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Abstract

Johann Jacob Bodmer stands at the beginning of a new era that saw the establishment of major English literary influences in Germany along with the rise of English to become a language of importance of the European stage.

The particular importance of this eighteenth-century Zurich translator and literary scholar lies in his translation of a canonical work of English literature, *Paradise Lost*, and in his tireless efforts to develop appreciation of this work in the German debate on aesthetics and translation of the 1730s. Bodmer was strongly opposed by scholars wishing to establish in Germany the neoclassical aesthetic conventions prevailing in France, then the hegemonic power in Europe. By overcoming the advocates of French literary models he paved the way for the widescale translation of English authors such as Shakespeare, and the adoption of English models.

As a translator, Bodmer advocated norms of faithful translation that deviated from those advanced for Germany by the advocates of French literary models. This study explores the origin of the new Zurich ideas, and outlines the extensive debate on translation conducted in Germany in the 1730s, in which Bodmer and his colleague Johann Jacob Breitinger overturned the arguments of Johann Christoph Gottsched and his supporters. In a number of respects, Bodmer and Breitinger’s ideas on translation can be seen as precursors of the ‘foreignising’ approach to translation developed by German thinkers such as Friedrich Schleiermacher at the end of the eighteenth century.

My study also investigates Bodmer’s translation practice in detail, based on analyses of his German translations of *Paradise Lost*. It gives particular attention to the way in which the debates of the 1730s prompted changes in his thinking on translation. Of especial interest here are his ideas on the translation of metaphor, to which he appears to have devoted more attention than any thinker before him.

My study applies a new approach to studying translation history currently being developed by translation scholar Anthony Pym. Pym’s ‘professional interculture’ ideas focus particular attention on individual translators and groups of translators, and the importance of their debates and discussions for negotiating translation norms.
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GREFENSEE, BODMERS GEBURTSORT.

Nach einem Kupferstich von F. Hegl.
Monseur et bonhomme,

Die folgende Meldung Ihnen übermittelt die Konsequenzen der verzögerten Überführung der von Ihnen erwähnten Maroden, die einstige Heerführer der französischen Armee. Ich rate Ihnen, die genauen Überführer der Heerführer zu erneuter Manöver der Maroden zu überprüfen, da die Armee frieren kann, wenn die Heerführer nicht ordnungsgemäß überführt werden.

Ich habe vor kurzem, nachdem der französische Heerführer der Maroden überführt wurde, einige wichtige Informationen über den aktuellen Stand der Operationen, die über die Maroden und die Überführung der Maroden bereitgestellt wurden. Es ist wichtig, dass die Operationen der Maroden ordnungsgemäß durchgeführt werden, um sicherzustellen, dass die Maroden ordnungsgemäß überführt werden und dass die Maroden ordnungsgemäß überführt werden.

Ich hoffe, dass dies Ihnen von Interesse ist und dass Sie die erforderlichen Maßnahmen ergreifen, um sicherzustellen, dass die Maroden ordnungsgemäß überführt werden. Ich möchte Ihnen nochmals danken, dass Sie die Maroden ordnungsgemäß überführt haben, und ich hoffe, dass dies Ihnen von Interesse ist.

Beste Grüße,

[Unterschrift]

Johannes Eckardt Besigius
Obwohl der 1. Termperatur war auf allgemeine Einverständnis gebühren, förderte er von sehr großen Zufällen, als das war. Die 1.
handelsgeschäft der Zunft bestand in Entfaltung und für die große
Schönheit und Handelsabenteuer der Zunft, die in fast allen Angeboten. Der Schatz der Zunft, der von der Handelsabenteuer in einem
wohltatende Forderung, die in fast allen Angeboten. Der Schatz der
zunehmende, als der 1. Termperatur eine.

Datum: 10. Februar 1745

[Signatur]
Chapter One – Introduction

Before the eighteenth century the dominant political and cultural force in Europe was that of France. The early part of the new century witnessed a new conflict between the upcoming power of England – a European player taking on increasing importance in the political, economic and cultural spheres – and the traditional hegemonic power of France.

Part of this struggle for dominance took the form of an acrimonious debate on literary aesthetics and translation involving two centres in German-speaking Europe – a debate in which new English literary models and ideas were pitted against those of hegemonic France.

This debate took place in the 1730s, and involved on the one hand, the Swiss city-state of Zurich, located on the German-speaking periphery, and on the other, Leipzig in the centre of the German-speaking part of Europe.

The Swiss city of Zurich was a major centre of cultural mediation between English and German-speaking Europe in this period. Its particular importance lay in the crucial influence exerted by the literary scholar, historian and translator, Johann Jacob Bodmer (1698-1783).

Bodmer was opposed in Leipzig by Johann Christoph Gottsched (1700-66) and his followers in Leipzig, who sought to consolidate in German-speaking Europe literary models similar to those in France.

The focal point of the differences between the two parties was Bodmer’s translation of a canonical work of English literature, John Milton’s Paradise Lost. Milton’s English epic had originally been published in 1667, more than 50 years before Bodmer first translated it. Written in blank verse in twelve books, it recounts man’s fall, featuring characters that include God, the archangels and angels, Satan, Adam and Eve. For Bodmer, Milton’s work was the supreme embodiment of new ideas on the importance of the imagination in literature being developed in Italy and espoused, to some extent, in England. These ideas ran counter to the French neo-classical approach that Gottsched sought to establish.

Thus, Bodmer’s translation of Paradise Lost became the central point of the 1730s debate on aesthetics which eventually helped to win acceptance for English literature in Germany. Yet little research has been done on the manner in which this influential translation was done, or the major differences between the first and second editions of Bodmer’s translation, completed before and towards the end of the debate respectively. Indeed, there is little awareness, even, in either the German or the English literature, that such differences exist.
In addition to pitting English literary models against French ones, the debate between Leipzig and Zurich also witnessed the confrontation between differing translation norms that emphasised, on the one hand, accountability to the source text (advocated by the Zurich party) and, on the other hand, reader-oriented target texts featuring correct flowing language, an approach with many similarities to the dominant norm then prevailing in France (advocated by the Leipzig party).

My research project therefore examines the translation debate of the 1730s between the two parties and the confrontation of the differing approaches to translation. It studies the impact of this debate on Bodmer’s work as a translator, with particular reference to the two editions of *Paradise Lost*, and outlines the role of Bodmer’s translation practice and theory in the cultural realignment of German-speaking Europe in this period.

### 1.1 Hypotheses

My hypotheses are, first, that Bodmer’s work as a translator was guided by peripheral translation norms that differed considerably from translation norms prevailing in the then dominant neoclassically-oriented culture of France. The norms to which Bodmer adhered appear to have been derived – to a large extent – from those formulated by the seventeenth-century translation scholar Pierre-Daniel Huet. Part of the explanation for his adherence to such norms may be found in his family background and the environment prevailing in Zurich in the early eighteenth century. I show how Bodmer’s position on translation was opposed to that of Johann Christoph Gottsched and his followers. The translation debate conducted in the 1730s pitted adherents of the two opposing views against one another.

My second hypothesis is that, by the end of the debate, the peripheral norms formulated by Bodmer and his colleague, Johann Jacob Breitinger, had superseded the dominant French-influenced norms advocated by Gottsched and taken a central position. The new central translation norm that emerged from the debate of the 1730s influenced the subsequent choice of models for translation and was a forerunner of new ideas on translation that developed in German-speaking Europe during the eighteenth century.

My third hypothesis is that the debate of the 1730s actually caused Bodmer to make some modifications to his approach to practical translation, although these were reflected only to a limited extent in his theoretical writings on translation. This may be seen in his practical approach to the translation of *Paradise Lost*, for instance in his translation of metaphor.
1.2 Subsequent presentation of material

In order to examine my hypotheses I use theoretical approaches developed in the field of translation history over the past 25 years. The most widely used frameworks for the investigation of historical translation topics today are the polysystem model developed by Itamar Even-Zohar and the Descriptive Translation Studies approaches that have developed from this. I therefore begin with a brief examination of systems and of Even-Zohar’s polysystem model in particular, as well as the concepts of central and peripheral norms introduced by Gideon Toury, who further developed Even-Zohar’s ideas. I then look at the two concepts of ‘patronage’ and ‘intercultures’ developed more recently within the field of Descriptive Translation Studies by André Lefevere and Anthony Pym respectively. In this way I will develop an ‘intercultural’ framework that allows me to examine the work of Johann Jacob Bodmer, the leading translator and literary critic in early eighteenth-century Zurich. This is presented in chapter two.

I then proceed to an analysis of the central and peripheral translation norms prevailing in France and in the German states in the early eighteenth century at the time Bodmer lived. This is presented in chapter three, where I also illustrate these norms with a brief examination of three translations of Milton’s work published in short succession around the year 1730 – Bodmer’s first translation of Paradise Lost published in 1732, and the French and Italian translations published in the same period.

When exploring a topic of this kind, it is necessary to examine both the big picture and the detailed picture – the wider economic, political and literary issues that impacted upon Bodmer’s work as a translator, and the minutiae of his translation decisions. In Descriptive Translation Studies, argues Maria Tymoczko,

\[\ldots\text{ a researcher can approach the research from two directions: from the macroscopic direction, by looking at the big picture, by turning a telescope on the culture, so to speak; or from the microscopic direction, by looking at the particularities of the language of a translation through a microscope, as it were. Ultimately, however, in my view the best work shows a convergence }\ldots\text{. (Tymoczko 2002: 17)}\]

My examination of the big picture may be found in chapter four in particular, where I look at the historical, cultural, political and economic environment in which Bodmer worked.

In chapter five the focus switches to a more detailed examination, with a discussion of the Zurich-Leipzig debate on translation conducted in German-speaking Europe in the 1730s. To assist with the chronological overview, a timeline is provided before the beginning of chapter five.
Chapters six and seven explore the detailed aspects even further, with an investigation of the extent to which the issues discussed in the translation debate were reflected in the far-reaching changes that Bodmer made when he reworked his first translation of *Paradise Lost* for the influential second version published in 1742. For this translation analysis I use the methodology outlined in chapter two.

Finally, in chapter eight I discuss the subsequent reception of the translation and later developments in translation theory.
Chapter Two – Methodological Considerations

2.1 Polysystems and other systems

2.1.1 Polysystem theory

Polysystem theory was developed in the 1970s by the Israeli literary theorist, Itamar Even-Zohar, to account for the behaviour and evolution of literary systems. In his theory, Even-Zohar devoted considerable attention to the role of translated literature. He based his work on the ideas of Russian Formalists, and in particular those of Jurij Tynjanov, and is said to have borrowed heavily from them (Genzler 1993: 109). Polysystem theory was described – not only by its advocates – as a new paradigm in translation studies because it shifted attention away from source texts to target texts. Even-Zohar’s work on translation was consolidated by Toury, another Israeli scholar, and further developed by translation history researchers in other countries, most particularly in the Netherlands and Belgium, under the more general name of Descriptive Translation Studies.

In the 1985 ‘manipulation’ volume, which set out the descriptive translation approach, Hermans defined Even-Zohar’s ‘polysystem’ as follows:

[…] a differentiated and dynamic ‘conglomerate of systems’ characterized by internal oppositions and continual shifts. Among the oppositions are those between ‘primary’ (or innovatory) and ‘secondary’ (or conservative) models and types, between the centre of the system and its periphery, between canonized and non-canonized strata […]. (Hermans 1985b: 11)

Within the polysystem, the system of translated literature may be either central or peripheral, depending on the situation in which the polysystem as a whole finds itself. There are three situations in which translated literature will be central rather than peripheral: when a literature is ‘young’, when it is ‘weak’ and when there are “turning points, crises, or literary vacuums” in a literature. “In such a vacuum, it is easy for foreign models to infiltrate, and translated literature may consequently assume a central position.” (Even-Zohar 2000: 194) Literature translated in a situation of this kind, where translated literature is located in the centre of the polysystem, may be translated particularly faithfully. There may, however, be a literary struggle before the new foreign models are accepted, although once they have, there will be a broader repertoire of translated literature, for a time at least.

Applying this to the actual historical developments in German literature during the eighteenth century, particularly with regard to translated English literature, many of the elements
described in Even-Zohar’s model can be identified. These elements are described briefly as follows (for a more detailed treatment see Baumer 2002).

First of all, was the literary system in German-speaking Europe ‘young’ or ‘weak’ in the early eighteenth century, or could we say there was a ‘vacuum’ in the system? Fabian argues that whereas France and Italy both had fully developed national cultures, Germany was still a backward country (Fabian 1992: 4). According to this reading, the German literary system may be said to have been ‘young’. Although in polysystem theory translated literature can move into the centre of the polysystem when a literature is young, there may be a struggle before the new foreign literary models are accepted. In the case of German-speaking Europe, there was indeed a struggle. The literary dispute that ensued in the 1730s, between the Leipzig group centred on Gottsched and the Zurich group around Bodmer and Breitinger was not a struggle for the acceptance of foreign literary models as such. Both were agreed that the vacuum left by the decline of Baroque literature in German-speaking Europe was to be filled by adopting models brought in from outside. The struggle related to which of two models, the French or the English, should be predominant. This literary struggle between Leipzig and Zurich was eventually decided in favour of the English literary models advocated by Bodmer, but what is interesting is that, in the process, the phenomenon of more faithful translation described by Even-Zohar in his theory – or at least the theoretical advocacy of this approach to translation – can actually be observed.

Finally, the theory states that, once the foreign models have been accepted, there will be a broader repertoire of translated literature for a time. Lawrence Marsden Price’s comprehensive investigations into the German translation and reception of English literature in the eighteenth century (1953) show that by the latter part of the century, translated English literature had adopted a position at the centre of the polysystem, in other words, that it belonged to the body of canonized literature accepted by the dominant circles in German-speaking Europe.

Thus, polysystem analysis explains the reception of English literature as a function of the weakness of the German literary system, and states that the manner of its mediation took the form of faithful translation. However, it does not shed any light on why Zurich should have served as a centre of mediation or the individual role of Johann Jacob Bodmer.

In a similar manner to my analysis above, a recent study of translation developments in China at the beginning of the twentieth century has applied the polysystem concept “as a framework to illustrate the dynamics of a cultural paradigm shift” (Chan 2002). Describing the Chinese translator Yan Fu (1854-1921) as China’s most influential translator and translation theorist, Chan argues that the polysystem approach helps to analyse Yan’s translation practice “in terms of culture and power, and as functioning in multiple interrelated systems rather than a conglomerate of disparate elements” (ibid: 62). Some elements of Yan Fu’s situation throw up fascinating parallels to Bodmer – both recognised the value of overcoming entrenched
literary models in favour of innovative ideas developed within the culture of an increasingly powerful external power. Yan had travelled in the West and was versed in both Western and Chinese scholarship, again a parallel of sorts to Bodmer with his professional links to both Italian and German scholars. However, as mentioned above, the polysystem model, useful though it may be in general terms, does not shed light on issues of individual agency, a point to which I will return later in this section.

2.1.2 A Luhmann approach

Before turning to recent developments in Descriptive Translation Studies that attempt to address these problems in the polysystem model, I will briefly outline a systems approach that has examined in detail the interaction between the German literary system in the eighteenth century and the social, familial, state, economic and educational systems of the period. Although this wide-ranging study does not specifically cover translation it provides insights that will be useful for my analysis of developments in this field. Based on the sociological systems approach developed by Niklas Luhmann, Siegfried Schmidt’s study (1989) describes the fundamental transformation of society in the eighteenth century, as it moved from a stratified hierarchical order cemented by religion and theology to a collection of differentiated systems – technology, business, law, science, religion, education and literature. This process featured new developments such as capitalism, the growth of the middle-class, the separation of the private and public spheres and the emergence of an independent literary system.

Relating this general analysis to the situation in Zurich in the early decades of the eighteenth century (described further in chapter four), we see that the political and religious order remained highly stratified despite attempts to change the situation in 1712-13. Business, by contrast, had advanced well down the road towards capitalism, while Bodmer himself was to become a major agent in the changes that occurred in the literary system during the early decades of the eighteenth century.

Schmidt goes on to show how agents in the literary system were alone in being freed from the socially-accepted model of objectivity and reality:

Durch diese Entwicklungen wird das Literatursystem im 18. Jahrhundert zum ideologisch prämierten Ort der geistig, emotional und moralisch gleichermaßen entfalteten Subjektivität (Stichwort: Selbstverwirklichung), die in allen anderen Bereichen entweder auf einen Sektor verkürzt oder völlig geopfert wird: in der Wissenschaft dem Leitziel Objektivität, in der Philosophie dem Leitziel Wahrheit, in der Wirtschaft der Arbeitsteilung und Entfremdung zugunsten des Profits, im Recht dem Gleichheitsgrundsatz.¹ (ibid: 21)

¹ In the eighteenth century, as a result of these developments, the literary system became the ideologically-rewarded sphere of subjectivity (self-fulfilment) in the intellectual, emotional and moral fields. In other spheres, this subjectivity was either limited to just one sector or totally sacrificed – to objectivity in science, to
How difficult it was to establish this exception for literature is demonstrated by the early eighteenth-century debate on literary aesthetics, Schmidt contends. Apart from the discussions on translation, one of the chief points at issue in the aesthetic debate between Leipzig and Zurich concerned the virtues of *Wahrheit* and *Wahrscheinlichkeit* as poetic norms. This debate, Schmidt argues, documents the emergence of a significant public sphere in the field of literature. Other features of the new literary system in the period following the debates of the 1730s were the possibility of earning a living as an author, the development of literary criticism in the middle of the century (with Gottsched being attributed a central role), and the emergence of a new reading public. It was during this period of expansion in the field of literature that translated English literature was brought into German-speaking Europe to fill the ‘gaps’ identified in connection with the discussion of polysystem theory above. Relating this now to Johann Jacob Bodmer, we see that although he did not belong to the new group of authors earning their living from writing, he did establish himself as an independent author by founding his own publishing company. Moreover, it is evident that in advocating the new ideal of poetic imagination he was occupying the progressive position in the redefinition of the parameters applying to the literary sphere.

2.1.3 Göttingen and the ‘transfer’ approach

This discussion of Even-Zohar and Schmidt demonstrates a number of ways in which a systemic approach can be useful in providing overall direction for studies in the field of translation history. Nevertheless, in recent years translation historians have drawn attention to a number of shortcomings inherent in systems. Researchers engaged in the large-scale Göttingen ‘special research centre’ investigations into German literary translation took issue with both the concept of literature as a system, and with the target-orientation of polysystem theory (see Frank 1989, Kittel 1992 and other volumes in the *Göttinger Beiträge* series). They preferred to focus on the process of *transfer* between two languages, literatures and cultures, describing their approach to investigating literary translation history as ‘transfer oriented’:

[...] wir [sehen] die literarische Übersetzung zuallererst als einen Transfer zwischen zwei Literatur-, Sprach- und Kulturräumen [an ... ], wohingegen die Manipulationsgruppe [Descriptive Translation Studies] die literarische Übersetzung programmatisch als Funktion des Ziel“systems” auffaßt [...]. Der Unterschied tritt dann voll zutage, wenn man berücksichtigt, daß die meisten im Sonderforschungsbereich Zusammenarbeitenden nicht die Auffassung der Literatur als eines “Systems” teilen [...].3 (Frank 1989: 6)

---

2 Truth

3 Probability

4 We regard literary translation first and foremost as a transfer between two literary, language and cultural spaces, while the manipulation group (Descriptive Translation Studies) regards it programmatically as a
2.1.4 Criticism of systems

These two aspects – systems and target-orientation – are among a number of concerns raised, discussed and developed further in Anthony Pym’s book, *Method in Translation History*. His problem with systems theory is that it overlooks causation and individual agency. With regard to causes, he says these have been “dealt with quite badly in contemporary translation theory. [...] More recent theorists assume the dominant cause lies axiomatically on the target side, such that the target system would somehow be the main cause of the translations entering it” (Pym 1998: 143). Pym believes that a more sophisticated approach to causation is needed.

He also calls for a stronger focus on the role of the translator as an individual: “Systems theory is superficially a kind of prose that does everything possible to suppress a humanized, subjective systematicity.” (ibid: 122) Referring to scholars within the paradigm of Descriptive Translation Studies, he states,

These are researchers with a background in literary studies [...]. This is perhaps why they have instinctively looked at texts rather than at people.

(quoted in Milton 2001: 279)

This issue of the agency of the individual translator is of particular interest in my study of the work of an individual translator, Johann Jacob Bodmer. How can an examination of Bodmer’s choice of source text and the manner in which he translated this text be carried out without some consideration of individual agency, an area upon which the polysystem model sheds no light? Some suggestions have been made by scholars such as Lefevere and Pym, and are examined later in this chapter.

Theo Hermans takes issue with the polysystem approach for being “not only ferociously abstract and depersonalized”, but also taking “little heed of actual political and social power relations.”

Literature and culture in general are described as sites of conflict, but the stakes remain invisible, and the struggle is waged by competing norms and models rather than by individuals or collectives who stand to gain or lose something by the outcome. As a result, the processes of change and reversal become self-propelling and cyclical: the canonized centre does what it does, and when it is overrun a new centre repeats the pattern, as if the whole thing were on automatic pilot. (Hermans 1999: 118)

He criticizes the unwillingness to identify an “engine which drives the historical machine”.

---

*function of the target ‘system’. The difference becomes very evident when we consider that most of the people working in the ‘special research centre’ do not subscribe to this concept of literature as a ‘system’. [my translation]*
Thus, like Pym, Hermans is not only concerned about the individual translator’s role but also wants to see the issue of causation addressed. It is these issues of individual agency and causation that particularly interest me in my investigation into the intermediary role of a translator based in Zurich, Johann Jacob Bodmer.

2.2 Lefevere’s ‘patronage’

Having shown the ways in which a systemic analysis can shed light on some of the larger-scale movements involved, I now turn to two approaches that are of greater assistance when investigating the decisions made by individual translators. The first of these is the concept of patronage suggested by André Lefevere, which is particularly helpful for analysing the external environmental factors that impacted upon his work. The second is the intercultural framework suggested by Anthony Pym, which will be of assistance in examining the professional setting within which Bodmer made his translation decisions.

Lefevere’s concept of ‘patronage’ relates to “the powers (persons, institutions) that can further or hinder the reading, writing, and rewriting of literature” (Lefevere 1992: 15). For Lefevere the agents that make up the literary system are professionals such as critics, reviewers, teachers and translators (all functions which Bodmer held) who “rewrite works of literature until they are deemed acceptable to the poetics and the ideology of a certain time” (ibid: 14). Patronage is a collective term covering all the ‘constraints’ – a term that Lefevere uses to refer to both positive and negative influences – operating upon these professionals from outside the literary system. These constraints are summarised under the headings of ideology, economic factors and status.

Lefevere’s patronage component of ‘ideology’ is described, after Fredric Jameson, as “that grillwork of form, convention and belief which orders our actions” (ibid: 16). As I show in chapter four, Bodmer’s ideology would have been shaped by cultural and literary influences emanating from Italian and German-speaking Europe, from France and England. In addition, it would also have been influenced by the juxtaposition of the rigid restrictiveness of the Zurich political and theological ruling class (negative constraints) with the freedom of his childhood and the failed revolutionary movement of his teenage years, and, on the larger European stage, the political and economic rise of Great Britain (all ‘constraints’ exerting a positive influence). The strong cultural and linguistic influences from outside Zurich to which he was exposed would have opened his mind to alternatives that could not be realised in the conservative Zurich political and religious arena, and could only be promoted through other means – in his case in the literary sphere. This particular mix of ideological influences is likely to have been instrumental in shaping his aesthetic views and his determination to further these views through translation.

Turning now to the economic components, Zurich’s prosperity in the early eighteenth century, particularly compared to the German states, would have created an overall climate in
which greater discretionary income was available to further literary pursuits, including mediation. A particularly important factor for Bodmer was his marriage to Esther Orelli, from the wealthy silk-manufacturing Orelli family.

Looking, finally, at the third component of ‘status’, we note that a significant level of status was assured to Bodmer from birth as the son of a clergymen and Zurich citizen. The position of professor which he eventually acquired substantially enhanced this status, and it is worth noting that he was always referred to as Professor Bodmer in the Leipzig literary publication, the Beyträge (see chapter five, in particular section 2.3, for further discussion of this publication). In 1737 he joined the central ruling group in Zurich when he was unanimously elected to the Grosser Rat. Thus, for Bodmer, both the economic and status elements of patronage were strong elements furthering a considerable degree of financial security, independence and influence as a translator.

2.3 An interculture approach

In addition to discussing constraints operating outside the literary system, Lefevere’s concept also sees translation professionals as being constrained within the system by the prevailing poetics, which includes both translation norms and norms of literary production. But how are the translation norms to which translators adhere determined? One way of looking at this and other aspects of the way in which translators act is the notion of an ‘interculture’, a concept currently under development by Anthony Pym (see in particular Pym 1998, 2000a, 2002, 2003).

2.3.1 Intercultural spaces

As opposed to Toury and descriptive translation scholars, who locate translation norms firmly in the target culture, Anthony Pym argues that these norms are actually to be found

[...] in the intersections or overlaps of cultures, in the intercultures where I suspect a lot of translators work [...] orms found only on one side or the other are mostly not properly translation norms, since they tend to concern non-translational text practices as well as translation ...]. (quoted in Schöffner 1999: 110)

He suggests that it might be useful to focus on the intercultural space in which, he believes, translators work. He makes the point that translators are involved in exchanges between two different cultures and that “specifically intercultural contexts [...] should probably tell us more about translation than can any benignly monocultural context [...]” (Pym 1998: 188). Pym defines his term ‘interculture’ as follows:

---

5 Zurich Great Council
I use the term ‘interculture’ to refer to beliefs and practices found in intersections or overlaps of cultures, where people combine something of two or more cultures at once. (ibid: 177)

He illustrates the concept with descriptions taken from his own work on German-French translation in the nineteenth century and on the history of Spanish translation. His examples include the French-German Alsatian Reichsland, the ‘multi-ethnic frontier town’ of Toledo where Jewish, Mozarab and Latinist intermediaries translated Arab texts into Latin, and a Castilian-Italian interculture that arose in the fifteenth century around Alonso de Cartagena, bishop of Burgos, and Leonardo Bruni, the Florentine translator.

An important advantage of an intercultural approach, according to Pym, is that it allows us to focus on people (translators) rather than just on texts (translations). Another positive feature is that it opens up aspects that would otherwise be invisible. Translation activities are often a matter of teamwork, or translators may be members of bilingual families and immigrant communities. Bodmer, for instance, although a well-established member of the ruling class in Zurich, also belonged (through his mother and wife) to a family that had originally immigrated from northern Italy and still had strong commercial links to its region of origin.

In my view, an intercultural approach, rather than a target culture approach, facilitates the proper consideration of these factors when examining both the development of translation theory in German-speaking Europe during the 1730s and Bodmer’s own translation practice.

In physical terms Pym locates intercultures generally in cities, the hubs of cross-cultural communications. Often enough, however, they are ‘invisible’. They hide their own existence. Also, he sees them as transitory formations.

People with different skills and competencies come together to work on cross-cultural relations [...] they do their work; they translate; then their professional relations loosen as the historical task diminishes. This might account for the lack of historical awareness; intermediaries have no history as a social group. (Pym 2000a, under ‘Principle 2’)

Thus intercultures can wax or wane over time. Or they may disappear altogether, either by becoming general, as when one monoculture envelops another and the interculture merges into one monoculture, or by shrinking away, when the two monocultures separate out with no area of overlap. The Zurich-Leipzig interculture I am investigating featured a very large area of overlap between the French and German cultures, since at a time when the French culture was dominant in German-speaking Europe the number of educated people speaking and writing both French and German would have been considerable. The overlap with the Italian and English cultures, by contrast, would have been extremely small. Indeed, since the Italian and English influences were confined, in these early decades of the eighteenth century, to Bodmer himself and a few other individuals it might even be preferable to explain them in terms of cultural influences as discussed within Lefeveré’s concept of patronage.
2.3.2. Interculturalists

A more recent refinement in Pym’s concept has been to limit the interculture to the group of professional intermediaries. Pym does not intend his concept to cover the entire community of individuals with links to more than one culture. He illustrates this by describing the case of Calaceite/Calaceit, a town on the Castilian/Catalan border where individuals move between two languages on a daily basis. If the definition of an interculture given above were adopted without any further restrictions, all the people living in Calaceit could be described as belonging to an interculture. Yet even if the inhabitants of Calaceit all combine something of two cultures, they are clearly not all translators or any other kind of intermediary (see Pym 2000b: 4).

Pym therefore restricts his concept of ‘interculture’ by stating that it must be related to professional status, such as the fact of being a translator, a diplomat or some other mediatory professional, rather than on the basis of birth or native language. The interculture functions as a “social space, with its own membership rites, norms of behaviour, ideologies and ethics” (Pym 2000a, under ‘Principle 2’). Because members of an interculture belong first and foremost to their primary culture or ‘monoculture’ through ties based on birth, language, everyday life and so on, their membership of the interculture is ‘secondary’ to their membership of their primary culture.

The work of our professionals is thus only intercultural because it assumes that there is a line to be crossed [...]. As soon as the line between cultures becomes non-operative [...] interculturality loses its derivative status and becomes indistinguishable from general cultural practice. (Pym 2000b: 5)

What Pym’s concept describes is, in essence, a group of professional intermediaries. For the purposes of this study, I propose to introduce a new term for these professional intermediaries, that of ‘interculturalist’. In line with Pym’s work, my ‘interculturalist’ is a professional working in an interculture whose membership of the interculture is ‘secondary’ to that of his or her primary culture. ‘Interculturalists’ are thus “all the professionals involved in cross-cultural communication, not all of whom operate as mediators in any direct sense,” using here the description of the players within an interculture presented in Pym’s latest paper on intercultures (Pym 2003, proposition 16.2).

I conclude by reaffirming the way in which Pym’s representation of the position of the translator – as an ‘interculturalist’ – contrasts with that of Descriptive Translation theorists, who argue that the translator belongs only to the target culture. Gideon Toury, for instance, has objected to the idea that translators should be regarded as members of an interculture, stating that

[whether one accepts this ideological stance or not, in reality there would at best be a series of different ‘intercultures’, each one pertaining to a particular target culture. (Toury 1995: 172, note 5)
Touby’s argument here is unclear, but there seems to be little reason why three or more intercultures should not intersect to form a complex interculture. A recent study has identified an Ottoman interculture which, similarly, featured an overlap of more than two cultures: “Ottoman poet-translators engaged in intertextual operations in the overlap of Turkish, Persian and Arabic cultures” (Paker 2002: 120).

2.3.3. Intercultures and power

Paker believes that her work on an Ottoman interculture might allow for expansion of the interculture concept to take in postcolonial concepts such as Homi Bhabha’s ‘hybridity’. At first glance, the postcolonial concept of hybridity bears some resemblance to the interculture idea. What this concept of hybridity should not be confused with is either multiculturality or the kind of “hybrid mix of anterior ethnicities” (such as the Spanish national mix of Latin-Christian Hispanics and Judeo-Islamic Hispanics) referred to by Pym in his recent discussion of the opposition of ‘pure vs. hybrid’ as a point of distinction between national cultures and intercultures (Pym 2002). Postcolonial hybridity refers to “the creation of new transcultural forms within the contact zone produced by colonization” (Ashcroft 1998: 118). Thus it does have some similarities with Pym’s notion of an overlap between two cultures. However, the defining characteristic of this overlap is the power differential between the cultures involved, and the opportunities offered for resistance on the part of the colonised. Prima facie, this would appear to limit the application of the concept to a historical period that postdates much translation activity, including that examined in this study. Thus, on the face of it, this approach could not be applied universally to the activity of translators, as Pym’s concept can be.

Another feature of the concept of hybridity is that it is in the space in between cultures, rather than in the cultures themselves, that cultures are defined:

[...] we should remember that it is the ‘inter’ – the cutting edge of translation and negotiation, the in-between space – that carries the burden of the meaning of culture. (Bhabha 1994: 38)

The production of this cultural meaning, Bhabha argues, occurs in the passage through the ‘Third Space of enunciation’. Bhabha’s ‘third space’ is not a physical place. Linked to texts or statements rather than locations, it refers to the non-written, non-spoken cultural and historical assumptions that lie behind any one utterance. Although these assumptions are unconscious, they become apparent when the text is transferred to another location (or time). As Bhabha explains,

[the] Third Space [...] represents both the general conditions of language and the specific implication of the utterance in a performative and institutional strategy of which it cannot ‘in itself’ be conscious. (ibid: 36)
In this “contradictory and ambivalent space”, the symbols of culture can be subverted by the less powerful for their own ends, they can be “appropriated, translated, rehistoricized and read anew” (ibid: 37). Wolf comments that in a postcolonial setting the translator is “no longer a mediator between two poles, but her/his activities are inscribed in cultural overlappings which imply difference [which is] interactive and refractive” (Wolf 2000: 142). In this act of translation, the meaning of culture is defined.

Bhabha’s ‘third space’ of cultural hybridity can be a creative space in which, as he says, new positions emerge. Citing the example of Salman Rushdie’s *Satanic Verses*, he explains that this novel shows how modern life – the city, contemporary sexuality – changes the way in which the Koran is read. Displaced from its traditional setting in countries like Iran to a modern city like Bradford in Britain, knowledge about the status of the Koran becomes a different thing, something that is incommensurable with traditional Koranic interpretations. Thus the process of cultural hybridity, he says,

> [...] gives rise to something different, something new and unrecognisable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation. (Rutherford 1990: 211)

Applying this concept to my study, it will be interesting to find out whether the debates conducted within the Zurich-Leipzig interculture constituted a creative space in which ‘something new and unrecognisable’ emerged. In spite of the differences to Pym’s concept, I will briefly touch on Bhabha’s notion of hybridity in appropriate parts of this study.

### 2.4 Norms

Having examined Pym’s interculture concept in some detail, I now return to the tools and methodologies developed within the Descriptive Translation Studies approach, which I apply in my examination of the interactions within intercultures and the way in which these interactions impact upon the translation decisions of individual translators.

The first important concept here is that of norms. Gideon Toury, although disclaiming responsibility for suggesting the association of translation and norms (stating that the association was implicitly present in the work of Jiří Levy and James Holmes) acknowledges that

> [...] I am probably the one person who would have to take the responsibility [...] for having injected the heaviest dose of norms into the veins of Translation Studies in the 1970s and early 1980s [...]. (quoted in Schäffner 1999: 11)

Influential in the 1980s and 1990s “[t]he concept [...] has supported the most active research programme in translation studies to date” (Baker 2001b: 163). Among the advantages of the
approach are that it avoids prescriptive statements on what a translation should be, examining this activity within the terms set by a particular historical period. It also opens the field to the study of paratexts such as prefaces and essays on translation, as well as translations themselves.

Hermans has even linked the socio-cultural norm approach to postcolonial theory, pointing out the "aspect of [...] manipulation, dislocation and displacement which the norms concept did so much to push into the foreground." Behind norms and values, he argues, lie issues of power, and the norms concept "should serve as a reminder that it is difference, not sameness or transparency or equality, which is inscribed in the operations of translation" (quoted in Schäffner 1999: 60-61).

2.4.1 Defining norms

The concept of translation norms refers to "regularities of translation behaviour within a specific sociocultural situation" (Baker 2001b: 163). Toury explains his concept with reference to the constraints to which translation, as a sociocultural activity, is subject. Norms are neither absolute rules to which a translator must adhere, nor are they individual idiosyncrasies; rather they occupy the middle ground of 'intersubjective factors' between these two. Because of these constraints translators in different situations will "adopt different strategies, and ultimately come up with markedly different products" (Toury 1995: 54). These differences are explained, at least to some extent, by the different norms of translation prevailing in the different situations.

Chesterman adopts a similar definition, which sees norms as descriptions of the kind of behaviour people in a given community regard as correct, rather than prescriptive rules governing that behaviour.

As "social reality", norms exist intersubjectively. Individuals have individual knowledge of norms, but norms are only recognized by virtue of their social existence. Norms reside in the social consciousness [...].

(Chesterman 1997: 54)

Like Toury, Chesterman believes norms are located in a middle ground, between mandatory laws and conventions (conventions being practices whose infringement would not provoke general criticism).

Norms are criteria used by the community – or the professional interculture – to evaluate the activities of a translator – his or her translations. Naturally particular translators may choose not to conform to the prevailing norms, although if they do so, they run the risk of incurring sanctions, such as criticism or lack of acceptance. Thus,

[...] even though there is always the possibility that one would be willing to take the risks which unconventional, non-normative decisions entail, under normal conditions, a translator would tend to avoid negative sanctions on
T Toury distinguishes different groups of translation norms – initial norms, preliminary norms, and operational norms (see Toury 1995: 56-61). ‘Initial norms’ determine whether the translator will subject him/herself to the norms realized in the original text (‘adequacy’) or the norms active in the target culture (‘acceptability’). ‘Preliminary norms’ relate to choice of text types or texts, as well as the directness of translation (whether the source text for the translation is itself a translation of the original source text). Preliminary norms are certainly important for the period being analysed in my investigation: While the prevailing situation, in which many German translations were based on French translations of originals, was being challenged, the choice of a ‘suitable’ text was a key factor for the group centred on Gottsched when assessing translations.

The final group of norms identified by Toury are ‘operational norms’, which determine the decisions made by the translator when he/she is actually engaged in translating. These relate to the fullness, distribution and segmentation of translated material (‘matricial norms’) and to the selection of material to express the target text in (‘textual-linguistic norms’).

Chesterman has presented a slightly different categorisation of norms, in which he distinguishes product (‘expectancy’) and process (‘professional’) norms (see Chesterman 1997: 64-70). What is particularly interesting in Chesterman’s analysis is the focus he places on the role of professionals. In translation, he states, the “norm authorities par excellence are perhaps those members of the society who are deemed to be competent professional translators [...]” (ibid: 67). This is my group of ‘interculturalists’ – Pym’s professional intermediaries who interact within an interculture.

In Chesterman’s scheme, ‘expectancy norms’ relate to the product, in other words, to reader expectations of what a translation of a particular type should look like. If the community at large considers that a translation conforms to expectancy norms, its translator is seen as a ‘competent professional’. Expectancy or product norms are governed by prevalent translation traditions in the target culture, parallel texts in the target language, as well as a wide range of phenomena including “economic or ideological factors, power relations within and between cultures and the like” (ibid: 64). According to this reading power relations and other environmental factors would affect not only translators and the positions they adopt with respect to translations and norms, but even the norms themselves. This seems particularly appropriate for my study of Johann Jacob Bodmer.

The behaviour of translation professionals determines the second group of norms, the process or ‘professional norms’ which regulate the actual process of translation. There are three categories of ‘professional norms’ - the ‘accountability norm’, the ‘communication norm’ and the ‘relation norm’. The first category or ‘accountability norm’ demands that translators meet
the demands of loyalty\textsuperscript{6} to “the original writer, the commissioner of the translation, the translator himself or herself, the prospective readership and any other relevant parties” (ibid: 68). This norm relates translation activities to ethical principles in a way that can be clearly observed in the debate on translation during the 1730s. Johann Jacob Breitinger, for instance, referred to the duties of a translator and the responsibility and accountability of translators (Breitinger 1740b).

The ‘communication norm’ states that “a translator should act in such a way as to optimize communication, as required by the situation, between all the parties involved” (Chesterman 1997: 69). Chesterman explains that this norm reflects a translator’s position as both a communications mediator and as a communicator in his/her own right. The operation of this type of norm can also be seen in the translation debate, which featured calls for a flowing, readable style of German.

While neither ‘accountability’ nor ‘communication norms’ are specific to translation, according to Chesterman, the ‘relation norm’ highlights the specific character of translation. In terms of an ‘interculture’ concept, we might say that the first two ‘professional norms’ are applicable to all intermediaries operating within the interculture, while the ‘relation norm’ applies only to translation intermediaries. It states that

\[
[...] \text{a translator should act in such a way that an appropriate relation of relevant similarity is established and maintained between the source text and the target text. (ibid: 69)}
\]

This relationship of ‘relevant similarity’ has varied through time, and was certainly a matter at issue in the translation debate conducted in the 1730s. For Chesterman, relation considerations cover issues such as equivalence, degree of target-culture adaptation, addition and omission.

Both Toury and Chesterman’s norm approaches are useful for my analysis of the approach to translation adopted by Johann Jacob Bodmer. Thus in chapter three, in which I analyse the prevalent norms during the period prior to Bodmer’s work, and in chapter five, in which I present the translation debate of the 1730s in which Bodmer was involved, I will make reference to both approaches.

\section*{2.4.2 Studying norms}

When studying translation behaviour, we cannot necessarily assume that we will find written records of translation norms. And even if we do, argues Toury, the written formulations may not necessarily be the same as those that actually prevail.

\textsuperscript{6} A term originally coined by Christiane Nord to describe a translator’s ideal attitude towards the source-text author as well as to the target-text reader, see, for instance, Shuttleworth 1999: 98.
Verbal formulations of course reflect awareness of the existence of norms as well as of their respective significance. However, they also imply other interests, particularly a desire to control behaviour – i.e., to dictate norms rather than merely account for them. (Toury 1995: 55)

Thus formulations found in publications of the 1730s, such as Venzky’s ‘Bild eines geschickten Übersetzers’, should not unquestioningly be taken as a reflection of the norms actually prevailing in the period.

It is not rare, says Toury, to find sets of competing norms existing alongside one another in a particular society, each with its own followers and a position of its own. These may generally be characterised as

[…] the ones that dominate the center of the system, and hence direct translational behaviour of the so-called mainstream, alongside the remnants of previous sets of norms and the rudiments of new ones, hovering in the periphery. (ibid: 62-63)

While the norms found in the ‘mainstream’ are referred to as ‘central’ norms, the new competing norms are ‘peripheral’ norms.

Toury identifies two major sources of information when reconstructing the translation norms for a particular period. These are textual sources, or the translated texts themselves, and extratextual sources – theoretical and critical formulations, translators’ statements in prefaces or other publications, or statements made by other people connected with translation (ibid: 65).

For Anthony Pym, the best way of locating norms is to look for evidence of their transgression. “The nature of functional norms is to be invisible except in cases of their transgression, and transgression is mostly the cause of debate. Debates can thus provide some useful shortcuts […]” (Pym 1998: 129) This kind of investigation also takes us into the realm of translation theories and criticism, since the formulation of a translation theory can often be a response to an ongoing debate. It also takes us into the field of negotiation, the arena where individuals negotiate norms within an interculture.

Several interesting things happen when we approach translation history in this way. Instead of compiling chronicles of stability (since that’s what we first find when we start looking for norms), we approach the history of change (which is, after all, what history is all about). Instead of risking an arbitrary selection of regularities or social groups, we can at least point to evidence that might help tie our descriptions to things actually at work within the historical objects. (Pym quoted in Schäffner 1999: 111)

Thus analysis of translation debate can help to define the norms operating within the interculture, as well as the shifts in such norms.

---

7 Portrait of a skilled translator
2.5 Comparing translations

Having discussed the study of norms in some detail, and the way in which they can serve my own investigation, I now turn to a methodology for analysing individual translations. As discussed above, statements relating to translation norms still need to be treated with a certain amount of care. Did Bodmer really translate according to the principles laid down in his own writing on translation and that of his colleague Breitinger? While the material gathered from the debate on translation norms will provide information on the general background and main issues, only a detailed analysis of Bodmer’s translations will reveal the extent to which his translation practice actually adhered to a new set of norms.

Bodmer’s major work of translation was *Paradise Lost*, which appeared in six different versions published over a period of almost 50 years. Breitinger and Bodmer made extensive reference to *Paradise Lost* in their theoretical writings on both aesthetic questions and translation. It was this work that became the focus of the 1730s debate on these issues. We would therefore expect the new translation norms advocated by the Zurich party in the translation debate to have been reflected in Bodmer’s translations of *Paradise Lost*.

2.5.1 Active retranslations

Indeed, Bodmer’s translations of *Paradise Lost* lend themselves to analysis for a number of additional reasons. First, we know that the translations published were Bodmer’s own texts, since all six versions of the translation appeared in his own publishing house. Thus we avoid the analytical difficulties raised by the intervention of a publisher, to which Levy has referred (Levy 1969: 160).

Second – and particularly interesting for this analysis – are the dates when Bodmer published his different translations of *Paradise Lost*. His second and most successful version of the translation was actually published at the end of the translation debate, in 1742, while the first version was translated before the debate, in 1723-24, and appeared in 1732. The differences between these two versions are extensive, so much so, in fact, that the 1742 version can be described as a complete retranslation (see Appendix IV for a small extract from the two translations). What might an analysis of the differences between the two versions show? Do they reflect some of the issues raised in the debate that had occurred in the period between the two translation processes? Might it be better to compare the two versions of the translation than to compare the translation with the original English text of *Paradise Lost*?

A number of writers have pointed out the advantages of comparing either two different stages in the development of a translation, or two different versions of a translation. Toury advocates studies of the emergence of a translation as a means of establishing how the translator chooses his/her path between ‘adequacy’ (greater adherence to source text norms)
and ‘acceptability’, a stronger target-text orientation (Toury 1985: 24; 1995: 73). Levy believes that the different versions of the same translation provide invaluable information on the development of a translator (Levy 1969: 169). Tymoczko states that a comparison of “two or more translated versions of the same source text [...] may make the norms of any given translation much more perceptible” (Tymoczko 2002: 20), which is precisely why I chose to compare two translations separated by a certain period of time. Tymoczko makes explicit reference to Pym, who has coined the term ‘active retranslations’, or retranslations sharing the same cultural location and timing, distinguishing them from ‘passive retranslations’ separated by geographic or dialect boundaries, and having little impact on one another.

Clearly, in the case of Bodmer’s different Paradise Lost translations, we are dealing with active retranslations.

Active retranslations are “a particularly subtle index of historical importance”, according to Pym. While comparisons of passive retranslations merely “affirm the general hypothesis that target-culture norms determine translation strategies”,

[t]he comparative analysis of active retranslations, however, tends to locate causes far closer to the translator, especially in the entourage of patrons, publishers, readers and intercultural politics [...]. The study of active retranslations would thus seem better positioned to yield insights into the nature and workings of translation itself, into its own special range of disturbances, without blindly surrendering causality to target-culture norms. (Pym 1998: 83)

In addition to stating the advantages of analysing active retranslations, Pym also argues strongly against comparisons of source and target texts, stating

This approach is the most difficult and often the least rewarding, since it quickly projects tangents, sending thoughts to several hundred dead-ends. (ibid: 106)

He therefore strongly recommends comparing different translations, while at the same time cautioning that such an approach should be informed by a “context wide enough to reveal change processes extending beyond the individual frame” (ibid: 107). When carrying out the comparison, checklists can be useful, he believes, but it is preferable to have specific goals in mind rather than having to “look for everything”.

For the purpose of my analysis, a comparison of the 1732 and 1742 editions of the Bodmer Paradise Lost translation would thus appear most likely to yield useful results. The broader context delineated in my study of the translation debate of the 1730s will provide useful guidance in my choice of specific goals for this comparison.

2.5.2 Translation analysis methodology

However, Pym’s comments on active and passive retranslation, while useful in providing direction, do not constitute a methodology for the analysis. A number of translation analysis...
methodologies are available within the Descriptive Translation Studies paradigm (Toury 1995, van Leuven-Zwart, Lambert & van Gorp, van Doorslaer). They are summarised by Hermans (1999, chapter 5) and will be described in more detail below. The ‘methodological toolbox’ is continually being developed and further suggestions embodying computer processing and alternative checklists are presented in some of the articles contained in a more recent publication edited by Hermans (2002). It is important to differentiate these methodologies from translation evaluation and translation assessment procedures, which allow for prescriptive judgment of a translation. Such procedures include House’s translation quality assessment focusing on functional equivalence (1997) and van den Broeck’s model of quality assessment (1985). A summary of these is provided by Lauscher in a special issue of The Translator devoted to evaluation and translation (2000).

Within the Descriptive Translation Studies approach two possible methodologies present themselves: Van Leuven-Zwart’s architranseme approach (1989) and Lambert and van Gorp’s contextual model (1985). Van Leuven-Zwart’s methodology has the advantage of being designed for integral literary translations (where integral translations are those without any additions or deletions above the sentence level), which would make it applicable to Bodmer’s translation of Paradise Lost. The disadvantage of the approach is that, because of its high level of complexity – Hermans describes it as the “most extensive and detailed ever designed for the purposes of translation analysis” (1999: 58) – there is a danger of losing focus and diverting attention from the clear lines of enquiry that will be provided by my analysis of the translation debate of the 1730s. Hermans has stated that working with the model “requires an induction course and is so labour-intensive that it can hardly be applied to longer texts [...]”. More seriously, he adds, “application of the model involves a strong interpretive element, but interpretation is not really given any space in the whole procedure” (ibid: 62), a difficulty to which I have already referred above.

Like Van Leuven-Zwart’s methodology, Lambert and van Gorp’s model was also developed as a tool for translation analysis within the Descriptive Translation Studies paradigm. For the practical analysis of texts Lambert and van Gorp provide a checklist which I will be using for my own analysis (1985: 52-53). The two authors work in both a top-down and bottom-up manner: Starting with preliminary data such as title, title page and metatexts, the checklist then proceeds to the ‘macro-level’. This includes division of the text into chapters, titles of chapters, relation between types of narrative, internal narrative structure and authorial comment. The analysis at the preliminary and macro levels should provide information leading to hypotheses on micro-structural strategies. At the micro-level the analyst then examines areas such as the phonic, graphic, lexico-semantic and stylistic levels and identifies shifts. Finally, at stage four of the checklist, he or she returns to the macro-structural and systemic levels to examine oppositions between micro and macro-levels, intertextual relations and intersystemic relations.
For my comparison of Bodmer’s two translations of *Paradise Lost* I will therefore begin by conducting Lambert’s preliminary and macro-level analysis. The next step will be a micro-level analysis where my parameters will be chiefly determined by the results of my analysis of the translation debate of the 1730s in German-speaking Europe. The key points of difference that arose in this debate as well as the main features of the new translation norm reflected in the writings of Breitinger and Bodmer will be the main parameters for analysis. This pragmatic approach will serve to focus my attention on the key points at issue during the period under review. As Hermans has pointed out,

[...]

2.5.3 Corpus selection

The final question that remains is that of corpus selection. Since *Paradise Lost* is too long to attempt an analysis of the entire work, certain passages will need to be selected for the purposes of comparison. How is this to be done? Addressing this question of corpus selection in translation analysis, Van Doorslaer finds that

[...]

He suggests that selection be guided by the ‘translational relevance’ of the individual passages, and proposes a pragmatic approach, whereby extra-textual data is added in the preliminary stage of the analysis. This extra-textual data would provide guidance on the important questions to be asked in the analysis, and appropriate passages could then be chosen. For my comparison this kind of extra-textual data will be supplied by my analysis of the translation debate.

In the special case of Bodmer’s translation of *Paradise Lost*, there are a number of additional factors that may be of assistance in selecting the passages for analysis. First, since *Paradise Lost* was the subject of considerable commentary during the 1730s, both in the translation debate and in the aesthetics debate, we occasionally find specific mention of individual passages in *Paradise Lost* in these commentaries. In ‘Abhandlung von der Schreibart in Miltons verlohrnen Paradiese’\(^8\), for instance, Bodmer himself makes specific reference to a number of metaphors that, he states, have been taken mostly from Milton’s description of Paradise in Book IV (J.J. Bodmer 1742b: 107). This extra-textual information may be of assistance for my analysis of Bodmer’s translation, and my corpus should therefore include those parts of Book IV containing the metaphors mentioned.

---

\(^8\) Treatise on the manner of writing in Milton’s *Paradise Lost*
An additional special factor that may be of assistance for the translation analysis as well as for the corpus selection is the fact that there exists another translation of a small part of *Paradise Lost*, completed close to the time of the two Bodmer translations. Some time before 1731, the Hamburg poet Barthold Heinrich Brockes (1680-1747) translated part of Book V of Milton’s work (Brandl 1878: 35). An extract from the translation is reproduced as Appendix V to this study. Brockes’ fragment was not published until 1740, as an appendix to his translation of Alexander Pope’s *Essay on Man*, so it is unlikely that Bodmer knew of it in summer 1740, when he retranslated *Paradise Lost* for his 1742 edition. In Pym’s terminology, the Brockes translation would thus qualify as a passive retranslation, having no ‘disturbing influence’ on Bodmer’s translation. For my analysis, a comparison of Bodmer’s translation with that of Brockes may provide additional evidence on new translation norms introduced by Bodmer in his translation work. For the purpose of corpus selection, this would point to the inclusion in the corpus of early passages from Book V to serve as a basis for comparison with Brockes’ translation.

Thus, like my overall translation analysis, my corpus selection procedure will be a pragmatic one, combining a top-down with a bottom-up approach.
Chapter Three – Background to the Study

Scholars on both sides of the translation debate conducted within the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture of the 1730s supported their arguments through reference to translation theorists of previous periods. Thus Johann Christoph Gottsched’s writings cited the influential seventeenth-century French translation theorist Pierre-Daniel Huet, while Georg Venzky supported his work with references to French and German translation writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries – Luther, Opitz, Schemelius, Schottel and Huet. In addition, the classical translation tradition clearly retained considerable influence in this period, as is evident from the Latin authorities cited – Horace in the essays by Johann Jacob Bodmer and Johann Jacob Breitinger, and Pliny and Quintilian in Venzky’s essay.

This chapter therefore outlines the translation norms prevailing in France and in the German-speaking region in the period prior to Bodmer’s translations of *Paradise Lost* and the debates of the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture. It also surveys the available information on translation norms in the Italian-speaking region and in England, both of which may have exerted some influence on translation ideas and practices in the period I am examining. It outlines the general situation with respect to translations from English at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and concludes with a comparison of the opening lines of three different translations of *Paradise Lost* carried out within a very few years of one another and yet displaying remarkable differences. These differences provide some illustration of differing translation norms prevailing in the French, Italian and German-speaking regions of Europe in the early eighteenth century.

Through this analysis I hope to shed some light on the questions raised in my first and second hypotheses (see chapter one, section 1), in other words, to examine the kinds of norms that guided Bodmer’s work as a translator of *Paradise Lost*, and that provided the background to the debates conducted in the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture of the 1730s.

### 3.1 The classical tradition

Rener has argued that European translation theory and practice right through to the time of Tytler (1797) presupposed a common set of norms derived from the classical tradition “with which [...] readers were so familiar that a ‘commonplace’ expression was sufficient to catch [the] attention” (Rener 1989: 5). As outlined by Rener, the classical approach to translation was based on a theory of language encompassing two levels – ‘grammar’ and ‘rhetoric’. The
precepts of the former demanded that translators select words in accordance with a number of requirements, including that of rendering the meaning of the original in a clear and understandable form (perspicuitas or clarity). In the seventeenth century, meeting this requirement of clarity often led translators to ‘domesticate’ translations by substituting foreign cultural terms with familiar domestic ones. It also meant that source text segments were often replaced with longer explanatory passages in the target text.

The role of ‘rhetoric’ – ornamentation or style – was to stir the emotions, but it might only select amongst words that had passed the grammatical tests. Since rhetorical or stylistic tools such as metaphor might introduce ambiguity, they needed to be used with care to ensure that they did not endanger the basic function of words, which was to ensure communication. Also, the words and ornamentation had to be appropriate to the subject matter – such as poetic or epic topics – and had to conform to the norms of good taste. The results of endeavours to fulfil this requirement can be observed in many of the translation theories and practices of the seventeenth century. My review of these theories and practices begins with the situation in France which, as the dominant culture in Europe, had a strong influence on translation in other parts of the continent.

