (1998: 98-100), individuals who carry texts or knowledge about texts as they move and thus constitute a geographical network of translators and authors.

Keeping in mind the three underlying motivations for translation put forward by Häseler, in this chapter we will look at some individual examples of "globally empowered" Huguenot translators, Jean Le Clerc, Pierre Coste, Abel Boyer, Pierre Desmaizeaux, and Matthieu Maty. But before doing so, it is worth briefly focusing on one of the key and somewhat underestimated genres in which translation took place, the literary review.

Translation in literary reviews and newspapers

It has been argued that literary journals, which emerged in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, were "as central to the 'age of enlightenment' as the canonical texts by which we normally define that movement" (Popkin 1991: 212), and Huguenot migrants played a not insignificant part in their growth. Finding themselves on the frontier between one emerging nation, Britain, and consolidated centres of learning such as Amsterdam, Geneva, and Paris, many Huguenots became crucial conduits for the dissemination of philosophy and science. Much of this was accomplished through the publication of books in translation, but perhaps even more importantly it occurred by means of literary journals,

which published translated "abrégés" of longer works. The titles of the literary magazines published in this period in Amsterdam give an idea of the international and cosmopolitan nature of these reviews. The best known were edited by two important figures in the early Enlightenment, Pierre Bayle and Jean Le Clerc. The former established what is sometimes considered to be the first international literary review, the *Nouvelles de la République des lettres*, but the latter was arguably equally important for his three reviews, the *Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique* (1686-1693), the *Bibliothèque Choisie* (1703-1713) and the *Bibliothèque Ancienne et Moderne* (1714-1727). While these were perhaps the best-known of the genre, other literary reviews of the early eighteenth century included the *Bibliothèque Angloise* (1717-1728) and its continuation, the *Mémoires littéraries de la Grande Bretagne* (1720-1724); the *Bibliothèque britannique* (1733-1747), and its successor, set up by Matthieu Maty, the *Journal britannique* (1750-55); and the *Bibliothèque italique* (1728-1734).[3]

An important function of these reviews was to disseminate, in French, work originally published in a foreign language (in practice, for the most part, English)[4] by means of summaries which included numerous translated extracts. In the first number of his *Bibliothèque Angloise*, Michel de La Roche, the editor, wrote that "you could say in general that English books are scarcely known outside this Island [Britain] & those that are translated from time to time into French, or of which the Journalists speak, do not suffice to give a just idea of the state of the Sciences here today, nor to satisfy the curiosity of the Public" (cit. in Goldgar 1995: 67). Establishing a review whose principal intention was to give publicity to books in English was, he reported, a response to a specific request by booksellers who "n'ont que très-peu, ou point de Commerce dans les Païs étrangers" (cit. in Thomas 1976). The editor of the *Bibliothèque italique*, Charles-Etienne Jordan wrote that "this project can be nothing other than very advantageous for the public, because through this it will find itself

[3] For information on the reviews, see the online data base edited by Jean Sgard et al (1976), *Dictionnaire des Journaux 1680-1789* (http://dictionnaire-journaux.gazettes18e.fr/). For a more general treatment, see Sgard (1990).

[4] The number of periodicals in French in Europe in the eighteenth century, in one survey, increased from 29 in the 1700s, to 65 in the 1730s, 115 in the 1760s and 167 in the 1780s (Popkin 1991: 207).

informed about books which appear in Italy: we know but little the books which are published in this country…" (cit. in Goldgar 1995: 68). Indeed, the reviews had a market precisely because they summarised material which was not intended for publication in full. As de La Roche said, "if all the good books in *England* were translated into *French*, I would not amuse myself by publishing this journal" (cit. in Goldgar 1995: 68).

If the reviews in Amsterdam were intent on spreading English thought, other Huguenot journals such as the *Bibliothèque Germanique*, published in Berlin by Johann Heinrich Samuel Formey were focused on making work published in German available to an international francophone readership. Formey was in constant contact with his co-religionists working in the book and review industry in Holland, in particular with the bookseller Prosper Marchand (Berkvens-Stevelink, 1987: 117), and was primarily concerned with popularising, through abridged translations into French, the writings of German enlightenment figures such as Christian Wolff (Häseler 1999). His campaign to popularize and defend the works of Wolff, beyond including extracts in his review, also involved publishing books in translation and a range of other textual genres such as fiction and invented dialogues in which he used the format made popular by Fontenelle in his *Entretiens sur la pluralité des Mondes* (Häseler 2002: 21-24).

The literary reviews of Amsterdam, Berlin and elsewhere, then, contributed much to the spread of religious, philosophical, historical and, as the century progressed, literary news in the early Enlightenment period and are central to our understanding of the "Republic of Letters" of the early enlightenment period (Bots 1984: 6). The extent to which this activity was heavily dependent on translation, however, has only recently been recognized (Häseler and McKenna 1999, 2002; Hammersley 2010b) and has not, as yet, been fully explored.

A search for translations, however, as Bielsa and Bassnett have pointed out (2009), should not limit itself to a consideration of material published in book form or even in magazine form but should also include newspapers.[5] Alongside translation in literary reviews, the period also saw an increase in translations of international news more generally, and once

[5] I am indebted in this paragraph to Federico Zanettin, who allowed me to read in draft parts of his forthcoming publication on this subject.

again, Huguenots can be identified as key actors in this process, although the evidence is somewhat sporadic. Some of Jean Le Clerc's contacts in London, for example, who supplied him with religious or philosophical material for the literary reviews, were also responsible for translating into English for newspapers, in London or elsewhere in England, the vast amount of foreign news which, according to one commentator, "made up the bulk of news in all contemporary newspapers" (Gibbs 1987: 23). The Huguenot refugee in London, Pierre Motteux, known for his translation of Rabelais into English in 1694, was also involved in editorial, managerial and inevitably, given the amount of foreign news, translational activities on British newspapers (Gibbs 1987: 23; Grist 2005). Abel Boyer, whom we will discuss in more detail below, the translator into English of a number of French thinkers such as François de La Rochefoucauld and Charles de St Évremond, as well as some English work into French, and a literary figure in his own right in London (Laursen 2002), had begun his career in London in 1705 as a translator of foreign news on the newspaper the *Post Boy,* "acquiring a reputation as an authority on Spanish news". His own *Political State of Great Britain*, published from 1711 to 1729 was "a monthly compilation of domestic, foreign and colonial news" (Gibbs 1987: 33).[6] This testifies to a particular attention on the part of Boyer and some other Huguenot journalists to the affairs of the Westminster Parliament (Littleton 2018: 61), to the extent that a standard history of England in this period gives Boyer "a place in the growth of parliamentary reporting" (Clark 1956: 379).

Translation of literary, philosophical or religious work, then, a primary focus for Huguenot intellectuals intent on earning a living but also on propagating their own religious and political world view, as we shall see, should be seen within a context of lower level news translation which was emerging as an important element, quantitatively speaking at least, of news reporting. We may add, in conclusion, that it is likely that translation played an important role in the way that newspapers began to construct a transnational and even cosmopolitan, rather than national, perspective by means of compiling reports from different localities,

[6] Some of the parliamentary debates in Westminster reported in this publication were subsequently translated for Dutch periodicals (Gibbs 1987).

integrating "isolated occurrences into a coherent world picture" (Popkin 1991: 205).[7]

Translation in literary reviews and newspapers, then, as well as in printed volumes, was an important vehicle for the transmission of Huguenot philosophical, religious and political perspectives in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. To deepen our understanding of the historical and material contexts of these translations, we will now turn to an exploration of the individual biographies of some of those concerned.

Jean Le Clerc: the Huguenot literary reviews in Amsterdam

The first figure that we will look at is the Protestant theologian, writer and editor Jean Le Clerc (1657-1736). Le Clerc was not strictly a Huguenot emigré from France as he was born and had his early education in the Calvinist city of Geneva. Unhappy with the intolerance of Genevan orthodoxy, he moved first to Grenoble and then, in 1683, after starting a correspondence with the Arminian pastor Philip van Limborch, to Amsterdam, where he spent the rest of his life. Before settling in Amsterdam, however, he spent a crucial period in 1682 in London where he preached in the French Huguenot church and was able to learn English. His knowledge of English and his contacts in London marked Le Clerc out from other booksellers and editors in the Dutch Republic and enabled him to become a point of reference for religious and political exiles in the 1680s such as John Locke (Golden 1972: 28).

As we have seen, Le Clerc was best known in Amsterdam for the three philosophical reviews that he founded and edited, the *Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique*, the *Bibliothèque Choisie* and the *Bibliothèque Ancienne et Moderne*. These three reviews were crucial points of reference for the exchange of ideas in the "Republic of Letters" both because of their overall longevity (they spanned the period from the Revocation to the mid-1720s), the quantity of material published (the *Bibliothèque*

[7] We may contrast this perspective on news, international news and translation in this period with the well-known one of Benedict Anderson who shows the reading of news to have an important function in the construction of national identies (2006 [1983]: 33-37).

Universelle et Historique ran to 19 volumes of text, the *Bibliothèque Choisie* to 27, while the *Bibliothèque Ancienne et Moderne* was issued regularly for 13 years), and for their particular openness to English ideas and thought. While the review edited by Pierre Bayle, the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, has rightly taken centre stage as a platform for European sceptical and rationalist thought, together with his even more influential *Dictionnaire Historique et Critique* (1697) (Israel 2001: 143), Le Clerc's journals instead were particularly oriented to reporting on and dialoguing with English thought.[8] This was at least to some extent a result of Le Clerc's experience in London in 1682 and his command of English. Robert Boyle attested, in an understated fashion, that given the number of English books reviews by Le Clerc over the years, "Monsieur Le Clerc, is not unacquainted with the language of this country" (cit. in Bots 1984: 54). Both Bayle and Henri Basnage de Beauval, the editor of the influential *Histoire des Ouvrages des Sçavans*, were, by contrast, according to Le Clerc's biographer, "handicapped by their limited knowledge of English" (Golden 1972: 57). Le Clerc himself pointed to the lack of a solid knowledge of English on the part of readers on the continent as a factor in the success of his reviews. A publication including a significant proportion of French accounts of material available in full only in English was thus well-positioned to find a ready audience:

> Combien peu de gens y a-t-il deça la mer, qui sachent l'Anglois? Cependant il y a une infinité de bons Livres dans cette Langue, qu'on n'a point traduits, & qui ne le seront apparemment jamais; dont il est néanmoins très-avantageux au Public d'avoir au moins quelque connoissance. (cit. in Bots 1984: 54)

The genre of the review, we may emphasize again, was one in which translation played an important part. They carried the voice of the

[8] The *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, "the first of the genuine 'critical' journals" according to Jonathan Israel, was only edited by Bayle himself for four years, whereas Le Clerc "soldiered on for decades" with an "unflagging output of long, penetrating and balanced reviews in a tone reckoned less judgmental than Bayle's" (Israel 2001: 143, 146).

reviewer but were characterised, as they would be for the rest of the century, by the inclusion of long extracts quoted from the original and translated into French. The aim of the *Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique*, for example, as stated by the editor himself, was "faithfully to abridge some Books which were every day publish'd in Latin, French, English, Italian and Dutch" and present these abridgements, or *abrégés* "in such Words as may both want Obscurity, and ingage [sic] the Reader" (cit. in Golden 1972: 32). Interestingly, the market for these *abrégés* was not only the francophone readership on continental Europe but also French exiles in Britain: the *Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique* had a specific arrangement with the London bookseller Sam Smith for sales in London, presumably for the most part amongst the exiled Huguenot population there (Bots 1984: 55).[9] The market for these reviews, and in particular ones such as Le Clerc's which carried out a sometimes intense and articulate dialogue with English writers, is testified also by the interest in publishers in continuing the reviews. Le Clerc was persuaded by the bookseller Henri Schelte, who had published the translation into French by Pierre Coste of Locke's *Essay on Human Understanding* (1690) (Rumbold 1991: 11) to found the *Bibliothèque Choisie* in 1703, and subsequently by David Mortier, a bookseller with an outlet in London as well, to continue with the *Bibliothèque Ancienne et Moderne* (Golden 1972: 41-42).

These translations had important functions in terms of the spread of ideas and the reciprocal osmosis of French and English writing. Le Clerc's *Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique*, for example, played a significant part in the history of the reception of two of the most fundamental texts in epistemology and political theory of the period, John Locke's *Essay on Human Understanding* (1690) and his *Two Treatises on Government* (1689). Locke was himself a contributor to Le Clerc's review when in exile in Amsterdam (Bots 1984:57), and used it to test the water in terms of the likely reception of his *Essay* to a non-English readership, as we shall see (Israel 2001: 478-479). The December 1690 number included, in French,

[9] Samuel Smith was bookseller to the Royal Society and spoke French and Latin fluently (Plomer 1922: 276).

a long review of Robert Filmer's *Patriarchia* and Locke's rejoinder, already published in full as *Two Treatises of Government*, the reviewer siding unequivocally with Locke (Golden 1972: 63). LeClerc's reviews also on occasions constituted a real contribution to the debates going on in England: some reviews in French were even translated back into English and published in London (Golden 1972: 70-71). The favourable review that Le Clerc gave in his *Bibliothèque Choisie* to the fiercely anticlerical pamphlet *The Rights of the Christian Church Asserted* (1707), published anonymously but later acknowledged to be the work of the deist Mathew Tindal, was immediately translated into English and published in London the following year. The preface imagined that the reader would perhaps "smile" at this retranslation, but justify it as "I do not expect to see a better Extract of it by any English hand, unless the Author himself would undertake it" (Le Clerc, *Extract and judgment*: iii; see also Israel 2001: 468-469; Golden 1972: 79).[10]

We may make two further points in conclusion regarding Le Clerc. The first is that his importance as a reviewer and translator in Amsterdam was the result to a large extent of his friendships with English writers and philosophers such as John Locke, Gilbert Burnet and the third Earl of Shaftesbury, author of the influential *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times* (1711). It was these long-lasting friendships that enabled Le Clerc to be a privileged interlocutor in terms of their writings and the theological and political debates of the time (Golden 1972: 57-58). The second relates to the position of Le Clerc within a movement of political and religious dissent. In terms of politics, his friendship with Locke and Burnet dated from their period in exile in Amsterdam in the 1680s and was strongly linked to the particular political conjuncture of the Williamite revolution of 1688, which enshrined moderate Anglicanism and constitutional monarchism in Britain. His links with Burnet in particular were such that he translated into French three of his sermons supporting the Williamite succession in 1689 (Golden 1972: 38). Le Clerc played a crucial role in the reception and spread of Locke's philosophy through their promotion in his review, but he also introduced Locke to his

[10] References to primary sources will cite the brief title of the work. The full reference can be found in the bibliography.

translator and later amanuensis, Pierre Coste (Rumbold 1991: 5-6). In terms of religion, although not a believer in the materialism of Spinoza which, for Jonathan Israel, marked out those fully participating in the radical voice of the Enlightenment, this did not stop some contemporary religious polemicists from attempting to tar him with the brush of atheism and "spinozism". Le Clerc's own brand of Protestantism, fiercely critical of transubstantiation and divine intervention but which accepted the notion of Revelation in the divine word of the Bible and the miracles of Christ, aligns Le Clerc with other more radical voices within the Enlightenment (Israel 467-469).

Pierre Coste and John Locke

The figure of Pierre Coste (1668-1747), translator into French of John Locke's *Some Thoughts on Education* (1693), and his *Essay Concerning Understanding* (1690), as well as Isaac Newton's *Opticks* (1704), is perhaps the best-known of the Huguenot translators in this period (see Delisle and Woodsworth 2012: 200-202). However, before looking at Coste, it may be worth briefly indicating the extent to which Locke himself can be considered a translator and mediator of philosophical thought between the anglophone and francophone cultures of the period.

The life and work of John Locke (1632-1704) had notable cosmopolitan contours. After a brief visit to France in the autumn of 1672, he returned in 1675 and spent the next four years there, mostly in Montpellier, during which period he learnt French from a Monsieur Pasty. In 1676 he used translation as a way of intervening in theological debate, translating three essays of the Jansenist Pierre Nicole's *Essais de Morale* (Marshall 1994: 131-137; Yolton 2000), giving them in manuscript form to the Countess of Shaftesbury. Only published in 1819, these translations were neglected in Locke scholarship until John Marshall's study indicated the extent to which the three essays of Nicole anticipated some of the subsequent themes of Locke's philosophy, such as the difficulty of acquiring knowledge, the relation between reason and the passions, the duties of civility, toleration and others (Marshall 1994: xvii; 131-137).[11] As in other cases (for example, Denis Diderot and Mary

[11] The three essays translated by Locke, the *Discourse containing in short the natural proof*

Wollstonecraft, as we shall see below), translation appears to have functioned for Locke as a sort of trial arena in which to test his own ideas.

From 1683 to 1689 Locke was in exile in Amsterdam due to his political writings during the exclusion crisis in which he had argued against the succession of Charles II's Catholic brother, James, to the throne. Locke returned to England only with the successful Glorious Revolution of 1688 and the installation of the Protestant William of Orange as monarch. In his period in Amsterdam he made the acquaintance of Jean Le Clerc, publishing a number of reviews in the *Bibliothèque Universelle* in 1686 (Bots 1984: 57). He was clearly aware of the importance of the review for the possibilities it gave for extending religious and philosophical debate. In 1689, for example, he sent Le Clerc Stephen Nye's *Brief History of the Unitarians* (1687), a text which had sparked the controversies over the trinity and had first given the term "Unitarian" prominence in England (Marshall 1994: 389). Locke also used the *Bibliothèque Universelle* to try out the foreign reception for his principal philosophical ideas, later to be published as the *Essay on Human Understanding* (1690) with a long extract from this work, translated into French by Le Clerc himself in 1688 (Israel 2001: 478-479; Eisenstein 1992: 62-63; Yolton 1993: 1-2). The editor ended the extract with an appeal, from Locke himself, for comments on the work,[12] and, in John Yolton's account, received two long replies (1993: 50-51).[13] The

of the Existence of a God, & the immortality of the Soule, the *Discourse of the Weakness of Man,* and the *Treatise concerning the way of preserving peace with men*, first published in French in 1671, have now been issued in a bilingual edition (Yolton 2000).

[12] "…l'Auteur a bien voulu publier, pour satisfaire quelques-uns des ses amis particuliers, & pour leur donner un Abrégé de ses sentimens. Si quelcun de ceux qui prendront la peine de les examiner, croit remarquer quelque endroit, où l'Auteur se soit trompé, ou quelque chose d'obscur & de défecteux dans ce système, il n'a qu'à envoier ses doutes, ou ses objections à Amsterdam aux Marchands Libraires chez qui s'imprime la Bibliothèque Universelle" (*Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique de l'année 1688*, p. 114).

[13] One came from the German Christian theorist and translator Christian Knor von Rosenroth and another from the Dutch Spinozist Fredericus van Leenhof, both defending the doctrine of innate knowledge which Locke was intent on refuting (Yolton 1993: 50-51; see also Israel (2001: 406-435).

importance of this *abrégé,* published in the *Bibliothéque Universelle et Historique*, is well-known: it was this translated extract that first called the attention of Gottfried Leibniz to Locke (Yolton 1993: 22).

Locke, in short, is customarily thought of in terms of his English context, but if we consider him in the context of his own relations with the early European Enlightenment, a somewhat different figure emerges, one who was at home reviewing and translating texts in French and collaborating closely with a Huguenot publisher in Amsterdam. Although he wrote his major works in English, his letters are in English, French and Latin, and the geographical frontiers of his own political and intellectual activity were by no means limited to England.

If Locke's personal and intellectual context was not only English but cosmopolitan, his writings, nevertheless, required translation in order to have their full impact in Europe, and thus the figure of Pierre Coste enters the story. There seems to be no doubt regarding the importance of Coste's translation of Locke's work, and the *Essay* in particular, in terms of its reception in continental Europe. Some older scholars such as Philippus van Limborch, professor at the Huguenot Collège des Remonstrants in Amsterdam did press for a translation of the *Essay* into Latin.[14] Most, however, including in all probability, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Condillac and Muratori, appear to have read this important text not in the English original but in Coste's translation, published in 1700 in Amsterdam (Yolton 1993: 21-25). Some, such as Locke's friend Nicholas Toinard and Jean Barbeyrac in Berlin, were stimulated by Coste's translation into beginning a course of study in English in order to be able to read it in the original (Rumbold 1991: 100, 112). Given the importance of Locke's work for the early Enlightenment, Coste's translation is a key example of the "impact" translation can have (Thomson 2007; Mason 2002).

The career of Pierre Coste is interesting as an example of an early Huguenot translator exploiting his intermediary status in order to flourish as a successful translator. Coste's background would appear to be fairly representative of the Huguenot diaspora. Born in 1668, the son of a successful cloth merchant in Uzès in southern France, his father's wealth,

[14] A Latin version of the *Essay* was printed in London, *De intellecu humano*, translated by Richard Burridge, in 1701.

on his death in 1707, passed to his brother, Jean, who had converted to Catholicism. The split with his brother was irreconcilable: throughout Pierre's life in exile, Jean was unable or unwilling to give any financial compensation to him for having lost out on the family inheritance. Another brother, Louis, was killed during a conflict between Catholics and Protestant in Uzès in 1710, his head being put on show in the main square not far from the family home (Rumbold 1991: 5). The discrimination and violence regarding Coste's immediate family environment should not be underestimated.

Pierre Coste was educated at the Protestant Academy at Geneva in 1684 and later in Leyden where he made the acquaintance of Jean Le Clerc (Rumbold 1991: 4-5). In a letter to Locke of 8 July 1695, Le Clerc suggested that a young "proposant" (candidate for the ministry) and theology student, Pierre Coste, could translate his *Some Thoughts on Education*, having already made a rough translation "plutôt pour apprendre la Langue, que pour se faire connoître par là" (Locke, *Correspondence*, vol. 5: 394), which he did, publishing it in 1695 with the title *De l'Éducation des enfans*. Coste's translation met with Locke's approval and led to some correspondence between them.[15] In1697, Le Clerc sent Coste to England to be employed in the household of Locke's patron, Lady Masham, as tutor to her son, Francis, where the philosopher himself lived, although Coste's English, according to Le Clerc's letter of recommendation, was only bookish: "il ne sait l'Anglois que par les livres, c'est à dire qu'il l'entend lors qu'il le lit" (cit. in Rumbold 1991: 7). After Locke's death in 1704, Coste became a friend and protégé of the third Earl of Shaftesbury, translating into French his *Sensus communis* (1709). From London he corresponded with Le Clerc's *Bibliothèque Choisie* as well as for the *Journal des Sçavans* and the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*. Later in life he returned to France, marrying at the age of 66 the daughter of a Protestant chaplain to an English regiment, Mlle de Laussac in 1735.

[15] In addition to Le Clerc's letter of 18 June 1695, Locke's correspondence contains eight letters from Coste to Locke between and July 1698 and July 1700 (*Correspondence*, vol. V: 395-96; 432-435; 660-662; vol. VI: 440-442; 154-157; 455-457; 648-652; 666-669; vol. VII: 107-108). See also Vet (2004).

On her death a year later, Coste returned to London but only briefly, going back to Paris where he died in 1743 (Rumbold 1991: 4-25).

It was as the translator of Locke's major philosophical work, his *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (1690) that Coste remains best known. His translation appeared first in 1700 in Amsterdam, published by Henri Schelte, publisher also of Le Clerc's *Bibliothèque Universelle*, with a second edition printed nearly thirty years later, in 1729, followed by third and fourth editions in 1735 and 1742.[16] There is some debate as to the nature of Coste's active intervention in the translation. Philippe Hamou (2018) has recently argued that Coste's footnotes, added in the later editions, constituted a conscious attempt by the translator to moderate some of Locke's claims. Although some of the notes were restricted to comments on language (for example, justifying the translation of "uneasiness" as "inquiétude" or "consciousness" as "conscience") or were merely elaborations of the argument, others instead took issue directly with some key elements of Locke's thought, in particular when it made direct attacks on some Cartesian orthodoxies. Locke's claims regarding thinking matter,[17] for example, along with those locating God in space and attributing to animals the capacity to feel and even think (although not to reason) allowed Locke's thought, according to Hamou, to be recruited for radical positions such as those of the Socinians, materialists or pantheists. For Hamou, Coste's notes were explicit attempts to mitigate these claims, as the translator had come "reluctantly to realize the role that Locke (and by implication, he himself) had played in the rise of this powerful wave of radical thinking" (2018: 76). It is beyond the scope of this work to examine this reading in detail but we may note that it would appear to reveal a Coste who is not only a key figure in the dissemination, in francophone Europe, of Locke's philosophy, but also a translator aiming to intervene and modify an interpretation of Locke which he considered to be erroneous.

[16] Jonathan Israel dates the influence of Locke's philosophy in Europe only from the 1730s onwards (2001: 253).

[17] For Locke's idea of "thinking matter", the notion that matter might be given the power of thinking by God, see Yolton (1993: 148-166).

If Coste is considered as the principal conduit for Locke's thought for francophone readers, it should not be forgotten that his work was, on the whole, approved of by Locke himself who, indeed, appears at all times to have kept a close eye on the French text which was being proposed, to the extent that Coste's translations can be considered the result of a close collaboration with the author. On numerous occasions, Coste asked Locke for his opinion regarding various aspects of the translation. Thus after translating *Some Thoughts on Education*, Coste wrote to Locke saying humbly that he had learnt that Locke was satisfied with his translation, which "au lieu de m'enorgueillir, m'engagera à prendere de nouvelles précautions, pour m'en render toûjours plus digne" (Locke, *Correspondence*, vol. 5: 434). This was in reality a somewhat subservient justification for putting forward other queries regarding the text. He tentatively questioned Locke's assertion, for example, that a mother can teach her child Latin just by reading it to him or her, as Locke suggested. For Coste, "on veut le croire, mais on ne le trouve pas assez vraisemblable" (*Correspondence*, vol. 5: 433). This criticism, indeed, was partially met by Locke who, in his fourth edition, expanded the comment to say that young children should not be burdened with grammatical rules. Other queries by Coste regarding the text proved easily resolvable, such as the misprinting of "June" for "Inn" which made the phrase "rolling here and there from one June [Inn] to another" meaningless (*Correspondence*, vol. 5: 434-5). After this successful interaction with the author over the translation of *Some Thoughts on Education*, we may presume that this collaboration continued with the work of translation of the *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* which took place when Coste was in residence with Locke with the Masham household. Coste essentially became Locke's amanuensis towards the end of Locke's life, playing an important part in the preparation of a final text of the *Two Treatises of Government* (1690) in English (Laslett 1988: 10).[18]

We cannot mention the *Two Treatises* without make a brief reference to the translation into French of this text, although this did not involve Pierre Coste. As with the *Essay*, an *abrégé* appeared in the *Bibliothèque*

[18] Relations between Locke and Coste worsened towards the end of Locke's life, and nothing was left to Coste in his will (Rumbold 1991: 19-20).

Universelle in 1691. The work was then published in the same year with the title *Du government Civil* by Abram Wolfgang, the publisher also of Jean Le Clerc's periodical. Although both the author of the *Two Treatises* and its translator into French remained anonymous, it is generally agreed that the translator was another Huguenot living in the Dutch Republic, David Mazel. Given that Locke was also a contributor to Le Clerc's review, as we have seen, it is likely that he knew about the publication and, probably, approved of it. The point is a crucial one as this translation "transformed" the original text, according to Peter Laslett, the editor of the most recent authoritative edition, as it left out Locke's *Preface*, the whole of the *First Treatise* and the first chapter of the *Second Treatise*, which links it to the first (Laslett 1988: 12-13). The effect of this, along with a series of "interventions insidieuses" on the part of Le Clerc, in his new preface, and by the translator himself was, according to one commentator, to situate the text firmly in the context of the Huguenot cause in France, giving it an orientation which was "plus radicale encore que celle proposée par Locke" (Soulard 2011: 757). The impact of this modified French translation was notable: it was this edition which was reprinted throughout the eighteenth century. As a testimony to the "well-known pathway of radical thinking from its origins in England, by way of French Protestants in Holland, and French political criticism in France", it was also this truncated version which was used as the basis for the first American edition which appeared in 1764 (Laslett 1988: 13-14).

The fact that one of the principal texts in political theory of the Enlightenment was "transformed as well as translated", in Peter Laslett's expression (1988: 12), has led to a claim by Delphine Soulard (2011), that Huguenot translators, often considered to be "acteurs de seconde zone" should instead be foregrounded in terms of the role they played in the orientation of the debate over Locke. Ann Thomson makes the same claim for Pierre Coste's translation of the dispute between Locke and Edward Stillingfleet, in which the importance of the role of Coste is clear: "Son rôle dépasse largement celui du simple traducteur: il est bien celui qui a contribué à façonner un image de Locke comme penseur irreligieux et l'a inscrire dans la tradition matérialiste" (Thomson 2007: 16).

Pierre Coste also translated one of the most important scientific works of the early Enlightenment, Newton's *Optics*, which appeared in 1704 in English, in Latin translation in 1706, and in 1720 in French. In his translation of Locke's *Essay*, Coste had discussed his work with Pierre Bayle (Yolton 1993: 23). In translating Newton, Coste availed himself of the help of the engineer, scientist and member of the Royal Society, a fellow Huguenot exile, John Theophilus Desaguliers, who oversaw the manuscript of the translation.[19] The second edition, published in Paris in 1722, saw modifications to the text (Baillon 2009: 2-18). It was promoted by the French mathematician Pierre Varignon, who indicated to Coste that he could count on the help of the Huguenot exile in London Abraham de Moivre as an advisor on style (Newton, *Correspondence*: 91). This was not a wholly satisfactory arrangement, as Coste's letters to Newton make clear. Varignon, Coste complained, would not print anything that Newton himself had not approved of, and had asked Coste to apply to Newton himself for the approval of any proposed modification: "c'est à luy que vous devez addresser pour l'employ des corrections que vous me dites avoir faites sur cet Ouvrage". Coste himself had not had the opportunity of "having the perusal of one third at least of the corrections of M. de Moivre". Coste had been, according to his own version, "used coarsely" given that the corrections of de Moivre had been printed without him even seeing them (Newton, *Correspondence*, vol. VIII: 148). It would seem, however, that Coste was satisfied with the end result, his own text being revised only slightly by de Moivre, whose corrections gave to the final French translation "un degré de perfection, qu'elle ne pouvait recevoir que de l'habilité, de la sagacité, & del la justesse di un si buon Esprit" (cit. in Rumbold 1991: 76).

It is difficult, at this distance, with only fragmentary evidence, to conclude anything particular regarding the disputes between translator, reviser, printer and author, although the importance of this text in the history of science would suggest that a careful textual analysis might prove

[19] Desaguliers was himself a prolific translator, particularly in the period 1711-18 when he published a number of translations on military fortifications and mechanics (Poni 1993: 219). Margaret Jacob sees Desaguliers as "the guiding force in British freemasonry" after 1717 (1981: 122).

fruitful. In the subsequent judgment of Matthieu Maty, another Huguenot exile and biographer of Abraham de Moivre, without these modifications to the second edition, the translation of Newton's *Optics* would have remained full of errors (Gibbs 1987: 28-29).[20] The exchanges would appear to confirm, in any case, Coste's recognition of the importance of translating as a collaborative enterprise.

As we have seen, Coste also translated a text by his subsequent patron, the third Earl of Shaftesbury, *Sensus communis: an Essay on the Freedom of Wit and Humour* (1709). In this case his interventions in the translation, which appeared in 1710, were applauded by Le Clerc as improvements. In particular, the text had been clearly divided into four parts "et cela sert en effet à mieux suivre les pensées de l'auteur", and he had added a preface in which "…nous en a donné & le dessin & le plan car j'avoue que j'y ai trouvé si peu de méthode, & tant de choses qui paroissent peu liées les unes aux autres, que j'aurois eu de la peine de m'en former une juste idée" (cit. in Rumbold 1991: 68). In the case of Shaftesbury, then, at least according to Le Clerc, the reception of his thought by a francophone readership in continental Europe is to be attributed, at least in part, to clarifications on the part of translator.

As well as acting as a conduit for the cutting edge of English philosophical and scientific thought, Pierre Coste continued to translate work broadly supportive of the Huguenot cause and the attacks on Catholic and absolutist orthodoxy. Along with *Some Thoughts Concerning Education*, and the *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, he also translated Locke's defence of rational Christianity, the anonymous *The Reasonableness of Christianity* (1695) as *Le Christianisme Raisonnable* (1696), undertaking this work without knowing that Locke was its author, or at least pretending not to know as can be seen in his letter accompanying the small volume in French which he sent to Locke (Locke, *Correspondence*, vol. 5: 660-662).[21] He also translated one work of history, this time not from English but from Italian. This too was an

[20] The text was later retranslated by Jean-Paul Marat, with a preface highly critical of Coste's translation (see below pp. 112-118 and Leech 2019).

[21] "Je viens de traduire un petit Livre Anglois intitulé *The Reasonableness of Christianity*, que je prens la liberté de vous envoyer" (*Correspondence*, vol. 5: 660).

apology for the Protestant and anti-absolutist cause: a biography of the militant Protestant dictator Oliver Cromwell, (Rumbold 1991: 50), written by the Calvinist Gregorio Leti, part of the Huguenot circle in Holland and whose daughter married Jean Le Clerc (Rumbold 1991: 50; Barcia 1983: 15, 70).

Although Coste was primarily a translator,[22] one publication in original French which he edited is worth mentioning as it indicates that Coste's commitment to radicalism may have gone beyond a simple defence of the Protestant cause. In 1727 he published, in The Hague, a five-volume edition of Montaigne's *Essais*. This edition included, for the first time, the controversial text *Discours sur la servitude volontaire* (1574), an essay written originally by Montaigne's friend Étienne de La Boétie. This essay, in brief, asked how it was possible that a single man could govern in a tyrannical manner over a whole nation of subjects, implying that it was a fault of the subjects themselves who allowed themselves to be slaves. The essay had been considered by the authorities to be so subversive that it was banned and circulated only clandestinely in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Pierre Coste's inclusion of it as an appendix to his edition of Montaigne's *Essais* was the first to mention the name of the author. It was also the edition on which significant subsequent translations were based, including the English version published in 1735 by the printer Thomas Smith, and the later Italian one published in the context of the Neapolitan Jacobin revolution of 1799 by the Italian patriot Cesare Paribelli (Panichi 1999: 11-12; 43-45).[23] The translation and diffusion in English and Italian of this controversial and subversive text, then, whose impact was to be felt in a series of different political contexts, was facilitated by Pierre Coste's activity as a promoter and editor of Montaigne.

We may make three brief points in conclusion. First, Pierre Coste, unlike many of the other figures we shall consider in this study, was the nearest thing to a professional translator that can be encountered in a

[22] Coste is categorized as a translator, for example, in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Vet 2008).

[23] The *Discours sur la servitude volontaire* may have been an important influence on Jean Paul Marat's *Chains of Slavery* which will be discussed in Chapter Four (see Panichi 1999:45-47). I am grateful for the "Collettivo Boétie" - Camilla Emmenegger, Francesco Gallino and Daniele Gorgone of the University of Turin for this reference.

period in which writing, journalism, philosophical criticism, editing, bookselling and translation seem to have merged into one another. Coste stands out as a figure whose particular contribution would appear to have been translation rather than any other of these activities. Second, Coste would appear to be part of an integrated Huguenot network of translators and editors whose central figure would appear to have been Jean Le Clerc rather than the better known Pierre Bayle. Coste's translations are best understood, not as the isolated work of a solitary figure but as emerging out of an active network of Huguenots, including the editors of literary journals, booksellers, writers and philosophers, journalists and so on, principally but not exclusively located in the cities of the Dutch Republic and London. Third, Coste, like the network which he was part of, was principally involved in the translation of works which defended the Protestant and Huguenot cause and were oppositional in terms of the dominant political thought of continental Europe at the time. In this, his biographer Margaret Rumbold was surely right in concluding that Coste was first and foremost a "protestant engage" (1991: 121).[24]

Pierre Desmaizeaux in London

Another French Huguenot exile who was an important conduit linking literary and philosophical London with the continent, primarily through the reviews in the Dutch Republic, was Pierre Desmaizeaux (or Des Maizeaux) (1673-1745). Desmaizeaux's personal story follows the usual trajectory of the Huguenot diaspora (Almagor 1989: 2-8). His father was a Huguenot pastor who fled France for Switzerland in 1685, charged with sedition for a sermon attacking Louis XIV. Desmaizeaux himself left Switzerland for Holland in 1699, where his personal and intellectual abilities came to the attention of Pierre Bayle. Armed with a recommendation from Bayle to the third Earl of Shaftesbury,

[24] Rumbold concludes her biography thus : "Résumons donc les attributs de Pierre Coste, Huguenot et réfugié. En premier lieu, il était homme de foi: ayant abandonné dans ses jeunes années sa carrière de Pasteur, soit volonté soit circonstances, il resta, cependant, protestant engagé. … Il n'est pas à s'étonner que les oeuvres qu'il traduisit traitaient souvent de matières de religion et que dans ses préfaces il saisissait l'occasion d'éxpliquer se convinctions théologiques" (1991: 121).

Desmaizeaux, like Coste two years before him, left Amsterdam and arrived in England in the same year. Much of his activity in London was dedicated to gathering material for the publication of *abrégés*, in French, for the reviews of his Huguenot co-religionists, in Amsterdam and elsewhere. He worked tirelessly, for example, as a correspondent for Jacques Bernard's Amsterdam review, the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres* between 1700 and 1710, as well as for Samuel Masson's *Histoire critique de la République des lettres* (1712-18), the *Journal des Sçavans* (1715-1720) and others.

In the case of Desmaizeaux, we have another example of the way in which Huguenot exiles could use their intermediary position and linguistic competence as cultural capital to generate income and personal advancement. His early translation work, for example, in the period 1710-1720, appears to have been carried out without payment and was aimed at "establishing and spreading our young French refugee's name as a reliable source of information on English affairs […]" as Desmaiseaux's biographer comments (Almagor 1989: 80). In this way he served a sort of apprenticeship period in which he managed to accredit himself with his English patrons and consolidate his relations with Dutch publishers and journalists such as Jacques Bernard and Henri Du Sauzet. This activity of accreditation, we may surmise, may have enabled him subsequently to be a promoter of his own work. His reputation in London was sealed with the publication of his *Recueil de diverse pièces sur la philosophie* (1720), which included an account of the philosophical and scientific controversy between Newton and Leibniz, and which earned him election to the prestigious Royal Society (Grist 2010: 38-39).

In terms of his activity as a translator, Desmaizeaux emerges as a figure intent on translating material coherent with his political and religious views, what might be termed an activist translator (Tymoczko 2010c). His contributions to the Huguenot reviews in Amsterdam and The Hague abounded with mentions of the publications of English religious and political radicals such as the deists and free-thinkers John Toland, Mathew Tindal and Anthony Collins whom Jonathan Israel and Margaret Jacob have identified as important voices in the materialist and republican "radical" enlightenment (Israel 2001: 609-623; Jacob 1981: 53, 61). His longer contributions to Jacques Bernard's *Nouvelles de la République des*

Lettres included letters praising the work of the historian and propagandist for William of Orange, Gilbert Burnet, and in particular his defence of the Anglican church, the *Exposition of the Thirty Nine articles of the Church of England* (1699). He also translated extracts from the sermons of John Tillotson, former archbishop of Canterbury, which were later translated in full by the jurist Jean Barbeyrac (Almagor 1989: 24, 49). The patronage of the third Earl of Shaftesbury led him to begin, but not finish, a translation of his *Inquiry concerning Virtue* (1711).[25] Like Pierre Coste with Locke, this translation seems to have been a collaborative effort involving both translator and the author himself (Klein 1994: 48; Hammersley 2010a: 45).

Desmaizeaux's contributions to reviews in Amsterdam also documented the reception of his mentor, Pierre Bayle in Britain, as well as the situation of Huguenots there and Protestant histories of the conflicts of the seventeenth century in Britain such as Clarendon's *History of the English Civil Wars* (1702-4) and his contemporary and fellow Huguenot Abel Boyer's *History of the Reign of William III* (1703) and *History of the Reign of Queen Anne* (1702-12)[26], which Desmaizeaux suggested should be translated in full into French (Almagor 1989: 49-71).

Desmaizeaux's closest collaboration was with the English philosopher Anthony Collins, known as a proponent of deism and freethinking (Israel 2001: 614-619). From 1710 onwards, according to Desmaizeaux's biographer, the two spent many entire summers together exchanging ideas. In 1717 Desmaizeaux oversaw the translation of Collins' major theoretical tract, the *Philosophical inquiry concerning human liberty* (1715) which had been published anonymously.[27] This was an important work, taking into account an exchange between Newton and Leibniz, and contributed, through its translation, to the familiarization of a francophone public with the ideas of Newton. In the same year, he published numerous articles devoted to Collins, including an open letter

[25] This text was later translated into French also by Denis Diderot (see below, p. 70).

[26] This work came out in serialised form over this ten-year period.

[27] The actual translation was carried out by a young Huguenot refugee from Berne, Charles De Bons, who produced a first draft of the translation on commission from Desmaizeaux. The translation was apparently done without payment as he would undertake it for "amour de la gloire" in Desmaizeaux's words, although the final translation appeared under Desmaizeaux's own name (Thomson 2010: 223).

from Collins to Desmaizeaux himself entitled *Lettre de l'Auteur du 'Discours sur la liberté de penser'* (Almagor 1989: 141*)*. On his death in 1729, Collins left eight volumes of manuscripts to Desmaizeaux (Almagor 1989: 7). It needs to be pointed out, however, that the collaboration or friendship between the two was an unequal one, between a member of the English gentry and a Huguenot exile, translator and writer, in which the former acted as a patron to the latter (Bots 2018).

Desmaizeaux was equally intent on promoting works of French materialist and libertine thought by translating them into English. In particular, in 1714 he published his own *Works of St Évremond*, whose subtitle read "*made English from the French original. With the author's life*" (Almagor 1989: 126).[28] Desmaizeaux's translational and journalistic work, moreover, dovetails with his own writing agenda, principally his own biography of his mentor Pierre Bayle in English (1708) and subsequently in French (1730) (Almagor 1989: 126) as well as an edition of John Toland's posthumous papers in 1726 (Dybikowski 2008).

Desmaizeaux, in short, appears to occupy a similar if less prestigious place in the history of the translation of English Protestants and radicals as Pierre Coste. We may observe the same intelligent but necessary exploitation of the cultural and linguistic resources of a French Protestant exile in a world of increasing print culture, the same adherence to the Protestant values of Williamite England that welcomed them both, and the same belonging to an international network of Huguenot exiles and writers.

Abel Boyer: translating Williamite Britain

Abel Boyer (1667?-1729), another Huguenot exile and translator, fled to Holland from his native Castres in Languedoc after the Revocation where he too met Pierre Bayle. Like Coste and Desmaizeaux, Boyer was also sent to England, this time by Bayle, with an introduction to Gilbert Burnet. Burnet's patronage enabled Boyer to establish himself as the tutor to the

[28] For Charles de Saint-Denis Évremond, see Hazard (1953: 149-154). Évremond lived as a sceptic and libertine in London from 1661 until his death in 1703 except for a six-year period in Holland (from 1666-1672) during which he became acquainted with Spinoza.

son of Sir Benjamin Bathurst, comptroller of the household of Queen Anne. This position enabled Boyer to make a name for himself above all for his French grammar book, *The Compleat French Master for Ladies and Gentlemen* (1694) which was to go through 18 editions in the first half of the eighteenth century, and for his *Royal Dictionary of French and English* (1699) (Gibbs 2008). While he remains best known for his grammar book and dictionary, Boyer was also an influential translator of important literary works, including Racine's *Iphigénie* (1700) into English and Joseph Addison's *Cato* (1713) into French (Laursen 2002: 38, 41). In particular, his translation of the latter, published in the same year in which it appeared on the London stage, links Boyer to the radical themes of virtue and republicanism. Whig republicans and atheists such as Thomas Gordon and John Trenchard echoed the themes presented in Addison's play with their *Letters of Cato* (1720-23) in which they attacked government corruption and infringement of liberties (Robbins 1959: 111-121) and their work was later to be translated into French by Baron d'Holbach. Addison's *Cato*, moreover, constituted an important reference point for figures such as George Washington and Benjamin Franklin in their promotion of the values of virtue and the republic during the American Revolution (Dunn Henderson and Yelling 2004).

Like Coste and Desmaizeaux, Boyer was intent on supporting the Protestant faith which had been the cause of his fleeing the increasingly clerical state in France after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. The Protestant Refuge offered Boyer, too, connections with other Huguenot exiles in the Dutch Republic which opened opportunities to him as a publicist, writer, and translator. To publicize the Williamite regime, he wrote "histories" (in effect more chronicles of contemporary England than real histories) of the reigns of William III and Anne (Gibbs 2008), which were subsequently translated into French, as we have seen, by Pierre Desmaizeaux (see above).[29]

[29] That these "histories" were in effect an apology for the Williamite regime is apparent from Boyer's dedication of the work on William III to the Queen: "Madam, amidst the joyful multitudes that crowd your palace, to congratulate your majesty's auspicious accession to the throne of your glorious ancestors, history, madam, makes bold to approach your sacred person and to lay at your feet the Life and Reign of King William the Third: a prince, whose heroical actions have filled the world with

In addition to his translations of literary works, he also translated pamphlets by dissenting French libertine, materialist and anticlerical (or at least anti-Catholic) thinkers. His *English Theophrastus* (1702-1708), for example, was a compendium of translations from libertines such as La Rochefoucauld and Saint Évremond, and its title gives a clear indication of Boyer's heterodox and anti-Catholic perspective (Laursen 2002: 42-44).[30] These were even more apparent in his translation into English in 1713, of the radical and anticlerical work by the French author, André-François Boureau Deslandes, entitled *A Philological Essay… Reflections on the death of Free-Thinkers* (1713). The English edition of this volume included four chapters (XVI to XIX) which, the translator notes, "were composed by the Author here in London, and are not to be found in the French edition". The additions included an account of how Henry VIII, on his deathbed, expressed the "utter Abhorrence he had for the monks", who were "a race of vile interested men, contemptible and hateful by their base and lewd morals", and referred to the atheist and materialist philosopher Thomas Hobbes as "one of the greatest wits England ever produced" and "a declared enemy of superstition". Priests, on the other hand, were only "a vast number of men…whose sole business is to forge chimeras and broach erroneous whimsies", although Byer's own note clarifies that "I suppose the author hints here at the Romish priests" (Deslandes, *A Philological Essay*: 99, 101, 105).

Boyer's preface to this work, the *Letter from the translator of the author*, indicates his intention to bring England closer to the example of French free-thinking. He hoped that translating the work might "convince the most incredulous, that there are FREETHINKERS in France as well as in England" (*A Philological Essay*: "Letter"). The preface also puts forward a notion of translation as an intercultural activity which should bring about mutual comprehension and peace. Writing in 1713, shortly before the Treaty of Utrecht between Britain and France, Boyer saw his translation as contributing to "suppressing old animosities". The consolidation of peace between the two nations could best be done by:

admiration, and whose memory will ever live in the records of fame" (*The History of King William the Third*: 2).

[30] Theophrastus, the Greek philosopher, was seen as an atheist *ante litteram*.

> …furnishing them with the means to be better acquainted with each other: for I am perswaded that the more they know, the more they will esteem and value each other; and you know, sir, that from esteem there's but one easie step to friendship. (*A Philological Essay*: "Letter")

Boyer's framing of the text as a means of furthering international understanding can perhaps be seen as an example of how translation can have an inherently cosmopolitan function as a promoter of the recognition and subsequent toleration of difference (see Bielsa 2016).

Matthieu Maty and the *Journal britannique*

The last Huguenot writer and translator we shall look at is Matthieu Maty (1718-1776). Maty was what might be termed a second-generation migrant, born near Utrecht in 1718 of a Huguenot family which fled there from France in 1685. Maty's father, Paul, was a Protestant minister who gave up his pastoral duties to teach in the Hague with Jacques Saurin, one of the editors of the *Bibliothèque Angloise.* Like Jean Le Clerc, Paul Maty subsequently tried to establish himself in England but without success and moved back to Leyden in 1731 or 1732. The young Matthieu, aiming no doubt to develop those intellectual skills which could enable him to embark on a career, attended Leyden university, before moving to London in 1749, taking his parents with him. There he probably met Pierre Desmaizeaux but above all became one of the group of French journalists who gathered at the "Rainbow" café in Marlybone (Janssens 1975: 7-13).

Maty had been a contributor of the *Bibliothèque Britannique* (1733-1747) when it ended production. His involvement in this journal convinced him that there was a market for information on English literature on the continent. Thus Maty set up his own *Journal Britannique* in January 1750, publishing it at The Hague with the printer Henri Scheurleer, who also specialised in selling English books and managing a circulating library. The *Journal Britannique* presented itself, in its original announcement, as a collective enterprise, inviting "tous les savans à aider è le remplire" (Janssens 1975: 54). The *Journal Britannique* was to include:

> Extracts of the chiefest books publish'd in Great Britain and Ireland… likewise any memoirs concerning Literature, or any Subject whatsoever,

> which Gentlemen will be pleas'd to communicate to the Author of this Journal, and if written in English or Latin, they shall be translated into French. (cit. in Janssens 1975: 54)

The announcement also give the names of 69 booksellers in Holland, Belgium, Germany, France, Switzerland, Italy, England, Scotland, and Ireland as proof of the geographical range of its readership. It is estimated that it had a print run of about 500 and a readership predominantly amongst the refugee population in England, Germany and Holland (Janssens 1975: 58).

The *Journal Britannique* required considerable energy on the part of its editor. It came out three times a year, each issue containing four months, with five articles every month, amounting to around 100 pages of copy. As much as two thirds of the material was written by Maty himself, although it had numerous and prestigious contributors such as Samuel Formey and Benjamin Franklin (Janssens 1975: 67). Many of the other contributors would appear to have belonged to the Huguenot diaspora, such as Jean Deschamps, a Huguenot minister educated in Geneva and Marburg where he studied with Christian Wolff, and whom he late translated in *abrégé* form (Janssens 2002: 114); Cesare De Missy, Huguenot minister, scholar and book collector from Berlin; and Jacques Francoise Bernouin, another Huguenot clergyman, attached to the church of Savoy (Janssens 1975: 73-76; Ossa-Richardson 2015).

What were Maty's motives in committing himself to commissioning, editing, translating, and correcting the review every month? One, of course, following Häseler's pragmatic indications, was to earn a living: Maty's biographer Uta Janssens indicates that his publisher, Scheurleer, gave him a lump sum of 70 florins (approximately 8 pounds) for each monthly issue, amounting to around £96 a year (1975: 57). But the preparation of an influential literary periodical was also a stepping stone towards recognition and towards other, more prestigious and more remunerative appointments. On the basis of the work of the first four volumes of the *Journal Britannique*, in fact, Maty was elected to the Royal Society and not long after, in 1756, was appointed Under Librarian of the British Museum. This position, which carried a salary of £100 a year (Janssens 1975: 57), was given to him also in virtue of his linguistic

abilities. His recommendation, from Lord Royston, indicates that he was "extremely well qualified to be one of the Under Librarians, as his knowledge of French will make him very useful, in attending upon Foreigners" (cit. in Janssens 1975: 20).

On his appointment to this position he gave up the editorship of the *Journal Britannique*, which passed in 1755 to a Huguenot clergyman M. de Mauve, in whose hands, however, the review did not flourish (Janssens 1975: 1). Maty remained at the British Museum, first as Under Librarian and subsequently as Chief Librarian until his death in 1776. The post enabled him to extend his personal network also through showing distinguished guests the new collections. His friendship with Edward Gibbon (to whom he gave advice over the publication of his *Essai sur l'Étude de la Littérature* (1761) published in London in French) gave him access to the world of the Parisian salons, and the chance to meet both Voltaire and Rousseau (Janssens 1975: 27). Maty's scientific background (he had trained to become a doctor) led him to promote inoculation against smallpox and to translate into English Charles Marie La Condamine's influential *Discourse on Inoculation* (1755) as well as the *New Observations on Inoculation* (1768) by the principal Italian promoter of inoculation, Angelo Giuseppe Maria Gatti. Maty died in 1776, leaving his collection to the British Museum. His second daughter, Ann, married another English Huguenot, the surgeon and assistant librarian John Obadiah Justamond, subsequently to become known as the translator of Abbé Raynal's *Histoire philosophique des deux mondes* (1770-80) (Harris 2008).

The life and work of Matthieu Maty exemplifies some of the characteristics of Huguenot translators as we have tried to outline it in this chapter. First, through his editing of the *Journal Britannique* and its policy of reviewing and extracting literary works published in London, he was, like other Huguenot editors in Amsterdam before him, a major conduit for English literature and ideas. Second, this activity can be located within a material context of literary and print production, distribution, and sales in which translation, although not fully visible, played an important part. Maty's principal publication, the one which earned him election to the Royal Society, was primarily a compilation of translations from English into French. Unlike the earlier Huguenot translators we have looked at, he

does not appear to have promoted a particularly radical religious or political point of view, espousing, according to Janssens, a consistently moderate Calvinist Christianity (Janssens 1975: 48). Maty and the *Journal Britannique* emerged from the Huguenot environment in Britain, but Maty himself was integrated institutionally and socially into the British elite as a member of the Royal Society and as the librarian of the British Museum. Although part of the establishment, he nevertheless did play a part in promoting new scientific ideas such as inoculation. He also maintained a critical view of absolutist France: along with David Garrick Maty was a strong supporter of Voltaire's denunciation of the execution of Jean Calas, a Protestant who had been convicted of murdering his own son to prevent him converting to Catholicism (Janssens 1975: 33). Finally, his extensive use of Huguenot contacts and networks establishes him too as a cosmopolitan translator, mediating between the francophone world of his family and background and the English scientific environment of mid-eighteenth century London.

Booksellers and printers: an urban milieu for translation

Our focus here has been on translators, highlighting in particular the texts which they translated for publication in book form or as extracts for literary reviews, in an effort to reveal the cosmopolitanism of their activity and the political or religious purposefulness of their translation. These elements are also linked to what we might term the "microgeography" of cosmopolitanism (see Cronin 2006: 15-20), which, although based on transnationalist or even universalist principles, may have a very local geographical basis in terms of production. Unearthing the material context of translation also requires a brief exploration of the local contexts of bookselling and printing. In London, for example, Huguenot booksellers often doubled as printing shops where editing, printing, bookselling, and no doubt also translation, could occur in the same space. In the period from 1685 to 1720, at least, they were grouped in particular in the area of the Strand, mainly because of the proximity to the French Church in the Savoy, located in the Savoy Palace, which had been used by the Huguenot community in London since 1661 but significantly enlarged after the Revocation. The Savoy Palace was not only a church – it housed also artisan workshops, a small prison and a printing press, and was generally

perceived as a haven for the French refugees. Booksellers were therefore setting up in an area near the principal religious meeting place where there was a significant community of French Huguenot immigrants like themselves, many of whom would have appreciated access to books in French. The term "French bookseller", in fact, in the eighteenth century, referred to the language of the books sold, not to the nationality of the seller (Swift 1990: 123-129).

Another example of a cosmopolitan Huguenot bookseller in this period, this time in The Hague rather than London, was Prosper Marchand (1678-1756). Until 1698 a bookseller in Paris, he joined the Protestant church and went into voluntary exile in the Low Countries in 1710, remaining in The Hague until his death in 1756 (Berkvens-Stevelinck 1987: 1-6). Starting as a proof-reader and corrector, he was primarily involved in bookselling, which was for some time his primary income. Subsequently, thanks to the way in which he cultivated his contacts, he and many of his contemporaries such as Charles de la Motte became real literary agents: "they placed manuscripts, negotiated terms and provided a link between the *libraire* and the author" (Goldgar 1995: 36). As a bookseller, Marchand was also involved in managing reviews such as the *Bibliothèque Britannique* (1740-1750) (Berkvens-Stevelinck 1987: 72) which on many occasions, as we have seen, included long reviews based on substantial extracts, in translation, of the books being discussed. On some occasions, he even intervened in translations: he added, for example, to the French title of Elize Haywood's *Anti-Pamela*, a satire on Samuel Richardson's *Pamela*, the subtitle "ou le vice puni", mirroring Richardson's own subtitle, "or Virtue rewarded" (Berkvens-Stevelinck 1987: 121).

These, then, were the very specific urban contexts of the Huguenot community. We have here, in Anthony Pym's terms, examples of areas of cities which in fact constitute intercultural borderlands (1998: 105), places "in which strangers are likely to meet" (Sennett: 1977: 48). The history of ideas and, in this case, translation, can only profit from an exploration of the specific conditions under which these actors worked, enhancing our understanding of the material contexts of the transmission of ideas.

A full description of translation includes an exploration of the social and material setting in which the translators were operating, "tracing the

movements" in the words of Anthony Pym (2009: 36) of the material conditions of the production of translations, in this case, the intricate mixture of competences, from writing, editing, translating, proofing, typesetting, printing, and bookselling all present in the production of literary reviews and books in this period (Eisenstein 2005: 114). This will help us recognize, as Margaret Jacob argues, "the vibrancy of civil society in the urban centres of northern and western Europe and regard it as critical in permitting the Enlightenment to become, not texts read in isolation, but a movement" (2017: 54).

The translations of the Huguenots in London and elsewhere in the period after 1685 can thus usefully be looked at according to three distinct but interrelated perspectives: the material and economic contexts of the religious refugees who had left homes and land in France and who had to rely on their ingenuity and linguistic competence to make a living; their desire to sustain and promote the religious ideas for which they had suffered persecution, alongside their hostility to the Catholic church and the absolutist regime which had persecuted them; and their status as intermediaries connecting the vibrant cultural and scientific urban environment of late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century London, with the principally francophone printing and bookselling world in Europe, particularly in the Dutch Republic. As such, the Huguenots and their activity as translators constituted a crucial link between the heterodox political and religious ideas circulating on the periphery of Catholic and absolutist France and the Williamite Protestant regime in England and its consolidation in the first half of the eighteenth century. They also provided a bridge between the early radicalism of religious dissent in France and the radical enlightenment as it evolved in the middle of the century, to which we will turn in the next chapter.

3. Translating the Radical Enlightenment

Translation has begun to receive specific attention on the part of Enlightenment scholarship only recently. The Enlightenment is in all accounts a movement which involved, to a greater or lesser extent, writers and thinkers in a number of different countries, and the reciprocal influences of these thinkers is recognized as crucial to our understanding of its development. Much work has been carried out on bringing to light these influences (see for example Robertson 1997, 2005; Hammersley 2010a), but the question of the specific languages in which these influences were articulated has not been fully explored. Translation is also clearly important for attempts to evaluate the impact of enlightenment thinking on monolingual readers (Munck 2000: 4). Despite these premises, translation as a specific focus of attention has only emerged clearly in the work of Fania Oz-Salzberger (1995, 2006, 2014).

Oz-Salzberger first notes that translation was a key component of some of the fundamental work of pillars of Enlightenment thought, from Voltaire's summaries of the work of Locke and others in his *Lettres philosophiques* (1734), Kant's reading of Hume in a German translation, and Herder's discovery of Ossian in Macpherson's pseudotranslation (Oz-Salzberger 2014: 53). But the reliance of the cross-flow of European Enlightenment thought on translation went far deeper than the reading or adapations of these well-known figures: "some thousands of relatively obscure translators worked in dozens of cities and towns, performing the

mass of Europe's growing translation industry" (Oz-Salzberger 2014: 53). She observes, moreover, that this was the first time that a cosmopolitan conversation was taking place not in a universal language (Latin) but substantially in two languages: French, "Europe's almost unrivalled lingua franca," and English, "a newcomer to the cosmopolitan scene" (2014: 48-49; 50).

We have looked at some Huguenot translators, lesser-known figures associated with the early phase of the Enlightenment, in the first chapter. Oz-Salzberger recognizes that the Dutch Republic was "a hub of multilingual translation for over a century before the Enlightenment" and "a pioneer of vernacular publishing" (2014: 53) in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, and that this tradition constituted an important basis for translation in the later period. In what follows, we will concentrate attention on some writers who were translating during the Enlightenment as part of a radical agenda. In particular, we will look in more detail at d'Holbach's translations of English deists and materialists, at the relevance of translation to those in the close circle of d'Holbach's friends and collaborators known as his "coterie", at some examples of translation in the field of economics, and finally briefly at the translations of two German writers, Johann Reinhold and Georg Forster. Our exploration will not make any general claims about the status of translation for the Enlightenment. But it is important to discuss briefly how a focus on translation fits within more general perspectives on the Enlightenment and the way that these perspectives have changed.

First, it is worth repeating that, for such a transnational movement, it is surprising that role of translation has not been given the attention that it deserves. This may be due to the established view of the Enlightenment as constituting essentially an educated conversation amongst an essentially plurilingual (or at least francophone) elite. Recent work, however, has begun to widen attention to include the "social" history of the movement (see, for example, Munck 2000), the Enlightenment in the "peripheries" of Europe (see for example Butterwick and Davies 2008), and the ways in which the process of Enlightenment involved not only a literate debate centered on libraries, salons and academies but also practices such as scientific demonstrations, masonic meetings and others (Jacob 2017), often involving a broader and sometimes monolingual readership. These

shifts in attention clearly bring with them a need to put translation in greater focus. Thus for Lawrence Kontler:

> ...the proliferation of translations is the symptom of the peculiar 'social geography' of the eighteenth century: a 'democracy of letters' emerged in which an increasingly impressive number of people could read, but only one language, and thus translations from French into other languages mark the points where Enlightenment texts reached readers beyond Europe's francophone elites. (Kontler 2006: 364)

Second, we may reflect upon the role of translation and the growth of national cultures in the period of the Enlightenment. Translation, it has been argued, was becoming a medium through which "a new linguistic self-awareness and cultural nationalism" could emerge (Kontler 2006: 362), an argument which can be linked to the notions of "domestication" and "foreignization" in translation theorized by Antoine Berman (1984) and Lawrence Venuti (1995: 19-20). However, our discussion here goes in a contrary direction, and will look at the ways in which translation could not only usher in linguistic self-awareness, but also paradoxically foster a sense of transnational solidarity. It will thus prioritize a view of the Enlightenment as having an important transnational and cosmopolitan impulse, over and above the "national contexts" which, since Porter and Teich's important collection (1981), have constituted an alternative focus of attention.[1] Their redirecting of Enlightenment studies to national contexts has given important results in terms of rooting shared Enlightenment concepts in concrete local and national realities (see, for example, Porter 2000; Broadie 2001; Brown 2016), but the transnational dimension of Enlightenment thought cannot be obscured, and we should avoid, as Jonathan Israel suggests, "the deadly compulsion to squeeze the Enlightenment … into the constricting straight-jacket of 'national history'" (Israel 2001: vii).[2]

[1] It should be said that some of the essays in the collection highlight the role of translation as an important ingredient of the development of Enlightenment thought in the single countries, for example, in the reception of Cesare Beccaria and Lodovico Muratori in German cities (Blanning 1981: 121) and Montesquieu in Naples (Chadwick 1981: 93).

[2] John Robertson has similarly seen dangers in the "Enlightenment in national

A third perspective on the role of translation in the Enlightenment is more complex and linked to the idea of an "original" and its subsequent modifcation in a translation. Our exploration of Huguenot translators in the first chapter, and our perspective on translation in the Enlightenment and revolutionary period in the next chapters, seeks to prioritize a view of the synchronic circulation of different writings in French and English, all associated with radical and dissenting ideas. I have tried to avoid the notion that these ideas have clear and defined "origins" and with this a diachronic perspective which leads us to attempt to trace texts and translators back to supposed roots. The common perception of the Enlightenment as originating in the thoughts and writings of a small number of innovative figures and subsequently progressively spreading first to the peripheries of Europe and then to the non-European world has been contested by those emphasising instead the Enlightenment's social character (Munck 2000), its strong presence in the peripheries of Europe as we have already mentioned, or its location in a culture of sociability (Gordon 1994; Goodman 1994). As Sebastian Conrad has pointed out, the tendency for historians of ideas to read "the history of knowledge as a script that is written in one place and then adopted and adapted in another" ignores or downgrades the importance of the reading and reception of texts. He argues, instead, that if we are to appreciate the Enlightenment fully in its global historical terms, historians "should not be concerned primarily with origins" but instead on "moments of articulation and invention" and that "these moments need to be understood in their constellations of global synchronicity" (2012: 1025, 1027). One example of this synchronicity was the meeting between d'Holbach and proponents of English atheism and materialism in the

context" approach as it "it deflects attention from the international connections of the Enlightenment, fragmenting the movement as a whole" and that "Enlightenment is better understood as an intellectual movement which was both cosmopolitan and patriotic" (1997: 667). Elsewhere, he stresses the need to direct attention not to the idea of nations (in any case weak in this period) but instead to provincial cities as the most appropriate ambit of research (2005: 21-23). See also Eisenstein, for whom the exploration of geographies of the Enlightenment "will be perpetually frustrated … if our inquiries are circumscribed by the boundaries of nineteenth-century nation-states" (1992: 101), and for a more general treatment, Withers (2007).

1760s and 1770s, as testified by his attempt to make this tradition better known to a French readership through translation. This points to a circularity of ideas and the need to explore the synchronic context of reading, adaptation and translation rather than limit our enquiry to the search for intellectual origins.

Jonathan Israel's recent work on the Radical Enlightenment leads us to a fourth point relating to translation. His assumption of the essential unicity of a Radical Enlightenment strongly tied to materialism and atheism and originating in the "one substance" philosophy of Baruch Spinoza[3] leads him to trace its manifestations both diachronically, from the late seventeenth century to the American Revolution, and synchronically in a wide European and extra-European perspective.[4] His approach, although certainly open to the charge of oversimplification, may be useful here for two reasons. First, tracing the ways in which this basic radical premise is articulated throughout Europe in a transnational pespective gives a specific and important role to translation. The Radical Enlightenment in his reading is a pan-European phenomenon involving a wide number of philosophers and writers in a number of different countries, often influencing each other through reading texts in translation. Second, his dichotomy between two different and opposing forms of Enlightenment thought, one "radical" and one "moderate", provides a template for focusing on those figures who had a specifically

[3] Spinoza held that mind and matter were of one substance, and this implied that matter was self-moving and that the natural world could not have been the result of a "prime mover". The negation of any form of divine intervention in the natural or human world became, for Israel, the principal philosophical corner-stone for the subsequent radical Enlightenment materialism and atheism (2001: 230-231).

[4] Israel's work has an impressive chronological and geographical scope. His first book on the subject, *Radical Enlightenment. Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750* (2001), significantly put forward the late seventeenth century as a starting point of the Enlightenment, and he has traced its principal characteristics as far forward as the nineteenth century in one of his recent works (*The Expanding Blaze. How the American Revolution Ignited the World, 1775-1848* (2017). His early work (2001) focused on the Dutch Republic and France but surveyed developments also in Spain and Portugal, Germany, the Baltic and Italy. His later volumes (2006, 2012), have chapters also on the Americas, the Dutch East Indies, China, India, and Russia.

radical agenda. Radicalism in the Enlightenment had been, in the words of one commentator "the *differentia specifica* of the movement as a whole" but in Israel's approach is circumscribed and limited to the work of "a fascinating and influential iconoclastic minority" (Kontler 2006: 361). His dichotomy, in other words, enables us to focus on this minority and the ways they looked to translation as a means of promoting, in one way or other, radical political and philosophical solutions. One of these figures was Baron d'Holbach.

Baron d'Holbach's translations of English atheists and materialists

In the period 1766-1773, as we saw in the introduction, Paul Henri Thiry, known as Baron d'Holbach (1723-1789), the materialist philosopher and contributor to the *Encyclopédie*, translated and published a number of anticlerical or materialist works by English deists, atheists, and freethinkers of the early eighteenth century, such as John Toland, Anthony Collins, John Trenchard, and Thomas Gordon, publishing them alongside his own principal contribution to Enlightenment thought, *Système de la nature* (1770). Together they consisted in an unprecedented attack on religious and political orthodoxy, as well as on hierarchical values in religion and politics. Some of the titles of these works in their French translation give a sense of their polemical, anticlerical, and anti-religious nature: *La Contagion sacrée ou Histoire naturelle de le superstition* (1768), *Les Prêtres démasqués, ou des iniquités du clergé chrétien* (1768), *De la cruauté religeuse* (1769), *L'Enfer détruit* (1769), and so on. This flurry of translations culminated in the publication in French of Thomas Hobbes' materialist work *De la nature humaine* in 1773 (originally *Elements of Law, Natural and Politic*, first published in 1640).[5]

Mladen Kozul (2010, 2016) has recently published extensive research into the translations carried out by d'Holbach and his collaborators. This

[5] For discussions of these translations, see above all the recent work by Kozul (2016), but also the following: Wickwar (1968: 74-77); Kors (1976: 83-83); Sandrier (2004: 294-329); Hammersley (2010a: 125-129); Kozul (2010); Curran (2012); and Leech (2020). Vercruysse (1971) remains the fullest descriptive bibliography of d'Holbach's writings

work fills a major gap in studies on d'Holbach himself, on the radical enlightenment, and on the Parisian milieu in which the translations were produced and read (although not published – along with many other works of the French enlightenment they had to be published abroad, in this case in Amsterdam[6]). Kozul demonstrates the extent to which translation was not peripheral but instead central to Baron d'Holbach's entire work as an enlightenment intellectual. Moving beyond Alain Sandrier's exploration of d'Holbach's "style philosophique" (2004), which is somewhat unquestioning about the division of d'Holbach's work into original writings, collections, and translation,[7] Kozul sees translation as pervading all d'Holbach's work, and not limited to this intense activity of translating radical materialists texts.

This emerges also from the fact that d'Holbach had been an active translator for some time before embarking on his translations of English radicals. Early translations, for example, included the long poem by his former schoolmate at Leyden, Mark Akenside, *Pleasures of the Imagination* (1754), and Jonathan Swift's *History of the Reign of Queen Anne* (1765), which introduced him to the religious and political disputes of early eighteenth-century England (Wickwar 1968: 18, 63, 74). Between 1752 and 1771 he also published 11 translations of significant scientific treatises from German into French,[8] to the extent that d'Holbach's collaborator, Jacques-André Naigeon, claimed in his obituary that:

> . . it is to him that we owe to a very large extent the rapid advances made by natural history and chemistry amongst us some thirty years ago; . . . it is he who translated the excellent works which the Germans had published

[6] For the importance to the French Enlightenment of the clandestine trade in books printed abroad and subsequently imported into France, see the work of Robert Darnton, in particular *The Forbidden Best-Sellers of Pre-Revolutionary France* (1996).

[7] In this Sandrier follows the categorization of Vercruysse (1971) into original works, works written in collaboration, translations, and edited works.

[8] The last scientific text is the *Traité des sels* (1771), which Kozul puts forward for the first time as a translation by d'Holbach or his collaborators (2016: 260). According to the attributions of Vercruysse (1971: vi), his translation of scientific texts ended in 1760 with the translation of *Pyritologie*.

> on these sciences - sciences that were then almost unknown, or at least very much neglected . . . (cit. in Wickwar 1968: 49).

It may be useful here to point out that the translations of English radical texts were not only often "pseudo-translations" (Toury 1995: 48-59), adaptations or reworkings. Kozul's analysis, in fact, includes translations tout court (as in the translation of Hobbes), but also summaries, interpolations, paratexts (notes, prefaces), rewritings, substitutions and so on, as well as "original" texts which were in effect translations published anonymously or under false or imaginary names (Kozul 2010: 281; 2016: 261-262).

Other work by d'Holbach, although considered original, was also, it might be argued, based on translation in the broad sense of work in one language heavily dependent on texts originally published in another. His collaboration with Diderot on the *Encyclopédie* consisted of the contribution of a large number of articles on mineralogy and geology, many of which were heavily based on his knowledge of German texts, and which dovetailed with his published translations in this area (Kozul 2016: 59-77). Even his best-known work, *Système de la nature*, on which his reputation as a philosopher rests, was closely reliant on John Toland's *Letters to Serena*, originally published in English in 1704 and which appeared in d'Holbach's translation in 1768. The fourth chapter of *Système de la nature*, entitled "Des loix du mouvement communes à tous les êtres de la nature", follows Spinoza in putting forward the notion of matter as inherently self-moving and closely resembles Toland's fifth letter which bears the title "Motion is essential to matter; in answer to some remarks by a noble friend on the confutation of Spinosa" (Toland, *Letters to Serena*).

D'Holbach's philosophical materialism customarily awards him a small but significant niche in histories of the Enlightenment (see for example, Cassirer 1979 [1932]: 69-73). An appreciation of his work as a translator, instead, allows a different, more rounded figure to emerge, one central to the propagation of a general and shared transnational philosophical radicalism based on a materialist and free-thinking philosophy enunciated forcefully also in England at an earlier period, as well as a figure constituting a crucial link, through his knowledge of German and his

scientific background, with German scientific exploration. Important in this appreciation is his collective method of work. As Alain Kors (1976) put forward some time ago, the importance of Baron d'Holbach is to be found not so much in his individual contribution as in the sum of relations and collaborations (to which we can now add translations) that he forged. It should not be forgotten, in fact, that the philosophical translations were, to some extent, a collaborative act. They involved translation, on his part, but reliance on Naigeon for revision, possibly Naigeon's brother as courier taking the texts for publication abroad, and the Amsterdam publisher Marc-Michel Rey (Wickwar 1968: 83-83).[9] Collaboration and working in networks, we may add, has been seen by some to constitute a particular characteristic of the way that translators working in radical contexts (Tymoczko 2010c: 230).

We may pause for a moment, at this point, to consider the issue of anonymity in d'Holbach's translations. None of the translations attributed to him posthumously or, indeed, even his *Système de la Nature* bore his own signature. The *Système*, for example, purported to be a posthumous publication of a work by Jean-Baptiste Mirabaud, former secretary of the Académie Française, and the real authorship was only disclosed after d'Holbach's death in 1789 (Vercruysse 1971: 16).[10]

What was the function of this anonymity, this example of the invisibility of the translator pushed to extremes? One obvious answer relates to the specific need of both authors and translators to avoid persecution by the authorities. In some cases, this anonymity was substantially pro-forma. It was well known, for example, that Abbé Raynal was the principal author of the *Histoire philosophique des deux Indes* (1770-1780), but the authorities only moved against the author of this forbidden work when, in 1780, a Geneva edition made this explicit, publishing it with the portrait of the Abbé himself (Kors 1976: 228). Voltaire's

[9] For the figure of Marc-Michel Rey, the "very embodiment of the cosmopolitan libraire-philosophe", publisher not only of d'Holbach but also of Rousseau, Voltaire and Marat, and whose trade network extended as far as Russia and Dutch colonies overseas, see Eisenstein (1992: 118-128).

[10] Vercruysse's annotated bibliography dedicates a whole chapter to the history of the attribution of work to d'Holbach (1971: 15-30). Mladen Kozul has argued for some new attributions (2016: 71-75).

anonymity, too, could sometimes be more tactical than real (Kozul 2016: 248). D'Holbach, on the other hand, retained his invisibility as an author as well as a translator, right up until his death.[11]

Kozul's work on authorship and anonymity in d'Holbach's work, however (2016), puts forward another, complementary explanation. Anonymity or the use of the names of authors long dead (either Jean Baptiste Mirabaud or English philosophers of a previous period in the case of the translations), as well as the indication that the texts were translated from English, he argues, was geared not only to the avoidance of arrest but also to the promotion of the notion of a sort of general consensus regarding the radical materialist and anticlerical ideas that were flooding the market. The intent was to promote a sort of "lumières imaginaires", a shared space in which radical and materialist ideas could be perceived as widely accepted on a European scale (2016: 4; 12).