3.2 France

3.2.1 Belles infidèles

The overriding tradition in French translation of this period was that of the ‘belles infidèles’ – very free, reception-oriented translation. The term belles infidèles was coined to describe the translations of the classics carried out by Nicolas Perrot d’Ablancourt (1606-1664). D’Ablancourt wrote as follows on his approach to translation, “[...] I do not always bind myself either to the words or to the reasoning of this author [the Latin author, Lucian]; and I adjust things to our manner and style with his goal in mind.” Explaining this extreme domestication of his original text, he wrote:

[…] as with beautiful faces, there is always something that we wish were not there, so with the best authors, there are sections that must be changed or clarified, particularly when things are only done to please; for one cannot then tolerate the slightest fault, and what little is lacking in refinement becomes annoying instead of enjoyable. (quoted from Robinson 2002: 158)

This revealing statement provides some indication of the features that were most important to d’Ablancourt in translation: Irrespective of the wording or even the content of the source text, the French translation must read beautifully and be expressed in clear and refined language. It must exhibit ‘good taste’. Thus brothels must be referred to as ‘temples of Venus’, while many animals such as pigs and donkeys might not be mentioned by name but had to be
described in such a way as to ensure that the reader could understand which animal was being referred to.

Moreover, in line with the classical tradition prevailing in the literature of the time, translations must conform to the rules of classical literature. Over and above the kind of language used, these rules stipulated compliance with the unities of place, time and action and also governed the question of appropriate content for different genres of literature. Thus John Milton’s *Paradise Lost* became an object of ridicule for the French critic, François-Marie Arouet, known as Voltaire (1694-1778), because its content failed to conform to the rules governing epic poetry. The epic was a genre strongly associated with classical (non-Christian) writers like Homer and Virgil, and to treat a religious topic in an epic was unacceptable. As Bodmer wrote in his *Critische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren in der Poesie*, with reference to the critic Voltaire:

> Der Franzose, sagt dieser Criticus, lacht mit einem verächtlichen Gesichte, wenn er höret, daß die Engelländer ein Episches Gedicht haben, in welchem die Materie abgehandelt wird, wie der Teufel mit Gott streitet, wie Adam und Eva aus Anstiften einer Schlangen einen Apfel essen [...].9 (J.J. Bodmer 1740b: 27)

Outlining the French national translation culture of the time, Stackelberg explains that what French translators of the classics were aiming to do was to demonstrate the qualities of the modern French language with respect to the ancient languages of Latin and Greek (Stackelberg 1988: 11). They wanted to present their translations as literary works of art.

Although the classic work on the period of the *belles infidèles*, Zuber’s *Les ‘Belles Infidèles’ et la formation du goût classique*, limits the period of the *belles infidèles* to the years from 1625 to 1653, domestication continued to be the dominant approach to translation in France long after this time. Berman, for example, cites the following statement by Collardeau, made at the end of the eighteenth century:

> If there is any merit in translating, it is perhaps only to perfect the original, if possible, to embellish it, to appropriate it, to give it a national air and, in some way, to naturalize this foreign plant. (quoted in Berman 1992: 199)

Heavily domesticated translation was thus, to use the norm terminology coined by Toury, the ‘central’ norm in the French tradition of translation, strongly established and barely challenged over a period of some two centuries from the early seventeenth to the end of the eighteenth century. Given the dominance of French culture and language in this period, this was therefore a norm with which translators in all countries of Europe would have been familiar, and would have had to come to terms with – either embracing it (fully or in part), as

---

9 According to this critic, the Frenchman laughs with a contemptuous expression on his face when he hears that the English have an epic poem whose subject matter is the Devil arguing with God, Adam and Eve eating an apple at the instigation of a snake [...] [my translation]
did Gottsched and his supporters in the German translation debate of the 1730s, or adopting a
different approach, as seems to have been the case for at least some Italian translators in the
eyearly eighteenth century.

### 3.2.2 Pierre-Daniel Huet

However, this does not mean that all translators in France adhered to the domestication norm.
The seventeenth century also saw the development of a ‘peripheral’ translation norm in France.
Stackelberg describes the translators in this tradition as an “übersetzerische Minderheit” of “philologisch-gelehrte[n] Übersetzer[n]”\(^\text{10}\). He cites here the translators Pierre-Daniel Huet (1630-1721) and Anne Dacier (1654-1720).

The importance of Pierre-Daniel Huet’s 1683 treatise *De optimo genere interpretandi*\(^\text{11}\) is evident in the translation discussions of the 1730s in Leipzig and Zurich. Not only was he cited as an authority in Georg Venzky’s treatise on translation, but his precepts on accuracy and even the placing of words are echoed in the translation essay published by Bodmer’s colleague, Johann Jacob Breitinger.

One of Huet’s aims was to attack the free translation practices of his time, which he did with a carefully-argued case in favour of faithful, word-for-word translation, in addition to pejorative allusions to the *belles infidèles*:

> I do think that whoever takes up the task of Translator should in that role especially exert his industry not to exercise his eloquence – if by chance he is gifted in that way – and not to fashion a deceit for the ears by the sweetness of his style, but rather to exhibit the author whose translation he is working on as an author to be looked at in his own words – as in a mirror and a reflection […]. (quoted from DeLater 2002: 40)

Indeed, it appears that even the term *belles infidèles* itself emerged out of opposition to the ‘central’ translation norm of seventeenth-century France, having been coined by Gilles Ménage, a friend and correspondent of Huet.

Arguing against St. Jerome (approx. 317-419/420), Huet claimed that word-for-word translation could be achieved whilst simultaneously preserving the semantic, lexical and stylistic integrity of the source text:

> [...] there are three things essentially required for true commendation of a translation: scrupulous care in setting forth the thoughts, fidelity in reproducing the words, and the utmost solicitude in presenting the stylistic colouring. [...] the thoughts should be set forth in such a way that they are enclosed by the same words; the words should be imitated such that the thoughts blossom out of them; and the thoughts and words together ought to

\(^\text{10}\) minority translator group made up of scholars of philology

\(^\text{11}\) On the best kind of translating
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correspond in such a way that the form, savour, and stylistic character rise up out of them both. (ibid: 82-83)

This fidelity, he argued, must take precedence over natural language, elegance and clarity – a requirement clearly in opposition not only to the belles infidèles but also, as I shall show in my discussion of the translation debate within the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture, in conflict with the requirements set out by the German scholars Venzky and Gottsched. Fidelity to the source text extended to proverbial sayings and metaphors where the translator, Huet argued, should “yield up the very words”, setting forth briefly “the meaning of the words in the margin or in the notes” (ibid: 56). Also, contrary to contemporary belief that the classical authority Horace had been opposed to faithful translation, Huet maintained that careful examination of Horace’s words and the context in which he had used them actually showed that Horace had in fact favoured fidelity in translation. This is an argument that was to re-emerge in the writings of Breitinger and Bodmer.

Following Huet’s death in 1721, an edition of his writings appeared in 1722 and was widely publicised in the learned and literary journals of the day, including the Neue Zeitungen von Gelehrten Sachen in Leipzig, which also drew attention to the name of the editor of the publication, Pierre-Joseph Thoulier d’Olivet (1682-1768). D’Olivet, too, was a translator, and he, too, advocated reproduction of the character of the author in translation. In the preface to his translation of Demosthenes’ Philippicis he referred to previous translations of the same work and criticised them for failing to reflect the character of the original:

Ils lui font dire à peu près tout ce qu’il a dit, mais rarement comme il l’a dit: & dès-la ce n’est pas le même Orateur. (D’Olivet 1736: 11)

D’Olivet is referred to in a note, written in Bodmer’s own illegible hand in his personal copy of his first translation of Paradise Lost (1732), now kept in the Zentralbiihlotheek in Zurich. This note is evidence of Bodmer’s interest in translators linked to the French ‘peripheral’ norm.

The other respected French translator who is said to have adhered to the ‘peripheral’ norms outlined above for Huet was Anne Dacier, best known for her translations of the Homeric epics, Iliad (1699) and Odyssey (1708). However, unlike Huet, Dacier was prepared to make concessions in the interest of preserving ‘good taste’, and argued against excessively radical fidelity to the source text. In her preface to the Iliad, she argued in favour of retaining the letter and the spirit of the original:

12 The existing edition of this translation, published together with d’Olivet’s translation of Cicero’s Catiliniaris, is dated 1736. However, there is an earlier reference to these two translations by d’Olivet in the 1721 issue of the Neue Zeitungen von Gelehrten Sachen (page 585), suggesting that there may have been an earlier edition of the translations.

13 They have him say practically everything he said, but seldom in the way in which he said it. For this reason it is not the same orator. [my translation]
When I speak of a translation of prose, I do not mean a servile translation, I mean a noble and generous translation which, adhering strictly to the way of thinking in the original, searches out the beauties of its language and represents the images without retailing [retaining? HB] the words. The first sort of translation becomes unfaithful through too scrupulous a faithfulness; for it loses the spirit to preserve the letter, which is the work of a cold and barren genius; whereas the other, though chiefly aiming to retain the spirit, yet fails not, in its greatest liberties, to retain the letter [...]. (quoted from Robinson 2002: 189)

It is further interesting to note her use of a musical metaphor for translation, contrasting with the more usual contemporary metaphor of the translator as an artist. To my knowledge this musical metaphor reappeared only once in the 1730s debate on translation, but it did so in one of the strongest challenges to Gottsched’s position. Anne Dacier wrote:

> We daily see musicians who, well skilled in their art, sing the notes of the tunes that are set before them, with the greatest nicety and exactness, without committing the least fault; and yet the whole is one entire fault, because [...] they take not the spirit that went to the composing of those tunes [...] This [...] is the difference between good and bad translations; the one, by a low and servile imitation, give the letter, without the spirit; the other by a free and noble imitation, retains the spirit [...] (ibid: 189)

One other recommendation by Anne Dacier was in line with Huet’s position and was taken up by both parties to the German dispute on translation of the 1730s – that verse should be translated in prose in order not to compromise the content through attempts to reproduce the poetic form.

### 3.3 Italian-speaking Europe

There is evidence that by the early eighteenth century some translators in the Italian-speaking part of Europe were adopting a norm similar to the ‘peripheral’ norm of Huet and d’Olivet. Ferrari has noted increasing respect for the source text amongst Italian speakers, with literary translation moving closer to the original, and verse translation being preferred to prose translation (quoted in Duranti 2001: 479). One case in point was Paolo Rolli (1687-1765), a translator known for the extremely faithful manner in which he translated *Paradise Lost* into Italian (see Dorris 1965 and section 7.3 of this chapter). In the preface to his translation of Demosthenes, d’Olivet referred to Rolli as a ‘judge’ who shared his opinion on former French translations of Demosthenes, while, in the preface to his first translation of *Paradise Lost*, Bodmer praised Rolli for complying with the rule that:

> [...] ein Übersetzer sein Original mit dessen eigenen Geist und der absonderlichen Art, so die Gedanken darinne haben, unverletzet ausdrücken müsse.¹⁴ (J.J. Bodmer 1732: Preface)

---

¹⁴ [...] a translator must express his original without impairment – with its own spirit and with the particular character of the thoughts found there. [my translation]
Another Italian translator of this period who appears to have translated particularly faithfully was Anton Maria Salvini, who carried out Italian translations of some of the works of Homer as well as, in about 1721, some extracts from Paradise Lost (which were never published). In the Neue Zeitungen aus der Gelehrten Welt of 1725, printed in Zurich, Salvini’s Homer translation was praised for having endeavoured to translate word for word as far as possible and for being very faithful, thereby differing from the French and English translations of Homer by De La Motte and Pope respectively (Neue Zeitungen aus der Gelehrten Welt 1725: 57, 692). Interestingly, the handwritten comments in Bodmer’s personal copy of his 1732 translation of Paradise Lost also make reference to Salvini (in addition to d’Olivet).

3.4 England

English ideas on translation in the seventeenth century were strongly influenced by the French belles infidèles, particularly due to the fact that a number of notable translators had been exiled to France with the royal court after the English civil war (see Ellis et al. 2001: 340). They included Huet’s contemporary, John Denham, a leading thinker on translation of his day and one who rejected literal translation.

At the end of the century however, the predominant English literary figure of the day, John Dryden (1631-1700), while praising the work of his predecessors, proposed a via media that would avoid the demands of extremely literal translation and the excesses of the belles infidèles tradition. In a new approach to translation method he coined the three terms ‘metaphrase’ (word-for-word translation), ‘paraphrase’ (translation with latitude) and ‘imitation’ (abandonment of the source text in the style of Denham and Abraham Cowley).

Unlike Huet, he clearly rejected the practice of very faithful translation (his ‘metaphrase’). He described this translation strategy as similar to “dancing on ropes with fettered legs”, and almost impossible to achieve without obscurity (see Robinson 2002: 172).

Of the three translation approaches, ‘paraphrase’ was the best, he argued. Dryden advocated conveying the content of the original, but still maintaining the clarity of the target text – rather than abandoning the demands of clarity in order to render each individual word, as Huet would have required. Thus, in the preface to his 1697 translation of Aeneas, Dryden wrote:

We are bound to our author’s sense, though with the latitudes already mentioned; for I think it not so sacred, as that one iota must not be added or diminished, on pain of an Anathema. (ibid: 175)

Accordingly, he gave preference to contemporary language over stringent reproduction of the original expressions, and stated that he had tried to present Virgil in the English that Virgil himself would have spoken if he had been born in England in the time of Dryden. Thus we
see that, despite modifications to the free approach of the ‘central’ norm in France, Dryden was far from adopting a translation norm in line with that advocated by the ‘peripheral’ tradition in France.

3.5 German-speaking Europe

Having looked at the situation in France, the Italian-speaking states and England at the beginning of the period I am examining, I now briefly outline the norms prevailing in German translation up to the 1730s. Berman has argued that, starting with Luther, German translation defined itself in opposition to French classicism (Berman 1992: 175). Stackelberg does not identify any translation culture at all in the German-speaking states of the period I am investigating that might have been comparable to that developed in France (Stackelberg 1988: 19). Yet, as has been noted above, the debaters of the 1730s did not have any difficulties finding German translation authorities such as Luther, Schottel and Opitz whom they could cite.

3.5.1 Luther and domesticating translation

Martin Luther (1483-1546) was a commanding figure in German translation, establishing a tradition of domesticating translation that was to be pursued further by a number of translation scholars and practitioners of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. His principle of translating the Bible using everyday words spoken by mothers at home, children on the street and common men in the marketplace was still familiar to translation scholars two centuries later, and during the Zurich-Leipzig debate of the 1730s his Bible translation was accorded the highest praise.

In his ‘Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen’\(^\text{15}\) of 1530, Luther stated that his aim had been to write pure and clear German: “daß ich rein und klar Deutsch geben möchte”. Using the example of the word allein, which he had added in his German translation of a text from St. Paul’s epistle to the Romans despite the fact that the word sola was not to be found in the Latin source text (the Vulgate), he explained that customary German usage demanded the addition of the word allein:

\[\text{Das ist [...] die Art unsrer deutschen Sprache, wenn sie von zwei Dingen redet, deren man eines bejaht und das ander verneinet, so braucht man des Worts solum ‘allein’ neben dem Wort ‘nicht’ oder ‘kein’.}\(^\text{16}\) (quoted from Störig 1963: 20-21)

\(^{15}\) Circular letter on translating

\(^{16}\) […] that’s the way we do it in German, when we are talking about two things, one of which we’re affirming and the other denying: we use the word allein [or ‘alone’ or ‘only’ or ‘just’] alongside ‘not’ or ‘no’. [translation by Robinson (2002: 86)]
Similarly, idiomatic Latin in the Bible needed to be rendered with different idioms in German that reflected normal German usage.

Justus Georg Schottel (1612-1676), the most important German linguist of the seventeenth century, followed in Luther’s footsteps, advising translators to use Luther’s translation precepts and practice as “a signpost and yardstick” (quoted from Lefevere 1977: 11). In his 1663 essay ‘Wie man recht verteuutschen soll’\(^\text{17}\), he praised the expressive power of the German language and questioned the need for language used by foreign authors to constrain its use.

Albrecht (1998: 80) has noted that domesticating translations were common practice in the German-speaking states in the seventeenth century and cites the example of Niclaus Ulenhart’s translation of one of Cervantes’ *Novelas ejemplares* which he transplanted to Prague, transforming typical Spanish foods into dishes more familiar to German readers.

### 3.5.2 Translating according to ‘the letters’

This strong tradition of ‘free’ or domesticating translation cannot be described as radically different to the approach then prevailing in France where the ‘central’ norm of the *belles infidèles* was dominant. For this period it is therefore difficult to concur with Berman’s statement that German translation defined itself in opposition to French traditions:

> [...] how the tradition of translation in Germany, which starts with Luther, defined itself in opposition to a culture – that of French classicism – in whose unfolding translation did not play a decisive role. (Berman 1992: 175)

Furthermore, the picture was complicated by the existence of differing norms, since alongside the domesticating norm of the seventeenth century, we also find a German tradition of faithfulness to the source text. Even Luther retained the individual words of the source text where he judged this to be theologically important. As he wrote in his ‘Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen’, he translated according to ‘the letters’ where necessary: “[...] wo es etwa drauf ankam, da hab ich’s nach den Buchstaben behalten und bin nicht so frei davon abgewichen”\(^\text{18}\) (quoted from Störig 1963: 25).

Another particularly interesting early translator is the Zurich theologian Leo Jud (1482-1542), who adopted a faithful approach for his entire translation of the Bible (and not just for theologically important texts). A contemporary of Luther’s, Jud carried out a Zurich translation of the Bible together with the Zurich reformer Huldrych Zwingli. The Zurich Bible translation was much closer to the Hebrew and Greek source texts than Luther’s

\(^{17}\) How to Germanise (translate) properly

\(^{18}\) [...] when a lot seemed to be riding on it I stuck to the letter and didn’t deviate from it quite so freely. [translation by Robinson (2002: 88)]
translation, faithfully rendering not only the lexis but also grammatical features of the Hebrew source texts such as suffixes, tense and number. Where it was unambiguous, the Hebrew was given preference over the Vulgate in all cases (see Himmighöfer 1995:188-192 and Sonderer:1984: 166). The tradition of faithful Bible translation in Zurich is of particular interest for the translation theories and practice of the eighteenth-century Zurich scholars Bodmer and Breitinger.

A seventeenth-century translator and author who advocated faithful translation and was often cited by early eighteenth-century translation theorists was the German writer Martin Opitz (1597-1639). In his study of Opitz’s translation of Sophocles’ Greek tragedy, Antigone, Richard Alewyn has described Opitz’s work as a ‘word for word’ translation. He concludes that – in contrast to the translations of Antigone done in French and Italian, where translators were neither capable of doing a faithful translation nor prepared to place such a translation before their readers – the German translation by Opitz was reliable and faithful:

Die Bedürfnisse des ausländischen Publikums waren ästhetisch und modern, die des deutschen gelehrt und antiquarisch. Dort mußte eine Übersetzung lesbar oder sogar auffühbar, hier sollte sie zuverlässig und treu sein. [...] Den Begriff der ‘ad verbum interpretatio’ kennt damals nur der Deutsche.19 (Alewyn 1925: 20)

Opitz himself, in the preface to his translation of Seneca’s Troades, claims to have followed his Latin source text as closely as possible. However, he writes, it had been impossible to express every single word, and to keep to the same number of lines, since “die Lateinische Sprache viel Eigenschaften derer unsere und unserer viel derer jene nicht fähig ist”20 (Opitz 1625: Preface). He also states that he has added explanations in the case of cities, rivers, countries, mountains and tales with which some readers may not be familiar.

Opitz is also known for his recommendation of translation as a method by which intending writers could practise the use of good language. In his Deutsche Poeterey he wrote:

Eine guete art der ubung ist, das wir uns zuwilen auß den Griechischen und Lateinischen Poeten etwas zue ubersetzen vornemen: dadurch denn die eigenschaft und glantz der wörter, die menge der figuren, und das vermögen auch dergleichen zue erfinden zue wege gebracht wird.21 (quoted from Fränzel 1914: 10)

19 While the requirements of the foreign public were aesthetic and modern, those of the German public were scholarly and antiquarian. There [abroad] translations had to be readable or even capable of being performed; here [in German-speaking Europe] they had to be reliable and faithful. At that time only Germans were familiar with the term ad verbum interpretatio (translating according to the words). [my translation]

20 The Latin language has many features that our language cannot reproduce while our language has many that Latin cannot handle.

21 A good form of exercise is sometimes to translate texts from Greek and Latin poets. This helps develop the character and brilliance of words, the combination of figures of speech and also the ability to create these. [my translation]
The seventeenth-century German philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716) spoke of literal translation that followed the original Fuß vor Fuß, ‘foot by foot’. He praised the expressive power of German but called for more efforts to enrich the language through translation in order to create a language capable of translating literally:

Der rechte Probierstein des Überflusses oder Mangels einer Sprache findet sich beim Übersetzen guter Bücher aus anderen Sprachen. Dann da zeigt sich, was fehlet, oder was vorhanden [...] Inzwischen ist gleichwohl diejenige Sprache die reichste und bequemste, welche am besten mit wörtlicher Übersetzung zurechte kommen kann, und dem Original Fuß vor Fuß zu folgen vermag [...]. 22 (quoted in Sdun 1967: 21)

Leibniz’ expression Fuß vor Fuß is one that is repeatedly encountered in writings of the 1730s.

Thus we see that the situation relating to ‘central’ and ‘peripheral’ norms is less clear for the German-speaking states than for France in this period. While there is a strong domesticating tradition following in the footsteps of Luther, other translators such as Jud and Opitz favoured a more faithful approach.

3.6 English – the unknown language

Turning now to Toury’s category of ‘preliminary norms’ (see chapter two, section 4.1), we see that another important feature of German translation in the early eighteenth century was the prevalence of retranslation, or translations of translations. Indeed, in his introduction to Graeber and Roche’s extensive bibliography of German retranslations of French translations of English literature in the seventeenth and eighteenth century, Stackelberg writes that the procedure was so well established that translators scarcely gave it a second thought:

[...] die Mehrzahl der deutschen Übersetzer französischer Bücher [empfanden sich] nicht als “Weiterübersetzer” [...]; sie nahmen [...] ihre Vorlagen für Originale und schämten sich ihrer Übertragung derselben nicht [...] 23 (Stackelberg 1988: 9)

Another feature of German translation that may be regarded as constituting a preliminary norm relates to the choice of text for translation. This was circumscribed by the tastes of German readership and even by the activities of the censors in many German towns. In

---

22 The true proof of a language’s abundance or shortcomings is to be found when translating good books from other languages. Here we see what is missing and what is available. [...] Nonetheless the richest and most adaptable language is one that is best able to handle word-for-word translation, that is able to follow the original foot by foot. [my translation]

23 Most German translators of French books did not consider themselves to be ‘retranslators’. They regarded their source texts as originals and were not ashamed of rendering them. [my translation]
particular, there was no tradition of translated English literature. In the preface to his *Critische Abhandlung*, Bodmer bemoans the fact that German readers, lacking the kind of familiarity with imaginative authors that English readers have, will fail to appreciate the beauties of Milton: “sie werden in Miltons Wercke von zu vielen Schönheiten einer hohen Art, die ihnen fremd und unbekannt ist, gleichsam überfallen, und verwirret”24 (J.J. Bodmer 1740b: Preface).

Bodmer’s comments are a clear indication of the lack of familiarity with English literature at the beginning of the period I am examining in this study. This lack of familiarity even extended to the English language itself. As Fabian notes, in 1700 England was *terra incognita* for the German states as for most of continental Europe. Apart from trading cities like Hamburg, the English language was completely unknown in the German states, so much so that a famous Frankfurt bibliophile, Zacharias Conrad von Uffenbach, was unable to find a single book in English in the city of Frankfurt apart from a Bible, and even in Amsterdam there was nothing to be found other than religious sermons and similar texts. Fabian also states that translation from English before the eighteenth century had been mainly limited to modest numbers of devotional and scholarly works. Often these were translated via French not only because there were no translators that understood English but also due to the fact that the book trade across the English Channel simply did not operate (for more detailed accounts see Fabian 1943 and Fabian 1992). This situation helps to explain why the young Bodmer was forced to teach himself English using only a Latin-English grammar (‘Ludewigs Grammatik’).

One example for the lack of knowledge of English literature at the beginning of the eighteenth century is the story of the early translation and reception of a canonical work of English literature, *Paradise Lost* – the text which constitutes the subject of my investigation. During his lifetime and for the 50 years that followed his death, John Milton was known in Europe less for his poetry than for his political and religious writings, particularly those defending the actions of Cromwell’s government, in which he held an official position. As such he was generally regarded as a dangerous writer, particularly in continental Europe. Not until the early eighteenth century did two important critical commentators on *Paradise Lost*, the English critic, Joseph Addison (1672-1719), and the French critic Voltaire, succeed in drawing the attention of people outside Britain to Milton’s achievements as a poet. The case of *Paradise Lost* is particularly interesting because of the very different ways it was translated into French, Italian and German, as well as its important role in the debates of the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture. In addition it raised important aesthetic questions which also played a role in the Zurich-Leipzig discussions. The next section examines the

---

24 In Milton’s work they will be confused and overcome – as it were – by the many sublime beauties that they find strange and unfamiliar. [my translation]
first few verses of the three translations in order to illustrate the varying translation and aesthetic norms prevailing in the different language regions in the early eighteenth century.

3.7 Rewriting Paradise Lost in Europe

In the late 1720s and early 1730s a total of five different translations of John Milton’s 1669 religious epic, Paradise Lost, were completed. The first French translation of Paradise Lost appeared in 1729, the initial six books of the first full Italian translation were published in the same year, two different Dutch translations appeared in 1728 and 1730, and Bodmer’s German translation – completed in 1724/5 – was published in 1732.

The dates of these different translations may be very close, and yet the approaches adopted for the different languages were remarkably different. The French translation, for instance, was so careful not to offend French sensibilities that it managed to transform Milton’s heavenly muse into a divin génie and his ‘greater man’ into God. The other extreme was the Italian text, so close to the original English that it almost resembled an interlinear translation.

3.7.1 Background

Outside England, attention had first been drawn to Paradise Lost through Joseph Addison’s series of essays on Paradise Lost (referred to as ‘papers’) printed in the English journal, The Spectator, during eighteen consecutive weeks in 1712. The Spectator was extremely influential in the reception of Milton in England, and also had a significant impact throughout Europe, eventually being translated into a number of European languages and emulated in many countries. The French translator of Paradise Lost, Nicolas Dupré de Saint-Maur (1699-1774), considered the Addison papers on Paradise Lost important enough to translate and publish with the French version of Paradise Lost.

In the first six of his Paradise Lost papers, Addison analysed the plot, character, sentiments and language of Milton’s Renaissance epic according to the Aristotelian classical rules of epic poetry (unity of place, time and action). This neo-classical approach to literary criticism was then generally prevalent in France, and thus, because of the cultural hegemony of France, had influenced thought in other countries of Europe as well.

However, such rules were entirely inappropriate for the analysis of Paradise Lost. In fact, John Milton’s Paradise Lost was one of the outstanding examples of an individualistic tradition of English literature said to have been “directly antagonistic to the Aristotelianism of the classicists” (Robertson 1962: 235). As such, it was unsuited to neo-classical analysis of the type carried out by Addison, who showed Milton to be guilty of transgressions including an excessive number of digressions, ostentation in learning and laboured language. This
judgement of *Paradise Lost* according to the Aristotelian rules was to colour later reception of the epic in France.

The other influential writer on Milton was the French critic Voltaire. Exiled in England as a young man, Voltaire published a favourable and influential essay on *Paradise Lost* in English, his *Essay on Epic Poetry* of 1727, just two years before the publication of the French translation. Although, like Addison, Voltaire was full of praise for Milton’s work, like Addison he also criticised elements that failed to conform to the neo-classical aesthetic approach. Milton’s sections on the war between Satan’s hordes and the armies of heaven, for instance, he deemed “an imaginary thing, which lies out of the Reach of our Nature”. Classical theory opposed imaginative writing that went beyond the limits of what we see in nature.

A year later French readers were able to read a French translation of Voltaire’s essay prepared by Desfontaines. Voltaire was furious that this translation had been made since he considered *Paradise Lost* a work that would not stand up to stringent neo-classical judgement of the kind it was likely to receive in France. In his view, readers in France should be given an entirely different introduction to Milton from that accorded to English readers:

> [...] that little pamphlet could not succeed in France without being dressed in quite an other manner. What j [sic] say of Milton cannot be understood by the french unless j [sic] give a fuller notion of that author. The stile besides is after the english fashion, so many similes, so many things which appear but easy and familiar here, would seem too low to yr wits of Paris. (quoted in Kölving 1996: 168)

Thus for his own French version of his essay on *Paradise Lost*, published in 1733, Voltaire completely rewrote the text on Milton, taking up a stance completely different from that adopted in his English essay, and one that can best be described as reserved or even hostile.

A final set of writings that needs to be examined at this point are a second set of papers that also appeared in *The Spectator*, Addison’s papers on the ‘Pleasures of the Imagination’. Here Addison expounded a new and very different approach to literary appreciation from that espoused in his papers on *Paradise Lost*, indeed one which is said to have laid the foundation for a whole new Romantic aesthetics in England. He also made direct reference to Milton and to *Paradise Lost* – in three different places. In no. 417 (June 28, 1712), for instance, he states:

> If I were to name a poet that is a perfect master in all these arts of working on the imagination, I think Milton may pass for one [...] No other subject [than that of *Paradise Lost*] could have furnished a poet with scenes so proper to strike the imagination, as no other poet could have painted those scenes in more strong and lively colours. (quoted in Bond 1970: 196)

One commentator states that the doctrine of the imagination expounded by Addison in these papers shows considerable similarities to the ideas discussed by a contemporary Italian
writer, Ludovico Antonio Muratori, in his *Della perfetta poesia italiana* (1706). His opinion is that Addison is likely to have read Muratori’s work, even if he did not refer directly to it or quote from it when writing for *The Spectator* (Robertson 1962: 244-49).

It was the papers on imagination, rather than those on *Paradise Lost* itself, which were to prove important for the German translation of *Paradise Lost*.

### 3.7.2 The French translation

With this background in mind I now turn to the first complete French translation of *Paradise Lost* (see Appendix I, section 1 for a transcription of the initial lines of this translation). It was published in 1729 together with a French translation of Addison’s articles on *Paradise Lost* from *The Spectator* and a translated life of Milton. We know very little about the translator, whose name, Nicolas Dupré de Saint-Maur, was not printed in the 1729 edition, although it did appear from 1733 onwards. Analysts of Dupré’s translation agree that, although unfaithful, it makes pleasant and poetic reading - a *belle infidèle* indeed! In this respect it was in line with the ‘central’ translation norm advocated by d’Ablancourt and outlined in section 2.1 above.

One analyst has written:

> [...] la différence radicale de ton entre le français et l’anglais est telle qu’on a du mal à reconnaître le *Paradis perdu* dans la version de Dupré. [...] L’allure si caractéristique du texte miltonien, cette tension, ce souffle tumultueux, Dupré les supprime presque entièrement.26 (Gillet 1975: 121)

The author of an essay published in Zurich (probably Johann Jacob Bodmer) went as far as to claim that although many readers might have become familiar with Milton on the basis of the French translation, the translation was so free that they could not claim to have truly read him:

> Derjenigen, welchen Milton aus dem Französischen bekannt geworden, mögen wohl mehrere seyn, aber von diesen kann man eigentlich nicht sagen, daß sie ihn gelesen haben: Der Hr. Uebersetzer von St. Maur hat sich allzu viele Freyheit damit herausgenommen.27 (J.J. Bodmer 1742c: 55)

---

25 Of ideal Italian poetry

26 [...] the radical difference in tone between the French and English texts is so marked that it is hard to recognise *Paradise Lost* in Dupré’s version. [...] Dupré has almost entirely suppressed the characteristic tempo of Milton’s text, its tension, its turbulent spirit. [my translation]

27 There may well be many who have got to know Milton from the French version, but it cannot really be said that they have read him, since the translator, [Dupré] de St. Maur, took too many liberties with it. [my translation]
Perhaps most interesting to observe is the translation shift deployed by Dupré in order to make it conform to neo-classical norms. "Si on oppose la version de Dupré au texte anglais," writes Gillet,

> il est évident que presque toutes les infidélités du traducteur vont dans le même sens, qu'on peut appeler la domestication du texte: l'invocation du début est ramenée à une invocation épique classique, le monde satanique réduit à une imagerie conventionnelle, et le jardin d'Eden tend vers la fadeur de l'idylle. Somme toute, une lecture qui cherche à ramener le Paradis perdu au connu, exactement comme le fait la critique d'Addison.28 (Gillet 1975: 126)

Thus, for instance, Milton’s epic invocation to the Muse disappears completely in the French translation, replaced by the words “I sing of the disobedience of the first man” and a call to the “divin génie, enfant du très-Haut”. Milton’s great quest and innovation in Paradise Lost (“things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme”, Book I, verse 16) was to write a Christian epic, and he appealed to a heavenly muse to inspire him. Dupré does not dare to combine classic pagan traditions with Christianity by writing of a muse céleste. The disappearance of the muse who has inspired the words of the poet robs the poem of a significant part of the authority with which Milton has sought to imbue it.

The initial verses of the translation contain a further significant transformation – in the French version Milton’s ‘greater man’ – Christ – becomes un Dieu homme – a God in human form. It has been said that Milton’s beliefs approached a form of Arianism, in which the emphasis was placed on Christ as a superior human being – ‘a greater man’ – rather than an aspect of God. However, Dupré clearly believed that French readers would not accept the presentation of Christ as a human being or ‘greater man’ and therefore chose a more theologically acceptable term – Dieu homme.

All in all, we see how Dupré ‘manipulated’ Paradise Lost to ensure its acceptability for French readers, in particular by shaping it into the Aristotelian mould with which they were familiar. However, it appears that, as another commentator has observed,

> [In spite of the interest which the French showed in Milton, the actual influence of the poet on French literature remained small and unimportant [...]. (Robertson 1908: 328)

---

28 If we compare Dupré’s version with the English text it is clear that almost all the translator’s infidelities are working in the same direction, towards domestication of the text. The opening invocation is reduced to a classical epic invocation, Satan’s world to conventional imagery and the garden of Eden verges on an insipid idyll. All in all, it is a reading that seeks to lead Paradise Lost back to what is known, just as Addison’s criticism did. [my translation]
It is interesting to speculate on whether Dupré’s domestication of the work was partly responsible for the lesser impact which Paradise Lost had on French literature of the eighteenth century than it did on German literature in the same period.

3.7.3 The Italian translation

It has been suggested that it was the Italians who were “the pioneers of a true critical appreciation of Milton on the Continent” (ibid: 329). A translator called Lorenzo Magalotti began a translation of Paradise Lost into Italian in 1713, and Antonio Salvini in about 1721, although neither translation was published. Interestingly, in the preface to his German translation of 1732, Johann Jacob Bodmer credits these two Italian translators with having stimulated his interest in Milton.

In connection with this Italian interest in Milton, it is also interesting to note the development of a new aesthetic approach to literature in the early eighteenth-century Italian states. The leading figure in this movement was Ludovico Antonio Muratori whose Della perfetta poesia italiana (1706) may have been the source of the ideas expressed in Addison’s papers on the pleasures of the imagination published in The Spectator. The function of poetry, Muratori argues, is to conjure up before our imagination sumptuous, new, noble and wonderful images – the fantasy must be stimulated to create images.

Although Muratori does not mention Paradise Lost in his Della perfetta poesia italiana, Muratori’s work, argues one commentator, might have been “intended as a vindication” of Paradise Lost. He writes:

When Rolli’s [full Italian] translation [of Paradise Lost] appeared, the Italians were thus better prepared than any other continental people to read Milton with understanding; and Rolli himself [...] took up the defence of Milton when Voltaire singled out certain ‘barbarian’ liberties for special censure in his Essay. (Robertson 1908: 330)

Rolli lived in England from 1715 and was an Italian master in the house of King George II (Dorris 1965: 213-25). He published his own poetry and Italian translations of Anacreon, Virgil and Steele. In 1729 his translation of the first six books of Paradise Lost was published in London, followed, in 1735, by the whole work (see Appendix I, section 2 for a transcription of the initial lines of this translation).

He himself described his translation as exact and literal, using the term ‘metaphrase’ (word-for-word translation) coined by John Dryden. Comparison of the initial lines of Rolli’s translation with the original English shows that Rolli did indeed stay extremely close to the words of his source text, with lines one and two, for instance, appearing almost as an interlinear translation. Thus Rolli appears to have been adhering to a translation norm close to that advocated by Huet and the other French translation scholars advocating the ‘peripheral’ norm described above.
Interestingly, this is the only verse translation of the three discussed here. In contrast to Milton’s blank verse, Rolli chose *verso sciolto*, an unrhymed hendecasyllabic line (11 syllables) with an accent on the tenth syllable, which he believed to be particularly suited to the Italian language.

Rolli omitted two passages in which Milton attacks the Roman Catholic church, hoping that this would help the book to escape prohibition in Italian-speaking Europe. His efforts were in vain, however. From 1732 the Verona edition of the first six books was placed on the Index, where it remained until 1900. Nevertheless the importance of the work was recognised throughout the Italian-speaking world and Muratori is said to have taken particular interest in the project. The translation was re-published throughout the century until as late as 1794.

### 3.7.4 The German translation

The Zurich scholar who translated *Paradise Lost* into German in this period was Johann Jacob Bodmer (1698–1783), who will be discussed in greater detail in the next chapter. Bodmer’s translation was not the first into German. In London, Theodor Haak (1605-90) had begun an unpublished translation of the first three books as early as 1668, while another translation by Ernst Gottlieb von Berge (1649-1722) entitled *Das verlustigte Paradeiß* was published in 1682 (for a detailed account see Kreuder 1970). However, as Bodmer noted in the preface to his translation, Berge’s work remained almost unknown, and Bodmer himself was certainly unaware of it until after he had completed his first translation.

Bodmer began to translate *Paradise Lost* in autumn 1723 and was soon totally absorbed in the task, identifying with his author to the point of imagining going blind, as did Milton. Full of enthusiasm, he described the work as a great religious work and the highest epic material imaginable, simultaneously penetrated with the spirit of antiquity, and featuring bold imagination, sublimity of emotion, captivating enthusiasm and powerful unity of style (Bodmer & Bodmer 1900: 11). As he translated *Paradise Lost*, Bodmer also became increasingly concerned that he would be unable to match Milton’s urgent, brief and sublime manner of writing (Bender 1965: 6* [sic]).

How did Bodmer approach his task of translating Milton? Both Bodmer and his lifelong collaborator and friend, Johann Jacob Breitinger, advocated complete faithfulness to the original in terms of both content and form when translating, although they preferred prose translations to verse-to-verse translations. Thus, unlike Rolli’s Italian version, Bodmer’s German translation of *Paradise Lost* is a prose rendering. However, Bodmer’s concern for faithfulness to his original is evident from a comparison of the source text and the German translation. Indeed, one analyst has concluded that Bodmer followed his original so closely that only slight variations were left for him to categorise (Viles 1903).
Bodmer showed special concern for the imaginative elements of Milton’s epic, and for the way in which metaphor, in particular, should be translated. Why did he focus on the imaginative elements in *Paradise Lost* at a time when the available critical literature was tending to play this down and to squeeze the Miltonic epic into a classical mould?

One answer to these questions is certainly to be found in Addison’s papers on the ‘Pleasures of the Imagination’ in *The Spectator*, which Bodmer had read in French translation. In his early twenties Bodmer had been so fired by his reading of *The Spectator* that he and a circle of friends had, for two years, published a moral weekly modelled on the English publication. A chronology of this first literary venture (Vetter 1887) reveals that the friends closely studied the French translation of the *Spectator*, reading it out loud to each other and learning sections by heart, while a letter written to Richard Steele, one of the publishers of the *Spectator*, on 18 October 1721, reveals in-depth knowledge of *Spectator* nos. 411 to 421 on the ‘Pleasures of the Imagination’. Bodmer was certainly strongly influenced by the papers on the imagination, in particular, and his comments on *Paradise Lost* bear this out. Addison’s neo-classical analysis of *Paradise Lost*, by contrast, had no affect whatever on Bodmer at this stage, since this set of papers was omitted in the early French translations of *The Spectator*.

Although a handwritten note at the end of Bodmer’s own copy of his first translation of *Paradise Lost* indicates that the translation was completed in May 1725, his initial efforts to get the work published were unsuccessful. When presented to the Zurich censor, publication was forbidden for reasons that would appear to lie in aesthetic norms governing stylistic choices for particular kinds of texts. The censor described it as an ‘excessively Romantic text’ for such a holy topic, and refused to allow publication:

> Es ist hier ein Herr Bodmer, […] welcher des verrühten Miltons Carmen Heroicum de paradiso perdito in Englisch beschrieben in das Deutsche in ungebunnder Rede übersetzt, es hat sollen hier gedruckt werden, die geistlichen Censores aber sehen es für eine allzu romantische Schrift an in einem so heiligen Themate. Es ist etwas Extra-Hohes und Pathetisches, aber nicht recht, dass man es nicht gestattet hat in Druk zu geben […] 29 (letter from Moritz Füssli to a St. Gallen correspondent named Huber and dated Zurich, 25 January 1725, quoted in Vetter 1900: 349)

Neither were the poets Barthold Heinrich Brockes in Hamburg or Johann Ulrich König in Dresden able to secure publication of Bodmer’s translation. Thus it was not until 1732 that Bodmer’s first translation of *Paradise Lost* was published – in Zurich, Frankfurt and Leipzig.

---

29 There is a Mr Bodmer here who has translated Milton’s notorious *Carmen Heroicum de paradiso perdito*, written in English, into German prose. It was to have been printed here but the religious censors regarded it as too Romantic a text for such a religious topic. It is something exceedingly sublime and emotional but not suitable that permission be given for it to be printed.
3.8 Summary

This overview of the situation in Europe prior to 1730 has shown the existence of a ‘central’ domesticating translation norm epitomised in the traditions of the French belles infidèles, alongside a strong classically-oriented aesthetic tradition in French literature. French cultural hegemony meant that these norms were influential throughout Europe.

French neo-classical aesthetic ideals ensured a negative reception of John Milton’s Paradise Lost by two influential critics – Voltaire (to some extent in his English essay and even more in his French translation of this essay) and Addison (in his papers on Paradise Lost – although not in his papers on the imagination).

In addition, the domesticating traditions of the French belles infidèles were reflected in the French translation of Paradise Lost done at the end of the 1720s.

Domesticating translation norms were also to be found in both England and the German-speaking regions of Europe, a situation attributable at least in part to the influence of France. In England, Dryden rejected literal translation, while in the German-speaking states a tradition of domesticating translation that had originated with Luther’s German translation of the Bible was further pursued by Schottel.

At the same time, a ‘peripheral’ translation norm emphasizing faithful translation had been formulated in France by Pierre-Daniel Huet, and appears to have found at least some adherents amongst scholars such as d’Olivet in France and also, to some extent, in the Italian-speaking region of Europe with translators like Paolo Rolli. This norm of faithful translation appears to have been instrumental in Rolli’s Italian translation of Paradise Lost, done almost contemporaneously with Dupré de Saint-Maur’s French translation, but completely different in its translation approach.

In German-speaking Europe, too, a tradition of fidelity to the source text existed alongside that of domesticating translation, with Luther translating according to ‘the letters’ in theologically important passages, while Zurich Biblical translation – in particular – was known for its faithful approach.

An additional development of particular interest for Paradise Lost was a new aesthetic norm advocating the virtues of the imagination in literature, that was being expounded in Italian-speaking Europe, while similar ideas were also espoused in England by Addison (in his papers on the imagination).

There is some evidence that Johann Jacob Bodmer’s work as a translator of Paradise Lost was influenced both by the ‘peripheral’ translation norm of fidelity to the source text, and by the new aesthetic ideas on imagination. What explanations can we find for this translator’s interest in peripheral norms that deviated from the ‘central’ norms of his time prevailing in
the dominant culture of France and in Europe as a whole? The next chapter will explore possible answers to this question by examining the background to Bodmer’s writings and translations, his exposure to Italian thought and the environment in which he worked.
Chapter Four – The Interculturalist

Johann Jacob Bodmer was a literary critic, author, historian, publisher, teacher and linguistic historian as well as a translator. He maintained a lively correspondence with literary figures in the German, Swiss and Italian states, and with his unbounded energy, dominated cultural life in Zurich from the 1720s to his death in 1783. He was fluent in eight living and dead languages including Latin, French, Italian, English and his native German, and corresponded in Latin, French, Italian and German. In addition to his important contribution to German aesthetic thought in the first part of the eighteenth century, the credit for introducing and establishing Milton’s *Paradise Lost* as a major literary work in German-speaking Europe is almost universally accorded to him.

But why should a literary scholar in land-locked Zurich, far from English trading routes and influence, have chosen to translate a work written in the then little-known language of English; a work that, in the early 1720s, at the time he began his first translation, was almost unknown outside Britain? And why did he choose to translate it in a faithful manner that deviated from the dominant French norms of ‘domesticating’ translation – outlined in the previous chapter. How far did the political, economic, family and personal environment in which Bodmer lived and worked influence the professional choices he made?

In order to examine these questions more closely, this chapter moves away from a detailed analysis of the translation norms that guide translation decisions made by translators working within a professional interculture – the approach used in the previous chapter – to consider the general environmental constraints acting upon Bodmer. For this I will apply the ‘patronage’ framework established by Lefevere and outlined in section 2 of chapter two.

I begin with a review of the existing material on Zurich’s literary life in the early eighteenth century as well as that on Bodmer himself. I then outline the political, religious and economic environment in which Bodmer lived and worked, his family background and his own professional career with reference to Lefevere’s constraints of ‘ideology’, ‘economic factors’ and ‘status’.
4.1 Review of the literature on Zurich and Bodmer

4.1.1 Literature on Bodmer’s Zurich

The history of Zurich as well as social and cultural developments prior to and during Bodmer’s life are well covered by Dändiker (1908-12) and Wysling (1983a), while a recent study outlines the importance of the three Enlightenment societies established in Zurich between 1679 and 1709 in preparing the way for Bodmer’s literary activities (Kempe & Maissen 2002). General descriptive accounts of Zurich’s role as a mediator of English literature in the eighteenth century are to be found in Mörikofer (1861), Vetter (1891), Baechtold (1892), de Reynold (1912), Ernst (1932) and Ermatinger (1933).

Schöffler (1925) places literary developments in Zurich in this period within a Protestant theological framework. He describes the spread of Enlightenment ideas as proceeding through Europe from west to east, borne through Protestant lands, in the main, by a particular social grouping consisting mainly of sons of ministers, and presents Johann Jacob Bodmer, himself the son of a minister, as a typical representative of this kind of grouping. Zurich, he writes, preceded the German Protestant part of Switzerland in its acceptance of Enlightenment ideas, as it did that of the Lutheran German states:

So wäre denn das Wichtige am literarischen Geschehen im Zürich der ersten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts, daß hier zuerst auf deutschsprachigem Boden Vorgänge sich fortsetzen, die bald nach Jahrhunderbeginn in England, dem westlichsten Lande des Protestantismus, eingesetzt haben [...].30 (ibid: 134)

Accordingly, it was the Biblical element in Milton’s works, Schöffler believes, that exerted the greatest charm on Bodmer. The line of argument pursued by Schöffler may present part of the explanation for Johann Jacob Bodmer’s particular interest in Paradise Lost. However, as my analysis will show, Bodmer’s motivation in taking on the role he did in German literature of the early eighteenth century was not founded in religious factors alone, since there is a great deal of evidence to show that aesthetic considerations were of far greater importance to him.

4.1.2 Literature on Bodmer

General accounts of Bodmer’s life were published as early as 1783 (Meister 1783, Füssli 1783-84); later accounts of his life and work include those by Mörikofer, Baechtold (1892: 524-687), Hans & Hermann Bodmer (1900), Ermatinger (1933: 314-89) and Wysling (1983b: 135-153), while Ernst’s collection of Bodmer’s writings includes Bodmer’s brief ‘personal anecdotes’ on his childhood and life’s work (Ernst 1938). No mention is made in any of these

30 Thus the importance of literary developments in Zurich in the first half of the eighteenth century lies in the fact that this was the first German-speaking territory in which processes initiated soon after the beginning of the century in England, the westernmost Protestant land, became established. [my translation]
works of the impact that either the general political situation in Europe or Zurich's political unrest of 1713 may have had on the young Bodmer.

The most important article outlining the circumstances of Johann Jacob Bodmer's first translation of *Paradise Lost* in 1723-24 is that by Hans Bodmer, written some 170 years later (1893). Hans Bodmer's account is based mainly on J.J. Bodmer's correspondence with his colleague Johann Jacob Breitinger (1701-76) and his lifetime friend and correspondent in Appenzell, Laurenz Zellweger (1692-1764), which is quoted at length. This article was followed in 1900 by a Bodmer commemorative volume including articles on Bodmer's links to French, Italian and English literature (Stiftung von Schnyder von Wartensee 1900). In the article on Italian links, Donati outlines the various aesthetic questions discussed in the lengthy correspondence between Bodmer and the Italian scholar Pietro dei Conti di Calepio (1693-1762), while Vetter's article on English literature traces the influence of Bodmer's English reading in his critical works, and establishes the dates of Bodmer's six different *Paradise Lost* translations (1732, 1742, 1754, 1759, 1769 and 1780). The commemorative volume was followed by two dissertations analysing aspects of Bodmer's translations of *Paradise Lost* (Viles 1903, Schmitter 1913), which are discussed in more detail in chapter six. More recently, Straub (1965) has further investigated the correspondence between Bodmer and Calepio on a wide range of aesthetic topics. Tisch (1968, 1975) has commended the "substantial contribution made by Switzerland to the cultural and literary discovery of England in the eighteenth century", ascribing Bodmer's fascination with *Paradise Lost* – like Schöffler – largely to religious factors and expressing the belief that Bodmer's "impressive achievement as a translator has been grossly underrated from his antagonist Gottsched down to modern critics".

The major contribution to our knowledge of Bodmer's work over the past fifty years, especially in the field of translation, has been made by Bender, in particular through a series of facsimile reprints of some of the chief literary works by Bodmer and his colleague Breitinger. These include Bodmer's 1742 translation of *Paradise Lost* (reprinted in 1965 with an afterword by Bender), as well as Bodmer's *Brief-Wechsel von der Natur des Poetischen Geschmackes*31 (1736), his *Critische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren in der Poesie*32 (1740) and Breitinger's *Critische Dichtkunst*33 (1740), all of which were reprinted in 1966 with afterwords by Bender. In addition, Bender has authored a monograph on the life and achievements of Bodmer and Breitinger (1973), listing as desiderata for research a wide range of areas including an edition of the unpublished correspondence and a critical-historical edition of at least some of their works.

---

31 Correspondence on the nature of good taste in poetry
32 Critical treatise on the miraculous in poetry
33 Critical art of poetry
Bender (1967) points out the discrepancy between Bodmer’s importance for the reception of Milton in German-speaking Europe and the lack of attention devoted to his translation of *Paradise Lost*, as well as mentioning uncertainties and inaccuracies in the German literature on the topic. Indeed, these inaccuracies often extend to the English literature on translations of Milton, where there is little awareness of the major differences between the different versions of Bodmer’s translation. The 1980 Milton Encyclopedia, for instance, erroneously states “The [1732] translation was reprinted in Zurich and Leipzig in 1742 as Johann Milton’s *episches Gedichte von dem Verlohrnen Paradiese*; some notes have been added” (Hunter (ed) 1980: 79-80), while the catalogue of the major Milton collection held at the Turnbull Library in Wellington, New Zealand surmises that the “two issues [1732 and 1742] seem to differ only by the TP [title page] device but it is not possible to be certain without direct comparison” (Coleridge 1980: 205).

While conceding that religious considerations were significant in Bodmer’s advocacy of Milton’s work, Bender believes that scholars such as Schöffler and de Reynolds have overstated this aspect, and maintains that aesthetic aspects were more important.

With regard to the individual translations, Bender identifies the 1711 Tonson edition of *Paradise Lost* held at the central academic library in Zurich (the *Zentralbibliothek*) as the source text for Bodmer’s first translation. He notes the ‘unravelling’ of Milton’s complex sentences in the 1732 translation and the ‘greater freedom’ in the translation of 1742 as compared to that of 1732. He also presents new material on the role of a Leipzig scholar, Johann Christoph Clauder, in a number of changes that Bodmer made in his 1742 version of the translation – all of them aimed at adjusting the language used to the ‘Meissen’ standard of German (see chapter six, particularly section 4, for more detail). Thus, he maintains, Bodmer’s translation played a significant role in the process of assimilating written German in Switzerland to that used in the rest of German-speaking Europe. Bender believes that Bodmer’s chief motivation in the adjustments made to his 1742 version was to render his Milton translation more acceptable to a wider group of German readers. He did this in the interests of promoting his aesthetic ideas:

Man geht gewiß nicht fehl in der Feststellung, daß es Bodmer schließlich nicht um Milton als solchen ging, sondern eher um die Erörterung wichtiger ästhetischer Probleme, für die dann freilich Milton das Exempel bildete. Insofern schien es natürlich auch geraten, der Übertragung eine mustergültige, allen Deutschen verständliche sprachliche Form zu geben. Von der Anerkennung derselben hing nicht zuletzt das Ansehen Miltons und die bereitwillige Aufnahme seiner Darstellungsweise ab.\(^{34}\) (Bender 1967: 249)

\(^{34}\) It would certainly not be wrong to conclude that what Bodmer was ultimately concerned with was not Milton as such but rather the discussion of important aesthetic problems – for which Milton then provided the example. Given this situation, it seemed natural to clothe the translation in an exemplary linguistic form that would be comprehensible to all Germans. The acknowledgement of this linguistic form would determine, not least, Milton’s reputation and the ready acceptance of his manner of presentation. [my translation]
Torbruegge (1971, 1972) has investigated the links between Bodmer’s aesthetic ideas and those of the Greek writer Longinus as well as the impulses that the eighteenth-century Zurich painter Johann Heinrich Füssli [known as Fuseli in English] derived from Bodmer’s work. Brandes (1974) compares the literary periodical published by Bodmer and his circle in 1721-23, the *Discourse der Mahlern*\(^{35}\), with the revised and rewritten edition of the publication entitled *Der Mahler der Sitten*\(^{36}\), published in 1746.

As noted by Bender, there is no general edition of either the correspondence or the works of Bodmer and his colleague Breitinger. Bodmer himself drew attention to one of the chief difficulties facing any researcher working on his correspondence – the illegibility of his handwriting. In a letter to Johann Georg Sulzer dated 1775 he wrote:

> Meine Briefe haben das Prinzip der Vernichtung in sich selbst, weil sie so schwer zu entziffern sind. Sie sind schon lebendig todt.\(^{37}\) (quoted in Baechtold 1892: 524)

If Bodmer’s handwriting was already regarded as illegible in his own day, this is much more the case in modern times, since the whole system of German handwriting has changed in the intervening period.

Most of Bodmer’s very extensive correspondence is still held in the Bodmer archive at the *Zentralbibliothek* in Zurich (an institution founded under the name of the *Bürgerbibliothek* in 1629), along with many items from Bodmer’s own library. A small selection from Bodmer’s correspondence has appeared in a wide range of different publications (including J.J. Bodmer 1736, J.J. Bodmer 1781, Meister 1783, Stäudlin 1794, Körte 1804, Danzel 1848, Zehnder geb. Stadlin 1875, Brandl 1878, Wolff 1895-97, Fischer 1899, Quigley 1921, Boldini 1964, Guthke 1966, Brandes 1974).

A number of scholars have written on Bodmer and Breitinger’s translation theories and their work is reviewed in chapter six.

---

\(^{35}\) Discourse of painters

\(^{36}\) Painter of customs

\(^{37}\) My letters embody the principle of destruction within themselves because they are so difficult to decipher. Though alive they are already dead. [my translation]
4.2 The political, religious and economic environment in Zurich

4.2.1 Political and religious situation

I now move on to examine the political, religious and economic environment prevailing in Zurich in the early part of the eighteenth century. I begin with the situation in the area of politics and religion which, in the case of Zurich, were so closely intertwined that I will present them together.

European politics during the period I am considering was dominated by the conflict between an established and dominant power, France, and the upcoming power of England. France had established its hegemony during the seventeenth century, and the ambitions and achievements of its king, Louis XIV, dominated international history. However, the war of the Spanish Succession (1702-13) saw commanders such as England’s Duke of Marlborough and Prince Eugene outshining the French generals. Maurer has identified England as the ‘natural’ opponent of France in this period:

Als Gegner Frankreichs mußte man auf der Seite Englands stehen. [...] Auf der einen Seite ein König, der sagen konnte: ‘L’état, c’est moi’; auf der anderen Seite ein vom Parlement angestellter König [...] Es hat also vieles für sich, wenn man die Geschichte dieser Zeit, [...] als Geschichte Frankreichs (These) und Geschichte Englands (Antithese) versteht und in dieses Spannungsfeld dann die anderen Staaten und Gesellschaftsformationen einordnet.38 (Maurer 1987: 27-28)

As the emerging world power in this period, “by 1713 Great Britain [...] was recognized as a European power the equal of France and the emperor, and far ahead of the Dutch republic” (Doyle 1992: 274). Certainly this was well accepted in Zurich at the time. Kempe & Meissen have shown that contemporary political and military developments in the European arena were an important topic of discussion in the Enlightenment societies that met in Zurich between 1679 and 1709, and Schöffler writes: “Nach Höchstädt [or ‘Blenheim’, 1704] and Malplaquet [1709] sind die Engländer aktuell, also redet Tschudi [a contemporary Zurich chronicler] mehrfach davon”39 (Schöffler 1925: 59). The subsequent antagonism between the use of French literary models and those from England in the debate of the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture in the 1730s can be read as just one small part of this major conflict.

38 Anyone who opposed France had to be on England’s side. On the one hand there was a king who could state, ‘I am the state’, and on the other side there was a king employed by parliament. Thus there is much to be said for seeing the history of this period as the history of France (thesis) and of England (antithesis), and classifying all the other states and social formations within this alignment of powers. [my translation]

39 After Blenheim [1704] and Malplaquet [1709] the English were a central topic of conversation; therefore Tschudi [a contemporary Zurich chronicler] often speaks of them. [my translation]
between two powers in Europe, while Bodmer’s role in advocating English literature was part of the continued growth in English power at the expense of French.

In this period the city-state of Zurich was still very small. Dändliker notes that from 1671 to 1769 its population grew from 9,122 to only 10,579 (Dändliker 1908-12: III, 46). It was an oligarchy run by a small group of ruling families whose number was steadily reduced throughout the eighteenth century, and was extremely conservative politically. The fundamental aspects of the city’s constitution dated back to the Guild Constitution of 1336, which had established 12 traditional guilds and the Constaffel (or aristocratic grouping). Since no further guilds had been established in the intervening 400 years, those engaged in the new branches of commerce simply joined one of the existing guilds. Members of the ruling bodies, the Grosser Rat and the Kleiner Rat, were elected solely from the guilds, and, within these, from a small group of families.

Religious observance and customs were also rigidly controlled. The Evangelisch-Reformierte Staatskirche in Zurich was a state church, so that no person could leave it without losing their Zurich citizenship. The Reformed church had become increasingly orthodox and rigid during the seventeenth century, culminating in the establishment, in 1675, of the Consensusformel which embraced the Calvinist doctrine of predestination. This was followed by heresy proceedings against those who refused to preach this doctrine. Religious precepts governed every aspect of life. The Reformationskammer, for instance, ensured compliance with the strict Sittenmandate or codes of morals that applied to all citizens. In a code of morals passed as late as 1744, for instance, the inappropriately coloured dress of young theologians was denounced, and they were ordered to wear ‘honest’ black clothing. In 1755, blasphemy, cursing and swearing were forbidden, as were dancing at weddings and public occasions, and the illumination of guild and private buildings.

Publications were tightly controlled by the censor, with all manuscripts being submitted to a censorship authority consisting of the Antistes (the head of the Reformed church), theologians and guild representatives (see Brandes 1974 for a more detailed account). An indication of the rigidity of this authority is contained in a letter to Bodmer from his friend Leonhard Meister dated 20 November 1720:

Wahrhaftig, unsre Herren Zürcher sind recht spanische Inquisitoren, und ich glaube nicht, daß jemal unter reformirten Christen so heftige Zeloten gewesen.40 (quoted in Füssli 1783: 139)

Just how conservative this authority was may be seen in an example cited by Schöffler, where in 1721 the Zurich censor declared the discovery of the spermatozoon to be an unimportant

---

40 Truly, our Zurich gentlemen constitute a real Spanish Inquisition and I do not believe there have ever been such fierce zealots amongst Reformed Christians. [my translation]
and obscene discovery and denounced the Copernican system (Schöffler 1925: 121). Apart from the eight-year delay in securing publication of Bodmer’s first translation of Paradise Lost, Bodmer and Breitinger’s Discourse der Mahlern of 1721-23 was also strongly affected by the activities of the censor, with many issues never passing, while others had to be submitted up to four times before they could be printed. This was despite efforts by Bodmer and his group to avoid discussion of the controversial topics of politics and religion.

Higher education was a preserve of the church. Run by the Chorherren of the Zurich Grossmünster, the Collegium Carolinum was the only academic institute in Zurich and its purpose was to train future ministers of religion. Teaching focused on theology, philosophy, history and classics. At the time Bodmer attended the college, it was so orthodox in its outlook that neither of the (almost) contemporary German philosophers, Leibniz and Wolff, were taught, while Johann Jacob Scheuchzer (1672-1733), an outstanding Zurich scientist and teacher at the school, was not permitted to pass on to his pupils the teachings of Copernicus.

Yet contemporary scientific thought, political developments and religious tolerance were familiar areas for a large proportion of the ruling group in early eighteenth century Zurich, due largely to the activities of the Collegia. These three Enlightenment societies, which followed one another in the period 1679 to 1709, have been described as the first societies of their kind anywhere in the German-speaking region. They were a purely private initiative, yet, as debating forums, they served rather like a training ground for future city rulers. A recent study has described their debates as the foundation upon which Bodmer and Breitinger’s later activities were able to build:


To some extent, too, the debates of the Collegia were the forerunners of the major challenge to Zurich’s rigid political and educational structure that occurred in 1712-13. One of the main figures in the Zurich uprising of 1712-13, the so-called ‘citizen’s unrest’, was Scheuchzer, who had been a leading figure in the Collegia debates. Scheuchzer had studied medicine in Nuremberg and Utrecht, and was a leading representative of the new scientific thought in

\(^4\) It was no coincidence that the Enlightenment, as a public process, began so early in Zurich. The foundation for Johann Jacob Bodmer and Johann Jacob Breitinger was laid with the debates in the Wasserkirche.

Throughout the half century following 1711, former members of the Collegia always accounted for at least one of the two Zurich mayors [during this period the city was run by two mayors at a time, rather than one], thereby guaranteeing a relatively benevolent environment – despite the inevitable tensions between the forces favouring tradition and those advocating renewal. [my translation]
Zurich, a member of the ‘Royal Society’ in London (from 1704), the ‘Preussiche Akademie der Wissenschaften’ (from 1705), the ‘Accademia degli Inquieti’ in Bologna (from 1706) and the ‘Académie des Sciences’ in Paris (from 1706). Yet his publications suffered heavily at the hands of the Zurich censors and it was not until 1731-33, when his Physica Sacra was published – interestingly enough, with the assistance of Bodmer – that his work become acceptable in Zurich. The other important figure in the 1712-13 uprising was Obmann Hans Heinrich Bodmer, a publisher and distant relative of Johann Jacob Bodmer’s, but also a military leader who had successfully led Zurich’s forces in the recent confessional wars in Toggenburg.

The uprising occurred one or two years before Johann Jacob Bodmer would have arrived in Zurich to attend the Collegium Humanitatis, a preparatory school for the Collegium Carolinum. It has been described as the most important political development of the period, and included the most comprehensive discussion ever held on the constitution of old Zurich. It was provoked by a matter involving a craftsman, and resulted in a violent confrontation between David Holzhalb, one of the two mayors, and Obmann Bodmer. Holzhalb was shown to have been guilty of both corruption and embezzlement. Obmann Bodmer demanded constitutional reforms and a meeting was called under the leadership of Scheuchzer. It was attended by 600 citizens. A reform commission was established, headed by Scheuchzer, and met regularly over a period of several months, eventually proposing wide-ranging changes. Yet Zurich’s rulers were able to frustrate introduction of almost all the proposals by means of clever tactics combining both delays and confusion. Political change within the city-state had been totally blocked by an entrenched and at times corrupt power structure.

Thus in terms of Lefevere’s patronage concept (Lefevere 1992: 15), we see a situation in early eighteenth-century Zurich in which extremely rigid constraints still applied with regard to “the powers (persons, institutions) that further or hinder the reading, writing and rewriting of literature”. Falling under the general heading of ideology, these factors exerted a strong influence on Bodmer, particularly in the very concrete form of censorship. At the same time he was exposed, at least to some extent, to an opposing current of Enlightenment thought represented by thinkers like Scheuchzer and a latent political opposition to the status quo.

The impact of this constraining political and religious environment on Bodmer is occasionally evident in statements made in correspondence or later publications. In a letter to Zellweger dated 28 January 1724 he described the sense of freedom he felt when he left the city, comparing it to Satan’s feelings in Paradise Lost, as he approached Paradise:

> Alss ich aus der stadt kame auf das freye feld, ware mir zu muthe, wie dem Satan als er aus der helle, die mit flussigem und gediegenem feiher brennt [...] in das paradiss kommen [...].42

(quoted in Hans Bodmer 1893: 190-91)

42 As I left the city [of Zurich] and entered into the open fields I felt like Satan when he left Hell, burning in liquid and solid fire, and entered into Paradise. [my translation]
And shortly afterwards he wrote to Breitinger from his parent’s house in Greifensee:

Wie möget ihr euer vastes gemüthe in die Drekstadt Zürich einschliessen, wo die grössten Projecte Eurer Mitbürger abgerichtet sind, Drek zu fabricieren.43 (ibid: 188)

Later in his life Bodmer used drama to express his political ideas – freedom of thought and of the press, abolition of serfdom, lower burdens on the middle class.

Ich schrieb [...] tragische Stücke nach den Mustern der Griechen [...] dann besann ich mich, daß sich in dieser dramatischen Art Staatsveränderungen bearbeiten, und politische Wahrheiten, die den Regierungen verhaßt sind, ungestraft sagen lassen, und schrieb die politischen Dramen, ohne daß ich die geringste Prätension auf ihre theatralische Aufführung machete.44 (quoted in Ernst 1938: 26)

Although he was careful not to engage in political activities, he encountered opposition from the state authorities in his historical work. He took the side of the Geneva revolutionaries in debates in the Grosser Rat, while a number of his followers were involved in the citizens’ unrest of 1777. These few indications, as well as his support for Scheuchzer’s scientific publication, provide at least some evidence for surmising that Bodmer’s own political sympathies tended towards a reformist viewpoint, but that political prudence caused him to concentrate his life’s work in areas where entrenched power structures would be less likely to frustrate his efforts.

4.2.2 Economic situation

Looking at Europe as a whole, we see that developments in the economic sphere in the period up to the early eighteenth century paralleled the rise of England as an important player in the political and military arena.

England by 1700 was already the richest nation in Europe. Its agriculture was being transformed, its overseas trade was expanding, its financial system was already more sophisticated and flexible than that of most other countries [...]. (Doyle 1992: 43)

England was particularly strong in the maritime sphere, and its trading empire was growing. By the late seventeenth century it was importing from overseas large volumes of a variety of products including East India silk – a development that would have been particularly noted by silk traders in Zurich including Bodmer’s mother’s family – the Orellis. English imports

43 How can you bear to imprison your great mind in the filthy city of Zurich where the great projects of your fellow citizens are all geared to making filth. [my translation]

44 I wrote tragedies on the Greek pattern. Then it occurred to me that this dramatic form could be used to treat political change, and that political truths detested by governments might be stated without punishment. So I wrote political dramas without the least pretence that they might be performed in a theatre. [my translation]
must have posed a serious challenge to the established Italian and French silk industries, particularly in 1698, when the silk crop failed in the Italian-speaking states and in France:

The popularity and the quick acceptance of Bengal raw silk in Europe [...] was undoubtedly the result of its lower cost as compared with other types of silk in the market. (Chaudhuri 1978: 346)

Thus England was a growing economic and, in particular, trading power, challenging France and the Italian states in the very industry in which the Orelli family conducted its very successful business; an industry which also accounted – to a significant extent – for the prosperity of Zurich.

By contrast, the German states were still suffering the effects of the Thirty Years War (1618-48). It took until well into the eighteenth century, for instance, to recover the population levels achieved before the war (see Bruford 1935). Many villages had disappeared completely in this terrible war, and historians agree that the population of other towns and villages was frequently reduced to a third, a quarter or even a tenth of the former number, seriously undermining the foundations of town life. The seventeenth century saw a decline in the trading strength of the northern Hanse towns, with the Dutch gaining almost a monopoly of Baltic trade during this century, and there was also a decline in the south German towns.

The Swiss towns were far more prosperous than those in the German states. During the seventeenth century they developed important export industries, particularly silk and woollen weaving, with products being exported to towns in Bavaria, Austria and Hungary. This was largely due to the skill and initiative of Protestant refugees from Italian-speaking Europe and France – like the Orelli family. The favourable geographic position of the Swiss towns also helped them become centres of trade.

Starting in the sixteenth century, they successfully overcame Dutch competition in the seventeenth, being so little affected by the Thirty Years’ War that their land seemed to ‘Simplicissimus’, for instance, an earthly paradise. (Bruford 1935: 181)

Exports in Zurich were so healthy that a tax on exports became the most important source of income for the city-state of Zurich. Indeed, Fritsche (1983) states that the problem of the eighteenth century was not finding capital but investing it, a situation which led to the export of capital through investment in foreign government bonds, as well as trading companies and plantations in Central and South America. In contrast to its rigid stance in political matters, the Zurich city-state promoted the development of commerce by progressive policies such as the setting up of a Factory Commission and Factory Regulations (1696).

The wealth was evident in the magnificent guild houses and public buildings constructed in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century. These included the Rathaus (Town Hall) built in 1694-98, as well as two guildhouses – the Zunft zur Zimmerleuten in 1708 and the
Zunfthaus zur Saffron (1719–23). Indeed, the lifestyle of the Zurich businessmen was so grand, with their “grosse Gesellschaften, Gastmähler, Concerte, und Bälle”, die nicht zur Nüchternheit der Zwinglistadt passen wollten⁴⁵, that they were subjected to criticism. We see that it was this general level of prosperity which made it possible for people to make time to devote to education, learning and the arts. For instance, Bruford states that, already in the seventeenth century, nearly half the population of Zurich could read and write, and half the children went to school.

Johann Jacob Bodmer had the opportunity of sharing in this prosperity through his Orelli family connections. Bodmer’s mother, Esther Orelli, was descended from silk weavers and traders who left Italian-speaking Locarno for religious reasons from 1555 onwards and were granted asylum by the city of Zurich. With other Locarnese, the Orelli family established silk weaving in Zurich, maintaining trading connections with the Italian states, to which they exported products, as well as exporting to France, England and the German states. By the end of the seventeenth century, the Orelli family companies dominated the economic life of the city. This is documented by the fact that nine Orelli family companies led the list of Zurich tax payers in 1678-79, with fiscal contributions more than twice as high as the second family in the list (Schulthess 1941: 119). Bodmer’s two uncles – his mother’s brothers – were both silk traders and ran a spinning mill in Italian-speaking Lugano.

Early correspondence with his friend Heinrich Meister would appear to indicate that Bodmer did not personally inherit any of the Orelli family wealth. In a letter dated 5 May 1720, he wrote:

Nachdem mich gott nicht mit so reichen erbfällen fournirt hat, daß ich mich selbst und frau und kinder so ich soll haben, mit comoditet azen und erhalten könte, so werde ich daehero genöthigt, mittel zusamenzulesen, mich und sie durchzubringen.⁴⁶ (extract from a letter reproduced in Brandes 1974: 249)

However, he was given the opportunity of a career in his Orelli uncles’ silk business, and finally secured his financial position through an advantageous marriage into another line of the Orelli family. Hermann Bodmer states that it was Bodmer’s marriage to (another) Esther Orelli in 1727 that provided the favourable financial background enabling him to engage in publishing activities (Hermann Bodmer 1897: 44). His substantial financial involvement in the Orelli publishing company that he later founded with his nephew, Conrad Orelli, is

⁴⁵ Great receptions, banquets, concerts and balls, that were quite out of step with the sobriety of the Zwingli city (Zurich) [my translation]

⁴⁶ Since God has not supplied me with a rich inheritance sufficient to comfortably azen [the verb ‘azen’ is not listed in any of the contemporary dictionaries consulted] and keep myself and any wife or children I may have, I am obliged to gather together funds with which I can support myself and them. [my translation]
substantiated by loan documents still held in the Bodmer archive at the Zentralbibliothek in Zurich. All his later works were published by this publishing company.

In terms of Lefevere’s patronage concept, it is clear that the economic components of this concept are very significant as far as Johann Jacob Bodmer was concerned. Zurich’s prosperity in the early eighteenth century, particularly as compared to the German states, would have created an overall climate in which greater discretionary income was available to further literary pursuits. Bodmer himself shared in this prosperity through his Orelli family connections. Returning to my initial question about the remoteness of a sea-faring nation like England for the land-locked city of Zurich, it is also evident that, for those engaged in business, as were Bodmer’s Orelli family, England was a nation of particular interest in view of its increasingly important position in world trade.

### 4.3 Bodmer’s life

#### 4.3.1 Childhood and education

Having outlined the political, religious and economic background in Zurich, I now turn to Bodmer’s own life and career. The Zurich history books make few references to the Bodmer family before the eighteenth century, although it was clearly established within Zurich’s exclusive group of ruling families, since otherwise Johann Jacob Bodmer’s father, Hans Jacob Bodmer, would not have received a position as the minister in Greifensee, near Zurich. The main historiographic reference to the Bodmer family before the time of Johann Jacob Bodmer is to Obmann Hans Heinrich Bodmer, the leader of the Zurich uprising of 1712-13, and his brother, who published a weekly newspaper called the *Ordinari Wochenzeitung*.

Of his idyllic early years as the son of the minister in Greifensee, Bodmer retained fond memories all his life. Recalling the streams, hills and trees of the panorama stretching from the Glarus Alps to the little town of Regensburg, the eighty-year-old wrote:

> Meine Wollust war, im Sommer in dem See mich zu kühlen, in Holz und Feld und Wald herumzustreifen, im Winter auf dem befrornen See schwebend zu laufen.\(^47\) (quoted in Ernst 1938: 21)

The various accounts of Bodmer’s life (see section 1.2 above) reveal that, during his childhood years at home, his reading included Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* in Albrecht von Halberstadt’s translation (1545) reworked by Jörg Wickram, and the Bible – in particular the Old Testament. This unencumbered childhood in the countryside outside Zurich was in stark contrast to the restricted atmosphere in the city itself.

\(^{47}\) In summer I delighted in cooling off in the lake, roaming in the woods, fields and forests, and in winter I enjoyed skating on the frozen lake. [my translation]
However, the idyllic period came to an end when Bodmer was sent to Zurich to further his Latin studies, being placed in the care of an Orelli uncle who lived there. This move would presumably have taken place in 1714 at the latest, when Bodmer was 16, the age of entry to the *Collegium Humanitatis* at the Fraumünster. From 16 to 18 he would have attended the *Humanitatis*, and then, from 18 onwards, the *Collegium Carolinum*. As outlined above, the training provided at the *Carolinum* was narrow-minded and conservative, with the only possible modifying influence being the *Antistes* (head of the Reformed Church) at that time, Peter Zeller, who, although he opposed Baptists and Pietists, is said to have represented Enlightenment thought (Wysling 1983b: 112). Zeller became Antistes in 1714 and died in 1718, the year that Bodmer broke off his theological training at the *Carolinum* (May 1918). For Bodmer, the chief outcomes of this schooling appear to have been a dogged determination not to comply with his father’s wish that he become a minister, and the creation of a circle of friends who included his later collaborators Johann Jacob Breitinger, Heinrich Meister and Jakob Zimmermann, as well as Scheuchzer, who may well have been an important influence on Bodmer in the scientific as well as the political domain.

The other important influences in Bodmer’s intellectual development in this period came from his reading in French, German and Latin, some of it discovered in his uncle’s book collection while other books came from friends at the *Carolinum*. His favourite author was the seventeenth century German poet, translator and literary theorist, Martin Opitz – so much so that he won the nickname of ‘Opitz’ among his friends. In Latin Bodmer read Virgil, Horace, Cicero, Juvenal, and particularly Homer, with enjoyment. Through Pierre Bayle’s *Dictionnaire* he learnt French, and subsequently read Fénelon’s *Aventures de Télémaque*, and John Locke’s philosophy in French translation. Bodmer’s later correspondence with the Italian scholar Calepio also makes frequent mentions of Orelli family members travelling between Zurich and Bergamo, where his uncle had an office, and there were many exchanges of books and letters between the two centres (Donati 1900: 255). It seems likely that the young Bodmer was exposed to significant Italian influences during the four years he spent in his uncle’s home.

The early exposure to Italian influences was further reinforced when it became clear that Bodmer was determined not to become a minister and he was instead apprenticed to his uncle’s business with the idea of becoming a silk trader. In May 1718 he travelled first to Geneva and then to Lyons, the centre of the French silk business. In July he returned home briefly, and a few days later he was on his way to his uncles’ business in Lugano. However he paid little heed to his commercial studies, travelling instead to places like Milan, Bergamo and Genoa. In Milan he admired the paintings by Holbein and Dürer in the Ambrosian Library, and in Bergamo he bought the works of the Renaissance poet Vida. Tasso’s *Gerusalemme liberato* also became a favourite work. Donati comments that during this brief period in the Italian-speaking region, Bodmer learnt Italian well enough to read Italian classics in the original language and even to write poetry in Italian. In addition to languages,
he was also interested in cultures and peoples. "Noch mehr als die Litteratur studierte Bodmer indessen die Menschen in ihren Sitten und Gebräuchen [...]."48 (ibid: 249). In addition to Vida and Tasso, Bodmer also returned home to Zurich in 1719 with works by the French authors Montaigne and Corneille, and Addison’s Spectator in (abridged) French translation.

Using Lefevere’s ‘patronage’ approach, this outline shows how, at an impressionable age, Bodmer was subjected to negative environmental constraints emanating from the religious and political conservatism of the city of Zurich as well as the wishes and influence of his own father. At the same time, however, he also experienced positive influences (or ‘constraints’, as Lefevere expresses it) from outside the literary system – the freedom of rural life, intellectual stimulation from his reading in French, German and Latin, and in particular from the seventeenth-century German author and translator Martin Opitz, and from an early exposure to Italian language and literature.

All of these influences were ideological ‘constraints’ that had a significant impact in furthering Bodmer’s subsequent rewriting of literature. They fostered in him a reformist viewpoint in opposition to the established powers (the Zurich church and state; possibly also, to some extent, the dominant French power) and made him receptive to different cultures and new currents of thought.

4.3.2 Historian and professor

Bodmer’s correspondence of this period shows that he was already full of plans for publishing a moral weekly based on the Spectator and establishing a printing company. However, upon returning to Zurich he initially took up an unpaid position at the Staatskanzlei (chancellery office). His intention in doing so, as he stated in a letter to Breitinger (undated but probably written in 1720), was related to the position of Professor of Swiss History at the Collegium Carolinum. He had not taken up Breitinger’s suggestion that he register an interest in the position, he wrote, for reasons he would reveal to him one day, but he did concede that his name was little known (“fair peu de bruit”). Clearly he was aware of a critical lack of ‘status’ at this stage. He had therefore begun spending time at the chancellery office in order to improve his chances of obtaining the position in future:

Quoiqu’il soit, j’ai commencé à aller frequenter La Stad Canzley, pour me fait remarquer, et je tâche à semer le bruit foncé ou non, de ma capacité en l’histoire. [...] Je roule encore un autre dessein dans la tête, qui est d’ériger une nouvelle imprimerie [...].49 (J.J. Bodmer 1720)

48 However, even more than literature, Bodmer studied people, their customs and habits. [my translation]

49 However, I have begun frequenting the Stadtkanzlei (Zurich chancellory office) so that I may be observed, and I am endeavouring to create the impression – justified or not – that I am knowledgeable about history. I also have another plan in my head – to manage a new publishing house. [my translation]
It was not until 1725 that the history position became vacant, and even then he was not appointed professor but only Verweser (administrator). Not until 1731 was he granted the title of professor, which was to be particularly significant in terms of his 'status' – another important constraint outlined by Lefevre within his concept of 'patronage'. He held this position for almost half a century, until 1775. Bodmer himself admitted that without his professorship he would have been a 'lost' person, and that the appointment only came about as the result of having the right connections:

Ich würde in den Ruf eines unbrauchbaren und verlorenen Menschen gekommen sein, wenn ich nicht, eher durch Empfehlungen als durch Verdienste, den Professorat der helvetischen Geschichte erhalten hätte.\(^{50}\) (quoted in Ernst 1938: 24)

Bodmer was active as a historian throughout his life – as a teacher, author and publisher – and was instrumental in the foundation of a number of historical societies, the first of them being the 'Helvetische Gesellschaft' in 1727.

### 4.3.3 Collaboration with Breitinger

Bodmer's lifelong colleague and companion in most of the fields in which he worked was Johann Jacob Breitinger (1701-76). Breitinger belonged to a highly-regarded Zurich family which over the centuries had numbered several leading scholars (for a detailed account on Breitinger's life and literary career see Hermann Bodmer 1897). Breitinger's forebears included his own namesake, the seventeenth-century Antistes, Johann Jacob Breitinger (1575-1645), who was responsible for important revisions to the Zurich Bible. With Bodmer, Breitinger attended the Collegium Humanitatis and the Collegium Carolinum. Ordained in 1720, he published an edited version of the Roman poet Persius with a commentary in 1723, a four-volume critical edition of the Septuaginta in 1730-32, and his major work on aesthetic theory, the Critische Dichtkunst, in 1740. In 1731 he was appointed Professor of Hebrew at both the Collegium Carolinum and the Collegium Humanitatis, and in 1745 Professor for Greek Literature at the Carolinum and simultaneously Canon at the Grossmünster Church.

Bodmer and Breitinger first worked together in the group that published the Discourse der Mahlern. A close collaboration in the field of aesthetic theory continued for the rest of their lives. Examination of the correspondence between the two men reveals, for instance, that while engaged on his first translation of Paradise Lost, Bodmer sent Breitinger the drafts to read through. Later, Breitinger read his Critische Dichtkunst out loud to Bodmer, section for section, while it was being written. The two men would take frequent long walks together, often along the Limmat and Sihl rivers, during which they would discuss their current

---

\(^{50}\) I would have attained the reputation of being a useless and lost person had I not been appointed Professor of Swiss History – more as the result of recommendations than on my own merit. [my translation]
projects. Bodmer recalled, for instance, how the *Critische Dichtkunst* had been a constant subject of conversation:

\[\ldots\] die beständige Materie unserer Unterredung, wenn ich mit diesem meinem wertesten Freunde an dem Gestade der Lindemag [Limmat] oder der Sihl einsam gespaziert.\(^{51}\) (quoted in Baechtold 1892: 549)

In many cases, Bodmer provided the preface to Breitinger’s works, while Breitinger wrote prefaces for Bodmer. In their collaboration, Bodmer excelled in modern languages and was the inventive spirit of the two while Breitinger had the stronger grounding in ancient languages, was hard-working and a more thorough systematician. As Bodmer wrote to his friend Laurenz Zellweger, shortly before completion of the *Critische Dichtkunst*: “Ich bin mit Herrn Breitinger ganz vergniigt: er hat mehr Arbeitsamkeit als ein Maultier”\(^{52}\) (quoted in Baechtold 1892: 551).

Bodmer outlived most of his contemporaries including his younger colleague Breitinger. At the end of his life, full of sorrow, he wrote of the final loss of his friend and companion:

\[\ldots\] auch Breitinger ist nicht mehr. Der Mitdenker meiner Gedanken, der Gesellschafter meines Lebens, der Zeuge meiner Handlungen hat mich verlassen.\(^{53}\) (quoted in Ernst 1938: 28).

### 4.3.4 Translator and translation theorist

In 1721 Bodmer, Breitinger and a group of friends began publishing their ‘moral weekly’, the *Discourse der Mahlern*, modelled on the English *Spectator*. In terms of my initial question as to why a scholar in Zurich should have taken an interest in English literature, it seems likely that part of Bodmer’s original fascination with this literature arose out of his strong interest in the aesthetic ideas expressed by Addison – some of which he may already have encountered in his Italian travels.

In 1720 Bodmer had begun learning English with the sole assistance of a grammar book, ‘Ludewigs Grammatik’, as he wrote to his friend Heinrich Meister (see Füssli 1783: 142). Through his friend Laurenz Zellweger, who had studied in Leyden, Holland, and had assembled an English library, he now made his initial acquaintance with English literature in the original. His first letter to Zellweger of May 1723 requested English books and expressed the belief that Milton’s *Paradise Lost* or Butler’s *Hudibras* might suit him. Bodmer followed up this first request with another letter expressing his ‘hunger’ for English books and

\[^{51}\text{[\ldots] when I went out walking along the deserted banks of the Limmat or Sihl rivers with my dearest friend [the *Critische Dichtkunst* was] our constant subject of conversation [my translation]}\]

\[^{52}\text{I am very happy with Mr Breitinger – he works harder than a mule. [my translation]}\]

\[^{53}\text{Breitinger is gone too. The man who thought with me, kept me company all my life and witnessed all my actions has left me. [my translation]}\]
requesting Addison’s *Cato*, Dryden’s *All for Love*, Congreve’s *Double Dealer* and Cibber’s *Careless Husband*.

Having finally received the 1711 Tonson edition of *Paradise Lost* from Zellweger, he left Zurich in autumn 1723 for his parent’s house in Greifensee, where he began translating Milton’s epic – first for amusement, and then increasingly seriously. The work soon consumed him to the extent of ceasing all correspondence with his friends and identifying even with his author’s blindness – an extreme case indeed of Roscommon’s recommendation to “choose an author as you choose a friend: [...] Your thoughts, your words, your styles, your souls agree, No longer his interpreter, but he” (quoted in Robinson 2002: 177). To Breitinger he finally wrote (at the end of 1723):


In January 1724, Breitinger wrote to Zellweger that his friend hoped to complete the translation within the next few weeks. However, in March 1724, Bodmer informed Zellweger that he would be keeping the copy of *Paradise Lost* a little longer since other commitments had prevented him completing the translation, and a handwritten note in Bodmer’s own copy of the translation states that it was completed in May 1725 (having been begun in October 1723).

The translation of *Paradise Lost* continued to occupy Bodmer until the end of his life. He later referred to his first translation of *Paradise Lost* as his ‘Swiss’ translation. By 1740 he was reworking it for a second edition, published by Conrad Orell und Comp. in 1742 under the title *Johann Miltons Episches Gedichte von dem Verlohrnen Paradiese*, and later referred to by Bodmer as his ‘German’ *Paradise Lost*. The radical changes he made to the text at this stage are analysed in chapters six and seven. This was followed by a third version, his self-styled ‘poetic’ *Paradise Lost*, published under the title of *Johann Miltons verlohrnes Paradies* in 1754 together with a critical history of *Paradise Lost*. As Bender points out, while the first two books of the 1754 edition were largely unchanged with respect to the second edition, the rest of the epic underwent further revisions at this stage, in the interests of reader acceptability:

---

54 This week I crept back out of chaos and ancient night and am now hovering with the arch-enemy near the sun, thumbing my nose at archangel Michael and Uriel in the hope of being shown Paradise, Adam and Eve. So anyone who imagines I am in Greifensee is deceiving themselves. Farewell. [my translation]
The fourth version of the translation was published in 1759 under the same title, with very few changes, and was followed by a fifth version in 1769 and a sixth in 1780.

Bodmer translated a number of other English works, although none of them had the impact of his *Paradise Lost*. In 1737 he published a translation of Samuel Butler’s *Hudibras* and in 1747 his translation of the first three books of Alexander Pope’s *The Dunciad* appeared. At the end of his life, in 1781 and 1782, he published translations of selected ballads taken from Thomas Percy’s *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*. Not long before this, in 1778 his complete translations of Homer had been published (in two volumes) – soon to be eclipsed by Johann Heinrich Voss’s Homer translation of 1793.

Both Bodmer and Breitinger wrote on the theory of translation in the years between 1740 and 1746, and their ideas are discussed in the chapters that follow. In 1779 Bodmer wrote a final essay on translation, ‘Schwierigkeiten, den Homer zu verdeutschen’\(^{56}\) in which he acknowledged the greater flexibility the German language had attained through the work of writers such as Klopstock, and expressed the – almost prophetic – hope that this would enable a ‘skilful translator’ to present Homer’s true character and render his almost inimitable simplicity (reproduced in Ernst 1938: 53-56).

### 4.3.5 Publisher

In the late 1720s Bodmer was able to realise one of the goals he had set himself upon his return from his Italian travels. Soon after his marriage to Esther Orelli in 1727 he set about fulfilling his plan of establishing his own printing house, working initially with a typographer named Marcus Rordorf. Thus his first translation of *Paradise Lost*, delayed due to the difficulties encountered with the Zurich censor and the failure to find a publisher anywhere else in German-speaking Europe, was finally published by Marcus Rordorf in 1732 under the title of *Verlust des Paradieses*. Two years later Bodmer founded the book publishing company, Orell und Kompagnie, with his nephew Conrad Orelli. While Conrad Orelli ran the business, the intellectual management was in the hands of Bodmer. The Orelli publishing house was to become the main publisher of all Bodmer and Breitinger’s works, as well as those of eighteenth-century writers as eminent as Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock, Christoph Martin Wieland (his Shakespeare translations) and Ewald von Kleist. With regard to its importance for German literature, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe is said to have commented

\(^{55}\) [...] several clumsy expressions and subordinated phrases were removed, the rhythm of the prose rendered more flowing and simultaneously tighter. [my translation]

\(^{56}\) Difficulties in translating Homer into German
that this publisher did greater service to true literature than half the publishers of Germany (see Bodmer & Bodmer 1900: 18).

4.3.6 Interculturalist

In addition to initial translation activities, the development of historical interests, the commencement of teaching activities and the establishment of a publishing house, the late 1720s also saw Bodmer’s first attempts to establish a literary alliance in the German-speaking heartland – what might be described as an initial, if unsuccessful, professional interculture. He established contact with the Dresden court poet, Johann Ulrich König, and in 1725 began drawing up with him plans for a literary club called the Boberfeldische Gesellschaft57 which would publish its own journal, the Phantast. The avowed aim of this society was to combat the ‘frightful taste’ of the Patriot, a Hamburg publication, and its main contributor, Barthold Heinrich Brockes (J.J.Bodmer 1881: 33, 139, 140, 149), although König’s comments in the correspondence would appear to indicate that Bodmer continued to recognise good qualities in some of Brockes’ work (ibid: 152, 153). Bodmer planned articles which would include critical items on German and foreign writers and poets, poetry as well as translations, and invited writers to contribute. König found a publisher and provided a list of further suggestions for articles. However, this venture failed due to differences between the two men, and in October 1727 König returned various manuscripts to Bodmer commenting that the Boberfeldische Gesellschaft was now unlikely to come to anything.

This unsuccessful attempt was followed, in the 1730s by Bodmer’s involvement in the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture which is discussed in the following chapter.

In 1742, after this interculture fell apart, Bodmer founded a literary club in Zurich, the Wachsende Gesellschaft. He also maintained an extensive correspondence with the main German and Swiss literary figures of his day – in addition to König these included Brockes and Friedrich von Hagedorn in Hamburg, Johann Christoph Gottsched in Leipzig, and Albrecht Haller in Berne. As an active interculturalist, however, his correspondence was not limited to the German cultural sphere, since one of his most important correspondents from 1728 onwards was the Italian scholar, Pietro dei Conti di Calepio, with whom he corresponded in French (Bodmer’s letters), Italian and Latin (Calepio’s letters) until 1761. The significance that Bodmer attached to this correspondence is indicated by the fact that in 1736 he published a German translation of extracts from it in his Brief-Wechsel von der Natur des Poetischen Geschmackes. Once again, in terms of Lefevere’s ideological ‘constraints’, the importance of Italian influence is evident.

57 Boberfeld Society [recalling Martin Opitz, of Boberfeld]
4.3.7 Literary theorist

In 1727 Bodmer published his first work on literary theory, *Von dem Einfluß und Gebrauche der Einbildungs-Kraft*58, dedicated to the German philosopher Christian Wolff. It was followed in 1736 by the edition of letters from Calepio, and in 1740-41 the four most important Swiss publications in this field appeared – Bodmer’s defence of Milton’s *Paradise Lost* entitled *Critische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren* (1740) and his *Critische Betrachtungen über die poetischen Gemälde*59 (1741), and Breitinger’s *Critische Dichtkunst* (1740) and *Critische Abhandlung von der Natur den Absichten und dem Gebrauche der Gleichnisse*60 (1741).

The two Swiss clearly rejected the ornate Baroque literary style – the ‘Schwulst’ – of the previous century in German-speaking Europe and adhered to the Enlightenment principle that poetry should imitate nature. Where they began to tread new paths, however, was in focusing on the ability of the imagination to paint unknown worlds, extraterrestrial beings or situations that had never existed. Here they drew on Addison’s concept of the ‘secondary pleasures of the imagination’ as well as the German philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz’s (1646-1716) concept of ‘possible worlds’. As Bodmer stated in a 1728 publication, “[...] ein Scribent baut sich selbst in seiner erhitzten Phantasey neue Welten”61 (J.J. Bodmer 1728: 110). The poet is no longer merely a copier of nature but a creator in his own right. In thus extending and enhancing the concept of what was seen as natural, and stressing the abilities of the imagination, they appear for Wysling to anticipate Klopstock, even Johann Gottfried Herder and Goethe (Wysling 1983b: 141). Thus he places them, in terms of literary history, between Gottsched, on the one side, and Lessing, followed by the *Sturm und Drang* movement, on the other.

Another important area in the aesthetic theory of the Swiss was their emphasis on the role of literature in moving the emotions, rather than merely instructing. This, they argued, could only be achieved through the Miraculous (‘Wunderbare’). Although imagination was still subject to the control of reason, it had a creative role in presenting new and miraculous ideas that extend beyond the real world. The use of powerful words with a strong impact, the so-called ‘Machtwörter’, was a useful tool in this endeavour.

The central role of *Paradise Lost* in this project is evident, both in the time and effort that Bodmer devoted to arguing the case for the work, and in his own statements on it. In his

58 Of the influence and use of the power of imagination

59 Critical considerations relating to poetic depictions

60 Critical treatise on the nature, intentions and use of allegories

61 An author creates new worlds for himself in his heated imagination
Critische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren, for instance, he explains that Paradise Lost is the ideal vehicle for presenting his ideas on the Miraculous and its link to the Probable, and this is the reason why he has written and published an extended treatise in defence of the work:

Ich habe diese Arbeit unternommen, [...] um meine Lehren von dem Verwundersamen und dessen notwendigen Verbindung mit dem Wahrscheinlichen, insonderheit in Absicht auf die unsichtbare Welt der Geister, auf eine angenehmere und lebhaftere Weise vorzutragen. Dieses vortreffliche Gedicht wird mir in der That die bequemsten Exempel lehnen, die ich bey deutschen Poeten vergebens suchen würde, meine Lehrsätze zu erklären [...] (J.J. Bodmer 1740b: 4)

The crucial importance of Paradise Lost, not just as a pivotal element in Bodmer’s arguments on literary theory but also a catalyst in his aesthetic thinking, is pointed out by Bender. In his view, although Italian theorists such as Calepio and Ludovico Muratori, the Frenchman Jean Baptiste Dubos and the English writer Addison were important in the development of Bodmer and Breitinger’s aesthetic ideas, the experience of reading Milton’s Paradise Lost was paramount:

Man kann Milton gleichsam als Kristallisationspunkt der schweizerischen Ästhetik überhaupt bezeichnen. Nur in Hinblick auf sein Epos vom Paradise Lost gewinnt sie ihre eigentliche Bedeutung. (Bender 1967: 259)

4.3.8 Middle High German scholar

The final area in which Bodmer’s work was to have a significant impact was in the history of German language and literature. During the years following the collapse of the Zurich-Leipzig interculture Bodmer’s endeavours were to culminate in his pathbreaking work in the field of Middle High German literature. In this field he is particularly known for his discoveries and publications relating to the Nibelungenlied and the Manesse Liederhandschrift (see Baechtold 1892: 676 et seq., Wysling 1983b: 145).

62 I have undertaken this work [...] in order to present, in a more pleasant and lively manner, my teachings on the Miraculous and its essential connection to the Probable, in particular with respect to the invisible world of spirits. This outstanding poem will indeed provide me with ideal examples for explaining my propositions—examples that I would seek in vain in the works of German poets [...]. [my translation]

63 Milton can be seen as the true crystallisation point for Swiss aesthetics. The real importance of these aesthetics has to be seen in relation to Paradise Lost. [my translation]
4.4 ‘Patronage’ and Bodmer

My outline of Bodmer’s life and work has shown the enormous range of his interests, from literary critic, aesthetic theoretician, author and translator to teacher, historian and publisher.

In terms of Lefevere’s ‘patronage’ concept his activities as an interculturalist and rewriter of literature were strongly influenced by constraints in the ‘ideological’ sphere. On the one hand he rebelled against the negative constraints of political and religious orthodoxy in Zurich, developing a strong reformist viewpoint. On the other hand, he was also influenced by positive factors (‘constraints’) including a strong exposure to Italian influences, the impact of Enlightenment thought, and possibly also the growing political and economic power of England on the European stage, that opened his mind to new currents of thought and in particular to ideas on the role of imagination in literature that were being developed in Italy and discussed by Addison, as well as to more faithful approaches to translation like those adopted by some Italian translators (which were similar to the precepts advocated by Pierre-Daniel Huet).

In the economic sphere, the second area of ‘constraints’ identified by Lefevere, Bodmer’s translation activities were furthered by Zurich’s prosperity and the wealth of the Orelli family, while in the third area, that of ‘status’, there were further environmental factors that were of critical assistance in his work and influence as a translator (critical importance of his professorship at the Collegium Carolinum).

His life story shows how he responded to the limitations that Protestant and political conservatism placed on him by turning his back on the establishment career path mapped out for him, embracing new ideas from the more progressive spheres of his life – the Italian arena – and new upcoming sources – England – and seeking new outlets for his considerable energies – a career in the literary sphere. It shows how, as an interculturalist, he worked in the overlap between different cultures.

Having examined the general environmental factors that impacted upon Bodmer’s work as a translator using Lefevere’s concept of ‘patronage’, my next chapter will return to Pym’s interculture approach, examining in detail the activities and debates within the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture to which Bodmer belonged in the 1730s, through which he played an important part in the cultural realignment of German-speaking Europe in the eighteenth century.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZURICH</th>
<th>LEIPZIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.J. Bodmer born in Greifensee</td>
<td>J.C. Gottsched born nr. Königsberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.J. Breitinger born in Zurich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Paradise Lost translation started</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boberfeld. Ges. planned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodm. app. Professor at Carolinum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gottsched app. Senior in poetische Gesellschaft, Leipzig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsche Gesellschaft statutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gottsched app. Prof. at Uni Leipzig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st ed. of Gott. Critische Dichtkunst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>END OF ZURICH-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BEGINNING OF ZURICH—**  
1st Paradise Lost transl. published  
1732  
Orell & Comp. book publ. founded  
1734  
Calepio corresp. published  
Bodmer becomes a member of Deutsche Gesellschaft.  
1736  
2nd Aeneas article in Beyträge  
1737  
Bodm. defense of Paradise Lost  
(Crit. Abh. von dem Wunderbaren)  
1740  
Breitinger’s ‘Von der Kunst der Übersetzung’  
1741  
Bodmer carries out revisions to Paradise Lost transl., July-Sept.  
1st issue of Sammlung Critischer Schriften  
1742  
2nd Paradise Lost transl. publ.  
‘Abhandlung von der Schreibart in Miltons verlorenen Paradiese’  
1743  
Finck’s ‘Bavarian sausage’ article on Schwarz’s Aeneas transl  
Final issue of Sammlung Critischer Schriften  
1744  
LEIPZIG INTERCULTURE  
Time line for the Zurich-Leipzig interculture  
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Chapter Five – Workings of the Interculture

This detailed account of the translation debates conducted within the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture of the 1730s begins with a review of the work already done on German translation theory in this period. It then presents the main scholars and publications that figured in the debates, and proceeds to a chronological account showing how the process of negotiation conducted within this professional interculture resulted in a shift in translation norms.

5.1 Review of the literature on early eighteenth-century translation

Fränzel’s seminal work (1914) argues that, in Germany, translation had become temporarily less important at the beginning of the eighteenth century, but that this lull ended in the 1730s, when early Enlightenment thinkers led by Gottsched focused on translated literature again, as a means to increase awareness of Latin and Greek classics. The first treatise on translation, ‘Bild eines geschickten Übersetzers’, by Georg Venzky (1704-57), appeared in the Beyträge zur Critischen Historie Der Deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit in 1734. This treatise reflected the educational goals of the Enlightenment, which included the accurate and complete translation of ‘useful’ works. Venzky attempted to reconcile this objective with the continued use of ‘good German’ in translation, a central demand of the Gottsched group. Subsequent writers in the Beyträje reiterated these demands. The easier it was to imagine that a translation was an original German work, they argued, the better was the translation. At the same time innovators were beginning to reject the demand for ‘good’ German, and the Swiss – Johann Jacob Bodmer and Johann Jacob Breitinger – were developing their ideas on translation. Fränzel believes the Swiss ideas originated with the seventeenth-century English poet and translator John Dryden. He argues that the Swiss ideas, which emphasized the priority of the original text in translation over the focus on ‘good’ German, became established by the end of the decade. As a result, Johann Christoph Gottsched found himself obliged to fight his enemies (Bodmer and Breitinger) on their own ground, using their own arguments.

Fuchs (1935) examines the translation theories of Venzky, Gottsched and Breitinger as well as actual translations carried out by members of the Deutsche Gesellschaft, and links these

64 Portrait of a skilled translator
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66 German Society (in Leipzig)
to the poetic theory of the time. Diagrammatically he presents these links in the form of a triangle (1935: 10), with translation theory, poetic theory and linguistic theory at the three corners of the triangle. Poetic practice and translation practice are located inside the triangle, with links to the corners of poetic theory and linguistic theory (but, interestingly, not to translation theory).

The appearance of Störig's German anthology of writings on translation theory (1963) was followed by the publication, in the 1960s and 1970s, of a number of further studies on aspects of eighteenth century German translation, including general overviews by Purdie (1965) and Krauss (1977), and Plückebaum's more detailed description (1966) of Bodmer's 1746 essay on translation theory, 'Von der erforderen [sic] Genauigkeit beym Uebersetzen'\(^67\). Plückebaum touches on Bodmer's handling of metaphor in translation and his differentiation of faithfulness to content from faithfulness to linguistic expression, and considers that an investigation into how far Bodmer fulfilled his demand for faithful translation in his *Paradise Lost* translation would be worth conducting. For Sdun (1967) the Enlightenment in Germany sees the first beginnings, still half-conscious, of an attempt to move readers towards the source text, rather than vice versa. Huber (1968) examines the link between literary criticism and translation theory from 1730 onwards.

Senger's comprehensive study (1971) of developments in German translation from 1734 to 1746 follows Fränzel and Fuchs, examining in detail the translation theories of Venzky, Gottsched and Breitinger, and adding the Bodmer essay to which Plückebaum had drawn attention. She regards Breitinger's definition of translation as being related to Dryden's ideas, agreeing in this respect with Fränzel. In addition, she argues that the theories of the Gottsched group were influenced by the seventeenth-century French translator Pierre-Daniel Huet. She outlines Huet's theory in detail in her study and considers it to have been a model ('vorbildlich') for Venzky. In my study I re-examine this question of possible precursors to the Gottsched/Venzky (Leipzig) and Bodmer/Breitinger (Zurich) approaches.

Senger also traces the impact of different translation approaches on two Bible translations carried out during the 1730s: The Wertheimer Bible, published in 1735, complied with the translation principles of the Gottsched group, focusing on translation in accordance with the 'rules of the German language' and modernising proper names in accordance with contemporary usage. The Junckherrott Bible of 1732, by contrast, carried the principles of fidelity to the divinely-inspired word to the utmost extreme.

Berman (1992) shows how the tradition of translation in Germany, starting with Luther, defined itself in opposition to the culture of France. He characterises the Swiss critic Breitinger as a literalist, and places him firmly within the 'dominant German tradition',

---

\(^67\) Of the requisite accuracy in translation
together with Leibniz, Voss and Herder. This tradition maintained that the German language lacked ‘culture’ and must expand through faithful translation in order to acquire this culture.

An exception to this German translation tradition, he argues, was the period of the Enlightenment with Gottsched and Venzky, which brought a trend of ‘purely formal translations’ described as ‘gallicising’ by contemporary Germans:

[...] these rationalist and empirical trends, which do not even have the superb ease of the classical French “non-translations”, are not peculiar to the dominant tendencies of German translation in the eighteenth century; they rather represent a phenomenon [...] of negation of the meaning of translation. (Berman 1992: 37)

In chapter three (sections 5.1 and 5.2) I have already shown that, contrary to Berman’s view, German translation theory and practice prior to the eighteenth century was characterised by a differing norms, with both domesticating translation and advocates of faithful rendering. For this reason it is difficult to identify any single existing tradition to which Gottsched’s group might have provided an exception. Moreover, as I have already noted, not all German translators in this prior period had directed their primary focus towards developing the German language – the Swiss translators of the Bible were a case in point, and this was recognised by participants in the debate of the 1730s (see section 4.6 of this chapter).

By contrast, Stackelberg, in his introduction to the Graeber/Roche bibliography of German retranslations (1988), argues that there was no national translation culture in Germany like that which had developed in France since the sixteenth century. In terms of translation history, he argues, the eighteenth century in Germany appears as a huge field of experimentation. There is no clear line or tradition as was evident in France during that period, and a German translation tradition did not emerge until the end of the eighteenth century:


Clearly, commentators on the history of translation and translation theory in the period I am examining are divided on whether any central translation tradition or ‘norm’ can be identified for this period. In addition, opinions also differ on the positions adopted by the opposing

---

68 Alongside the adherents of the ‘French translation manner’ we find their opponents in increasing numbers from the forties onwards. But what are their positions? Not until the turn of the century (18th - 19th) does it become clear where German translation history is leading. With Humboldt, Herder, Goethe, Schlegel, Tieck, Schleiermacher and a number of others, Germany’s translators finally leave behind them their French precursors, in both theory and practice. [my translation]
groups in the debates of the 1730s, on the extent to which one or other of these positions had been developed from previous traditions and the extent to which they formed the basis for later developments by translation theorists such as Goethe or Schleiermacher.

5.2 Scholars and journals involved in the translation debate

The analysis in this chapter focuses on the professional interculture that developed towards the end of the 1720s, with its two centres in Zurich and Leipzig. The main figures in this debate were Johann Jacob Bodmer and Johann Jacob Breitinger (introduced in the previous chapter), and Johann Christoph Gottsched.

5.2.1 Johann Christoph Gottsched

Johann Christoph Gottsched (1700-66) was born in the extreme north-east of the German-speaking world, near Königsberg in East Prussia. He attended the university in Königsberg, where he was strongly influenced by the philosophy of Wolff and Leibniz. In 1724, in order to escape being recruited into the Prussian Army (because of his height) he moved to Leipzig. At this time Leipzig was the most important trading centre of the mid-German states, the home of regular trade fairs and a university of increasing importance. In 1730 he was appointed extraordinary professor of poetry at the University of Leipzig, and in 1734 ordinary professor of logic and metaphysics (Crüger 1884: xxii-xxiii).

Gottsched’s work and influence extended from his efforts to establish a standardised form of written German (the language of educated people in Meissen near Dresden) and a standardised system of poetic aesthetics, to a wide-ranging reform of the stage. It was in the area of poetic aesthetics, above all, that he came into conflict with the Swiss. Gottsched first set out his approach in his Versuch einer Critischen Dichtkunst vor die Deutschen, a comprehensive handbook first published in Leipzig in 1730. In this work he discussed the different genres of literature, including epic, comedy and tragedy. The style of writing in an epic should always be pure, clear and natural, he maintained. A tragedy must hold to the unities of action, time and place. In tragedy as in comedy he believed that the French had achieved perfection. In contrast to the Swiss position, he held that the miraculous (‘Wunderbare’) must at all times remain within the limits set by nature. Imagination in literature should always be held in check by reason. The ideas contained in his Critische Dichtkunst were developed further in various articles contained in the Beyträge zur Critischen Historie (ibid: xxxiii-xlvi).

---

69 Critical art of poetry for the Germans
5.2.2 The *Deutsche Gesellschaft*

In 1726 Gottsched became ‘Senior’ (effective head) of the Leipzig ‘poetische Gesellschaft’ (the later *Deutsche Gesellschaft*). The programmatic statement in the society statutes of 1727 laid particular emphasis on his objectives of establishing pure and correct German.

Man soll sich allezeit der Reinigkeit und Richtigkeit der Sprache befei17(17; d.i., nicht nur alle ausländische Wörter, sondern auch alle Deutsche unrichtige Ausdrückungen und Provinzial-Redensarten vermeiden [...] (quoted in Blackall 1959: 107)

He also raised the profile of the society by appointing new members to the society from outside Leipzig, and began using it as the vehicle through which he could realise his own ideas. The *Deutsche Gesellschaft*, under the leadership of Gottsched, was to become active in the field of both literary aesthetics and translation practice and debate, publishing three volumes of *Eigene Schriften und Übersetzungen* in the years 1730, 1734 and 1738, as well as its periodical *Beyträge zur Critischen Historie Der Deulschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit*.

In his writings on professional intercultures, Anthony Pym refers to membership rites within intercultures. It could be argued that, for the professional interculture I am examining, the *Deutsche Gesellschaft* in Leipzig played at least some role in determining membership of this particular social space. Bodmer’s contributions were published in the *Beyträge*, but not until 1737 was he accepted as a member of the *Deutsche Gesellschaft*, an ‘honour’ communicated to him in a letter from Gottsched dated 23 June 1737. In December Bodmer replied, indicating his great pleasure at this decision:


Bodmer’s *Deutsche Gesellschaft* membership certificate is still to be found amongst the documents contained in the Bodmer archive at the *Zentralbibliothek* in Zurich.

---

70 At all times it is necessary to make a great effort to cultivate purity and accuracy in language. In other words, not just all foreign words but also all incorrect expressions in German and all provincial figures of speech must be avoided. [my translation]

71 Society papers and translations

72 You may well believe me when I say that I read the news of my admission into the scholarly *Deutsche Gesellschaft* in your esteemed letter of the 23rd June with the greatest of pleasure. I intend to recognise my obligation to the said [Leipzig?] Society with a respectful letter of thanks. [my translation]
5.2.3 Beyträge zur critischen Historie

The forum for the debates on translation conducted within the Deutsche Gesellschaft – the Zurich-Leipzig interculture – was, initially at least, its periodical, the Beyträge zur critischen Historie.

The first issue of the Beyträge appeared in 1732. It was published, as its title page indicated, by a number of members of the Deutsche Gesellschaft in Leipzig and printed by Bernhard Christoph Breitkopf. In his preface to the first edition, Gottsched declared that the new ‘historisch-critische Monatszeitschrift’ would evaluate the merits and deficiencies of German authors according to basic rules, print discussions on German literature and criticism and publish extracts from old and new German books (Crüger 1884: xxxii). In the 32 issues in eight volumes published between 1732 and 1744, articles printed included catalogues of German translations of Latin and Greek authors (the catalogue of Latin authors, published in the first issue of 1732, was prompted by a similar catalogue, Traduttori Italiani73, published in 1720 by Scipione Maffei), discussions of Italian, French and German translations of the Greek author Anacreon, discussion of a popular German translation of Ovid’s Metamorphoses done in the 13th century and revised in the 17th century, and German translations of Cicero, Virgil, Pliny and Longinus. Few of the articles published in the Beyträge were signed, but we can assume that a significant number were written by Gottsched himself. Other authors of articles on translation included Wolf Balthasar Adolph von Steinwehr, Venzky and Bodmer.