In this reading, the movement of dissent promotes itself as a generalized European counter-consensus, and not simply the work of individuals. The visibility of the author or translator gives way to the polemical and purposeful nature of dissent and protest. The overriding importance is the work itself, the translation or the utterance, and its effects; the focus is on the act and the reader, and not the author or translator. D'Holbach's intent, we may assume, was to inundate France (and thus francophone Europe) with a series of pamphlets and publications which, taken together, were to form a concentrated attack on the philosophical underpinnings of clerical and authoritarian regimes such as the France of Louis XV, not to secure his own position in a posthumous Enlightenment canon. Mona Baker (2015: 2) has found a similar urgency and sense of purpose, and a similar notion of translation as a collective,

[11] For Kors, the authorship of the *Système de la nature* was, at least amongst d'Holbach's immediate circle, an open secret. Abbé Morellet's opinion was that "a good many of us know, beyond any doubt, that these works were the Baron's, whose principles and conversation we found in this book. I can say that at least, as we later admitted, we were deeply convinced of it, Marmontel, Saint-Lambert, Suard, Chastellux, Roux, Darcet, Raynal, Helvétius and I. We lived constantly together, and, before the Baron's death, not one of us confided to the other our knowledge of this point, although each certainly thought that the other knew as well" (cit. in Kors 1976: 84).

rather than individual, activity in the protests of the Egyptian revolution and the need to describe these protests to the outside world. The translator's voice and visibility or invisibility, in short, can be a function of the specific communicative and political context in which translation takes place.

A further explanation put forward by Kozul leads us back to the question of translation and cosmopolitanism. It is surely significant that the major atheistic impulse of the French Enlightenment was heavily reliant on translation and that the anonymous assault on theistic orthodoxy was articulated through translations of texts which originally appeared in a foreign language. In a period of pervasive "anglomania" in France (Grieder 1985), the indication "traduit de l'anglais", Kozul argues, was a crucial legitimating signature (2016: 4). This "anglomania", moreover, was even stronger in relation to radical ideas or invocations of other political systems such as that of England whose freedom was held up in stark contrast to French absolutism, as in the case of Voltaire's *Lettres philosophiques* (1734) and Montesquieu's *L'esprit des lois* (1748), both of which were directly influenced by English thought (Israel 2006: 356-58).[12] It was, for example, the foreign origin of the texts and the ideas expressed in the *Système de la nature* which constituted, for the state censor, Antoine Lois Séguier, a principal motive for their prohibition – the "fureur impie de nos propres écrivains" being reinforced by a "commerce de poison avec l'étranger" (cit. in Kozul 2016: 13). In short, d'Holbach's translations constituted a deliberate attempt to indicate the foreign, English origins of the texts and the ideas that were expressed in them, and to promote, in France, a Radical Enlightenment which had significant proponents in the more liberal Anglican and latitudinarian context of Protestant England (Wickwar 1968: 73). We may also note that this appeal to the legitimacy of foreign ideas appears to be taken forward almost entirely by this initial framing ("traduit de l'anglais") and not by any "foreignizing" textual strategy. Little trace of the English language originals can be found in the

[12] Margaret Jacob (1981, 2017) has stressed more generally the particular importance of English texts for the radical enlightenment. For Wickwar (1968: 72), "England seems … to have played almost as important a part in [d'Holbach's] evolution as in that of Voltaire or Montesquieu a generation earlier."

published translations (Kozul 2016: 37-40), which, in terms of their language, are paragons of domestication.[13] In this case, then, the openness to other cultures of a translation rests on this framing rather than traces of the foreign in the texts themselves.

Abbé Morellet, Jean-Baptiste Suard, and d'Holbach's "coterie"

Translation was a constant interest not only for d'Holbach but also for a number of those who attended the Baron's weekly salon in the period 1750-1780, the Parisian hub of erudite radical Enlightened opinion. Among d'Holbach's closest friends and collaborators was Denis Diderot (1713-1784), also, at least at an earlier date, an active translator. Diderot had actually begun his work as a translator from English, first of Temple Stanyan's G*recian History* (1707) and subsequently of the English philosopher, the third Earl of Shaftesbury's *Inquiry Concerning Virtue* (1699), for many years a key text in English Whig philosophy and aesthetics, published in French in 1745 (Furbank 1992: 18, 25; Israel 2006: 785; Robb 1991). Diderot's biographer, P.N. Furbank, notes that he translated Shaftesbury's text "pretty freely, adding his own interjections and digressions" to the extent that the French version could be classed as "original work in the margins of another's text" (1992: 25). His own involvement in the *Encyclopédie* began in 1745 when the bookseller André François Le Breton launched a plan to bring out a French language version of Chambers' *Cyclopedia, or universal dictionary of the arts and sciences* (1728). This was envisaged first as a translation, subsequently as an expansion and rewriting in French and finally became an authentic French production, for which first Jean Baptiste Le Rond d'Alembert and subsequently Diderot were engaged as editors. Diderot argued in the *Prospectus* that to bring out a simple translation would be to "excite the indignation of scholars and protests from the public, who would be receiving, under a new and pretentious title, riches that had already been in their possession for many years past" (Furbank 1992: 36).

Other members of d'Holbach's unofficial "coterie" also distinguished themselves as translators. Nicolas La Grange, tutor to d'Holbach's children, translated the *Works* of Seneca (Furbank 1992: 404). Friedrich

[13] Kozul uses the term "annexant" rather than domesticating (2016: 37-40).

Melchior Grimm, the author of the *Correspondance Littéraire* (1750-1790) which documented the literary and philosophical world of the Paris salons, was also a translator, for example of works by Carlo Goldoni (Furbank 1992: 183). Augustin Roux, a younger member of d'Holbach's "coterie" collaborated with d'Holbach on his scientific translations (Hunter 1925: 113-114; Kors 1976: 175-193). Particularly associated with translation, however, are Abbé Morellet and Jean-Baptiste Suard.

Abbé Morellet (1727-1819), another frequenter of d'Holbach's circle, is known in particular for his translations of works spreading radical and dissenting ideas to a public eager to challenge accepted orthodoxies. His first published translation was of a Latin text which he had found when in Rome attending the Papal Conclave of 1758, the *Manuel des inquisiteurs, à l'usage des inquisitions d'Espagne & de Portugal*, by Nicolas Eyméric, originally published in 1358, and translated by Morellet in 1762.The intention was to publicise the iniquitous activity of the Inquisition in a period in which it was still active in Spain and Portugal and to provoke the reader's indignation. The volume was welcomed as such by figures such as Frederick the Great and Voltaire, who suggested that it should be translated into Castillian and Portuguese (Medlin 1978: 190-192).[14] Morellet also translated several articles by Benjamin Franklin, the American ambassador to Paris from 1766 to1785, as well as a letter to his daughter denouncing the possibility of the birth of an aristocratic military order, the Society of the Cincinnati, which we will look at in the next chapter (Medlin 1978: 199). His activity as a translator also included a collaboration with the Italian doctor, Angelo Giuseppe Maria Gatti as part of a campaign to support innoculation, whose work was also translated into English, as we have seen, by Matthieu Maty in London. A first work was entitled *Réflexions sur les préjugés qui s'opposent aux progress et la perfection de l'inoculation* (Bruxelles, 1764).[15] Once again, this was not a translation in the sense of the transformation of one text into its twin in another language but a process of writing up, in one language, notes and comments or conversations made in another (the original Italian version of this text, in fact, was never published). Morellet comments:

[14] In fact, a Spanish edition was published only in 1819 (Medlin 1978: 192).

[15] Innoculation had been officially suspended in France in 1763 (Medlin 1978: 192).

> Je recueillais les notes qu'il me dictait en italien, ou qu'il m'envoyait en brouillons; je les traduisais, je les développais, et surtout, je les arrangeais pour en faire un tout à ma manière. (cit. in Medlin 1978: 192)

This was followed, three years later, by another collaborative work with Gatti, *Nouvelles réflexions sur la pratique de l'inoculation* (1767), also subsequently translated into English (as we saw in Chapter Two) by Maty and into German and Italian (Medlin 1978: 192-193). The process of these translations, as Kozul made clear in the case of d'Holbach's anonymous translations of English free-thinkers, makes any attribution of authorial status, originals and translations a complex and arguably fatuous as they are collaborative works from the beginning. We may also note that Morellet was operating in a context determined above all by political or ideologial considerations, rather than financial gain: Morellet declared that he had no benefits from the translation except from the honour of being the "l'organe des idées fortes et grandes, et des sentimens de bienfaisance" (cit. in Medlin 1978: 198-199).

This comment was made in a letter to the Italian jurist and philosopher Cesare Beccaria, whose work *Dei delitti delle pene*, first published in Leghorn in 1764, was translated by Morellet into French in 1766, and it is this translation for which Morellet is best known. It was Morellet's translation, in fact, that made the text "the most sensational literary success of the age" (Israel 2012: 340), also because it formed the basis not only of many other translations, for example into German and Swedish, but even for subsequent Italian editions (Tonin 2011: 43). Morellet's translation of Beccaria consisted in a radical reordering of the original text, changing the order of chapters, combining chapters together in order to make the text, as Morellet writes in the preface, "plus utile à notre Nation, en lui donnant une forme plus analogue à celle qui nous est familière" (cit. in Medlin 1978: 196).[16] Beccaria himself not only

[16] The number of paragraphs of the text decreased from 45 in the third Italian edition to 42 in Morellet's translation. Ten were moved without alteration, but all the others were modified in some way. Morellet also added an entirely new chapter (XXVI), on "Crimes de lèse majesté" (Tabet 2017: 131). For a detailed analysis of five translations

acquiesced in these changes in the all-important French edition but assured Morellet that in future Italian editions "mi conformerò in tutto, a quasi tutto, al nuovo ordine, che rende più luminose, più chiare le verità poste nel mio libro" (cit. in Medlin 1978: 196). Interestingly, this strong "domestication" strategy, making the text conform to accepted characteristics and a more familiar form, was justified by an appeal to the contrary principle of cosmopolitanism. Morellet argued that the translation of a book which pleaded "si éloquemment la cause de l'Humanité" was not the property of any single culture but instead "appartient désormais au Monde et à toutes les Nations" (cit. in Medlin 1978: 193).

The "coterie" of d'Holbach also functioned as a vehicle for the translation of Beccaria's work into English. Another guest in this period was the English radical journalist and politician, John Wilkes, in exile in France from 1763 to 1768 fleeing accusations of libel (Rudé 1962: 35-36; Thomas 2008; Loretelli 2017: 13-18). At d'Holbach's salon, Wilkes came into contact with Diderot and began translating Nicholas Boulanger's *Recherches sur l'origine du despotisme oriental* (1761) which had been published posthumously by d'Holbach with the help of Diderot himself on the basis of Boulanger's manuscripts (Israel 2012: 132). This work, which Israel describes as "the most comprehensively subversive underground publication to appear yet" (2012: 132) was not only an attack on the Church and the existing political order but also was a "concerted assault also on the imperial structures of Asia and the Americas" (2012: 133). On his return to England, Wilkes published the volume first in French at his own private printing press and subsequently also in English with the modified title *The Origin and Progress of despotism. In the oriental and other empires of Africa, Europe and America* (1764). In d'Holbach's salon, Wilkes also met Morellet and the Milanese writer Alessandro Verri, a collaborator together with his brother Pietro, with

of Beccaria's work into French, see Audegean (2017). I am grateful to Francesca Piselli for these references. Raffaella Tonin (2017) has undertaken a careful comparison of the translations of Beccaria's work into Spanish in the versions of Juan Antonio de las Casas (1774) and Juan Rivera (1821).

Beccaria,[17] and through them became acquainted with Beccaria's work, which he decided to translate and publish in England on his return (Loretelli 2017). Wilkes was assisted in this publication by the radical bookseller and publisher John Almon, "the most distinguished bookseller of the Whig party", and by another London publisher, this time the Italian collaborator and correspondent of Alessandro Verri, Pietro Molini (Loretelli 2017: 2-5; 13).[18]

The diffusion in English and French of this crucial text in the Radical Enlightenment, then, one which had an important impact on figures such as David Hume (Israel 2012: 339) as well as on founding fathers of the American Republic such as Thomas Jefferson and John Adams (Loretelli 2017: 1), is directly traceable to the network of radical journalists and writers who congregated in d'Holbach's salon. As Rosamaria Loretelli concludes, the story of the translation of Beccaria into English is not only a textual one: it is evidence of a radical cosmopolitan network connecting London to Paris and Tuscany, and shows a prominent English radical "in a milieu unusual for his British historians, seeing him through the lenses of enlightenment philosophes during his long Parisian exile" (2017: 22).

Another member of d'Holbach's coterie closely associated with translation was Jean-Baptiste Suard (1732-1817). Although not a prominent writer himself, Suard made his reputation through journalism and translation, eventually being rewarded with election to the Académie Française in 1774. In his youth, Suard had met Abbé Raynal, friend and associate of Denis Diderot and co-author with Diderot of one of the radical best-sellers of the Enlightenment, the *Histoire philosophique des deux Indes* (1770) (Furbank 1992: 415-418).[19] Raynal adopted Suard as his protégé and encouraged him to learn English given the growing importance of English literature in France. Suard was first involved in editing two reviews, first the *Journal étranger* and later the *Gazette*

[17] For Israel, Beccaria's *Dei delitti e delle pene* was "the fruit of intensive group dialogue" between the three (2012: 338).

[18] Although Molini may have helped in the translation from Italian, the borrowings from Morellet's French edition make it likely that the English translator worked with this version (Loretelli 2017: 19).

[19] Raynal's *Histoire* was translated into English by Matthieu Maty's son-in-law J.O. Justamond (see above p. 55).

littéraire, both of which aimed to present material first published in English journals to a French readership through translation of extracts and summaries (Gordon 1994: 146; Hunter 1925: 25-50)[20]. In September 1760, for example, the *Journal étranger* published the first translation into French of two extracts from the Ossian epic poem cycle which had appeared in the same year in England (purporting to be the translations of ancient Gallic by James Macpherson but in reality written by Macpherson himself), translated into French by Ann-Robert-Jacques Turgot (1727-1781), enlightenment economist, reformer and friend of Abbé Morellet, later to become the Contrôleur Général des Finances under Louis XV (Gordon 1994: 146-148).

Robert Darnton has seen Suard as a "representative *philosophe* of the High Enlightenment" (1971: 82) which he distinguishes from the "low-life of literature" version as highly integrated into the conservative power structures of the last years of the *ancien régime*. Despite the fact that Suard was undoubtedly a conservative figure (Israel 2012: 900), Daniel Gordon has made a case for Suard's centrality in terms of the creation of a "sociability" which, he argues, played an important part in oppositional thought in this period.

In this perspective, the translations that Suard chose to undertake can also perhaps be included as part of a radical agenda. Suard was, for example, the recognized translator of Scottish Enlightenment and Romanticism. He too published translations of Ossian in extracted form in his *Journal étranger*, William Robertson's *History of the Reign of Charles V* (published in English in 1766, and in French translation in 1771), as well as David Hume's essays and his autobiographical "My Life."[21] If none

[20] Hunter (1925: 52-71) provides a comprehensive list of the English works reviewed in the *Journal étranger* and the *Gazette littéraire*.

[21] Dominique-Joseph Garat's *Mémoires Historiques sur la vie de M. Suard* (1820, vol. 2) mentions the possibility that Suard also translated the early eighteenth-century rationalist philosopher, pamphleteer and opponent of Whig corruption, Henry St John Bolinbroke. Garat also provides an interesting vignette of Suard as an intepreter for the English actor David Garrick when performing informally in the Parisian salons: "Les succès de Garrick dans les salons de Paris prouvent peut-être mieux encore l'éminence de ses talents que sur les theâtres de Londres. … Garrick, sans attendre que le désir devint une prière, seul et environné des visages qui touchaient presque le sien,

of these can be considered radical texts in the conventional meaning of the term, Gordon points out that the works defended and promoted ideals of sociability which were outside the reach of politics and thus, from this perspective, oppositional.[22] Suard's comment on the translations of Ossian, for example, stressed the progress of humanity from a state of "barbarism" towards one of "civilisation"; his translation of Robertson legitimated the sphere of commerce and the growth of urban centres as hubs of civilization; his translation of Hume's conservative essays highlighted the autonomy of civil "refinement" in a space outside the political sphere (Gordon 1994: 137-176).[23] Suard was also a strong supporter of public opinion as something "more powerful than the public force charged with the execution of the laws" and as such an important element in radical thought, although in the subsequent revolutionary climate, as Gordon notes, "Suard's urbanity, to make an understatement, was no longer progressive" (1994: 173, 175).

jouait les plus grandes scènes du théâtre anglais. … La seule precaution prise parmi tant de spectateurs qui n'entendaient pas assez vite l'anglais dans la rapidité du débit dramatique, était des traductions faites à l'instant per M. Suard" (*Mémoires Historiques,* vol. 2: 86, 128).

[22] For Gordon, opposition to authoritarian political regimes such as that of absolutist France may take the form of open resistance or exile, but also a decision to "invest the seemingly insignificant area of life that the authorities do not control with the maximum amount of meaning" (1994: 3). Thus if the political sphere in *ancien régime* France was a closed and controlled system, the social sphere of literary salons and cafés was not, and could be cultivated to constitute sphere of activity beyond the reach and control of the authorities. Jonathan Israel, we may note, takes a different position with regard to the notion of "sociability", relating it to the diffusion of radical ideas. For him, the question of sociability in the Enlightenment is "a gigantic red herring": the contribution to the Enlightenment of the salons, a key cultural space for commentators who argue for the importance of sociability, was "practically zero, except as a (very) marginal conduit of dissemination" (2012: 5).

[23] Suard also translated Hume's account of his dispute with Rousseau, under the supervision of Hume himself, published in 1766 with the title *Exposé succinct de la contestation qui s'est élevée entre M. Hume et M. Rousseau* (Malherbe 2005: 88).

Translating economics: Morellet, Turgot, and Benjamin Vaughan

Jonathan Israel traces the "breakthrough" of Radical Enlightenment thought in the 1770s in particular with regard to the increasing dominance of materialist philosophy, attacks on established Catholic theology and the rise of radical politics (Israel 2012: 648-683). Also important, however, were breakthroughs in economic thought at the end of the eighteenth century, in particular the shift, from the Physiocrats onwards, from a statist mercantilist perspective to one giving priority to the importance of economic growth based on the private economic activity of farmers, merchants, and industrialists. The key work in this transformation, of course, was Adam Smith's *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776).

The history of the translations of Smith's work into French,[24] charted in detail by Gilbert Faccarello and Philippe Steiner (2002), takes us again to the heart of late Enlightenment Paris. The translation of the *Wealth of Nations* was published in France, but parts of it, in particular the attacks on the corporations in the chapter entitled "On Wages and Profits", attracted the attention of the authorities, whose reaction provides more evidence of the highly-charged context in which translations into French were operating in mid-eighteenth century France. It was Abbé Morellet himself who, despite having been encouraged by Turgot, at the time Contrôleur Général des Finance under Louis XV, to translate this extract, found that it would not pass the censor.[25] In a letter to Turgot on 26 February 1776, he first complains about the time that it was taking to publish the translation, and, four days later, relates to Turgot at length the "étrange aventure" of the publication being held up by the censor, to which he adds, in a memorable condemnation of the absurdities of French censorship:

> Qu'est-il donc arrivé qui puisse empêcher d'imprimer la traduction de ce que dit un anglois des corporations angloises sans réflexion, sans applications? Je

[24] For a discussion of the translation of Smith into German, see Oz-Salzberger, whose judgement is that this was "a story of misreception as much as a story of reception" (2017: 251).

[25] No surviving edition of Morellet's manuscript of this translation has come to light (*Lettres*: 311, note 1).

> ne crois pas qu'il y ait depuis que les tyrannies exercées sur l'impression sont connues un exemple d'une tyrannie plus ridicule. (*Lettres*: 312)

Under these circumstances, he added, how would it be possible for him to publish his own *Dictionnaire de commerce* which Turgot was also promoting?

> Je me flatte bien qu'il n'y aura pas une page de mon livre qui ne soit au moins aussi brulable que l'extrait de Smith. (*Lettres*: 312)

Once more we can see here a context in which the act of translation itself, above and beyond the textual strategy adopted, constituted a conscious political act of opposition.

Morellet had actually begun a translation of the entire text of the *Wealth of Nations*. Having met Smith on a visit of the latter to France in 1762, after which Morellet noted that "il parlait fort mal notre langue" (Morellet, *Mémoires*: 257), during which they met and conversed with Turgot and the philosopher Claude-Adrien Helvétius (1715-1781), he was sent a copy of Smith's completed work by the English Whig politician and patron, Lord Shelburne, and set about translating it during the summer of 1776. When he realised that the text was being serialised in the *Journal de l'agriculture, du commerce, des arts et des finances* he gave up the idea of its publication, athough he continued the work of translation. The translator of the published version was Abbé Jean-Louis Blavet, also the translator of the 1774 edition of the *Theory of Moral Sentiments* (Faccarello and Steiner 2002: 65), who, according to Morellet, was a "mauvais traducteur" to the extent that Smith had been "trahi plutot de traduit, suivant le proverbe italien" (Morellet, *Mémoires*: 258). The conditions necessary for the production of a translation of quality, for Morellet at least, here came up not against the censor but against a market eager for instant translations in serialised form. Morellet's own translation was circulated in manuscript form, as, put with little modesty by Morellet himself, "tout ce qui est un peu abstrait dans la théorie de Smith, inintelligible dans Blavet et dans une traduction plus moderne de Roucher, l'un et l'autre ignorant la matière, peut se lire dans la mienne avec plus d'utilité" (*Mémoires*: 258*).* It was, for example, read by Nicholas

de Chamfort, friend and collaborator of Mirabeau, later to become an ardent Jacobin (Israel 2014: 33), who wrote to Morellet congratulating him (*Mémoires*: 279).

The history of the translations of Smith, then, leads us back to figures such as Morellet, central to the d'Holbach "coterie", but also to Sophie Grouchy de Condorcet, widow of the Marquis de Condorcet and active participant herself in the Girondin group of the French Revolution (Israel 2014, 122-23). Grouchy translated Smith's earlier *Theory of Moral Sentiments* in 1798, and it was this edition which was to become the standard version in French for the next century (Faccarello and Steiner 2002: 67). Given the association of Morellet and Grouchy, respectively, with radical figures such as d'Holbach and the circle of the Girondin revolutionaries, we may perhaps conclude that the censors, acting, if Morellet's account is reliable, entirely independently of the King's principal advisor at the time (Turgot was in office as Contrôleur General from 1774 to 1776 when Morellet was writing to him) had indeed identified an economic discourse which dovetailed with heterodox philosophical and religious opinions.

A key, and as yet under researched figure in the network of radicals and translators was the English dissenter, radical and later diplomat Benjamin Vaughan (1751-1835). Vaughan has recently been identified, by De Vivo and Sabbagh (2015) as the translator of another fundamental work in the history of economic thought, Turgot's *Réflexions sur la formation et la distribution des richesses* which had circulated privately in French in 1770 but became available in book form only in 1788, and was published in an anonymous English translation in 1791-92 (De Vivo and Sabbagh 2015: 185, 192-197). Vaughan had a "knack at being mysterious" (in his own words) and what the authors see as a "craze for anonymity", although as we have seen, anonymity in translation in this period, particularly with regard to radical works, was hardly exceptional. But with De Vivo and Sabbagh's careful attribution of the translation of Turgot's text to him,[26] Vaughan emerges as another figure who exemplifies the importance of translation for a radical agenda in this period. The journal *Repository*,

[26] I.C. Lundberg (1964) had sought to attribute the translation to Adam Smith himself.

which came out in the pre-revolutionary period 1788-1799 under his editorship, published much material in translation. This included, for example, a partial translation of a book entitled *Le Conciliateur*, first published anonymously in French in 1754, possibly by Turgot himself, which argued for religious toleration, a theme close to Vaughan's heart. It also published Vaughan's own preface to another translation of a work arguing for religious toleration, Ignaz von Born's *John Physiophilus' Specimen of the Natural History of the Various Orders of Monks* (1783) brought out by Joseph Johnson, the radical publisher and friend of the dissenter and scientist Joseph Priestley (see below Chapter Five). Vaughan had already published the first translation into English of Turgot's well known article in the *Encyclopédie* entitled "Fondation" which carried, in the translator's preface, the hypothesis that "[i]f the present publication shall be favourably received, the translator may possibly present his country with the principal works of M.Turgot in an English dress" (cit. in De Vivo and Sabbagh 2015: 191) which gives us a fairly clear indication that the translator was also the future translator of Turgot's *Reflections*. The *Repository* also published an almost complete translation of Turgot's own defence of the American Revolution (De Vivo and Sabbagh 2015: 192). The serialised copy of the first translation of the *Reflections* was also to appear in thirteen instalments from January 1791 to December 1792 in a subsequent review, the *Literary Magazine*. Finally, Vaughan has also been identified as the translator of Condorcet's *Life of Turgot*, also published by Joseph Johnson in 1792 (De Vivo and Sabbagh 2015: 190-191).

This list of translations, as identified by De Vivo and Sabbath, clearly establishes a place for Vaughan in the history of the translation of economic thought. But this activity is also to be read in the light of the importance of translation to the radical circles in France, England, and America at the time. Vaughan's pedigree as part of the American-Franco-English radical movement is without dispute (Davis 2004; De Vivo and Sabbagh 2015: 186). He was educated at the cradle of radical dissent in Britain, the Warrington Academy, where he resided with Joseph Priestley. His father had associated with Wilkes in the 1760s and subsequently with other later radicals such as Richard Price. Vaughan subsequently met other figures such as Lord Shelburne and Benjamin Franklin, as well as Mirabeau, Paine and Samuel Romilly, all of whom will figure to a greater

or lesser extent, in our exploration of translation during the French Revolution. Vaughan became implicated in the reform movement in London and was forced to flee for France in 1792, subsequently travelling to Switzerland and later to America (Davis 2004). With this list of names, we may begin to piece together a transnational network of radicals involved in the propagation of their ideas through translation.

Johann Reinhard and Georg Forster: cosmopolitan explorers, translators, and revolutionaries

The strong dichotomy that Jonathan Israel sets up between a "Radical" and a "Moderate" Enlightenment may have the merit, as he himself claims, of going some way to explaining why "ardent long-standing adherents of radical ideas" in many parts of Europe "instantly embraced the [French] Revolution as the apotheosis of the Enlightenment" whereas those customarily associated with a moderate Enlightenment "headed by Burke, Ferguson and Gibbon … were never willing to recognize the Revolution as anything of the sort" (Israel 2012: 16-17). Amongst the enthusiasts for the Radical Enlightenment in Germany, Israel makes particular mention of Georg Forster, ethnographer, explorer and scientist - and we may add translator - who was involved in the revolutionary movement in Mainz in 1790.

Georg (or George) Forster (1754-1794) was himself the son of the linguist, explorer, and translator, Johann (or John) Reinhold Forster (1729-1798). Johann Forster, born in Eastern Pomerania, for twelve years a Protestant pastor near Danzig and later for fourteen years resident in England, said of his own cosmopolitanism: "we are almost Englishmen, at least not Germans, although born in a corner of Prussia which was formerly Polish" (cit. in Hoare 1976: 3). Johann, along with his son, emigrated to England in 1766 and was chosen to succeed Joseph Priestley as a tutor in the Warrington Academy where he taught foreign languages, particularly French and German. At the Warrington Academy he met the Welsh naturalist and antiquarian Thomas Pennant (1726-1798) who encouraged him to translate a series of works of travel and natural history into English, given his linguistic competence (it was said that he knew 17 languages). Thus Forster translated from Swedish the work of explorers and naturalists such as Pehr Kalm (*Travels into North America*, 1770) and

Peter Loefling (*Travels through Spain and Cumana in South America* - 1771), as well as from German Pehr Osbeck's *A Voyage to China and the East Indies* (1771). Together they constituted, for Pennant, the presentation to the English nation of the "three voyages of pupils of Dr Linnaeus" (cit. in Hoare 1976: 57-58). These were accompanied by translations from French of the explorer and naval captain Jean Bernard Bossu's *Travels through that part of North American formerly called Louisiana* (1771) and, most importantly, Louis-Antoine Bougainville's *A Voyage round the world* (1772). If these translations were signed by Johann Forster, however, Pennant himself recognized that the son Georg, "with his extraordinary command of English, French, Russian and German … bore the main burden of primary translation, while Forster tackled the delicate task of reorganising and updating the natural history" (cit. in Hoare 1976: 58). Johann Forster had also come to the attention of the scientific establishment with a paper he gave in Latin to the Royal Society in 1767 on the natural history of the Volga region (the Forsters had previously travelled down the Volga river on commission by the Russian government – Hoare 1976: 26) possibly through the invitation of the Huguenot secretary of the Royal Society (and librarian at the British Library, as we have seen) Matthew Maty.

Johann Forster's growing reputation led to an invitation, along with his son, to accompany the second voyage of Captain James Cook, which gave the young Georg the possibility of writing an account of the voyage, which appeared in 1776 under the title *Voyage Round the World* (Hoare 1976: 162-63). After a trip to Paris in 1777, when father and son met the naturalist George-Louis Buffon (1710-1788) and the American ambassador Benjamin Franklin (Gilli 2005: 9), they returned to Germany in 1780, where both Johann and Georg continued to translate travel literature, this time from English into German, the latter translating into German Cook's account of his third voyage (Hoare 1976: 272-77). Johann also kept his contacts in England alive, translating, for example, the Swedish-German scientist Karl Wilhelm Scheele's *Chemical observations and experiments on fire and air* (1780) for Joseph Johnson's publishing house.

Both the Forsters, then, merit a mention in terms of their work in translating and popularizing accounts of exploration which were an important part of eighteenth-century Enlightenment thought and its

encounter with the world outside Europe.[27] Georg Forster, however, also became involved in the radical movements of the later Enlightenment and even, as we have seen, the French Revolution. On his return to Germany, Georg became a publicist of some note, intervening in the debate over Pantheism, a moment which is seen by Israel as a defining one in the Radical Enlightenment in Germany. Georg also engaged in polemics with Kant, and making known his enthusiasm for the American Revolution (Israel 2012: 687-8; 743). His reading of Spinoza led him to develop materialist and atheist positions and to publish the first German translation of the text which was to become the touchstone for materialism and atheism, Constantin-François Chasseboeuf de Volney's *Les Ruines ou Méditations sur les révolutions des empires* (1791) (Gilli 2005: 20).[28] He then became an active supporter of the French revolution and was elected Vice President of the Mainz Convention in 1793 (Mainz had been invaded by French revolutionary troops). He threw himself "feverishly into the work of propagating *Republikanismus* and establishing a genuinely democratic republican movement in collaboration with the French" (Israel 2014: 320), editing two short-lived pro-French newspapers, the *Neue Maizner Zeitung* and the *Der Patriot*, which featured translations of speeches of republican cosmopolitans such as Anacharsis Cloots and others" (Israel 2014: 320-21).

As well as translating French revolutionary ideals for a German readership, we may mention, as testimony to his radical standpoint, Georg Forster's refusal to translate into German Edmund Burke's stringent attack on the French Revolution, *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790). For Forster, Burke's work was "un verbiage aussi miserable" (cit. in Gilli 1975: 565; Goujard 2005: 3). On the other hand, he thoroughly approved of Thomas Paine's *Rights of Man*, and although his position as Vice President of the Mainz Convention did not allow him to translate the work himself, he supervised the translation, carried out by a Madame Forkel (Gilli 1975: 368). Georg then was sent as a representative to the French Convention but became stranded in France as Mainz was besieged

[27] For a discussion of the Enlightenment in global history, see Conrad (2012).

[28] Chasseboeuf adopted the name "Volney" as a contraction of "Voltaire" and "Ferney" (where Voltaire lived the later part of his life) in homage to the philosopher.

by Prussian troops, and died there in 1794, probably from illnesses contracted during his travels (Gilli 1975: 584).

The translation of French radical thought into German is outside the scope of this work but the work of both the Forsters is a testimony to the cosmopolitan nature of the Radical Enlightenment and its reliance on translation as a means of ensuring a certain coherence amongst its proponents. This cosmopolitan and, indeed, multilingual framework of some of the representatives of the Radical Enlightenment, like the Forsters, is apparent in Georg's own summary of his linguistic abilities:

> J'écris le latin et je comprends un tant soit peu le grec. Je parle avec facilité et j'écris de même le français, l'anglais et l'allemand; je lis facilement le hollandais et l'italien; et avec un peu de routine, je pourrais me perfectionner dans la connaissance de l'espagnol, du portugais et du suédois, dont je possède les rudiments, Je comprends même un peu du polonais et de russe… (cit. in Gilli, 1975: 4)

Georg Forster's self-evaluation gives us a useful perspective on translation and cosmopolitanism in the later Enlightenment. Translation occurred within an overall framework of a shared cosmopolitan radical discourse. Our discussion of the commitment to translation amongst many of those involved in the more radical fringes of the Enlightenment highlights a sense of a cosmopolitan, transnational community, francophone but competent in other languages and interested in translation in order to spread radical ideas. We have looked at translation between English and French but of course this exploration of translation, cosmopolitanism, and dissent would benefit from an exploration also of translation into and from other languages. With Georg Forster, moreover, we move towards the revolutionary period, which Israel sees as a natural outcome of the successful battle for hegemony on the part of the ideas of the Radical Enlightenment. We turn, then, in the following chapters, to the part that translation played in the concerns of a number of figures more or less involved in the upheavals of the French Revolution, and subsequently to the reception of the French Revolution, through translation, in Britain in the 1790s.

4. Revolutionary translators

The Huguenot translators considered in Chapter Two were literary and philosophical figures whose translational activity fitted into their overall work as writers, correspondents and mediators in the European "Republic of Letters". The philosophers and writers we met in Chapter Three, at the apex of the Enlightenment, were also essentially literary figures, only turning to active political participation in the case of Georg Forster during the revolutionary period. In this chapter, we will look at translations carried out by journalists, publicists, and politicians whose primary claim to fame, for the most part, resides in their political, rather than literary or translational, activity. We will look at translations both from English into French and from French into English, our focus being not so much on the impact on the culture of arrival of radical texts produced in another language but on the circularity of texts in two languages, testimony to the transnational (and indeed, trans-Atlantic) milieu of the translators. We shall explore, in particular, the translations of the doyen of the early years of the French Revolution, Count Mirabeau; the American poet and activist Joel Barlow; Girondin publicists and politicians such as François Lanthenas and others and in particular their translations of the transatlantic radical and revolutionary, Thomas Paine; and the revolutionary, activist, and editor of the radical newspaper *L'ami du Peuple*, Jean-Paul Marat.

Honoré Gabriel Riqueti, Count Mirabeau: the revolutionary as translator

We will first look at the example of Honoré Gabriel Riqueti, Count Mirabeau (1749-1791), the flamboyant and charismatic leader of the early years of the French Revolution, who died prematurely in 1791. Jonathan Israel sees Mirabeau as a key figure in bringing together a radical anti-aristocratic movement in the period immediately prior to the Revolution (2014: 75-76), and it is surely interesting that Mirabeau clearly considered publishing material in translation to be crucial to this activity.

Mirabeau's *Considérations sur l'Ordre de Cincinnatus* (1784), for example, published in 1784 in London to avoid the French censors, a long pamphlet which William Doyle calls the "first overt and direct attack on the principle of nobility in Europe itself" (2009: 137), was in fact an amplified translation of an American original (see Doyle 2009: 88-137; Israel 2017: 77-78; Monnier 2011).[1] The Society of the Cincinnati had been set up in the new United States in the spring of 1784 as an attempt to give recognition to the pre-eminent generals and officers in the United States army through the constitution of an association to which they had the right to exclusive membership. This membership was also to be extended to foreign generals (principally, of course, French) and it was proposed that it should include a hereditary principle, that is, that membership would be handed down to descendants. This clause, in particular, roused passionate opposition in America, particularly after its denunciation in a tract entitled *Considerations on the Society of the Cincinnati* published in Charleston by "Cassius", in reality the South Carolina soldier and judge Aedanus Burke,[2] the previous year. The controversy was noted by Benjamin Franklin, the American ambassador to France at the time, in particular because the president of the Cincinnati,

[1] Mirabeau's partial "pseudo-translation" (Toury 1995: 48-59) appears to be approximately double the length of Burke's original text, testifying to the extent to which he used the original as a springboard for his own considerations.

[2] Aedanus Burke was himself testimony to the circularity of people and ideas in the eighteenth-century Atlantic: he was born and raised in Galway and educated in the Jesuit college in St Omer before migrating to America, probably in the 1760s (Doyle 2009: 102).

General Washington no less, had sent a letter to a number of people in France, including General Lafayette (who had played an important part in the success of the American rebellion), asking them to promote the society. Franklin contemplated making a robust and open reply of his own, using his own printing press in Passy.

The problem of heredity was already a focus of attention for Franklin. He had recently published, in French and in English, his *Information to those who would remove to America* (1784), which indicated in no uncertain terms that birth was not a useful or acceptable passport in the new republic. Now Franklin prepared a more explicit attack on the hereditary principle, in a denunciation of the Society of the Cincinnati in a letter to his daughter, which he had translated in readiness for publication by Abbé Morellet (Doyle 2009: 121). Morellet's translation of this letter somewhat softened Franklin's criticisms of the vanity of the French officers interested in becoming part of the Society, adding a tactful "correctif" that these officers had "contribué à la liberté et au bonheur de mon pays" (Echeverria 1953: 126). The letter, however, and the French translation, were circulated clandestinely in manuscript form but never published: Morellet dissuaded Franklin from publishing it as it would attract the attention of the French censor and perhaps because it would be considered inappropriate for the American ambassador to show his opposition so strongly (Doyle 2009: 121).