5.2.4 Sammlung critischer, poetischer und anderer geistvoller Schriften

While Gottsched’s publication forum for most of the 1730s was the Beyträge, Bodmer had set up his own publishing company in Zurich, and it was here that almost all his own publications and those of his colleague Breitung were published from 1732 onwards. These included all the editions of Bodmer’s translation of Paradise Lost. Bodmer’s substantial financial involvement in this venture is evident from a letter dated 13 October 1737 held in the Bodmer archive, in which Konrad [sic] Orell and Comp. confirms the receipt of 450 Gulden from Professor Bodmer. In the years 1741-44 Conrad Orell and Comp. also published a series of critical papers entitled Sammlung critischer, poetischer und anderer geistvoller Schriften zur Verbesserung des Urtheils und des Witzes in den Werken der Wohldreheit und der Poesie74. After the break with Gottsched these papers continued the discussion on translation topics begun in the Beyträge such as a disputed translation of Virgil’s Aeneas, with other articles on translation including, for instance, the evaluation of a Gottsched translation of Horace and an article by Bodmer on the translation of Paradise Lost.

73 Italian translators

74 Collection of critical, poetical and other intellectual writings for the improvement of judgement and reason in works of eloquence and poetry
5.3 Debate of the 1730s – areas of agreement

Although there were areas of serious disagreement between the members of this interculture centred on Leipzig and Zurich, and a process of debate and negotiation was underway with the aim of defining what translation norms should prevail, there were also considerable areas of agreement. I begin by outlining these.

In terms of Toury’s ‘preliminary norms’, this period saw growing recognition of the importance of translating from original texts rather than from other translations. This is clear from statements made by Gottsched’s wife, Luise Adelgunde Victoria Gottsched (1713-62), a translator in her own right. In the preface to her translation of Alexander Pope’s Rape of the Lock, published in 1744, she recounted how she had been unable to obtain an original copy of the English work and had therefore done her German translation from the French version. She had already completed four books by the time she received the English original. Reading Pope in his native language caused her to greatly regret the time she had wasted with the inadequate French translation. She realised that all her efforts had been a waste of time and was furious with the French translator for ‘misleading’ her:

Ich war also über meiner verlornen Zeit, und einer Arbeit, die mir doch bereits viele Mühe gemacht hatte, ja über meinen französischen Verführer, so verdrießlich; daß ich alles voller Unmuth hinwarf, mit dem Vorsatze, allen Uebersetzungen, nach französischen Dollmetschern, gänzlich zu entsagen.75 (quoted in Tgahrt 1982: 69)

There was also some agreement in the area of ‘operational norms’. Both Gottsched and Bodmer shared the view of the French translator, Anne Dacier, that verse should be translated into prose rather than verse, arguing that preservation of the meaning was more important than attempts to preserve the form. In their Discourse der Mahlern (VII. Discours, 1722), Bodmer and Breitinger wrote: “[M]an sihet nirgend klarere Marquen von dem Schaden welchen die Reimen der Poesie thun als in den Übersetzungen.”76 (Gesellschaft der Mahler 1721-22: 54) In 1728, in the preface to his translation of Xenophanes, Gottsched states his intention of translating verse into prose and gives his reasons:

Daß man in Übersetzungen sonderlich Ursache habe, sich von der Last der Reime zu entledigen, braucht meines Erachtens keines großen Beweises. Man muß seiner Sprache schon sehr mächtig seyn, wenn man auch in

---

75 I was so annoyed at the time I had lost on a piece of work that had already caused me a great deal of trouble, and at this Frenchman who had thus misled me, that I flung everything away in anger, vowing to give up all translation from French renderings. [my translation]

76 Nowhere does one see clearer signs of the damage done to poetry by rhyme than in translations. [my translation]
5.4 Areas of difference – a chronology

I now turn to a chronological account of the substantial areas of difference that emerged in the translation debate conducted within the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture.

5.4.1 Gottsched formulates a central norm (1730)

In 1730, Gottsched published the first edition of his *Versuch einer Critischen Dichtkunst für die Deutschen*. In it he laid down the need for a pleasant, flowing German style in translated texts, and argued against translating word for word. In discussing his own translation of Horace’s *Ars poetica*, he echoed the *belles infidèles*, stating his intention of producing a translation that Germans might read without taking offence and, if possible, with enjoyment.


Gottsched also stated his belief that French literature should be a model for Germans in the same way as the Greeks had been to the Romans. The French, he argued, had provided good models for all genres of literature (ibid: 78). In accordance with this aim, later editions of the *Critische Dichtkunst* emphasized the importance of choosing the ‘right’ text for translation. Suitable texts were those providing a model that conformed with French classical traditions, and *Paradise Lost* subsequently met with considerable censure since it did not meet this requirement.

Two years earlier, in 1728, Bodmer had begun his correspondence on literary aesthetics with the Italian scholar Pietro dei Conti di Calepio, a correspondence that was to last over thirty years. From 1731 to 1732 the two men exchanged ideas on the translation of idiomatic expressions. Bodmer wanted to know whether idiomatic expressions in a poetic text should be translated literally, even if this contravened normal language usage. In posing this

---

77 In my view no great proof is required to demonstrate that there are particularly strong reasons to rid oneself of the burden of rhyme in translation. In order to express the full emphasis, beauty and merits of a foreign poet – even in prose form – one must have an extremely good command of one’s language. [my translation]

78 I was keen to translate Horace in a manner that would ensure he could be read in our language without offence and, if possible, with enjoyment. However, I would not have attained this objective had I failed to observe correct German syntax alongside purity in metre and rhyme. The ears of our compatriots are extremely delicate when it comes to these externalities. [my translation]
question, we see that there was clearly some question in Bodmer’s mind as to the validity of the rules of pleasant, flowing language established by the *belles infidèles* and Gottsched. Calepio replied that, in general, an existing similar expression should be chosen rather than introducing foreign expressions. However, he did concede that literal translation of certain expressions might be permitted in two cases. First, when the source language was old and its character well established, as in the case of Greek and Latin. Second, when the target language was young and might still gain in character, as in the case of English. In these two cases a language might be enriched by the literal translation of idiomatic expressions from another language. Bodmer appeared, in principle, to agree with these arguments (Straub 1965: 134-35). The issue of how to translate metaphoric and idiomatic expressions was to re-emerge later in the Zurich-Leipzig debate.

5.4.2 The first translation of *Paradise Lost* (1732)

In 1732, Bodmer’s first translation of *Paradise Lost*, completed in 1725, was finally published by Marcus Rordorf. In the preface, Bodmer made reference to the recently published Dutch, French and Italian translations of the work, and mentioned the earlier translations of extracts by the Italians Lorenzo Magalotti and Anton Maria Salvini (see Appendix II for a selection of extracts from this preface). The Dutch translation, written in the same verse form as the original, was praised as a good rendering of the original, which had been well received in Holland even though this verse form was unfamiliar to them. The French translation, by contrast, continually infringed the rules requiring a translator to express the spirit of the original. The Italian translator had not transgressed in this manner (although his choice of words had not always been fortunate, since he had used words suited to prose rather than poetry). An earlier German translation of *Paradise Lost* by Ernst Gottlieb von Berge (referred to by Bodmer as ‘von Berg’) had not achieved any success despite the fact that it reflected much of the character of the original poet.

In all these assessments Bodmer was clearly privileging an approach to translation that aimed to take the reader closer to the original than Gottsched would have favoured.

Bodmer went on, in his preface, to claim that his translation had captured a number of linguistic features of the original English text – the imitation of foreign languages, use of ancient but powerful words, adoption of neologisms, adaptation of syntax, use of unusual metaphors and so on. However he was not sure whether these features would be accepted in the German translation in the same way they had been accepted in the original English, due to the ‘delicacy’ of the German ear (to which Gottsched had also referred).

Daß es mir aber eben so leicht werde zu gut gehalten werden als ihm, kann ich für gewiß nicht sagen, indem vielleicht die Deutsche Sprache nicht so wie die Engelländische vonnöthen hat, sich mit fremdem Reicthum zu helfen [...] oder das Deutsche Ohr so zärtlich, daß es ihm ungewohnte Metaphoren nicht ertragen kan, und zugleich über unser Urtheil so mächtig,
Bodmer enclosed a copy of this first translation of *Paradise Lost* in a letter to Gottsched dated 5 February 1732. This marked the beginning of a seven-year correspondence between the two men. Gottsched replied, on 7 October, enclosing a copy of his critical review of Bodmer’s translation for publication in the *Beyträge*. The only further comment in the letter was a veiled criticism of the original text, making reference to Milton’s ‘irregular powers of imagination’, and read as follows:

[...] ich [bin] begierig [...] die Regeln zu wissen, nach welchen eine so regellose Einbildungskraft, als des Miltons seine war, entschuldiget werden kan.80 (quoted in Wolff 1895-97: vol 1, 212)

This question of the place of imagination in poetry was to become a central issue in the literary debate of the following decade, and in eighteenth century poetics in general.

Gottsched actually published two translation reviews for *Paradise Lost* in the *Beyträge*, one covering the earlier German translation of the same work by von Berge, and one on Bodmer’s translation. As opposed to Bodmer, who had praised von Berge’s retention of the character of the original, Gottsched’s judgement on von Berge’s work, published in the first issue (‘Stück’) of 1732, was highly unfavourable:

Die Wörter sind oft gewaltig verstümmelt, das Sylbenmaass ist sehr rauh und unrein; die Wortfügung verworfen; die Zusammensetzung der einfachen Wörter sehr ungeschickt, verwegten und unmässig. Mit einem Worte seine Sprache überhaupt ist so gezwungen und altväterisch, daß man ihn unmöglich mit Vergnügen lesen kan.81 (Gottsched 1732a: 104)

Yet the review of Bodmer’s translation in the second issue published in 1732 could not have been much more complimentary, stating that, in the translation, Milton had gained a power and emphasis that was not to be found in the original:

---

79 I cannot say for certain whether people will credit me with this as easily as they credited him, for the reason that the German language is possibly less in need of assistance from foreign riches [...], or the German ear so delicate that it cannot bear unfamiliar metaphors, while at the same time exerting such power over our judgement that we are obliged to reject what is not agreeable to it – for no other reason than that it is not agreeable. [my translation]

80 I am keen to know the rules under which such unregulated power of the imagination as that displayed by Milton can be excused. [my translation]

81 The words are often dreadfully mutilated, the metre very course and impure, the syntax overturned, the assembly of simple words very awkward, audacious and immoderate. Quite simply, his language is so forced and old-fashioned that it is impossible to read him with any pleasure. [my translation]

79
The only criticisms concerned the translator’s syntax, which was attributed to the "Vaterlande des Herrn Uebersetzers" (his Swiss version of German) and the title, where Gottsched suggested ‘das Verlorene Paradies’ would have been better than ‘Johann Miltons Verlust des Paradieses’. The reviewer concluded with the hope that a treatise promised by Bodmer would discuss the French criticisms of Milton’s work that had been published with the French translation of *Paradise Lost*, as well as those by Voltaire.

It is difficult to decide why Gottsched’s initial reaction to this translation should have been so positive. In terms of ‘preliminary norms’ it did not constitute a suitable model in the French classical tradition. And in terms of ‘operational norms’ Bodmer’s preface seemed to indicate clear differences to Gottsched’s own stand. Was Gottsched still unclear on the precise nature of the norms he was trying to establish? Did he fail to recognise the precise character of the work and the translation? Or was Gottsched simply anxious to avoid antagonising a man who already had a considerable standing as a literary critic in his own right?

Certainly, Bodmer appears to have taken Gottsched’s comments on Swiss forms seriously. Bodmer feared that his German translation of *Paradise Lost*, coloured as it was by Swiss expressions and grammar, might not be acceptable to a wider German audience. In 1731 he therefore began corresponding on this subject with a Leipzig scholar (and librettist to Johann Sebastian Bach), Johann Christoph Clauder (1701-1779), a correspondence which continued until 1734. The kinds of issues Bodmer was concerned about may be deduced from Clauder’s letter of 6 December 1731, which discussed three questions raised by Bodmer: Which figures of speech were in good taste (for instance, were figures of speech used in ‘common’ conversation at court acceptable?), might words and figures of speech be invented by use of analogy and were new metaphors to be rejected merely because they were new?

Although his letters are not preserved, the replies from Clauder kept in the Bodmer archive at the Zentralbibliothek in Zurich indicate that Bodmer’s main reason for initiating this correspondence was to establish the rules governing ‘Meissen’ German. In view of the repeated endeavours of members of the Deutsche Gesellschaft to establish the use of ‘pure’ German – by which they meant the German of Meissen and Upper Saxony – we may even regard this as part of Bodmer’s attempts to ensure Zurich’s place in the emerging professional interculture. Bender (1967) has shown how Bodmer obtained Clauder’s aid in correcting his first translation of *Paradise Lost*, which had been published in 1732. Bodmer’s own *editio princeps* of *Paradise Lost* held at the Zentralbibliothek in Zurich does in fact contain

[82 Through this rendering Milton has gained even more power and emphasis than he has in his native language. [my translation]
corrections, as well as a note on the flyleaf in Bodmer’s hand which reads, “Emendationes grammaticas manu sui addidit Clauderus, magister Lipsiensis, a qui nonnullas epistulas ad me scriptas conservavi.”

5.4.3 Junckherrott’s translation of the New Testament (1732)

The year 1732 also saw the publication of Johann Jacob Junckherrott’s New Testament translation. This work must surely go down in history as the most radical departure from the prevailing norms of its day. It has been discussed in detail by Senger (1971: 81-85), so I will comment only briefly here. Unfortunately, as Senger points out, we have no information on who Junckherrott was, nor even where he lived. His translation approach – carefully explained in a preface – was based on the doctrine of the inspired Biblical word, which taught that each individual word had been handed down by the Holy Ghost. The resulting translation procedure is similar in nature to that which the twentieth-century Bible translator and theorist, Eugene Nida, terms ‘formal equivalence’ (Nida 1964). Thus, for instance, a word in the source text must always be translated by the same German word irrespective of the context, synonyms must always be translated by different words and the forms of pronouns and adjectives may not be changed (Nida’s concordance of terms). An example of the effect of this procedure was given in a review of the translation that appeared in the Beyträge. In the familiar Lutheran translation of the time, the passage Romans 7, 11-12 read as follows

Denn die Sünde nahm Ursache am Gebote und betrog mich und tödte mich durch dasselbe Gebot: Das Gesetz ist je heilig, und das Gebot ist heilig, recht und gut. (quoted in Senger 1971: 85)

Junckherrott’s translation of the same passage read

Dann die Sünde da hinaufgerütschwerung da abhin habende genommen dahin durch der da hinaufgehung da einhin hat verführt mich da aushin auch durch derselben mich hat getödtet da abhin bey dem geführetwerden da aufhin. Also beydes die zwar gesetzwerdung gesetzlich fest heilige auch die da hinaufgehung da einhin heilige auch gute. (ibid: 85)

The scholar reviewing this translation in the 14th issue of the Beyträge had a field day, describing it as an “unverständlicher Mischmasch” with “widersinnische, unnatürliche und abgeschmackte Ausdriückungen, Wortfügungen und Wörter.” (Anon. 1736: 331)

Nevertheless, the developments of 1732 appear to have focused the thoughts of the Gottsched group, both with respect to translation theory and with respect to the special topic of Bible

83 Cluudr, Master of Leipzig (from whom I have kept several letters written to me) added grammatical corrections in his own hand. [translation by Justin Glyn]

84 incomprehensible mish-mash with nonsensical, unnatural and tasteless expressions, syntax and words. [my translation]
translation. Venzky’s treatise on translation, which I discuss below, was published in 1734, the following year saw another Bible translation, and in 1737 a detailed analysis of three historical Bible translations appeared in the Beyträge.

5.4.4 Venzky re-establishes the central norm (1734)

Two years later, in 1734, a major statement on translation principles appeared in the Beyträge. Georg Venzky’s ‘Bild eines geschickten Uebersetzers’ was published in the 9th issue of the Beyträge. Venzky, who studied in Halle, was a member of the Deutsche Gesellschaft from 1732, and was regarded as a loyal follower of Gottsched. Senger (1971: 47-51) identifies his treatise as the first methodological treatment of translation problems in German, providing a historical overview and the first definitions of translation. Drawing on previous translation traditions Venzky described the purpose of translation as to improve the German language and to hone an individual’s linguistic skills, but adds to this a more Enlightenment objective of enjoying and profiting from works one would not otherwise read. Although he cited a range of different translation authorities to lend his own work authority, including the Latin authors Pliny and Quintilian, the German writers Luther (whose Bible translation is described as exemplary), Opitz, Schemelius and Schottel, and the French translation theorist Huet, it cannot be said that he actually adhered to the views of all the authorities cited.

In terms of ‘preliminary norms’, Venzky laid down the requirement that the choice of original text should be limited by considerations of ‘usefulness’, by which he was referring to works conforming to the rules of classic literature that would help develop German literary taste.

Man soll nicht jedes beliebige Buch übersetzen. Es gibt nützliche, die übersetze man; es gibt unnützliche, die lasse man, wo sie sind, und freue sich, daß sie nicht Deutsch geschrieben sind.85 (quoted in Fränzel 1914: 38)

Turning to ‘operational norms’ the main difference between Venzky’s approach and that of the French belles infidèles was his emphasis on accurate and complete translation. The translation should express the meaning and intention of the author

[…] genau und accurat […], dergestalt, daß sie ihm nichts entziehe, nichts fremdes oder wiederstreitendes andichte, den Worten und Ausdrücken die Bedeutung und den Nachdruck bestimmme, welchen der Verfasser ihm zugeeignet wissen will.86 (Venzky 1734: 110-11)

---

85 We may not translate any book we like. There are useful books and these should be translated. There are books that are not useful and we should leave these alone, rejoicing in the fact that they were not written in German. [my translation]

86 […] precisely and accurately in such a way that nothing is taken from him, nothing external or contradictory added, and the words and expressions create the meaning and emphasis that the author wished to be attributed to himself. [my translation]
Such a translation should not, however, be interlinear or even necessarily word for word, but rather sentence for sentence. This was a contrast to Huet’s view that each word should be expressed by a word and that even the ‘placing’ of the words should be retained. Echoing Leibniz’s comment on translations following the original ‘Fuß vor Fuß’

\[\text{Eine geschickte Uebersetzung aber trägt als das Nachbild eben das, was im Vorbilde geschrieben war, in einer andern Sprache wieder vor, und folget dem Original auf dem Fusses nach, wo nicht völlig von Wort zu Wort, doch von Satz zu Satz.}^{88}\ (\text{ibid: 64})

Above all, the language in which the translation is expressed must be clear and pure, free of provincialisms and free of neologisms. Indeed, if the original is unclear or obscure, a translation may even be an improvement on it. Thus the translator should ensure that the translation is

\[\text{[...]} \text{deutlich und klar [...], damit man gleich errathen könne, was man haben will, ohne verdrüßlich nachzudenken. }^{89}\ \text{[...]} \text{Daß sie rein sey, und also keine veraltechte, ungewohnliche, neuegemachte, Provinzialwörter, und doch die rechten, eigentlichen und die Kunstwörter gebrauche.}^{89}\ (\text{ibid: 111})

Once again, Venzky was stressing the primacy of a reader-oriented approach through the use of ‘good’, flowing German based on the ‘Meissen’ variant of German, similar to the approach of the belles infidèles and Luther. This was a major point of difference with respect to Huet, who clearly stated that fidelity to the thoughts, words and stylistic colouring of the source text must at all times take precedence over questions of naturalness, elegance or clarity (see DeLateur 2002: 84). The ideal of good, readable German together with accuracy was the norm by which most translations were to be judged in the pages of the Beyträge over the next few years. Discussions of translations quoted individual sections of the translations extensively, printing them together with the original text, and compared the two texts in detail.

5.4.5 Two Bodmer publications (1736-37)

In 1736 the Zurich publishing house Caspar Orell und Comp. published Bodmer’s German translation of extracts from his correspondence on literary questions (including the question of imagination in literature) with Calepio\(^{90}\), and in a review of the book published in the 15th

---

\(^{87}\) foot by foot, or step by step

\(^{88}\) However a skilful translation expresses as a replica in another language just what was written in the original and follows its original step by step – from sentence to sentence if not completely from word to word. [my translation]

\(^{89}\) [... ] plain and clear, so that people can guess immediately what one is trying to achieve, without the annoyance of having to think about it. That it is pure, in other words, that it does not use obsolete, unfamiliar, newly-coined or provincial words, and does use correct, authentic and artistic words. [my translation]

\(^{90}\) Brief-Wechsel von der Natur des poetischen Geschmackes
issue of the Beyträg, Gottsched praised the achievements of the Swiss in improving literary taste.

In 1737 Bodmer published an almost word for word translation of Samuel Butler’s satiric work, Hudibras, which was mentioned in the Beyträg, but without any judgement on the quality of the translation. This translation is likely to have been done much earlier, before publication of the first translation of Paradise Lost, and it has been suggested that Bodmer may have been attracted to this satiric work by the difficulties he encountered in finding a publisher for his Milton translation (Bender 1973: 48).

5.4.6 The discussion on Biblical translations is revived (1737)

In 1737 a discussion of three historical Bible translations by a scholar and cleric named Johann Jacob Brucker was published in the 17th issue of the Beyträg. Following the controversial Junckherrott translation, this appears to have been an attempt to reconfirm the domestication norm dating back to Luther, and to confirm the primacy of the ‘Meissen’ dialect as the standard dialect in such domesticated texts.

Good translations, Brucker argued, were important because of the contribution they made to extending, enriching and improving the language, and Bible translations had made the biggest contribution to German in this respect. Divine providence had provided such a work in Luther’s translation, he stated. The same could not be said of the Bible translation published in Zurich in 1545 (a translation that was more faithful to its Hebrew source text, in particular, than Luther’s, see chapter three, section 5.2). Brucker’s view is of particular interest for the translation debate since Bodmer, as the son of a Swiss protestant pastor and trained at a Swiss theological college, would have been intimately familiar with the Zurich translation. One of the translation decisions he faced when translating Paradise Lost was the question of how to translate English Biblical quotations into German. Should he use the equivalent passages in the Zurich Bible or those in the Luther Bible, or should he favour a literal translation? I examine this question in my analysis of Bodmer’s translation (chapter six, section 5).

The review of the Zurich Bible translation begins on a critical note, describing the translation as ‘odd’:

Dieses ist die berühmte alte Schweizerische Uebersetzung, welche so wohl ihrer Dollmetschung wegen, als auch wegen der darinne gebrauchten Schweizerischen Provinzial-Mundart merkwürdig ist [...].\(^{91}\) (Brucker 1737: 31)

It points out that while there are wide-ranging similarities between the Zurich Bible and the Lutheran Bible in the historical books of the Old Testament (relevant for Bodmer’s

\(^{91}\) This is the famous old Swiss translation that is odd not only because of its rendering but also because of the Swiss provincial dialect it uses. [my translation]
translation) and the New Testament, a number of other books including the Prophets, Job and the Psalms were quite independent translations. However the main thrust of the review was to criticise the language used in the translation as unfamiliar, hard and unpleasant:

Was aber die in dieser Uebersetzung gebrauchte Sprache und Mundart anlangt, so haben sich die Uebersetzer ganz nach ihrer Provinz und der darinnen zu ihrer Zeit gewohnlichen Aussprache und Wortfügung gerichtet, daher sie auch Ohren welcher der Schweizerischen [...] Mundart ungewohnt und unkundig sind, hart, ungereimt und widrig vorkommen muß.  

(Anon. 1738: 331)

5.4.7 The Aeneas controversy is launched (1737-38)

In 1737 Bodmer became a member of the Deutsche Gesellschaft. The year 1737 also marked the beginning of one of the most acrimonious debates conducted in the pages of the Beyträg and subsequently in Zurich publications. In this year a short translation was submitted to the Beyträg. It was a German rendition of a section of the first book of Virgil’s Aeneas by an unknown translator. In an article published in the 17th issue of the Beyträg (Anon. 1737), the submitted translation was reviewed alongside an alternative translation by a Mr. Schwartz – Johann Christoph Schwartz of Regensburg. Although unsigned, this article was probably written by Gottsched, to judge by comments made in a later article published in Zurich (Finck 1743: 34). Gottsched judged Mr. Schwartz’s translation to be superior, arguing that it was complete, had expressed Virgil’s meaning, retained the same number of lines, and had observed all details of correct German. The matter of good German was discussed at length, and the unknown translator accused, amongst others, of shortening words by omitting letters, using a neologism without being obliged to do so and using non-German syntax. To a certain degree, these arguments echo those of the belles infidèles in favour of good French.

In the next issue the unknown translator rushed to his own defence. His arguments recall the thinkers associated with the peripheral translation norm of seventeenth century France, and their demand that the spirit or character of the original author be retained. The unknown translator also stated that a translator should use words as emphatic as those in the original text.

Es ist daher nöthig, daß ein Uebersetzer sich alles eben so lebhaft und deutlich vorbilde, als sein Dichter, und in der Abbildung keinen Strich von dessen Bildern weglasse. Und ich glaube, hierinnen besteht auch die Stärke einer Uebersetzung, daß man eben so nachdrückliche Worte brauche.  

(Anon. 1738: 331)

92 As far as the language and dialect used in this translation is concerned, the work of the translators was governed entirely by their region and the customary pronunciation and syntax customary in that region at that time. That is why it seems hard, muddled and unpleasant to those who do not speak, or are unfamiliar with the Swiss dialect. [i.e. the Swiss form of standard German] [my translation]

93 For this reason it is necessary that a translator imagine everything just as clearly and in the same lively manner as his poet; that in his depiction he does not omit a single brush stroke from his images. And I believe that the strength of a translation lies in using words which are just as emphatic. [my translation]
The unknown translator reiterated his point using the metaphor of notes in a song, already familiar from Anne Dacier’s preface to her translation of Homer’s *Iliad*.

He cast doubt on the authority of the first reviewer, suggesting that the most respected members of the *Deutsche Gesellschaft* — Gottsched, Bodmer and Steinwehr — did not share his views. Then came further rhetoric and the appeal to a translation authority, that of Horace — including a reference to the need to read Horace in the right context.


A similar reference to the correct interpretation of Horace’s often-quoted statement on translation may be found in Huet, who stated that Horace had in fact been arguing in favour of faithful translation and not against, as so often claimed. This argument is also to be found in Bodmer and Breitinger’s later writings on translation, where they used it in support of their views.

The unknown translator’s demand that a translation follow the original word for word, retain the images created in the original text and use words as emphatic as those in the original was a clear challenge to the norms established in Venzky’s treatise. As Senger notes, by now Gottsched found himself fighting

[...] mit zunehmender Verbissenheit im Namen des guten Deutsch gegen das beginnende Übersetzerdeutsch. Er spürte, daß ein neuer Übersetzungsstil heraufkam [...].\(^5\) (Senger 1971: 73)

The year 1737 also saw the publication of the second edition of Gottsched’s *Critische Dichtkunst*, in which Bodmer’s translation of *Paradise Lost* was described in rather different tones to those used by Gottsched in 1732.

Noch neulich hat man uns in der Schweiz eine neue deutsche Uebersetzung in ungebundner Rede davon geliefert; die aber von großer Härte ist, und ihrem Grundtexte keine völlige Gnüge thut, außer daß sie das ungeheure, rauhe und widrige des Originals in seiner völligen Größe ausdrückt.\(^6\)

(quoted in Birke & Birke 1973: 291)

\(^4\) I beg you, my readers! Where is Virgil? How much better it is when a translator translates word for word? If Horace is seen in the proper context, he is clearly on my side here [when he says] *Nec verbum verbo curabis reddere fidus interpres* (nor trouble to render word for word with the faithfulness of a translator). [my translation]

\(^5\) [...] with increasing doggedness in the name of good German, against the budding German translationese. He sensed that a new style of translation was emerging. [my translation]

\(^6\) A new German prose translation of the work was published not long ago in Switzerland, but it is very harsh and does not do full justice to its source text other than expressing the full extent of the outrage, coarseness and unpleasantness of the original. [my translation]
5.4.8 Gottsched resigns from the *Deutsche Gesellschaft* (1738)

Nevertheless, Gottsched’s correspondence with Bodmer still maintained a collegial tone. On 9 May 1738 he wrote to Bodmer of the praise that Bodmer’s critical writings had earned from a considerable number of experts and reiterated his desire to read Bodmer’s critical work on *Paradise Lost*:


(quoted in Wolff 1895-7: vol 1, 227)

One year later, in a letter dated 11 May 1739, Gottsched informed Bodmer that he had left the Society:

Seit dem ich die Aufsicht über diese Gesellschaft, als eine Last, die bey ihrer Beschwerde keinen Dank sondern Haß und Verdrüß nach sich zog, niedergelegt habe, weis ich nicht mehr was darinn vorgeht. Die Beyträger aber, als mein eigen Werk, werde ich fortsetzen.

(ibid: 231)

The background to this decision is outlined by Danzel (1848: 99-101). In 1738 Gottsched had offered a token resignation following an insult, and to his utter amazement and dismay, the resignation was unexpectedly accepted by the other members of the society. Although this account does not indicate any explicit link to any rift with Bodmer it is still interesting to note that this resignation and the rift with Bodmer occurred within a short space of one another.

On 26 December 1739, Bodmer wrote to his friend Laurenz Zellweger in Appenzell that Gottsched had stopped writing to him, wondering whether this was due to comments that Breitinger had made about Gottsched in his work of literary theory on metaphor and allegory, *Critische Abhandlung von der Natur, den Absichten und dem Gebrauch der Gleichnisse*.

Ich weiß nicht, ob die Freiheit, so Herr Professor Breitinger in den Gleichnissen gegen Gottsched gebraucht, mir diesen Correspondenten abgespenstiget hat; ich bin ohne Brief von ihm. Er wird wohl noch sauer Mienen geben, wenn erst die Dichtkunst und Schutzschrift Miltons herauskommen werden.

(quoted in Windfuhr 1967: 15* [sic])

---

97 We spoke extensively about Milton and the critical work in which your esteemed person intends to justify this poet. I am very keen to see this defence. [my translation]

98 Since I relinquished supervision of this Society – as a burden whose troubles brought no thanks but only hate and annoyance – I no longer know what is going on there. However, I will continue publishing the *Beyträger* as my own work. [my translation]

99 Critical treatise on the nature, intentions and use of allegories

100 I do not know whether the liberties Professor Breitinger has taken against Gottsched in his *Gleichnisse* have cost me this correspondent: I have not received any letters from him. He is likely to pull a sour face once the *Dichtkunst* and the defence of Milton have been published. [my translation]
The differences between Gottsched and the Swiss in the areas of both aesthetics and translation theory were about to come into the open, and the scene was set for an acrimonious debate.

### 5.4.9 ‘Weapons’ and compromised honour in the Aeneas controversy (1739-40)

But first of all, in 1739, the second edition of Gottsched’s *Ausführliche Redekunst, Nach Anleitung der alten Griechen und Römer, wie auch der neueren Ausländer* was published. It included Gottsched’s own essay devoted to translation, entitled ‘Von den Uebersetzungen’ in which Gottsched reiterated some of the principles already set out by Venzky. Like Venzky, Gottsched cites Huet as an authority in translation matters. Despite this, he argued that translators should translate sentence by sentence rather than word by word, and should use natural German language:

> Bemühe man sich nicht so wohl alle Worte, als vielmehr den rechten Sinn, und die völlige Meynung eines jeden Satzes, den man übersetzt, wohl auszudrücken. Denn obgleich die Wörter den Verstand bey sich führen, [...] so lassen sie sich doch in einer andern Sprache so genau nicht geben, daß man ihnen Fuß vor Fuß folgen könnte. Daher drücke man denn [...] alles mit solchen Redensarten aus, die in seiner Sprache nicht fremde klingen, sondern derselben eigenthümlich sind. (Mitchell 1975: 7)

In the same year, the discussion on the two translations of *Aeneas* by Bodmer and Schwartz was resumed in the pages of the *Beyträge*, with Schwartz defending himself against the attacks by Bodmer. This belligerent article is an indication of how the tone of the discussion was beginning to deteriorate.

> Ich kann nicht wider die Billigkeit handeln, wenn ich spitzige Waffen wider einen Feind ergreife, welcher nicht nur spitzige sondern auch so gar vergiftete, wider mich gebrauchet. (Schwartz 1739: 69)

---

101 A comprehensive rhetoric, in accordance with the rules set down by the ancient Greeks and Romans as well as more recent foreigners

102 Of translations

103 One should endeavour to express not so much every single word but rather the correct sense and complete meaning of each sentence that one translates, since, although the words carry the meaning, they cannot be rendered so precisely in another language that one is able to follow them step by step. For this reason one should express everything with figures of speech that are authentic in one’s own language and do not sound strange. [my translation]

104 I cannot be accused of being unfair if I take up pointed weapons against an enemy who has attacked me with weapons that were not just pointed but also poisoned. [my translation]
Word for word translation made the target text unclear and confusing, argued Schwartz, and the translator should pay attention to the meaning of all the words together, rather than the limited meaning of one word alone.

The next blow in this war of words was dealt by Breitinger the following year (1740), in his essay on translation published in his *Critische Dichtkunst*. The publisher of the original article on the *Aeneas* translations (i.e. the *Deutsche Gesellschaft* headed by Gottsched) was severely at fault, he wrote, for allowing the original article to appear in 1737 in an uncensored form. Indeed, the publisher had compromised the honour of the German nation in doing so. The publisher had included:

> [...] die liederliche Schrift dieses jungen Menschen ohne das Correctif einer ernstlichen und wohlerdienten Censur in den critischen Beyträgen [...], wodurch er weder die Ehre seiner Sammlungen noch der deutschen Nation in Acht genommen.  

(Breitinger 1740b: 159)

### 5.4.10 Breitinger’s ‘Von der Kunst der Übersetzung’ (1740)

In 1740 Bodmer’s defence of *Paradise Lost* that Gottsched had been waiting for so long was published. The *Critische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren in der Poesie* defended *Paradise Lost* using aesthetic ideas derived from England and Italian-speaking Europe that were anathema to Gottsched. Of interest for translation is merely the fact that the Italian translator and critic Paulo Rolli is again mentioned, as is Horace. Also, as an appendix Bodmer translates an essay on the language used in *Paradise Lost* by the English social critic Joseph Addison, which reiterates Aristoteles’ rules on epic language. Pointedly, these recommend the removal and addition of syllables for interest (something the Gottsched group had criticised), the use of bold but lovely metaphors and the use of the characteristics of other languages (J.J. Bodmer 1740b).

The same year saw the publication of Breitinger’s poetics, which appeared under the same title as Gottsched’s earlier work, *Critische Dichtkunst*. Breitinger’s *Critische Dichtkunst* contained the first major Swiss publication on translation theory, his essay entitled ‘Von der Kunst der Übersetzung’ (Breitinger 1740b). Breitinger’s main authority is Horace, and he quotes him, going on to demonstrate how the common representation of Horace as an advocate of free translation is in fact incorrect. Thus he is already preparing the ground for arguments in favour of a more source-text oriented translation approach.

---

105 [...] the careless paper of this young person without the corrective of serious and well-deserved censorship in the *Critische Beyträuge*, thereby compromising the honour both of the publication and of the German nation. [my translation]

106 Of the art of translation

107 Critical treatise on the miraculous in poetry
Unlike Venzky and Gottsched, his essay does not contain any requirements relating to ‘preliminary norms’. In the area of ‘operational norms’ he also differs from Venzky and Gottsched in that there are no reader-oriented arguments in favour of good, pure or flowing German, or against the use of neologisms or dialect terms or words taken from other languages.

Breitinger reiterates Venzky’s arguments in favour of accurate and complete translation. However he differs from Venzky and Gottsched in adding the requirement that the ideas of the source text should be presented in the same order. What is even more important, is that they should have the same effect on the reader as the original text had on its reader, an idea similar but by no means identical to Huet’s requirement that a translation should be “nothing other than the explicit image and likeness of the author.”

Von einem Uebersetzer wird erforderlich [sic], daß er eben dieselben Begriffe und Gedanken, die er in einem trefflichen Muster vor sich findet, in eben solcher Ordnung. Verbindung, Zusammenhange, und mit gleich so starckem Nachdrucke, mit andern gleichgültigen bey einem Volck angenommenen, gebräuchlichen und bekannten Zeichen ausdrücke, so daß die Vorstellung der Gedanken und Beyderley Zeichen einen gleichen Eindruck auf das Gemüt the des Lesers mache. Die Uebersetzung ist ein Conterfey, das desto mehr Lob verdient, je ähnlicher es ist. Darum muß ein Uebersetzer sich selber das harte Gesetze vorschreiben, daß er niemals die Freiheit nehmen wolle, von der Grundschrift, oder in Ansehung der Gedanken, noch in der Form und Art derselben, abzuweichen.108 (Breitinger 1740b: 139)

Breitinger takes one more step in the direction of source-text oriented translation reflecting the character of the foreign language, when he criticises contemporary German translators for failing to use some of the effective syntactical tools – such as participles or ellipsis – they encounter in foreign languages. He goes on to present a lengthy argument in favour of the use of participles and ellipsis in German translation, citing Opitz, Haller and the Middle High German authors as successful users of the participle form in the German language, and Milton as a writer who makes effective use of ellipsis.

What is evident here is a clear shift from a largely target-oriented approach to a hesitatingly source-text approach, an approach that had already been used in some of the translations discussed in the pages of the Beyträge, such as Junckherrott’s New Testament and the Aeneas texts of the ‘unknown’ translator. This approach differs so considerably from that of the Venzky/Gottsched group that I would describe it as the formulation of a new translation norm.

---

108 A translator is required to express the same thoughts and concepts he finds before him – arranged in an excellent pattern – in the same arrangement, with the same combination and coherence, and with similar emphasis, in other equivalent signs accepted by, used by, and known to a nation, so that the concept or thought underlying both signs makes the same impression on the reader’s feelings. Translation is like painting a portrait: the more it looks like the original, the more praise it deserves. Therefore the translator must impose the following harsh law upon himself: that he will never take the liberty to deviate from the original, whether with respect to the thoughts expressed in it, or to their nature and shape. [translation by Lefevere (1977: 24)]
within the professional interculture. It is likely that this new norm owes something, at least, to the translators within the French peripheral tradition (Huet, Dacier), which may have been adopted and further developed by some Italian translators such as Salvini and Rolli. Although none of these translators are mentioned at any point, Breitinger’s precepts actually have more in common with those of Huet than do Venzky’s. Indeed, a writer in the Beyträge who later published a cynical translation review making use of Breitinger’s precepts attempted to demonstrate that all of Breitinger’s ideas had been taken from Huet.

5.4.11 What Breitinger owes to Huet and Dryden

Was it true that Breitinger’s ideas on translation had been lifted wholesale from Huet’s 1683 treatise? Certainly a comparison of the two theories shows many points of similarity.

For Breitinger as for Huet good translations were those that placed before the eyes of the reader the same images as those presented by the source text. While Huet wrote of the translation “that raises up before our eyes the whole author properly represented in his natural colours” (see DeLater 2002: 45), Breitinger referred to a reader being able to visualise the same images and descriptions as in the original (in a statement explicitly relating these ideas to Bodmer’s translation of Paradise Lost):

Milton muß uns in der Ubersetzung eben dieselben erhabenen und verwundersamen Bildnisse und Schildereyen, in eben der Ordnung, wie in dem Originale, vorstellen [...].

(Breitinger 1740b: 139-40)

However, Breitinger takes a step beyond Huet when he also requires that the translation should have the same effect on the reader as the source text. This idea is one that we do not find in Huet’s treatise.

In ‘Von der Kunst der Ubersetzung’ we find an echo of Huet’s requirement of fidelity to the original even in the difficult case of source language idioms when Breitinger argues at length for the preservation of source language characteristics in German translation. In ‘Von der Kunst der Ubersetzung’ Breitinger does, however, concede the difficulty of retaining these features without creating a strange effect in the target language.

[...] es einem Uebersetzer oft sauer ankömmt, die Gedancken seines Originales ohne Verminderung des Nachdruckes und der Schönheit mit gleichgültigen Zeichen auszudrücken, welche in seiner Sprache nicht fremd klingen, und dem Character derselben nicht Gewalt anthur.

( ibid: 143)

---

109 In translation Milton should present us with exactly the same noble and marvelous images and descriptions arranged in the same order as in the original. [translation by Lefevere (1977: 24)]

110 [...] it is often difficult for a translator to find equivalent signs that do not sound strange in his own language or do violence to its character, and yet to express the thoughts of this original without diminishing either its emphasis or beauty. [my translation]
Clearly, Breitinger was aware of the difficulties in adhering to Huet’s precept of placing words, thoughts and style above target language naturalness, elegance and clarity. Nevertheless, he argued strongly in favour of retaining source-text linguistic features such as English participle constructions and ellipsis.

Breitinger’s insistence that the ideas be presented in the same order as in the original echoes Huet’s demand that, in general, “the arrangement of words should be retained as well.” (see DeLater 2002: 48) What is missing, however, in Breitinger, is a statement corresponding to Huet’s repeated demands that the words of the source text be reproduced word for word “so long as the innate quality of the language, the clarity of the discourse, and the integrity of the thoughts can bear it.” (ibid: 77-78)

With this exception, however, Breitinger’s insistence on a translation as a likeness (‘Conterfey’) that should be as similar as possible to the original, expressing the same ideas and thoughts in the same order, connection and emphasis as the original, owes a great deal to Huet and the seventeenth-century peripheral translation norm, a point that is not made in the current literature on the Zurich translation theories of the time.

The same cannot be said with respect to Dryden’s ideas on translation. While Breitinger believed that the translator should never depart from the thoughts, form, order of thoughts, emphasis or impression made by the source text, Dryden gave preference to an approach to translation that he described as ‘paraphrase’ or translation with latitude (see chapter three, section 4). He held that translators might alter both words and lines, take liberties with expression and occasionally add or subtract material, as long as they retained the sense. In some respects Dryden’s thoughts on ‘paraphrase’ appear similar to those of Venzky, for instance, when Dryden uses dress as a metaphor for language, and states that the words of the source text may have been “so ill chosen as to make it appear in an unhandsome dress, and rob it of its native lustre.” (ibid: 174) If we also bear in mind Dryden’s statements about rendering Virgil in the English he would have spoken had he been born in England, in Dryden’s own time, it becomes apparent that, contrary to the arguments of Fränzel and Senger, Breitinger’s approach to translation owes little to the Englishman.

Breitinger’s approach, as outlined in his ‘Von der Kunst der Uebersetzung’, is particularly interesting, because of the way in which it anticipates some of the ideals of Friedrich Schleiermacher expressed in his ‘Über die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens’111 of 1813, which is regarded as one of the major documents of Western translation theory. In stating that the more a translation looks like the original, the more praise it deserves, Breitinger is moving away from the Gottschedian emphasis on sense and communication to come closer towards Schleiermacher’s ideal of translations that convey the foreign flavour of the source text.

111 On the different methods of translating
5.4.12 Gottsched’s barbed attack on Bodmer’s translation (1740)

In their *Critische Dichtkunst* and *Critische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren in der Poesie* of 1740, Bodmer and Breitinger had clearly formulated a set of aesthetic principles in direct opposition to Gottsched’s position, and it is not surprising that, as he had written to his friend Zellweger, Bodmer was apprehensive about the reaction. It was not slow in coming. Gottsched responded directly to Bodmer’s *Critische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren in der Poesie* with a new article on Bodmer’s translation of *Paradise Lost* which was as damming as the first review, eight years previously, had been laudatory.

In issue 24 of the *Beyträg*, Gottsched set out to demolish both Bodmer’s translation and his defence of it. Gottsched accused Bodmer of self-love in claiming *Paradise Lost* was a great work simply because he liked it. Bodmer, he said, was trying to force Germans to admire this foreign book merely because he had translated it. Yet Milton’s verses were ‘rough’, his language old-fashioned and his thoughts bombastic. Gottsched had been informed by an English admirer of Milton’s who had visited Leipzig that Milton’s linguistic strengths had consisted of infringements against the rules of grammar, the transformation of all normal word orders and a thousand other impermissible errors of which no other poets had been guilty. For a man who like Gottsched, who had fought untiringly to establish rules of German usage, the work of a poet guilty of such transgressions was completely unacceptable.

He then went on to attack Bodmer’s translation itself, beginning with Bodmer’s statement that all poems lost something in translation, particularly those translated from English, a language whose expression was more flexible than German. With regard to flexibility, Gottsched argued – in a direct attack on Bodmer’s German with its Swiss features – that it was certainly true that the language of some German provinces was relatively stiff and inflexible, and incapable of bending to foreign figures of speech:

> Allein war die Geschmeidigkeit der Sprache anlangen, so ist es vielleicht einigermaßen von der Sprache etlicher Provinzen in Deutschland wahr, daß sie ziemlich steif und unbegießbar ist, sich in den Redensarten einer fremden zu schicken [...].\(^\text{112}\) (Gottsched 1740: 248)

Readers of Bodmer’s translation, he said, had been offended not only by the poet’s terrible and wild thoughts but also by the strange and repulsive use of German. They had not been prepared to offend their sensibilities by reading a whole book written in this style. Why should they learn a new way of speaking German in order to comprehend the ideas contained in the poem?

\(^{112}\) However, as far as flexibility in language is concerned, it may be true of some German provinces that their language is rather stiff and inflexible when it comes to adapting to the figures of speech of a foreign language. [my translation]
A clearer formulation of the position against a ‘foreignising’ approach to translation than this one would be hard to find. Indeed, if Bodmer was concerned about the losses in his German translation, said Gottsched, the answer was to improve the original. “Wir schließen also daraus, daß auch ein Übersetzer seine Gedichte verschönern kann [...]”114 (ibid: 247).

5.4.13 Bodmer prepares his second translation of *Paradise Lost* (1740)

It was at about this point in the chronology that Bodmer began working on the revisions to his first translation of *Paradise Lost*, as is evident from his correspondence. Unpublished letters to his friend Zellweger held in the collections of the cantonal library in Trogen, Appenzell, indicate that the second translation was done over a period of three months in the summer of 1740.

To what extent does this new translation reflect the ideas on translation – the conflict between the demands of ‘good’ German and accountability to the source-text author – that were discussed within the professional interculture during the years that had elapsed since the publication of his first translation? Some clues are provided by Bodmer’s handwritten notes on the first pages of his own copy of the first translation of *Paradise Lost* (see Appendix II, section 2 for a transcription).

A Latin note on the flyleaf, quoted above, refers to Clauder’s grammatical corrections to the text and records Bodmer’s donation of the volume to the city library in 1780. On the following page, Bodmer has made more extensive notes, beginning with a reference to typographic errors – ‘Errores typographie in Miltons verlorenen Paradiß’115. The next line refers to improvements to the translation of *Paradise Lost* (‘Verbesserungen der übersetzung von den verl. Par.’) with a critical examination of some figures of speech (‘Redens-Arten’) for a future edition, together with a preface about the linguistic liberties used by Milton. Bodmer then goes on to list a number of items which include – interestingly for this study – a specific reference to the *Beyträge of the Deutsche Gesellschaft von Leipzig*.

Other items include a reference to Clauder’s difficulties integrating conjunctions (‘Fügungs-Wörter’) in verse (not identified in any of the correspondence between Bodmer and Clauder)

113 For many hundreds of readers it proved impossible to ignore this dreadful language; they were unable to muster sufficient patience to do violence to their ears all the way through a book, and learn a new way of speaking German so they could satisfy their desire for the content. [my translation]

114 Thus we conclude that a translator is also permitted to improve his poems [i.e. the poems he translates].

115 Typographic errors in Milton’s *Lost Paradise*. 
a letter on Milton’s linguistic liberties by ‘König’ (probably Johann Ulrich König, court poet in Dresden, who corresponded with Bodmer from 1725-27, although none of the published correspondence or the unpublished manuscripts in the Zentralbibliothek appear to contain comments that might be relevant here) and the reference to d’Olivet and Salvini already mentioned in chapter three.

Bodmer’s final note refers to a translation of Paradise Lost done by a Swiss pastor called Johann Veiel. The translation is described as extremely amateur (‘ganz schülerisch’) and is therefore of little interest in itself. What is interesting, however, is that Veiel’s translation is said to have been dispatched in March 1740. This means that the notes must have been written after March 1740. Since they refer to Bodmer’s translation revisions, it would appear most likely that they were noted down immediately before he began his revisions, as a kind of check-list for him as he began to rework his earlier translation.

Based on the evidence of these notes, it would therefore appear that, amongst other things, the discussion conducted in the pages of the Beyträger played a significant role in the ‘improvements’ to the translation that Bodmer carried out in 1740.

Meanwhile, in 1741, the acrimonious debate between Leipzig and Zurich continued. In the second issue of the Zurich-based Sammlung critischer, poetischer, und ander geistvollen Schriften, zur Verbesserung des Urtheils und des Witzes a writer (probably Bodmer himself) claimed that Bodmer, the English critic Joseph Addison and English literature in general were being associated for the purpose of ridicule:

[...] B-dm-r mit Addison u. der gantzen Engl. Nation in eine Linie gesetzt wird, nur zu dem Ende, damit er mit ihnen von dieser Höhe daniedergestürzt u. zum Gelächter gemacht werde.116 (J.J. Bodmer 1741: 73-74)

5.4.14 Bodmer’s ‘Abhandlung von der Schreibart’ (1742)

In 1742 the second translation of Paradise Lost was published. An article by Bodmer published in the Sammlung critischer, poetischer, und ander geistvollen Schriften in the same year gives a clear idea of the translation principles that guided him in this revision of his translation (J.J. Bodmer 1742b). Although mentioned in passing by Bender in his publications on Bodmer, Bender does not refer to its statements on translation. To my knowledge these have not been reviewed by any of the commentators on Bodmer to date. Here I review the general comments contained in this article, ‘Abhandlung von der Schreibart in Miltons verlohrnen Paradiese’117, while more detail may be found in chapter seven, sections 5.2 – 5.5 (see Appendix III for the transcription of an extract).

116 Bodmer is being lumped together with Addison and the entire English nation for the sole purpose of ensuring that he can be toppled with them and made a figure of ridicule. [my translation]

117 Treatise on the manner of writing in Milton’s Paradise Lost
In ‘Abhandlung von der Schreibart’, Bodmer focused on the need to reproduce the style and character of the original. In his own translation of Paradise Lost, he wrote, he had given higher priority to reproducing the style of his original than to translating into good German:

Meine Furcht ist in wahrer Arbeit der Uebersetzung beständig grösser gewesen, daß ich Miltons nachdrückliche, kurze und erhabene Schreibart nicht erreichen mögte, als daß ich durch die genaue Ausdrückung derselben gewissen Sprachlehrern und Deutsch scheinen würde [...].¹¹⁸ (ibid: 131-32)

He had nothing but praise for Italian translators, who he believed had been very successful in reproducing the style and character of their source texts, particularly in their translations of Paradise Lost. Mentioning Salvini, Magalotti and Rolli by name, he praised them for translating all of Milton’s words, in the same order and composition as the original, and added that Salvini had done the same for Homer and the best Greek poets and Maffei for the Iliad. He wrote:

Sie haben in ihre Uebersetzungen nicht nur die Gedanken Miltons, sondern auch seine Sprache hinübergebracht, welche die Form und das Siegel der Gedanken ist. Und niemand hat ihnen vorgeworfen, daß sie damit den Character ihrer eigenen wohlverfaßten Sprache verletzet, oder dieselbe Dunkel, anstössig, unzückerlich oder ungereimt gemacht haben.¹¹⁹ (ibid: 88)

In his view translators who failed to give attention to emphatic reproduction of the style of the original ended up being superficial, and their translations resembled the reverse side of a Turkish carpet, an analogy used by Cervantes in Don Quijote (Second Part, 1615, chapter LXII), but more likely to have originated from Plutarch’s story of Themistocles (see Hermans 1985c: 114, for discussion of the use of this image in translation). He cited the example of the contemporary poet and translator Barthold Heinrich Brockes, and his German translation of Alexander Pope’s Essay on Man.

Denn ohne diese Sorge muß man nothwendig in eine periphrastische Kaltsinnigkeit und Flüchtigkeit verfallen, dergleichen man dem Poeten Schuld gegeben, der Popens Versuch von dem Menschen in deutschen Versen übersetzt hat; man wird nur Uebersezung machen, die gegen die Originale gestellt das seyn werden, was ungekehrt Türkische Tapeten.¹²⁰ (ibid: 130)

¹¹⁸ Throughout the work of translation I was always more afraid of failing to achieve Milton’s emphatic, concise and sublime manner of writing than that of seeming un-German to certain teachers of language because of my accurate rendition of this manner of writing. [my translation]

¹¹⁹ In their translations they rendered not just Milton’s thoughts but also his language, which is the form and seal of thoughts. And nobody accused them of violating the character of their well-composed language, or making it dark, repulsive, clumsy or muddled. [my translation]

¹²⁰ Without this care it is inevitable that the translator will fall victim to a periphrastic indifference and cursoriness like that of which the poet who translated Pope’s Essay on Man into German verse has been accused. As compared to the originals his translations will be like reversed Turkish carpets. [my translation]
In his translation of *Paradise Lost*, Bodmer wrote, he had added extensive comments and notes in order to help the reader understand the thoughts and ideas of the poet, and to remove prejudices that might stand in the way of such understanding.

He had also tried to demonstrate the efficiency of the tools Milton used in his poem – tools such as metaphor and ellipsis – in order to achieve a certain affect in people's minds. Bodmer argued that Milton's skilful use of metaphor could be reproduced in all languages. At the same time, he distinguished between different kinds of metaphor – those displaying 'similarities in nature', those whose image was derived from a nation's 'customs' and a category he described as 'anomalies'. While the images for metaphors displaying 'similarities in nature' could be rendered in full, there were some limitations in the other categories. Bodmer pointed out that, when translating metaphors, the translator must pay attention to the elements of sense that link the object and the image used in the metaphor. The reason for this was that words whose core meanings were considered equivalent in different languages acquired a range of 'additional meanings' that differed from one language to another (ibid: 113).

Bodmer appears to have given more detailed attention to the treatment of metaphor than any translation scholars before him, as least as far as I am able to ascertain. What is interesting in the context of the translation debate is the way in which his concern for reproducing the style of the original, as advocated by Huet, caused him to explore the implications of this norm for the translation of metaphor, and in particular the cases when strategies other than the full rendering of the source text image might have to be adopted. Detailed discussion and analysis of Bodmer's ideas on the translation of metaphor and his actual translation practice in this area may be found in chapter seven.

Bodmer's 'Abhandlung von der Schreibart in Miltons verlohrnen Paradies' was a clear statement of how Bodmer had come to favour a translation approach in which the reader is moved closer to the author. This new norm presented a strong challenge to the norm formulated in Venzky's 'Bild eines geschickten Übersetzers'. Significantly, it was printed not in the pages of the *Beyträge* but in a new publication that appeared in Bodmer's own publishing house, Conrad Orell und Comp., in the early 1740s. This, following Gottsched's departure from the *Deutsche Gesellschaft*, surely signals not only the end of the role of the *Gesellschaft* in defining membership of the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture, but also the end of the *Beyträge* as the sole forum for discussion within this interculture.

**5.4.15 Inflammatory end to the Aeneas controversy (1742-44)**

In 1742 the first part of Schwartz's disputed German translation of *Aeneas* was published. Gottsched lent his authority to this publication with a preface, and Schwartz added a discussion of the criticism to which his translation had been subject. According to a favourable announcement of the new translation published in the *Beyträge*, the work
demonstrated that the translator appreciated not only the beauties of the Latin original but also those of the German language, and was capable of producing flowing poetry (Anon. 1742: 190-92).

The following year, an inflammatory condemnation of the translation by ‘Stephan Finck’ was published in the 8th issue of the Zurich-based Sammlung critischer, poetischer and anderer geistvollen Schriften.

‘Finck’ (who, according to Baechtold, was probably Breitinger, see Baechtold 1892: 560) accused Mr Schwartz of mercenary motives in undertaking the translation in the first place. Aeneas, it was claimed, had been translated into Bavarian sausages. Stephan Finck wrote:

> Man sagt öffentlich, der Hr. Verfasser habe seine Sinnen und Gedancken vielmehr in patina als in Virgils Aeneis gehabt; die Uebersetzung sey nur seine Nebenabsicht, die Hauptsicht sey eine gute Suppe und ein Kälberbraten gewesen; er habe die Aeneis in Bayerische Schincken und Knackwürste übersetzt [...] (Finck 1743: 39)

He went on to relate the tale of a Mr. von Jonquille, who had sat in public judgement over the translation, had found that Virgil’s divine poetry had been “geschändet, entweyhet und entheiliget” by the translation, and had condemned it to be destroyed by fire. The entire town, he said, was talking about Mr von Jonquille’s ‘execution’. Examples of ‘poor’ translation cited as evidence in the proceedings against the translation had included many cases where colourful Latin metaphors had been converted to sense in German, to which Mr. von Jonquille had commented:

> Glaubet ihr nun, daß man die Virgilianischen Redensarten nicht genauer und nachdrücklicher geben könne, als Hr. Schwartz getan hat [...]? (ibid: 44)

Here we see Bodmer’s concern with the translation of metaphors directly reflected in the discussion on the controversial Aeneas translation. Interestingly, Mr. von Jonquille is also quoted in giving preference to translating the ‘idea’ of a metaphor, rather than rendering it word for word, a clear departure from Huet’s precepts and an indication that the Zurich theorists were further developing their ideas on metaphor:

121 They are saying publicly that the learned author’s thoughts and senses were focused on his soup bowls rather than on Virgil’s Aeneas. The translation was no more than a side thought. His main objective was to earn himself a good pot of soup and a veal roast. He has translated Aeneas into Bavarian ham and knackwurst sausage, they say. [my translation]

122 defiled, profaned and desecrated

123 Do you believe that Virgil’s figures of speech could not have been rendered more precisely and emphatically than Mr Schwartz did [...]? [my translation]
The controversy continued in the 32nd and final issue of the *Beyträge*, with a critical assessment of Bodmer’s translation of an extract from Fenelon’s Telemach and a final salvo in the battle over the *Aeneas* translation.

In the review of Bodmer’s Telemach, the reviewer claims he will demonstrate that Bodmer has failed to comply with the translation precepts set out by his own colleague, Johann Jacob Breitinger, in the latter’s essay on translation. He then cites three of Breitinger’s precepts, demonstrating as he does so, how Breitinger has taken all of these ideas from Huet. Then comes another veiled attack on the Swiss protagonists, deploying the barbed weapon of irony:

> Diess hat Herr Breitinger abermal von Huetius genommen. Doch nein! Huetius wird es wohl aus seiner Dichtkunst gelernt haben; weil doch die Herrn Zürcher die ersten Erfinder aller Wahrheiten sind.  

(Anon. 1744: 674)

This article shows not only the antagonistic tone that had arisen between the two parties, but also the extent to which representatives of the Gottsched party now found it necessary to argue on Breitinger and Bodmer’s terms.

An even more extreme instance of this is the final article in the controversy relating to the translation of Virgil’s *Aeneas*, published in the *Beyträge* (Lerche 1744). Couched in terms of most extreme irony, this riposte to Finck’s article referred to the “allgemeinen Kunstlehrer Deutschlands, dem großen Herrn Bodmer”  

126  

the “treuherzige und patriotische Beurtheilung einer Stelle aus Herrn Schwarzens übersetzter Aeneis”  

127 and included a snide reference to Bodmer’s translation of Butler’s *Hudibras*. The author, Martin Lerche, recounts how he had gathered together the main actors in the previous judgement and “grausame Exekution” to sit now in judgement over Bodmer’s own translation of a passage from Virgil’s *Aeneas*, which had been published in his *Character der Teutschen Gedichte*  

128 of 1734, with a revised

---

124 Mr. Jonquille responded: Nobody says that the Latin has to be rendered word for word, in the way that the dictionary gives each word according to its first and most superficial meaning. On the contrary, the translator must supply the “idea” of each [figure of speech] with precision, in accordance with its intention, with the correct measure, and to the correct degree. [my translation]

125 This is yet another thing that Mr Breitinger has taken from Huet. But wait…! Huet must have learnt it from his [Breitinger’s] *Dichtkunst*. After all, it is the Zurich gentlemen who are the first inventors of all truths. [my translation]

126 All Germany’s teacher of the arts, the great Mr Bodmer

127 ingenuous and patriotic assessment of a section from Mr Schwartz’s translation of Aeneas

128 Character of German poetry
version included in the 20th issue of the *Beyträge* (1738). The criteria by which Bodmer’s translation is to be judged are those laid down by Breitinger in his essay on translation, which, claims Lerche, are impossible to fulfil. As noted by Senger (1971: 70), it is significant that in this final battle, the Gottsched party has abandoned the attempt to judge Bodmer’s translation according to its own norms as laid out by Venzky and Gottsched. The debate is now being conducted according to the norms established in the recent publications of the Swiss party.

The new court finds that Bodmer’s translation had completely failed to observe the requirements of a translator set out by Breitinger and had “geschändet, entweihet und entheiliget” Virgil’s divine poetry just as much as Schwartz had been accused of doing. The translation was “matt und nachlässig.” In particular, of eight adjectives in the Latin original, Bodmer had omitted four and yet had managed to include a total of 13 ‘artistic’ adjectives in his translation. Lerche attributed these additions to manipulation on the part of Bodmer, aimed at presenting Virgil as a more ‘artistic’ author than he really was.

> Wo sind diese zehn untergeschobene, und wenn ich so sagen darf, unvirgilianische Beywörter anders hergekommen, als von einer Begierde, den Virgil zu verschönern und ihn recht wider seinen Willen, zum Maler zu machen? (Lerche 1744: 667)

The ‘court’ pronounced that Bodmer’s translation be copied out six times, shredded and smoked by the participants, and further, that a copy be pinned to the same school donkey to which Schwartz’s translation had been pinned before.

These two articles published in the final issue of the *Beyträge* are good examples of how the Leipzig party attempted to suppress, or if this was impossible, to ridicule the work of translations done in accordance with the new norm formulated by Breitinger and Bodmer.

5.4.16 Bodmer’s ‘Von der erfoderten [sic] Genauigkeit beym Uebersetzen’ (1746)

Four years later, in 1746, Bodmer published another essay on translation (J.J. Bodmer 1746) in *Der Mahler der Sitten*, a new Zurich-based moral weekly. In a scarcely veiled reference to the discussions in the *Beyträge*, Bodmer noted how Germans had been familiarised with classic and modern scholarly works through translation. Unfortunately, he commented, the translators of these works had been content to reproduce the content in “rein und zierlich deutsch.” Very few had taken the trouble to present to the German reader the manner in

---

129 flat and careless

130 What can be the reason for the surreptitious inclusion of these ten adjectives – un-Virgilian ones, if I may say so – if it is not the desire to improve Virgil and turn him into a painter against his will? [my translation]

131 pure and attractive German
which the author had presented his material: "die Weisen, wie ein Urheber die Sachen vorgetragen." Where they had done so, such translators had been subjected to public ridicule or even suppressed:

Die strenge Regierung, welche gewisse Oberherren in dem deutschen Sprachreiche seit geraumer Zeit so unbarmhertzig ausüben, hat solche Versuche allmahlich mit ihrem öffentlichen Gespött als einem schmerzhaften Eisen gebrandmahlet, oder gar ersticket.\textsuperscript{132} (J.J. Bodmer 1746: 522)

The clear authority for Bodmer’s essay, cited at the head of the text, was Horace. The main new idea presented here by Bodmer was that there were two possible approaches to translation, and the translator had the choice either of a translation focusing on simple communication of content or a faithful translation:

[...\textit{ist die Absicht, die in der Urschrift enthaltene Materie in einer andern Sprache der Welt einfälltig mitzutheilen, so liegt dem Uebersetzer ja ob, alles auf das klareste und deutlichste nach dem Genius seiner Sprache vorzutragen: Will man aber eine genaue Uebersetzung haben, die nicht nur die Gedancken der Urschrift vorlege, sondern auch alle die Arten und Weisen, die der Urheber gebraucht, seine Gedancken an den Tag zu geben, beybehalte, so muss auch solches gantz genau bewerkstelliget werden [...]}.\textsuperscript{133} (ibid: 521)

The latter approach, particularly when applied to metaphors, often resulted in attractive and vivid images for readers.

\section*{5.5 Significance of the Zurich-Leipzig translation debate}

We see how, during the course of the literary debate, a new translation norm had emerged that favoured greater source-text orientation in translation. Initially this norm may be regarded as having been 'peripheral' within the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture, while most writers in the \textit{Beyträge} complied with the 'central norm' formulated by Venzky and Gottsched.

In the area of translation, as in aesthetics, Gottsched’s party followed the French 'central norm' in emphasising the need for flowing, readable German translations. In doing so they placed a stronger focus on a 'communication norm' than was the case for the Swiss, where

\begin{flushright}\textsuperscript{132} Under the strict control that certain supreme leaders have been exercising so remorselessly in the German language empire for some time now, such attempts have been consistently discredited as embarrassing problems, through public derision, or else they have been suppressed. [my translation]\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}\textsuperscript{133} If the intention is to communicate the material contained in the original text into another language of the world in a simple manner, it is the duty of the translator to present everything in the clearest manner in accordance with the nature of his language. However, if a precise translation is wanted that presents not only the thoughts of the original text but also retains the entire manner used by the originator to reveal his thoughts, then this needs to be managed absolutely precisely. [my translation]\end{flushright}
accountability to the author held a more central position ("Where is Virgil?")
and issues such as the appropriate translation of metaphor became more important.

Gottsched’s objections to the ‘peripheral’ position also included considerations of
‘preliminary norms’, in other words, the decision to translate a work like Paradise Lost in the
first place. In line with French aesthetic thought, he regarded imaginative passages such as
the description of ‘Pandemonium’ as the height of bad taste. Bodmer’s transgression was that
he not only translated such works but also defended them in publications such as the
Critische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren in der Poesie, using new ideas taken from
Italian and English literary thought, such as the role of imagination in poetry. More detail on
these ideas and on the conflict between Bodmer and Gottsched in the field of literary theory
may be found in the literature on the period (for example Newald 1975, Bender 1973, Robertson 1962).

The Zurich-Leipzig debate was also a contest between two opposing literatures – that of the
established political, economic and cultural power of France and that of the emerging
political and economic power of England. As noted in chapter four (section 2.1), England has
been identified as the natural opponent of France in this period, and the Zurich-Leipzig
debates can be read as part of this conflict, from which English literature – advocated by
Bodmer – emerged as the winner.

By 1744 the translation norm formulated by Bodmer and Breitinger appears to have moved
into a central position, with contributors to the Beyträger assessing translations in accordance
with Breitinger’s precepts. The debate that raged within the Zurich-Leipzig professional
interculture, and the ‘victory’ of the peripheral norm with which it concluded, is particularly
significant in view of later developments in translation theory and practice in eighteenth
century German-speaking Europe.

My following two chapters will analyse in detail the impact of the debate of the 1730s on
Bodmer’s own translation practice in his translations of Paradise Lost, while chapter eight
presents a brief review of subsequent developments.
Chapter Six – The Translation

My discussion of the translation debate conducted within the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture during the 1730s has shown how the Zurich protagonists – Johann Jacob Bodmer and Johann Jacob Breitinger – advocated norms featuring greater source-text orientation in translation and more accountability to the source-text author. They argued that, in translation, ideas should be presented in the same order and using the same images as the source text, and achieving the same effect on the target text reader as the source text did on its reader. In doing so their arguments followed those of earlier translators in the French peripheral tradition, especially Pierre-Daniel Huet. They opposed the central norm advocated by Johann Christoph Gottsched and Georg Venzky, who favoured translations couched in flowing readable German.

To what extent did Bodmer’s second translation of Paradise Lost, prepared at the end of the period when this debate took place, reflect the differing ideas on translation discussed within the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture? Did his translation practice actually embody the principles that he was advocating so forcefully during this debate? Or was he also influenced by ideas put forward by the opposing party?

My study continues with a detailed investigation into Bodmer’s actual translation practice, focusing my attention on the differences between his first translation of Paradise Lost, completed before the Zurich-Leipzig translation debate, and the second one, published at the end of the debate.

6.1 Review of the literature on Bodmer’s translation practice

With the exception of Bender and Schmitter, none of the literature on Bodmer’s German translation of Paradise Lost has examined the changes he made to the translation from 1732 to 1780, the period over which his six different versions were published. Viles (1903) set out to catalogue all the deviations of the German text from the source text, basing his work on the 1769 (fourth) edition of the translation. Like many commentators, his approach was normative in character and his conclusion went no further than to state that “Bodmer […] followed the original so closely and accurately, that my labor was reduced largely to categorizing the variations in word, phrase and clause.” (Preface) Schmitter’s dissertation (1913) compared the orthographic, grammatical and genus changes through five of Bodmer’s six translations in order to document the process of linguistic change in Switzerland over this
50-year period. Thus his work properly belongs to the field of linguistics rather than translation studies. Schöffler (1925: 66-67) merely refers to Bodmer’s ‘slavish’ translation approach and to the hundreds of passages in the 1732 edition that cannot be read nowadays without a smile and that were not necessarily improved in the 1742 translation.

The most extensive work on Bodmer’s translations of Paradise Lost has been done by Bender (1967). He draws attention to the surprising lack of information on how the six different texts came into being, and comments on some of the features of the 1732 translation, in particular the way in which Bodmer ‘unravelled’ the complex sentences found in the source text. He outlines Bodmer’s correspondence with Johann Christoph Clauder after publication of the 1732 translation and Breitinger’s discussion of Clauder’s suggestions for improvement in his Critische Dichtkunst, and goes on to discuss some of the changes that Bodmer made in his 1742 translation, again focusing on the area of syntax.

Baumer (2001) presents a detailed analysis of a passage from Book VIII, in which Adam and the Archangel Raphael discuss the nature of the universe in the light of the traditional theological worldview and the “new science”. Bodmer’s 1742 translation is compared with the source text using Juliane House’s (revised) model for translation quality assessment (1997). The analysis reveals a number of shifts in the translation that weaken the theological-scientific line of argumentation whilst strengthening the imaginative elements of the passage. In particular, lexical items reflecting the noble, elevated style typical of an epic appear to have been reproduced relatively accurately, although there was a tendency to overstate their semantic content where there was an element of charm or captivation, while the attributes of God tended to become more autocratic and less delightful. These changes were in line with Bodmer’s view that the purpose of the text was poetical, not theological.

6.2 Methodology

6.2.1 Texts for analysis

This study uses a much wider and more extensive range of samples than my 2001 analysis, and a different methodology, as outlined in chapter two (section 5). It was necessary to make use of a considerable range of handwritten original sources and rare books, many of them available only in the Zentralbibliothek in Zurich. This was due to the fact that apart from a number of reprints of major works in the 1960s and some limited collections of correspondence printed mostly in the nineteenth century (see chapter four, section 1.2), little original material on Bodmer is available and certainly no edition of collected works has ever been published.

Thus, although I was able to use a facsimile reprint of 1965 for my basic text – the 1742 translation – my information on the timing of Bodmer’s actual revisions for this publication
was obtained from manuscripts held at the Appenzell Ausserrhoden cantonal archive at Trogen, Switzerland. This is where the correspondence of Bodmer’s friend Laurenz Zellweger is kept. Bodmer’s letters are composed in an old German script (a predecessor of ‘Sütterlin’ script) using letter forms that in many cases are completely different from modern forms. The problems in deciphering this writing are even greater due to the fact that, as Bodmer got older, his handwriting became increasingly rushed. Indeed, it is acknowledged by a number of scholars to be almost illegible – which may be one reason why no collection of his correspondence has ever been published! Zellweger’s letters, by contrast, are written in the French that was so prevalent in Switzerland at that time, using a more legible Latin script.

Until the latter half of 1738, at least, Bodmer appears to have been reluctant to rework his first translation, despite the extensive corrections to the German of the 1732 edition made by Clauder. On 30 July 1738 he wrote to Gottsched that he would like to make improvements to his first translation of Paradise Lost, in which he himself recognised many “rauhtönende Wörter und Wortfügungen”\(^{134}\), but the difficulty of the job was a serious deterrent, and he wished that a more skilled man than himself could do it (Wolff 1895-97: vol 1, 229-30).

On 23 June 1740 Bodmer, who was in Zurich, wrote to Zellweger in Trogen, suggesting that it would be a good time for Zellweger to visit him, since he (Bodmer) had just completed a number of pieces of work. It would therefore appear that, at this stage, Bodmer had still not begun his revisions to Paradise Lost. However, in a letter dated 29 August, he wrote that he was working very hard on his new translation, and on 5 September Zellweger responded, indicating his pleasure that Bodmer was translating Milton and hoping this would not cause Bodmer to neglect his friends. On 2 October Bodmer wrote back, saying he hadn’t wished to reply until he was in a position to say he had completed his second translation of Paradise Lost. “Nachdem dieses gescheh[en], ist mir eine schwere Last vom halse [..].”\(^{135}\) (J.J. Bodmer 1740a) Eleven days later, Zellweger wrote sincerely congratulating Bodmer and expressing the hope that the work would soon be published, embellished with Bodmer’s remarks. It would therefore appear that the revisions were completed very rapidly, over a period of three months at most – July, August and September – in the summer of 1740.

My main text for comparison is the two-volume 1732 translation, where I have been fortunate enough to work from Bodmer’s own copy, donated to the Zentralbibliothek in 1780, and held there to the present day. This copy contains (fairly illegible) notes added in Bodmer’s hand on the two empty pages before the beginning of the printed text (see Appendix II, section 2), as well as comments on the final page. As noted in the previous chapter (section 4.13), these notes would appear to have been a form of check-list drawn up by Bodmer as he began to

\(^{134}\) coarse-sounding words and syntax

\(^{135}\) A heavy burden is off my shoulders now that this is done. [my translation]
work on his second translation. They refer to ‘emendationes grammaticas’ made by Clauder, and planned improvements for a future edition, including a reference to the debates on aesthetics and translation conducted in the pages of the *Beyträge zur Critischen Historie der deutschen Sprache*.

Although the ‘emendationes grammaticas’ by Clauder are no longer available, the *Zentralbibliothek* does hold a manuscript collection of letters written by Clauder to Bodmer, covering the period from 6 December 1731 to 8 October 1734, as well as one undated letter. These provide some information on the improvements referred to in Bodmer’s handwritten notice.

Throughout the copy of the text held by the *Zentralbibliothek* there are also numerous handwritten corrections that appear to have been made by at least two different people, one of whom appears to have been Bodmer (see Appendix IV, which contains the transcription of a short extract from this text, including the handwritten corrections). Many of the corrections relate to orthography, while in other places individual words or phrases have been underlined. Even if these underlinings are not necessarily Clauder’s own corrections, it can be assumed that they were made on the basis of Clauder’s comments. Corroboration for this assumption may be found in Breitinger’s *Critische Dichtkunst*, which contains a lengthy section defending ‘einige Redensarten’ in Bodmer’s translation of *Paradise Lost* against criticisms made by a ‘deutsche Criticus’ – in other words, by Clauder (Breitinger 1740a: vol 2, 70-90). The phrases cited by Breitinger all occur in Books I and II of the 1732 translation, and in every single case the corresponding phrase in Bodmer’s copy of the translation has been underlined. Bender concludes:

> Allem Anschein nach hat also Breitinger Clauders Anmerkungen unmittelbar der nicht erhaltenen Handschrift entnommen, um sie dann später dem Abschnitt *Von den Macht-Wörtern* als Zitat einzufügen. (Bender 1967: 245)

Thus Breitinger’s commentary in his *Critische Dichtkunst* as well as the underlined passages in the *Zentralbibliothek* copy of *Paradise Lost* provide useful indications as to what was actually corrected by Clauder.

---

136 grammatical corrections

137 a number of figures of speech

138 It would appear that Breitinger took Clauder’s comments directly from the manuscript [i.e. Clauder’s manuscript], which no longer exists, and later inserted them in the section entitled *Von den Macht-Wörtern* (Of Powerful Words) in the form of quotes.
Since the 1732 translation was published in two volumes, all my references to this translation in this and the following chapter indicate first the volume (1 or 2) followed by a comma, and then the page number.

My other text for comparison is the English source text of Milton’s *Paradise Lost*. Since a period of 73 years had elapsed between the date of the original publication and the time when Bodmer made his revisions, the question arose as to which English edition of *Paradise Lost* Bodmer had used as his source text. Bender has assumed that for the 1742 translation he used the same 1711 Tonson edition that he used for his first translation (ibid: 246). However, my work has shown that he had access to at least one other edition at this time, the new edition of Milton’s *Paradise Lost* by Richard Bentley published in 1732, to which explicit reference is made in Bodmer’s 1742 translation. Fowler has noted that the editions of the first half century were all reprints and that the first edition that could be called critical was Bentley’s (Fowler 1998: 7). We might therefore expect that Bodmer’s knowledge of this edition would have had an impact on his second translation. However, a selective examination of the alterations made in Bodmer’s 1742 translation did not reveal any instances where changes made by Bentley appeared to have affected Bodmer’s decisions. For the purpose of the analysis I therefore made use of the Fowler edition of *Paradise Lost* which notes the chief deviations between early reprints of the work. For ease of reference, when quoting from *Paradise Lost* in this chapter and the following one, I have in all cases indicated the number of the book in Roman numerals followed by the line number in Arabic numerals.

### 6.2.2 Method of comparison and corpus

Using these three base texts, I compared the two translations of 1732 and 1742 using the checklist drawn up by Lambert and van Gorp (Lambert & van Gorp 1985; see chapter two, section 5.2, for more information on this). The parameters for my micro-level analysis were based on the key points of difference identified in the translation debate of the 1730s. Thus they included issues of ‘good, flowing German’ as advocated by Gottsched and Venzky (orthography, grammar, vocabulary), maintaining word order as advocated by Bodmer and Breitinger, and participle constructions and ellipsis, which were also discussed by Bodmer and Breitinger. In view of the extensive discussion of Bible translation, the fact that two different Bibles were used in Zurich and Leipzig, and the nature of the material covered by *Paradise Lost*, my analysis also touched on issues of Biblical quotation. Finally, I devoted particular attention to the issue of metaphor, which was a major aspect of Bodmer’s ideas on translation and a particular point of contention between the parties. My findings on metaphor are presented in the following chapter.

Since the twelve books of *Paradise Lost* are too lengthy to consider a full comparison of the translation with the original, I decided to select sample passages for a more detailed analysis. Before embarking on a full analysis I first did a trial comparison of texts in Books XI and XII. I then selected the corpus for my full analysis in line with the considerations presented in
chapter two, section 5.3. As outlined there, extra-textual data on the use of metaphor in *Paradise Lost* was available for a lengthy passage in Book IV, and this therefore constituted one of the passages in my corpus. In addition, I chose five further passages on the basis of other sources of extra-textual data on Bodmer’s translation. These were the first 55 lines of Book III, which form the subject of critical comments by Gottsched in his initial review of Bodmer’s first translation of *Paradise Lost* (Gottsched 1732b), parts of Books IX and X where the English source text uses quotations from the English Bible, and parts of Book I for which Breitinger’s commentary on Clauder’s linguistic corrections is available. In addition, for the passage in Book I, I was also able to make comparisons with excerpts from Berge’s first translation of *Paradise Lost* (quoted in Gottsched 1732a), as well as with the first few lines of the Italian and French translations (Dorris 1965; Gillet 1975).

Finally, as noted in chapter two, I chose a passage from the beginning of Book V for which a German translation had been done by Barthold Heinrich Brockes (1680-1747) at around the same time as Bodmer’s translation, but without his knowledge (see Appendix V for a short extract from this translation). A comparison of Bodmer’s translation with Brockes’ was particularly interesting for my analysis of metaphor.

Thus my final corpus provides a good spread of passages taken from different sections of the translation. It consisted of Book I lines 1-220, Book III lines 1-55, Book IV lines 131-357, Book V lines 1-274, Book IX lines 655-732 and Book X lines 158-208. Taken as a whole, these passages represent almost 1000 lines or a little under one tenth of the entire work.

A final consideration when investigating translations done almost 300 years ago is the problem of working with antiquated vocabulary. Here it was necessary to resort to old dictionaries, and this was, in itself, a problem due to the fact that it was not until the eighteenth century that the process of compiling German dictionaries began in earnest. In 1734, during the years of the translation debate and just six years before Bodmer made his revisions, Steinbach had published his *Vollständiges Deutsches Wörter-Buch* (Steinbach 1734). Unfortunately, however, the number of entries proved to be insufficient for my study. I therefore used Adelung’s dictionary, published at the end of the eighteenth century (1793-1802) and the German dictionary initiated by the brothers Grimm (1854-1960), who gave particular attention to Alemannic terms and excerpted extensively from Bodmer and Breitinger.

6.3 Preliminary and ‘macro-level’ data

Following the checklist provided by Lambert and van Gorp (see chapter two, 5.2) I began my analysis of the differences between Bodmer’s 1732 and 1742 translations by examining
preliminary and ‘macro-level’ data (including title, title page, metatexts, division into chapters, authorial comment).

6.3.1 The title of the translation

In his 1742 translation Bodmer altered the title of his Paradise Lost translation from Verlust des Paradieses, which he had used for his first translation, to Das Verlohrne Paradies. As some commentators have pointed out, the use of a past participle in the English title was a deliberate choice by Milton, drawing on Latin and the epic tradition, and seen in titles such as Gerusalemme Liberata. As an idiomatic phrase it meant ‘the losing of Paradise’ and not ‘the lost Paradise’ (Hale 1997: 111). Thus Bodmer’s first title, Verlust des Paradieses, was a correct interpretation of the English title.

However, this title was one of the few things criticised by Gottsched in his otherwise favourable initial review of Bodmer’s translation in the Beyträg (Gottsched 1732b: 294). Johann Miltons Verlust des Paradieses, he wrote, sounded strange to German ears, as though Milton himself had lost Paradise. The translator should have followed the English and written ‘das verlohrne Paradies’. In his letter of 30 July 1738 to Gottsched, Bodmer defended his choice of title, saying that this minor ambiguity could be defended on the grounds that any person of reason would understand what was meant, and there were precedents in titles such as ‘Boileaus Pult’, ‘Popes Haarlocke’ and ‘Brocksen Kindermord’ (Wolff 1895-97: vol. 1, 230). Nevertheless, when he came to revise his translation two years later, he used precisely the title suggested by Gottsched, Das Verlohrne Paradies, which corresponds to ‘the lost Paradise’ and not ‘the losing of Paradise’. This is perhaps the first indication that Bodmer was prepared to make some compromises with respect to the norm of word-for-word faithfulness enshrined in Huet’s paper on translation if it would ensure greater acceptability for his translation in the wider German-speaking world.

The full title pages of the two versions read as follows:

\[ \text{Johann Miltons / Verlust / des / Paradieses. / Ein / Helden=Gedicht. / In ungebundener Rede übersetzt. / Zürich, / Gedruckt bey Marcus Rordorf, 1732.} \]

\[ \text{Johann Miltons / Episches / Gedichte / von dem / Verlohrnen / Paradiese. / Uebersetzt und durchgehends mit Anmerckungen / über die Kunst des Poeten} \]

139 Loss of Paradise

140 The Lost Paradise

6.3.2 Translator’s preface, ‘arguments’ and prose form

While the title page of the first translation contained no mention of the translator’s name, the second does. No information is available on the reasons for this. However, it is possible that by the time of the second translation Bodmer’s reputation had become more firmly established, and that his name was included on the title page in the hope of selling more copies. For the second translation, Bodmer also arranged for the translation to be simultaneously published in Leipzig and Zurich. Again, no information is available on the reasons for this. It cannot have been to escape the Zurich censor (during this period, books published in Zurich often bore the names of other cities to make it appear as though they had been published elsewhere and thus escape the still rigorous Zurich censorship, but this is not the case here since one of the locations given is Zurich itself). It is possible that the two publication locations were another attempt to increase acceptability within German-speaking Europe. Finally, Bodmer combined the two volumes in which the first translation had been published to create a one-volume edition for the 1742 translation.

What Bodmer did not include in 1742, however, was the extensive translator’s preface covering Milton’s life, the writing of Paradise Lost itself, and the various translations in Latin, French, Italian, Dutch and German, which had been published with the 1732 translation. Nor did he reproduce his earlier translation of Dryden’s short poem on Paradise Lost, or the Latin poem on Paradise Lost by Sam Barrow, both of which had been included in the 1732 translation. By checking an original copy of the 1742 translation in the extensive Milton collection held by the Turnbull Library in Wellington, I was able to confirm that the facsimile edition I was working with had actually reproduced the entire contents of the original publication, and that there was indeed no preface. Thus, from the title page, the reader of the 1742 edition moved straight into Book I of the translation. It seems that this decision to omit a preface had surprised Bodmer’s close friend Zellweger, since he wrote to Bodmer on 19 March 1742:

Pour quelle raison vous n’avez mis de Préface à votre nouveau milton? Ce défaut choquera un peu le public.143 (Zellweger 1742)

142 John Milton’s epic poem of the Lost Paradise. Translated with the addition of notes on the poet’s art throughout, by Johann Jacob Bodmer. Zurich, Conrad Orell und Comp. 1742 and Leipzig, Joh. Friederich Gleditsch

143 Why did you not include a preface with your new Milton? This omission will offend the public somewhat. [my translation]
It appears that a preface may originally have been planned for the 1742 edition, since Bodmer’s handwritten notes in his own copy of the first edition – his translation check-list – made reference to a ‘Vorrede von den freyheiten, die Milton in der Sprache gebraucht hat’\textsuperscript{144}. However this topic was actually covered in a separate article, ‘Abhandlung von der Schreibart in Miltons verlohrnen Paradiese’, which was also published in 1742.

Like the 1732 translation, the 1742 version was based on the twelve-book version of Milton’s *Paradise Lost* (rather than the 10-book initial version), with the chapter division used in English editions from 1674 onwards. However, neither translation included the introductory texts or ‘Arguments’ which Milton’s printer, Samuel Simmons, had added as a preface to each of the 12 books (Fowler 1998: 5). As in 1732, Bodmer’s 1742 translation of Milton’s verse was in prose. The use of prose translations was an uncontested issue within the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture, and Gottsched had praised Bodmer’s decision to use prose for his 1732 translation in his initial favourable review printed in the *Beyträge*.

### 6.3.3 Footnotes

At a ‘macro-level’ the major innovation in the 1742 edition was the addition of extensive footnotes throughout the translation (see Appendix IV for an example of this). As early as October 1724, Bodmer’s friend Laurenz Zellweger, in a letter bemoaning the difficulties in getting the first translation published, had suggested the addition of notes explaining the difficult passages (Zellweger 1724). The use of explanatory footnotes in translations was not in itself a contested issue in the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture, since Venzky had advocated the use of ‘small footnotes’ to clarify the ‘darkest’ and most controversial issues (Venzky 1734: 111). However, the role allocated to footnotes by Huet was more significant. Since he opposed intervention within the text itself, he urged translators to use footnotes to explain the origin and meaning of expressions that had been translated literally:

> Accordingly then, however careful and accurate a translation may be, nonetheless, due to the discord between languages you shall scarcely have any that can do without notes and cautionary reminders, as though they would amend what is defective and wanting in language conversion. (see Delater 2002: 51)

Bodmer’s footnotes, however, do not relate to difficulties in the translation. A large number of them refer to criticisms of particular passages in *Paradise Lost* by French and German commentators. They also include translations of quotes from a range of different authorities, most of them English, designed to convince a German readership of the qualities of individual passages in Milton’s epic. Clearly Bodmer’s overriding concern was to counter objections to the aesthetic aspects of the work that had included a particularly virulent attack by Gottsched published in the same year that Bodmer prepared his second translation (see

\textsuperscript{144} Preface on the liberties taken by Milton in his use of language
As Bodmer himself explained in his ‘Abhandlung von der Schreibart in Miltons verlorenen Paradiese’:

Ich habe viele besondere Nachrichten und Anmerckungen einflissen lassen, welche dienen, die Fähigkeit des Lesers zu erweitern, ihn in die Gedancken, und Vorstellungen des Poeten einzuführen, und die Vorurtheile, welche desfalls im Lichte stehen, wegzuräumen.¹⁴⁵ (1742b: 75)

Just how extensive these footnotes are is evident if we consider that in the 49 pages of the translation of Book I alone, there are a total of 36 footnotes, 14 of which are half a page or more long, while the final footnote at the end of Book XII presents four pages of discussion about the close of the epic.

Looking at the translation as a whole, the commentator who features most frequently in the footnotes is Constantin de Magny, author of the Dissertation critique sur le Paradis perdu¹⁴⁶, published in 1729. In more than forty footnotes, some of them over a page long, Bodmer rebuffed criticisms by Magny relating mainly to Milton’s depiction of characters in Hell, the description of angels, and the content of the epic. There are also footnotes dealing with criticisms of Paradise Lost by Voltaire, based clearly on Desfontaines’ French translation of Voltaire’s 1727 English essay on epic poetry (and not Voltaire’s own later translation), as well as a few footnotes discussing criticisms by Gottsched.

In support of Milton’s epic, Bodmer also included thirty extensive quotes by Joseph Addison (in German translation; presumably by Bodmer), most of them taken from Addison’s papers on Paradise Lost published in The Spectator. Following six general papers on the action, actors, sentiments, language, criticism and defects of Paradise Lost, Addison’s papers had discussed each book separately, and it is from these detailed discussions that Bodmer took his quotes relating to individual passages in the epic. In almost every case the comments chosen were highly complimentary of Milton’s poem and drew attention to particularly effective writing.

Other English commentators cited included J. Richardson, father and son, authors of Explanatory Notes and Remarks on Milton’s Paradise Lost, published in 1734 and presenting detailed comments on individual passages in the epic, and Richard Bentley, editor of a new edition of Milton’s Paradise Lost published in 1732 which set out to ‘correct’ numerous typographical and spelling errors that Bentley had identified in the existing editions. Explicit references to Bentley’s edition, such as the mention of a Greek proverb in a footnote on page 13 of Bentley’s Paradise Lost (J.J.Bodmer 1742a: 16) are evidence that has led me to revise

¹⁴⁵ I have included a great deal of special information and notes that serve to enhance the reader’s abilities, to introduce him to the thoughts and ideas of the poet and to clear away the prejudices that stand in the way of this. [my translation]

¹⁴⁶ Critical dissertation on Paradise Lost.
the assumption by Bender (Bender 1967: 246) that Bodmer based his 1742 translation on the 1711 Tonson edition of Paradise Lost alone. However, it does not appear that this access to a later edition of Paradise Lost prompted any substantial changes in the translation. Where Bentley and Tonson differ, Bodmer appears to have stuck to the Tonson version.

Taken as a whole, the footnotes clearly reveal Bodmer’s concern to enhance the reader’s appreciation of the aesthetic qualities of Paradise Lost. Indeed, on more than one occasion, the footnotes even go as far as hinting that Milton had included material merely because it could be described so poetically. A case in point is Book VIII, where the archangel Raphael describes God’s creation of the world to Adam, and Bodmer adds the following footnote:

Diese Vorstellung des Sonnenlichtes und des Planetenlichtes mag nichts anders als ein Tand und Traum seyn, so ist sie doch wegen ihrer Lebhaftigkeit gantz poetisch, und steht als eine sinnliche Ausbildung selbst in dem Munde des Ertzengels an ihrem Orte.147 (1742a: 340)

However, nowhere do the footnotes comment on details relating to the challenges of the translation itself. Part of the reason for this may be linked to Bodmer’s decision not to publish a preface. A more important explanation for the lack of comment on translation, however, probably lies in Bodmer’s overriding concern to establish the aesthetic qualities of the source text.

6.4 ‘Micro-level’ data – issues of ‘good’ German

Continuing with Lambert and van Gorps’s check-list, I now turn to a ‘micro-level’ analysis of the differences between the 1732 and 1742 translations. The first thing to note at the micro-level (phonic, graphic, lexico-semantic and stylistic levels) is that there is barely a sentence in the 1742 edition that has not been altered in some way. The specific changes relate to orthography, grammar, lexical choice, syntax and sentence breaks. Even in the area of typography there are changes, with the 1732 partial capitalisation of ‘GOtt’ and ‘GOttes’ changed to ‘Gott’ and Gottes’ in the 1742 edition. Because the differences are so extensive I decided to focus my examination of the two translations on the specific issues of ‘good German’ and style raised in the translation debate of the 1730s, and to give special attention to the handling of metaphor.

6.4.1 ‘Swiss’ grammatical features

Both Clauder and Gottsched drew attention to ‘Swiss’ grammatical features of Bodmer’s 1732 translation that did not conform to the norms of the ‘Meissen’ variety of German and

---

147 This description of the light of the sun and the planets may be no more than mere show and delusion, and yet its liveliness renders it most poetic, and it has its justification as a sensory depiction - even when placed in the mouth of the archangel. [my translation]
were therefore regarded – by both Gottsched and Bodmer (at least at the time) – as being ‘hard’ and ‘coarse’. In a letter to Bodmer dated 19 October 1732, Clauder outlined two specific grammatical ‘rules’. The first was:

   Alle Substantiva die im Nominativo Singulari sich nicht auch in e endigen nehmen im plurali das n anders nicht, als in dativo und ablativo an.\(^{148}\) (Clauder 1732)

The Swiss plural ending in \(-n\) criticised here was a very striking and prevalent feature, for instance in the titles of Swiss poetic works of the early eighteenth century such as Bodmer and Breitinger’s own Discourse der Mahlern. Even the Zurich Bible, which had led the way in the gradual process of assimilation, with each new edition moving closer to the German spoken in the south-eastern German states, still used \(-n\) plural forms as, for instance in Genesis 3, verse 2, “Da sprach das weib zu der schlangen.” (Biblia 1712)

Clauder’s second ‘rule’ related to singular endings in \(-e\), and read as follows:

   Alle monosyllaba die den Genitivum durch 2. [sic] Syllaben formiren nehmen in dativo und ablativo singul. ein e an. Hingegen vice versa, wo der genitivus auch ein Monosyllabum bleibt, müssen der dativus od. ablativus nothwendig auch monosyllabum bleiben.\(^{149}\) (ibid)

In his initial review of Bodmer’s translation of Paradise Lost, Gottsched had also criticised Bodmer’s infringement of precisely these two rules, listing specific examples from the text of Book III (Gottsched 1732b: 297-98) and citing the late-seventeenth century German grammarian Johann Bödiker as his authority on these grammatical matters. For instance, Gottsched made reference to Bodmer’s use of an \(-e\) ending in the word ‘Strom’ (meaning river, here in the accusative case and spelt in the eighteenth-century manner with an ‘h’). In Bodmer’s text the relevant passage read: “Oder hörst du dich lieber einen reinen Etherischen Strohme heissen [...]” (Bodmer 1732: 1, 83). According to ‘Meissen’ rules, the word ‘Strohme’ should have been spelt without an ‘e’.

Criticism of Bodmer’s ‘Swiss’ grammar related not only to his declination of nouns but also to his conjugation of verbs. Gottsched’s article in the Beyträge cited two examples, while examination of Bodmer’s own copy of the 1732 translation revealed seven corrections to verb forms in just the first 220 lines of Book I. These markings related in particular to \(-e\) endings for verbs, such as ‘ware’ instead of ‘war’, ‘seye’ instead of ‘sey’ or ‘einnahme’ instead of ‘einnahm’.  

\(^{148}\) All nouns that do not end in \(-e\) in the nominative singular, take an \(-n\) in the plural only in the dative and ablative cases. [my translation]

\(^{149}\) All monosyllables whose genitive cases are formed with two syllables take an \(-e\) in the dative and ablative singular. On the other hand, in cases where the genitive remains a monosyllable, the dative and ablative must of necessity remain monosyllabic. [my translation]
There is evidence for Bodmer’s own concerns about his ‘Helvetic’ style of German throughout the period between the first translation of *Paradise Lost* and the second. Following his early initiative in seeking a scholar who would correct his 1732 translation in accordance with the rules of ‘Meissen’ German and the ensuing correspondence with Clauder, a letter to Gottsched dated 28 August 1735 is accompanied by a postscript in which he again seeks linguistic correction. He has enclosed a poem written upon the death of his young son, and grants Gottsched full powers to correct such ‘errors’ that may have arisen as a result of his provincial manner of speaking (Wolff 1895-97: vol 1, 219).

Two years later, shortly after Bodmer’s acceptance into the *Deutsche Gesellschaft*, his friend Laurenz Zellweger makes reference in a letter to deprecating remarks Bodmer has evidently been making privately to his lifetime confidante about the *Deutsche Gesellschaft*. Zellweger chides Bodmer, arguing that his friend should be particularly appreciative of his acceptance into the *Gesellschaft* because this honour has been granted despite the disregard in which Swiss scholars are held – particularly by the people of Saxony – due to their Swiss style of German:

> Les Suisses sont si décriés, tant du côté du bel esprit qu’à l’égard de leur Style allemand, qu’il [sic] faut des qualités fort éminentes pour persuader leurs Antagonistes (dont il y en a un grand nombre partout et principalement aussi en Saxe) du contraire, il faut donc qu’absolument on ait reconnu en Vous un mérite fort éclatant dans ces sortes des sciences, pour Vous y avoir donné place préférentiellement à tant d’Allemands qu’l’ambitionneraient et qui s’en feraient plus de fête que Vous ne semblez d’en faire.150 (Zehnder geb. Stadlin 1875: 322)

Less than a year later, in another letter to Gottsched, Bodmer admits that he has himself noticed many coarse-sounding words and syntax in his first translation of *Paradise Lost*, and had only been deterred from reworking it by the effort this would entail.

Even allowing for the fact that Bodmer’s statements in his correspondence with Gottsched may not always have fully reflected his own thoughts, it appears clear that Bodmer recognised the impediment to acceptance of his *Paradise Lost* translation presented by his ‘Helvetic’ spelling, grammar and style, and that he intended to address this issue in a later reworking of the translation.

With regard to grammatical changes made in the course of his revisions for the 1742 edition, these have been examined in detail by Schmitter, while Bender also gives examples of grammatical corrections. For this reason, I have limited my investigation of this aspect to

---

150 The Swiss are so greatly disparaged – as much from the point of view of bel esprit (cultivated taste) as with respect to their German style – that really outstanding qualities are required to convince their opponents (of whom there are many everywhere, and especially in Saxony) of the contrary; therefore it is quite certain that in this branch of learning exceptional qualities have been recognised in you, to have granted you a position in preference to that of Germans who would have sought such honour, and that they are making more of a celebration of it than you appear to do. [my translation]
examining how the individual grammatical items criticised by Gottsched for Book III were handled in the 1742 translation. To this I added a small sample of the handwritten grammatical corrections entered in Bodmer’s own copy of his first translation. These were taken from my first sample passage – the translation of lines 1-220 of Book I. I noted that for all of these criticised and corrected items, there was not one single case in which the 1742 translation had retained the original ‘Swiss’ grammatical version of 1732. In some cases the corrections had been made exactly as indicated or recommended by Gottsched, and in a slightly larger number of cases Bodmer had rewritten the passage.

6.4.2 Lexical choices

Gottsched’s criticism of the first translation of Paradise Lost also mentioned lexical choices that, in his opinion, did not conform to good ‘Meissen’ practice. The term ‘Gesprosse’, for instance, which Bodmer had used in his translation of Book III, was a ‘fremdes Wort’ for people in Upper Saxony, who would prefer to use the expression ‘Kind des Himmels’. In his letter to Bodmer dated 27 February 1733, Clauder showed himself to be less dogmatic than Gottsched, stating that although he had marked words in the translation as being strange, that did not mean that he personally rejected them but simply that they were unfamiliar to people in Upper Saxony. He continued:

Ich räume aber gleich freywilling ein, daß es vor die Obersachsen und Meisner ein großer hochmuth sey dergleichen guten Worten den Zutritt zu versagen, (da man doch keine beßerer hat) und dabey sich ein Imperium über die anderen Dialectos anzumaßen.\(^{151}\) (Clauder 1733)

An examination of Breitinger’s commentary on Clauder’s corrections, together with the handwritten corrections in Bodmer’s editio princeps, helps to identify some of the words or expressions in Books I and II that may have been regarded as excessively ‘Swiss’. My investigation of this aspect therefore looks at the individual items identified by Clauder/Breitinger in Books I and II, and by Gottsched in Book III, to see how Bodmer had handled them in his 1742 translation.

Gottsched criticised a total of seven ‘Swiss’ terms, and in all but one case Bodmer adapted his translation as suggested by Gottsched. In the final case he rewrote the passage completely. Amongst the 18 corrections by Clauder discussed in detail by Breitinger there are four instances where Clauder was clearly making reference to ‘Swiss’ expressions, as can be seen from the use of comments like “komme den Sachsen […] fremd für.” (Breitinger 1740a: vol 2, 82) However, despite Breitinger’s spirited defence of all these expressions in his Critische Dichtkunst, Bodmer abandoned them in every single case in his 1742 translation.

---

\(^{151}\) I voluntarily concede that it is enormous arrogance on the part of the Upper Saxons and people of Meissen to deny such good words admission (since they don’t have any better ones) and to set up their own empire over the other dialects. [my translation]
6.4.3 Orthographic corrections

Another area in which the ‘Swiss’ features of Bodmer’s German were criticised was that of orthography. For instance, Gottsched’s review of Paradise Lost made mention of the word ‘lange’, which he said was spelt ‘lang’ by the Upper Saxons, while the handwritten corrections to Bodmer’s own copy of his 1732 translation include a large number of orthographic corrections. Since this aspect has been examined by Schmitter in detail, I limited my investigation to the 16 handwritten orthographic corrections found in my first analysis sample (Book I, lines 1-220). In 11 of these instances the 1742 edition was changed in accordance with the handwritten corrections. These changes include ‘Samen’ to ‘Saamen’ (J.J.Bodmer 1732: 1,1), ‘Liecht’ to ‘Licht’ (ibid: 1,4), ‘feurige’ to ‘feurige’ (ibid: 1,4) and ‘schröcklich’ to ‘erschrecklich’ (ibid: 1,7). In a further 4 instances Bodmer rewrote the passage. Only once did he retain his original spelling: Instead of accepting the correction of ‘Stammeltern’ to ‘Stamm=Eltern’ (ibid: 1,2), he used ‘Stammältern’ in the 1742 edition.

6.4.4 Acceptance of the ‘Meissen’ linguistic norm

This brief review is sufficient to show that Bodmer gave quite consistent preference to ‘Meissen’ grammar, orthography and vocabulary in his 1742 translation, clearly indicating his acceptance of the ‘Meissen’ linguistic norm for his translation of Paradise Lost despite the fact that this norm was by no means fully established in Switzerland at the time. From the mid-sixteenth century onwards, the prestige of ‘Meissen’ German had overtaken that of the upper German dialects in German-speaking Europe as a whole (von Polenz 1994: 138). Yet in Switzerland the Alemannic-Swiss tradition had continued into the seventeenth century in commercial, administrative and even poetic writing. Only in the course of the eighteenth century did ‘Meissen’ German become established as the written language in Switzerland and it is Bender’s view that Bodmer’s translation of Paradise Lost was an important factor in securing this final alignment (Bender 1967: 225).

Interestingly, shortly after publication of his second translation of Paradise Lost Bodmer began to argue the case for using Swiss Alemannic as a written form of German, opposing what he referred to as the ‘tyranny’ of ‘Meissen’ German. It was probably as a result of his endeavours that the term ‘Schweizerdeutsch’ first came into being around 1750 (Sonderegger 1985: 1904). Bodmer’s case was strengthened as he discovered more and more Middle High German literary texts and began to realise the leading role that upper German language variants had played in this early literature. The boost that Bodmer’s work in this area gave to the status of the Swiss-Alemannic variant of German is said to have been decisive in creating the present-day situation of diglossia in Switzerland, where standard German is used as the written form of the language alongside Swiss German dialects as the spoken form (ibid: 1906ff; Arquint et al. 1982: 158).
However, this was a later development. As my analysis has shown, at the time he made his revisions to his second translation of *Paradise Lost*, Bodmer’s endeavours were clearly guided by the wish to create a text as acceptable as possible to as many German readers as possible, and therefore one that conformed to the dictates of ‘Meissen’ German. As he himself stated, while his first translation had been ‘Swiss’, his second one was ‘German’.

6.5 ‘Micro-level’ data – Biblical quotations

A further area of difference between Leipzig and Zurich at this time was the fact that two different Bibles were in use. These were the Luther Bible (in Leipzig), whose linguistic form had remained unchanged since the time of Luther, and the Zurich Bible, translated by Huldrych Zwingli and Leo Jud, first published in its complete form shortly before publication of the first complete Luther Bible and continually updated since then (see chapter three, section 5.2). The existence of these two versions is interesting for an examination of Bodmer’s translation since not only is Milton’s material Biblical, but he also quotes from the Bible in a number of places. In a commentary on Book X of *Paradise Lost*, Joseph Addison drew explicit attention to the fact that Milton’s Biblical quotations had been very exact:

[...] our author, who has also kept religiously to the form of words, in which the three several sentences [sic] were passed upon Adam, Eve and the serpent. He has chosen rather to neglect the numerosness of his verse, than to deviate from those speeches which are recorded on this great occasion. (quoted in Bond 1970: 150)

Since Bodmer would have been familiar with this comment, as he was with all the contents of Addison’s *Spectator*, we might expect that, in his German translation, he would also have kept religiously to the ‘form of words’ in the German Bible. As a theologically schooled Swiss, we can certainly expect that all the texts in question were very familiar to him and that he would have had no difficulty recognising the relevant passages in the English text or transferring them into the corresponding German Biblical texts. Thus the question arises as to whether his translation of the Biblical quotations gave preference to the Zwingli-Zurich text of the Bible or the Lutheran one.

This question takes on additional interest in view of the extensive debate on Bible translation within the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture. Did Bodmer give preference to the Zurich Bible, whose Old Testament was known to have been translated with greater attention to faithful rendition of the Hebrew texts, but was used only in parts of Switzerland and had been heavily criticised in the review of old Bible translations published in the *Beyträge* (see chapter five, section 4.6)? Or, when making his revisions, did he – as we might possibly expect on the basis of his comprehensive changes in favour of the standard written German familiar to most German readers – tend to favour the widely-known Lutheran Bible over the Zurich one?
My micro-level analysis therefore includes an analysis of a number of passages in Books IX and X, where the source text reproduces quotations from chapter 3 of Genesis. There are six texts in total and they cover Eve’s temptation by the serpent and God’s judgement on Adam, Eve and the serpent. In each case I began by comparing Milton’s source text to that in the King James Bible. I noted that in each case the English Paradise Lost remained very close to the Biblical text, although there were slight variations in word order and occasional expansion or ellipsis, presumably necessitated by the poetic form of the work (despite Addison’s comment that Milton had chosen to neglect numerousness in the interests of retaining the form of words).

I then recorded the corresponding verses from the Zurich Bible. Bearing in mind that the Zurich Bible had been continually updated, I chose for the purposes of this analysis the text in use at the time Bodmer was doing his translation. This was the 1724 edition (whose text for the passages in question was the same as the 1712 edition, which I have used). I also recorded the same verses for the Luther Bible, whose text had remained unchanged.

Finally, I compared the source text and the three Biblical texts with the appropriate passages in the translations of 1732 and 1742.

My results take the form of the example shown below, where the source text (X, 179-81) quotes Genesis, chapter 3, verse 15:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biblical text: Genesis 3:15</th>
<th>Paradise Lost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Between thee and the woman I will put /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bible</td>
<td>Enmity, and between thine and her seed; /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Her seed shall bruise thy head, thou bruise his heel. (Holy Bible)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Zurich Bible              | Und ich wil feindschaft setzen |
|                          | zwischen dir und dem weibe / und |
|                          | zwischen deinem samen und |
|                          | ihrem samen. Derselbige sol dir |
|                          | den Kopf zertreten / und du wirst |
|                          | ihm die fersen zertreten. (Biblia |
|                          | 1712) |

| Luther Bible              | Und ich will Feindschaft setzen |
|                          | zwischen dir und dem Weibe und |
|                          | zwischen deinem Nachkommen |
|                          | und ihrem Nachkommen; der soll |
|                          | dir den Kopf zertreten, und du |
|                          | wirst ihn in die Fersen stechen. |
|                          | (Bibel 1967) |
Examination of this example shows minor differences between the Luther and Zurich Bibles for the verse cited. The first and most obvious differences relate to orthography; in addition, the Zurich Bible used the term ‘samen’ where the Luther Bible used ‘Nachkommen’. Also, on the two occasions where the King James Bible used ‘bruise’, this is paralleled in the Zurich Bible by the word ‘zertreten’, while the Luther Bible used ‘zertreten’ on one occasion and ‘in die Ferse stechen’ on the other.

Looking now at Bodmer’s translations, I noted that the orthography of both the 1732 and 1742 translations was closer to that of the Luther Bible. However, although Bodmer had used some Biblical vocabulary and formulations, he did not stay as close to either of the German Bible formulations as Milton had to the English Bible. In the 1732 translation there were two lexical elements – ‘anrichten’ and ‘zerquetschen’ – that are not found in either German Bible. In the case of ‘zerquetschen’, it is likely that he considered this word to be closer to the English ‘bruise’ than the word ‘zertreten’ used in the German Bibles, and therefore gave it preference. The term ‘bruise’ appears in several other places in the source text, particularly in Book XII, and only in one place did Bodmer translate it as ‘zertreten’ (1742a: 554). In this instance he had used ‘zerquetschen’ for the 1732 translation.

I then went on to compare the 1732 and 1742 translations of the passage. Here, I noted that Bodmer’s revisions did not bring the text closer to the Luther Bible, as might have been expected, or indeed, to either Bible. In fact, his main changes appear to have been made in the area of syntax.

My observations on this passage hold true for all six passages I analysed. In general, Bodmer appears to have given priority to reproducing the precise terms used by Milton, rather than ‘religiously’ reproducing the ‘form of words’ from the German Bible. This procedure is most evident in cases where the King James Bible and Milton’s text differ from the two German Bibles. The King James version of Genesis 3, verse 5, for instance, refers to gods in the plural, “then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods” (my italics), and this is reflected in Milton’s text, “your eyes [...] shall perfectly be then / Opened and cleared, and ye shall be as gods.” (IX, 706-08) Both the Luther and Zurich Bibles refer to God in the
singular, "und daß ihr wie Gott seyn" (Biblia 1712), "ihr werdet sein wie Gott" (Bibel 1967). Despite this German Biblical unanimity, Bodmer consistently sticks to Milton's usage, translating gods in the plural in both his 1732 and 1742 translations: "ihr werdet zu Göttern werden" (1732: 2,97) and "daß ihr wie Götter seyn" (1742a: 410). Thus Bodmer does not appear to have given preference to either the Zurich or the Lutheran Bible. On some occasions he used the text of one, and at other times he used the text of the other. Neither does he appear to have moved clearly in the direction of either Bible in his revisions of 1742. His main changes in 1742 appear to have tended either towards further clarification of the text through explicitation or changes away from Milton's sentence order in the interests of producing a more familiar syntactic structure in German. This is a tendency I note even more clearly in the next major area of investigation in my micro-level analysis.

My findings in this part of my translation analysis are interesting in view of the results of my earlier 2001 translation assessment, which noted a tendency to weaken the theological elements in the translation of a passage from Book VIII (Baumer 2001), as well as Bodmer's exclusive attention to issues of aesthetic importance in his footnotes to this edition. My findings here provide further evidence to refute Schöffler's contention that it was the Biblical element in Milton's works, rather than the aesthetic content, that exerted the greatest charm on Bodmer (Schöffler 1925: 64). My analysis has shown that Bodmer attached little importance to accurate rendition of Biblical quotations using either the German words of the Lutheran Bible that would have been familiar to, and therefore most effective for German readers of his time, or the words of the Zurich Bible that were known to have been particularly faithful to the original Hebrew text. Instead he gave preference to Milton's source text as, in his view, a work of supreme aesthetic value.

6.6 'Micro-level' data – stylistic issues

In the next part of my 'micro-level' analysis, following Lambert and van Gorp's checklist, I look at stylistic differences between Bodmer's first two translations, beginning my investigation with an analysis of syntactic changes at the sentence level.