Rather than publish his own denunciation, then, Franklin turned to Mirabeau for a translation of the original critique by Aedanus Burke. Mirabeau, with the help of his associate Nicolas de Chamfort, set about translating and amplifying this work, reading it to Franklin on 13 July 1784 (Doyle 2009: 122-123). The Mirabeau text, in its transformation of the Burke original, added not only elements relating to Europe but a strident denunciation of Washington himself, missing in the original text:

> Le jour où l'adoption des membres honoraires a été votée, Washington, si grand quand il voulut redevenir un simple particulier, Washington, premier citoyen et bienfaiteur d'un peuple qu'il a rendu libre, a voulu se distinguer de ce peuple! Pourquoi n'a-t-il pas senti que son nom était au-dessus de toute distinction? Héros de la révolution qui brisait les fers de la

> moitié du monde, comment n'a-t-il pas dédaigné l'Honneur coupable, dangereux, et vulgaire d'être le héros d'un parti! (Mirabeau, *Oeuvres*, vol. III: 252; cfr. Doyle 2009: 124)

This translated text, then, included elaborations by both Mirabeau and Chamfort to the extent that the latter, during the Terror, claimed that the most virulently anti-aristocratical parts, the "morceaux les plus vigoureux" were written by himself (Doyle 2009: 124).[3] The French edition also included other translations in the appendix, including a letter from the economist and former French minister Turgot to Richard Price, the Welsh radical and supporter of the American revolution.

As an attack on the principle of aristocracy, like other radical works before it, the *Considérations* was considered to be too risky for publication in France. Two versions, one in French and one in English translation, were published contemporaneously in England by the printer and publisher, Joseph Johnson, whose involvement in translating and publishing radical works by French revolutionaries and radicals we shall look at in the following chapter. Publication of the text in French in London was deemed to be a profitable venture only if it appeared alongside the translation of this amplified work back into English for an English readership, something which was carried out by Mirabeau's personal friend, the young lawyer Samuel Romilly (Doyle 2009: 128). This second English-language edition of the *Considérations* appeared first in London and was subsequently reprinted in Philadelphia in 1786, to the irritation of the author of the original pamphlet, Aedanus Burke (Israel 2017: 78).

Two further publications which included denunciations of the aristocratic principle of heredity being surreptitiously introduced in America were similarly the result of translation. The first was the publication of a book in English, *Researches on the United States* (1788), by

[3] The *Biographical anecdotes of the founders of the French republic* (1797) a publication providing short popular biographical portraits of French revolutionaries, agreed that "the most eloquent passages in the *Letters on the Order of Cincinnatus"* belonged to him: "Mirabeau, in short, was the friend of Chamfort, and often borrowed his pen" (*Biographical anecdotes*: 303).

Filippo Mazzei, an Italian who had become a prosperous farmer in Virginia where he was the friend and neighbor of Thomas Jefferson. This book had originally been written in Italian but had appeared also in a French translation overseen by the Girondin philosopher Condorcet and his wife Sophie Grouchy, translator also of Adam Smith's *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, as we have seen (Doyle 2009: 133; Darnton 2003: 131-133). Finally, the reply of another of the founding fathers of America, John Adams, to the letter of Turgot printed in Mirabeau's volume, his *Defence of the Constitutions of the United State of America* (1787), also appeared in 1792 in French translation (Doyle 2009: 133).

We may pause for a moment to consider some of the salient features of this affair. The first is that it bears out the notion that we are looking at a truly transatlantic controversy, part of what Robert Palmer (1959) and later Jacques Godechot (1965) many years ago argued was an "Atlantic Revolution". A second is that translation plays a crucial part in the way that the controversy developed. It began with a text by an American, Aedanus Burke, published in America. This text was then translated into French, with amplifications, by a journalist who was to become one of the foremost figures of the early years of the revolution in France, Mirabeau. This translation was printed, however, not in Paris but in London, alongside an English version of this modified and amplified text. Further interventions in the controversy included a text originally written in Italian but which appeared contemporaneously also in French and English translations (Filippo Mazzei's *Researches on the United States*) and another work in English (that of John Adams) which was subsequently published in French during the revolution. The controversy over heredity, then, was not only a transatlantic one but a translingual one, and carried out in three languages. A third is that the affair did not involve "translators" belonging to a distinct category but rather some of the major figures involved in the production of a political and ideological consensus regarding the principal ideas of the revolutionary period: Franklin, Mirabeau, Turgot, Mazzei and Adams, along with aspiring younger figures such as Romilly. The translations were the work not of "translators" but of lawyers, journalists, and politicians, French, English and Italian, intent on spreading radical, anti-aristocratic opinions throughout at least three countries, America,

Britain and France, although the French edition apparently did not have the impact in France that the translators/authors desired, possibly because of the difficulties of effective distribution (Doyle 2009: 127). Finally, it is also worth noting the intensely collaborative nature of the event, in which Franklin, Mirabeau, Chamfort, Romilly, and the publisher Johnson appear to have worked closely together. We may add that the publisher for the two translations was found through Franklin's friendship with the English journalist and radical Benjamin Vaughan, whom we met in the last chapter as the translator of Turgot's *Réflexions sur la formation et la distribution des richesses* (1770), whom Franklin had introduced to Mirabeau (Doyle 2009: 122-123; Hammersley 2010a: 174-175). The history of "subversive" translations confirms the importance of collaboration between different actors and their belonging, effectively, to a transnational network of radicals.

Samuel Romilly has left an account of his experiences with Mirabeau which is illuminating. The translation of the *Considérations*, for example, was probably the result of a desire on the young lawyer's part to promote his own opinions on the question of heredity to an English readership; in any case it was not considered to be a remunerative prospect. Indeed, Mirabeau had passed his text to Romilly to translate as "he knew that it was impossible to expect anything tolerable from a translator that was to be paid" (Romilly, *Memoirs*, vol. 1: 79). Romilly came to the conclusion that it would be a "useful exercise" and that he would do it also in consideration of the fact that he had "sufficient leisure on [his] hands" (*Memoirs*, vol. 1: 79). His account also stresses the collaborative nature of the translation itself as well as Mirabeau's own commitment to the work:

> The Count was difficult enough to please; he was sufficiently impressed with the beauties of the original. He went over every part of the translation with me; observed on every passage in which justice was not done to the thought, or the force of the expression was lost; and made many very useful criticisms. (*Memoirs*, vol. 1: 79)

The activity of translation, indeed, cemented the friendship between the two:

> During this occupation, we had occasion to see one another often, and became very intimate; and, as he had read much, had seen a great deal of the world, was acquainted with all the most distinguished persons who at that time, adorned either the royal court of the republic of letters in France, had a great knowledge of French and Italian literature, and possessed a very good taste, his conversation was extremely interesting and not a little instructive. (*Memoirs*, vol. 1: 79-80)

Romilly's *Memoirs* also provides further examples of Mirabeau's use of translation. On a trip to Paris in 1788, Romilly took part in a visit to the prison of Bicêtre in the company of Mirabeau with a group of fellow radicals including the writer Louis-Sebastian Mercier, the Genevan journalist Jacques Mallet du Pan, and their mutual friend, Pierre Étienne Dumont. The sight of the prisoners there left him "shocked and disgusted" (*Memoirs*: 97). Romilly continues:

> I saw Mirabeau the next day, and mentioned to him the impression they had made on me; he exhorted me earnestly to put down my observations in writing and, and to give them to him. I did so; and he soon afterwards translated them into French and published them in the form of a pamphlet, under the title of *Lettres d'un Voyageur Anglais sur la Prison de la Bicêtre.* (*Memoirs*: 97)

This pamphlet included some of Mirabeau's own considerations on criminal law, which, however, says Romilly, were "very nearly a translation from the little tract I had published on Madan's *Thoughts on Executive Justice*."[4] Romilly's original letter was subsequently published in English in Benjamin Vaughan's review *The Repository*, being printed as a translation from Mirabeau's publication, "although it was in truth the original" (*Memoirs*: 97). Once again we have a feeling of the fluidity of texts and their translation and this was acknowledged by Mirabeau in the title, which referred to the "Voyageur Anglais" and the fact that the text was "Imité de l'anglais."[5]

---

[4] *Observations on a late publication, intituled, Thoughts on Executive Justice* (1786).

[5] The full title was as follows: *Observations d'un voyageur anglais, sur la maison de force*

Romilly's work continued to be of interest to Mirabeau as originals to be translated and transformed for a French readership. A few years later, Romilly was commissioned by a certain Count de Sarsfield to prepare a handbook in English on the rules and orders of the English House of Commons, with the idea that it might be of assistance to the French Estates General in their deliberations in 1789. When finished, Sarsfield set about translating it into French, a task which, on Sarsfield's death, passed to Mirabeau, who finished the translation and published it under his own name with the title *Règlements observés dans la Chambres des Comunes* (1789). In a letter to Dumont, Romilly notes that Mirabeau did acknowledge, in the preface, his debt to the original, although without mentioning his name: "Je dois ce travail, entrepris uniquement pour la France, à un Anglois qui, jeune encore, a mérité une haute reputation" (*Memoirs*: 357).[6] Mirabeau, in Romilly's account, was "fully sensible of the importance of the work" although Romilly himself was sceptical regarding its impact: "it never, however, was of the smallest use; and no regard whatever was paid to it" (*Memoirs*: 102).

Romilly's proximity to Mirabeau also enabled him to make some critical comments on Mirabeau's reliance on his collaborators for material which he subsequently elaborated, modified or translated:

> The eight octavo volumes which he published on the Prussian monarchy were entirely, as to everything but the style, the work of M. de Mauvillon. He tracts upon finance were Clavière's; the substance of his work on the Cincinnati was to be found in an American pamphlet; his pamphlet on the opening of the Scheldt was Benjamin Vaughan's… (*Memoirs*: 111)

The reference to the opening of the Scheldt river is to Mirabeau's *Doubts concerning the free navigation of the Scheldt* (1785), an intervention in a

appellée Bicêtre; suivies de réflexions sur les effets de la sévérité des peines, & sur la législation criminelle de la Grande-Bretagne. Imité de l'anglais. Par le comte de Mirabeau; avec une lettre de M. Benjamin Franklin (1788).

[6] For Romilly, the book was "upon the whole, well translated; but there are some errors in it which I would correct, and send you or him the corrections, if I thought there were any probability of its passing through a second edition" (*Memoirs*: 357).

pamphlet war over the Emperor Joseph II of Austria's plans to open the River Scheldt to free trade which Romilly attributes, at least in terms of the original, to Vaughan.[7]

Mirabeau appears, then, even in eighteenth-century terms, to have had little regard for notions of fidelity or authority, conceived of as the individual "ownership" of a text: his well-known *Courrier de Provence,* which relayed to his constituents the events in Paris, was largely written by Dumont and his fellow Genevan exile Jacques-Antoine Duroveray (Israel 2014: 76). The texts Mirabeau produced, whether "translations" or originals, were, it would appear, the fruit of ideas and expressions which had matured over a series of conversations and texts produced by Mirabeau, Vaughan, Dumont, Romilly, and others. Romilly noted somewhat testily that his friend Dumont:

> …has done what few people could have the magnanimity enough to do; he has seen his compositions universally extolled as masterpieces of eloquence, and all the merit of them ascribed to persons who had not written a single word in them; and he has never discovered that he was the author of them but to those from whom it was impossible to conceal it. Of every thing that he has written, the advantages have been shared between Mirabeau and his bookseller, the one taking the glory, and the other the emolument. It is true that with respect to the *Courrier de Provence*, Dumont ought by agreement to receive a share of the profit. (*Memoirs*: 386)

Romilly's *Memoirs*, then, gives us a glimpse of Mirabeau as a voracious producer of radical journalism using all means that come to hand, including translation, pseudo-translation, rewriting, adding, appropriating the work of others and so on. Translation, in this example, cannot be isolated from the overall context of the swift production of multiple texts in different languages, with different contributions by different people.

[7] The opening of the Scheldt would have benefitted the Austrian economy and was opposed by Mirabeau. He conceded that in theory international law should allow free trade but argued that small nations also had the right to govern their own commerce (see Wijffels 2002: 244-247).

We may note, in conclusion, that Mirabeau's attention was not limited to contemporary writing. In 1788, he published a pamphlet entitled *Sur la liberté de la presse, imité de l'anglois de Milton* (1788) freely adapted and amplified from John Milton's *Areopagitica* (1644) from a 1698 edition prepared by John Toland. This was followed by a translation of Milton's *A Defence of the People of England* from the same edition, published posthumously in 1792 as *Défense du peuple anglais, sur le jugement et la condemnation de Charles Premier Roi d'Angleterre. Ouvrage propre à éclairer sur la circonstance actuelle où se trouve la France*. The full title, in this case, makes clear Mirabeau's intentions were contemporary and not historical (Tournu 2002; Davies 1995; Hammersley 2010a: 176-182; Monnier 2011: 43-45).[8]

Mirabeau's activity as a translator fits perfectly with his working practice as writer, journalist, and revolutionary activist. His work, crucial in creating a consensus in public opinion for radical change in the years immediately prior to the French revolution, included significant attention to translation, in particular from English. This enabled him to pick up on radical discourse of other periods and other contexts: a pamphlet promoting freedom of the press during the English Civil War, anti-aristocratic polemics in the new American Republic, material denouncing the French prison system, a controversy over the freedom of shipping in the Scheldt river in the Dutch Republic and no doubt many others. In the fervent years before the outbreak of the French Revolution, when the legitimacy of the royal absolutist government was swiftly ebbing but still powerful, when a series of political upheavals in Geneva, the Dutch Republic and America constituted a shared cosmopolitan context of rebellion, translation enabled the easy shift and transfer of meanings from one realm to another, and provided diachronic or synchronic analogies of use to polemicists and reformers and helped to create a shared climate of radicalism.

[8] Christophe Tournu (2002: 46-54) has undertaken a careful analysis of the changes that Mirabeau made in his translation of this second work.

Joel Barlow: transatlantic radical and translator

Mirabeau, then, like the Huguenot exiles earlier and numerous French enlightenment figures such as Voltaire and d'Holbach, looked to England for political models and spent formative and productive periods in London in contact with like-minded radicals. The sense of living and contributing to a shared Atlantic space conducive to the circulation of material and ideas in French and English was common also to two other revolutionary leaders, both associated with the Girondist movement, Constantin-François de Chassebœuf, otherwise known as the Comte di Volney and Jacques-Pierre Brissot de Warville. Both lived for considerable periods in the new American Republic, and Brissot also spent some time in England in 1783-84 (Darnton 1968: 301-301). Both were concerned to publish their radical views in both English and French, and both were translated into English by another radical who played a small but not insignificant role in the revolutionary period in America, England and France: Joel Barlow.

Born in 1754 in Connecticut, after being a pupil at Yale alongside the future lexicographer Noah Webster, Joel Barlow (1754-1812) started his adult life at the time of the American Revolution, contributing articles to American newspapers supporting the American cause and serving as a chaplain in the revolutionary army. An aspiring poet, he was able to obtain permission from the court of Louis XVI to dedicate his early poem, a paean to the new America entitled *The Visions of Columbus* (1787), to the French king, permission probably conceded by the court as a means of maintaining a relationship of amity with the new American republic. Barlow's record in the army, his activity as a poet, and in particular his ability to raise funds and find influential supporters as far away as France, gained him the recognition of a group of American land speculators who had set up a company, the Scioto Company, with the intention of selling land in the Ohio Valley to interested parties in Europe.[9] Barlow left

[9] The entire business venture failed - the land that was sold to prospective French migrants turned out not to have been the property of the Scioto Company, and the whole enterprise was denounced as fraudulent in the French press and by the American Ambassador, Gouvernor Morris (Buel 2011: 120-126).

America for Europe as an agent for the company, arriving in Paris in the summer of 1788. He soon made contact with a network of pro-American French writers, activists, and enthusiasts for the American Revolution who had set up a Société Gallo-Americain[10] and which included such figures as Etienne Clavière, a Genevan banker and another collaborator of Mirabeau, and the radical journalist Brissot, later to become the leader of the Girondin faction during the Revolution (Buel 2011: 1-112).

As part of his activity as land agent, Barlow moved frequently between Paris and London. While in London he frequented radicals such as Thomas Paine, William Godwin, and others, and began to make a name for himself with two publications, his *Advice to the Privileged Orders in the several states of Europe* (1792), a sustained polemic against primogeniture, entail and privilege, and an equally polemical poem *The Conspiracy of Kings* (1792) (Buel 2011: 146-148). Both of these were published by Joseph Johnson; indeed, the publication of Barlow's pamphlet led to Johnson's indictment for sedition in the Treason Trials of 1794 (Braithwaite 2003: 145-146). With the appearance of these two works, but also the publication of his translation of Brissot's *Nouveau voyage dans les États Unis de l'Amérique* which had appeared in Paris in 1791, Barlow "made a considerable splash in Britain's radical culture" (Buel 2011: 148).

It is worth pausing for a moment to consider the origins of this work and its translation. Brissot had begun, in the later 1780s, to promote a particularly positive view of the new American republic as something approaching a virtuous Republican utopia. After founding the Société Gallo-Americain, whose activity consisted principally of publishing material praising the American example, with the financial help of Clavière he set off on a trip to America in order to prepare a work which could give a concrete description of the republic whose virtue featured so prominently in his own work and that of other radicals (Oliver 2016: 12-13). The volume thus continued the path of other influential works such as John Hector St. John Crèvecoeur's *Lettres d'un cultivateur américain* (1784) and the four-volume *Recherches historiques et politiques sur les États-*

[10] For the Société Gallo-Americain, see Darnton (2003: 127-131).

Unis de l'Amérique septentrionale (1788) by Filippo Mazzei that we have already mentioned.[11]

This was the context of Brissot's experience in America in 1788, itself formative for the future revolutionary in terms of his meeting there with English radicals such as Richard Price (Coursin 2018). His *Nouveau voyage* was clearly intended to promote the new republic and distinguished itself clearly in the preface from the growing genre of narratives of exploration:

> L'objet de ce voyage n'a pas été d'étudier des antiques, ou de rechercher des plantes inconnues, mais d'observer des hommes qui venoient de conquérir leur liberté: or, un peuple libre ne peut plus être étranger à des François. (*Nouveau voyage*: i)

Barlow, as we have seen, had met Brissot in Paris as the land agent for the Scioto company, and his acquaintance with him was thus both political and commercial. Indeed, at times it is difficult to distinguish the two. While Brissot's text extolled the political virtues of the republic, Barlow's translation was intent also on stressing the potential of America as an important commercial subject, as emerges in his preface:

> …we have always been surprisingly ignorant both of the Americans and of their country. Had we known either the one or the other while they were colonies, they would have been so at this day, and probably for many days longer; did we know them now, we should endeavour to draw that advantage from them that the natural and adventitious circumstances of

[11] In some ways, indeed, Brissot's *Nouveau voyage* may have been intended as a reply to Mazzei, whose work had attempted to demystify some of the more starry-eyed celebrations of American ruralism that Brissot had already published without actually having set foot in America (Darnton 2003: 119-136; Oliver 2016: 11-16). Mazzei's work, according to Robert Darnton, became "a virtual encyclopedia of information about America, much of it supplied by Jefferson," adding that Condorcet himself "vetted the translation into French" (Darnton 2003: 133).

> the two countries would indicated to reasonable men. (*New Travels*, 1792: xxiii)[12]

Barlow's prefaces to the translation yield a number of other indications of his particular framing of the text. The 1792 edition, for example, introduced Brissot to the English and American readership with a eulogy of him both in terms of his contribution to America and France:

> No traveller, I believe, of his age, has made a more useful present to Europe, than M. de Warville in the publication of the following tour in the United States. The people of France will derive great advantages from it; as they have done from a variety of other labours of the same industrious and patriotic author. (*New Travels*, 1792: p. xxiii)

Given the speed of revolutionary events, this preface was modified in the second, revised, translation, published in 1794. The translator's preface now included a reference to Brissot's death on the guillotine after the fall of the Girondins in the summer of 1793, and the "people of France" is modified to "the inhabitants of Europe" (*New Travels,* 1794: viii), perhaps in response to the context of a revolutionary France attempting to put itself at the head of a Europe-wide movement of revolution or reform. The 1794 preface also heightens the polemical tone a little: in the first version, Barlow, as we have seen, merely observes that there is a widespread ignorance in France (or Europe in general) with regard to America. In the second edition, this is attributed implicitly to the evils of the *ancien régime*: it was "reasons of state" which had kept Europeans "utterly ignorant both of the Americans and of their country" (*New Travels,* 1794: ix).

Finally, Barlow's preface to the second edition includes a panegyric to America:

[12] I have been able to consult the 1797 edition published by Joseph Bumstead in Boston which is, however, a reprint of the 1792 edition.

> An immense country-increasing in opulence and splendour every day; the rising feat of Arts and the asylum of Liberty. The pigmy nations of Europe sink in comparison with this vast country like stars compared with the grand luminary. No wonder that the mind of Brissot should feel the warm glow of congenial sentiment in a tour through a country where tyranny is no more, and where peace and plenty are the fruits of nature and industry. (*New Travels*, 1794: vii-viii)

We can only speculate on the reasons for this addition. As Barlow's career as revolutionary activist and journalist flourished it was perhaps the case that a clear commitment on his part to the American Republic was prudent.

Barlow had, in the period between 1792 and 1794, become well-known in his own right both in Paris and London. He had written an address to the Constituent Assembly of France on behalf of 10 other American residents in Paris (not signed, significantly, by the prudent American ambassador Gouverneur Morris), and in Britain he had been entrusted, along with John Frost, with making a representation from the Society of Constitutional Information to the new French Convention. Barlow and Frost, it is likely, had been chosen to represent the Society also because of their competence in French, Frost subsequently translating their address to the Convention (Miller 1932: 35-36; Buel 2011: 156; Ziesche 2010: 74-75). In December 1792, the French revolutionary government appointed Barlow to a committee which, along with the revolutionary and publicist Abbé Henri Grégoire, was to be sent to Piedmont to promote the new regime. Barlow's contribution consisted of the publication of a *Lettre addressée aux habitants du Piémont* (1793) written originally in French, possibly with the assistance of Grégoire, subsequently translated by himself into English and published in London by the radical editor Daniel Eaton in 1795 (Buel 2011: 158-159, 230).

A final translation by Barlow, undertaken, according to his biographer, Richard Buel, at a time when he no longer had pressing financial constraints, was of the four final chapters of Volney's *Ruins of Empire*, in which the author attacked the whole notion of revealed religion (Israel

2014: 224).[13] This text became a fundamental point of reference for the radical movement of the nineteenth century: according to the later nineteenth-century radical Richard Carlisle, the *Ruins* had "made more Deists and Atheists than all the other anti-Christian writings that have been circulated in this country" (cit. in Williams 1964: 58; Israel 2017: 354).

The *Ruins* ran through a series of editions in English in the 1790s.[14] Volney, however, was unhappy with both the translation published by Joseph Johnson in 1792, and the subsequent version which appeared in Philadelphia in 1795, despite the fact that it purported to have been corrected by the author himself, at that time residing in America. He thus approached first Thomas Jefferson, who translated the chapters dealing with politics, and subsequently, on his return to Paris in 1798 after his expulsion from America under the Alien Friends Act (1798), Joel Barlow, whom he asked to complete Jefferson's work by retranslating the final four chapters under his own supervision. It was this edition, which appeared in 1802, which remained the standard one throughout the nineteenth century (Todd 1888: 152; Buel 2011: 259-60).

What can we conclude regarding the figure of Joel Barlow? He appears to have played a significant role in the 1790s in a number of areas: as poet, land entrepreneur, radical publicist, revolutionary activist, and diplomat, operating in America, France and Britain.[15] As such he may be seen as an

[13] These additional chapters were added to the English translation of the *Ruins* only in the 1796 edition published by Joseph Johnson. They had first appeared in a short-lived radical fortnightly newspaper the *Patriot* in May 1793 and, interestingly, had been translated (or paraphrased) in a Welsh-language version by the radical Baptist minister and anti-slavery activist Morgan John Rhys in November the same year (Williams 1964: 60-63).

[14] The English Short Title Catalogue indicates that there were eight printings of the work, under the title *The Law of Nature*, in the 1790s. As we have seen, Volney's *Ruins* was translated into German by the ethnographer and revolutionary Georg Forster.

[15] Barlow was also involved in the post-revolutionary regimes of the Directory and the First Empire. He was appointed American consul to Algiers and subsequently returned to America in 1805 before accepting a mission to negotiate trade relations with Napoleon. This led him to Vilnius in Poland (now in Lithuania) in 1812, where

example, along with Paine and others, of a truly cosmopolitan radical in the revolutionary age. It has been argued that Barlow's *Advice*, in particular, indicated a path to a supra-national and cosmopolitan sentiment which he saw as necessary if citizenship was to be created through a process of regeneration (Ziesche 2010: 69-73). His literary productions and translations naturally brought him into contact with political figures in America, radicals in Britain, and revolutionaries in France, as did his early commercial activities and later work as a diplomat. Barlow's variegated career brought with it a need to be competent in two languages and to be able to operate successfully on the literary and political frontier between these worlds using this competence. It also brought him to translate important works by two of the emblematic figures of the Girondist faction of the French Revolution. Brissot's *New Travels* will not, perhaps, be what the Girondin leader is most remembered for, but, as Robert Darnton has argued, it was a significant contribution to French ruralist and republican sensibility (2003: 123-131) and its translation enabled this sensibility to be appreciated also in America and Britain. Volney's *Ruins*, or more accurately, its last four chapters entitled *Law of Nature*, already translated but inadequately according to its author, was to become a touchstone for later materialist and radical thinking. Despite the importance of these two works, and the fact that he brought both these texts to an anglophone readership, Barlow's role as a translator has not emerged fully. Richard Buel's recent biography (2011) is extensive and well-researched but only dedicates a few pages to his translations. Earlier works such as those carried out by Blau (1949), Adams (1937) and Miller (1932) make only passing references to them, if at all. It is perhaps indicative of a general downplaying of translation that has led Barlow's contribution to the reception of these works to have been largely ignored. Barlow was indeed a poet and revolutionary in his own right, but translation, if it was not his principal activity, was nevertheless an integral part of his own particular brand of cosmopolitan activism. His translations of Brissot and Volney were fully

he was caught up in the retreat from Moscow and fell ill, dying of pneumonia near Cracow (Buel 2011: 196-204; 352-64).

part of his general radical role as a revolutionary publicist. Translation, once again, appears here as a dense and at the same time indispensable means of the transmission of the ideas and values of the Atlantic Revolution.

Thomas Paine in French: François Soulés, Antoine Labaume, Francois Lanthenas, and the Cercle Social

Thomas Paine (1737-1809) was perhaps the most emblematic radical journalist, activist, and theoretician of the late eighteenth century, particularly if we consider the political movements in Europe and America, as we have here, as part of a single, if variegated, political phenomenon: an "Atlantic" revolution.[16] His position in American political history as a theorist of the American rebellion with his *Common Sense* (1776), and in the history of British radicalism with his *Rights of Man* (1991), is firmly established. His involvement in the French Revolution (he was a member of the Convention and resided in France from 1792 to 1802), however, was somewhat neglected until a recent work by Carline Lounissi (2018) explored for the first time in detail Paine's experiences in Paris and his involvement with the Girondin group.[17] This period should not, however, be studied in isolation from the rest of his activity as a militant cosmopolitan revolutionary. According to another commentator, "Paine's connections with reform circles in France are important to understanding him, even if much Paine scholarship almost entirely ignores them" (Philp 2011: 40).

Born in Thetford in England in 1737, after an unsuccessful career in as an excise officer, Paine left for America in 1774 on the advice of Benjamin Franklin, whom he had met in London. As a supporter of the American Revolution, he published there his hugely influential pamphlet *Common Sense* attacking the British monarchy, before returning to Europe in 1787, first to France and then to England where he published his *Rights of Man* (1791-92). This was a response to Edmund Burke's attacks on the French

[16] J.C.D. Clark's recent work on Paine (2018) emphasises throughout, instead, the differences between the American and French contexts of Paine's activity.

[17] John Keane's biography of Paine covers his experiences in Paris from 1792 to 1802 but does not examine his writings and collaboration with the Girondin revolutionaries in any great detail (1995: 349-452).

Revolution in his *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790), and consisted of a defence of the Revolution and a polemical attack on the principle of monarchy as in his earlier *Common Sense.* Pursued by the Pitt government for libel, Paine fled England for France in 1792, remaining there throughout the period of the Revolution, the Directory and the first years of the Napoleonic regime, returning to America only in 1802 (Keane 1995: 301-452). During this period, he wrote extensively and also saw his own work appearing in French. We will focus here first on Paine's own productions in French, probably the result of translation, and subsequently on the principal translations into French of his major writings.

As Lounissi has shown, Paine was the author of a considerable number of articles in the revolutionary press in France. This poses the question whether they were originally written in French or whether they were translations, for Paine's own competence in French was limited. Lounissi provides ample evidence that despite his long stay in France, Paine was never at home in the language. As late as 1798, after six years of continuous residence in France, he communicated with a member of the French Directory, Bertrand Barère, through an interpreter (2018: 198). When intervening in the National Convention, he spoke in English with a translator. Indeed, on one occasion, speaking on the subject of the punishment that was to be deemed appropriate for the condemned Louis XVI, the validity of the translation was contested by Jean-Paul Marat, who was proficient in English (2018: 132, 147). His fame and recognition led him to be nominated to the Committee of the Convention charged with drawing up the new Constitution, but he preferred to act within the committee with written rather than oral contributions (2018: 148-149; see also Griffo 2011: 305-306). Arriving at the Convention on the day in which the Girondins were being expelled, 31 May 1793, and unable to make himself understood to Hanriot the leader of the National Guard, it was Danton who explained the situation to him and who persuaded him to return to the safety of his home (Griffo 2011: 334).[18] In the *Age of*

[18] Clark relates another similar episode on the day after the Flight from Varennes, 21 June 1791, when Paine was surrounded by a crowd and only saved by the intervention of the French-speaking English radical, Thomas Christie (2018: 225).

Reason, Paine admits to having "no inclination to learn languages" (cit. in Keane 1995: 28). While lodging with the family of the Girondin politician Nicholas Bonneville (1760-1828), in 1797 he was still able to speak French only with difficulty although his passive knowledge had improved. Mme Bonneville said that "he could not speak French; he could understand it tolerably well when spoken to him, and he understood it when on paper perfectly well" (cit. in Keane 1995: 437).[19]

Given Paine's lack of productive competence in French, then, it is clear that the many short writings that appeared in his name in the period of his residence in Paris were translations, or at least were not originally written in French. In the turmoil of journalism in this period it is fatuous to attempt to pin down texts in terms of single authors, dates of first publications, and even titles. But Lounissi has shown the extent to which Paine put his name to a number of pieces which appeared first in French and which were only later, with subsequent collections of his work, translated into English (2018: 101). Paine was, for example, involved in various editorial ventures, mostly initiated by the Cercle Social. This was a group of writers and radicals which transformed itself, in 1791, from an informal association into a real publishing house, remaining very close to the Girondin circle of revolutionaries and counting amongst its members Bonneville, Abbé Claude Fauchet, Brissot, Jean-Marie and Manon Roland and Condorcet as well as Paine himself and others (Kates 1985). As well as directly publishing books, some of which as we shall see were translations from English, the Cercle Social was also involved in printing newspapers

[19] Clark gives Paine's lack of proficiency in French as evidence of limits to Paine's effective (rather than aspired to) cosmopolitanism: "that so able a man should not acquire fluency in spoken French during that time [his stay in France from 1792 to 1802] suggests a degree of cultural parochialism in the presence of what was still Europe's most prestigious and widely spoken language" (2018: 99). This lack of productive competence may not mean, however, that Paine's frame of reference was "specifically English" (2018: 99); his active association with the Girondin group would suggest otherwise, and in any case his comprehension of written and spoken French was by all accounts adequate. It does suggest, however, that the Girondin group that Paine associated had considerable competence in English, and that translation, in the case of Paine, takes on a particular significance.

such as *Le Vieux Tribun, Le Bien Informé* and the *Chronique du Mois*. The latter published several essays by Paine in French, and, indeed, he was its editor in chief for the issue of May 1792 (Lounissi 2018: 178). Given Paine's involvement in publishing initiatives such as this and the number of articles in French which were published in his name, we may conclude that although Paine often communicated in French through a translator, his understanding of French, in particular when it was written, as Mme Bonneville attested, was more than adequate (Lounissi 2018: 21, 178), although it is likely that he continued to have problems expressed himself even in writing.

Turning to the translations of Paine's major writings, we should first remember that it is difficult to overestimate the importance of Paine's *Rights of Man* in the radical tradition. It was a huge publishing event in Britain, selling around 200,000 copies in the first two years and becoming, according to one contemporary commentator, as canonical in popular literature as *Robinson Crusoe* or *Pilgrim's Progress* (Thompson 1963: 117-118). For this reason alone, it would be useful to chart fully the history of the book in translation. As we have seen, Georg Forster promoted the translation of the work into German. In our quest for revolutionary translators, we will limit our exploration to looking at those primarily responsible for the French versions of Paine's principal writings in the revolutionary period: François Soulés, Antoine Labaume and François Lanthenas.

The first translation of Paine's *Rights of Man* (Part I) was published in Paris by Buisson with the title *Droits de l'Homme. En Réponse à l'Attaque de M. Burke sur la Révolution Francois* (1791) and bore the name François Soulés (1748-1809) as the translator. Little is known of Soulés apart from the fact that he appears to have previously published a *Histoire des troubles de l'amérique anglaise* (1787), and the *Affaires de l'Inde depuis le commencement de la guerre avec la France en 1756* (1788). Soulés had been sufficiently integrated into the network of those supporting the American Revolution to have benefitted from comments on the manuscript of his *Histoire* by Thomas Jefferson, although in a letter to Soulés, Jefferson admitted that his corrections were "very trifling" (Jefferson, "From Thomas Jefferson to François Soulés"). It is possible that Paine had some

contact with him concerning the translation of the *Rights of Man*, or with his publisher Buisson, as the translation included a preface that Paine wrote specifically for the French readership, in which he made a strong distinction between the "people" of a nation and its government, with particular reference to Britain: "Il ne faut point confondre les peuples avec leurs gouvernements, et particulièrement le peuple Anglais avec son gouvernement" (*Droits de l'Homme*, 1791: v).

A second translation of Paine's *Rights of Man* appeared in the following year with the more theoretical title *Théorie et pratique des droits de l'homme* (1792), and announced on the title page that it was a translation undertaken "par F. Lanthenas et par le traducteur du *Sens commun*". François Lanthenas (1754-1799), who we will discuss below, was a Girondin politician, a friend and collaborator of Jean-Marie Roland. The translator of *Sens commun*, the first French edition of Paine's *Common Sense* (1776), published in 1791 using an edition which had come out in London in the same year (Chappey 2013: 228), was a less well-known figure, a teacher, translator and journalist by the name of Antoine Labaume (1756-1805)[20] Jean-Luc Chappey has retraced the career of this translator, who began as a teacher and journalist and became, in 1787, chief editor of a daily and later weekly newspaper *Censeur universel anglais* dedicated to English letters and "un des vecteurs essentiels des échanges entre l'angleterre et la France" (Chappey 2013: 226). His translations at first had been principally literary: Fanny Burney's *Eveline* (1778) and Laurence Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* (1775). But when he entered the world of radical politics in France in the late 1780s, he turned to translating a work by Ottobah Cugoano (1757-1801), entitled *Thoughts and Sentiments on the Evil and Wicked Traffic of the Slavery and Commerce of the Human Species* (1787) with a preface by Labaume himself denouncing the slave trade (Chappey 2013: 227). Whether this translation brought him to the notice of the recently founded Société des Amis des Noirs, founded by

[20] Strangely, perhaps, given the interest in radical circles in France in the American Revolution, there had been no previous translation of this work. Paine had been known in France in particular for his polemical *Letter to Abbé Raynal* contesting some of Raynal's notions regarding the American Revolution, a work which was translated into French in 1783 (Lounissi 2018: 3).

Brissot and which counted amongst its members many of those who would become better known in the Girondin circles such as Condorcet and Roland, or whether Labaume already belonged to this circle is not clear and perhaps not relevant.

From the title page of the 1792 translation of the *Rights of Man*, then, it is clear that Labaume collaborated with Lanthenas, although it is not clear to what extent and whether the omission of his name was, as Chappey speculates, a "signe de la faible reconnaissance pour celui qui n'est que traducteur", confirmation of the perennial "invisibility" of the translator (Venuti 1995), or due to understandable prudence on the part of Labaume himself. Labaume went on to publish a second edition of *Sens Commun* (1793), collaborating this time with the Girondin and life-long friend of Paine, Nicholas de Bonneville, this time with the printing firm managed directly by the Cercle Social. He was later to earn recognition (and a pension) from the Thermidorian Directory as "traducteur de plusieurs ouvrages anglais", and went on to found a literary and philosophical review, also specialising in translation, the *Bibliothèque Germanique* (Chappey 2013: 229-232).

Both Soulés and Labaume, then, were working within the radical circles of French support for the American Revolution and the Girondin republican group in revolutionary Paris. In both figures, however, it would seem that their linguistic and translational competences were at least as important as their political involvement.[21]

The second edition of Paine's *Rights of Man*, published in 1792 by the Cercle Social merits further discussion. Lounissi recounts that the decision to translate this work and publish it with the Cercle Social's "imprimérie" was based on an appreciation of the prestige of Paine as a foreigner and protagonist of the American Revolution, and on the hope that it would

[21] Chappey points to the example of Labaume as evidence of the emergence of a figure with specific linguistic and translational competences: "la représentation et la fonction du travail de traducteur évoluent selon le contexte politique: considéré comme un voyageur chargé de faire circuler les textes dans un espace politique de réciprocité sous la République, le traducteur devient progressivement un collecteur dont la mission est d'enrichir le dépôt parisien des matériaux récoltés dans toute l'Europe sous l'Empire" (2013: 235).

lead monarchists "of good faith" to question their views on hereditary monarchy (2018: 100). The text, however, published under the title *Théorie et pratique des droits de l'homme*, entirely omitted Part One and was only a translation of the more theoretical Part Two. Even Paine's preface to the original Part Two, which included another polemical attack on Edmund Burke, was omitted. There is, however, a brief, two-page introductory note, unsigned and without a title, which we may suppose to be by François Lanthenas, or at least to be the voice of the Cercle Social. The note explains why the original preface by Paine had been omitted: Paine had been obliged to make reference to the controversy with Burke for the English readership because of the "préjugés qui gouvernent encore *ce peuple*" (*Théorie et practique*: "Préface"). For a French readership, the note continued, it could be omitted as the French were not governed by the same prejudices. Paine's lengthy dedication to his friend and hero of the American Revolution, the Marquis de Lafayette was also conspicuously absent: Lafayette, by 1792, was in open opposition to the Girondin faction because of his support for a constitutional monarchy. With commendable philological rigour, the omission of this dedication was explained in the note. It had been cut partly because the French "ne supportent plus les épîtres dédicatoires", but also because Paine's own enthusiasm for Lafayette, according to the note, had been misplaced. Paine's respect for Lafayette, however, could be excused by the fact that, as an "Américain austère," he could have had no knowledge of the corrupting life of court flattery and the "langage apprêté des courtisans" (*Théorie et pratique*: "Préface"; see also Clark 2018: 311-312).

It is likely, given Paine's close collaboration with the Girondin group, that these interventions were not made autonomously by the translator or the editor but instead were agreed with the author himself. Paine had been on good terms with Lafayette (Lounissi 2018: 83), but the political situation in France had changed radically since the publication of Part One, in particular after the Flight to Varennes, Louis XVI's unsuccessful attempt to flee Paris and join the counterrevolutionary forces in July 1791. This appears to have radically changed Paine's perspective on the French monarchy: whereas in Part One he had shown himself open to a constitutional form of monarchy, Part Two reverted to the republican and

strongly anti-monarchical position of *Common Sense*. Indeed, after the Flight to Varennes, Paine published (in French, the original English version has never been found) a Republican Proclamation which led him into a polemic, in the newspapers *Le Républicain* and *Le Moniteur*, with the early theorist of the constitutional monarchy, Abbé Sieyès. Both the Robespierrist and Girondin factions in revolutionary France, moreover, were engaged in a campaign against Lafayette which culminated in the General's indictment and flight from France after the downfall of the monarchy in August 1792 (Lounissi, 2018: 106-115; Schama 1989: 560, 624). In this context, the reason for the omission of the dedication to Lafayette in Lanthenas' translated version becomes clear. His translation and publication of the second part of Paine's *Rights of Man* in 1792, in other words, can be inscribed within a general strategy of the more radical activists of the French Revolution, and in particular those associated with the Girondin group and their publication venture, the Cercle Social, which prioritized a radical republican vision of the future of France, in contrast to the constitutional monarchism of Lafayette.

Lanthenas went on to publish further translations of works by Paine, first the deist and anti-clerical *Age of Reason* (1794) and subsequently, Paine's attempt to discredit the English financial system, entitled *The Decline and Fall of the English System of Finance* (1796). Both these works were published in Paris, the former by the English publishing house Hartley, Adlard and Son, and the latter by the Cercle Social. Lanthenas introduced the *Decline and Fall* with a three-page preface entitled "Le traducteur a ses concitoyens" arguing that as the English system of finance, according to Paine, was on the verge of collapse, those who had so far not put their faith in the French system should do so now. The French constitution now offered "aux capitalistes timides les guaranties les plus sûre", and the time was ripe to take up the proposal to set up a National Bank. Lanthenas's appeal was directly to the new, moderate Frenchmen supporting the Directory:

> L'écrit dont je leur offre la lecture, éveillera sans doute en eux une juste défiance sur tous les placements qu'ils peuvent avoir fait de leur fortune dans l'étranger…Qu'ils rappellent donc promptement leurs richesse dans

> leur patrie… (*Décadence et chute du système de finances de l'angleterre*, "Le Traducteur")

The preface ended with a eulogy to Paine, "l'homme de génie, capable d'avancer l'esprit public des tems où il vit" who, moreover, through this very preface, announced that he "pardonne et oublie tout" (that is, his imprisonment for four months in the Luxembourg prison[22]) "pour l'amour de la liberté" (*Décadence et chute du système de finances de l'angleterre*, "Le Traducteur").

For Lanthenas, it is clear, translating Paine was one of the principal ways of conducting his political activity. Unlike Soulés and Labaume, he had no linguistic training or experience in translating, it would appear, having studied medicine in Lyon where he first came into contact with the Rolands (Kates 1985: 113). He himself made some important contributions to political debate, particularly with a book attacking primogeniture (*Inconvénients du droit d'aînesse*, no date, see Kates 1985: 114) and another arguing for the absolute liberty of the press (*De la liberté indéfinie de la presse*, 1791). The former, moreover, indicates that Lanthenas' thinking was particularly close to that of Paine, for whom the whole issue of heredity was a crucial element of his critique of monarchy and nobility (Casadei 2012: 69-71).

This brief exploration of the translation of Paine's principal works into French in the revolutionary period show the Girondin group and the Cercle Social, its publishing stronghold, to have had a particular interest in translation, although Gary Kates' otherwise thorough examination of the Cercle never pinpoints translation as a key element in their activity. We have seen how Labaume, a translator by profession, came into the orbit of the Cercle through his translation of Paine's *Common Sense*. Other Girondin figures were similarly active translators. Bonneville, who became a particular friend of Paine's (Keane 1995: 433-434), had made a living before the Revolution translating German and English classics (Kates

[22] Paine was arrested as a foreigner on 28 December 1793 and released only four months after 9 Thermidor and the fall of Robespierre in November of the same year (Keane 1995: 400-419).

1985: 20). Etta Palm d'Aelders, the Dutch feminist who moved to France in 1774 and also gravitated towards the Cercle had written a polemical tract in French attacking Mirabeau, subsequently translating this into Dutch along with Condorcet's speech to the National Assembly entitled "Declaration de l'Assemblée aux puissances de l'Europe" (Kates 1985: 122; Vega 1999: 348). Condorcet himself, although not putting his own name directly to any translated work, appears to have translated much material from Paine and others. Paine later wrote that his essay on "the Eighteenth Fructidor" was signed by him but was "was concerted between Condorcet and Myself. I wrote the original in English and Condorcet translated it" (cit. in Lounissi, 2018: 126). Paine's first intervention in the Convention on 21 November 1792 was translated by Condorcet and read out by Jean Baptiste Mailhe. His answers to "four questions" which formed the basis for articles by him in the *Chronique du Mois* were serialised in May, June, July and August 1792 and translated by Condorcet (Lounissi 2018: 135, 178).

This perspective on the Cercle Social and those associated with the Girondin group allows us a glimpse of a vibrant political and editorial milieu open to foreign influences. It reinforces a view of the Girondins as revolutionary writers and activists committed to radical change in France but working within a shared framework of transnational radicalism, the context of an "Atlantic Revolution" in which translation, as a means of sharing across different contexts a core set of ideas and values, was an integral and necessary part.

The writings of Thomas Paine and their reception in France through the translations of his Girondin associates are central to this story. The extent to which these writings embodied the reciprocal influences of the three political contexts to which they referred, America, Britain, and France, or instead related to a "specifically English frame of reference" (Clark 2018: 99) is still a matter of debate. Of all the English radicals in revolutionary Paris, however, some of whom will be discussed in the following chapter, Paine, no doubt because of his fame as publicist for the American revolution and the storm over the publication of his *Rights of Man* in Britain, would seem to be the one most closely associated with the revolutionaries, in particular with the Girondin group. If his intellectual

frame of reference may have remained English and American, his personal lived experience was certainly not. In France this included his election to the Convention to represent the Pas-de-Calais department, his intervention in the debate over the sentencing of Louis XVI, when he argued cogently (through a translator) for imprisonment rather than execution (Keane 1995: 358-369; Lounissi 2018: 125-147),[23] and his own arrest and incarceration in the Luxembourg prison. Suspected of support for the monarchy and tainted by his association with the Girondins, in his own account at least, he only escaped the guillotine by the inefficiency of his guards (Keane 1995: 413-414). The intricacies of the reciprocal influence of differing political traditions, whose unicity and particularity in the American, British, and French contexts are rightly stressed by Clark (2018: 415) should not obscure Paine's own real and effective involvement in the political events of all three countries.

Jean-Paul Marat: translating English politics and science

The revolutionary Jean Paul Marat (1743–1793) is not usually remembered for his translational activity but instead for being an ardent democratic journalist, editor of one of the most radical and outspoken newspapers of the Revolutionary period, *L'Ami du Peuple*, instigator of popular violence through his robust prose full of denunciations of revolutionary back-sliders, and for being assassinated, stabbed in his bath by the Girondin supporter Charlotte Corday on 13 July 1793. But in fact, Marat too was a cosmopolitan intellectual and one who, on at least two occasions, made his mark as a translator.

As an ambitious Swiss medical student, Marat settled for a period in Britain, from around 1765 until 1777, when he returned to France. While in Britain he published in English a number of scientific pamphlets, and two philosophical treatises, one of which he translated into French and published in Amsterdam in three volumes, *De l'homme* (1775-76) with

[23] Paine's biographer describes the moment at which Paine was called to give his verdict, based on the minutes of the sitting, as follows: "He steadied himself, paused, hands behind his back, and spoke slowly in practiced French: 'I vote for the confinement of Louis until the end of the war, and for his perpetual banishment after the war'" (Keane 1995: 367).

Marc-Michel Rey (Gillispie 1980: 300; Gottschalk 1967: 4-8).[24] He also produced and published in a lavish edition, a radical denunciation of monarchical tyranny, *The Chains of Slavery* (1774). This volume clearly had an English readership in mind and was intended to resonate with the citizens in the election campaign of 1774; the work was prefaced by an "Address to the Electors of Great Britain". This work was highly critical of some of the defects of the British constitution, including bribery, the power of the monarch and the corruption of Parliament, but in many respects it was a classical republican polemic, to the extent that it has been seen as essentially a "commonwealth text" in the tradition of the English seventeenth century (Hammersley 2010a: 138-140; Gillispie 1980: 299-300). In its denunciation not only of despotic monarchs but of the servility of their subjects who tolerated their rule, it has also been argued that the work shows the influence of Etienne de La Boétie's *De la servitù volontaire* the clandestine radical text whose author came to light, it will be remembered, in the edition brought out by Pierre Coste in 1727 (Panichi 1999: 43).[25]

Perhaps because *The Chains of Slavery* promoted the virtues of republics in small states and the difficulties of reproducing the republican system in large nations, a common theme in radical political debate in the eighteenth century, Marat waited until after the execution of Louis XVI and the establishment of the first French Republic before publishing the French edition as *Les chaînes de l'esclavage* (1792) It is not clear which of the two versions, English or French, preceded the other.[26] The French

[24] For a bibliography in English of Marat's writings, see Gottschalk (1967: 107-205).

[25] Panichi points out, however that "[È] pressoché impossibile … rendere conto dei numerosi *emprunts*, anche per l'assonanza con alcuni brani tratti da Rousseau che a sua volta subiva il fascino di La Boétie. Un passo per tutti contenuto nell'incipit di uno degli ultimi paragrafi, "Le peuple forse ses fers": "Le peuple ne se laisse pas seulement enchaîner: il présente lui-même la tête au joug" (1999: 46).

[26] It might be assumed that Marat wrote first in French and then translated (or had translated) this version into English, but without evidence this is only speculation. Rachel Hammersley's thorough discussions of the *Chains of Slavery* and *Les chaînes de l'esclavage* (2005, 2010a) do not address the problems of language or translation in any detail, but, following the chronology of publication, assume that the French version

edition, however, did include a number of chapters specific to the French situation, although they were not concerned with the new context of the revolution but rather to debates in the 1760s and 1770s over the origins of the *parlements* and the *States General*. Marat had, in fact, used parts of his text in his journalism in the years leading up to the Revolution, so it is probable that these parts of the text had been written long before 1793 when the translation was finally published (Hammersley 2010a: 145-146).

The self-translation of his own *The Chains of Slavery* (either into English from French or vice-versa) was not however Marat's only translation. In 1787, he published a new French edition of Newton's *Opticks* (1704) under the title *Optique de Newton. Traduction nouvelle* (1787) (Gillispie 1980: 320-323; see also Leech 2019). This was a major piece of work which Marat hoped would gain him acceptance into the French scientific community. The title page of the edition gives some indication of this, containing the validation of Nicolas Beauzée "l'un des Quarante de l'Académie Francoise" and stating that the new translation had been "approuvée par l'Académie Royale des Sciences". Beauzée also contributed a "Notice du traducteur." This justified a new translation of the work, here called *Traité de Newton sur les couleurs*, by saying that, although Newton's work was a "traité sublime, consacré depuis prés d'un siècle par les suffrages de l'Europe savante", it was nevertheless true that "par-tout on se plaint, & avec fondement, de l'obscurité & de l'infidélité des traductions qui ont paru jusqu'ici." This could be explained by the fact that to translate such a work, "il falloit des Traducteurs égalment au fait des Langues & de l'Optique, réunion des connoissances qui se rencontre trop rarement" (*Optique*: ix). The failings of the Coste translation, which we may remember was the standard version in French throughout the eighteenth century, were precisely due to this fact. Coste was "étranger à la

was a translation of a work originally published in English. It is legitimate to wonder, however, whether Marat's English was good enough to write fluently and correctly in English without assistance or revision. In his promotion of the *Chains of Slavery* in England, we may note, he sent a copy to John Wilkes accompanied by a letter written in French (Hammersley 2005: 665; 2010a: 143). Gillispie argues that "it is clear from his style that he had written his drafts in French and translated them into English" (1980: 300).

matière, peu versé dans les Langues, moins encore dans l'art d'écrire, il a servilement copié les tours de phrase de l'original" (*Optique*: x). The criticisms of Beauzée, in short, were that Coste had undertaken a translation which depended too much on the style and language of the original. Marat's translation, said Beauzée, followed a freer approach:

> Il a souvent rendu par un mot de longues périphrases; il a retranché une infinité de répétitions fastidiuses; … il a jeté en notes plusieurs definitions & observations, qui, intercalées dans le texte sous la forme de parenthèses, rompoient la chaîne des raisonnements." (O*ptique*: xi)[27]

All of these modifications were aimed at producing a text which would be useful particularly to young people in order that they could better understand "le plus sublime ouvrage qui ait jamais paru sur les étonnants phénomènes de la lumière" (*Optique*: xiv). The indications regarding the style and method of the translation in the editor's preface are reproduced also in Marat's own translator's preface. In particular, if reading Newton's *Opticks* was to be made "agréable", this could only be done "dans une traduction libre" (*Optique*: xvii)."

There are three observations to be made here. First, the entire translation project by Marat and his supporter in the Académie Royale des Sciences is to be understood as part of a strategy on the part of Marat to gain recognition for his own theories of light, first by the prestigious national Académie and subsequently by provincial academies, notably Rouen, Lyon and Montpellier (Baillon 2009; Gillespie 1980: 290-330).[28] Marat did not, however, as some detractors put forward, use the translation as a means of promoting his own views through footnotes –

[27] Beauzée's comments paraphrase Marat's own explanation of his translation methodology in his own preface: "…j'ai rendu par des termes propres de longues périphrases. J'ai retranché une infinité de répétitions… J'ai jeté en notes plusieurs definitions & observations … J'ai transposé quelques passages…J'ai ménagé des transitions naturelles…" (*Optique*: xix).

[28] The translation has been generally recognized as competent. According to Gillispie's authoritative account of science late eighteenth-century France it was an "excellent one … nowhere unfaithful to Newton's meaning" (1980: 320).

almost all of these refer to criticisms of the experimentalist and physicist Abbé Rochon (Gillispie 1980: 321). The criticisms of Pierre Coste's translation in Beauzée's preface indicate a different strategy behind the publication of this translation: to contrast Coste's apparent lack of scientific knowledge with the scientific competence of Marat. This attempt to delegitimate the Coste's standard translation can be interpreted as a strategy of "negative filiation", in the words of André Lefevere, an "attempt to denigrate predecessors whose work may lay claim to the position of 'standard translation'" (1998: 47), and as such is a recognizable and recurrent strategy in translations which have to promote a new version. In this case, the retranslation by Marat was clearly part of the promotion of the figure of Marat himself, here portrayed implicitly as one of those rare figures who could unite linguistic and scientific knowledge (although, as we have seen, the second French edition of the *Opticks* published in Paris in 1720 had been heavily revised by scientists such as de Moivre and Desaguliers).[29] As such, the translation can be seen as part of Marat's attempt to legitimate himself, linguistically and scientifically, before the Academy and, as a consequence, to strengthen his own attempt to criticize the orthodoxy of Newtonianism.[30] In this light, science was another area in which those challenging orthodoxies could portray themselves as heroes attempting to overthrow the establishment, apparently the way that Brissot interpreted Marat's scientific career (Gottschalk 1967: 28). Struggles between scientists and intellectuals on the "outside" and the Academies in eighteenth-century France were a common trope of radical discourse. The "closed" nature of the academies, in particular, could be compared to the closed nature of monarchical government, and the attack on Newtonian orthodoxy could thus be interpreted as analogous to attacks on monarchy.[31]

[29] As Baillon points out, the accusation with regard to Coste "seems ill-advised" as "the second printing of his translation of the *Opticks* was very much a collaborative work in which several key figures belonging to Newton's circle were involved" (2009: 2).

[30] Louis Gottschalk's biography of Marat goes so far as to suggest that if Marat had been accepted into the Academy he would have played only a small part in the Revolution as his desire for fame would have been met" (1967: 30).

[31] We may add that, for Jonathan Israel, Newtonian thought is to be collocated on the

Second, this attack on the closed nature of the academies was carried over into the justification of the translation. As we have seen, the prefaces acknowledged the importance of Newton but suggested that the available translations were obscure, and thus were not appropriate to young people or those with no prior scientific knowledge. A freer more elegant translation would thus open Newton's theories up to a wider reading public. Coste, according to the editor's preface, had mimicked the excessive reverence for Newton with a "word for word" translation and had "servilement" followed the original (*Optique*: x). Marat significantly referred to his own translation as "une traduction libre" (*Optique*: xvii). It would seem here that the semantic range of the term "libre" used to describe a translation strategy is wider than its strict linguistic application and conjures up, rhetorically, notions of free scientific interpretation (in opposition to the orthodoxies of the Académie) as well as freedom from the shackles of *ancien régime* institutions. In this perspective, translation strategy itself could resonate within a wider context of notions of freedom, orthodoxy, obedience, fidelity and so on.

Finally, the translation is a striking example of high visibility of the translator, in comparison with many of the other translations we have been considering, often anonymous. Although the name of Marat does not appear on the title page, there was no doubt, either at the time of publication or subsequently, that he was the translator (Gillispie 1980: 320-323). His own motive for undertaking the translation, and this was of course behind his visibility, was clearly related to his personal ambitions. This is not, of course, how the motives were described in his translator's preface, which instead stressed his personal quest for scientific knowledge. Wanting to deepen his knowledge of Newton's system of colours and "n'ayant pas l'original sous la main, je commencai à l'étudier dans quelques traductions, dont je ne tardai pas à sentir les défauts" (*Optique*: xv). In order not to waste time, and "de me soutraire aux dégoûts inséparables d'une lecture laborieuse" he had begun to translate it. Indeed, he continues, "cette

"moderate" rather than the "radical" wing of the Enlightenment due to its "insistence on the impossibility of our grasping final causes and the dependence of the natural world on divine regulation" (2001: 518).

traduction, entreprise pour mon usage particulier, n'étoit pas destinée à voir le jour…" (*Optique*: xv-xvi). Translation, then, is here portrayed not as a service to the community but an activity responding to the particular needs of the translating subject himself. Whether the result of personal ambition or the desire for knowledge, translation here emerges as a natural correlative of the intellectual, political, religious, and scientific work with which the translators are in any case engaged.

Marat's radicalism, then, was articulated not only through his journalism during the Revolution but his self-translation of an earlier denunciation of political subjection, his *Chains of Slavery*, and also, in a more indirect manner, in his retranslation of Newton's *Opticks* as part of a challenge to the accepted scientific establishment. In both of these cases, and as indeed his translator's preface to Newton's *Optique* makes apparent, the objective was not only the adaptation of a text through a translation, to a foreign readership but a fervent proposal of the translator himself as a legitimate political, or, in the second case, scientific agent. In this, Marat's translations are in line with the activity of the other translators we have considered in this chapter. Mirabeau, although publishing anonymously and in forms which relied on extensive collaboration between different producers of text (including in particular, it may be remembered, Samuel Romilly and Etienne Clavière) was also intent on translating with the specific purpose of undermining political orthodoxy. Barlow's translations were strongly linked to the propagation of the radical ideas, in this case of Brissot and Volney, as, of course, were the various editions of Thomas Paine's work which appeared in French in the 1790s. In all these cases, to a greater or lesser extent, the experiences of England and North America were valued by radicals in France and for this reason translated. Translation had a communicative and socializing function, but it also served to legitimate revolutionary ideas through attention to radical works outside France, as part of a more generalised radical and often republican consensus. But as the French Revolution progressed and became a key focus for reformists and radicals outside France, this relationship inverted: English radicals began increasingly to turn their attention to the events in France in a similarly emulatory move. It is to the English translators of the French Revolution in the 1790s that we will now turn.

5. Joseph Johnson: radical publishing and translation in Britain in the 1790s

For different groups of radicals in the eighteenth century translation was a significant activity. It was part of an attempt to broaden the transnational basis for their ideas, and to put before their readers, radical or revolutionary experiences and ideologies such as those of Britain and America, which could be held up for emulation. In 1790s Britain, it will be argued, translating texts relating the French revolutionary experience could do likewise, that is, open readers to a greater awareness of a revolutionary experience ripe for emulation on the part of the British reform movement. The translational activity and interaction between radicals and revolutionaries on both sides of the channel is evidence of a shared cosmopolitan perspective on reform and revolution which substantiates the "Atlantic Revolution" thesis of Palmer and others already discussed (Palmer 1959; Godechot 1965). In terms of Britain in the 1790s, this cosmopolitan perspective has not been awarded a central place in the historiography, in which, it must be said, a focus on the growth of indigenous radical movements takes pride of place.[1] Although these

[1] The key text for the history of British radicalism in the 1790s remains E.P. Thompson's well-known *The Making of the English Working Class* (1963) which, however, restricts the scope specifically to England. Other works on British radicalism

transnational, cross-over areas of contact may be peripheral to events unfolding in fundamentally different national contexts, our focus here on translation in these radical spheres has in any case the aim of throwing light on some of these hitherto underdeveloped areas.

The particular British experience of radicalism in the eighteenth century leads to a necessary specification in terms of the notion of dissent. In France, as we have seen, radical opposition to the absolutist regime often took the form of opposition also to Catholic orthodoxy and the assumption of an openly materialist and atheistic philosophy (as, for example, in the work of d'Holbach). In Britain, instead, perhaps due to the effective exclusion of religious dissenters from full political participation (those who did not accept the thirty-nine articles at the basis of the Anglican faith were denied voting rights and were not able to hold public office), radicalism often found an outlet in a specifically "dissenting" religious opposition for which atheism and materialism were anathema (Thompson 1963: 28-58). Materialists and radical philosophers such as Toland, whose deism could often be read as outright atheism, were never mainstream (Israel 2001: 610-614); more common were figures such as Joseph Priestley, the late eighteenth-century scientist and radical, whose materialism and political radicalism were always carefully put forward within the dissenting (and not atheist) framework (Porter 2000: 96-129). Many of the radical figures whose translational activity we will be considering in this chapter and the next emerge from this specific background in religious dissent.

---

have taken a similarly national focus: McCalman (1988), Barrell (2000), Barrell and Mee (2006) and Mee (1992, 2016). Some work has been done on the impact of the French Revolution on the British literary scene and the debates over the interpretation of the Revolution (Butler 1984; Crisafulli 1990) and individual studies of figures such as Thomas Paine (Keane 1995) or Helen Maria Williams (Kennedy 2002) have constructed narratives which include Paris in a significant manner in the concerns of radicalism in London. Some research has been undertaken on the French exile community in England (Burrows 2000). A recent work by Peter Linebaugh (2019) has, through its focus on the figure of Colonel Despard, the radical executed for treason in 1802, located this radicalism more firmly in a global (colonial) perspective.

One of Joseph Priestley's earliest collaborators was the publisher Joseph Johnson, whom we met as the publisher of Mirabeau's work attacking the Society of the Cincinnati in the mid-1780s. Johnson and his printing shop was, in the 1780s and 1790s, a hub for English radicals with a cosmopolitan outlook. His own cosmopolitan perspective can be traced in the number and nature of the books he published in translation which were related to the events of the revolution in France. Before exploring these translations, however, we may turn first to another of Joseph Johnson's publishing ventures, the *Analytical Review*, a monthly literary magazine which published without interruption from 1788 to 1798, and also to translations to be found in other journals and newspapers.

Joseph Johnson's *Analytical Review*

Joseph Johnson (1738-1809), originally from Liverpool, set himself up as a publisher and bookseller in London in the 1760s in Paternoster Row. In 1770 after a fire on his premises, he moved to 72, St Paul's Churchyard, which was to be the headquarters of his business until his death in 1809 (Braithwaite 2003: 83). From a Calvinist family, Johnson was an active voice calling for the full political rights of dissenters, and set up the first Unitarian church in London with Theophilus Lindsey in 1774 (Braithwaite, 2003: 27). His biographer, Helen Braithwaite, argues indeed that Johnson's radicalism can be characterised principally as religious, whereas his political radicalism was of a moderate variety and should be distinguished from the more popular and forceful activities of popular booksellers, publishers and writers such as Daniel Eaton and Thomas Spence (Braithwaite 2003: 163-165).[2] Johnson's radicalism may have derived, at least in part, from the influence of Joseph Priestley. Priestley had much of his own work, including his early political tract the *Essay on the First principles of Government* (1768) published by Johnson (Braithwaite 2003: 13). But the influence went further: it is likely that the scientific work published in Europe that Johnson put out in translation,

[2] John Barrell's review of Braithwaite's work, while admitting that Johnson was radical in religious matters but "less radical than you might think" in politics, is critical of her substantial dismissal of popular politics. For Barrell, Braithwaite "redraws the political map of radical London in the 1790s, to make it a place fit for gentlemen" (2003: 11).

including works by Lavoisier, De Fourcroy and other members of the Royal Academy of Sciences, came to Johnson through Priestley, in particular after his visit to Paris in 1784 (Braithwaite 2003: 93-94). It is likely too that Priestley's contacts through Lord Shelburne were also decisive in Johnson's decisions to publish works of political and religious dissent.

Turning to Johnson's *Analytical Review*, one historian has seen it as "perhaps the purest example of Enlightenment cosmopolitanism in the 1790s" (Scrivener 2007: 33). Although other reviews such as the *Monthly Review* and the *Critical Review* are also known for their attention to European cosmopolitanism, the *Analytical Review* stood out for maintaining this approach throughout the crucial decade of the 1790s when national perspectives were "reshaping British culture" (Scrivener 2007: 59).[3] It was founded by the Scottish radical Thomas Christie (who will be discussed below in Chapter Six) in 1788 but its day-to-day running was soon devolved to the owner Joseph Johnson. The content of the review, according to Michael Scrivener, clearly illustrates its cosmopolitanism: it had a general "enthusiasm for the foreign" and regularly published articles on oriental and exotic themes such as Turkey, Africa, America, the West Indies, and India (2007: 59, 62).[4] The cosmopolitan orientation of the review was also apparent in the long appendices to be found at the end of each issue entitled *Literary Intelligence* which gave brief summaries of publications and debates abroad in a number of fields, in particular regarding the activities of European literary and scientific academies. A brief look at a single, typical issue can provide an idea of the extent and nature of the transnational (and thus, as we shall see, translational) scope of the review.

[3] The circulation of the *Monthly Review* (5,000) and the *Critical Review* (3,500) were larger than that of the *Analytical Review* (1,500) although this was still significant for the period (Braithwaite 2003: 88).

[4] Scrivener notes the particular interest of the review in oriental and colonial topics (2007: 63), although its Europe-centred viewpoint makes it fairly typical in terms of what is increasingly being seen as the general Eurocentrism of the Enlightenment (Conrad 2012).

The May 1789 (vol. 4) issue was made up of 128 pages, of which the last 16 were dedicated to the section *Literary Intelligence.* This section included notices on the activities of the Royal Agricultural Society of Paris, the Royal Society of Gottingen and the Society for Promoting Natural Knowledge at Bern; brief reviews of books on political economy and biography translated from a literary review published in Jena; a review of a volume entitled *Principes des loix criminelles* (1789) published in Paris, one of a number of translations of articles which had appeared in the *Journal des Savants*, also published in Paris; reviews of works on medicine and chemistry originally published in French; and summaries of works in German on mathematics and military science (*Analytical Review*, hereafter *AR*, vol. 4: 113-127). Longer articles in the issue were also often dedicated to foreign topics and material. The May 1789 issue, for example, included a review of a translated work on the sufferings of the Huguenot population in France brought to the attention of the public by Priestley (*AR*, vol. 4: 64-66).

The review, as we have seen in other cases such as the Huguenot literary reviews explored in Chapter Two, also contained much material in translation. This issue included, for example, a review of a polemic against the Prussian monarchy, the *Histoire secrète de la cour de Berlin* (1789) published anonymously in French (but in fact put together by Count Mirabeau) (*AR*, vol. 4: 80-87), and an article summarising five books or pamphlets published either in English, in French or in English translations from French, relating to the *Memoirs* of the "Countess" Jeanne de la Motte justifying her part in the "Diamond Necklace" court scandal in Versailles (Schama 1989: 203-210).

The quantity of material appearing in the *Analytical Review* in translation or reporting on translated works, is ample evidence, then, of its cosmopolitan orientation and the particular attention it paid to events, publications, controversies, and scientific discussions which occurred in Europe. It is significant that a later issue included a long review dedicated to the work of the most prominent proponent of a cosmopolitan revolutionary world-view in Paris, Anacharsis Cloots' *La République Universelle* (1792) (Scrivener 2007: 62).

The general cosmopolitanism of the review highlighted in Scrivener's account took on a specifically radical hue in its support for the French Revolution: throughout the 1790s, it featured articles directly relating to the Revolution in almost every issue. In particular, it published a large number of positive reviews of works emerging from the radical but non-Jacobin area of the Revolution which we can for convenience sake put under the category of "Girondin". As we shall see, this is in line with Johnson's policy of publishing a number of works written by figures closely allied to the Girondin group. The August 1793 issue, for example, contained a review of the *Oeuvres* of the Girondin Jérôme Pétion (1793), almost entirely made up of translated extracts, which ended with an appreciation of Pétion as an "able and enlightened legislator" (*AR*, vol. 16: 455). It is true that the *Analytical Review* did publish notices of works hostile to the Revolution, but these notices could also be highly critical of this hostility. The July 1793 issue, for example, reviewed a work entitled *Éloge funebre de Louis Seize*, written by a Mr Lenoir, professor of the French language, whose antipathy towards the regicides led him to call down the wrath of God on them:

> Annihilate all those guilty heads! Let a frightful consequence leave a memorable and terrible example of the interest which heaven takes in the destiny of kings, and of the severe justice which awaits nations that are so criminal as to shed the precious blood of the sacred representatives of thy dignity here below. (*AR*, vol. 16: 342)

To which the sober reviewer replies:

> It is not without horror, that we can behold a man, in cold blood, offering up his supplications to the Deity, for an indiscriminate slaughter of his countrymen. (*AR*, vol 16: 342)

The attention the *Analytical Review* paid to the French Revolution, however, was primarily not political but literary, scientific, and philosophical. When it did treat political affairs, its orientation was perhaps unusual. The October 1789 issue, for example, published a long

review of a book entitled *Le dignité du commerce* (1789) written by the French orientalist, Abraham Hyacinth Anquetil-Duperron (1731-1805) which advocated free trade and attacked the *ancien régime*'s prohibition of the nobility from carrying on any form of commercial activity. This might seem an issue that was marginal to the concerns of the French Revolution but in fact it was the subject of some considerable controversy as the revolution sought to differentiate itself from the constrictions of the *ancien régime* (Smith 2017: 27-28).

This article is worth some attention for a number of reasons. The first is that, as we have seen with other reviews, it consisted not only of criticism but lengthy summaries and extracts in translation. The volume was never translated fully into English and so, like other examples in reviews, may fall off the radar of the history of translation. Any consideration of transnational influences, translation strategies and the reception of texts through translation needs also to take into account this type of material, which appeared only in reviews. Second, it is worth noting the prominence given to the article: it was the first item in the October 1789 issue, occupying the first 21 pages. This alone testifies to the importance that Johnson and the editors assigned to the topic and its author. In other words, in the year of the fall of the Bastille, the Grand Peur in rural France and the abolition of feudalism, the *Analytical Review* gave pride of place to a long presentation of a volume on the importance of free trade. Third, and perhaps this may explain the prominence given to the topic, Anquetil-Duperron was already a well-known figure who occupies a small but significant place in the history of translation and orientalism as the first translator of Zoroastran texts (Said 1995 [1978]: 76-78).[5] As the reviewer reminded readers, "the ingenious and learned M.

[5] In 1789, Anquetil-Duperron was clearly in the reform camp (Smith 2017: 28) and Siep Stuurman (2007) has argued persuasively that his particular view of orientalism was based on universalist and cosmopolitan principles. However, Anquetil-Duperron subsequently became a supporter of the counterrevolution, as was apparent in his later translation of the sacred Sanskrit texts, the *Upanishads* (1801-2), which was "offered to the public as a counter-revolutionary polemic, filled with notes, asides and appendices in which Anquetil allowed himself, at the slightest pretexts, to comment on political developments in France" (Smith 2017: 26).

Anquetil du Perron is already known to the public, by his edition of the *Zend-Avesta* of Zoroaster" (*AR*, vol. 5: 129). Fourth, the review enters into considerable detail regarding the specific topics treated by Anquetil-Duperron. A brief exploration of this article will give us some indication of the particular interest taken by the review in the events in France.

The review gave considerable space to a discussion of Anquetil-Duperron's liberal economic worldview. It contained a substantial translation of almost all of the first section, *Foundations of Commerce*, to which the reviewer adds a single comment of his own underlining the importance of access to credit (*AR*, vol. 5: 130-131). After brief summaries of the intervening sections, the reviewer then concentrates first on Anquetil-Duperron's criticism of Montesquieu's defence of the prohibition of the nobility from any involvement with commerce (*AR*, vol. 5: 133-134), and then on the contemporary problem of the financial arrears of the French monarchy, the precipitation factor of the crisis of the spring and summer of 1789, translating in full his five suggestions for "restoring France to her ancient power and greatness" (*AR*, vol. 5: 137). The review then attacked Anquetil-Duperron's proposal to set up a French chartered company with a monopoly of trade with the East Indies on the model of the British East India Company. This proposal, the reviewer pointed out, went against Anquetil-Duperron's general defence of free trade and his previous attacks on such monopolies as "useless and pernicious" (*AR*, vol. 5: 139).[6] The summary and translations of the extracts thus enabled the reviewer to put forward his or her own views on the subject, essentially confirming Anquetil-Duperron's economic liberalism.

The article also reported faithfully, through translation, the long section of Anquetil-Duperron's volume summarising the instructions of the different "bailliages, towns, nobles &c" to the deputies in the National Assembly regarding the theme of commerce. These were included as they provided, according to the reviewer, "a specimen of the opinions and ideas

[6] Anquetil-Duperron's previous criticisms of state monopolies were in line with the attacks of Edmund Burke and others on the extensive corruption and despotism in the East India Company under the governorship of Warren Hastings (Israel 2012: 603, 607-608).

that now prevail in the kingdom of France" (*AR*, vol. 5: 139). The extracts, all translations, related to four themes chosen by the reviewer: the "honour of commerce"; the issue of the commercial treaty between France and Britain of 1786; the abolition of monopolies, in particular that of the French East India Company; and the abolition of slavery in the French colonies (*AR*, vol. 5: 139-150). Taken together, these translations and extracts from the final part of Anquetil-Duperron's volume indicate the interest of the review, and it is to be presumed, its editors and readers, in a detailed exposition of the views of French citizens on four important issues facing the National Assembly and the economic policy of the French government in the early years of the Revolution. As the reviewer concluded, what was being presented to the reader was:

> …the most singular and most interesting collection of state papers ever published. For what are the machinations of despots, or the intrigues of worthless statesmen, when compared to the object now before us? A nation of twenty-four millions of people, raising their unanimous voice in favour of liberty, and the rights of human nature! (*AR*, vol. 5: 147)

Interest in French affairs, later to be focused on political rights, constitutional innovation, the nature of the monarchy, citizenship and so on, at this point was specifically focused on the issue of the commercial and economic development of France. The article closed with a few pages in support of France becoming a "free and commercial people": this should be seen not as the rise of a rival power but of a nation in which "riches will be more generally diffused" (*AR*, vol. 5: 149) and thus one which could constitute an important export market. It would also usher in a regime of free trade which "excites mutual emulation, gives a new spur to mutual industry, and thus ultimately is an advantage to both" (*AR*, vol. 5: 148). In addition to these political and economic motives, there were also moral considerations:

> As men, we ought to be interested in the happiness of man; as freemen, we ought to rejoice in the extension of freedom; as citizens of the world, we should wish well to all its inhabitants; and as Christians, we are bound to

> consider all men as our brethren. Instead then of viewing their rising liberty with mean and jealous suspicion, we ought to hail the auspicious day, when the sun of freedom arose to illuminate their land. (*AR*, vol. 5: 149)

The *Analytical Review*'s extended treatment of Anquetil-Duperron's *Dignité de commerce*, in short, brought before an anglophone readership the considerations of important moderate reformist voices active in the early part of the revolution (although the debate over the position of the nobility was soon to be eclipsed by more radical issues such as the status of the monarchy and the church), as well as the opinions of a large number of French citizens through their instructions to the deputies sitting in the National Assembly. This was done by means of a general commentary on the work which included extracts directly translated from the French original, summaries framed for the English readership, and the reviewer's own opinions. The stance of the reviewer is undoubtedly liberal and moderate, as was the volume of Anquetil-Duperron itself. There is no indication of his or her identity: the article was signed with the initials 'T.T'. It is clear, however that the reviewer's liberal economic views and support for the French Revolution found their outlet in an important work of *de facto* translation. It is also interesting that the review of a work on what can only be seen today as a marginal topic to the French Revolution was given centre stage in Johnson's magazine.