6.6.1 The conflicting positions

With regard to syntax, the two sides in the debate conducted in the pages of the Leipzig Beyträge took very different stances. The 'unknown translator' in the debate on a translation from Virgil's Aeneas stated that a translation should follow its original word for word, and in his paper on translation, Breitinger also required that the ideas of the source text be presented in the same order in the translation. Gottsched, on the other hand, advocated sentence by sentence translation, with the focus on meaning and good flowing German text.
Breitinger devoted considerable attention to two specific syntactic features, participles and ellipsis, that are used extensively by Milton. Milton makes considerable use of participles, gerunds and adverbs in adjectival positions or other unusual locations in the sentence, in order to compress meaning. Some examples of this are “be lowly wise” (Book VIII, line 173), “Adam’s doubt proposed” (VIII, 64) meaning Adam’s doubt, which he had proposed, “sun that barren shines” (VIII, 94) meaning sun that is barren and yet still shines. Participial constructions, wrote Breitinger, created an impressive brevity and should either be retained in translation or replaced in some other way. The German language had used participles in the past and was well suited to the use of this kind of construction (Breitinger 1740b: 146-47). Yet Gottsched strongly opposed the use of participles. He referred to them as “gezwungene[n] partcipialische[n] Redensarten”\textsuperscript{152} introduced by innovators who infringed accustomed German use by imitating French and English (quoted in Bender 1967: 262).

Both Breitinger and Bodmer advocated the use of ellipsis, a term which they used to refer to the omission of individual words that in normal speech would be obligatory for grammatical reasons. Bodmer pointed to the ability of the English language to use ellipsis with personal pronouns as well as nouns, and argued that German could also use this kind of poetic tool (1742b: 102-04). Gottsched, however, clearly opposed this practice, as we see in his criticism of Bodmer’s first translation of Paradise Lost, where he complained about the omission of the word ‘wäre’ (Gottsched 1732b: 298).

My analysis of syntax therefore examines issues of sentence ordering, participle constructions and ellipsis. For the sake of convenience, some of my results here are presented under the headings of ‘rationalisation’, ‘clarification’ and ‘expansion’ as defined in Berman’s categorisation of ‘deforming’ tendencies in translation. These headings are used for the sake of convenience only, and are not intended to imply any element of ‘deformation’ in Bodmer’s translations.

6.6.2 Sentence length

I began my analysis with an examination of sentence length in Bodmer’s two translations. Long sentences are a characteristic element in Milton’s epic and an essential stylistic feature designed to achieve specific effects. As Fowler explains:

For Milton’s long verse paragraphs to take full effect, they must be sustained grammatically and rhythmically beyond the ordinary syntactic breath […] there are many metaphorical passages where multiple chains of discourse need to be left open rather than adjudicated between by decisive punctuation […] (Fowler 1998: 9)

Fowler also draws attention to the complexity of Milton’s sentences:

\textsuperscript{152} forced participial figures of speech
Milton’s syntax is highly unusual, characterized by more frequent embedded clauses than can be found in any other canonical seventeenth century writer. He often mixes left- and right-branching clauses (word groups before, and after, what they modify), keeping all in suspension. Long sentences with lower subordination are particularly common, sometimes with long chains of dependent clauses. (ibid: 13)

Despite this complexity, the skilful construction of the sentences has the effect of creating tension and pace, of drawing the reader through the text and sustaining the argument. A number of Milton’s devices are particularly interesting. One is the frequent placing of a salient word at the end of a long phrase or sentence, yet at the beginning of a line of verse. This causes readers to pause on the key word, while at the same time quickly drawing them into the next phrase or sentence with its new argument. If Bodmer were to retain the stylistic character of his original, Milton’s “nachdrückliche, kurze und erhabene Schreibart”\(^{153}\), as he wrote in ‘Abhandlung von der Schreibart in Miltons verlohrnen Paradiese’ (1742b: 131-32), the length and structure of Milton’s sentences was one feature he needed to pay attention to.

Interestingly, my analysis reveals major differences in sentence length between the first and second translations. For each of my six samples, taken from Books I, III, IV, V, IX and X, I counted the number of sentences in Milton’s original text, and in the corresponding translations in Bodmer’s 1732 and 1742 versions. The results are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Total number of sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book I, 1-220</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book III, 1-55</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book IV, 131-357</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book V, 1-274</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book IX, 655-732</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book X, 159-208</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The similarity between the number of sentences in Milton’s original and those in Bodmer’s first translation, which he did at his parent’s house in Greifensee in the years 1724-25 is striking. Further examination of individual sentences shows that in the majority of cases he began and ended sentences in exactly the same places as Milton.

All in all, my statistics show that, for my six samples, Bodmer used 152 sentences in his 1732 translation, relatively close to the total number of sentences for the same samples in the source text. In the 1742 edition, however, the 152 sentences of the 1732 edition had become a

---

\(^{153}\) emphatic, concise and sublime manner of writing
total of 229 sentences. Why had the sentences been broken down? What changes had been made within the sentences?

One of the more obvious changes he made in 1742 was to split many of Milton’s long sentences into two or more shorter sentences. The following example taken from Book IV of Paradise Lost illustrates this procedure. First the original text:

So on he fares, and to the border comes / Of Eden, where delicious Paradise, / Now nearer, crowns with her enclosure green, / As with a rural mound the champaign head / Of a steep wilderness, whose hairy sides / With thicket overgrown, grotesque and wild, / Access denied; and overhead up grew / Insuperable height of loftiest shade, / Cedar, and pine, and fir, and branching palm, / A sylvan scene, and as the ranks ascend / shade above shade, a woody theatre / Of stateliest view. (my italics) (Book IV, lines 131-42)

In his translation published in 1732, Milton’s sentence began and ended at the same point:

Also ziehet er fort, und kommt an die Gräntzen des Landes Eden, sieht das lustreiche Paradies jetzt in der Nähe liegen, das mit seinem grünen Gehäße, als mit einer Dorfschantze, den breiten Gipfel einer bergichten Wildniß umringet, deren bedorneter Rücken auf abentheuerliche und wilde Art mit Hecken verwachsen den Durchgang verwehrt; oberhalb demselben wuchse der Schatten der erhabensten Wipfels in eine unersteigliche Höhe, die Ceder, die Tanne, die Fichte, und der zinckigte Palmbaum; eine waldigte Spielbühne, und, indem die Stämme in gleichen Reihen einen Schatten über den andern hinaufführen, ein Forsththeater überras prächtig anzuschauen! (my italics) (J.J.Bodmer 1732: 1,121).

Although the sentence is about one and a half times the length of Milton’s, we note that its elements have been presented in the same sequence as in the original with very little reordering. The main reason for the added length is a certain amount of clarification (for instance, addition of the word ‘siehet; ‘ranks’ translated as ‘die Stämme in gleichen Reihen’) and nominalization of adjectives (‘loftiest shade’ translated as ‘Schatten der erhabensten Wipfels’).

Here is Bodmer’s translation of the same original sentence in his 1742 edition:

Indessen fuhr Satan fort, und nähernd dem Landstriche von Eden, wo das lustvolle Paradies, nunmehr vor Augen lag. Das hohe Gefilde eines steilen Busches war mit einem grünen Gehäße, wie mit einer Dorfschantze umgeben; dessen heckigte Seiten verwehrten allen Zugang durch ihr Gesträuche, das auf eine wilde und seltsame Weise zusammengewachsen war; über demselben stiegen die schattigsten Wipfel der Ceder, der Tanne, der Fichte, des zuküsten Palmbaumes in eine ungemeine Höhe, es war eine Scena von Wald, eine waldigte Schauspiel=Bühne, indem mit den aufwärtssteigenden Wipfeln ein Schatten über dem andern emporstieg, überras prächtig anzusehen. (J.J.Bodmer 1742a: 149)

Not only has the single sentence been broken down into two, but the entire description of Paradise has been reordered in this second translation.
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6.6.3 Word order in sentences

A large number of the changes made in the 1742 translation may be categorised under the heading of what Berman refers to as ‘rationalisation’ – “recompos[ing] sentences and the sequence of sentences, rearranging them according to a certain idea of discursive order.” (Berman 2000: 288) In this case Bodmer was reordering the sentences to comply with a more accepted German syntactic order, one more in line with the linguistic norm. Bender has already noted for the first translation a tendency to transform Milton’s participial and infinitive constructions into main clauses, relative clauses and conditional clauses (Bender 1967: 237). My analysis shows that this process was even more pronounced in the second translation. Looking at a total of 37 sentences in the 1742 translation (taken from the initial pages in my samples of Books I, IV and V), I noted a total of eleven sentences where the word order had been rearranged in 1742 to better conform to normal German syntax. Of these, six sentences introduced relative clause constructions where there had been none in the 1732 translation.

The consequences of the syntactic changes that Bodmer made in his translation of 1742 were, in many cases, to weaken the power and effectiveness of the source text, and in some, to change the emphasis or even slightly change the meaning, when compared to both the source text and the translation of 1732. Lines 47-49 of Book I in Milton’s source text describe how Satan was hurled from Heaven to Hell, “there to dwell / In adamantine chains and penal fire, / Who durst defy the omnipotent to arms.” (my italics) The concise form achieved through the use of the infinite ‘to dwell’ and the elliptical ‘Who’ places the full focus of this description on the word ‘durst’, stressing the enormity of Satan’s rebellion. This poetic emphasis is lost in Bodmer’s translation of 1742, which removes the infinitive construction, and introduces a relative clause with ‘derjenige’ and ‘welcher’ in place of the concise ‘who’. The text reads as follows: “daselbst sollte derjenige in diamantenen Ketten und einem straffenden Feuer wohnen, welcher den Allmächtigen zu einer Schlacht hatte auffordern dörfen.” (1742a: 3)

An example of a change in focus arising from Bodmer’s syntactic changes is the text from Book IV cited in the section above, in which Satan approaches the borders of Paradise. Here the subject in the 1732 translation, as in Milton’s source text, was Paradise, which crowned a steep wilderness. In Bodmer’s 1742 translation, however, the division of the sentence and reordering of the second part has shifted the focus to the high climes (‘hohe Gefilde’), surrounded by a green enclosure.

The fact that Bodmer was prepared to make changes of this kind in his 1742 translation, despite his stated intention of reproducing Milton’s style and actual words as closely as possible, is evidence of his occasional willingness to subordinate even some of Milton’s stylistic features to linguistic norms in the interests of increasing the acceptability of his translation. This acceptance was of paramount importance to Bodmer since Paradise Lost
was the chief vehicle for transporting his literary teaching on the role of imagination in literature. Thus these changes did not reflect any alteration in his thinking on translation but rather his overriding objective of successfully arguing the case for the role of the imagination and the Miraculous in literature. As he wrote in his *Abhandlung von der Schreibart*:

> Ich habe die Begierde noch nicht verlohren, meinen Landesleuten das Vortrefflichschöne und Angenehme in Miltons Paradiese zu ihrem Gebrauche zu entdecken und mitzuteilen. Die neue Uebersetzung und vornehmlich die Erklärungen von des Poeten Erfindungen, Vorstellungen, und der Ausbildung derselben, sind Zeugen davon. (Bodmer 1740a: 75)

### 6.6.4 Participles and compensation

Perhaps surprisingly, in view of Breitinger’s strong comments in favour of the use of participial constructions in translation, I did not discover either an increase or a decrease in the use of participial constructions in the 1742 translation as compared to the earlier translation. This is a further demonstration of Bodmer’s pragmatic approach when it came to the revision of his translation.

What is evident, however, was an attempt by Bodmer in 1742 to compensate for some of the negative effects of his earlier ‘unravelling’ of Milton’s concise sentences. Bender has already noted almost 200 cases where subordinated relative or subjunctive clauses in the 1732 translation were transformed back into nominal constructions in the 1742 translation (1967: 240). This process was confirmed by my analysis, along with a general tendency to use more concise formulations where possible. A good example is a description of blossoms and fruits in Book IV where the source text uses a participial construction – ‘enamelled colours’. In his 1732 translation, Bodmer had rendered this as a relative clause:

> [...] zu einer Zeit sahe man Blüthe und Früchte von einer güldenen Farbe, die mit einem heiteren Schmelz der buntsten Farben eingesprengt waren.
> (my italics) (1732: 1,121-22)

However, in his 1742 translation, Bodmer replaced the adverbial phrase with an adverb, introduced a (different) participial construction, and transformed the relative clause into a nominal construction, all in the interests of reproducing Milton’s ‘nachdrückliche, kurze und erhabene Schreibart’:

> [...] Blüthe und Frucht zugleich, goldfarbig, mit einem Schmelz der edelsten Farben (my italics) (1742a: 150)

---

154 I have not lost my desire to reveal and communicate to my compatriots for their own use the outstandingly beautiful and pleasant features of Milton’s Paradise. The new translation, and in particular the notes on the inventions and ideas of the poet, and the elaboration of these, bear witness to this. (my translation)
6.6.5 Clarification and expansion

A further group of changes made by Bodmer may be summarised under Berman’s headings of ‘clarification’ and ‘expansion’ (Berman 2000: 289-90). As defined by Berman, clarification is the “manifestation of something that is not apparent, but concealed or repressed, in the original” while expansion is an “unfolding of what, in the original is ‘folded’.” Both aim to make the target text clearer to the reader. The latter technique, adds Berman, is often called ‘overtranslation’.

My analysis of 37 sentences from the 1742 translation reveals a total of 13 occasions where Bodmer clarified or expanded his translation as compared to the earlier version. In most cases the clarification was minor, as in the description of Adam’s ‘airy light’ sleep bled from ‘pure digestion’, which appears in lines 3-5 of Book V. In the 1732 translation, Bodmer had expanded the term ‘bred’ into the explanatory phrase ‘seine Nahrung hatte’: “[...] sein Schlaf ware leicht wie die Luft, zumalen er von einer reinen Duung und gemässigten sanften Dünst en seine Nahrung hatte.” (my italics) (1732: 1,160) In his 1742 translation, however, Bodmer excised the word ‘digestion’, referring instead to a ‘light food that was easy to consume’ and using this process of easy consumption as a simile to explain the lightness of Adam’s sleep: “[...] sein Schlaf war luftig, als der von einer leichten Speise, die sich leicht verzehrete, und von sanften Dünst en entstunden [...]” (my italics) (1742a: 202) Interestingly, Brockes’ translation stays much closer to Milton’s original at this point: “Schlaf [...] / Welcher leicht war, wie die Luft, (So die reine Düung machte, / Woraus reine Dünste quillen)” (my italics) (Brockes 1740: 145). Is it possible that Bodmer’s clarification here and his omission of the word ‘digestion’ was intended not only to enhance the clarity of the meaning, as advocated by the Gottsched/Venzky party in the debate on translation, but also to render the translation slightly less ‘vulgar’? If so, it is interesting that Brockes, translating in a similar period, did not consider this necessary.

Occasionally Bodmer’s additions were slightly more imaginative, as in Book IV, where Satan’s entry into Paradise is compared to a thief breaking into the house of a rich citizen. This is the original English text:

[...] Or as a thief bent to unhoard the cash / Of some rich burgher, whose substantial doors, / Cross-barred and bolted fast, fear no assault, / In at the window climbs, or o’er the tiles [...]. (IV, 188-91)

In the 1732 edition, Bodmer added a little clarification with the words ‘keinen Ansprenger’ and the more graphic verb ‘einbrechen’ (breaking in) instead of ‘climbing in’:

[...] Oder wie ein Dieb, des Vorhabens die Kisten irgend eines reichen Bürgers auszuplündern, wessen maßive Thüren creutzweise vergittert und fest = verriegelt keinen Ansprenger zu befahren haben, zum Fenster oder durch die Ziegel einbricht [...]. (1732: 1,123)
The word 'An sprenger' is underlined in the Zentralbibliothek copy of the translation, so this is likely to have been a term marked by Clauder because it failed to conform to 'Meissen' usage, while the word 'wessen' had also been corrected to 'dessen'. The 1742 edition dispensed completely with the addition of 'keinen An sprenger' and restored the element of climbing in ('hineinsteigt'), but also added a completely new element that was not in Milton's text - 'auf dem Dache'. In other words, Bodmer had assumed that the window was located on the roof even though this was not stated in the source text. The 1742 edition also added the short explanatory phrase 'wenn er sieht', making the thief's sequence of actions more visible to the reader but in the process slowing the action:

[...] oder wie ein Dieb, der die Kiste eines reichen Bürgers plündern will, wenn er sieht, daß die massiven Thüren creuzweise vergittert und verrigelt keine Gewalt zu fürchten haben, zu einem Fenster auf dem Dache oder durch die Ziegel hineinsteigt [...]. (my italics) (1742a: 152)

Occasionally, in his 1742 translation, Bodmer reverted to two German words to render one English word, despite having used only one in the 1732 translation. An example of this in the passages analysed may be found in Book IV, where Milton's text refers to the 'entwined' undergrowth. Although the 1732 translation simply rendered the word 'entwined' with 'verschränkt', in the 1742 edition Bodmer made use of two words, 'verwirret und verschränkt' (1742a: 151).

6.6.6 Ellipsis and compensation

In his 1742 translation Bodmer also appears to have made textual clarifications to a number of instances of ellipsis, adding a missing auxiliary or other grammatical element in line with Gottsched's precepts. In my small sample of 37 sentences I identified three such cases, all of them in Book IV. For instance, where Milton had omitted the auxiliary in "loaden with fairest fruit" (IV, 147), Bodmer had faithfully translated "die mit der schönsten Frucht beladen" without an auxiliary in 1732 (1,121). When he came to make his revisions, however, Bodmer appears to have pursued a pragmatic policy that contravened the principles outlined in both his and Breitinger's writings on translation. Thus he restored the 'missing' auxiliary 'waren', to produce the following translation: "die mit der schönsten Frucht beladen waren." (my italics) (1742a: 150)

However, in my analysis I did identify one other instance where ellipsis had been reintroduced as a stylistic element in the 1742 edition after having been removed in 1732. This occurred in Book V, where Milton's text reads "O sole in whom my thoughts find all repose" (V, 28), and Bodmer translated in 1742, "O einziger, in welchem mein Hertz seine Ruhe findet." (1742a: 205)

Likewise, there were a few instances where - as in the example of the thief climbing in at the window cited above - Bodmer reversed clarifications or expansions introduced in the 1732
edition. Thus the word ‘Berg’, which had been added in the first translation to clarify the word ‘Oreb’ at the beginning of the first book, was removed in the 1742 edition. It would appear that in such cases Bodmer was endeavouring to compensate for the many changes he had felt obliged to make in the interests of making his German text more clear and readable for a German public. In general, however, there were more new clarifications and expansions in the small sample of sentences I analysed than instances where such clarifications or expansions had been removed.

6.7 ‘Micro-level’ data – corrections and changes

Before concluding this chapter, reference should be made to a small number of changes that Bodmer made to the text that resulted in significant changes to the meaning of individual sentences, as well as some minor omissions in his translation.

The most interesting change I noted in the samples examined in my analysis occurs in Book IV, in the description of seafarers passing Mozambique and smelling the scent of Arabian spices. In the source text these scents are borne on north-east winds, and this wind direction is faithfully reproduced in the 1732 translation. However, in the 1742 translation it was replaced by north-west winds (1742a: 151). Examination of a world map shows that the north-west direction is probably more accurate. In view of this, and bearing in mind that Bodmer’s rendering was rarely inaccurate in factual terms, it would seem likely that this represented a correction by Bodmer. However, if this is the case, Bodmer was clearly infringing here against the principles established by Huet in that not only did he interfere with the text itself, but he also failed to include an explanatory footnote.

Among the very small number of – probably deliberate – changes I identified in my analysis was a passage in Book V, where Bodmer’s 1742 translation described Adam and Eve as dropping respectfully to the ground instead of bowing lowly, as they did in the original text (212). In another passage, in Book IV, where the source text describes a lion sporting, ramping and dandling the kid in its paw, Bodmer’s lion merely entered, amusing itself and cradling the lamb in its claws (159). In both cases the 1732 translation had been much closer to the source text. It is possible that cultural considerations prompted both these changes, with the salient factors being different religious customs in the one case and differing attitudes towards violence – to be described in more detail in the chapter on metaphor – in the other. However, here again there were no explanatory footnotes.

My analysis also revealed occasional omissions, such as that in the first sentence of Book I, where Milton refers to the ‘mortal taste’ of the apple and Bodmer’s 1732 translation renders this as ‘deren vergifftetes Essen’, but the 1742 edition contains no reference at all to mortal or poisoned taste or eating. In Book V, the source text quotes Eve saying “such nicht til this I
never passed” when describing a dream in which she was tempted by Satan (V, 31), a line which is rendered in 1732 but missing in the 1742 edition. However, such omissions are rare and may simply have been oversights in Bodmer’s reworking of his text.

6.8 Summary

Looking at the results of my macro and micro-level analyses as a whole, it is evident that the revisions to the first translation undertaken by Bodmer in July to September of 1740 could hardly have been more major. He changed the title of his translation and added very extensive footnotes. He intervened in almost every sentence of the translation with changes to the orthography, grammar, lexical choice, syntax and sentence breaks of the translation.

In his revisions he appears to have given consistent preference to ‘Meissen’ grammar, orthography and vocabulary, clearly indicating his acceptance of the ‘Meissen’ linguistic norm. He broke down source-text sentences, and, for the samples I have analysed, transformed even more of Milton’s participial and infinitive constructions into main clauses, relative clauses and conditional clauses than has already been noted by Bender for the 1732 edition. He also added clarifications and expansions to a number of passages.

All of these alterations, as well as his adoption of the changes to the title suggested by Gottsched, are clear indications that Bodmer was prepared to make compromises if these would ensure greater acceptability of his translation in the wider German-speaking world. His overriding concern, as demonstrated in the choice of footnotes as well as his defence of Paradise Lost in Critische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren, was to establish his translation as a vehicle for promoting his aesthetic ideas (see also chapter four, section 3.7). The evidence of his correspondence with Clauer, Gottsched and Zellweger shows his awareness of the impediment that his Swiss linguistic traits posed to such acceptance, and it is clear that for this reason he was willing to embark on large-scale revisions to remove such impediment. Even in the area of syntax my analysis has demonstrated some readiness to make concessions in the direction of slightly greater reader-orientation.

However, such revisions do not appear to provide evidence for any serious wavering in Bodmer’s adherence to the peripheral translation norm of accountability to the source text. In my samples, I did not identify any tendency to reduce the number of Miltonian participial constructions despite the forceful criticism of this kind of construction by Gottsched. Although Bodmer did not reproduce Milton’s widespread use of ellipsis to any greater degree in the 1742 translation despite the attention that both he and Breitinger had paid to this feature in their writings, neither did he curb its use in line with the criticism to which he had been subjected by Gottsched on this score. On the contrary, I have identified one instance where he reintroduced into his translation an elliptical source-text formulation. Moreover, my
analysis revealed a significant attempt by Bodmer to compensate for some of the negative affects of ‘unravelling’ Milton’s concise sentences. In particular, as noted by Bender, he transformed subordinated relative or subjunctive clauses back into nominal constructions wherever possible.

As noted by George Viles, Bodmer’s translation faithfully reproduced the content of Milton’s source text, and the fact that my analysis revealed a negligible number of alterations and omissions is noteworthy in itself. Also, his concern to faithfully reproduce Milton’s text overrode issues of theological argumentation and accuracy, as my 2001 translation analysis and the findings of this study on Biblical citation have shown.

Generally speaking, then, this part of my analysis has shown that although Bodmer’s 1742 revisions clearly demonstrate his willingness to make large-scale concessions with respect to the use of Helvetic linguistic forms and submit his translation to the ‘Meissen’ norm – in order to promote his aesthetic project rather than because of considerations relating to translation principles – in other respects his translation practice continued to embody the principle of accountability to the source text, in line with the peripheral norm. In so doing, he was taking a clear stand against the central norm espoused by Gottsched and Venzky, which prioritised a reader-oriented approach focusing on flowing texts and ‘good’ German.

The next part of my analysis of Bodmer’s translation practice is devoted to metaphor, which was identified and discussed by Bodmer as being one of the most important stylistic elements of Milton’s source text.
Chapter Seven – New Ideas on Metaphor

In my discussion of the translation debate conducted in the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture during the 1730s I have shown the particular attention that Johann Jacob Bodmer gave to reproducing metaphoric images in translation (see chapter five, section 4.14).

As far as I can ascertain, Bodmer appears to have devoted more attention to metaphor and translation than any writer on translation before his time – and indeed, more than most commentators before the latter part of the twentieth century.

I therefore devote this chapter to the translation of metaphor, the ideas introduced by Bodmer, and the extent to which these were realised in his translation of Paradise Lost. As I have done so far in this study, my discussion is placed within a norm structure, examining first the norms governing the translation of metaphor prior to Bodmer’s time and then considering how far his work constitutes the emergence of a new norm in this area.

In view of the importance of this topic for Bodmer’s work in translation, my discussion of metaphor begins with a short review of recent work done in this area. This is followed by a description of the methodology I have chosen for my analysis of Bodmer’s translation practice with respect to metaphor. I then explore the norms applying to the translation of metaphor before his time by reviewing classical thought and the ideas of Pierre-Daniel Huet, and continuing with a brief examination of the way in which metaphors were translated in comparable translations prior to Bodmer’s translation of Paradise Lost. I then examine in more detail Bodmer’s own writings and those of Johann Jacob Breitinger on the translation of metaphor and compare them to Bodmer’s translation practice using the results of my detailed analysis of Bodmer’s translation of Paradise Lost. I conclude by briefly relating Bodmer’s ideas and practice in this area to developments in the field of translation theory and practice during the latter part of the eighteenth century in German-speaking Europe.

7.1 Review of the literature on metaphor translation

General overviews of the literature on translation of metaphor are few and far between: Worth mentioning here are van Besien & Pelsmaekers (1988), Alvarez (1993), the comprehensive treatment by Kurth (1995: 106-25) and Schäffner (2004). The paper by van Besien & Pelsmaekers also includes a brief outline of the history of metaphoric function in literary texts.
Turning now to individual discussions of the translation of metaphor, we see that the 'cultural' dimension of the translation of metaphor plays a prominent part in modern discussion of this question. An approach that may broadly be described as 'cultural' has been adopted by Nida (1964), Dagut (1976, 1987) Newmark (1980, 1985, 1988) and Snell-Hornby (1995).

Nida points out that metaphors in a language are often closely related to the experience of a people and this requires adjustment in translation, either through the use of simile or by translating metaphors as non-metaphors (1964: 219-20).

In his seminal article on metaphor translation, Dagut draws attention to the "paradoxical neglect of 'metaphor' by translation theorists" and calls upon translation theory "to make a start on a thorough and systematic discussion of the translation implications of 'metaphor'." (1976: 21) He advocates a narrow definition of the term metaphor to embrace only original metaphors embodying an "individual flash of imaginative insight." (22) Translatability of metaphors, he says, depends on the cultural experiences and semantic associations the individual metaphor exploits and the extent to which these can be reproduced non-anomalously in the target language. This depends on the degree of overlap of cultural experience between the source language and the target language (31-32).

Newmark discusses metaphors in terms of the 'object' described by the metaphor, the 'image' or picture conjured up by the metaphor and the 'sense', or the semantic overlap between 'object' and 'image' (1988: 105). His definition of metaphor is very broad and covers a spectrum of six categories ranging from 'dead' metaphors through to 'original' metaphors. He also defines a range of procedures for translating metaphor – reproducing the same image in the target language, replacing the source language image with a standard target language image which does not clash with target language culture, translation of metaphor by simile, translation of metaphor by simile plus sense, conversion of metaphor to sense, deletion and same metaphor combined with sense (1980: 96-97). Since Newmark's nomenclature is well established I use it in my commentary on Bodmer's translation of metaphor in Paradise Lost.

A cognitive approach to the translation of metaphor develops cultural approaches further by drawing upon the ideas of Lakoff and Johnson, who emphasised the crucial role of metaphor in structuring thought processes (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). Based on the work of a wide range of scholars including Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf, Lakoff and Johnson have swept aside the traditional concept of metaphor as merely a rhetorical flourish, showing how the entire conceptual structure of cultures is metaphorical in nature. Pointing out that the cognitive approach to metaphor is only gradually taking root within translation studies, Christina Schäffner (2004) presents a number of modern examples of problems arising out of the translation of metaphor between German and English. In this way she is able to show how the analysis of the translation of metaphor can make differences in conceptual structures between two cultures explicit. In addition to these considerations, Kurth (1995: 98) also
draws attention to the importance of non-linguistic cognitive processes such as the creation of visual images, in the production and reception of metaphors.

Within the paradigm of Descriptive Translation Studies both van den Broeck (1981) and Toury (1995) have discussed the translation of metaphor. Like Newmark, van den Broeck adopts a broad definition of metaphor, and presents a scheme of categories of metaphor and a range of modes of metaphor translation. In line with a Descriptive Translation Studies approach, he feels it is acceptable to assume that “the actual ways in which metaphors in literary texts are translated stand in close relation to rules and norms.” He goes on to state that a description of metaphor in terms of initial norms starts from the following distinction: “If the translation adheres to the SL [source language] norm, metaphors will tend to be translated sensu strictu [reproducing the same image].” (1981: 85) The results of my analysis of Bodmer’s translation of Paradise Lost lend support to this statement.

Toury points out that metaphor has normally been considered from the point of view of source-text metaphors, without considering metaphors that occur only in the target text. A broader perspective that also looks at metaphors occurring in the target text, he writes, “may facilitate the account of compensation.” He recommends adding to the list of categories for an analysis of metaphor translation the two categories ‘non-metaphor into metaphor’ and ‘0 into metaphor’ (1995: 81-84). I have included these categories in my study of Bodmer’s translation of metaphor.

There has not been a great deal of extended empirical research into the translation of metaphor, although particular mention should be made of Kurth (1995), who examines in detail the translation of ‘grotesque’ metaphors in Charles Dickens on the basis of a number of different German translations. Other studies include Kjär (1988) (described in Koller 1997: 255-58) who examines ‘original’ verbal metaphors in Swedish translations of modern German literature, and Alvarez (1993), who analyses the Spanish translation of a novel by Angela Carter, finding that the same image has been transferred in more than 50% of the cases. Interestingly, this figure of over 50% is more or less comparable to the figure for the transfer of the same metaphoric image in the sample I analyse for Bodmer’s translation of Paradise Lost. Unfortunately, however, this article by Alvarez does not indicate either the name of the translator nor the title of the translation, and provides no explanation of her methodology.

7.2 Methodology

My investigation of the handling of metaphor in Bodmer’s translation of Paradise Lost uses the same six passages as those chosen for my investigation of macro-level and micro-level data in the previous chapter. Working through the six source-text passages, I identified a total
of 83 metaphors, most of them falling into Newmark’s category of ‘original’ metaphors, although some of them could be described as ‘stock’ metaphors. Inevitably such a procedure entails an element of randomness, especially from the point of view of modern theories of metaphor that regard metaphor as ubiquitous. In addition, from a Descriptive Translation Studies point of view it might be argued that I should have begun with the target text, identifying metaphors in Bodmer’s translation and working back to the source text. However, since my objective was to establish the extent to which Bodmer had complied with his own statements on the principles of translation, I decided to base my initial selections on Bodmer’s own definitions and categorisations of metaphor.

I then examined the way Bodmer had handled the 83 source-text metaphors in his translation of 1742. Using the categorisation of metaphor translation strategies provided by Newmark I determined whether Bodmer had rendered the same image or a different one, converted the metaphor to sense or deleted it altogether in the 1742 translation. I also noted whether the strategies deployed for the 1742 translation differed from those in the earlier version of his translation published in 1732. Subsequently I carried out a detailed comparison between the two target texts themselves for the six passages I had examined previously, with the aim of identifying striking differences in the treatment of metaphor that I had not discovered on the basis of my source-text approach. This procedure added a further nine target-text metaphors to my list, demonstrating the validity of the retrospective stance to the study of metaphor proposed by Toury. For these nine cases I noted down the corresponding metaphor (or non-metaphor) in the source text, and proceeded to define the translation strategy deployed in a similar manner to that used for the metaphors based on the source-text search.

In this way I hoped to determine whether the Zurich-Leipzig debate on translation that had taken place between the preparation of the two translations had influenced Bodmer’s translation decisions (see chapter five for an account of this debate). Did the changes in his decisions on the translation of metaphor reflect some of the issues raised in the debate?

Finally, I compared Bodmer’s translation solutions with those chosen by Barthold Heinrich Brockes in his translation of the early section of Book V. I also compared Bodmer’s handling of metaphor with that of Ernst Gottlieb von Berge, the first German translator of Paradise Lost, and Nicolas Dupré de Saint-Maur and Paolo Rolli, the French and Italian translators of Paradise Lost, in the first few lines of Book I. In this way I hoped to obtain a few more indications on the kinds of norms applying to the translation of metaphor in the three different countries. In my comparison of Bodmer’s 1742 translation with Brockes’ translation I identified five additional metaphors that I had not included in my initial comparisons, and compared them in a similar manner.

Thus, all in all, I compared a total of 97 metaphors and categorised them according to the kinds of translation decisions made by Bodmer in summer 1740, when he carried out the revisions prior to publication of his second version in 1742. I then attempted to allocate these
97 cases to the three types of metaphor identified by Bodmer in his discussion of the translation of metaphor.

### 7.3 Translation of metaphor before Bodmer

I now begin my discussion of Bodmer’s translation of metaphor by examining the theories and practice of metaphor translation that prevailed in the period leading up to the early eighteenth century.

#### 7.3.1 The classical tradition and Huet

Up to and including Bodmer’s time, the discussion on both metaphor and metaphor in translation had remained firmly within the classical tradition (for a comprehensive account of classical thought and its influence on translation theory to the late eighteenth century see Rener 1989). For Bodmer and his contemporaries, the main classical authorities on metaphor were Cicero, Aristotle and Quintilian. The latter is cited on several occasions in Breitinger’s discussion of metaphor in his *Critische Dichtkunst* (1740), while Aristotle is the main authority on metaphor in Bodmer’s ‘Abhandlung von der Schreibart in Miltons verlohrenen Paradiese’\(^\text{155}\) (1742b), the article in which he discusses metaphor and translation.

In classical theory of language, grammar held a position superior to that of rhetoric (which included metaphor). The field of grammar embraced clarity of language along with other considerations, and its rules were mandatory, taking precedence over rhetoric. We see this reflected, for instance, in the few comments on translation of metaphor made by Cicero, where he states he has adapted Greek metaphors (category of ‘rhetoric’) to suit the Latin manner of speaking (category of ‘grammar’) (Robinson 2002: 25).

Rhetoric (and thus also metaphor), by contrast, was regarded essentially as a form of ornamentation. Its essential function was to move the reader to accept the message being conveyed. Here is Aristotle’s description in his *Rhétoric* (Book III, part 11) of the way in which metaphor works:

> Liveliness is specially conveyed by metaphor, and by the further power of surprising the hearer; because the hearer expected something different, his acquisition of the new idea impresses him all the more.

For Quintilian, as for Cicero, metaphor was an abbreviated form of simile (a view which we still encounter today). Thus emphasis was placed on the point of similarity between the ‘object’ and its ‘image’, to use Newmark’s terminology. Bodmer’s indebtedness to this view of metaphor is evident in his repeated use of the word ‘Aehnlichkeit’ (similarity) in his

---

\(^\text{155}\) Treatise on the manner of writing in Milton’s *Paradise Lost*
treatment of the subject. Breitinger went as far as stipulating that when translating, foreign metaphors that were ‘hard for German readers to believe’ be presented first in the form of a simile:

Daß man ein solch geschicktes, aber dabey neues und bisher ungewohntes Bild, in offbaren Vergleichungen zum öftern vor Augen lege, und durch die Wiederholung bekannt mache, ehe man solches in ein metaphorisches Symbolum verwandelt.¹⁵⁶ (Breitinger 1740a: vol 2, 349)

In the classical theory of language, metaphor was not seen as reflecting fundamental ways of thinking, as we see in modern cognitive approaches to the study of metaphor. This clearly circumscribed view of the phenomenon may help to explain the relatively small amount of attention paid to it in early thinking on translation.

While the Italian scholar and translator Leonardo Bruni (1369-1444) drew the translator’s attention to the importance of style and rhetorical features, the French scholar Pierre-Daniel Huet (1630-1721) may have been the only well-known translation writer before Bodmer to devote explicit attention to the question of the translation of metaphor. In his treatise on translation, De optimo genere interpretandi¹⁵⁷ (1683), Huet argued that metaphors should be reproduced in the same words as those used by the author of the source text: Translators should “yield up the very words.” (see DeLater 2002: 56) If necessary, they should have recourse to marginal comments or notes to explain the meaning. Any other procedure would be a departure from the source text. In words that curiously pre-empt Schleiermacher, Huet continued that if they failed to reproduce “the very words” of the source text, translators would be “more and more torn away – and indeed wander[s] away – from the Author.” Referring to St. Jerome’s statement that by translating metaphors word for word, “the senses and sprouting growths of language expression are choked off,” Huet urged:

One should adhere to the words so long as the innate quality of the language, the clarity of the discourse, and the integrity of the thoughts can bear it. (see DeLater 2002: 77-78)

Huet adhered to a norm that advocated a word-for-word approach to translation, in which the semantic, lexical and stylistic integrity of the source text are maintained and these recommendations on the translation of metaphor are clearly in line with such an approach. However, his precepts were far from being universally accepted. This is clear from the opposition he faced in France, from the belles infidèles school, where the lack of explicit statements on the translation of metaphor is evidence in itself for the lack of importance

¹⁵⁶ That a fitting but new and hitherto unfamiliar image of this kind be placed frequently before the eyes in the form of explicit similes, and be made familiar through repetition, before it is transformed into a metaphoric symbol. [my translation]

¹⁵⁷ On the best kind of translating
attached to the translation of metaphor in general, and the rendering of source-text images in particular.

7.3.2 Berge, Rolli and Dupré

An interesting demonstration of the lack of importance attached to the reproduction of source-text metaphors is provided by the first known German translation of Paradise Lost, that done by Ernst Gottlieb von Berge and published in 1682 (one year before Huet’s treatise was published). Sixty-two lines taken from Book I of this translation were published by Johann Christoph Gottsched in the Beyträge in 1732, together with a review.

Bodmer had been unaware of this earlier translation when he embarked on his first translation of Paradise Lost in 1723. Not until March 1724 did he learn from the Dresden-based scholar Johann Ulrich König that a certain Ernst Gottlob [sic] von Berge had done a ‘very impressive’ translation of Milton’s work in unrhymed verse (J.J.Bodmer 1881: 40), and in 1725 König sent him an extract from Berge’s translation of Book VI (König 1725). Bodmer’s letter to Johann Michael von Löen dated 12 January 1729 indicates that five years later he was still trying to obtain a full copy of the Berge translation (von Löen 1856: 34). By the time his own first translation was published in 1732, he had clearly obtained a copy since in his preface he reproduces nine lines from Berge’s Book V, dismissing the translation as creating a very ‘finster’ (murky) impression of Milton. My comparison of Bodmer’s translations of Paradise Lost with the section of Berge’s translation published in the Beyträge provides little indication that Bodmer made any use of Berge’s text in corrections to either his 1732 or 1742 versions.

In my comparison of the translation fragment from Berge published in the Beyträge with the corresponding section in Bodmer’s translation, I paid special attention to the translation of metaphor. Berge’s translations of eight metaphors used in Milton’s source text were compared with Bodmer’s translations in his 1732 and 1742 versions of Paradise Lost. The first two translations of metaphor were also compared with those in the first lines of Book I of the Italian translation by Paolo Rolli (1729, 1735) and the French translation by Nicolas Dupré de Saint-Maur (1729) (see chapter three, sections 7.2 and 7.3, as well as Dorris 1965 and Gillet 1976 for more information on these translations).

For the eight metaphors examined, Berge did not reproduce the same image on any single occasion. He converted three metaphors to sense, altered the sense of two and completely omitted three. By comparison, Bodmer reproduced precisely the same image on five occasions and converted the three other metaphors to sense, with no alterations or omissions.

Turning now to the Italian and French translation fragments (see Appendix I), I note that Rolli, like Bodmer, reproduced the same image for the first two metaphors examined, while Dupré, like Berge, converted the same two metaphors to sense.
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A good example of the procedures followed by the four translators are the translations chosen for Milton's words "chosen seed" in line 8 of Book I, where the image 'seed' metaphorically represents the race of Israel. Rolli used "seme eletto" and Bodmer (1742) "erwehlten Saamen" [sic], thereby retaining the Miltonian seed image. By contrast, Dupré converted the seed metaphor to sense, with "la race choisie", as did Berge, with "dein ausgeführtes Volk".

My analysis of these few lines is insufficient for drawing any detailed conclusions on the precise norms guiding the way in which these four translators handled metaphor. However, it would seem to indicate that the translation strategy for metaphors chosen by Berge – and possibly also Dupré – was not that advocated by Huet of 'yielding up the very words' as long as 'the innate quality of the language' and 'the clarity of the discourse' can bear it. On the other hand, the strategy employed by Bodmer – and possibly also Rolli – appears to display some similarities to Huet's precepts on the translation of metaphor. In terms of norms, we may tentatively conclude that while the Frenchman Dupré and the seventeenth-century German Berge adhered to the established norm that gave preference to clarity of language and acceptable target language style at the expense of rendering source language metaphoric images, the Italian Rolli and the early eighteenth-century German-speaking Swiss Bodmer adhered to a peripheral norm that gave preference to rendering source-text metaphoric images wherever possible.

This issue was again raised in the Zurich-Leipzig translation debate of the 1730s, in which we see Venzky representing the established norm and Bodmer the 'peripheral' one. In his 1734 treatise, 'Das Bild eines geschickten Übersetzers'158, Georg Venzky reiterated the traditional classical view on the translation of metaphor. Words, metaphors and word orders should not be transferred from the source language into the target language without necessity, particularly if they did not conform to the nature and character of the target language and thus violated the character of the language (Venzky 1734: 71). By contrast, Bodmer's arguments focused on the importance of reproducing source-text images.

### 7.4 Barthold Heinrich Brockes

One German translator who is particularly interesting with reference to the theory and practice of metaphor translation in this period is Bodmer's contemporary, Brockes. Independently of Bodmer and quite possibly shortly before Bodmer's first translation was published in 1732, Brockes translated the first 272 lines of *Paradise Lost* Book V (see comment and note in Brandl 1878: 100). However, this translation fragment was not published until much later, 1740, together with a translation of Alexander Pope's *Essay on Man* (see appendix V for a transcript of the first few lines of Brockes' translation).

---

158 Portrait of a skilled translator
Since Bodmer’s (unpublished) correspondence with his friend Laurenz Zellweger shows him to have been already working on the corrections to his second (1742) version of his Paradise Lost translation in July to September of 1740, it is unlikely that Brockes’ translation strategies or solutions had any significant influence on Bodmer’s work. Similarly, it is unlikely that Bodmer’s approach affected Brockes’ work in any way, since Brockes probably prepared his translation before Bodmer’s first version was published. Neither had Bodmer published any of his thoughts on translation at this stage.

It is therefore interesting to note that Brockes’ approach to the translation of metaphor was very similar to that of Bodmer. My analysis of Bodmer’s treatment of metaphor in his 1742 translation of Paradise Lost included a comparison with Brockes’ handling of metaphor for the first 272 lines of Book V.

Of 30 metaphors analysed, Brockes chose exactly the same translation method as Bodmer in 16 cases. In other words, where Bodmer retained the original Miltonian image in his 1742 translation – which occurred in eight of these 16 cases – so did Brockes. Or in cases where Bodmer decided in favour of another translation method in 1742, such as using a different image, Brockes often chose precisely this method.

In lines 149-150 of Milton’s Book V source text, for instance, the abstract quality of eloquence is portrayed as a stream, flowing from Adam and Eve’s lips as prose text or rhythmic verse. In the example below, as in the many examples of metaphors and their translation that follow in this chapter, I have drawn attention to the metaphor by placing it in italics in both the original text and the translation:

f...f eloquence Flowed from their lips in prose or numerous verse,

In Bodmer’s 1742 translation this was rendered with the same flowing image:

 [...] eine fertige Wohlredenheit floß von ihren Lippen, in ungebundenener Rede, oder in wohlgemessenen Versen. (J.J.Bodmer 1742a: 212-13)

Brockes chose the same translation method for the metaphor, transferring the same image into German:

 [...] floß in solcher Süßigkeit,
So in ungebund’nen Worten, als gebund’nen, allezeit
Von den Lippen solche schnelle fertige Beredsamkeit (Brockes 1740: 157)

While the example just described shows how both Brockes and Bodmer endeavoured to retain Milton’s images, there are many cases where, for whatever reason, both translators not only decided against doing so, but adopted similar solutions. In lines 39-40, for instance, where Milton writes, “save where silence yields To the night-warbling bird”, both translators eventually decided against rendering the martial metaphor of silence ‘yielding’ with either the
same or a similar image. They both ultimately chose to convert it to sense. Brockes’ translation read “eine Still’ herrscht überall, Als nur wo sie unterbrochen.” (1740: 147) Bodmer clearly had difficulties with this metaphor, since he altered his strategy between his earlier and his later translation. In the 1732 edition he had chosen to render the metaphor with the same image, “die Stille dem streichlenden Gesange des nächtlichen Vogels weicht” (J.J.Bodmer 1732: 1,162); by 1742, however, he had reached the same decision as Brockes, converting the metaphor to sense, “aber wird die Stille gestört” (J.J.Bodmer 1742a: 206).

In a further seven instances, although Brockes’ decisions deviated from those made by Bodmer, his selections may have been motivated by considerations of form. While Bodmer made a conscious and reasoned decision in favour of prose, Brockes rendered Milton’s blank verse in rhymed verse, using a four-foot anapaestic metre with a caesura after the second foot. Thus there are a number of instances where Brockes has subordinated the preservation of a metaphoric image to the dictate of either rhyme or metre.

An example of a situation in which Brockes gives precedence to rhyme may be found in his translation of Milton’s line 137, “[…] under shady arborous roof”, where Milton’s metaphor moves the ‘object’, vegetation, into the domain of human construction. While Bodmer transferred the image fully in German as “unter dem schattigbelaubten Dache” (1742a: 212), Brockes’ text reads:

Und sie giengen alle beyde, nach den Bluhmenreichen Feldern,
Doch vorher erblickten sie, unter Schattenreichen Wäldern (Brockes 1740: 157)

Clearly the image of roofs has been abandoned and the metaphor rendered by sense in the interests of finding a word to rhyme with ‘Feldern’.

We are left with only seven cases of a total of 30 analysed in which Brockes adopted translation strategies for metaphors that clearly differed from Bodmer’s for reasons that do not appear to be attributable to form considerations. This represents a considerable contrast to the results of our analysis of the very short passage from Berge’s translation of Paradise Lost.

Without extensive analysis of Brockes’ translation works and writings, it is not possible to reach any definite conclusions as to why he, like Bodmer, adopted an approach to the translation of metaphor that was so different to the prevailing classically-influenced norm. Brandl has commented, however, that Brockes strove for preciseness in translation, and aimed to present to the reader the original author himself (Brandl 1878: 32). This explains why, in his translation of Paradise Lost, Brockes printed the original English text next to his translation. (In a similar manner, Rolli had drawn explicit attention to his English original by printing Milton’s line numbers on the left hand margin of his Italian translation of Paradise Lost.) Another similarity between Bodmer and Brockes was that, like Bodmer, Brockes had extensive exposure to Italian literature and thought, having completed a translation of Giambattista Marino’s Strage degli Innocenti in 1715.
At an early stage in his career, Bodmer appears to have seen in Brockes’ work some elements that conformed to his own aesthetic ideals. Two years after the first part of Brockes’ poem ‘Irdisches Vergnügen’ was published, Bodmer wrote to Brockes trying to persuade him to write a German epic – or at least that is the impression conveyed by Brockes’ response to Bodmer in November 1723. Brockes declined on the grounds that he was not capable of writing such a work (J.J.Bodmer 1881: 27-28).

However, soon afterwards Bodmer’s attitude towards Brockes and his work appears to have undergone some modification. This may be related to his attempts to set up the ‘Boberfeldische Gesellschaft’ (see chapter four, section 3.6). At this early stage in his career Bodmer may have regarded it necessary, in order to establish his position in this professional interculture, to distance himself from any writer who was being accused of embodying the ‘bombast’ and ‘excessive ornateness’ (‘Schwulst’) of earlier German writers in Silesia such as Christian Hofmann von Hofmannswaldau and Daniel Caspar von Lohenstein (see Blackall 1959 for further comment on this topic). The extensive use of metaphor had been a notable feature of these writers’ style and Bodmer was certainly concerned to establish his opposition to the ‘incorrect’ use of metaphor using extravagant baroque imagery, a ‘sin’ that Brockes was accused of by many contemporary commentators. Brockes’ Italian connections and translation of Marino were regarded as particularly reprehensible, with Gottsched, for instance, commenting:

Was soll ich von dem Marino sagen, dessen Schriften ebenso voll unwahrscheinlicher Dinge sind als seiner Landsleute?159 (quoted from Steinmetz 1972: 141)

At the same time, Bodmer was concerned to avoid the other extreme of excessive flatness attributable to the complete avoidance of unusual metaphor, as advocated by the Gottsched party. Metaphor was an essential feature in imaginative writing, which was the key element in Bodmer’s aesthetic theory. Since Milton’s Paradise Lost was his supreme example of imaginative writing, this meant that the principles governing the translation of the metaphors in this work were also of great importance to him.

### 7.5 Bodmer

#### 7.5.1 Galepio, Clauder and Breitinger

During the course of the debate on translation conducted in the pages of the Beyträge, Bodmer was able to crystallise his ideas on translation, and in particular his ideas on the treatment of metaphor in translation. Already by the early 1730s, Bodmer was demonstrating

159 What can I say about Marino, whose writings are just as full of improbable things as are those of his compatriots? [my translation]
his interest in the principles governing the translation of metaphor in the extensive correspondence he carried on with the Italian scholar Pietro dei Conti di Calepio. More details on the issues discussed may be found in chapter five, section 4.1.

Bodmer's correspondence with Johann Christoph Clauder in connection with the linguistic changes he made to his first translation of Paradise Lost also touched on the matter of metaphor. Asked whether 'correct' metaphors should be rejected merely because they were new, Clauder replied to Bodmer on 6 December 1731 that if care was taken not to depart from the natural meaning or use of a word, they might be used (Clauder 1731).

Not until 1740, however, did either Bodmer or Breitinger openly publish any of their thoughts on the translation of metaphor. Breitinger's Critische Dichtkunst contained an extended discussion of the topic (Breitinger 1740a: vol 2, 338-49) which located the difficulties in translating metaphors in the varying semantic fields of individual words in different languages, the fact that metaphors in different languages make use of differing words and images, the fact that some metaphors are based on 'anomalies' and the difference in customs between different cultures. All these ideas are to be found in Bodmer's treatment of metaphor and will be discussed in more detail below.

As a result of these difficulties, Breitinger deduced that the translator's freedom to translate metaphor was limited by a number of rules. First, greater care should be taken when translating into established languages than when translating into 'young' ones (Calepio's recommendation); second, metaphors should be translated only if the images were strong, clear or ornamental; and third, they should be translated only if they were probable. The requirements of probability and clarity both reflect neo-classical thought, and neither of the latter two rules is to be found in Bodmer's writing. In the event that a foreign metaphor to be translated from a foreign language was hard to believe ("etwas unerhörtes und freches an sich zu haben scheinet"\(^{160}\)), the translator should take care to limit its use to poetic literature, introduce it by means of a simile on the first occasion or rewrite it in the form of an allegory. Again, these are rules that we do not encounter in Bodmer's translation writings; neither do they appear to have been observed in his translation practice.

### 7.5.2 Bodmer's views on the nature of metaphor

I now turn to a consideration of Bodmer's specific statements on metaphor, and how far these principles were reflected in his actual translation of Paradise Lost. His ideas on translation in general are to be found in 'Abhandlung von der Schreibart in Miltons verlohrnen Paradiese' (J.J.Bodmer 1742b), 'Von der erfoderten Genauigkeit beym Uebersetzen'\(^{161}\) (J.J.Bodmer

---

\(^{160}\) appears to have something outrageous and bare-faced about it

\(^{161}\) Of the requisite accuracy in translation
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presented hiding definition Enlightenment on this question. 'Aehnlichkeit' (similarity) information defined Rolli's theoretical underpinning of metaphors defended by Bodmer, Rolli, and others, accused their work of being word-for-word rendering of metaphors, which was not advisable. By using the tools advocated by Aristotle, but also using older metaphors, including those taken from Milton, Fletcher, and Shakespeare.

Abhandlung von der Schreibart' begins by stating its intention of presenting to the German reader the artistic means that Milton had used in order to achieve a desired effect on readers (or, to express this statement in the terminology of classical thought, Milton's rhetorical tools), and citing Aristotle in support of this endeavour. Deploying the tools advocated by Aristotle, Milton, wrote Bodmer, had used metaphor in particular to embellish his ideas, and lend them light, brilliance and emphasis. He had created original metaphors himself and had also used older metaphors, including ones taken from Spencer, Fletcher and Shakespeare.

In an argument clearly aimed at dismantling the objections to full rendering of metaphor put forward by the Gottsched group, Bodmer then embarked on a lengthy discussion of the character of different languages, demonstrating that the German language was more flexible than the French. Thus, rhetorical embellishments were more readily translated into German than they were into French. This was a strong argument against accepting the translation norm of the French belles infidèles. He praised the Italian translators Salvini, Magalotti and Rolli, who had transferred not only Milton's thought but also his language, without being accused of offending against the character of the Italian language. This represents a theoretical underpinning of the similarity between Bodmer's approach to metaphors and that of Rolli found in my very brief examination of their translation practice.

Bodmer then dealt in detail first with ellipsis and then with metaphor.

Before proceeding further some attention needs to be given to the way in which Bodmer defined the term 'metaphor. Since Abhandlung von der Schreibart' presents no direct information on how Bodmer defined this term – despite his frequent use of the word 'Aehnlichkeit' (similarity) in this connection – we must now turn to Breitinger for initial enlightenment on this question.

In his discussion of metaphor in Critische Dichtkunst, Breitinger reiterated the classical definition of metaphor as the noblest rhetorical tool, most widely used, and most suited to hiding the poverty of languages and providing the greatest ornamentation to speech. It presented things in visible form using similar emblematic images:

162 Difficulties in translating Homer into German
Bodmer appears to have shared this view of metaphor, since he used the same words, "ähnliche Dinge unter gantz neuen emblematischen, jedoch deutlichen und lebhaften Bildern" in his discussion of Milton’s use of metaphor. Breitinger reiterated the classical view of metaphor as an abbreviated simile and discussed the objection to metaphor as an apparent lie, presenting one object under the name of another. He explained that the obvious similarity between object and image in metaphors was soon recognised by our faculty of reason and was therefore justifiable. For this reason, however, metaphors should not be too far-fetched, or they would not be recognised as such.

On the basis of these definitions, we can say that both Breitinger and Bodmer appear to have subscribed to a view of metaphor that conformed fully to that espoused by the classical theory of language. However, in other places we see Bodmer beginning to explore new aspects of metaphor that pre-empt modern culture-based and even cognitive approaches.

In ‘Von der erforderten Genauigkeit beym Uebersetzen’ (1746), for instance, Bodmer discussed the origin of metaphor and the different metaphors to be found in different languages. Like Breitinger, Bodmer located these differences in the varying environments encountered by different peoples. He cited the English people as his example, mentioning the general admiration for the magnanimous, masculine character of the English, and explaining that their frequent use of metaphors in the domain of blood, slaughter and death was attributable to the English lack of regard for death and suicide, and the frequent fights between people and animals (515-16). This comment on the widespread use in the English language of metaphors from a particular domain is interesting in view of the findings of my analysis of Bodmer’s translation practice, which appear to indicate a consistent strategy of avoiding direct transference to German of metaphorical images taken from this very domain. This aspect will be discussed at greater length in my section on Bodmer’s category of ‘custom’ metaphors.