Translation in newspapers

The *Analytical Review*, then, constituted a significant conduit for literary, philosophical, and political news of revolutionary France, also by means of translations embedded, so to speak, in the articles. As such, it was merely the literary equivalent of numerous other ephemeral publications – newssheets, newspapers, broadsheets, magazines and so on – which did likewise for political news and the daily affairs of foreign governments, in particular, in this period, the French Revolutionary governments. Attention to French affairs and extensive translations from French publications were particularly evident, as may be imagined, in newspapers which were promoting the cause of radicalism and an oppositional stance towards the British state.

The organ of the United Irishmen in Belfast, for example, the *Northern Star*, edited by William Drennan, included much material following the fortunes of the French Directory after 1795 (Davies 1990). If we take only the issues of the first months of 1796, we can find a translation of a speech by Boissy d'Anglas on the liberty of the press made to the Council of Five Hundred, a long translation of a letter from the French plenipotentiary to Philadelphia, a letter to the Directory from General Hoche, future leader of the attempted invasion of Ireland in December 1796, and character sketches of the major leaders of the Directory (*Northern Star*, issues 421, 430-431, 444). This active focus on French affairs can be seen also in a major way in *The Press*, the short-lived newspaper edited by Arthur O'Connor, one of the Dublin leaders of the United Irishmen and future husband of Eliza Condorcet, daughter of the philosopher and Girondin, and published in Dublin between September 1797 and March 1798. This newspaper, issued three times a week, included translations of many of the major speeches in the Directory, accounts of the activities of the French armies in Holland and Italy as well as a serialisation of Volney's *Law of Nature* (Leech 2017). Another example is the *Moral and Political Magazine*, the short-lived newspaper of the radical association, the London Corresponding Society, which was issued over a period of 12 months from June 1796 to December 1797, and which similarly included much material focused on the activities of the revolutionaries in France. In June 1796, for example, it included a three-page translation of a letter to the Directory from Francois-Noel "Gracchus" Babeuf, known for his Conspiracy of Equals plot in May the same year, followed by a proclamation by Bonaparte to his soldiers, a memoir on Bonaparte written by a member of the Council of Ancients, as well as six pages of *Foreign and Domestic Transactions* also dedicated mostly to French affairs. These translations were clearly part of the magazine's oppositional political stance, as was made explicit in the September 1796 issue which included further accounts of the successes of the French armies in Flanders and Italy:

> We have translated the following article from a French journal, in which it is inserted as an extract from an Italian Gazette. It offers an example of the

> progress of freedom in Italy, of the same kind as that of Milan on the same occasion. (*Moral and Political Magazine*: 169-170)

Nor was the activity of these newspapers limited to news alone. In August 1796 the *Moral and Political Magazine* published what it claimed was the first translation into English of the first chapter of Abbé Emanuel Sieyès well-known pamphlet of spring 1789 entitled *Qu'est-ce que le Tiers-État*? with an appropriate introduction:

> Among the writings which more immediately prepared the way for the French Revolution, the most eminent and powerful were two pamphlets by the Abbé Sieyès, namely AN ESSAY ON THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS and a discussion of this question – "WHAT IS THE THIRD ESTATE OF THE NATION" or in other words "WHAT IS THE RELATION OF THE PEOPLE IN SOCIETY?" The former has been translated into English; but, we believe, the latter never has. Indeed, so great a part of the latter relates merely to the local circumstances of the old French polity, that it never could be generally demanded here. But it contains one chapter applicable to all people, in all times. It is the first chapter of the work; and we give it our readers with infinite pleasure. (*Moral and Political Magazine*: 126)[7]

The full extent and nature of translated material in the English press during this period remains a subject for further work. But the few examples given here suggest that this material was considerable. As Esperança Bielsa and Susan Bassnett have pointed out, the quantity of translated material appearing in newspapers and magazines betrays a substantial activity of behind-the-scenes translation, sometimes surfacing as identifiable texts but much of the time serving instead as a back office activity (Bielsa and Bassnett 2009).

[7] The *Moral and Political Magazine* was correct: the ESTC catalogue lists only one work by Sieyès in translation before 1800, his *An Essay on the Privileged Orders* (1791).

Joseph Johnson and the Girondins in English

Returning to the figure of Joseph Johnson, the *Analytical Review*, as we have seen, was characterised by a particularly cosmopolitan and transnational perspective, one which broadly supported the French Revolution, at least in its early stages, and one for which translation occupied a central place through summaries, extracts, and commentaries. The review was, though, only a small part of Johnson's business, which was primarily the editing and production of printed volumes. His publishing business, in fact, according to his biographer, was one of the most important in London in this period, along with those of Thomas Cadell and P. Stockman (Braithwaite 2003: 83).

Johnson's publishing house was known for its particular dissenting political and religious orientation, as can be expected given that it emerged from the circle of Joseph Priestley. One of its early publications was Priestley's defence of the liberty of the American colonists in the period before the rebellion, his *The Present State of Liberty in Great Britain and her colonies* (1769).[8] Johnson also published Benjamin Franklin's *Political, Miscellaneous and Philosophical Papers* (1779), edited by Benjamin Vaughan, the pivotal figure in terms of relations between Franklin, Mirabeau, Romilly, Priestley, and Johnson himself, as we have seen (Braithwaite 2003: 56-58). The dissenting orientation of his activity is evident from his publication of a number of other controversial works such as Priestley's influential *Address to Protestant Dissenters of All Denominations, on the Approaching Election of Members of Parliament*

[8] This pro-American stance was continued during the War of Independence with the publication, for example, Richard Price's *Observations on the Nature of Civil Liberty; the Principles of Government, and the Justice and Policy of the War with America* (1776), perhaps "the most influential English defence of the colonists" (Braithwaite 2003: 48). According to Braithwaite, this highly critical position with regard to the British government was prompted not so much by radical politics per se as by Johnson's close ties "to the fortunes of the dissenting community at home" (2003: 58). The amount of material published defending the American case, in fact, was inferior to that of other publishers such as the those of the Dilly brothers and John Almon, who published, for example, Thomas Paine's pathbreaking *Common Sense* (1776) (Braithwaite 2003: 57-58).

(1774), which argued for the widening of the political franchise to include religious dissenters, and Richard Baron's radical denunciations of orthodox Christianity, *The Pillars of Priestcraft and Orthodoxy Shaken* (1752). Johnson did not ignore, however, other popular radical causes such as Corsican independence (Braithwaite 2003: 30), a touchstone for those proposing constitutional reform in the 1760s (Israel 2012; 363-364) and the growing anti-slavery movement with, for example, John Newton's anonymous account of his experiences on a slave ship, *An authentic narrative of some remarkable and interesting particulars in the life of* ******** (1764)[9] and Olaudah Equiano's *Interesting Narrative* (1789).

This was the overall context of the translations Johnson published relating to the French Revolution. These can be divided chronologically into two periods. The first, from 1785 to 1792, saw the publication, as we have seen in Chapter Four, of Mirabeau's *Considérations sur l'Order de Cincinnatus* (1784), in French and in English; Condorcet's *Life of Turgot* (1787); Jacques Necker's *Of the Importance of Religious Opinions* (1788), translated by Mary Wollstonecraft; a brief pamphlet by Jean-Paul Rabaut Saint-Étienne, an early leader of the French Revolution; a work by the collaborator of Mirabeau and later translator of Jeremy Bentham, Pierre Etienne Louis Dumont's *Letters containing an account of the late revolution in France* (1792); and finally the *Ruins of Empire*, by Volney, soon to become a key text for religious and political radicalism in the early nineteenth century. The second period was concentrated in 1795, and consisted of a spate of personal accounts of the French Revolution by Girondist protagonists. These included Konrad Oelsner's *Life of Sieyès* (1795); Madame Roland's *An appeal to impartial posterity* (1795); Louvet's *Dangers to which I have been exposed* (1795); Condorcet's posthumous *Outline of the history of the progress of the human mind* (1795); and the French Girondist General Dumouriez's *A political view of the future situation of France* (1795). Taken together, these publications constituted a notable corpus of work relaying in some detail a series of aspects of the French Revolution.

[9] The asterisks are present in the original title.

Condorcet's *Life of Turgot*, published in French in 1786[10], as we have seen, was in all probability translated by Benjamin Vaughan (De Vivo e Sabbagh 2015). Although his name does not appear in the text, the anonymous translator provided copious prefatory material and notes as well as a series of appendices which testify to an active interest and commitment to the publication. The translation was dedicated, for example, to the Marquis of Lansdowne, Lord Shelburne, as the latter had given "a public testimony" of the high esteem in which he held Turgot (*Life of Turgot*: iii). The translator saw the work not simply as a biography but as a narrative of the resistance of the French absolutist monarchy to reform,[11] and a lesson for English readers, as the English government, in the translator's eyes, was putting up similar resistance:

> The translator of the following work is induced to lay it before the English public, from a persuasion of the importance of most of the principles contained in it, and that many of them may be found adapted to the present situation of Great Britain and Ireland, where the minds of men seem daily opening to political truth. (Condorcet, *Life of Turgot*: x)

This was followed by a disclaimer that "the freedom which M. Turgot appears to have entertained on the subject of religion, was certainly not among the reasons for translating the following work" (*Life of Turgot*: xiii). "Freedom" here suggests the "free-thinking" materialism and atheism of d'Holbach and others, and is a position from which the translator maintains a significant distance. The preface continues, putting forward a possible justification of this free-thinking position:

[10] See Baker (1990: 162-164). The frontispiece of the *Vie de Monsieur Turgot* (1786) gives "Londres" as the place of publication, but as with much politically sensitive material, as we have seen, this is a false imprint (see ESTC catalogue).

[11] Turgot had attempted to reform both the public administration and the taxation system of the French monarchy before both collapsed under the strain of its support for the American rebellion, a collapse which led directly to the political and economic crisis of the French state in the late 1780s.

> … the absurdity of the Roman Catholic form of Christian religion, and the suppression of every other public form of it, has led aside a prodigious number of the most respectable persons of that enlightened nation from the belief of any religion whatever. (*Life of Turgot*: xiii-xiv).

If the careful positioning of the translator between the extremes of free-thinking and Catholicism may suggest a translator from the dissenting tradition, the reference to the "liberal and comparatively tolerant religious establishment" of England in the same preface (*Life of Turgot*: xiii) would appear to be a prudent acknowledgement of the legitimacy of the Anglican basis of the Whig regime.[12]

Of interest, in this volume, is also the addition of five substantial Appendixes (*Life of Turgot*: 381-419). The first consisted of the translation of Turgot's own article for the *Encyclopédie*, the general philosophical reflection on *Foundations*. The second was highly technical and consisted of a translation of Condorcet's considerations on the conversion of direct into indirect taxation, part of the original *Life*, but taken out from the main body of the text so that "those who are interested in studying it may find it separate, and where it does not interrupt other objects" as the translator's note indicates (*Life of Turgot*: 398). The third was the dissenting minister Richard Price's reply to a criticism of Turgot regarding Price's own representation of Turgot's ministry. The fourth was a paragraph in the original text of Condorcet, a note on the "Succession of Property" which the translator decided to be "most suitable to the Appendix" (*Life of Turgot*: 413). The final one consisted principally of the translation of the "Advertisement" to the French edition which justifies the appearance of Condorcet's *Life* so soon after the publication of a *Memoir* (attributed to Chevalier Du Pont) also treating the events of the Turgot ministry. The translator, on this occasion, reinforces this justification by stating that the *Memoir* was "less adapted for the English nation, than the work of the Marquis of Condorcet, which contains details of *principles*, rather than of facts" (*Life of Turgot*: 417). The appendices,

[12] Benjamin Vaughan, the probable translator of this work, although a pupil of the dissenting Warrington Academy, appears to have been orthodox enough to be elected to Parliament in 1792 (Davis 2004).

then, in adding material by Turgot, extracting parts of Condorcet's main text to give greater emphasis to his own considerations and including a reply by Richard Price and a justification for the English translation, are signs of an active, interested and competent translator, at home not only with the language but also with the technical and administrative complexities of the French reformist and his interpretation by Condorcet. All of which confirms the hypothesis that the translator was at the heart of the Shelburne circle, and probably, as De Vivo and Sabbagh put forward, Benjamin Vaughan (2015: 190-191).

Condorcet's *Life of Turgot* (1787) was followed closely by the publication of a translation of a work by another of the key French reforming ministers, the Swiss banker and economist Jacques Necker, *Of the Importance of Religious Opinions* (1788). Necker, the minister entrusted by Louis XVI to make a last desperate attempt to reform the royal finances, was to become even better known when his removal from government on 12 July 1789 provoked the immediate crisis leading to the insurrection in Paris (Schama 1989: 372-373). In his 1788 work, he was intent on bolstering the regime, arguing in this work against the "esprit philosophique" which, with its attack on all organised religion, would result in the delegitimation of political as well as religious institutions (Israel 2014: 14-15). This translation was the first of a number carried out by Mary Wollstonecraft in the period of her collaboration as a reviewer for Johnson's *Analytical Review* from 1788 to 1792 (Vantin 2017; Wardle 1947).[13] It may be noted that the choice of text, whether by Johnson, Christie or Wollstonecraft herself, reinforced the dissenting view of the need to present a firm position against the degeneration of religious attitudes towards atheism and the sceptical and materialist "esprit philosophique" running from Spinoza to Diderot, amply documented by Jonathan Israel (2001, 2006, 2011), and is furthermore in line with the distancing of the translator of Condorcet's *Life of Turgot* from his alleged religious scepticism.

[13] Wollstonecraft's contributions to the *Analytical Review*, as far as can be ascertained, are to be found in Wollstonecraft, *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft,* vol. 7.

In 1791, Johnson published a short 20-page *Address to the English nation* by Jean-Paul Rabaut Saint-Etienne (1743-1793), the Protestant pastor from Nîmes and revolutionary. This was a translation of a specifically French contribution to the debate in Britain regarding the French revolution occasioned by Burke's *Reflections* and the responses by Priestley, Wollstonecraft, Paine, and others, translated from the French but apparently written specifically for an English readership.

The next translation to appear was an enigmatic volume entitled *Letters containing an account of the late revolution in France* (1792) purporting to have been written by a "Henry Frederic Groenveldt" and subsequently translated into English. The "Advertisement" to the volume presents the letters as the considerations of a German traveller on his visits to France and England. It was thus a travel journal but a rather different one from the usual ones "whose only ambition was to take a catalogue of the pictures they had seen [or]…describe the ruined castles they had met with on their route…" (Dumont, *Letters*: iii).This volume would focus on the political situation in France and England: "the light in which such a foreigner, without any of those prejudices, of which no native can wholly divest himself, has seen some of our most important institutions" would, the "Advertisement" continued, "not be entirely uninstructive to Englishmen" (*Letters*: v). It was with this in mind that the translation had been undertaken. At first it was thought to present only "the letters written during the author's residence in England", but:

> …on a more attentive perusal of the letters written from Paris and Versailles, they were found to comprise a more complete and connected narrative of the late revolution than any that had appeared in this country, and to contain many facts which have never before been published, even in France. (*Letters*: v-vi)

The careful construction of the narrator, the hypothetical German visitor to Paris and London, and the apparently meditated choice of presenting the translation of a point of view external to both France and Britain was in fact the work of Samuel Romilly and Pierre Étienne Dumont, the Swiss friend and collaborator of Mirabeau and later translator of Jeremy

Bentham (Blamires 2009; Whatmore 2007: 26-29). The editor of Romilly's *Memoirs* makes clear in a note that the latter had encouraged Dumont to write a history of the Revolution but that they decided instead to publish a series of twelve letters recounting the events of 1789, translated from the French, followed by eleven letters written by Romilly himself on England, covering the topics such as "Lotteries", "On Civil and Criminal Laws in England", and "On the Attempt made in England to abolish the Slave Trade". They had originally planned to publish the work under the name of Kirkerberger but then decided on the name Henry Groenveldt (Romilly, *Memoirs*: 415). The fiction of the translation is used to effect also in notes to the text. The note to the letter on nobility in England, for example, which mitigates the critical view of the nobility contained in it, situates the translator at a critical distance from the hypothetical German observer:

> The translator publishes this letter merely for the amusement of his readers, and would be very sorry to have it thought that he adopted the principles which it contains, as applied to English nobility. (*Letters*: 345)

This was a complex text, then, purporting to be a translation from a German original but in fact consisting of two lengthy (and very different) pieces of writing, one a detailed historical eye-witness of the events in France and the other a series of essays on aspects of life in England. Whereas the latter were probably originally written in English by Romilly, it is likely that the former were translations. It has been assumed that this translation was undertaken by Romilly himself, the native speaker of the pair, with the help of an associate of Romilly, James Scarlett (Barker and Cawthorn 2009).[14] In his letter to Dumont of 6 September 1791, however, Romilly says that he should remember "that since K. [Kirkerberger] has been in England, you have done nothing but translate", adding "pray send me the originals and translations as fast as you can" (*Memoirs*: 433) The "you" would suggest that the name Kirkerberger was

[14] The English Short Title Catalogue of the British library indicates that the volume was "in fact, written in French by Pierre Étienne Dumont and translated into English by Samuel Romilly and James Scarlett."

intended to be applied to Dumont, which in turn suggests that at least the draft of the translation was carried out by Dumont himself, before being sent to Romilly for the preparation of the final version. Romilly hurried Dumont by adding: "I can hardly reckon upon more than a month's leisure, if so much, and after that, adieu to K. Enable me to make the best of my time" (*Memoirs*: 433) .This affords us, perhaps, of a glimpse of a collaborative effort at translation, a self-translation into a second language on the part of Dumont and a revision of this by the native speaker, Romilly. This method of work on their part emerges at another point in Romilly's *Memoirs*, when he records that he asked Dumont for a translation (presumably from French into English) of the *Lettres de Mirabeau à ses Commentans*, later to become better known as the *Courrier de Provence* (*Memoirs*: 353-354).

We may pause for a moment to comment on this collaboration. Dumont is known as the translator into French of Jeremy Bentham (see Whatmore 2007); Romilly as a reforming lawyer and politician. Their publication of the account of France and England in the early 1790s, as well as their friendship with Mirabeau, shows us two young radical Europeans, at home in French and English (and, indeed, it would seem, France and England), writing and translating in both languages to push forward their own radical perspective of the events in France and the situation in Britain. The world they inhabited was an intercultural and cosmopolitan one made of French revolutionaries and English reformists. Their primary focus and interest appears to have been that of supporting the radical ideas of the French revolution and spreading news of the events in Paris to reformist circles in Britain. Translation, of their own and others' work, was clearly a necessary part of this activity.

As Helen Braithwaite indicates, after the first publication of Volney's *Ruins of Empire* in 1792 (superseded by that of Joel Barlow in 1802 as we have seen), there was a gap in Joseph Johnson's publication of material relating to the Revolution translated into English, until the mid-1790s when he printed, as well as two re-editions of Volney's work in 1795 and 1796, a number of volumes written by members of the Girondin group. One of these was Konrad Oelsner's *An Account of the Life of Sieyès* (1795), the well-known author of the pamphlet *Qu'est-ce que le Tiers-État* (1789).

Oelsner was a German enthusiast for the French Revolution who had arrived in Paris in its early stages before fleeing during the Terror, and become a close collaborator of Girondist leaders such as Sieyès and Brissot (Heuvel 2001: 87; Israel 2014: 305). The English text was a brief 60-page pamphlet followed by some translations of original documents. We may note that the anonymous translator does not appear to have had a particularly deep knowledge of the events described. A disclaimer in a footnote (*Life of Sieyès*: 24) confesses his or her ignorance of the meaning of the term "oeil de boeuf", beyond its literal meaning as sky-light, whereas the term was commonly used to indicate, metaphorically, the King.[15] But the translator does reveal a radical stance with regard to the moderate position of Sieyès. The translation included the latter's defence of the well-known distinction between "active" and "passive" citizens, later to become enshrined in the Constitution of 1791, which excluded "women, at least in their present state; children, foreigners, those also who contribute nothing to support the public establishment" from active participation in public affairs (*Life of Sieyès*: 97-98). The translator's note criticising this position is worth quoting in full:

> The Translator cannot avoid adding a note on this error of so many eminent writers. There is no person in any state who does not contribute. While consumable commodities are the only possible objects of taxation, every consumer is a contributor. But the strongest objection to this doctrine of true active citizens excluding the poor, is, that society is not merely an association to defend our goods and chattels, but likewise to secure the infinitely more valuable attributes of intellectual existence. (*Life of Sieyès*: 98)

Once again we have evidence of a translator intervening in a highly-charged political debate, in this case regarding issues of citizenship, a shared concern in both Britain and France.

[15] Its literal reference was to the salon of Versailles in which the French monarchs held the *grand lever*, as it had a skylight, called an "oeil de boeuf". Thomas Carlyle uses the term throughout his *French Revolution. A History* to indicate Louis XVI and his court (1989 [1837]: infra).

Along with Oelsner's work, 1795 also saw Johnson publish Manon Roland's *An Appeal to Impartial Posterity*, her memoir which aimed to relate and justify the actions of the defeated Girondin group. The translation of Mme Roland's *Appeal* appears to have gone through five English editions in the period 1795-98 (three in London, one in Dublin and one in New York), but reveals little in terms of its translational aspects. The *Appeal* was edited in France by Louis Bosc, the French naturalist and friend of the Roland's, and the English translation includes his preface in translation emphasising his personal relations with Manon Roland. The only significant translator's note to the first edition indicates that the part of the text recounting the experiences of the first Roland government, much of which had already been published, had been reproduced because it contained both "many brilliant passages" not in the *Memoirs*" and "a judgement on our countrymen Mr Thomas Paine and Mr David Williams" (*Appeal*, "Advertisement"). The *Appeal* contained an advertisement inside the front cover which promoted the book alongside Oelsner's *Life of Sieyès* as well as other works which made up this "Girondist" series of Johnson: two books on the French general, Dumouriez, Jean-Baptiste Louvet de Courvray's picaresque narration of this Girondin politician's escape from France in 1793, *An Account of the Dangers to which I have been exposed since the 31st of May 1791* (1795), Condorcet's previous *Life of Turgot* (1787) and his important philosophical work, written in hiding, *Outlines of a historical view of the progress of the human mind* (1795). It is worth noting that Louvet's account, Oelsner's *Life of Sieyès* and Dumouriez's pamphlet were also advertised as available in French, possibly targeting the growing French exile community in London (Burrows 2000).

This series confirms Johnson's commitment to supporting the radical Girondist group of the French Revolution. But besides or beyond a political motive, we may note two other possible determinants of this flurry of translations. The first was put forward by Johnson's biographer Helen Braithwaite: during the recent trial of John Horne Tooke, the judge had declared that although it was undesirable for French works to be published in England, they had "no immediate relation to our government" and thus were not liable to prosecution. In other words,

publishing radical French works, even in translation, as long as their subject matter regarded France and not England, had been confirmed as legitimate (Braithwaite 2003: 149). Another was surely that Johnson's choice of texts was determined by the range of his personal contacts. It is likely that Oelsner's biography of Sieyès and the works by Dumouriez and Louvet had been sent to him via Thomas Christie or Mary Wollstonecraft, both of whom were in Paris and in direct contact with the Girondin group. Another key contact was the French bookseller Joseph de Boffe in Soho who had been interrogated during the repression of British radicalism in the Treason Trials of 1794 (Barrell and Mee 2006). Boffe reprinted some of these works in French and sold them through Johnson, who then had them translated and sold in English, using the *Analytical Review* to provide publicity (Braithwaite 2003: 149).

Such, then, were the principal translations which emerged from St Paul's Yard under the supervision of Joseph Johnson. We must first appreciate the quantity of material. The *Analytical Review* kept a constant attention to the events in France and the wealth of printed material that was flooding the French market, and this attention necessarily involved a constant and regular activity of translation from French to English. This interest in the events of revolutionary France and support for the radical Girondin wing of the Revolution[16] continued with Johnson's publication of some of the principal Girondist accounts of events. Radical Londoners, themselves the object of fierce repression with the Treason Trials of 1794, no doubt watched the plight of some of the major figures active in the early French Revolution such as the Rolands, Brissot and Condorcet with

[16] Jonathan Israel has attempted to reinstate the Girondin group as representing the continuation of the Radical Enlightenment, portraying the Jacobin Terror as its antithesis. His appreciation of Benjamin Constant's view of the revolution, in a pamphlet entitled *De la terreur* (1796) provides the best summary of his own: "Constant rightly considered Robespierre's and Saint-Just's rejection of the Revolution's core values as the wrecking of the Revolution and a virulent form of Counter-Enlightenment and anti-intellectualism, hostile to freedom of thought, individual liberty, erudition, and the right to criticize. In terms of principles, Robespierre was the Revolution's contradiction, the Enlightenment's very antithesis" (2014: 697).

some trepidation, and they could did this principally through reading their work in translation. To be able to publish these translations, as we have said, Johnson relied heavily on intermediaries such as Wollstonecraft and Christie, both of whom, like a number of other English radicals and reformists, had moved to Paris to be closer to events there. It is to these figures, both those in Paris and those who stayed in London, that we will now turn.

6. Translations of English radicals in Paris and London

In the last chapter, we discussed translated texts proposed for an English readership, in particular those radicals interested in following the events in France in the 1790s, in reviews, newspapers and in printed volumes. As well as the ways in which these texts were framed and how the translator emerges in paratextual material such as prefaces and notes, biographical information is also clearly relevant in determining the specific context of the translations, the translators, and the reading public that the publications were targeting. Johnson's friendship and collaboration with Priestley, Vaughan's relations with Mirabeau and Lord Shelburne, and Romilly's friendship with Étienne Dumont are all factors which flesh out the reasons behind the translations, enabling us to arrive at a "thick description" of the act of translation (Appiah 2012 [1993]; Hermans 2003).[1]

This chapter will look at the lives and activities of a number of English radicals operating for the most part both in Paris and London and committed to relating the events occurring in France and radical ideas produced there for a non-francophone public through translation

[1] Cheung (2007) charts the notion of "thick translation" in Kwame Anthony Appiah and Theo Hermans and and its derivation from Gilbert Ryle and Clifford Geertz.

in one form or another. They were, it will be argued, individuals occupying a sort of frontier between cultures, engaged in "cross-cultural networking" and with "multiple allegiances" (Pym 2009), constructing or consolidating through their translations a shared transnational radical belonging. Their loyalty to Britain, in any case, was to a considerable extent already compromised, in most cases, by their status as dissenters and radicals in the eyes of the Pitt government, characterised by its hostility to the new French regime and to British radicalism at home.

English radicals abroad: translating revolutionary Paris

In the early years of the French Revolution, a number of British radicals arrived in Paris to witness the events at first hand, including the young William Wordsworth, Helen Maria Williams and many others. Some of these figures began to congregate at White's Hotel in the second *arrondissement*, which became the headquarters and meeting place of the British Club of supporters of the revolution, sometimes referred to as the Society of the Friends of the Rights of Man (Rogers 2012: 11).[2] The hotel was thus a centre for English radicals in France and constituted as Rachel Rogers has put forward, an important "vector" for revolutionary ideas, particularly in the early period of the revolution characterised by its openness to foreigners, until the Robespierrist government enacted a series of decrees against aliens (Rogers 2013; 2012: 97-103).[3] The foreigners meeting there could have access to and share information about political events, the debates taking place in the National Assembly and the political

[2] Rachel Rogers uses the term "British Club" to indicate, in her words, "the loose gathering of British and Irish residents of Paris who met regularly at White's Hotel during the late months of 1792 and early 1793." The club did not have a formal status but its mention in official documents leads her to suppose that "there was a clear associational, organised character to their activities." The hotel was named "White's" after its English owner, Christopher White, entrepreneur and wine merchant (2012: 11 and note 6). See also Duthille (2017: 268-270).

[3] The international character of the early part of the Revolution is treated in two important accounts of cosmopolitanism in the early modern period, Julia Kristeva's, *Strangers to Ourselves* (1991: 148-165) and Margaret Jacob's *Strangers Nowhere in the World* (2007: 132-138).

clubs, and the voluminous material which was now appearing in the French press and in printed speeches and pamphlets (Israel 2014: 30-52). They were thus able to act as privileged intermediaries, relaying this first-hand information back to their countries of origin. As such, it is not surprising that translation was a major part of their activity.

One of the foreigners who frequented White's Hotel was Thomas Christie (1761-1796), founder of the *Analytical Review*, which played such a prominent part in Joseph Johnson's activity as a publisher. At first sight, Christie would not seem a typical cosmopolitan intellectual. Born in Montrose in 1761, his father was a Scottish merchant and Unitarian who sent his son to Montrose grammar school and set him up as a medical student in Westminster in 1784. It may have been during a six-month tour of Great Britain in 1787 that Christie began to move in enlightened (and dissenting) scientific and philosophical circles, meeting both the natural philosopher and poet Erasmus Darwin and Joseph Priestley. His enthusiasm for science and philosophy led him to found the *Analytical Review*, as we have seen, to ally himself with the supporters of the French Revolution in London, and then to leave for Paris, armed with introductions from Richard Price to Mirabeau, Sieyès, and Necker (Christie and Toit 2004).[4] The result of this visit to Paris was publication of his *Letters on the Revolution of France, and on the new constitution established by the National Assembly* (1791), one of a number of works attacking Edmund Burke's hostility to the Revolution as it emerged in his *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790). Its objective was to counter opinion with direct testimony, and describe in as much detail as possible life in revolutionary Paris. Christie's text, indeed, highlights his position as a privileged and well-connected eye-witness:

> When the accounts of Mr Burke's abusive speech against the French Revolution reached us here in Paris. M Neckar [sic]… remarked to me that

[4] Christie and Toit (2004) give 1790 as the date of Christie's first vist to Paris, while for Rogers his first visit was instead in May 1791, followed by others in 1792 and in the spring of 1793 (2012: 114).

> Mr Burke, though a man of great abilities, was very apt to be too hot (*trop échauffée*). (*Letters on the Revolution of France*: 57)

The particular form that the *Letters* took leads us to consider the volume as in many ways the result of *de facto* translation. The conversation reported above, for example, probably took place in French, given the indication of the expression "trop échauffée", and it is likely that many of the descriptions contained in the *Letters* were transpositions, into English, of events and discussions which had originally taken place in French. The *Letters* also included numerous translations of texts appearing in French newspapers, probably undertaken by Christie himself. An example is the translation of a long critique of Burke's *Reflections* which appeared in the *Journal de Paris* on 23 December 1790 (*Letters*: 52-56), of which Christie signals his appreciation in a note:

> The following account of Mr Burke's book by a French journalist, contains much good sense, and will enable you to form an idea of the sentiments of intelligent men on the Continent respecting this publication. (*Letters*: 52)

Christie's text, an attempt to provide a detailed view of events which could give the lie to the rhetoric of Burke's *Reflections*, also includes some pointed considerations on works in translation. He begins by citing the translation of the *Reflections* into French as an example of the newly found freedom of the press in France, which saw a government willing to allow any publication critical of the Revolution "except when it directly called the people to arms" (*Letters*: 51). However, Burke's "eloquence", he predicted, would have little success in France,

> … where it must be read in a translation. *Logic* is translatable. *Reason* is the same in all languages; but who can transfer mere declamation into a foreign tongue, without losing the spirit and consequently the *effect* of the original?" (*Letters*: 51-52).

In this, Christie was following the denunciations of Burke's florid style by Paine and others (Keane 1995: 294-296).

The appendix to this work consists of 40 Acts of the National Assembly, speeches, and extracts from newspapers which are evidence of a more specific act of translation on the part of Christie. A small part of this material, he points out, had already appeared in English "but not very correctly translated, nor always from authentic originals" and in any case it would be convenient for readers "to have all the information necessary on the subject, collected into one book" (*Letters*, "Appendix": 1). Christie's activity as a translator continued in 1795, with a translation of the 1791 Constitution into English, publishing it in Paris with the Girondin's own press, the Cercle Social, as well as with Joseph Johnson in London in 1795 (Christie and Toit 2004). It should be added that Christie's visits to Paris were also commercial: he represented the English grain merchants, Turnbull, Forbes and Co., which had sent wheat to France in the period of dearth in 1789, and one of his motives for going to France was to attempt to recover debt (Rogers 2012: 147).

Another British radical active in Paris, one of the founder members of the British Club, was the London coal merchant and member of Richard Price's congregation, John Hurford Stone (1763-1818), who had moved to Paris with his wife Rachel in February 1793 (Buel 2011: 177). Here he began an activity as bookseller and printer, setting up an "English press", printing Paine's *Dissertation on First Principles of Government* (1795) both in English and in a French translation, Joel Barlow's *The Vision of Columbus* (1793), a translation into French of Helen Maria Williams' *Letters written in France* (1795) and a work by General Francisco de Miranda, a Venezuelan revolutionary who fought in the American Revolution and in the French revolutionary armies (Rogers 2012: 139). Stone too was involved in commercial activity, as were Christie and Joel Barlow, as we have seen, trading in cotton and real estate (Rogers 2013: 20).

Stone had, according to Rogers, a "secure knowledge of European languages" (2012: 137) and used these competences, sometimes in translational activities, to aid the English community and to push forward the revolutionary agenda. There were a number of other English radicals whose competence in French enabled them to act as translators or interpreters. Stone's wife, Rachel, for example, acted as an interpreter for Joel Barlow. Robert Smyth, a former member of the British Parliament

and another member of the club, apparently helped Paine to read material in French (Rogers 2012: 153-154). The Scottish pamphleteer, vegetarian and soldier John Oswald worked on the editorial committee of the *Chronique du Mois*, a publication close to the Girondins and the Cercle Social, for which he translated regularly (Rogers 2012: 143-144). The English radical Sampson Perry, who had fled England to avoid imprisonment for libel, was able to give evidence without the need for an interpreter in the trial of Jean Paul Marat, and on his return to England (before being betrayed and sent to Newgate) worked as a translator (Rogers 2012: 153-154; Davis et al 2005: 117-119). Rogers also mentions the figure of Nicholas Madgett, an Irish translator and interpreter serving in the French Bureau de Traduction.[5]

For many of the English radicals we have only fragmentary evidence, despite Rachel Roger's careful reconstruction. Some figures, however, emerge more clearly, particularly when they had already achieved some notoriety before the Revolution. Robert Merry (1755-1798), for example, had been one of the literary figures associated with Hester Lynch Piozzi, in Florence, and who had been collectively termed the "Della Cruscans" (Russell 2004; Mee 2016: 113-114). With advent of the revolution, Merry moved to France and, before leaving with many other radicals in late 1793 with the Robespierrist clampdown on foreigners, moved regularly between London and Paris. In Covent Garden in 1790 he put on a pantomime entitled *A Picture of Paris*, representing the events of the French Revolution up to the Fête de la Federation of July 1790. In 1795, he published a play entitled *Fénelon*,[6] which he described as a "free translation from a French play" (cit. in Mee 2016: 123). In fact this was based on a work by Marie-Joseph Chénier, the republican enthusiast well-known in

[5] The figure of Madgett is explored in some detail by Sylvie Kleinman (2017) in her work on the Irish revolutionary Theobald Wolfe Tone's experiences in Paris while he attempted to obtain the support of the Directory for an invasion of Ireland (see also Elliott 1982: 60-63).

[6] François de Salignac de La Mothe-Fénelon was one of the "acknowledged heroes" for the circle of British radicals which centred on William Godwin as well as for figures such as Thomas Holcroft who were active in the London Corresponding Society (Mee 2016: 127).

Paris at this time for the enormous popularity of another of his works, *Charles X* (1789), with its attack on the principle of monarchy (Israel 2014: 68-70).[7] In 1790s London the publication of any work by a playwright such as Chénier could only be seen as a political statement, and Merry himself asked the publisher not to disclose his own part in the work, and in particular "not to mention my being the Translator …as the name of a Republican would damn any performance at this time" (cit. in Mee 2016:124). In Paris, Merry was, according to Jon Mee, one of those "directly involved in framing constitutions in the context of the French National Convention in 1792" (2016: 11). His obituary in the *Monthly Magazine* mentions him as the author of a "short treatise in English, on the nature of free government … translated into French by Mr Madget" (cit. in Mee 2016: 122) probably as *Réflexions politiques sur la nouvelle constitution qui se prepare en France, addressee à la république* (Mee 2016: 122).

There were also other figures prominent in the British Club and active on the revolutionary scene who were not, on available evidence, active as translators, but who are worth mentioning. One of these was the political and religious theorist David Williams (1738-1816). Williams had met Benjamin Franklin during the latter's stay in London and had published tracts both on dissenting religion such as *Liturgy on the Universal Principles of Religion and Morality* (1776), a copy of which he had presented to Rousseau in Paris in that year, and on politics, giving support to the American Independence with his *Letters on Political Liberty* (1782). The latter had been translated by the Girondin revolutionary Jacques-Pierre Brissot, for which he had been interrogated in the Bastille in 1784 (Davies 2009), and it was presumably through his connection with Brissot that Williams was brought into the circle of the Girondin elite in the early 1790s. Here he was engaged, along with the radical Richard "Citizen" Lee and Paine, in discussions over the best form of constitution (Mee 2016: 11), his own view being translated into French by a M. Maudru and published in Paris by the Cercle Social in 1793 as a short 48-page

[7] Chenier later assisted the painter Jacques-Louis David in the stage-managing of public events such as the funeral of Jean-Paul Marat and the Festival of the Supreme Being (Schama 1989: 748).

pamphlet with the title *Observations sur la dernière constitution de la France* (1793) (Davies 2009; Rogers 2012: 278-293). Manon Roland had a particularly high opinion of Williams, whom she rated above Paine as a constitutional theorist. Paine was charismatic, "gains the applause of a club, or excites the enthusiasm of a tavern; but for cool discussion in a committee, or the regular labours of a legislator, I conceive David Williams infinitely more proper than he" (*An Appeal:* 42). Manon Roland makes no judgment as to Williams' linguistic abilities, reserving her criticism in this regard to Paine. Jérôme Pétion, however, Girondin mayor of Paris from 1791 to 1792, does say that his conversation with Williams "lacked the vivacity and interest which it could have had if we could have spoken the same language" (cit. in Rogers 2012: 155).