Another new idea about the nature of metaphor emerges in the ‘Abhandlung von der Schreibart’, when Bodmer discusses ‘Nebenideen’ or the differences in the semantic range of individual words in different languages. Although Breitinger had touched on this concept, Bodmer explores its practical implications for translation more deeply than did Breitinger. As Bodmer explained, words whose core meaning was considered to be the same in different

163 It is an artistic figure because it not only makes things understandable but also places them most visibly before the eyes in the form of similar emblematic images. [my translation]

164 similar things in the form of totally new emblematic yet clear and lively images
languages acquired additional meanings that differed in different languages, so that the connotations and semantic fields of these apparently equivalent words did not overlap fully in different languages. When these words were encountered in metaphors, the translator needed to take additional care.

 [...] es geschieht allzu gerne, daß die Wörter, welche in verschiedenen Sprachen vor gleichgültig unter einander gehalten werden, wiewohl sie in dem Hauptbegriffe eines sagen, dennoch durch gewisse Nebenideen, so sich daran anzuhiingen pflegen, unvermerckt davon abgeführt, und nach und nach hauptsächlich verändert werden.\textsuperscript{165} (J.J.Bodmer 1742b: 113)

In such cases, translators needed to avoid using the words shown to be equivalent in the dictionary and seek out the basis (‘Grund’) of the similarity: “den Grund derselben, der in der Aehnlichkeit lieget.”\textsuperscript{166} (112) Expressed in Newmark’s terminology, they needed to analyse the metaphor and determine the elements of ‘sense’ (‘Grund’) that linked ‘object’ and ‘image’.

A case in which this insight into the nature of metaphor appears to have caused Bodmer to change his translation strategy in the 1742 translation is a passage in Book I of \textit{Paradise Lost} (lines 183-85). In this passage Milton uses the image of a harbour, one that has multiple meanings in English. Here he is playing on the additional meaning as ‘a place of refuge’ alongside the core meaning of ‘a place on the coast where ships may moor in shelter’ (both definitions from the Oxford English Dictionary). Thus the sense of the metaphor is a dual one:

\begin{quote}
[...] Thither let us tend
From off the tossing of these fiery waves,
There rest, if any rest can harbour there [...]
\end{quote}

In his 1732 translation, Bodmer elected to render Milton’s image with a similar image in German, that of the ‘Herberge’ (inn). This word has the additional meaning of ‘a place of refuge’, although the core meaning is different:

\begin{quote}
Wir wollen uns von diesen feuerigen Wellen, die uns erschüttern, dahin wenden, daselbst ruhen, \textit{wofern Ruhe daselbst herbergen kan}, [...]
(J.J.Bodmer 1732: 1,9)
\end{quote}

The problem with this strategy, however, is that the core maritime meaning of ‘harbour’ has been lost and therefore the solution chosen, ‘Herberge’ or inn, does not fit with Milton’s linked image of the ‘fiery waves’. It has reproduced one of the senses of the metaphor but

---

\textsuperscript{165} [...] it is all too often the case that words regarded as equivalent in different languages are drawn apart unobtrusively as a result of certain ancillary ideas that are customarily associated with them – even though their main meaning is the same – and with time become changed. [my translation]

\textsuperscript{166} the basis [in German ‘Grund’: alternatively ‘ground’, ‘reason’ or ‘sense’) of that wherein the similarity lies [my translation]
produced a contrary rendering of the other. When reworking his translation for publication in 1742, this was probably what prompted Bodmer to rethink the "Grund derselben, der in der Ähnlichkeit lieget", in other words, the 'sense' and, since he was unable to render the 'sense' satisfactorily, abandon any attempt at reproducing the image:

 Лацъ уз подъ Гангъ вонъ дэзенъ ершютерденъ фэуригенъ Веллъ дортхин вёденъ, дасельбъ аузхурутъ, 

 _wenn je die Ruhe daselbst Platz finder_;

 (J.J.Bodmer 1742a: 12)

It is evident that these additional considerations relating to the cultural origins of metaphors and the multiple senses inherent in one word and thus in one metaphor were leading Bodmer to refine Huet’s precepts of adhering to the words of the original “so long as the innate quality of the language, the clarity of the discourse, and the integrity of the thoughts can bear it.”

A final issue with respect to the definition of metaphor is to decide the bounds of what constitutes a metaphor. Although Bodmer made no statement on this issue, it is possible that he adhered to a relatively narrow definition of metaphor if we consider his reference to ‘stock’ metaphors – or at least some ‘stock’ metaphors – as ‘anomalies’ (see section below on ‘anomalies’).

### 7.5.3 Metaphors based on similarities in nature

I now turn to the next section in ‘Abhandlung von der Schreibart’, in which Bodmer categorised metaphors according to whether they were easier or more difficult to render in another language. He distinguished here between three different kinds of metaphor – those based on similarities in nature, those using images based on customs, and a category which he described as being based on ‘anomalies’.

Beginning with the first category, he argued that since nature is the same in all countries, metaphors based on similarities in nature could be translated from any language into any other – contrary to the claims of “certain timid language critics” (J.J.Bodmer 1742b: 111-12). This final comment referred in particular to criticisms of metaphors describing natural phenomena that Bodmer had translated from English. In a 1727 publication entitled _Von dem Einfluß und Gebrauche der Einbildungs-Kraft_ Bodmer had included a translation of a number of passages taken from Book IV of _Paradise Lost_, although he did not reveal the fact that the text was a translation, or what the original source had been. A ‘well-known critic’ – presumably Gottsched – had condemned this text in highly scathing terms. He had described the passage as extravagant (‘ausschweifend’) and made particular mention of the ‘strange’ metaphors, quoting them at length, comparing them to the baroque metaphors used by Lohenstein and Hoffmanswaldau, and concluding that modern taste would not tolerate them:

---

167 Of the influence and use of the power of imagination
This was the kind of attack to which Brockes’ writing had been subjected, and Bodmer responded by stressing the fact that the metaphors in question used natural imagery and not the overladen baroque imagery of the earlier Silesian writers like Lohenstein and Hofmannswaldau. By stressing the importance of natural imagery in metaphors Bodmer was distancing himself from the Silesian authors whose writing all members of the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture were united in rejecting.

This critic’s opposition to the Miltonian metaphors, argued Bodmer, must be founded in his opposition to objects being described with images that display similarities to them. This response turned Gottsched’s own arguments against him, since the use of similar images was the procedure advocated by the classical authorities. Bodmer concluded by stating that the critic’s opposition clearly demonstrated that he was no poet.

Criticism of Bodmer’s translation of metaphors was also included in Clauder’s corrections to the 1732 translation of Paradise Lost. This is evident from Breitinger’s commentary on some of Clauder’s corrections in his Crítische Dichtkunst. The eighteen corrections discussed in detail by Breitinger included three that made explicit reference to Bodmer’s use of metaphors. For instance, one of the corrections by Clauder related to Bodmer’s phrase “Wir müssen die Gelegenheit nicht verfliegen lassen,” on page 9 of the 1732 translation of Book I (the words “nicht verfliegen lassen” are underlined by hand in the Zentralbibliothek copy). This German metaphor was Bodmer’s rendition of “Let us not slip the occasion” (Book I, 178) and used a different, but – to judge by the commentary in the Crítische Dichtkunst – original image, to render the source text. Breitinger defended his friend, describing the metaphor as a good one cleverly invented by the translator to fit the situation. It should be judged not according to custom but according to the rules of good metaphors, in other words, stylistic considerations with regard to metaphor should take precedence over matters of ‘good’ German:

---

168 What is his refuge of fauns and ‘Silvanen’ [word not listed in either Grimms’ or Adelung’s German dictionaries, but probably related to Latin ‘silva’, i.e. something along the lines of ‘wood creatures’], his jagged [or angular] palm tree, his theatre in the wood, [...] finally the leaves sounding harmoniously in the spring breezes? What other than Lohenstein and Hoffmannswaldau fragments are all these marvellous flowers that modern tastes will scarcely tolerate in poetry, let alone in prose. [my translation]
Also muß diese Redensart nicht nach dem Gebrauche, sondern nach den Regeln einer guten Metapher beurtheilet werden.¹⁶⁹ (Breitinger 1740a: vol 2, 76)

To what extent did Bodmer actually comply with his own principle that metaphors based on similarities in nature can be translated from any language into any other? The first problem I encountered in analysing the translation of this metaphor category in Paradise Lost was to delimit it. Was Bodmer referring to situations in which the ‘object’ was located in nature, those where the ‘image’ was located in nature, or both? In addition, the passages I examined included a number of ‘imaginary’ objects such as the Holy Spirit, divine light, heavenly creatures and saints, or ‘imaginary images’ such as the God of War. Were these understood to be part of nature or not? What about abstract objects such as human feelings and thoughts?

I therefore limited my initial analysis of this category to only those metaphors for which both object and image were clearly located in the sphere of nature, whether this be animal life, vegetable life or the human body and emotions. I excluded natural objects represented metaphorically with an image from another domain, since Bodmer explicitly mentioned ‘similarities in nature’. Of a total of 97 metaphors examined in the six passages I analysed, a total of 43 metaphors clearly fell within this category.

I encountered many examples of metaphors based on similarities in nature where the source-text image had been fully rendered in the German translation. In one of the metaphors taken from the controversial description of Paradise in Book IV discussed above, for instance, Milton’s trees weep like humans: “rich trees wept odorous gums and balm.” (line 248) Bodmer’s translation solution was the same in 1732 and in 1742, to fully render the same image: “deren köstliche Bäume wohlröchenden Gummi und Balsam weineten.” (J.J.Bodmer 1742a: 154-55) In a total of 19 instances, Bodmer complied with his stated principle of fully rendering metaphors in which both ‘object’ and ‘image’ were taken from the realm of nature. In three of these cases he rendered his 1732 rendering more accurate or complete in 1742, and in two overturned his earlier decision to render a source-text metaphor by sense and instead rendered the same image. It may well be the case that the translation discussions conducted in the pages of the Beyträge and Bodmer’s subsequent elaboration of his own principles with regard to the translation of metaphor led him to make these adjustments.

However, Bodmer did not always render the image of the source-text metaphor in full, even in the 1742 translation of Paradise Lost. In a total of 15 instances within the category of ‘similarities in nature’ he converted the source-text metaphor to sense. In another eight cases he used a different image and in one case he deleted a metaphor. In other words, Bodmer was unable to fully render metaphors based on similarities in nature in 24 of the 43 instances

¹⁶⁹ Thus this figure of speech should be judged not according to usage but according to the rules governing good metaphors. [my translation]
examined, which is well over half of the total. If we compare the actual translation strategies deployed in 1732 and 1742, we see that many of these cases evidently caused Bodmer particular difficulties. In well over half of them he altered the translation strategy when he revised his 1732 translation for publication in 1742 – for instance, altering same image renderings to sense renderings or using different images, or deleting a metaphor that had been previously rendered by sense.

Bodmer’s difficulties do not seem surprising in the light of modern discussion of metaphor and its translation. Newmark raises the possibility that no metaphors are universal, not even ones where the images are derived from nature, giving the example of ‘dirt’, which usually represents impurity but in some African societies is a protection against the cold (Newmark 1980: 95). Kurth discusses the varied associations linked to animals (such as dragons) in different cultures (Kurth 1995: 86-87), and the resulting difficulties for the translation of metaphor in the category I am considering here.

It is difficult to determine whether the difficulties encountered by Bodmer were in fact due to different cultural associations for given natural phenomena, or whether other factors were responsible for choosing a translation strategy that deviated from his own principles. However, some of my findings are interesting, particularly when Bodmer’s decisions are compared to those of Brockes.

In two cases Bodmer made a conscious decision to change the image where it touched on female anatomy, altering the metaphoric image from bosom to lap in one instance, and from lap to bosom in the other. In Book V, line 127, Milton describes groves, fountains and flowers that “open now their choicest bosomed smells.” In his translations of 1732 and 1742, Bodmer rendered ‘bosom’ with ‘Schosse’ (lap): “Diese geben izzo aus ihrem Schosse die auserlesensten Arten Geruches hervor [...]” (1742a: 211-12) Brockes chose the same term in his translation of this passage. May we conclude that the image of a bosom had different, and possibly less acceptable connotations for German readers than for English ones?

However, in what appears to be a completely contradictory decision to the one discussed before, Milton’s “flowery lap Of some irriguous valley” (Book IV, lines 254-55) became Bodmer’s “den bluhmenreichen Busem eines wohlgemässerten Thales” in his 1742 translation (155). This decision to change the image from lap to bosom seems difficult to justify since a valley floor would appear to have more similarity with a woman’s lap than with her bosom. It is therefore particularly interesting that in his 1732 translation, Bodmer had indeed preserved the source-text image of a lap: “die Blumenschoß irgend eines wasserreichen Thales.” (1732: 1,126) We cannot say what prompted him to alter the image in such an inexplicable manner.

In the passages analysed I noted six cases in which the object of a metaphor was an abstract human faculty or emotion – worry, envy, wisdom, thoughts, imagination and reason. In
'Abhandlung von der Schreibart’ Bodmer made explicit mention of abstract objects that can only be sensed and thought, and that are presented in material form in a metaphor. His only requirement with the regard to such images was that they correspond to the abstract object in a manner that allowed the reader to have a sense of the character of such an object:

Es kommt nur darauf an, daß diese cörperlichen Bilder bequem seyn, die Beschaffenheit, die Folgen und die Eindrüke der empfundenen und gedachten Sachen durch ihre Uebereinstimmung in das Gemüthe zu bringen.170 (J.J.Bodmer 1742b: 111)

Despite this clear statement, Bodmer’s 1742 translation rendered the image used to describe human faculties or emotions in only one of the six cases identified. (Interestingly, in this one case, Brockes, who generally used Bodmer’s strategy of rendering source-text images in full, chose not to render the same image, presenting it in the form of a simile.) In three of these six instances involving human faculties or emotions Bodmer had chosen to render the same image in 1732, but changed his mind when he came to revise the translation, deciding to use either a different image or to convert the source-text metaphor to sense.

The following example of a metaphor whose object is an abstract human faculty or emotion actually departs from our discussion of the category of nature, since it uses an image taken from Bodmer’s category of ‘custom’. However it is particularly interesting because Brockes adopted a strategy different from those used in either of Bodmer’s two translations.

In Book V, lines 102-03, Milton’s source text uses the image of an office-holder to represent the faculty of ‘fancy’ or imagination. ‘Fancy’ is one of a number of faculties in the soul, the highest of which is reason. Milton writes, “[...] among these fancy next Her office holds [...]”

In his 1732 translation Bodmer rendered the source-text image in full: “[...] hat die Phantasie das höchste Amt nach ihr” (1732: 1,165) but in his revisions for the 1742 translation he altered the image from ‘Amt’ to ‘Sitz’. The term ‘Sitz’ means, literally, ‘seat’ and only in a figurative sense can it be taken to mean ‘office’. Thus Bodmer’s 1742 translation conveyed more of the sense of a location than an office: “Unter denselben hat die Phantasie ihren Sitz nächst an ihrer Seiten [...]” (1742a: 210) By making this modification Bodmer weakened Milton’s image of imagination as an official who holds responsibility and makes decisions. He reduced this image to one of an individual with an allotted place. May we conclude that metaphoric personification of faculties such as imagination to the extent that Milton did was too great a violation of German linguistic norms at that time? In the light of the aesthetic debate over the role of imagination it is possible, of course, that personification of the faculty of imagination was particularly tricky.

170 All that is necessary is that these physical images be suitable, through their relationship [to the abstract object], to transport into the mind the nature, implications and impressions of the things that have been experienced and thought. [my translation]
It is interesting to note that Brockes dropped Milton's metaphor completely, merely noting that imagination was below reason and influenced reason's decisions: "[...] der denkende Verstand, als ihr Oberhaupt, regiert, Welche aber, unter ihm, von der Phantasie beweget [...] three intervening lines [...] Wirket das, so man beschließt, oder das, was man verneinet [...]." (Brockes 1740: 153)

The other six cases of metaphors whose objects were human faculties or emotions that I encountered in my investigation involved the faculties of reason and wisdom, the emotions of envy and worry, and thoughts in general. Adopting a cognitive approach to these metaphors and examining the domains from which the source-text images for these metaphors are taken, I noted that in four out of the six cases, the images use a concept of the mind as a building in which the emotion or faculty occupies (or does not occupy) a space. While envy dwells in human 'breasts', i.e. minds (Book IX, line 729-30), reason retires into a private cell (Book V, lines 106-109). While wisdom is shut out at one entrance (III, 50), imagination holds office (in a room?) below reason.

It is possible that this conceptual structure of faculties or emotions within the building of the mind was too foreign to German readers to be acceptable in a translated text. Brockes' difficulties with the translation of the metaphor involving imagination would appear to provide some substantiation for this view. As a result of the debate on translation and aesthetics conducted in the pages of the Beyträge during the 1730s, Bodmer may have concluded that Milton's metaphoric imagery for the faculties constituted too great a violation of German norms at that time, and therefore changed his translation decisions in half of the six cases examined when he came to rework his translation at the end of the decade.

An interesting case in point is the one criticised by Clauder and outlined above, where Bodmer had used the metaphor ‘die Gelegenheit verfliegen lassen’ to render ‘slip the occasion’. When he revised his translation in the months of July to September 1740, Bodmer decided to abandon the original metaphor he had used in 1732 and use a stock metaphor instead. He did so despite the spirited defence of his 1732 rendering by his friend and colleague, Johann Jacob Breitinger. Thus the 1742 translation read, “Lasset uns die Gelegenheit nicht verschlafen.” (1742a: 12)

So far I have been discussing the group of metaphors relating to natural phenomena occurring in this world. However, my analysis of the handling of metaphor in Bodmer's 1742 translation of Paradise Lost also identified a small number of metaphors for which the objects described are 'imaginary', such as divine light, heavenly creatures and the Holy Spirit. These metaphors were not included in the group of 43 metaphors based on similarities in nature described above.

However, in their aesthetic theory, Bodmer and Breitinger extended the scope of topics that might be treated in literature to include the imaginary world, arguing that it was an extension
of the natural world. Thus we would expect Bodmer’s handling of this small group of eight metaphors to be comparable to his treatment of ‘nature’ metaphors. Indeed, my analysis of metaphors in this category showed that his translation decisions for this group are very comparable to those for the ‘nature’ category, with most of them being rendered with the same source-text image, only one rendered with a different image and two converted to sense.

### 7.5.4 Images derived from customs

I now turn to Bodmer’s second category of metaphors, those for which the images are derived from customs, both moral and otherwise (‘Sitten und Gebräuche’). Where these images were taken from distant or old nations they were valid, argued Bodmer, in cases where the reader could be expected to be familiar with them. This was the case where the readers were well educated:

> Was Bilder sind, die von den Sitten und Gebräuchen besonderer, vornehmlich entfernter und alter, Nationen entlehnet worden, so haben solche ihren Preiß und Glantz vornehmlich, wenn man geschickte und in den Geschichten der Völker und ihrer Sitten erfahrene Leser hoffen darf.\(^{171}\) (J.J.Bodmer 1742b: 112)

By way of example, he then presented a metaphor taken from classical literature, stating that uneducated readers from the common people would not be able to understand it.

In this limited discussion of ‘custom’ metaphors, Bodmer appears to be indicating that there may be a problem translating metaphors in this category where the image used is taken from a domain unfamiliar to the reader in another culture. In this respect his comments are similar to those of twentieth-century translation scholars who have drawn attention to the difficulties in translating ‘cultural’ metaphors.

To what extent did Bodmer encounter difficulties in the translation of ‘cultural’ or ‘custom’ metaphors? In my analysis I examined all the metaphors from my sample whose ‘image’ was taken from the area of ‘custom’, leaving aside metaphors whose ‘object’ related to this field. This included areas such as clothing, farming, sailing, administration, theatre and music, painting, architectural features, classical and religious knowledge, heraldry, war and marital customs – a total of 45 metaphors in the samples examined. In my analysis I paid special attention to metaphors whose images were based on English customs with which even well-educated German readers might be expected to be unfamiliar.

I found that in his 1742 translation Bodmer had rendered a total of 25 metaphors using the same image as that presented in the English source text. This accounted for well over half of all the metaphors examined in my sample. Many of the metaphors in this category were the

---

171 With regard to images taken from the customs and usages of particular nations – above all distant and ancient nations – such images are praiseworthy and brilliant above all in cases where one may hope for readers who are clever and experienced in the history of peoples and their customs. [my translation]
controversial ones from Book IV of *Paradise Lost* cited in ‘Abhandlung von der Schreibart’ – a forest as a theatre, rustling leaves tuned like instruments, burnished fruit, personified whispering gales, fruit of vegetable gold. In all these cases Bodmer reproduced the same source-text image despite the criticism to which he had been subjected. Only in three cases had Bodmer changed the translation strategy he used in his 1732 translation.

Of the 21 metaphors that Bodmer decided not to render fully in his 1742 translation, 12 were modified. In four of these cases Bodmer decided to abandon the rendering of the same image he had used in the 1732 translation in favour of using a different image: Three of these cases have already been mentioned under the previous category and involve human faculties or emotions.

The final case is a metaphor that compares a vine to a ‘marriageable’ woman entwining her arms around the elm tree (Book V, line 215), a metaphor that Brockes also appears to have had trouble with. In his 1732 translation Bodmer used the term ‘ihre Heurathzeitigen Arme’ (1732: 1,170) or ‘marriage-time arms’, changing the image in his 1742 version to “mit ihren getreuen Armen” (1742a: 216) – faithful arms. In his translation, Brockes also changed the image, to “mit verliebtem Arm” (Brockes 1740: 163) or loving arm. In these latter two cases the change in image has rendered the vine less active in capturing her man in marriage, and more the faithful or loving wife. Possibly Milton’s image was too wanton for German taste at the time, and Bodmer’s change in strategy was a reaction to the debate conducted in the pages of the *Beyträge*. Possibly the concept of a ‘marriageable’ woman was not a familiar one in German-speaking countries of the time? Without more information on contemporary moral, social and linguistic norms, these questions cannot be answered.

The most interesting cases examined, however, were a number of metaphors in which the image in the source text was taken from the domain of warfare or violence. My analysis showed that Bodmer was quite consistent in his decisions not to fully render metaphors of this kind, choosing rather to alter the image, convert it to sense or even, in one instance, to delete the metaphor. I encountered a total of six ‘martial’ metaphors in my analysis.

An example is the description of Eve in Book V, lines 14-15, where Milton describes Adam looking upon “Beauty, which whether waking or asleep, Shot forth peculiar graces.” The use of an image from the domain of warfare to describe the power of beauty was intended to convey the particular force of this power, and was not unusual in the English language. However, neither in the 1732 version nor in the 1742 one did Bodmer render this image, converting it in both cases to sense. The 1742 translation read, “Schönheit, die im Schleife, wie im Wachen, eine sonderbare Annehmlichkeit zeigte” (1742a: 203), a rendering devoid of the power of the original metaphor.

Other ‘martial’ images that Bodmer converted to sense were ‘piercing ray’ and ‘silence yields’, while he used the image of ‘becoming inflamed’ to render “smit with the love of
sacred song." The metaphoric image of (military) ranks of trees was entirely deleted. The only instance where the image of shooting was retained was in Book V, lines 139-41, where Milton presents his readers with the classical image of the sun in his chariot, shooting rays. This image would have been familiar to German readers from their classical education, and Bodmer is therefore likely to have judged it to be in accordance with prevailing aesthetic and linguistic norms.

In my analysis I also encountered a source-text metaphor whose image was taken from the domain of violent punishment – in this case the rack, an instrument of torture. In Book I Milton describes Satan as "racked with deep despair" (line 126). Neither in the 1732 nor in the 1742 translation does Bodmer make any reference to a ‘Folterbank’ (rack), ‘foltern’ (torture) or any synonym of these terms. Instead he chose a different image in 1732, while in 1742 he converted the image to sense. In the 1732 translation his rendering was "ward innwendig von hülf- und trostlosen Gedancken genaget" (1732: 1.6), literally ‘gnawed by helpless thoughts’. The 1742 version read, "inwendig ward er von einer tiefen Verzweifelung gepfezet." (1742a: 9) The verb ‘pfetzen’ has gone out of use in modern German, but the definition given in Grimm is “pfetzen. 2 (uneigentlich). c) innerlich bedrängen, mit worten zusetzen, wehe thun [...] strafen”, in other words, punished or beset by deep despair. Interestingly, although Bodmer changed his translation strategy in 1742, he rendered the term ‘deep despair’ more literally. It is possible that, finding himself unable to reproduce the source-text image, he tried to compensate for this by rendering other textual elements more closely.

Bodmer’s clear strategy of not rendering warlike or violent images is particularly interesting in view of the considerable space he devotes to describing the frequent English use of metaphors in the domain of blood and slaughter. This feature clearly struck German readers as unusual and must therefore have been a strong departure from German usage. Interestingly, as Blackall notes, the German poet Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock (1724-1803) also appears to have avoided scenes of physical violence in his highly-regarded epic, Messias, even in scenes such as Christ being struck by the High Priest (Blackall 1959: 342).

Another image that Bodmer decided not to reproduce in German in the samples I analysed was that of the veil, which occurred in two places in my investigation. On one occasion Milton’s source text referred to the cataract that has caused his own blindness as a veil over his eyes (Book III, line 26) and on one occasion to the archangel Raphael’s wings before his face (Book V, line 250). In this latter case Bodmer had used the veil image in 1732, but converted it to sense in 1742. Is it possible that he decided that this image, although well accepted in the English language, was too novel for German readers? Certainly the examples of its use in German literature quoted in the Grimm dictionary appear to date from after Bodmer’s period.
Other source-text images that are not reproduced in the 1742 translation include the image of the sun's fleecy skirts to describe the sun shining through mists (Book V, line 187), the heraldic image of a mantling vine (Book IV, line 258), and waves as Norway foam (Book I, line 203). In the latter two cases Bodmer rethought his 1742 translation – in both cases choosing a different image instead of conversion to sense. He may have thought that although the source-text image was unfamiliar, it suited his strategy better to use a metaphor with a different image than to 'lose' the metaphor completely.

With regard to the categories of 'nature' and 'custom' metaphors in general, the changes that Bodmer made when he revised his translation were too varied in nature to conclude that the translation debate in the Beyträged or the crystallisation of his ideas of translation of metaphor prompted any consistent pattern of modifications.

What emerges from my analysis, however, is that the debate did not deter him in any way from his principle of rendering the same source-text image wherever this was feasible. Indeed, occasionally he managed to come closer to this objective. In a total of eight instances he either rendered the same image where he had previously used a different image or converted the metaphor to sense, or else he changed the translation slightly to ensure that the rendering was even closer to the full source-text image. All in all he rendered the same source-text image for 45 of the 89 metaphors examined.

However, he also appears to have clarified his thought on the translation of certain groups of metaphor, most notably those whose objects were human faculties and emotions, and those using images taken from the domain of war and violence. In both cases he appears, on the basis of the findings derived from my analysis of a sample of his translation, to have decided against rendering source-text images in full. We may possibly conclude that the debate on norms of translation had caused him to modify a few of his earlier translation decisions by accepting that some kinds of metaphor could not be rendered in full.

7.5.5 'Anomalies'

I now turn to Bodmer's final category of metaphor, the one whose definition is least clear on the basis of the brief discussion of metaphors in 'Abhandlung von der Schreibart'. When describing this category of 'anomalies', Bodmer urged care in dealing with metaphors since languages had adopted certain metaphors and forms of speech that were 'anomalies' because they were based on an external and coincidental similarity or on the arbitrary waywardness of a nation:

[...] weil es in den Sprachen gewisse angenommene Metaphoren und Formen der Rede gibt, welche blosse Anomalien sind, indem sie nur auf
Although no further definition of this category was provided by Bodmer, the section on metaphors in Breitinger’s *Critische Dichtkunst* gave it more detailed attention (Breitinger 1740a: vol 2, 343-45). Like Bodmer, Breitinger used the description “äusserliche und zufällige […] Aehnlichkeit” for the category of ‘anomalies’. He continued by explaining that these metaphors had managed to creep into common speech and finally to establish themselves so firmly that people had forgotten their illogical origin and accepted them as genuine words:

Diese Anomalien mögen entstanden seyn, weil die Metaphern in ihrem Grund schon von Anfang ungeschickt waren [...] aber das Glück gehabt, sich in die gemeine Rede einzuschleichen, und durch den Gebrauch endlich so feste zu setzen, daß man zuletzt ihren ungeriemten Ursprung vergessen, und sie vor eigentliche Wörter genommen hat.  

He then provided the example of the French figure of speech, ‘faire la cour à quelqu’un’, a figure of speech he would not want to introduce into German because in itself it constituted an illogical ‘anomaly’ whose real meaning was confused and unclear. In Latin the corresponding term would be ‘adulari’ and German had a much more correct term, ‘einem Höflichkeit erzeigen’. He gave a second example, the German figure of speech ‘einem die Aufwart machen’. Both examples, he stated, showed the power of customary practice, which destroyed the recollection of the metaphor (here he used the classical term for metaphor, ‘translation’) and prevented people from being aware of obvious faults in the construction:

Diese zwei Exempel […] können zeigen, wie groß die Macht der Gewohnheit sey, daß sie nicht alleine das Angedencken der Translation zerstört, sondern auch hindert, daß man eine offenbare Unrichtigkeit in der Construction nicht einmahl wahrnimmt.

The repeated references to ‘anomalies’ being established in common speech to the extent of being unrecognisable as metaphors would appear to indicate that Bodmer and Breitinger are referring to ‘stock’ metaphors. The term ‘stock’ metaphor is one used by Newmark in his classification of metaphors and refers to established metaphors not deadened by overuse. An

172 […] because in languages there are certain adopted metaphors and forms of speech that are mere anomalies, insofar as they are based only on some external or coincidental similarity, or on the arbitrary waywardness of a nation. [my translation]

173 These anomalies may have come about because although the basis ['Grund' or 'sense'] of the metaphor was unsuitable from the very beginning, they had the good fortune to smuggle their way into common speech and finally to become so established through usage that people eventually forgot their illogical origins and accepted them as real words. [my translation]

174 These two examples serve to demonstrate the enormous force of customary practise which not only destroys the recollection of the metaphor but also prevents an obvious fault in the construction being perceived. [my translation]
alternative terminology is provided by van den Broeck, who refers to ‘lexicalised’ metaphors that are part of the established semantic stock of the language.

Bodmer and Breitinger’s further references to ‘coincidental similarity’, ‘illogicality’, ‘arbitrary waywardness’ and ‘faults in the construction’ are less easy to interpret. Certainly, ‘stock’ or ‘lexicalised’ metaphors are frequently used in a manner that bears no relation to the original image of the metaphor, and it is possible that it was this phenomenon that the two eighteenth-century scholars were thinking of.

Bodmer’s own discussion of ‘anomalies’ continued with a firm stand against retaining them in translation:

Dergleichen Metaphoren in der Uebersezung beybehalten, wird sie eben so ungereimt machen, als sie in der Grundsprache selbst sind [...] 175

(J.J.Bodmer 1742b: 113)

In doing so he went further than Newmark, who, although he concludes that ‘stock’ metaphors are sometimes tricky to translate, states that the “first and most satisfying procedure for translating a stock metaphor is to reproduce the same image in the TL [target language], provided it has comparable frequency and currency in the appropriate TL register.” (Newmark 1988: 108) Van den Broeck, by contrast, sees in ‘lexicalised’ metaphors the “main challenge for the translation of certain texts” and points to the dangers of overtranslating such metaphors (van den Broeck 1981: 82).

Because of the lack of clarity in the definition of ‘anomalies’ I found it difficult to allocate metaphors to this category with any degree of certainty. One possible candidate, however, may be the ‘racked’ metaphor described above. Another may be a group of source-text metaphors using the image of ‘feeding’. In my analysis I encountered three source-text metaphors that used this image – feeding a fire, feeding flowers and feeding on thoughts. The Oxford English Dictionary defines this figurative sense of the verb as “to keep (a reservoir, watercourse, etc.) supplied, to supply (a fire, etc.) with fuel” giving literary quotes that go back as far as 1582 and include Shakespeare as well as Milton. It is possible that by Milton’s time this metaphor was well enough established for it to be considered a ‘stock’ metaphor, or at least, for Bodmer to have believed it to be one on the basis of his own reading of English, which by 1740, when he reworked his first translation of Paradise Lost, is likely to have been relatively extensive. According to Bodmer’s principles set down in 1742, this ‘feeding’ metaphor would therefore not have been rendered with the same source-text image.

However, in modern German at least, there is a direct equivalent with the same meaning – the modern Duden gives the figurative sense of ‘einer Sache zuführen’ under the heading of ‘speisen’ (to feed). Thus in modern German there would be no problem in rendering ‘feeding’

175 Retaining these kinds of metaphors in translation would make them just as illogical as they are in the source language. [my translation]
with ‘speisen’. But further exploration of the history of this figurative use of the word ‘speisen’ in Grimm revealed the following entry: “Speisen. 4) Mit anderen Subjekten. i) eigentümlicher sind ausdrucksweisweise, wo ein abstrakter begriff als object zu speisen tritt.” The use of the term ‘eigentümlich’ in the entry would appear to indicate that, historically, this kind of figurative sense for the word ‘speisen’ was relatively uncommon. Some corroborating evidence for this assumption is provided by the fact that, on the one occasion in his 1732 translation when Bodmer uses the word ‘speisen’ in this sense, it is underlined in Bodmer’s own copy of the 1732 translation, and had therefore – most probably – been commented on adversely by Clauder.

It is therefore interesting to note that, in his 1742 translation, Bodmer decided against rendering the source-text image for all three cases I examined. The first case occurs in Book I of Paradise Lost, where the description of hell refers to a “fiery deluge, fed With ever-burning sulphur unconsumed” (lines 68-69). In his first translation completed in 1724 and published in 1732, Bodmer used the term ‘speisen’ and rendered the source-text image in full:

...] und eine feurige Glut stets tobet, welche von ewig brennendem Schwefel, der sich nicht vernehret, gespeiset wird. (J.J.Bodmer 1732: 1,4)

By the time he came to revise his translation, however, Bodmer may have decided that the ‘feeding’ image was an ‘anomaly’, a ‘stock’ metaphor that may even have been ‘illogical’ and based on a ‘coincidental similarity’. In the 1742 version, he abandoned the image of ‘feeding’, converting the metaphor to sense instead:

[...] und eine feurige Sündflut ströhmt, welche sich von einem ewigbrennenden Schwefel, der niemahls verzehret wird, unterhält. (1742a: 6)

My second example of a metaphor using the image of ‘feeding’ occurs in Book IV, where Milton describes brooks that visited plants and “fed Flowers worthy of Paradise” (lines 240-41). In his 1732 translation, Bodmer used a different image to render ‘feeding’ (‘erzielen’, meaning ‘targeting’), while in the 1742 version he changed his mind about the image and used ‘hervorbringen’ (‘bring forth’) instead. For the third example, the metaphor ‘feed on thoughts’ (Book III, line 37) he also tried the image of ‘targeting’ (‘erzielen’) in 1732, changing it to ‘thoughts rising up to me’ (“steigen mir Gedancken auf”) in 1742.

Bodmer’s discussion of metaphor and translation in the ‘Abhandlung von der Schreibart’ ends after his discussion of ‘anomalies’, proceeding to look at the way in which the German language can be enriched by using techniques deployed by Milton – reviving archaic metaphors, poetic omissions in words, neologisms – and discussing Gottsched’s criticism of Milton’s allegedly ‘wild and dreadful thoughts’. Bodmer concludes with apologies for his ‘weak and prosaic’ translation.
7.5.6 Introducing new metaphors

I would like to turn briefly now to a feature in Bodmer’s handling of metaphor in his 1742 translation of *Paradise Lost* that I encountered when I directly compared the texts of the 1732 and 1742 translations and checked back deviations against the source text. When comparing the 1732 translation with the 1742 translation I identified two cases in which Bodmer had introduced a new metaphor in the 1742 target text that was not included in the 1732 text. By checking back against the English text of *Paradise Lost* I was able to confirm that the new metaphor did not correspond to one in the source text.

This is the situation discussed by Gideon Toury, where metaphors are found in the target text but not in the source text. Toury suggests that a framework allowing such metaphors to be identified may “facilitate the account of compensation” (Toury 1995: 83), the phenomenon whereby a loss of important source-text features is made up by approximating their effects in the target text using other means. Of particular interest here is the phenomenon of compensation *in place*, where a lost effect in one part of the source text is recreated in another part of the target text (see Hervey et al. 1995: 29-30). In the case of Bodmer’s translation of *Paradise Lost*, this might mean introducing a metaphor at a place in the target text where there was none in the source text, in order to compensate for metaphor losses in other places.

The first new target-text metaphor was found in Bodmer’s 1742 translation of Book IV, where Satan is described sitting on the tree of life in the guise of a cormorant:

Doch gewann er dadurch das rechte Leben nicht wieder, sonder saß darauf, für die so lebten, *den Tod zu schmieden*, […] (J.J.Bodmer 1742a: 152).

This metaphor uses the image of a blacksmith, forging an item from metal, to represent Satan hatching his plans for Adam and Eve. In modern German this is a ‘stock’ metaphor. However, it was not present in the 1732 translation, which spoke only of Satan sitting on the tree and intending to kill those that lived. Neither can it be found in the source text, which reads: “yet not true life Thereby regained, but sat *devising death* To them who lived.” (Book IV, lines 196-97)

In the other instance of a new target-text metaphor – another passage in Book IV, in which the sun is described racing down the sky in his chariot – Bodmer added a metaphor that fell within the category of ‘stock’ metaphors in his time but is no longer current in modern German. It is a metaphor that uses the image of a rider galloping with a loose rein to represent great speed:

denn die Sonne hatte sich izo geneigt, und eilte *mit verhängtem Zügel* zu den Inseln des Oceanus, […]. (J.J.Bodmer 1742a: 160)
This metaphor was not present in either the 1732 translation or the source text, which read, "for the sun Declined was hasting now with prone career To the Ocean Isles." (Book IV, lines 352-54)

In both of these instances, Bodmer may have been attempting some compensation for the loss of the same source-text image in other metaphors that he had modified following the translation debate of the 1730s.

7.5.7 Summary of translation analysis

Looking at the overall results of my analysis of Bodmer’s treatment of metaphor in six selected passages of Paradise Lost, it is clear that the theoretical importance he attached to reproducing source-text form was largely reflected in his translation practice with respect to metaphors. Of a total of 97 metaphors I analysed in this investigation, over half were rendered in German with the same image in Bodmer’s second translation of 1742.

What is interesting, however, is that in his first translation prepared in 1723-24 and published in 1732, Bodmer appears to have rendered slightly more metaphors in full than he did in the second translation, or at least this is the case for the metaphors I examined in the six passages chosen for my investigation.

The second translation of 1742, although based on the earlier translation published in 1732, was the result of radical revisions to the earlier version carried out by Bodmer in the summer of 1740. My analysis of a selection of passages from his 1742 translation shows that in fourteen cases where he had rendered a metaphor with the same image in the 1732 translation, he altered his strategy in the 1742 revisions. In these cases he either replaced the full source-text image with another image or converted it to sense. On far fewer occasions – in only five cases – did he choose to render a full image in 1742 where he had not done so in 1732.

Bodmer’s decisions to abandon a same-image rendering related most particularly to metaphorical descriptions of human faculties and emotions, to a few cases that appear to have been related in one way another to social customs relating to women – using the lap or the bosom as a metaphoric image, the concept of a ‘marriageable’ woman and the use of the veil as an image – and to a number of metaphors like those using the image of ‘feeding’ that he may have decided were ‘stock’ metaphors falling within his category of ‘anomalies’.

With regard to the group of human faculties and emotions, it is possible that Bodmer’s decision to abandon a full rendering of these metaphors was an outcome of the debate on translation conducted in the pages of the Beyträże. He may have concluded that Milton’s metaphorical imagery for faculties constituted too great a violation of German linguistic norms at that time. It is interesting to note that Brockes also decided against a full rendering of the two metaphors of this kind in the passage of Paradise Lost that he translated.
The group of social customs relating to women is fairly diverse, and it is difficult to come to any generalised conclusion here, although it is possible that he decided against reproducing the source-text images because some of them, at least, may have offended against sexual mores and thus reduced the acceptability of his text.

In the case of the third group, the metaphoric 'anomalies', it is possible that in grappling with the heavy criticism his use of metaphors was subjected to in the debate of the 1730s, Bodmer came to the conclusion that 'stock' metaphors were not essential for transporting the poetic character of a source text.

Looking now at the overall group of metaphors that Bodmer had not rendered with the same image even in his 1732 translation, I noted that he made far more changes to this group in his 1742 revisions than he had for metaphors originally rendered with the same image. In well over half of the cases I investigated he had changed his translation strategy for the 1742 version. It would appear that the 'failure' to render a source-text metaphor with the same image was a cause of dissatisfaction to him, and that he therefore attempted to improve on his previous rendering wherever possible.

Of particular note amongst the metaphoric images not rendered in full were the group of images taken from the domain of warfare and violence. Bodmer was quite consistent in deciding not to render these images in full, and Brockes may have adopted the same strategy if the one metaphor of this kind encountered in the Brockes translation is anything to go by. On this basis of Bodmer's own comments about this kind of metaphor and his translation practice in the six passages I analysed, it is evident that this metaphoric domain constituted one of the areas of 'custom' metaphors that Bodmer did not believe would be understood by his German readers.

7.6 Bodmer's ideas on metaphor and subsequent developments

7.6.1 Bodmer's approach

My examination of Bodmer's statements on the translation of metaphor and my comparison of Bodmer's 1742 translation of *Paradise Lost* with his 1732 translation have shown how, following the translation debate of the 1730s, Bodmer developed his thoughts on the translation of metaphor and modified the approach advocated by Huet.

This crystallisation of his thought on the translation of metaphor constitutes part of his endeavours to ensure that a new, more 'faithful' norm of translation would be adopted within the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture. Thus, in place of word-for-word translation of the metaphoric image as proposed by Huet he advocated examination of the underlying 'sense' of the metaphor, and he developed a categorisation for metaphor that recognised the
difficulty of translating certain culturally-bound metaphors and the inadvisability of translating 'stock' metaphors.

To a very large extent his principles appear to have been reflected in his own translation practice. Here his approach demonstrates his continued adherence to the peripheral norm of accountability to the source-text author, despite the criticism to which the use of metaphor in his first translation of *Paradise Lost* had been subjected by the neo-classicist camp. Although in 1734 Venzky had spoken out against transferring metaphors from the source language without necessity, in his second translation of *Paradise Lost*, published eight years later, Bodmer rendered more than half of the source-text metaphors identified in my sample. This practice reflected his own statements that, contrary to the claims of 'certain timid language critics' metaphors in nature could be translated from any language into any other, and that images based on customs were valid in cases where the reader could be expected to be familiar with them.

Few translation thinkers before the twentieth century appear to have devoted as much attention to the problems created by metaphor and ways of solving them as Bodmer did, and there is little evidence of his ideas on metaphor having been pursued further in the latter part of the eighteenth century in German-speaking Europe.

### 7.6.2 Translations published in Zurich

In Zurich a number of Bodmer's 'disciples' carried on his work of translating English literature. In the absence of detailed studies on these translations, no statement can be made on their treatment of metaphor. However, one Zurich translator, Johann Jacob Steinbrüchel, was commended by Gotthold Ephraim Lessing – known to be an advocate of respecting the character of the original – for successfully "thinking along with his poet.” (see Lefevere 1977: 29).

Apart from Bodmer, the most important translator to have lived in the eighteenth century in this period was Christoph Martin Wieland (1733-1813). As a young man Wieland spent twenty months in Bodmer's house in Zurich (1753-54), working with Bodmer and familiarising himself with English literature and the contents of Bodmer's library. While in Zurich he also learnt English and read Shakespeare's dramas, and his translations of Shakespeare were published by the Orell publishing company during the 1760s. In line with Bodmer's ideas on translation, Wieland advocated translations that preserved the individual character of the source-text author. The poetry of an author's style and his poetic colouring should be clear in the translation. At the same time, however, he argued against the use of translationese, stating that German readers might find this disturbing (see Tgahrt 1982: 270).

Despite these comments, Wieland's translations omitted long passages and even complete scenes. Metaphors were either deleted or rendered in 'natural' prose. In one example, taken
from *Romeo and Juliet*, Act V, scene one, Shakespeare’s text reads, “My bosom’s lord sits lightly in his throne.” Wieland rendered this striking metaphor by converting it to sense: “Ein ungewöhnlicher Geist der Fröhlichkeit erfüllt meinen Busen.” By way of comparison, in 1797 Caroline and August Wilhelm Schlegel, in the Shakespeare translation that was to become the canonical Shakespeare in Germany, rendered the image of the source text in full as “Leicht auf dem Thron sitzt meiner Brust Gebieter.” (see Tgahrt 1982: 140) Thus, although Wieland may have adopted Bodmer’s norms with respect to the choice of source text (from English), he certainly does not appear to have embraced his norms of accountability to the author or rendering source-text norms wherever practicable in his translation practice. However, the one example given here is a small piece of evidence indicating that these norms may have been reflected in the translation practice of the Schlegels at the end of the eighteenth century.

**7.6.3 Herder**

Like Bodmer, Johann Gottfried Herder (1744-1803), who translated Percy, Shaftesbury and the Song of Songs among others, was an advocate of greater accountability to the source-text author. Although Herder did not expressly mention metaphor, a key concept for him was that of the author’s ‘tone of voice’. The objective in translation, according to Herder, was to capture and recreate the author’s musical tone:

> Auch beim Übersetzen ist das schwerste, diesen Ton, den Gesangton einer fremden Sprache zu übertragen [...] Oft ist kein ander Mittel, als, wenns unmöglich ist, das Lied selbst zu geben, wie es in der Sprache singet, es treu zu erfassen, wie es in uns übertrönet, und festgehalten, so zu geben.176

(quoted from Tgahrt: 125)

Specifying this concept further, Herder asked which translator would be able to

> find his [the author’s] distinctive tone of voice, to take over the nature of his style and to express for us the really distinctive features, the diction and the colouring of the foreign original, its dominant traits, its genius and the nature of its poetic style. (quoted from Lefèvere 1977: 32)

Although metaphor is not explicitly listed here, terms such as ‘colouring’ or ‘the nature of its poetic style’ may well be understood to include metaphor.

**7.6.4 Humboldt**

Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835), although more concerned with the matter of metre in translation, did also comment briefly on metaphor in his preface to a translation of Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon* (translated 1797, published 1816), where he stated that source-text

---

176 In translation, too, the most difficult thing is to transfer this tone, the *singing tone* of a foreign language. When it proves impossible to reproduce the song itself, as it sings in the language, there is often no other alternative to faithfully registering it as it sounds *in us* and recording it in this manner. [my translation]
metaphors were ‘untouchable’ and the translator should not attempt to clarify difficult metaphors:

[...] wo es sich [the source text] Metaphern erlaubt, deren Beziehung schwer zu fassen ist, [...] da würde der Übersetzer unrecht thun, auß sich selbst willkürlich eine den Charakter des Textes verstellende Klarheit hineinzubringen.\(^{177}\) (quoted from Störig 1963: 84)

In line with the comments of his predecessors, Humboldt pleaded for a translation that aimed to reproduce the real nature of the original and praised Voß for introducing classical antiquity into the German language. He said that the translation should have a foreign colouring to reflect what is strange, but not to the point of strangeness:

Solange nicht die Fremdheit, sondern das Fremde gefühlt wird, hat die Uebersetzung ihre höchsten Zwecke erreicht; wo aber die Fremdheit an sich erscheint, und vielleicht gar das Fremde verdünkt, da verräth der Uebersetzer, dass er seinem Original nicht gewachsen ist.\(^{178}\) (quoted from Störig 1963: 83)

This preface in *Agamemnon* is also interesting because of its lengthy discussion of the nature of language and the word, where the word becomes the nucleus of meaning rather than just a sign, as in the classical theory of language. Here we see the beginnings of a departure from the classical framework that had dominated translation theory for so long.

---

\(^{177}\) […] where it [the source text] allows itself metaphors whose meaning is hard to grasp, […] there the translator would go wrong if he were to introduce, of his own accord, a clarity which disfigures the character of the text. [translation by Lefevere (1977: 43)]

\(^{178}\) Translation has reached its highest goals as long as what is felt is not strangeness, but merely what is strange; but where strangeness appears as such, and probably even obscures the strange, there the translator betrays that he is not up to his original. [translation by Lefevere (1977: 42)]
Chapter Eight – What Survived?

This research project has focused on the work of an eighteenth-century translator and the way in which his ideas influenced, and were influenced by the debates of the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture. In chapter five I described how, by the end of the 1730s, debate was already becoming acrimonious as the opposing parties - who never actually met one another - traded insults. How long did the Zurich-Leipzig interculture actually last? And what survived of the ideas put forward by the two parties in their discussions on translation? This chapter outlines the end of the professional interculture and the enduring results of Johann Jacob Bodmer’s work as an interculturalist, showing how this transitory formation disintegrated after the 1730s and what its lasting effects were.

8.1 End of the professional interculture

8.1.1 Developments to 1744

The first clear sign of a serious rift within the professional interculture occurred in 1738, when Johann Christoph Gottsched left the Deutsche Gesellschaft. However, he did not relinquish responsibility for the Beyträge, retaining this until the journal ceased publication in 1744. Since he was no longer a member of the Gesellschaft, he simply changed the name of the publication. The original name had been Beyträge [...] herausgegeben von einigen Mitgliedern der Deutschen Gesellschaft in Leipzig179. In 1739 it became Beyträge [...] herausgegeben von einigen Liebhabern der Deutschen Litteratur180.

A series of Zurich publications on aesthetic theory from 1740 onwards posed an increasingly strong challenge to Gottsched’s position, and in 1741 he instigated the publication of another journal in Leipzig, the Belustigungen des Verstandes und des Witzes181 (1741-45). Although published under the name of Johann Joachim Schwabe, rather than Gottsched’s name, it soon became clear who was behind this journal when it began printing acerbic attacks on ‘Merbod’ (Johann Jacob Bodmer) and ‘Greibertin’ (Johann Jacob Breitinger) in articles bearing the confrontational title of ‘Der Deutsche Dichterkrieg’182. The Swiss retaliated in

179 Contributions [...] published by a number of members of the Deutsche Gesellschaft in Leipzig

180 Contributions [...] published by a number of admirers of German literature

181 Entertainment for the reason and the intellect

182 War of the German poets
their *Sammlung Critischer, Poetischer und anderer geistvollen Schriften* (1741-44). From 1742 onwards the *Belustigungen* also came under fire from writers in other German-speaking states.

In 1743 and 1744 a scholar from Halle, near Leipzig, published an enthusiastic two-part defence of Bodmer and Breitinger’s aesthetic principles relating to imagination in poetry. In his *Erweis, daß die G*itsch*dianische Sekte den Geschmak verderbe* [sic], Immanuel Jacob Pyra even went as far as lamenting the concessions that Bodmer had made in his second translation of *Paradise Lost*. Bodmer, he wrote, should have contented himself with correcting a few grammatical details, and not have made so many concessions to Gottsched’s translation norm:

> Die neue Übersetzung des Milton aber hat dadurch viel von ihrem Sinn eingebüßt, daß der Herr Verfasser das unnütze Getadle einiger deutschen Pedanten gar zu vieler Achtung werth gehalten, da die alte im Gegentheil so schön in die nachdrückliche und verwegene Wortordnung des Englischen einschlägt. Es hätten nur einige grammatikalische Kleinigkeiten dürfen geändert werden, die allein für anstößig zu erklären wären. (quoted in Schneider 1965:21)

Writing to Bodmer himself, Pyra expressed the opinion that the Gottsched party was falling apart and was the subject of contempt even in Leipzig:

> Die Gottschedische Sekte scheint sich inzwischen überall zum Falle zu neigen, und ist in Leipzig, wie uns alle versichern, selbst in Verachtung. (letter from Pyra to Bodmer dated 21 April 1744, reproduced in J.J. Bodmer 1781:72)

8.1.2 The ‘Bremer Beiträger’ and Klopstock

Yet Gottsched remained a powerful man in the world of German literature, as subsequent developments involving a group of scholars referred to as the ‘Bremer Beiträger’ were to demonstrate. At the end of 1744 another new journal entitled *Neue Beiträge zum Vergnügen des Verstandes und Witzes* appeared (see Schröder 1956 for a detailed account of the

---

183 Evidence that the Gottsched sect is ruining good taste

184 However, the new Milton translation has forfeited much of its significance due to the fact that the author has been overly respectful of the worthless censure of a few German pedants. The previous translation, by contrast, retained the emphatic and bold word order of the English in a most attractive manner. The only changes that were needed were a few grammatical details, since these were the only elements that could be regarded as objectionable. [my translation]

185 The Gottsched sect appears to be declining everywhere, and is despised even in Leipzig itself – or so everyone assures us. [my translation]

186 Bremen contributors

187 New contributions for the entertainment of reason and intellect
history of this journal). Its writers were—and remained—anonymous and were simply referred to as the ‘Bremer Beiträger’ because the journal was published in Bremen. In fact the instigators and editors were mainly contributors to Schwabe’s journal and members of the Gottsched circle, and none of them lived in Bremen. In an anonymous letter to Bodmer written in summer 1745, one of the ‘Bremer Beiträger’, Johann Adolf Schlegel, gave some indications as to why he and his colleagues had gone to such lengths to hide their identities. Since he was a citizen of Leipzig, he explained, Gottsched was still in a position to harm him and, indeed, he wrote, such harm was a real possibility due to Gottsched’s malicious character. In this letter Schlegel also mentioned that Gottsched’s supporters in Leipzig now numbered no more than half a dozen (see Schröder 1956: 38-41).

In view of later developments in the field of translation, it is interesting to note the names of a number of translators amongst the ranks of the ‘Bremer Beiträger’. They included Johann Arnold Ebert, who later came to be highly regarded within the field of scholarly translation (see Knufmann 1969: 502) and whose renderings included many of Edward Young’s works, Just Friedrich Wilhelm Zachariä, whose hexameter translation of Paradise Lost in 1760 owed much to Bodmer (see Tisch 1973, Bender 1967: 226), and also Christlob Mylius, not only a minor translator in his own right but also a cousin of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing who is known chiefly as a German dramatist but who also wrote on translation.

It was the ‘Bremer Beiträger’ who took the major step that was to result in the ultimate rejection of Gottsched’s aesthetics and help establish a new set of poetic aesthetics along the lines advocated by Bodmer. In doing so, they vindicated Bodmer’s efforts in his translation of Paradise Lost. In 1748, the ‘Bremer Beiträge’ journal published the first part of a major literary work that embraced Bodmer’s aesthetics of the imagination. This was a religious epic by Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock entitled Messias. According to his own account in a letter written to Bodmer, Klopstock had been inspired to write his epic by Bodmer’s translation of Paradise Lost. Klopstock related what an overwhelming experience reading the German Paradise Lost had been for him:

Und als Milton, den ich vielleicht, ohne Ihre Übersetzung, allzuspät zu sehen bekommen hätte, mir in die Hände fiel, loderte das Feuer, das Homer in mir entzündet hatte, zur Flamme auf, und hob meine Seele, um die Himmel und die Religion zu singen.188 (quoted in Bender 1965: 19* [sic])

In 1747, Klopstock’s manuscript copy of the initial sections of the epic came into the hands of the ‘Bremer Beiträger’, who were initially unsure whether they should publish it. They sent it to both Bodmer and Friedrich von Hagedorn in Hamburg, asking for their opinions. Hagedorn was hesitant, believing the Messias would be even more controversial than

188 And when Milton, who, without your translation, I might have seen too late, fell into my hands, the fire that Homer had ignited in me leapt high in flames and raised my soul to sing of Heaven and religion. [my translation]
Paradise Lost had been. However, Bodmer’s reaction was enthusiastic and the work was published in 1748. Despite Hagedorn’s concerns, the Messias attracted favourable reviews right from the outset – even if it took time for the work to be accepted more generally (for a more detailed account see Jenny 1890: 54-60).