Some of the English radicals in Paris had specific institutional duties. These included the calico manufacturer, Thomas Cooper, and James Watt, son of the more famous engineer of the same name (Robinson 2013). In Paris on business, they were asked by the Manchester Constitutional Society to make a representation on their behalf to the Jacobin Society (Newman 2006; Braithwaite 2003: 123-124), Cooper demonstrating his linguistic competence by making his speech in French (Rogers 2012: 154-155). Thomas Cooper (1759-1839) was an associate and collaborator of Priestley, later emigrating to America with him in 1804 and editing the scientist's memoirs in 1806-7. He achieved some notoriety in France: his successful representation to the Jacobin club led him to be proposed as a candidate to the French Convention, as were Priestley and Paine (Israel 2014: 274-275).

Cooper was also a translator. It may have been these contacts made in Paris which led him to translate a brief 30-page account of the 10 August 1792 uprising against the monarchy in Paris by a J. B. D'Aumont, entitled *A Narrative of the Proceedings relating to the Suspension of the King of the French on the 10th of August 1792* which merits attention.[8] The "Advertisement" by the translator, signed T. Cooper, indicates clearly that

[8] There seems to be no trace of a French edition of a similar narrative, so some doubt would seem to remain over the authenticity of the translation in the absence of an identifiable source text.

his intent, like that of Thomas Christie earlier, was to counter what he saw as false accounts of the revolution:

> I received the narrative now presented to the public, accompanied by a letter, of which the following is an extract. "I am sensible that the reports circulated England will be perfectly contrary to the truth; and as it is of great consequence to correct any false impressions, which those accounts may have occasioned, I think a letter from an *eye witness* will have a good effect. I wish you to amend the English, which I know to be very defective, and to add any observations that may occur to you, but not to alter any of the facts, as I have rigidly adhered to the truth." (D'Aumont, *A Narrative*: "Advertisement")

Cooper added that he had "no doubt of the fidelity and correctness of this narrative" and that his translation "strictly complied with [his] correspondent's request, in adding some explanatory observations, but leaving the facts as he related them" (*A Narrative*: "Advertisement").

In the preface, this construction of the authenticity of the first-hand description is reinforced by explanatory interpolations clarifying some French terms which remain in the text, such as "patrouille" ("watch") or "Chevaliers du Poignard" ("*Knights of the Dagger* - the Aristocrats, so called from them making a practice of carrying these weapons about them"). In other places the translation is followed by the French term, as in "cunning knaves" (*fourbes adroits*), functioning once again to enhance the authenticity of the original narrative, as when one of the revolutionaries "called aloud to the patriots to follow him (*a moi les patriotes*)" (*A Narrative*: 8, 19, 34, 24).

Although the text purported to be a translation from French, it was clearly not a translation of something written with a French readership in mind. There are, indeed, several places in which it is clear that the intended readership was from the outset an English one. On one occasion, the text asks readers to "contemplate the disinterested honour of the [French] people" and to "compare their conduct with that of those noble officers who basely betrayed the cause of the country which they had sworn to defend" and in this comparison "lay their hands on their hearts and say whether they deserve the name of *swinish multitude*" (*A Narrative*:

28). The expression "swinish multitude" had been used by Edmund Burke in his *Reflections of the Revolution in France* (1790) to describe the Parisian crowd, and had been taken up by popular radicals such as Thomas Spence, who published a radical pamphlet with the ironical title *Pig's Meat. Or lessons for the Swinish Multitude* (1794) (see Knox 1977; Leech 1990), and Daniel Eaton in his magazine entitled *Hog's Wash or Politics for the People* (Mee 2016: 24, 34; Smith 1986: 68-109). The presumption of an English readership continues with a direct appeal to an English reader's sensibility in terms of the atrocities which could be found in comparable moments of national history:

> Far be it from me to attempt to justify the cruelties of this day, but in judging of them, let us not throw wanton reproaches upon the French. Let us remember what has been the conduct of every people upon earth during their civil wars and amongst others, let us not forget the acts of cruelty with which the English history is replete. (*A Narrative*: 30)

The text was followed by an appendix, signed "T.C.", presumably Thomas Cooper. This consisted of the translation of two brief texts by Condorcet. The first was a comparison of the 10 August 1792 uprising in Paris with the "Glorious" Revolution in England in 1688, which had been "copied with some slight alterations from the *Star"* and which, as it was brief, the translator had not deemed necessary to retranslate. The comparison, according to "T.C", bore out the similarities between the two revolutions "in the motives which occasioned them and the principles by which they were directed" which proved that "notwithstanding the difference of the times, the circumstances and the state of knowledge … the cause of the French is exactly the same as that of the English nation", indeed, that this cause is common to "all nations, that are, or have conceived the hope of becoming free" (*A Narrative*: 37-38). The second was Condorcet's address to the National Assembly "On the necessity of a National Convention" which instead the "T.C." had "translated expressly from the original" (*A Narrative*: 46).

These translations made by Thomas Cooper, then, fall squarely into the category of purposeful interventions in the English radical debate over

the French Revolution. Cooper had made his own intervention in the debate publishing, in 1792, a *Reply to Edmund Burke*.[9] Much later, when he settled in America, Cooper also translated a work by the French materialist and physicist F.J.V. Broussais, *On Irritation and Insanity* (1831). Jonathan Israel's link between materialist philosophy and radical politics once again would seem to be borne out in the work of Thomas Cooper, although this materialism, in line with Priestley's Unitarian thought, was seen by Cooper, in his preface, not as proof of atheism but instead as "a doctrine actually held and maintained in the christian gospels." (Broussais, *On Irritation and Insanity*: viii). Cooper, unlike Priestley, continued to be active in reformist politics when he became a university professor in Pennsylvania (Braithwaite 2003: 176; Schofield 2004: 74; Newman 2006).

Finally, we may mention two radical women writers who gravitated to Paris in the early years of the revolution, Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-1797) and Helen Maria Williams (1759-1827). As we have seen, Wollstonecraft had already been active in translating and reviewing for Joseph Johnson in the period from 1788 to 1792 (Vantin 2017). This period of collaboration was without doubt a formative one for her. She was able to perfect her French although she hoped to visit France in order to have the "opportunity of conversing" (Wollstonecraft, *Letters*: 173), as well as learning German in order to translate the educationalist Christian Gotthilf Salzman's tract *Elements of Morality for the Use of Children* (1790). Johnson's print shop in St Paul's Yard was also an excellent place to afford easy access to a number of European politicians, radicals, and artists such as Paine, William Godwin, the exiled Charles-Maurice de Talleyrand-Perigord, and the Swiss painter Henry Fuseli (Braithwaite 2003). In 1792 she left for Paris, part of a group which included Henry

[9] Despite the radical and subversive nature of this volume, Cooper was not prosecuted as its price made it inaccessible to a popular readership, as the Attorney General's advice to Cooper made clear: "Continue if you please to publish your reply to Burke in an octavo form, so as to confine it probably to that class of readers who may consider it coolly: so soon as it is published cheaply for dissemination among the populace, it will be my duty to prosecute" (Braithwaite 2003: 132).

Fuseli and Joseph Johnson himself. The party was turned back at Dover, with the arrival of the news of the uprising of 10 August, but Wollstonecraft continued on her own to Paris, where she participated in the celebration of the new revolutionary republic in November (Israel 2014: 1-5) and met the extensive community of anglophone supporters of the Revolution already there: Thomas Christie, his wife Rebecca, Thomas Paine, Joel and Ruth Barlow, Helen Maria Williams, John Hurford Stone, Robert Merry, David Williams, Robert Smyth, Edward Fitzgerald, John Oswald and others (Rendall 2011). Although she did not publish any translations as such in her period in France, her *Historical and Moral View of the French Revolution* (1794) included long extracts from Paris newspapers which may have been her own translations.

Wollstonecraft's 1794 work can be put alongside Helen Maria Williams' *Letters Written in France* (1790), another attempt to contrast Burke's invective against the Revolution with a detailed, personal account of experience in revolutionary Paris. Williams came from a Presbyterian, Scottish background, and had been associated with radical circles such as that of the Lunar Society of Birmingham, and the oppositional politicians who met under the wing of Lord Shelburne at Bowood House. After travelling to Paris, moved by enthusiasm for the revolution and meeting many of the foreign radicals there including the Scottish poet Thomas Muir (Leask 2007: 54), she published the *Letters* in England in 1790. The volume quickly became a best-seller, went through a number of editions and were immediately translated into French where they brought immediate recognition to her on the part of the French public (Kennedy 2002: 21-80). Williams' biographer characterises the *Letters* as "part history, part journalism, part melodrama, part documentary" (Kennedy 2002: 109) but we should also note that they were also part translation, both of the "Memoirs of Mons and Madame du F" which make up a considerable part of the volume, and, throughout, of many of the numerous anecdotes related. One such is her translation of the dramatic "recitative" performed in Notre Dame on 13 July 1789, the day before the fall of the Bastille, which included the words: "People, your enemies advance, with hostile sentiments, with menacing looks! They come to bathe their hands in your blood!" (Williams, *Letters*: 3). Later volumes of

the *Letters* were written mostly by John Hurford Stone, and Thomas Christie (Kennedy 2002: 98), once again confirming the collaborative nature of much radical writing and translation. Of all the English radicals in Paris, we may note that Williams was perhaps the one most committed to translation per se, later translating Bernardin de St Pierre's *Paul et Virginie* and Alexander von Humboldt's seven volume *Personal narrative* of the latter's voyage to South America (Kennedy 2002: 122-127; 185).

Translating materialism in London

While English radicals in Paris sent back reports and translations of the explosion of texts, opinions, and events in France, and while the radical movement in England wrestled with its own struggles with the repressive Pitt government, the translation of literary and philosophical work continued. Although much attention in the period was to politics, often in close proximity to dissenting circles, other figures were occupied in translating radical literary and philosophical texts.

One of these was Richard "Citizen" Lee (*c.* 1774–1798?) active in the London Corresponding Society from May 1794 until he fled to the United States, along with some 10,000 other radicals going into exile in response to the repression of the radical movement by Pitt in 1794 (Mee 2002 and 2016: 149-167; Schofield 2004: 322; Durey 1997). In 1795, Lee published a translation of an excerpt from Rousseau's *Émile* under the title *Gospel of Reason.* This was the confession of faith of the Savoyard vicar, which emphasized free grace and the autonomy of the individual's spiritual feelings, in line with the religious enthusiasm which motivated Lee's own particular brand of radicalism. The translation was republished in America when Lee settled in Philadelphia as part of a series of pamphlets entitled *Political Curiosities* (1797) (Mee 2016: 165-167). In Philadelphia, Lee set up a radical review entitled *American Universal Magazine*, publishing an "Essay on Man" which consisted of a long translated extract from the French revolutionary and utopian Louis Mercier's *Fragments de politique et d'histoire* (1792), extolling the Rousseauian General Will. The essay asked the question: "The general will is always good, and can never deceive. By what sign shall we know it?" (Mee 2016: 61). It is probable that Lee at least had a hand in the

translation of this work by Mercier. The "Advertisement by the translator" which prefaced the work gives no clue either to the name of the translator or the origin of the text, but does commend both Mercier, "the author of the *Picture of Paris*, and of several other works which have acquired him a high reputation", and the text itself: "In those of the fragments in which he has handled the various subjects of polity and legislation, he displays much historical learning…" (Mercier, *Fragments*: xi-xii). Two other translated "fragments" from Mercier were also published in the *American Universal Magazine* in its issue of 3 April 1797, entitled "Iron in the hand of man" and "Primitive Right", both again taken from the collection published in London in 1795 (*American Universal Magazine*, 1797: 21-23), with no indication of the translator, although it is possible that these too were by Lee. Like other radical publications in this period, the *American Universal Magazine*, as well as promoting works such as Volney's *Ruins* and William Godwin's *Political Justice* and supporting the abolition of slavery (Mee 2016: 166-167), also contained considerable material on France, in this case "Anecdotes of persons connected with the French Revolution" (*American Universal Magazine*, 1797: 12-18) necessarily the result, at some point in the editorial process, of translation.

Other London radicals such as the publisher Daniel Eaton (1753-1814), who we have already met as the publisher of the review *Hog's Wash, or Politics for the People*, were concerned to propagate the seeds of materialism and atheism, sown early in the eighteenth century by England materialists and taken up forcefully, as we have seen, by Baron d'Holbach in his translations into French in the mid-century. Eaton was also associated with the radical plebeian and artisan milieu of the London Corresponding Society. Not only a publisher, however, Eaton was also a translator, having, presumably, acquired competence in French during a five-year period of schooling in the Jesuit College at St Omer (Davis 1996: 95). In 1796, as well as publishing Paine's rationalist *Age of Reason*, written while in prison in Paris, he also brought out another translation of Volney's *Law of Nature*, the final four chapters of the *Ruins*, containing, as we have seen, the most radical and materialist parts. Convicted of libel for publishing his fellow-radical Charles Pigott's *A Political Dictionary* (1795), Eaton went into hiding and subsequently emigrated to America, leaving

his family in London and attempting to establish himself as a bookseller in Philadelphia. In 1801 he returned to London where he was promptly confined to Newgate for 18 months for publishing another edition of Paine's *Age of Reason*. In prison he set about translating works by the French materialist philosopher Nicholas Fréret, later publishing his *A Preservative against religious prejudices*, and *Moseiade*, both in 1812, along with a volume entitled *The True Sense and Meaning of the System of Nature* (1810), attributed to Claude Helvétius but consisting of a summary of d'Holbach's own *Système de la nature* (1770) (Davis 1996: 100-101).

While in prison in 1801, Eaton contacted a Scottish radical and freethinker George Houston with a view to publishing a second edition of Baron d'Holbach's *Ecce homo! or a critical inquiry into the history of Jesus Christ,* which had already appeared in 1799.[10] Charged with libel also for this publication, Eaton apparently negotiated his own freedom with the authorities by indicating Houston as the translator, although the latter tried to shift the responsibility for the translation onto a certain Thomas Edward Ritchie, author of a biography of David Hume. Despite this, Houston was tried, convicted for blasphemous libel and sentenced to two years in prison (Dinwiddy 1977: 327).[11]

D'Holbach's *Système de la Nature* also appeared in English in the 1790s, as *The system of nature; or, the laws of the moral and physical world* (1795-96) and bore the name of the radical politician and pamphleteer William Hodgson (1745-1851) as the translator, printer, and bookseller. There had been a rumour, however, of an unpublished manuscript translation of the *System of Nature* in circulation, apparently carried out by the radical and member of the English Jacobin club in Paris, Charles Pigott, in November 1793 (Mee 2016: 143). It was later claimed that the 1795-96 edition had been translated "by a person confined in Newgate as a patriot" (cit. in Mee 2016: 143). This, however, clarifies little, as Hodgson and Pigott had been prison mates in Newgate together (Davis et

[10] The British Library catalogue indicates the place of publication as London, while Dinwiddy (1977: 326) sees it as having been published in Edinburgh.

[11] After his release from prison, Houston too emigrated to America where he republished *Ecce Homo* and began disseminating radical and freethinking literature (Dinwiddy 1977: 328).

al 2005; 129). The edition which was published by George Kearsley a year later in four volumes, according to the publisher, was based on a manuscript found in "the library of a man celebrated for his learning" (cit. in Mee 2016: 223, note 57), which Jon Mee supposes to have been Charles Pigott. In the climate of fear, repression and imprisonment of the London of the 1790s (Davis et al 2005: ix-xix), it is hardly surprising that the authorship and responsibility for the translation, publication, and sale of a radical atheist philosophical treatise tends to be muddied. This is particularly the case given that the strong link that Jonathan Israel makes between radicalism in politics and religion, basing his work predominantly on continental French and Dutch material, was more problematic in England than for French and Dutch radicals, as we have seen. The atheism of a work like *The System of Nature*, in fact, "infuriated" many in the London Corresponding Society whose links were rather with the English dissenting tradition than with atheism (Mee 2016: 143).

Was the translator of d'Holbach's *Ecce Homo,* finally republished in 1813, Eaton, Houston or Ritchie? Was the translator of his *The System of Nature* William Hodgson or Charles Pigott? For our purposes, the identification of a single translating subject may not be so important. The final text in English, the result of translation, revision, and collaboration on the part of figures prominent in Scottish and English radicalism indicates the interest these radical circles had in spreading French materialism and atheism through translation. It also provides more evidence that translation, in radical dissenting circles, working more or less underground, was often the work of a number of different people, collaborating through an informal network of publishers, booksellers, journalists and activists.

7. Conclusion

This study has enabled us to spend some time in the company of a series of disparate individuals involved in translation during the eighteenth century. First, the study explored a number of figures translating in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries as part of a Huguenot network. The hub of this network was undoubtedly the world of literary and philosophical reviews and booksellers in Amsterdam, but it had an important node in London. Their work made known to a francophone readership the philosophical, literary and political ferment in England during this period. Some of these translators, in particular Pierre Coste, contributed to the diffusion, in French, of major works of the English enlightenment by figures such as John Locke and Isaac Newton. It then considered some of the translations carried out by philosophers and writers active in the French enlightenment, in particular those associated with the radical circle or "coterie" of Baron d'Holbach. This activity included d'Holbach's own translations of English deists and materialists, but also the translations of early treatises in economic theory, and works of the Scottish enlightenment. Translation was also identified and explored as part of the political activity of revolutionary activists before and during the French Revolution and a number of journalists and politicians active in the Girondin group. Finally, the study looked at the ways in which translation played a part in the support for the French Revolution and in the popularising of some of the radical political views of the revolution to

an anglophone public. In all of these cases, the focus on translators has enabled us to flesh out the context of the translated texts themselves, as well as the rather nebulous notion of the "influence" of one tradition on another.

The individual translators we have looked at were active in different periods, were involved in different networks, often came from very different walks of life and had different aims, as is to be expected when looking at figures working in a variety of historical and political contexts. This study has attempted to bring these figures into a fruitful relation by virtue of a series of shared characteristics. The first of these is simply their interest in and practice of translation, not as a peripheral marginal activity but as one which was central to their intellectual production or their political mission. Le Clerc, Desmaizeaux, Boyer and Maty, the Huguenot translators; Baron d'Holbach, Abbé Morellet and Suard, the translators of d'Holbach's "coterie"; Count Mirabeau, Barlow, Lanthenas, Marat and others before and during the French Revolution; Christie and Cooper in Paris, Wollstonecraft, Daniel Eaton and others in London: all of these figures, despite in most cases being primarily involved in other literary or political ventures, dedicated time, resources, and energy to translation. In only one case, that of Pierre Coste, was translation such a major part of their work that he has earned a place in a standard history of translators (Delisle and Woodsworth 2012: 200-202).[1] The history of translation and translators must clearly take account of the numerous figures who achieved notoriety in other areas for whom translation was an important of their overall work.

A second characteristic involves motivation. An analysis of translated texts, as Anthony Pym has pointed out, does not always yield clear and unequivocal indications of the reasons behind a translation (Pym 2009: 37). Prefaces and other paratextual material are useful but are often absent or unrevealing. A careful consideration of those who translate (to avoid the term "translators"), their life histories, their position within a larger context of literary or political activity, and their other journalistic or political work can help us come to an understanding and an appreciation

[1] Brief mentions are also made of Le Clerc, Desmaizeaux (spelled "Desmoizeaux"), Mirabeau and Morellet (2012: 200-201, 219).

of their motivations. Coste and other Huguenot translators clearly adhered to what may be called a "Protestant international" (Gwynn 2001) which relied on translation as a vehicle for the spread of the political and religious tenets of this group of Protestant reformers, above and beyond their interest in translation as a means of personal advancement in a world of learning in which talented individuals could exploit their double cultural and linguistic heritages. Baron d'Holbach's translations of English deists and materialists were part of his overall aim to advance the materialist philosophy which he was elaborating also in his own work. In a similar fashion, the translations that were undertaken by some of those involved in the French Revolution such as Mirabeau, Barlow, Lanthenas, and Marat responded to clear political aims. It may be that the particular ideological orientation of these figures can be identified in their specific lexical or textual choices. This could be the object of a further study which takes the methodologies of text analysis as its starting point. Some of these orientations are made explicit in paratextual information. In general, however, it is difficult to explore issues of motivation without a clear picture of the social, political, and cultural context of the translation.

Third, and relatedly, translation was chosen as one of the key means of political expression precisely because it involved an appeal to ways of thinking that challenged the accepted orthodoxies of the political culture of the country that the translators inhabited. Thus from Coste to Le Clerc, from d'Holbach to Suard, from Christie to Eaton, all had as a primary objective introducing new ways of thinking into their societies, and all chose the translation of texts first produced in a different language as one of the principal means by which this could be effected. In other words, their radicalism pushed them to find texts from other cultural contexts which could be translated as illustrations of other ways of thinking and as examples worthy of emulation. In this way, this study has argued, we can identify a particular link between translation and dissent, in its widest meaning. The Huguenot translators were intent on demonstrating that the repressive political regime of Louis XIV and its persecution of religious minorities was not the only possible one: over the water in Britain as well as in the Dutch Republic, political regimes with greater religious toleration were thinkable, ones which encouraged, indeed, religious practices which could be considered more reasonable than those of "superstitious"

Catholicism. Similarly, d'Holbach and others presented to French readers texts which advertised themselves as "traduit de l'anglais" and thus provided evidence that the political and religious orthodoxies of *ancien regime* France were not everywhere accepted. Mirabeau's attacks on the principle of hereditary aristocracy took the form of supporting those in the new society of America who repudiated this principle and were fighting to stop any degeneration towards this model, considered the norm in eighteenth-century France. The radicals in London who congregated around the bookseller and printer Joseph Johnson similarly looked to France for models which could be held up for emulation in a Britain increasingly dominated by oligarchical forms of political organisation.

It has also been argued that the translators adhered, in the main, to an underlying cosmopolitan world view. This is first of all evident in the personal trajectories of many of the individuals involved, from Huguenot migrants such as Coste, Desmaizeaux, and other later figures such as Paine and Barlow, all of whom resided for long periods abroad. But over and above those whose personal life histories illustrate a cosmopolitanism of experience, other translators such as Le Clerc, Locke, Christie, and others also spent important, often formative years out of the country of their birth. And even amongst those whose visits abroad were brief, such as d'Holbach, Morellet, and others, their contacts in the European world of letters give us an impression of allegiance to transnational networks and to cosmopolitan principles tied to the promotion of universal values of political, religious or philosophical notions. In other words, in all of them we can perceive a general allegiance to the transnational, cosmopolitan ideals and practices of the Enlightenment (Schlereth 1977; Scrivener 2007).

The issue of allegiance takes us back to the question of whether, or to what extent, translators in the last instance are representative of the cultures and languages to which they are translating, their "home" cultures to which, in some accounts, they owe a primary loyalty. Anthony Pym (2009) is highly critical of this assumption, also because it overemphasises translation as an act involving a relation between two opposing and contrasting cultures. The result of this framework is the adoption of a methodology of inquiry which focuses on translation choices and whether translators prioritise the target culture and language (domestication) or the

original (foreignization), the latter being seen as indicative of a cosmopolitan orientation (Venuti 1995: 15-20; Berman 1984). As we have seen, however, the translators we have looked at here do not seem to be primarily concerned with the dialectics of the relations between two different cultures or languages. Rather, they were interested in the propagation of radical views which, although expressed in different linguistic codes, constituted a shared transnational or cosmopolitan political or philosophical perspective.

This cosmopolitan outlook on the part of some of figures we have been looking at has not always been fully recognized. Focusing on their translation activity can provide, perhaps, a key to this outlook. Mirabeau, for example, is largely imagined as representing or exemplifying a certain sort of French-ness, "the Type-Frenchman of this epoch" in Thomas Carlyle's memorable nineteenth-century narrative (1989 [1837]: 144). But from our exploration of Mirabeau's involvement in a number of translation enterprises, a somewhat different figure emerges: a journalist and revolutionary whose principal political context was without doubt French but who was clearly situating his own activity within a cosmopolitan frame of reference, and interacting with a number of other non-French writers and publicists such as Franklin, Romilly, Vaughan, and Johnson. Joel Barlow, on the strength of his epic poem *The Columbiad* (1807), has been awarded a small but significant place in the American canon, but his experiences in the 1790s in America, France and England as a translator and activist show again his cosmopolitan and transnational perspective. Even figures such as Marat, indissolubly linked to the French revolutionary experience and the Terror, if his work as a translator is explored, can be recognized as a figure whose links with the British radical (and scientific) traditions were fundamental.

Many of the translators we have looked at here were figures whose allegiance to a "home" culture was in any case problematic given their marginal, dissident (and sometimes persecuted) status: Huguenots fleeing from discrimination in the period after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, radical Enlightenment philosophers publishing their work and their translations anonymously to avoid imprisonment, revolutionaries distrusted and even under threat of arrest in their home countries. As such, they inhabited a liminal zone which, if not that of Pym's

"professional intercultures" (2009: 37-40), were intercultural as a specific and necessary result of their political activity or ideological convictions.

Rather than look for allegiance to a home culture, then, it may be more profitable to locate these translators within a frontier space of interculture. We may conceptualise these areas in a flexible and metaphorical sense as spaces in which cultures and languages mix freely. We may think of them in regional terms, such as the "fertile crescent" running from Geneva to Amsterdam and London where printing and, it has been argued here, translation constituted a crucial intercultural and cosmopolitan area in which the Enlightenment developed (Eisenstein 1986). Or we may think of them instead as city spaces, which Richard Sennett suggested are the real places of intercultural exchange, rather than actual border areas (1977: 47-52). Or again we may think of them on a "micro-cosmopolitan" level (Cronin 2006: 15-20), as spaces such as the Savoy Palace, the Protestant refuge church in London, or the booksellers and printing shops run by Huguenots in Amsterdam, by Joseph Johnson in St Paul's Yard in London, by Benjamin Franklin in Passy in Paris, or by the Girondins at their Cercle Social. Cosmopolitanism is an abstract term but finds its concrete, material realisation in such specific intercultural spaces. These spaces were also spaces of translation and interlingual communication, providing a "local" focus on translation which can help us identify the specific ways in which ideas and influences cross cultures (Agorni 2002: 1-2).

Translation itself emerges as an important element of the cosmopolitan outlooks of eighteenth-century Europe, from the Huguenot refugees to the radical Enlightenment and the ferment around the "Atlantic Revolution". It emerges also as a significant element of dissent and radicalism. A commitment to cosmopolitan radicalism involved, for those whose work we have looked at here, reaching out to create and consolidate similarities with others within a shared framework. As a result, the need to translate was inescapable.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Reviews and newspapers

American Universal Magazine. Philadelphia, 1797-1798.

Analytical Review. London, 1788-1798.

Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique de l'année 1688. Amsterdam.

Moral and Political Magazine of the London Corresponding Society. London, 1796-1797.

Northern Star. Belfast, 1792-1797.

Books

Biographical anecdotes of the founders of the French republic, and of other eminent characters, who have distinguished themselves during the progress of the revolution. London, 1798-99.

Boyer, Abel. *The History of King William the Third*. London, 1702.

Brissot, Jacques-Pierre. *New Travels in the United States of America performed in 1788. Second edition, corrected.* London, 1794.

Brissot, Jacques-Pierre. *New travels in the United States of America. Performed in 1788*. Boston, 1797 (reprint of 1792 edition).

Brissot, Jacques-Pierre. *Nouveau voyage dans les Etats-Unis de l'Amérique Septentrionale fait en 1788*. Paris, 1791.

Broussais, F.J.V. *On Irritation and Insanity.* Columbia, 1831.

Christie, Thomas. *Letters on the Revolution of France, and on the new constitution established by the National Assembly.* London, 1791.

Condorcet, Jean-Antoine-Nicolas de Caritat, marquis de. *The Life of M. Turgot, Comptroller General of the Finances of France, in the years 1774, 1775, and 1776*. London, 1787.

D'Aumont, J.B. *A Narrative of the Proceedings relating to the Suspension of the King of the French on the 10th of August 1792*. Manchester, 1792.

Deslandes, André François Boureaux. *A philological essay: or, reflections on the death of free-thinkers*. London, 1713.

Dumont, Pierre Étienne. *Letters containing an account of the late revolution in France*. London, 1792.

Garat, Dominique-Joseph. *Mémoires Historiques sur la Vie de M. Suard.* 2 vols. Paris, 1820.

Jefferson, Thomas. "From Thomas Jefferson to François Soulés, 13 September 1786." *Founders Online,* National Archives, accessed September 29, 2019. https://founders.archives.gov/documents/Jefferson/01-10-02-0256. [Original source: *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, vol. 10, *22 June–31 December 1786*, ed. Julian P. Boyd. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1954, p. 363].

Le Clerc, Jean. *Mr. Le Clerc's Extract and judgment of the rights of the Christian church asserted.* London, 1708.

Locke, John. *The Correspondence of John Locke*. Ed. E.S. De Beere. Oxford, 1976-1989.

Mercier, Louis-Sebastien. *Fragments of Politics and History*. 2 vols. London, 1795.

Mirabeau, Honoré-Gabriel de Riqueti. *Oeuvres de Mirabeau*. vol. III, Paris, 1822.

Morellet, André. *Lettres d'André Morellet*. vol. I, 1759-1785. Ed. Dorothy Medlin, Jean-Claude David and Paul Leclerc, Oxford, 1991.

Morellet, André. *Mémoires de l'Abbé Morellet*. Paris, 1821.

Newton, Isaac. *The Correspondence of Isaac Newton,* vol. VII, 1718-1727. Ed. A. Rupert Hall and Laura Tilling, Cambridge, 1977.

Newton, Isaac. *Optique de Newton. Traduction nouvelle, faite par M--- sur la dernière Édition originale.* Paris, 1787.

Oelsner, Konrad Engelbert. *An account of the life of Sieyès.* London, 1795.

Paine, Thomas. *Décadence et chute du système de finances de l'Angleterre*. Paris, 1796.

Paine, Thomas. *Droits de l'Homme. En réponse à l'attaque de M. Burke*. Paris, 1791.

Paine, Thomas. *Théorie et pratique des droits de l'Homme*. Paris, 1792.

Roland, Marie-Jeanne (Manon). *An appeal to impartial posterity,* London, 1795.

Romilly, Samuel. *Memoirs of the Life of Sir Samuel Romilly.* 3 vols. London, 1840.

Toland, John. *Letters to Serena*, London, 1704.

Williams, Helen Maria. *Letters Written in France in the Summer 1790*. London, 1790.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *Collected Letters*. Ed. Ralph M. Wardle, Ithaca and London, 1979.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft,* vol. 7. *Contributions to the Analytical Review 1788-1797*. Ed. Janet Todd and Marilyn Butler, New York, 1989.

Secondary sources

Adams, M. Ray. (1937). "Joel Barlow, Political Romanticist." *American Literature*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 113-152.

Agorni, Mirella. (2002). *Translating Italy for the Eighteenth Century. British women, Translation and Travel Writing (1739-1797*). Manchester: St Jerome.

Almagor, Joseph. (1989). *Pierre Des Maizeaux (1673-1745), Journalist and English Correspondent for Franco-Dutch Periodicals 120-1740*. Amsterdam: APA-Holland University Press.

Anderson, Benedict. (2006 [1983]). *Imagined Communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism.* London: Verso.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism. Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: Norton.

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. (2012 [1993]). "Thick translation." In Lawrence Venuti (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, 3rd edition, pp. 331-343.

Armitage, David. (2002). "Three Concepts of Atlantic History." In David Armitage and Michael J. Braddick (eds.), *The British Atlantic World, 1500-1800*. Basingstoke: Palgrave/Macmillan, pp. 11-30.

Audegean, Philippe. (2017). "La présomption d'innocence à l'épreuve des premières traductions françaises de *Dei delitti e delle pene* de Cesare Beccaria (1765-1822)". In F. Piselli and F. Proietti (eds.), *Les*

Traductions comme textes politiques. Un voyage entre France et Italie (XVIe-XXe siècle). Paris: Classiques Garnier, pp. 145-168.

Baillon, Jean-Francois. (2009). "Two Eighteenth-Century Translators of Newton's *Opticks*: Pierre Coste and Jean-Paul Marat." *Enlightenment and Dissent*, no. 25, pp. 1-28 (http://www.qmulreligionandliterature.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/2520092.pdf).

Bailyn, Bernard. (2005). *Atlantic History. Concepts and Contours*. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Bailyn, Bernard and Philip D. Morgan (eds.). (1991). *Strangers Within the Realm. Cultural Margins of the First British Empire*. Chapel Hill and London: University of North Carolina Press.

Baker, Keith Michael. (1990). *Inventing the French Revolution. Essays on French Political Culture in the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baker, Mona. (2007). "Reframing Conflict in Translation." *Social Semiotics*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 151-169

Baker, Mona. (2010). "Translation and Activism: Emerging Patterns of Narrative Community." In Maria Tymoczko (ed.), *Translation, Resistance, Activism*. Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, pp. 23-41.

Baker, Mona (ed.). (2015). *Translating Dissent. Voices from and within the Egyptian Revolution*. London: Routledge.

Banks, Bryan A. (2017). "The Huguenot Diaspora and the Politics of Religion in Revolutionary France." In Bryan A. Banks and Erica Johnson (eds.), *The French Revolution and Religion in Global Perspective, War Culture and Society 1750-1850*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 3-24.

Barcia, Franco. (1983). *Un politico dell'età barocca. Gregorio Leti*. Milan, Franco Angeli.

Barker, G., & Cawthon, E. (2009). "Scarlett, James, first Baron Abinger (1769-1844), judge." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Retrieved 23 Oct. 2019, from https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-24783.

Barrell, John. (2000). *Imagining the King's Death. Figurative Treason, Fantasies of Regicide 1793-1796*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Barrell, John. (2003). "Divided We Grow." *London Review of Books*, vol. 25, no. 11, pp. 8-11.

Barrell, John and Jon Mee (eds.). (2006). *Trials for Treason and Sedition, 1792-1794*. London: Pickering and Chattus.

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

Bayly, Chris, Sven Beckert, Matthew Connelly, Isabel Hofmeyr, Wendy Kozol, Patricia Seed. (2006). "*AHR* Conversation: On Transnational History." *American Historical Review*, vol. 111, issue 5, pp. 1441–1464. [Accessed on line 28(8/2019. https://doi.org/10.1086/ahr.111.5.1441]

Beck, Ulrich, W. (2007). "The Cosmopolitan Condition. Why Methodological Nationalism Fails." *Theory, Culture & Society*, 24 (7-8), pp. 286-290.

Berkvens-Stevelinck, Christiane. (1987). *Prosper Marchand. La via et l'oeuvre (1678-1756)*. Leiden: Brill.

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

Bhabha, Homi. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Bielsa, Esperança. (2016). *Cosmopolitanism and Translation. Investigations into the experience of the foreign*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bielsa, Esperanca and Susan Bassnett (2009). *Translation in Global News*. New York: Routledge.

Blamires, C. (2009). "Dumont, Pierre-Étienne-Louis [Étienne] (1759–1829), editor and promoter of the work of Jeremy Bentham". *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Retrieved 10 Oct. 2019, from https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-98255.

Blanning, T.C.W. (1981). "The Enlightenment in Catholic Germany." In Roy Porter and Mikulaš Teich (eds.), *The Enlightenment in National Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 118-126.

Blau, Joseph. (1949). "Joel Barlow, Enlightened Religionist." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 430-444.

Bots, Hans. (1984). "Jean Leclerc as journalist of the *Bibliothèques*. His contribution to the spread of English learning on the European continent". In G.A.M. Janssens and F.G.A.M. Aarts (eds.), *Studies in*

Seventeenth-Century English Literature, History and Biography. Amsterdam: Rodopi, pp. 53-66.

Bots, Hans. (2018). "Pierre Des Maizeaux. A Great Cultural Intermediary." In Robert Mankin (ed.), *The Internationalization of Intellectual Exchange in a Globalizing Europe 1630-1780*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, pp. 55-73.

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1984). *Distinction. A social critique of the judgement of taste*. London: Routledge.

Braithwaite, Helen. (2003). *Romanticism, Publishing and Dissent. Joseph Johnson and the Cause of Liberty*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Broadie, Alexander. (2000). *The Scottish Enlightenment. The Historical Age of the Historical Nation*. Edinburgh: Birlinn

Brown, Michael. (2016). *The Irish Enlightenment*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Buel, Richard. (2011). *Joel Barlow: American citizen in a revolutionary world*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Burke, Peter. (2005). "The Renaissance Translator as Go-Between." In Andreas Hofele and Werner von Koppenfels (eds.), *Renaissance Go-Betweens. Cultural Exchange in Early Modern Europe*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, pp. 17-31.

Burrows, Simon. (2000). *French exile journalism and European politics*, Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer.

Butler, Marilyn (ed.). (1984). *Burke, Paine, Godwin and the Revolution Controversy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Butterwick, Richard, and Simon Davies (eds.). (2008). *Peripheries of the Enlightenment* (SVEC 2008: 01). Oxford: Voltaire Foundation.

Carlyle, Thomas (1989) [1837]). *The French Revolution. A history*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Casadei, Thomas. (2012). *Tra ponti e rivoluzioni. Diritti, costituzioni, cittadinanza in Thomas Paine*. Turin: G. Giappichelli Editore.

Cassirer, Ernst. (1979 [1932]). *The Philosophy of the Enlightenment*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Chadwick, Owen. (1981). "The Italian Enlightenment." In Roy Porter and Mikulaš Teich (eds.), *The Enlightenment in National Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 90-105.

Chappell Lougee, Carlyn. (2017). *Facing the Revocation. Huguenot Families, Faith, and the King's Will*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chappey, Jean.-Luc. (2013). "La traduction comme pratique politique chez Antoine-Gilbert Griffet de Labaume (1756-1805)." In Gilles Bertrand and Pierre Serna (eds.). *La République en voyage, 1770-1830*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes, pp. 225-233.

Chesterman, Andrew. (2009). "The Name and Nature of Translation Studies." *Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication Studies,* no. 42, pp. 13-22.

Cheung, Martha P.Y. (2007). "On thick translation as a mode of cultural representation." In Dorothy Kelly and Kyongjoo Ryou (eds.), *Across Boundaries. International Perspectives on Translation Studies*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 22-37.

Chiswick, Harvey. (2017). "Of Radical and Moderate Enlightenment." In Steffen Ducheyne (ed.), *Reassessing the Radical Enlightenment*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 61-79.

Christie, R., & Toit, A. (2004). "Christie, Thomas (1761–1796), political writer." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Retrieved 27 Oct. 2019, from https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-5365.

Clark, George. (1956). *The Later Stuarts 1660-1714*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2nd revised edition.

Clark, J.C.D. (2000). *English Society 1688-1832.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2nd edition.

Clark, J.C.D. (2018). *Thomas Paine. Britain, America, and France in the Age of Enlightenment and Revolution*. Oxford: Clarendon Press

Colley, Linda. (1992). *Britons. Forging the Nation 1707-1837*. London: Pimlico Press.

Conrad, Sebastian. (2012). "Enlightenment in Global History: A Historiographical Critique." *American Historical Review*, vol. 117, no. 4, pp. 999-1027.

Cottret, Bernard. (1985). *Terre d'exil. L'Angleterre et ses réfugiés français et wallons, de la Réforme à la Révocation de l'Édit de Nantes, 1550-1700*. Paris: Aubier.

Coursin, Régis. (2018). "Brissot et la république en acte." *La Révolution française* [En ligne], 13 | 2018, mis en ligne le 22 janvier 2018,

consulté le 31 janvier 2018. URL: http://journals.openedition.org/lrf/1894; DOI: 10.4000/lrf.1894

Crisafulli, Lilla Maria (ed.). (1990). *La Rivoluzione francese in Inghilterra*. Naples: Liguori.

Cronin, Michael. (2006). *Translation and Identity*. London: Routledge.

Curran, Mark. (2012). *Atheism, religion and enlightenment in pre-revolutionary Europe*. Croydon: The Boydell Press (Royal Historical Society).

Dam, Helle V. and Korning Zethsen, Karen. (2009). "Translation Studies: Focus on the Translator." *Hermes - Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, no. 42, pp. 7-12.

Darnton, Robert. (1968). "The grub street style of revolution: J.-P. Brissot, police spy." *Journal of Modern History*, 40 (3): 301-327.

Darnton, Robert. (1971). "The High Enlightenment and the Low-Life of Literature in Pre-Revolutionary France." *Past and Present*, vol. 51, pp. 81-115

Darnton, Robert. (1996). *The Forbidden Best-Sellers of Pre-Revolutionary France*. London: Harper Collins.

Darnton, Robert. (2003). *George Washington's False Teeth. An unconventional guide to the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Norton.

Davies, Damian Walford. (2009). "Williams, David (1738–1816), political and religious theorist and founder of the Literary Fund." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Oxford University Press. Date of access 26 Mar. 2019. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-29494

Davies, Simon. (1990). "The *Northern Star* and the propagation of enlightenment ideas." *Eighteenth-Century Ireland*, vol V, pp. 143-152.

Davies, Tony. (1995). "Borrowed Language: Milton, Jefferson, Mirabeau." In David Armitage, Armand Himy and Quentin Skinner (eds.), *Milton and Republicanism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 254-271

Davis, M. (2004). "Vaughan, Benjamin (1751–1835), diplomatist and political reformer." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Retrieved 24 Sep. 2019, from https://www.oxforddnb.com/

view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-28123.

Davis, Michael T. (1996). "Daniel Isaac Eaton." In *British Reform Writers, 1789-1832, Dictionary of Literary Biography*. Detroit: Bruccoli Clark Lay, pp. 94-102.

Davis, Michael T., Iain McCalman and Christina Parolin (eds.). (2005). *Newgate in Revolution. An anthology of radical prison literature in the Age of Revolution*. London and New York: Continuum.

De Vivo, Giancarlo and Sabbagh, Gabriel. (2015). "The First Translator in English of Turgot's *Réflexions sur la formation et la distribution des richesses*: Benjamin Vaughan." *History of Political Economy*, vol 47, no. 1, pp. 186-199.

Delanty, Gerard. (2006). "The cosmopolitan imagination: critical cosmopolitanism and social theory." *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol, 57, no. 1, pp. 25-47.

Delanty, Gerard. (2014). "Not all is lost in translation: world Varieties of Cosmopolitanism." *Cultural Sociology*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 374-391.

Delisle, Jean and Judith Woodsworth (eds.). (2012). *Translators through history*. 2nd edition, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dinwiddy, J.R. (1977). "William, Cobbett, George Houston and Freethought." *Notes and Queries*, vol. 122, pp. 325-329.

Dodds, Gregory. (2011). "'Sham liberty of conscience': Huguenots and the problem of religious toleration in Restoration England." In David Trim (ed.), *The Huguenots: History and Memory in Transnational Context. Essays in Honour and Memory of Walter C. Utt*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 69-101.

Doyle, William. (2009). *Aristocracy and its enemies in the age of revolution*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Dunn Henderson, Christine and Mark E. Yelling. (2004). *Joseph Addison,* Cato: A Tragedy*, and Selected Essays*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund, pp. xi-xxiii.

Durey, Michael. (1997). *Transatlantic Radicals and the Early American Republic*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

Duthille, Rémy. (2017). *Le Discours radical en Gran-Bretagne, 1768-1789* (SVEC 2017: 11). Oxford: Voltaire Foundation.

Dybikowski, J. (2008). "Des Maizeaux, Pierre (1672/3–1745), biographer and journalist." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Retrieved 16 Nov. 2019, from https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-7546.

Echeverria, Durand. (1953). "Franklin's Lost Letter on the Cincinnati." *Bulletin de l'Istitut Français de Washington*, no. 3, pp. 119-126.

Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. (1992). *Grub Street Abroad. Aspects of the French Cosmopolitan Press from the Age of Louis XIV to the French Revolution*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Eisenstein, Elisabeth L. (2005). *The Printing Revolution in Early Modern Europe*, 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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

Elliott, Marianne. (1982). *Partners in Revolution. The United Irishmen and France*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. (2012 [1978])."The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem." In Lawrence Venuti (ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge, 3rd edition, pp. 162-167.

Faccarello, Gilbert and Philippe Steiner. (2002). "The Diffusion of the Work of Adam Smith in the French Language: An Outline History." In Keith Tribe and Hiroshi Mizuta (eds.), *A Critical Bibliography of Adam Smith*. London: Pickering and Chatto, pp. 61-119.

Furbank, P.N. (1992). *Diderot. A Critical Biography*. London: Secker and Warburg.

Genette, Gerard. (1987). *Seuils*. Paris: Éditions du seuil.

Gentzler, Edwin and Maria Tymoczko (eds.). (2002). *Translation and Power*. Amherst and Boston: University of Massachussetts Press.

Giacobazzi, Cesare. (2017). "Walter Benjamin e la rivoluzione romantica nella teoria della traduzione." *La Questione Romantica,* n.s., vol. 9, nos. 1-2, pp. 79-90.

Gibbs, Graham C. (1987). "Huguenot contributions to England's intellectual life, and England's intellectual commerce with Europe, c. 1680-1720." In Irene Scouloudi (ed.), *Huguenots in Britain and their French background, 1550-1800. Contributions to the Historical*

conference of the Huguenot Society of London, 24-25 September 1985. Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes and Noble, pp. 20-41.

Gibbs, G. (2008). "Boyer, Abel (1667?–1729), lexicographer and journalist." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Retrieved 30 Apr. 2019, from http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-3122.

Gilli, Marita. (1975). *Georg Forster. L'oeuvre d'un penseur allemand réaliste et révolutionnaire (1754-1704)*, Thèse presentée devant l'Université de Paris X. Paris: Honoré Champion.

Gilli, Marita. (ed.). (2005). *Un révolutionnaire allemand. Georg Forster (1754-1794)*. Paris: Éditions du CTHS.

Gillispie, Charles Coulton. (1980). *Science and Polity in France: the End of the Old Regime*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Godechot, Jacques. (1965). *France and the Atlantic Revolution of the Eighteenth Century, 1770-1799*. New York and London: The Free Press/Collier-Macmillan.

Golden, Samuel A. (1972). *Jean LeClerc*. New York: Twayne Publishers.

Goldgar, Anne. (1995). *Impolite Learning. Conduct and Community in the Republic of Letters 1680-1750*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Goodman, Dena. (1994). *The Republic of Letters. A Cultural History of the Enlightenment*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Gordon, Daniel. (1994). *Citizens without Sovereignty. Equality and sociability in French thought, 1670-1789*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Gottschalk, Louis. (1967). *Jean Paul Marat. A study in radicalism*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Goujard, Philippe. (2005). "Un révolutionnaire allemand, Georg Forster (1754-1794)." *Annales historiques de la Révolution française* [on line], 342, consulted 1 May 2019. [http://journals.openedition.org/ahrf/1964]

Grieder, Josephine. (1985). *Anglomania in France 1740-1789. Fact, fiction and political discourse*. Geneva-Paris: Librairie Droz.

Griffo, Maurizio. (2011). *Thomas Paine. La vita e il pensiero politico*. Soveria Manelli: Rubbettino Editore.

Grist, Elizabeth. (2005). "Peter Motteux (1663-1718): Writer, Translator, Entrepreneur." *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, XXVIII (3), pp. 377-387.

Grist, Elizabeth. (2010). "Pierre Des Maizeaux and the Royal Society." In Ann Thomson, Simon Burrows and Edmond Dziembowski (eds.), *Cultural transfers: France and Britain in the long eighteenth century* (SVEC 2010: 02). Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, pp. 33-42.

Gwynn, Robin. (1977). "James II in the Light of His Treatment of Huguenot Refugees in England, 1685-1686." *English Historical Review*, vol. 92, no. 365, pp. 820-833.

Gwynn, Robin. (2001). "The Huguenots in Britain, the 'Protestant International' and the defeat of Louis XIV." In Randolph Vigne and Charles Littleton (eds.), *From strangers to citizens. The Integration of Immigrant Communities in Britain, Ireland and Colonial America, 1550-1750.* Eastbourne: Sussex Academic Press, pp. 412-424.

Habermas, Jurgen. (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere. An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Hammersley, Rachel. (2005). "Jean-Paul Marat's *The Chains of Slavery* in Britain and France, 1774-1833." *The Historical Journal*, 48, 3, pp. 641-660.

Hammersley, Rachel. (2010a). *The English Republican Tradition and eighteenth-century France. Between the Ancients and the Moderns*. Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Hammersley, Rachel. (2010b). "The 'Real Whig'-Huguenot network and the English Republican tradition." In Ann Thomson, Simon Burrows and Edmond Dziembowski (eds.), with Sophie Audidère, *Cultural transfers: France and Britain in the long eighteenth century* (SVEC 2010: 04). Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, pp. 19-32.

Hamou, Philipe. (2018). "Philosophy in the Margins. Pierre Coste's Annotations to the French Translation of Locke's *Essay concerning Human Understanding.*" In Robert Mankin (ed.), *The Internationalization of Intellectual Exchange in a Globalizing Europe 1630-1780*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, pp. 75-95.

Harris, P. (2008). "Maty, Matthew (1718–1776), physician and librarian." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Retrieved 30 Jan.

2020, from https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-18353

Häseler, Jens. (1999). "Intégration ou conquête? Le public francophone en Prusse: les lecteurs de la *Gazette littéraire de Berlin.*" In Jens Häseler and Antony McKenna (eds.), *La vie intellectuelle aux refuges protestants I. Actes de la Table ronde de Munster du 25 juillet 1995*. Paris: Honoré Champion, pp. 111-136.

Häseler, Jens. (2002). "Les Huguenots traducteurs." In Jens Häseler and Antony McKenna (eds.), *La vie intellectuelle aux refuges protestants II. Actes de la Table ronde de Dublin, juillet 1999*. Paris: Honoré Champion, pp. 15-25.

Häseler, Jens and Antony McKenna (eds.). (1999). *La vie intellectuelle aux refuges protestants I. Actes de la Table ronde de Munster du 25 juillet 1995*. Paris: Honoré Champion.

Häseler, Jens and Antony McKenna (eds.). (2002). *La vie intellectuelle aux refuges protestants II. Actes de la Table ronde de Dublin, juillet 1999*. Paris: Honoré Champion.

Hazard, Paul. (1953 [1938]). *The European Mind 1680-1715*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Hermans, Theo. (ed.). (1985). *The Manipulation of Literature: Studies in Literary Translation*. London: Routledge.

Hermans, Theo. (2003). "Cross-cultural translation studies as thick translation." *Bulletin of SOAS*, 66, pp. 380-389.

Heuvel, Jon Vanden. (2001). *A German Life in the Age of Revolution: Joseph Gorres*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press.

Hill, Christopher. (1958). "The Norman Yoke." In *Puritanism and Revolution. Studies in the Interpretation of the English Revolution of the 17^{h} Century*. London: Mercury Books, pp. 50-122.

Hoare, Michael E. (1976). *The Tactless Philosopher. Johann Reinhold Forster (1729-98).* Melbourne: Hawthorne Press.

Hunter, Alfred C. (1925). *J.-B.-A. Suard. Un introducteur de la littérature anglaise en France*. Paris: Champion.

Israel, Jonathan. (2001). *Radical Enlightenment. Philosophy and the Making of Modernity 1650-1750*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Israel, Jonathan. (2006). *Enlightenment Contested. Philosophy, Modernity and the Emancipation of Man 1670-1752*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Israel, Jonathan. (2012). *Democratic Enlightenment. Philosophy, Revolution, and Human Rights, 1750-1790*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Israel, Jonathan. (2014). *Revolutionary Ideas. An intellectual history of the French Revolution from the Rights of Man to Robespierre*. Oxford and Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Israel, Jonathan. (2017). *The Expanding Blaze. How the American Revolution Ignited the World, 1775-1848*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Jacob, Margaret C. (1981). *The Radical Enlightenment. Pantheists, Freemasons and Republicans*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Jacob, Margaret C. (2007). *Strangers Nowhere in the World. The rise of cosmopolitanism in early modern Europe*. Philadelphia: University of Phildelphia Press.

Jacob, Margaret C. (2017). "The Radical Enlightenment. A heavenly city with many mansions." In Steffen Ducheyne (ed.), *Reassessing the Radical Enlightenment*. London and New York: Routledge.

Janssens, Uta. (1975). *Matthieu Maty and the* Journal Britannique *1750-1755. A French view of English literature in the middle of the eighteenth century*. Amsterdam: Holland University Press.

Janssens, Uta. (2002). "'Learned agents of cultural transmission,' or the ideal translator as 'morning star.'" In Jens Häseler and Antony McKenna (eds.), *La vie intellectuelle aux refuges protestants II. Huguenots Traducteurs. Actes de la Table ronde de Dublin, juillet 1999*. Paris: Honoré Champion, pp. 111-123.

Kates, Gary. (1985). *The* Cercle Social*, the Girondins, and the French Revolution*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Keane, John. (1995). *Tom Paine. A Political Life*. London: Bloomsbury.

Kennedy, Deborah. (2002). *Helen Maria Williams and the Age of Revolution.* London: Associated University Presses.

Kishlanksy, Mark. (1996). *A Monarchy Transformed. Britain 1603-1714*. London: Penguin.

Klein, Lawrence E. (1994). *Shaftesbury and the Culture of Politeness. Moral discourse and cultural politics in early eighteenth-century England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kleinman, Sylvie. (2017). "'From Logistics to Liberation'. Theobald Wolfe Tone, Irish Revolutionary and Translator in Exile (1796-1798)." *La Questione Romantica*, n.s., vol. 9, nos. 1-2, pp. 49-63.

Knox, Thomas. (1977). "Thomas Spence: The Trumpet of Jubilee." *Past and Present*, no. 76, pp. 75-98.

Kontler, Laszlo. (2006). "What is the (Historians') Enlightenment Today?" *European Review of History – Revue européene d'Histoire*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 357-371.

Kors, Alan Charles. (1976). *D'Holbach's Coterie. An Enlightenment in Paris*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kozul, Mladen. (2010). "D'Holbach et les déistes anglais: la construction des 'lumières radicales' à la fin des années 1760." In Stefanie Stockhorst (ed.), *Cultural Transfer through Translation. The Circulation of Enlightened Thought in Europe by means of Transation*. New York: Rodopi, pp. 279-295.

Kozul, Mladen (2016). *Le Lumières imaginaires. Holbach et la traduction* (SVEC 2016: 5). Oxford: Voltaire Foundation.

Kristeva, Julia. (1991). *Strangers to Ourselves*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Laslett, Peter. (1988). "Introduction." In John Locke, *Two Treatises of Government*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 3-122.

Laursen, John Christian. (2002). "Abel Boyer. The translation of Libertines and the politics of French politeness in Britain." In Jens Häseler et Antony McKenna (eds.), *La vie intellectuelle aux refuges protestants II. Actes de la Table ronde de Dublin, juillet 1999*, Paris: Honoré Champion, 2002, pp.37-48.

Leask, Nigel. (2007). "Thomas Muir and *The Telegraph*: Radical Cosmopolitanism in 1790s Scotland. *History Workshop Journal*, no. 63, pp. 48-69.

Leech, Patrick. (1990). "'Una moltitudine di porci': Thomas Spence e la politica della plebe" In Lilla Maria Crisafulli (ed.), *La Rivoluzione francese in Inghilterra*. Naples: Liguori, pp. 381-397.

Leech, Patrick. (2017). "The Foreign Affections of the United Irishmen: France, and the French Revolution in Arthur O'Connor's *The Press* (1797-98)." *La Questione Romantica*, n.s., vol. 9, nos. 1-2, pp. 65-77.

Leech, Patrick. (2019). "How to do things with translation. Jean-Paul Marat's translation of Newton's *Optics* (1787)." *mediAzioni*, 24, http://mediazioni.sitlec.unibo.it.

Leech, Patrick. (2020). "'Raining bombs in the house of the Lord.' A Note on Translation and Dissent in the Work of Baron d'Holbach." In Agnieszka Pantuchowicz, Anna Warso (eds.), *Protest and Dissent. Conflicting Spaces in Translation and Culture*. Berlin: Peter Lang, pp. 105-119.

Lefevere, André. (1998). "Translation Practice(s) and the Circulation of Cultural Capital. Some Aeneids in English." In Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere (eds.*), Constructing Cultures. Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon/Philadelphia/Toronto/Sydney, Johannesburg: Multilingual Matters, pp. 41-56.

Linebaugh, Peter. (2019). *Red Round Globe Hot Burning: a tale at the crossroads of commons and closure, of love and terror, of race and class, and of Kate and Ned Despard*. Oakland, Ca.: University of California Press.

Littleton, Charles G.D. (2018). "Abel Boyer and other Huguenot reports of Parliament. Hansard *avant le lettre*?" In Vivienne Larminie (ed.), *Huguenot Networks 1560-1780. The Interactions and Impact of a Protestant Minority in Europe*. New York and London: Routledge, pp. 61-74.

Loretelli, Rosamaria. (2017). "The first English translation of Cesare Beccaria's *On Crimes and Punishments*. Uncovering the Editorial and Political Contexts." *Diciottesimo Secolo*, anno II, pp. 1-22.

Lounissi, Carine. (2018). *Thomas Paine and the French Revolution*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lundberg, I.C. (1964). *Turgot's Unknown Translator. The* Réflexions *and Adam Smith*. The Hague: Marinus Nijhoff.

Malherbe, Michel.(2005). "Hume's Reception in France." In Peter Jones (ed.), *The Reception of David Hume in Europe.* London and New York: Thoemmes Continuum, pp. 43-97.

Marshall, John. (1994). *John Locke. Resistance, Religion and Responsibility*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mason, Sheila. (2002). "The Afterlife of Pierre Coste." In Jens Häseler and Antony McKenna (eds.), *La vie intellectuelle aux refuges protestants II. Actes de la Table ronde de Dublin, juillet 1999*. Paris: Honoré Champion, pp. 49-62.

McCalman, Iain. (1988). *Radical Underworld. Prophets, revolutionaries and pornographers in London, 1795-1840*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Medlin, Dorothy. (1978). "André Morellet, translator of liberal thought." In Haydn Mason (ed.), *Miscellany/Mélanges* (SVEC 1978: 174), Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, pp. 189-202.

Mee, Jon. (1992). *Dangerous Enthusiasms. William Blake and the Culture of Radicalism in the1790s*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Mee, Jon. (2002). "The strange career of Richard 'Citizen' Lee: poetry, popular radicalism and enthusiasm in the 1790s." In Nigel Smith and Timothy Morton (eds.), *Radicalism in British literary culture, 1650-1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 151-166.

Mee, Jon. (2016). *Print, publicity and popular radicalism in the 1790s. The Laurel of Liberty*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Merkle, Denise. (2010). "Secret Literary Societies in Late Victorian England." In Maria Tymoczko (ed.), *Translation, Resistance, Activism.* Amherst and Boston: University of Massachussetts Press, pp. 108-128.

Miller, Victor Clyde. (1932). *Joel Barlow: Revolutionist, London 1791-92*. Hamburg: de Gruyter.

Milton, John and Paul Bandia (eds.). (2009). *Agents of Translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Monnier, Raymonde. (2011). "Traduction, transmission et révolution: enjeux rhétoriques de la traduction des textes de la conception républicaine de la liberté autour de 1789." *Annales historiques de la Révolution françaises*, no. 364, pp. 29-50.

Munck, Thomas. (2000). *The Enlightenment. A Comparative Social History 1721-1794*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

Munday, Jeremy. (2014). "Using primary sources to produce a microhistory of translation and translators: theoretical and methodological concerns." *The Translator*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 64-80.

Newman, Stephen. (2006). "Cooper, Thomas (1759–1839)." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Retrieved 30 Mar. 2019, from http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-6231.

O'Malley, Maria and Denys Van Renen (eds.). (2018). *Beyond 1776. Globalizing the Cultures of the American Revolution*. Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press.

Oliver, Bette W. (2016). *Jacques Pierre Brissot in America and France, 1788-1793. In Search of Better Worlds*. Lanham and London: Lexington Books.

Onnekink, David. (2011). "Models of an imagined community; Huguenot discourse on identity and foreign policy." In David Trim (ed.), *The Huguenots: History and Memory in Transnational Context. Essays in Honour and Memory of Walter C. Utt*. Leiden: Brill, pp. 193-215.

Ossa-Richardson, Anthony. (2015). "Missy, César de (1703–1775), minister, scholar, and book collector." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press. Date of access 18 May. 2019. https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-107399

Oz-Salzberger, Fania. (1995). *Translating the enlightenment: Scottish civic discourse in eighteenth-century Germany*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Oz-Salzberger, Fania. (2006). "The Enlightenment in Translation: Regional and European Aspects." *European Review of History – Review européene d'Histoire*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 385-409.

Oz-Salzberger, Fania. (2014). "Enlightenment, national enlightenments, and translation." In Aaron Garrett (ed.), *The Routledge Companion to Eighteenth Century Philosophy*. Routledge: Abingdon, pp. 33-60.

Oz-Salzberger, Fania. (2017). "Adam Smith's Early German Readers: Reception, Misreception, and Critique." In Fonna Forman (ed.), *The Adam Smith Reader*, vol. 9. London: Routledge, pp. 201-218.

Palmer, R.R. (1959). *The Age of Democratic Revolution. A Political History of Europe and America, 1760-1800*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Panichi, Nicola. (1999). *Plutarchus Redivivus? La Boétie e i suoi interpreti*. Napoli: Vivarisum.

Philp, Mark. (2011). "Paine, *Rights of Man.*" In Pamela Clemit (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to British Literature of the French Revolution in the 1790*s. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 51-46.

Plomer, Henry R. (1922). *A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers who were at work in England, Scotland and Ireland from 1668 to 1725*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pocock, John G.A. (2005). "The Redescription of Enlightenment." *Proceedings of the British Academy,* vol. 125*,* 2003 Lectures. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.101-117

Poni, Carlo. (1993). "The Craftsman and the Good Engineer. Technical Practice and Theoretical Mechanics in J.T. Desaguliers." *History and Technology*, vol. 10, pp. 215-232.

Popkin, Jeremy D. (1991). "Periodical publication and the nature of knowledge in eighteenth-century Europe." In D.R. Kelly and R. H. Popkin (eds.), *The Shapes of Knowledge from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publications, pp. 203-213.

Porter, Roy. (2000). *Enlightenment. Britain and the Creation of the Modern World*. London: Penguin.

Porter Roy and Mikuláš Teich (eds.). (1981). *The Enlightenment in National Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pym, Anthony. (1998). *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Pym, Anthony. (2009). "Humanizing Translation History." *Hermes - Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, no. 42, pp. 23-48.

Rancière, Jacques. (2010). *Dissensus. On Politics and Aesthetics*. London: Continuum.

Rendall, Jane. (2011). "Wollstonecraft, Vindications and Historical and Moral View of the French Revolution." In Pamela Clemit (ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to British Literature of the French Revolution in the 1790*s. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 71-85.

Robb, Bonnie Arden. (1991). "The making of Denis Diderot: translation as apprenticeship." *Diderot Studies*, vol. 24, pp. 137-154.

Robbins, Caroline. (1959). *The Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthman, Studies in the Transmission, Development, and Circumstance of English Liberal Thought from the Restoration of Charles II until the War with the Thirteen Colonies*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Robertson, John. (1997). "The Enlightenment above national context: political economy in eighteenth-century Scotland and Naples." *The Historical Journal*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 667-697.

Robertson, John. (2005). *The Case for the Enlightenment. Scotland and Naples 1680-1760.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Robinson, Douglas. (1991). *The Translator's Turn*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Robinson, E. (2013). "Watt, James (1769–1848), engineer and manufacturer." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Retrieved 14 Dec. 2019, from https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-28881.

Rogers, Rachel. (2012). 'Vectors of Revolution: The British Radical Community in Early Republican Paris, 1792-1794.' PhD dissertation, Université Toulouse le Mirail - Toulouse II.

Rogers, Rachel. (2013). "White's Hotel: A Junction of British Radical Culture in early 1790s Paris." *CALIBAN. French Journal of English Studies*, no. 33 . pp. 153-172. [consulted on line 23 march 2019: https://journals.openedition.org/caliban/139#text

Rudé, George. (1962). *Wilkes and Liberty: A Social Study of 1763 to 1774*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Rumbold, Margaret E. (1991). *Traducteur Huguenot: Pierre Coste*. New York: Peter Lang.

Rundle, Christopher. (2012). "Translation as an approach to history." *Translation Studies*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 232-248.

Rundle, Christopher. (2014). "Theories and methodologies of translation history: the value of an interdisciplinary approach." *The Translator*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 2-8.

Russell, Corinna. (2004). "Merry, Robert (1755–1798), poet." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press, Date of

access 23 Mar. 2019. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-18611

Russell, M. S. and A. Montin, A. (2015). "The Rationality of Political Disagreement: Rancière's Critique of Habermas." *Constellations: an international journal of critical and democratic theory,* 22 (4), pp. 543-554.

Said, Edward. (1995 [1978]). *Orientalism*. London, Penguin.

Sandrier, Alain. (2004). *Le style philosophique du baron d'Holbach. Conditions et contraintes du prosélytisme athée en France dans la seconde moitié du XVIIIe siècle*. Paris: Honoré Champion.

Sayols, Jésus. (2018). "Transculturation and Bourdieu's habitus theory. Towards an integrative approach for examining the translational activity of literary translators through history." *Target*, 15 March 2018.

Schama, Simon. (1989). *Citizens. A Chronicle of the French Revolution*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Schlereth, Thomas J. (1977). *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought. Its form and function in the ideas of Franklin, Hume, and Voltaire 1694-1790*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Schofield, Robert E. (2004). *The Enlightened Joseph Priestley. A Study of His Life and Work from 1773 to 1804*. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Scrivener, Michael. (2007). *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in the Age of Revolution and Reaction, 1776-1832*. London: Pickering and Chatto.

Sennett, Richard. (1977). *The Fall of Natural Man.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sgard, Jean et al. (1976). *Dictionnaire des Journaux 1680-1789*. Grenoble: Presse Universitaire de Grenoble (available at http://dictionnaire-journaux.gazettes18e.fr/).

Sgard, Jean. (1990). "La multiplication des périodiques." In Roger Chartier and Henri-Hean Martin (eds.), *Histoire de l'édition française. Le livre triomphant 1660-1830*. Paris: Fayard/Cercle de la Libraire, pp. 246-255.

Simeoni, Daniel. (1998) "The Pivotal Status of the Translator's Habitus." *Target*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1-39.

Smith, Blake. (2017). "Counter-Revolution and Cosmopolitan Spirituality: Anquetil Duperron's Translation of the Upanishads." In B.A. Banks and E. Johnson (eds.), *The French Revolution and Religion in Global Perspective, War Culture and Society, 1750-1850*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 25-47.

Smith, Olivia. (1986). *The Politics of Language 1791-1819*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Soulard, Delphine. (2011). "L'oeuvre des premiers traducteurs francais de John Locke: Jean LeClerc, Pierre Coste et David Mazel." *Dix-septième siècle*, no. 4, pp. 739-762.

Stuurman, Siep. (2007). "Cosmopolitan Egalitarianism in the Enlightenment: Anquetil Duperron on India and America." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 68, no. 2, pp. 255-278.

Swift, Katerine. (1990). "'The French-Booksellers in the Strand': Huguenots in the London book trade, 1685-1730." *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society*, XXV, (2), pp. 123-139.

Tabet, Xavier. (2017). "Beccaria l'obscur? Contribution à l'étude des traductions françaises des *Délits et des peines*". In F. Piselli and F. Proietti (eds.), *Les Traductions comme textes politiques. Un voyage entre France et Italie (XVIe-XXe siècle)*. Paris: Classiques Garnier, pp. 127-143

Thomas, Marguerite. (1976). "Michel de la Roche" (? – 1742). In Jean Sgard et al (eds.). *Dictionnaire des journalists (1600-1789)*. Grenoble: Presse Universitaire de Grenoble (available on line at http://dictionnaire-journalistes.gazettes18e.fr/journaliste/458-michel-de-la-roche. Accessed il 10/12/2019).

Thomas, Peter G. (2008). "Wilkes, John (1725–1797), politician." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Retrieved 12 Dec. 2019, from https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-29410.

Thompson, Edward P. (1963). *The Making of the English Working Class*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Thomson, Ann. (2007). "Locke, Stillingfleet et Coste. La philosophie en extraits". *Cromohs*, 12, pp. 1-16

Thomson, Ann. (2010). "Des Maizeaux, Collins and the translators: the case of Collins' *Philosophical inquiry concerning human liberty.*" In

Ann Thomson, Simon Burrows and Edmond Dziembowski (eds.), *Cultural transfers: France and Britain in the long eighteenth century* (SVEC 2010: 04). Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, pp. 219-231.

Thomson, Ann. (2013). "Toland, Dodwell, Swift and the circulation of irreligious ideas in France: what does the study of international networks tell us about the 'radical Enlightenment.'" In Lise Andries, Frédéric Ogée, John Dunkley and Darach Sanfey (eds.), *Intellectual journeys. The translation of ideas in Enlightenment England, France and Ireland* (SVEC 2013:12). Oxford: Voltaire Foundation, pp. 159-175.

Todd, Charles Burr. (1886). *Life and Letters of Joel Barlow, LLD, Poet, Statesman, Philosopher*, *with extracts from his works and hitherto unpublished poems*. New York and London: Putnam.

Tonin, Raffaella. (2011). *El tratado Dei delitti e delle pene de Cesare Beccaria y sus dos primeras traducciones al castellano*. Padova: Unipress.

Tonin, Raffaella. (2017). "Juan Rivera: un traduttore militante nella Spagna nel Triennio Liberale." *La Questione Romantica*, n.s. vol. 9, nos. 1-2, pp. 17-34.

Tournu, Christophe. (2002). *Milton, Mirabeau: rencontre rèvolutionnaire*. Montélimar: EDIMAF.

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

Trevor-Roper, Hugh. (1987). "A Huguenot Historian: Paul Rapin." In Irene Scouloudi (ed.), *Huguenots in Britain and their French background, 1550-1800. Contributions to the Historical conference of the Huguenot Society of London, 24-25 September 1985*. Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes and Noble, pp. 3-19.

Tymoczko, Maria. (2007). *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*. Manchester: St Jerome.

Tymoczko, Maria (ed.). (2010a). *Translation, Resistance*, *Activism*. Amherst and Boston: University of Massachussetts Press.

Tymoczko, Maria. (2010b). "Translation, Resistance, Activism: An Overview." In Maria Tymoczko (ed.), *Translation, Resistance*, *Activism*. Amherst and Boston: University of Massachussetts Press, pp. 1-22.

Tymoczko, Maria. (2010c). "The Space and Time of Activist Translation." In Maria Tymoczko (ed.), *Translation, Resistance,*

Activism. Amherst and Boston: University of Massachussetts Press, pp. 227-254.

Van de Veer, Peter. (2002). "Colonial Cosmopolitanism." In Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen (eds.), *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism. Theory, Context and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 165-79.

Vantin, Serena. (2017). "Mary Wollstonecraft traduttrice. Educazione, morale e pensiero radicale dalle pagine dell'*Analytical Review* alla Francia Rivoluzionaria." *La Questione Romantica*, n.s.,vol. 9, nos. 1-2, pp. 35-48.

Vega, Judith. (1999). "Feminist Republicanism. Etta Palm-Aelders on Justice, Virtue and Men." *History of European Ideas*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 333-351.

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

Venuti, Lawrence. (1998). *The Scandals of Translation. Towards an ethics of difference*. London, Routledge.

Vercruysse, Jeroom. (1971). *Bibliographie descriptive des écrits du Baron d'Holbach.* Paris: Minard.

Vertovec, Steven and Robin Cohen. (2002). "Introduction: Conceiving Cosmopolitanism." In Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen (eds.), *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism. Theory, Context and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 1-22.

Vet, J. J. V. M. de. (2004). "Coste, Pierre (1668–1747), translator and writer." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford University Press. Date of access 28 Feb. 2019, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-6377

Wardle, Ralph M. (1947). "Mary Wollstonecraft, Analytical Reviewer." *PMLA*, vol. 62, no. 4, pp. 1000-1009.

Whatmore, Richard. (2007). "Étienne Dumont, the British Constitution and the French Revolution". *Historical Journal*, 50, 1, pp. 23-47.

Wickwar, W.H. (1968). *Baron d'Holbach. A Prelude to the French Revolution*. New York: Kelley.

Wijffels, Alain. (2002). "Flanders and the Scheldt Question: A Mirror of the Law of International Relations and its Actors." *Sartonia* 15, pp. 213-280.

Williams, G.A. (1964). "Morgan John Rhys and Volney's *Ruins of Empires*." *The Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies*, vol. XX, Cardiff: University of Wales Press, pp. 58-73.

Withers, Charles W.J. (2007). *Placing the Enlightenment. Thinking Geographically about the Age of Reason*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Yolton, Jean S. (ed.) (2000). *John Locke as translator. Three of the* Essais *of Pierre Nicole in French and English* (SVEC 2000: 07). Oxford: Voltaire Foundation.

Yolton, John W. (1993). *Locke and the Way of Ideas*. Bristol: Thoemmes Press.

Ziesche, Philipp. (2010). *Cosmopolitan Patriots. Americans in Paris in the Age of Revolution*. Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press.

INDEX OF NAMES

Ultimi volumi pubblicati:

Félix San Vicente, Ana Lourdes de Hériz, María Enriqueta Pérez Vázquez (eds), *Perfiles para la historia y crítica de la gramática del español en Italia: siglos XIX y XX. Confluencia y cruces de tradiciones gramaticográficas.*

Amalia Amato e Gabriele Mack, *Comunicare tramite interprete nelle indagini di polizia. Implicazioni didattiche di un'analisi linguistica.*

Gloria Bazzocchi e Raffaella Tonin (a cura di), *Mi traduci una storia? Riflessioni sulla traduzione per l'infanzia e per ragazzi.*

Francesca Gatta (a cura di), *Parlare insieme. Studi per Daniela Zorzi.*

Adele D'Arcangelo (a cura di), *Promuovere la competenza interculturale nella didattica della traduzione. L'esperienza della Scuola Interpreti e Traduttori di Forlì.*

Roberta Pederzoli, Licia Reggiani, Laura Santone (dir.), *Médias et bien-être. Discours et représentations.*

Elide Casali, *Il bambino e la lumaca. Rileggere Piero Camporesi (1926-1997).*

Derek Boothman (a cura di), *La traduzione come luogo di incontro e di scontro.*

Félix San Vicente, Gloria Bazzocchi, Pilar Capanaga (eds), *Oraliter. Formas de la comunicación presencial y a distancia.*

Motoko Ueyama, Irena Srdanović (eds), *Digital resources for learning Japanese.*

Raffaella Baccolini, Roberta Pederzoli, Beatrice Spallaccia (eds), *Literature, Gender and Education for Children and Young Adults / Littérature, genre, éducation pour l'enfance et la jeunesse.*

Adele D'Arcangelo, Chiara Elefante, Valeria Illuminati (eds), *Translating for Children Beyond Stereotypes / Traduire pour la jeunesse au-delà des stéréotypes.*

Mariachiara Russo, Emilia Iglesias Fernández, María Jesús González Rodríguez (eds), *Telephone interpreting. The impact of technology on dialogue interpreting / L'interpretazione telefonica. L'impatto della tecnologia sull'interpretazione dialogica.*

Anabela Cristina Costa da Silva Ferreira, *A língua do Direito de Família. Peculiaridades, problemáticas e prática da linguagem setorial jurídica em confronto entre português e italiano para estudantes PLE.*

Greta Zanoni, *Lo sviluppo della competenza pragmatica in italiano: dalla rete alla classe.*

Finito di stampare nel mese di maggio 2020
per i tipi di Bononia University Press