This chronology shows how, by the mid 1740s, Swiss ideas were becoming accepted in the aesthetic field. In the field of translation, as I outlined in chapter five, the increasingly acrimonious debate in the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture had already resulted in a ‘victory’ for the peripheral translation norm advocated by the Zurich scholars – even if Bodmer had made some concessions to his translation practice in the process.

By the mid 1740s it can no longer be claimed that any professional interculture engaged in debating translation matters was in place. The Beyträe had ceased to exist and separate publications had been established in Leipzig and Zurich. Identification of an exact date when the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture ended depends on what the precise criteria defining the existence of a professional interculture are. If we take the criteria of membership rites mentioned by Anthony Pym, it might be said that the interculture ended in 1739, when the Deutsche Gesellschaft as such ceased publishing the Beyträe. However, it might also be argued that it continued longer, since the individuals engaged in the debate continued to exchange ideas on translation, even if acrimoniously, until the mid 1740s. Nevertheless, no matter which definition we take, the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture cannot be said to have lasted longer than 15 years.

And what of the main figures in the professional interculture, Gottsched and Bodmer? How long did their influence last? I have already shown how support for Gottsched dwindled as his ideas on aesthetics and translation became discredited.

8.1.3 Bodmer’s followers in Zurich

As far as Bodmer is concerned, his personal influence endured somewhat longer, while the long-term impact of his ideas on translation is likely to have been considerably greater than is generally realised.

André Lefevere wrote that:

translation does not manage to subvert or transform a literature all on its own. Translation does so in conjunction with other forms of rewriting [...] (Lefevere 1985: 237)

Bodmer is a prime example of a translator who also engaged in other forms of rewriting, including criticism, and whose efforts played a significant role in the transformation of German literature in the eighteenth century. Klopstock’s Messias provides just one example of the different levels at which Bodmer worked – in this case exerting influence behind the scenes to secure publication of a work he considered important for his aesthetic project, as
well as providing direct support for and encouragement to the youthful author himself. He did so both during the life of the professional interculture and subsequently, in order to gain acceptance of the new aesthetic norms he wished to see adopted for German literature as a whole. In addition to his activities as a practitioner and theorist in the field of translation, he published general works on aesthetic theory and individual papers on the manifestation of this theory in Milton’s work, and corresponded extensively with influential individuals in more than one country.

How long did Bodmer’s personal influence last? Even after the Zurich-Leipzig interculture had ceased to exist, he retained his influence in Zurich, a centre that had taken on a new importance as a result of his literary publications and activities. By the middle of the century Zurich had become a centre of cross-cultural mediation between English and German literature (see Hentschel, Ermatinger, Vetter 1891 for accounts of this period). One commentator has even used the term ‘Umschlagplatz’ or ‘trans-shipment centre’ (J. Nadler, quoted in Büeler 1936: 24). Its reputation as an important centre in German literary life at that time is evident from a comment by Ewald von Kleist in a letter to Johann Wilhelm Ludwig Gleim dated 22 November 1752, in which Kleist commented that there were far more people of wit and taste in small Zurich than in large Berlin:

Statt daß man in dem großen Berlin kaum 3 bis 4 Leute von Genie und Geschmack antrifft, trifft man in dem kleinen Zürich mehr als 20 bis 30 derselben an. 189 (quoted in Hentschel 2000: 14)

By the 1740s Bodmer had built up a circle of followers in Zurich, all of whom were encouraged to translate English authors. More information on their work may be found in section 2.2 of this chapter. In 1750 two of Bodmer’s followers, Johann Georg Sulzer and Johann Georg Schulthess, persuaded Klopstock to visit Zurich, and Bodmer provided further monetary encouragement amounting to 300 talers. However, the young Klopstock was anything but the poetic Messiah Bodmer had expected. His chief concern was to amuse himself, which he did with full abandon, drinking and enjoying the company of as many young women as possible. The climax of his stay was an outing with a party of young men and women to the Au peninsular on Lake Zurich. Bodmer took deep offence at what he regarded as Klopstock’s lack of moral standards and a serious rift between the two men ensued. Within a very short period of time Klopstock had moved out of Bodmer’s house and bitter recriminations ensued about the travel funds provided by Bodmer. In February 1751 Klopstock left Zurich (see Ermatinger 1933: 374-75).

Two years later a more amenable visitor arrived in Zurich, Christoph Martin Wieland, later to become a literary figure of considerable significance in the field of translation in German-speaking Europe since he was the first person to translate a large body of Shakespeare’s plays

---

189 Instead of barely 3 to 4 people of intelligence and good taste who may be encountered in large Berlin, more than 20 to 30 such people can be found in small Zurich. [my translation]
into German. Wieland spent a total of seven years in Zurich, twenty months of them (1753 and 1754) in Bodmer's house, working day for day in the same room as Bodmer. During this period, Wieland later related, Bodmer was translating from the *Ilias* and *Odyssee*, and Wieland himself was introduced to English literature and the English language.

### 8.1.4 Bodmer's influence fades

However, by now Bodmer's personal influence, even in Zurich, was already waning. Shortly after Klopstock's departure the *Wachsende Gesellschaft*, a literary society in Zurich dominated by Bodmer, had fallen apart. A new society was established, the *Dienstags-Compagnie*, to which Bodmer did not belong. It appears that the moral rigidity Bodmer had displayed in the case of Klopstock had weakened his following among younger scholars (Hentschel 2000: 11-14). As Hentschel concludes:

> Und so ging Bodmer als 'Vater der deutschen Litteratur', als 'Gründer des deutschen Geschmacks' in die Literaturgeschichte ein und zugleich doch auch als ein Dichter, der einer vormodernen 'patriarchalischen Welt' angehörte wie kein zweiter.\(^{190}\) (ibid: 16)

By 1775, when Johann Wolfgang von Goethe visited Zurich and paid an obligatory visit to Bodmer in his house on the Zurichberg overlooking Zurich, Goethe had little more to say than to commend the old man for delaying his departure from this world long enough for him to meet the 'muntrer Greis' (cheerful old man). Bodmer had outlived his influence, and German literature and translation had adopted ideas and norms far beyond the innovatory scope of Bodmer's younger years.

### 8.2 Lasting effects of the professional interculture

It is perhaps the extent of later changes, both in literature in general and in the field of translation, that has tended to overshadow the influence that Bodmer exerted in his earlier career and the lasting influence this had on later developments. The ideas put forward in the debates of the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture and Bodmer's work as an interculturalist within this group survived in many ways – in ideas on how to translate and in the choice of literature for translation, as well as in the aesthetic principles governing creative literary activity and the choice of literary models for original writing in the German language.

\(^{190}\) Thus Bodmer entered literary history as the 'Father of German Literature', the 'Founder of German Taste', and yet, at the same time, as a writer who, more than any other, belonged to a pre-modern 'patriarchal world'. [my translation]
8.2.1 Literary models and style

For Bodmer this latter field – aesthetic principles and the choice of literary models - was the primary objective of his endeavours in the field of literature and translation. As he wrote in ‘Abhandlung von der Schreibart in Miltons verlohrnen Paradiese’:

Ein folgendes Geschlecht Menschen wird seiner Phantasie einen weiten Kreis vergönne, sich darinnen umzusehen und zu üben, als diese enge Erde [...] In demselben Weltalter wird Milton die Lust und das Wunder der Deutschen seyn, und die Iztlebenden, welche Miltons Stoff, Erfindungen, und Vorstellungen so unnatürlich und ausschweifend heissen, werden dann nicht nur ihren Schriften sondern auch dem Nahmen nach todt und vergessen seyn. Und vielleicht wird dieses Weltalter unmittelbar auf das unsrige folgen, so daß eine gute Anzahl von den Iztlebenden dasselbe noch erleben wird.\(^{191}\) (J.J. Bodmer 1742b: 132-33)

The subsequent developments with regard to Klopstock’s *Messias* show that the establishment of the rights of imagination in German literature and the creation of a German epic based on John Milton’s *Paradise Lost* were even closer than Bodmer had imagined when he wrote the above comment in his ‘Abhandlung von der Schreibart’. Bodmer played a key role in this development by providing theoretical tools and arguments supporting the role of imagination in creative writing, as well as a model religious epic in translation.

Moreover, Schneider has shown that even the language used by Bodmer in his translation of *Paradise Lost* had an impact on Klopstock’s literary style. He has identified noun forms in particular as deriving from Bodmer, and also pointed out Bodmer’s influence in Klopstock’s use of linked adjectives and participles (Schneider 1965: 17-27). *Messias*, in its turn, influenced much of the creative writing that followed it. As Johann Gottfried Herder later acknowledged, Klopstock had created a new language of gentleness, fullness and melody that opened up the way for true expression of the soul and the feelings. According to von Polenz, this regeneration of poetic language after Klopstock also impacted on the German language as a whole. He writes of Klopstock:

Er hat denn auch auf die dt. Dichtersprache und durch sie auf die allgemeine dt. Hochsprache eine tiefgreifende Wirkung ausgeübt.\(^{192}\) (Polenz 1978: 125)

Bodmer himself recognised the possibilities opened up by the new linguistic fullness and flexibility. In an essay written at the end of his life, he expressed the hope that the new

---

\(^{191}\) A future generation of human beings will grant their imaginations a wider sphere of observation and action than just this narrow earth. In that same age, Milton will be the enjoyment and wonder of the Germans, and our contemporaries who find Milton’s subject, inventions and ideas so unnatural and extravagant will be dead and forgotten – not just their writings but even their names. And this age may even follow immediately after ours, so that a considerable number of our contemporaries will experience it. [my translation]

\(^{192}\) Thus he also had a profound influence on literary German, and, through it, on standard German in general. [my translation]
language of the *Messias* and other German epics might make it possible for a skilled translator to create a German translation of Homer that presented Homer’s true form and visage:

Seitdem wir die Messiaide und andere Epopöen haben, in welchen unsere Sprache sich zu den verschiedenen Manierens und Schwüngen bequemt hat, die der Poet zu jedem Gemützzustand, jeder Lebensart, jeder Schattierung des Charakters nötig hätte, sind wir berechtigt zu hoffen, daß sie von einem geschickten Übersetzer behandelt uns Homers wahre Gestalt und Gesichtszüge, ohne Verstellung, in ihrem Licht und Leben, obgleich nicht ihn selbst persönlich, darstellen werde.\(^{193}\) (J.J. Bodmer 1779: 53)

Unfortunately, dying in 1783, his life ended too soon for him to experience Johann Heinrich Voss’s Homer translation of 1793, a work that he would surely have acknowledged as the fulfilment of this hope.

In chapter two I discussed Homi Bhabha’s ‘third space’ in which new positions emerge through an act of cultural translation. My study has shown how, through the interaction of two cultures – the translation of a work of English literature into the German context and the production of accompanying texts on the aesthetic principles incorporated in that work, followed by a process of debate on these innovations conducted in the interculture – something new had emerged in German literature. This may be seen as the “something new and unrecognisable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation” referred to by Bhabha (see interview in Rutherford 1990: 211). These ‘new and unrecognisable’ elements were new literary models and a new poetic language. In their turn they gave rise to new forms of creative activity in the literary sphere, a development that was to culminate in the works of writers such as Lessing, Schiller and Goethe – the highpoint in German literature, the classic period.

8.2.2 Translated literature from England

But what of Bodmer’s work in the field of translation? This too had an enduring impact. The debate of the 1730s and Bodmer’s role in this debate, in particular, contributed to the establishment of new translation norms in German-speaking Europe.

Looking at Toury’s preliminary norms first of all, we see how the period following the debate witnessed both a new choice of text type – texts originating from England – and the gradual acceptance of direct translation rather than indirect translation through French.

\(^{193}\) Since we now have the *Messias* and other epics in which our language has adapted itself to the various manners and flourishes that a poet might need for [depicting] any kind of emotional state, all ways of life, every character shading, we are entitled to hope that – handled by a skilful translator – it will present to us Homer’s true form and features, without disfigurement, in their own light and life, even if they be not he himself. [my translation]
The most immediate and striking of these two developments was the strong growth in the translation of literature from England. The role of Zurich, in particular, in the earlier stages of this development – around the middle of the century – cannot be underestimated. A number of Bodmer’s ‘disciples’ carried on his work of translating English literature during the 1750s and 1760s. Salomon Gessner translated works by Addison and William Collins. From 1756-66, Johann Heinrich Waser’s translation of the works of Jonathan Swift appeared in eight volumes. Waser also translated English religious works and completed a full translation of Butler’s Hudibras together with a defence of the work. Johannes Tobler translated the poems of James Thomson, including his Seasons, using the prose form advocated by Bodmer.

The importance of Bodmer’s role as a mediator of English literature in his publishing activities as well as his translation and teaching roles, is evident from the fact that most of these translations were published in Zurich by Bodmer’s Orell publishing company. By far the most influential translations published in Zurich were the translations of 22 Shakespeare plays done by Christoph Martin Wieland (1733-1813) between 1761 and 1766 – also published by the Orell publishing company. These Shakespeare translations of the 1760s – the first available in the German language – were the source from which authors of the ‘Sturm und Drang’ movement derived their knowledge and enthusiasm for Shakespeare.

Turning now to the growing predominance of translated English literature in the German-speaking states in the course of the eighteenth century, the investigations made and figures gathered by L.M. Price are of particular interest. L.M. Price writes:

The record of the reception of English literature in Germany is no obscure bypath but one of the main highroads of literary ascent. (Price 1953: 47)

The rapid growth of interest in both English literature and other works in English – including theological, philosophical and geographical titles – is clearly demonstrated in the statistics collated by Price and Price in their two bibliographic works covering English translation in German-speaking Europe in the eighteenth century (Price & Price 1934; Price & Price 1955). In the first decade of the eighteenth century, they state, just five English novels were translated into German. In the second, third and fourth decades the figure remained low, at seven, 12 and six respectively; thereafter numbers rose rapidly and for the six latter decades of the century the figures were 30, 44, 52, 159, 129 and 150 (Price & Price 1934: 15). Developments in the field of theological, philosophical and geographical works were similar: From approximately 60 translations out of English in the first decade of the century, figures increased to around 100 between 1740 and 1750, and to 300 in the final decade of the century (Price & Price 1955: graph on page xi).

L.M. Price also cites statements by some of the leading literary figures in the contemporary German-speaking world which confirm the central role of translated English literature in the latter part of the century. Goethe, for instance, commented to Eckermann in 1824, “Unsere
These statements are evidence that by the latter part of the century translated English literature had become part of the body of canonized literature accepted by the leading literary figures in German-speaking Europe. In the forward to her bibliography of translated English literature, Mary Bell Price notes that (presumably in the latter part of the century) English novels were so much more likely to bring financial return than German originals that German novelists might either give their characters English names, or even take existing English novels and translate them without acknowledging the original author. “The phrase ‘aus dem Englischen’ or ‘nach dem Englischen’ was sufficient acknowledgement and at the same time a good ‘selling point’.” (Price & Price 1934: 12)

Price notes that by the time the translation of Edward Young’s Night Thoughts appeared, in 1752, translated English literature had become so popular that there was a danger of the Young translations attaining cult status. “The time had passed when an English work of note had difficulty in commanding attention in Germany. The danger was rather that it might be taken up as a cult [...]” (Price 1953: 113)

Translated English literature also became an important source of literary models including both the novel and other genres including drama (Shakespeare), sentimental literature, as well as folk song and poetry (see Baumer 2002 for a more detailed account).

The importance of English sources in the development of German literature cannot be understated. Fabian has gone as far as describing the German discovery of England as “something historically unique”, as a discovery that substantially changed the culture of the country, and one with significant political ramifications:

The impact of England on Germany was the impact of an established culture on an emerging national culture. From the Germans’ point of view, theirs was a massive attempt to assimilate a foreign culture in all its manifestations and to use it as a stimulus in their efforts to modernize the country. Modernization implied breaking away from the cultural supremacy of France; it implied the refinement of the German language into a flexible and articulate idiom; it implied the transformation of German literature, still Baroque in essence, into a socially responsive medium [...] (Fabian 1992: 4)

194 Not even the English themselves greeted their most excellent writers with the lively and genuine affection which we showed when we adopted Shakespeare, Milton, Addison, Swift, Thomson, Sterne, Hume, Robertson and Gibbon. [my translation]
Seen from this perspective, the debates on the relative merits of English and French literary models conducted within the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture could not have been more far-reaching in their implications. They marked the beginning of a new era that saw the establishment of major English literary influences in Germany, influences which played an important role in the flourishing of German literature at the end of the eighteenth century.

Moreover, they represented a turning point in a major process of cultural realignment, away from the former hegemony of France and towards the growing power of England. This increasing importance of English literature in the cultural sphere constituted a parallel development to England’s increasing dominance in the field of politics and economics.

8.2.3 Direct versus indirect translation

Although not a topic of explicit debate in the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture, the demands for greater accountability to the source text author made by Bodmer and Breitinger constituted an implicit rejection of the practice of indirect translation. In the case of English such indirect translation was widespread due, to a large extent, to the lack of knowledge of the English language and the difficulty in accessing English original texts (for accounts of the situation see Fabian 1943, Fabian 1992, Fabian & Spieckermann 1995). However, a growing awareness of the disadvantages of indirect translation is clear from the statements by Luise Adelgunde Victoria Gottsched, when she found she had wasted her time translating Pope’s Rape of the Lock from a French translation (see chapter five, section 3). However this realisation was slow to impact on translation practices in general. Graeber has shown that, despite the insights of Frau Gottsched and other scholarly translators such as Ebert, the practice of indirect – or ‘second-hand’ – translation persisted until about 1770 for fictional texts, and until the end of the eighteenth century for others (see Graeber 1991, 1993).

8.2.4 ‘Foreignising’ translation

I now turn to Toury’s initial norms – the translator’s decision on whether to adopt the norms of the source text (‘adequacy’) or those of the target text (‘acceptability’) – or, using Chesterman’s approach, the norm of ‘accountability’ which demands that translators meet demands of loyalty to the original writer, commissioner of the translation, and/or any other relevant parties.

In this area, the ideas debated in the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture are particularly interesting in view of developments in German translation theory in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. The writings of Goethe (1813, 1819) and Friedrich Schleiermacher (1813) are generally recognised as amongst the most powerful formulations of a source-text orientation in translation – an orientation that was also reflected in Voss’s Homer translation. My analysis has provided evidence suggesting that, in his writings on translation, Bodmer was a precursor of this approach.
I have shown how, in the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture, a peripheral norm advocating greater source-text orientation finally gained the upper hand over the central ‘domesticating’ norm. In giving priority to the character, style and language of his source text over considerations of acceptable German, Bodmer pointed the way to greater accountability to the source text. Breitinger, too, stressed the importance of presenting source-text ideas in the same order with the same interconnections and the same emphasis (Nachdruck), never departing from either the thoughts or the character of the source text.

Similarly Schleiermacher described how a ‘foreignising’ translator tried to communicate the very image and impression that he had of the work through his knowledge of the source-text language.

However, ‘foreignising’ translations, as described by Schleiermacher, went even further than this, by endeavouring to display traces of the difficulties encountered in doing the translation. They displayed the special characteristics of a translation, being written in what is often referred to as ‘Übersetzersprache’ – ‘translation language’ or ‘translatorsese’. Indeed, it was possible to identify, on the basis of the translation, which language it had been translated from.

According to Schleiermacher, there was no middle ground between ‘foreignising’ translation and ‘domesticating’ translation. The translator had to choose between the two: “[...] ich möchte auch weiter behaupten, daß es außer diesen beiden Methoden keine dritte geben könne [...]” (Schleiermacher 1813: 48).

Interestingly, Breitinger also made unfavourable comments on translators whose work failed to exhibit characteristics of either the source text or the target text language. Looking at recent translations that had been highly praised, he said, they certainly succeeded in presenting the thoughts expressed in the foreign language. However, the translations appeared flat because they avoided all the characteristics of the foreign language. As a result it was impossible to detect in these translations either the character of the German language or that of the source text language:

Und daher kommt, daß man diesen Übersetzungen weder den Character und die Eigenschaften der deutschen Mundart, noch der fremden Sprache, aus welcher man übersetzt, anmerken kann. (Breitinger 1740b: 146)

195 I merely would like to add that there cannot be a third method [...] over and above these two. [translation by Lefevere (1977: 74)]

196 And that is why neither the character and features of German, nor those of the foreign language from which one is translating, may be detected in these translations. [my translation]
By way of example, Breitinger mentioned translations from languages that made skilful use of participles, and wondered why such translators had failed to recognise the expressive brevity of such constructions and use them in their target texts.

Schleiermacher believed that some languages were more suited to ‘foreignising’ translation than others. He wrote:

\[\ldots\] diese Methode des Uebersetzens [kann] nicht in allen Sprachen gleich gut gedeihen [\ldots\], sondern nur in solchen die nicht in zu engen Banden eines klassischen Ausdruucks gefangen liegen, außerhalb dessen alles verwerflich ist.\textsuperscript{197} (Schleiermacher 1813: 56)

Only languages (like German) permitting greater innovatory freedom could engage in ‘foreignising’ translation. This alleged freedom in the German language was to serve as the basis for scholars like Schleiermacher who argued in favour of widespread translation into German so that it might serve as the repository of the literature of the world – ‘Weltliteratur’.

Similarly, in his ‘Abhandlung von der Schreibart’ Bodmer discussed the character of different languages, concluding that English, Greek, Italian and German were more flexible than French. Italian, for instance, was said to be ‘like wax’, and this was why clever Italians had succeeded in reproducing characteristics of Paradise Lost in their translations (J.J. Bodmer 1742b: 87). Likewise, rhetorical embellishments were more readily translated into German than into French.

Schleiermacher’s comments on the difficulties faced by ‘foreignising’ translators who, he said, were regarded as clumsy because they tried to remain as close as possible to the foreign language and were criticised for subjecting their native language to unnatural, foreign contortions recall some of the criticisms made of Bodmer’s translation of Paradise Lost within the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture:

Wer wird sich gern gefallen lassen, daß er für unbeholfen gehalten werde, indem er sich befreißiget der fremden Sprache so nahe zu bleiben als die eigene es nur erlaubt, und daß man ihn [\ldots\] tadelt, daß er seine Muttersprache [...] an ausländische und unnatürliche Verrenkungen gewöhne!\textsuperscript{198} (Schleiermacher 1813: 55)

Amongst the criticisms made of Bodmer’s translation of Paradise Lost had been unfavourable comments on his use of linguistic and stylistic features familiar to English but not employed in the German language at that time. These included participle forms and

\textsuperscript{197} [...] this method of translating cannot thrive equally well in all languages, but only in those which are not the captives of too strict a bond of classical expression outside of which all is reprehensible. [translation by Lefevere (1977: 79)]

\textsuperscript{198} Who would put up with being considered clumsy, by trying to keep as close to the foreign language as his own language allows? Who would suffer being accused [...] of bending his mother tongue to foreign and unnatural dislocations [...]. [translation by Lefevere (1977: 79)]
ellipse, as well as English word order and metaphoric constructions. Bodmer’s translations of Milton’s metaphors, for instance, were described as extravagant and strange and judged unacceptable to contemporary taste. Both Bodmer and Breitinger went to considerable lengths in their theoretical writings to defend the use of such unfamiliar features in translated texts.

8.2.5 Different translations for different purposes

Another way in which Bodmer’s ideas anticipated those of later German translation theorists related to the possibility of different approaches to translation for different purposes. Schleiermacher distinguished between ‘domesticating’ translations for commercial purposes and ‘foreignising’ translations for scientific and literary purposes. In 1813, Goethe also differentiated between translations that bring the source text author to the reader and those that take the reader to the source text author:

Es gibt zwei Übersetzungsmaximen: die eine verlangt, daß der Autor einer fremden Nation zu uns herüber gebracht werde, dergestalt, daß wir ihn als den Unsrigen ansehen können; die andere hingegen macht an uns die Forderung, daß wir uns zu dem Fremden hinüber begeben und uns in seine Zustände, seine Sprachweise, seine Eigenheiten finden sollen.199 (Goethe 1811-19: 35).

As my analysis of Bodmer’s theoretical translation considerations has shown, this possibility that the translator might choose which way he rendered a text, rather than being bound by fixed rules on how to translate, had already been expressed some 70 years previously. In his 1746 essay on translation, Bodmer had distinguished between two possible approaches, with the choice between the two depending on the translator’s intention. If he wished simply to communicate the material contained in the source text, he should do this in the clearest possible manner in accordance with the rules of the target language. However, if he wished to provide a more accurate translation demonstrating the manner in which the source text author had expressed his ideas, this must be done precisely without fear of being accused of ‘outrageous strangenesses’ (J.J. Bodmer 1746: 521).

8.2.6 Theory of language

In my chapter on metaphor (chapter seven) I have shown how scholars in the early eighteenth century still held to a theory of language based on the classical tradition, and how this affected thinking on translation over many centuries. However, my examination of the work of the Zurich scholars Bodmer and Breitinger in this area has shown up some ideas on language that anticipate more culture-based approaches. While it cannot be claimed that Bodmer and Breitinger seriously moved outside the classical tradition in this area, their

---

199 There are two maxims in translation: one requires that the author of a foreign nation be brought across to us in such a way that we can look on him as ours; the other requires that we should go across to what is foreign and adapt ourselves to its conditions, its use of language, its peculiarities. [translation by Lefevere (1977: 39)]
comments on the characteristics of different languages, and the reflection of this in Bodmer’s translation practice are important precursors of new language theories developed later in the century by Herder. It was these ideas of Herder’s that provided the theoretical foundation for the new approaches to translation developed by Schleiermacher and other translation theorists of his day.

8.2.7 Fidelity to form

Finally, Schleiermacher’s 1813 essay referred to the difficulties in rendering the ‘musical’ element in language that revealed itself in the rhythm and changes in tone (‘Tonwechsel’) of the source text (53). His comments recall Herder, who – writing in 1766-67 – spoke of the necessity of rendering the distinctive tone of voice, style and colouring of the foreign original. Within the context of eighteenth century translation theories in German-speaking Europe, it is Herder who is credited with having formulated the requirement of fidelity to form in translation (see Kelletat 1984, Purdie 1965). Interestingly, in the latter part of his life Bodmer chose to render translations of some poetic works in poetic form. Moreover, although all his translations of Paradise Lost were rendered in prose, here too he appears to have moved towards some recognition of a need to render the poetic form of the epic. In his lengthy forward to the 1759 version he called for a Paradise Lost translation in hexameters in the interests of retaining poetic features such as metaphor:

Noch scheinet mir nöthig, um das verl. Paradies im Deutschen zu dem Grade der Vollkommenheit, die es in seiner ursprünglichen Sprache hat, auf die möschigste Art zu nähern, daß die Übersetzung in der vollen Pracht des deutschen Hexameters sollte gemachet werden; denn in dieser Versart dürfte man sich gewisse Freiheiten nehmen, welche in der Prose noch zu verwegen scheinen, vornehmlich in der Nachahmung fremder Mundarten, in anständigen Versezungen der Wortfügung, in dem Gebrauche alter Machtwörter, in morgenländischen Metaphern, und andern dergleichen Erhebungen der Sprache, zu welchen unsere Poesie sich seit wenigen Jahren in dem Hexamer durch die geschickte Bemühung einiger ausserordentlicher Genien empor geschwungen hat.200 (J.J. Bodmer 1759: 40)

However, considerations of this kind formed no part of his earlier theoretical writings, which clearly advocated the use of prose for the translation of poetry on the grounds that this was the best way of transmitting the ideas contained in the source text. Thus it is here that we find the major area in which Bodmer’s ideas on translation fell short of later requirements with regard to source text accountability.

200 In order that the Lost Paradise in German may approach as closely as possible that degree of perfection that it displays in its original language, it appears to me necessary that the translation be carried out in the full glory of the German hexameter. In this verse form certain liberties might be taken that would seem too bold in prose – chiefly in the imitation of foreign tongues, in appropriate syntactical transpositions, in the use of ancient Machtwörter (powerful words), in exotic metaphors and other similar elevations of language to which our poetry, in the form of the hexameter, has risen over the past few years, through the skilful efforts of a few extraordinary intellects. [my translation]
This overview has shown how the debates of the Zurich-Leipzig interculture of the 1730s proved fruitful for later developments in translation theory and practice in German-speaking Europe. We see that the ideas expressed by advocates of the peripheral norm that eventually became established within this professional interculture influenced not only what was translated in the decades that followed, but also anticipated many of the theories on how these texts should be translated. As an interculturalist we can say that Bodmer, in particular, had a lasting impact on translation activities in the important period that followed the short life of the Zurich-Leipzig interculture.

8.2.8 Developments from Bodmer to Schleiermacher

It would be interesting to trace the precise development of translation norms in the 70 years that elapsed between Bodmer’s writing on translation and that of Schleiermacher. Anthologies of German writings on translation give a general impression of the development and some studies have been done. One interesting link I have noted are the connections between the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture and the translators who contributed to the ‘Bremer Beiträge’ journal. At least some of these translators appear to have given further consideration to ideas debated in the Zurich-Leipzig interculture. Knufmann’s survey of translator’s prefaces, for instance, includes the following extract from a preface by ‘Bremer Beiträger’ Johann Arnold Ebert, written in 1754, which displays interesting points of contact to the ideas of Schleiermacher and Goethe:


More work is needed to trace the development of these ideas in more detail. However, this does not fall within the scope of my study.

201 A translator must work under the eyes of his original, as it were, and treat all its thoughts and expressions conscientiously, as he would the belongings of others. He must wrestle with his original, thereby, through a kind of wondrous act, becoming an original himself whilst still remaining a translator. [my translation]
Chapter Nine – Conclusions

9.1 Results of my study

In this study I have applied a new approach to studying cross-cultural communication that is currently being developed by Anthony Pym. Using his concept of a professional interculture I have focused on the translation discussions of the 1730s in German-speaking Europe and analysed their effects on translation practice, with particular reference to Johann Jacob Bodmer’s German translation of Paradise Lost.

My study has shown how a Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture emerged in the early 1730s with the Beyträge as its forum for debate on translation issues, and membership of the Deutsche Gesellschaft, the publisher of the Beyträge, as an important defining element in membership of the professional interculture.

I have outlined the way in which a central ‘domesticating’ translation norm was both formulated and challenged within this interculture, in articles published in the Beyträge. The central domesticating norm was formulated largely by Georg Venzky and Johann Christoph Gottsched. Although Venzky cited the seventeenth-century French translation theorist Pierre-Daniel Huet as an authority, I would argue that the norm formulated in Venzky’s treatise actually departed significantly from Huet’s recommendations. Thus, contrary to Senger’s claim that Huet was a model for Venzky (Senger 1971), it appears that the ‘domesticating’ approach was closer to the central norm then prevailing in France, often referred to by the name of belles infidèles.

Moreover, in contrast to Berman’s argument that a German tradition had developed in opposition to the belles infidèles from Luther onwards, interrupted only by gallicising tendencies in the period of Gottsched and Venzky (Berman 1992), my analysis would appear to suggest that Gottsched and Venzky were in fact maintaining and adapting a tradition of domestication that was already established in German-speaking Europe. Only in the 1730s did a strong challenge to this central ‘domesticating’ norm emerge, and that challenge came largely from Zurich.

Within the Zurich-Leipzig professional interculture, a new peripheral norm emphasising greater accountability to the source text author was urged in a number of contributions to the Beyträge. These articles covered topics ranging from a review of Junckherrott’s New Testament translation to a translation of Virgil’s Aeneas. This new norm was formulated in detail in publications by the Zurich scholars Johann Jacob Breitinger and Johann Jacob
Bodmer. My investigation of the debates conducted within the professional interculture has provided evidence that appears to confirm my second hypothesis, that the peripheral norm formulated by Bodmer and Breitinger eventually superseded the central domesticating norm formulated by Venzky and Gottsched. In many ways, as I have shown in this chapter, this new norm can be regarded as a precursor of major new developments in German translation theory and practice that culminated some eighty years later in theories advocating radical ‘foreignising’ of translations.

In line with my first initial hypothesis, my analysis has shown that, unlike Venzky’s treatise, Bodmer and Breitinger’s approach does bear considerable resemblance to the peripheral norm formulated by French scholar Pierre-Daniel Huet. I have not found any indications that Bodmer and Breitinger’s ideas were derived from John Dryden, as claimed by Fränzel (1914) and Senger. Both my selective analysis of actual translation practice and comments made by Bodmer suggests it is possible that Huet’s ideas may also have been influential in at least some of the translation work done in the Italian-speaking states in the period immediately prior to the period I have been studying, although further analysis of this link would need to be carried out in a separate study.

It is interesting to note that the new strategies advocating greater accountability – and thus the use of more foreignising texts – were brought to German-speaking Europe by scholars working at the periphery of the German-speaking world. Reference to Bodmer’s background and biography shows his own strong exposure to non-German speaking cultures and in particular to Italian culture and language. It is possible that German-speakers in such an environment, also speaking a non-standard variety of German, would have been more receptive to ‘foreignising’ translation than those in the centre of the German-speaking region of Europe, and that they would be more likely to advocate ‘foreignising’ strategies in translation. This, too, would be an interesting area for further study.

My work has also shown how, despite his own espousal of the peripheral norm, the debate of the 1730s conducted in the pages of the Beyträge caused Bodmer to make some concessions to the central ‘domesticating’ norm in his own translation practice. My comparative analysis of two versions of Bodmer’s Paradise Lost translation, the one published in 1732 and the one published in 1742, has identified major revisions to the translation that are likely to have been largely prompted by the debate conducted within the professional interculture. In the 1742 translation, Bodmer adapted the entire text of his translation to comply with the linguistic norms of ‘Meissen’ German. On occasion he even went as far as to weaken some of the ‘foreignising’ features of his first text in the area of word order and syntax.

His objective in making these changes was most probably to increase the acceptability of his translation within the German-speaking world. Paradise Lost was the central vehicle for Bodmer in presenting his ideas on the role of imagination in literature, and it was this project which was of overriding importance in all his endeavours. This is evident from his many
publications on aesthetic matters. Nowhere was the importance of Milton's work for Bodmer's literary ideas clearer than in the statements he made in his defence of *Paradise Lost* in *Critische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren*, where he wrote that *Paradise Lost* was the ideal example for demonstrating his propositions and that no comparable work existed in German literature. Thus, if acceptance of the 'Meissen' norm in linguistic matters might promote acceptance of his *Paradise Lost* translation and with it his ideas on aesthetics, Bodmer would not hesitate to make the appropriate concessions in his translation. However these concessions did not represent any serious departure from the peripheral norm of accountability to the source text, as my analysis has shown.

Indeed, the thought he gave to the demands of accountability are demonstrated in his elaborations on metaphor. In this area my work has shown how the translation debate conducted within the Zurich-Leipzig interculture prompted Bodmer to give new consideration to this phenomenon as it relates to translation. As a result he was able to develop a more sophisticated approach to metaphor and its translation than any of his predecessors appear to have done.

With reference, once again, to my first hypothesis, these results appear to confirm that Bodmer's work as a translator was indeed guided by peripheral norms emphasizing accountability to the source-text author and may have been derived — at least to some extent — from the formulations of Pierre-Daniel Huet. The changes he made to his translation for the 1742 publication do not appear to represent any serious modification in this stand — despite the concessions made with respect to 'Swiss' linguistic features of his text and the elaborations in his thought on the translation of metaphor. Thus my third hypothesis, that the debate of the 1730s caused Bodmer to modify his practical approach to translation, does not appear to have been confirmed by the results of my study.

My work has also shown that although, as Anthony Pym writes, professional intercultures are transitory phenomena that disappear after a relatively short period (Pym 2000a), they still draw on the work and thinking of other translation theorists in preceding periods and their influence persists, even after they have been disestablished. It cannot be argued, like the writer quoted by Störig in his collection of writings on translation, that translation displays a 'Mangel an Kontinuität' (lack of continuity) and that translators drawing up rules for translation are unaware of the contributions of their predecessors and contemporaries (1963: xviii–xix). The norm approach I have adopted in this study has allowed me to trace numerous interconnections between translation thinkers in different places and at different times.

The outcome of the debates within the interculture had wide-ranging implications for cultural developments in German-speaking Europe in the decades that followed. New literary ideas, models and even linguistic style emerged, which were to culminate in the literary flourishing of the 'classic' period of Goethe and Schiller, while translated literature from England took on a new role as the cultural dominance of France waned. This cultural realignment paralleled
similar realignments in the fields of politics and economics. As an interculturalist – translator, teacher, correspondent, publisher, literary theorist – Johann Jacob Bodmer played a key role on the cusp of these developments by helping to establish new ideas on literary aesthetics, new sources of literary models from England and a new approach to translation emphasizing accountability to the source-text author.

9.2 Usefulness of the professional interculture concept

The results obtained from this study have also demonstrated the usefulness of Anthony Pym's professional interculture concept for the study of translation history. This concept allows us to study translators as individuals and as professional groupings, and gives us some ideas on where they might be located – in cultural overlaps or intercultures. They occupy this space together with other professionals such as diplomats. For this study I have coined the term 'interculturalist' to refer to all professionals within the interculture who are engaged in cross-cultural communication but whose membership of the interculture is 'secondary' to that of their primary culture.

The interculture approach draws our attention to the importance of the translation debates conducted within the interculture and the development of translation theories. It helps us to examine the manner in which translation norms might be negotiated and where this takes place.

Moreover it utilises the tools already developed over the course of two decades within the paradigm of Descriptive Translation Studies – an important advantage when it comes to detailed investigation of individual translations. Particularly fruitful for my work has been the suggestion made by a number of translation scholars (Pym, Toury, Levy, Tymoczko) that active retranslations may provide valuable information on translation strategies. My comparison of two different translations of the same work by the same translator has revealed extensive modifications largely attributable to discussions and debates conducted within a professional interculture. Thus this method of translation comparison has proved a particularly useful tool in studying the development of translation norms.

Pym describes his concept as "a modest proposal developed out of diverse empirical work" (Pym 2002). However, since the concept is still being developed, with the most recent proposal currently existing in the form of a pre-print version (Pym 2003) it is hardly surprising that my project of applying this concept to a specific historical study has raised a number of issues. Some of the difficulties concern the original definition of the term interculture and the refinements made to this definition. The original definition of a cultural overlap, illustrated by examples of intercultures such as the Alsatian 'Reichsland', was a fairly simple notion of an interculture. It appeared to encompass all people with a foot in two
cultures, people of ‘double vision’ or hybrids. This rather general, cultural overlap definition of an interculture, without the added refinements relating to professional activities, would appear to be the sense in which this term tends most commonly to be used, even in theoretical translation discourse. In this respect, we note references by Simeoni (1998) and Wolf (2000).

However, the more general sense of the word interculture differs from Pym’s subsequent definition of an interculture, which adds the requirements of professionalism and a cultural border (‘secondness’). Pym’s later definition of an ‘interculture’ is closer to what I might describe as a professional intermediary group, or a centre of cultural mediation. In my view Pym’s most recent proposal to use the term ‘professional interculture’ for his concept helps to reduce the possible confusion between the more general sense of the term ‘interculture’ and his own very specific use of it (Pym 2003, section 14.1).

My consideration of Gottsched’s intercultural position has thrown up a second difficulty in connection with the redefinition of interculturality. Pym argues that an interculture must display ‘secondness’. This means that a border existing in the culture as a whole must be crossed in translation, or, to use the example of Calaceit, there is no interculture if everyone can communicate in both languages. Yet if we examine the history of translation from Latin, in particular, we see that much translation into the vernacular was carried out not to cross borders but to develop the vernacular languages of Europe. Readers of the translation understood the original. In the early eighteenth-century German states, too, the educated readers of German translations from French and Latin would have understood the original texts. No border was being crossed for this group, and there was therefore no interculture. Gottsched was clearly a translator. He was an intermediary and he was professional. Yet according to Pym’s current definition he was not intercultural.

In a personal communication with the writer, Anthony Pym has suggested two answers to this objection. First, that the Latin texts existed in the contemporary culture, and the border created was thus between the groups using Latin and those using the vernacular. Second, that the borders created were between the vernaculars, with each one claiming its translation, and translation choices often steering away from calques with neighbouring languages.

The third issue with regard to Pym’s interculture concept that has arisen out of my research project is the issue of how environmental factors that affect the ideological stance of translators, and possibly also the translation norms by which they work, can be integrated into the concept. After all, these factors are surely important in providing answers to the questions posed at the beginning of Method in Translation History, which include the following: Translation history should explain why translations were produced at a particular social time and place, its central object should be the human translator, and it should organize its world around the social contexts where translators live and work (Pym 1998: ix-x). As I have shown in chapters two and four, these aspects are in many ways better dealt with in Lefevere’s patronage approach. Accordingly, this study has made use of Lefevere’s concept of
'patronage' alongside Pym's 'professional interculture' concept for the study of early eighteenth century translation in German-speaking Europe and the work of Johann Jacob Bodmer.
Appendices

Appendix I:

The French and Italian translations of *Paradise Lost*

In 1729 a French translation of *Paradise Lost* by Nicolas Dupré de Saint-Maur was published. In the same year the first six books of an Italian translation by Paolo Rolli appeared, followed by the entire work in 1735. These two samples from the beginning of Book I illustrate the different approaches adopted by the two translators. They are taken from Gillet (1975) and Dorris (1965) respectively, and in each case are printed beside the English original text for ease of comparison. In the Italian translation the figure printed to the right of the text (8) was included in the original translation to indicate the line in the original to which the Italian translation related. A discussion of the two translations may be found in chapter three (sections 7.2 and 7.3).

1 The French translation

1 Of man's first disobedience, and the fruit
2 Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
3 Brought death into the world, and all our woe,
4 With loss of Eden, till one greater man
5 Restore us, and regain the blissful seat,
6 Sing heavenly Muse, that on the secret top
7 Of Oreb, or of Sinai, didst inspire
8 That shepherd, who first taught the chosen seed,
9 In the beginning how the heavens and earth
10 Rose out of chaos: or if Sion hill
11 Delight thee more, and Siloa's brook that flowed
12 Fast by the oracle of God, I thence
13 Invoke thy aid to my advent'rous song,
14 That with no middle flight intends to soar
15 Above the Aonian mount, while it pursues
16 Things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme.

Je chante la désobéissance du premier homme, et les funestes effets du fruit défendu, la perte d'un Paradis, et le mal et la mort triomphant sur la terre jusqu'à ce qu'un Dieu homme vienne juger les nations, et nous rétablisse dans le séjour bien-heureux.
Divin Génie, enfant du très-Haut, descendez des sommets solitaires d'Horeb et de Sinaï, où vous inspirâtes le Berger qui le premier apprit à la race choisie comment le Ciel et la Terre sortirent du Chaos; ou si vous chérissiez davantage la montagne de Sion et les claires fontaines de Siloé, qui coulent près des lieux où l'Éternel rendait ses oracles, c'est de là que j'attends votre assistance.
Mes chants s'élevant hardiment au-dessus du Mont d'Aonio embrasseront des choses qui n'ont point encore été tentées ni en prose, ni en vers.
2 The Italian translation

1 Of man's first disobedience, and the fruit
2 Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
3 Brought death into the world, and all our woe,
4 With loss of Eden, till one greater man
5 Restore us, and regain the blissful seat,
6 Sing heavenly Muse, that on the secret top
7 Of Oreb, or of Sinai, didst inspire
8 That shepherd, who first taught the chosen seed,
9 In the beginning how the heavens and earth
10 Rose out of chaos: or if Sion hill
11 Delight thee more, and Siloa's brook that flowed
12 Fast by the oracle of God, I thence
13 Invoke thy aid to my advent'rous song,
14 That with no middle flight intends to soar
15 Above the Aonian mount, while it pursues
16 Things unattempted yet in prose or rhyme.

Dell'Uom la prima Trasgressione e il Frutto
Di quell'Arbor vietato, il cui mortale
Gustar, Morte nel Mondo e ogni Mal nostro
Apportò con la Perdita dell'Eden,
Finch'è poi ne ristora un Uom più grande
E ne racquista la beata Sede;
Canta o celeste Musa che d'Orebbre
O di Sinai su la secreta cima
Ispirasti 'l Pastor che al Seme eletto

10 Fu il primo ad insegnar come in principio
8
Sorsero fuor del Caso la Terra e i Cieli:
O se il Colle di Sion più ti diletta
E il Ruscel di Siloe che presso scorse
All'Oracol di DIO; quindi io t'invoco
All'alba del mio riscioso Canto
Che con Vol non mediocre, alto più intende
Del Monte Aonio sorvolar, tracciando
Cose ancor non tentate in prosa o in rima.
Appendix II:

Extracts from the ‘Preface’ and the handwritten comments in Bodmer’s own copy of the 1732 translation

In the preface to his first translation of ‘Paradise Lost’, done mainly in 1723-24 and published in 1732, Johann Jacob Bodmer makes comments that shed light on some of his early ideas on translation (see also chapter five, section 4.2). An extract from the text is reproduced in section I below.

Some time later, probably in 1740, he made a number of handwritten notes in his own copy of the 1732 translation, now held at the Zentralbibliothek in Zurich (the same institution as the ‘Bibliotheca Civium’ to which Bodmer noted he had donated the two volumes in 1780). Bodmer’s handwritten notes may be read as a kind of check-list for the major revisions he made to the first translation in the summer of 1740, resulting in the publication of a second translation in 1742 (see chapter five, section 4.13). My transcript of these handwritten notes is reproduced in section II.2 below.

1 Extracts from Bodmer’s ‘Preface’ to his 1732 translation


Die Frantzösische ist in ungebundener Rede geschrieben, u. der Hr. Saint Maure mit Miltons Wercke umgegangen, wie der Herr La Motte mit der Ilias. Er stöset aller Orten wider die Regel an, daß ein Übersetzer sein Original mit dessen eigenen Geist und der absonderlichen Art, so die Gedancken darinne haben, unverletzet ausdrücken müsse.
Dieser Lehre ist Paul Rolli in seiner Übersetzung von eilfsylbigen Versen gefolgt, wiewol er im übrigen getadelt wird, daß er hin und wieder Prosaische Wörter mit einfließen lassen; denn wie die Italiener gewisse eigene Wörter haben, die eintzig den Poeten zugehören, also haben sie auch andere gemeine Wörter in nicht geringer Zahl aus der Poetischen Rede gantzlich ausgeschlossen.


Ohn Angst den weiten Himmelstrich hinüber
Hiel Abdiel die Nacht durch, biß der Uhre
Umlauf den Morgen wackerte, der bald
Mit röselichter Hand den Tag entschloß.
Nah dort am Allmachtsberg ein raume Hölle
Sich findt; darinnen Licht und Finsterniß
Tunckl oder Demmung nur allda zu nennen,
Einander schiedlich stets ablösen, Tag
Und Nacht so viel amnathiger zu machen ec.
Aus dem sechsten Buche.

Diese Übersetzung ist in keinen Ruf kommen. Wahr ist, daß Milton sehr verfinstert darinne aussiehet; doch behält auch der gefallene Poet so viel von seinem angebohmen Glantz, daß er bey nachsinnenden Lesern ein Aufsehen machen, und zum wenigsten eine Begierde nach dem Original hat erwecken sollen.

Uber diese Sticke haben seine Tadler am meisten zu sagen gewußt. Gleichwie dieses nur äußerliche Dinge sind, dörfte ich ihn wol zuweilen getroffen haben. Daß es mir aber eben so leicht werde zu gut gehalten werden als ihm, kan ich für gewiß nicht sagen, indem vielleicht die Deutsche Sprache nicht so wie die Engelländische vonnöthen hat, sich mit fremdem Reichthum zu helfen, und bey mir ein Mangel der Sprachkundschaft gewesen, was bey ihm ein Mangel der Sprache ware; oder das Deutsche Ohr so zärtlich, daß es ihm ungewohnte Metaphoren nicht ertragen kan, und zugleich über unser Urtheil so mächtig, daß wir was ihm nicht angenehm aus keiner andern Ursache, als weil es ihm nicht angenehm, verwerffen müssen.

Was ich biß dahin gesagt habe, gehet allein die äußerlichen Umstände von Miltons Gedichte an; Von dem inwendigen Wesen desselben habe mir vorgenommen in einer absonderlichen Abtheilung zu reden. Ich gedencke dieselbe mit unterschiedenen Critischen Aufsätze anzufüllen, und werde damit desto mehr eilen, weil zu fürchten ist, daß ohne Unterrichte von dem was wahrscheinlich, von der Fabel, von der Parabel, und der Allegorie, solche Leser, die ihren Geschmack nicht in den poetischen Schriften der Alten, sondern in den geistlosen Romanen der Neuern formiret haben, nicht nur keine Lust an Miltons Gedancken und Vorstellungen finden, sondern vielmehr davon dörften irre gemacht werden.

2 Handwritten comments in Bodmer's own copy of his 1732 translation

[opposite frontispiece]

Emendationes grammaticas manu sui addidit Clauderus, magister Lipsiensis, a qui nonullas epistulas ad me scriptas conservavi.

Bibliotheca Civium
d.d. Bodmer 1780

[following page]

Errores typographie in Miltons verlorenem Paradiß


Appendix III:
Extracts from Bodmer's 'Abhandlung von der Schreibart'

Johann Jacob Bodmer's essay 'Von der Schreibart in Miltons verlohrnen Paradiese' (see chapter five, section 4.14, as well as chapter seven) is an important source of information on the translation principles that guided him in his second translation of Paradise Lost. It was printed in the Zurich journal, Sammlung critischer, poetischer, und andrer geistvollen Schriften, in 1742 and, to judge by the footnote on the first page of the article (page 75), it appeared shortly before the publication of the second translation. This probably dates it after Gottsched's strong attack on the first translation, published in the Beyträge in 1740.

In his essay Bodmer makes specific mention of criticisms levelled at the manner of writing in Milton's Paradise Lost, including, in particular, the use of metaphor. My initial extracts from the essay, pages 75-76 below, are taken from the introductory pages of the essay. The next set of extracts covers the section from page 104 to page 113, where Bodmer first reproduces lengthy quotes from criticisms of various passages in his translation, including in particular sections of the translation of Book IV of Paradise Lost (pages 104-11), and then proceeds to a discussion of the translation of metaphor (pages 112-13). The final extracts are taken from the conclusion of the essay on pages 130-33.

The words reproduced in bold print in this transcript correspond to the use of bold print in the original text.

[page 75]

einem gemeinen und am Irdischen klebenden Verstande, der weder genugsam angebaut, noch 

(*) Diese neue Uebersetzung kan auf künftige Ostermesse aus der Presse kommen.


[page 76]


[page 104]

Von dieser Art sind folgende: **Eine Ruthe mit Feuer besprengent;** Er redet von einer Zündruthe; **mit Schilfe und Sträuchern verbrämites Gestade; Violen und Hyancinthen brodirten den Boden mit einem reichen Stickwerke; die Erdenklässer kalbeten.** (*) Man sollte darum nicht fürchten dürfen, daß jemand von unsern deutschen Sprachlehrern dergleichen Redensarten verwerffen würde, wenn es nicht wirklich geschehen wäre; denn welcher Deutscher versteht nicht, was **besprengen, was verbrämt, was brodirt,** und
endlich was kalben ist? Und wenn diese Bilder zu den Wörtern Feuer, Schilf, Violen, Erde, gesezten werden, wer ist so plump, daß er dasjenige, was von diesen Dingen gesagt wird, nicht in der ähnlichen Vorstellung erkenne? Ich erinnere mich hier, daß man in der Abhandlung von poetischen Gemälden, welche zuerst un-

(*) Ich will die ganze Stelle ausschreiben: “Die Erde öffnete ihre fruchtbare Schoß, und begunte eine unzählige Menge von lebendigen Geschöpfen mit vollkommenen Gestalten und ausgewachsenen Gliedmassen auszuheken; - - die Grasreichen Erdklösser kalbieten izeo; izeo erschien der braune Löwe mit dem halben Leib.” Ist schier nach dem Buchstaben wahr, weil sie Kälber hervorbrachten. Also gründet sich dieser wunderbare Ausdruck auf die Erzählung einer sonderbaren Geschichte. Von dieser Art ist, was Herr Haller von den Ägyptern gesagt hat, daß sie die Gartenbetter zu heiligen Tempeln gemacht und ihre Götter gedünget haben. So wunderlich und krause die Verbindung dieser zwey wiedervärtigen Ideen scheinet, Götter, und Dünge, wird sie doch durch die Geschichte genugsam gebilligt, daß die Ägypter dem Knoblauch göttliche Ehre bezeiget haben.

[page 106]


[page 107]

ruchreichen Flügel ein natürlicher Rauchwerck in die Nase, das sie von den kräftigsten Specereystauden gestohlen haben. Und damit euer Gehöre nicht allein ohne Speise bleibe, so läßt er die Vögel ihre Chöre anstimmen, und die Blätter der Bäume, wenn die Frühlingslüfte damit spielen, von einem wohlklingenden Schalle erthönen.” Diese Metaphoren sind sämtlich oder doch meistentheils aus Miltons Beschreibung des Paradieses im vierten B.
genommen. Von denselben nun hat der bekannte Kunstrichter, der von unsers Englischen Poeten Schreibart so übel denket, folgender Gestalt geurtheilet: "So poetisch oder vielmehr so ausschweifend klinget eine prosaische Beschreibung nach dem Geschmacke dieses schweizerischen Kunstrehrs." Und dieses Urtheil hat er mit diesen Worten zu behaupten vermeinet: "Wenn mich, sagt er, die Furcht vor der Weitläufigkeit nicht abhielt, so wollte ich mir die Lust machen, und unserm hochsinnigen Schreiber darthun, daß er machinalische Gedächtnißkünste, unmöthige und aus einem poetischen Lexicon erborgte Beywörter, und seltsame Metaphoren, oder verblümte Ausdrückungen darinnen angewandt. Was ist seine Herberg der Faunen und Silvanen, sein zukiger Palmenbaum, sein Waldtheater, sein Krantz von Obstbäumen, die gülnde und mit einem heitern Schmeltz eingesprengte Farbe, der unschädliche Most, die geruchreichen Flügel des linden Westes, die ein natürliches Rauchwerck von den Specereystauden gestohlen haben,

[page 108]

endlich die Blätter, die von den Frühlingslüften mit einem wohlklingenden Schalle erhöhen? Was sind alle diese herrlichen Blümen anders, als Lohensteinische und Hofmannswaldauische Broken, die nach dem heutigen Geschmacke kaum in der Poesie, geschweige denn in der Prosa zu dulden sind."


[page 109]

Rauchwerck, dem Wald eine theatralische Gestalt, zugeeignet wird? Er muß demnach nicht leiden wollen, daß ähnliche Dinge unter ähnlichen Bildern vorgestellt werden. Wie es scheint, stößt er sich noch mehr an der Herberg der Sylvanen, an den Flüglern des Westwindes, und an dem Diebstal, den sie begangen haben. Dieses giebt uns zu verstehen, daß er kein Poet ist; er hat das Reich des Wahrscheinlichen niemals besucht; er weiß nicht, daß das Mögliche eben
sowohl nach der Natur ist, als das Würkliche, und daß ein Poet ein Schöpfer ist, der das Mögliche zur Würklichkeit bringt; die Dichtung, die reichste Quelle des Neuen und des Wunderbaren, hat keinen Reitz für ihn. Man muß sich nicht schmeicheln seinen Beyfall zu erhalten, wenn man die platte und alltägliche Prosa verlassen darf.


(*) Um des Poeten lob ihr Leben zu vergiessen. Character der deutsch. Ged. V. 39

(a) Milt. im zweyten B. Ihre Gesang war partheyisch, aber die Harmonie desselben stellte die Hölle still. Their song was partial but the harmony / Suspended Hell.

(b) Auf diese Weise hat Boileau gesagt, peindre la parole, parler aux yeux, donner de la couleur & du corps aux pensées, welche Redensarten von der französischen Kunstlehrern sehr bewundert worden.

(c) Ich habe dieses Bild in der Klageschrift gebraucht, der ich die Aufschrift gemacht hatte, die Trauer eines Vaters, welche hernach von dem Herausgeber mit der langsamen Ueberschrift vertauschet worden: Trauergedichte eines Vaters über seinen Sohn; als ob das Wort Vater die Beziehung auf den Sohn nicht ohne dieses in sich schloßse, und die Trauer für sich allein nichts was weit empfindlicheres sagte, als Trauergedichte, das so viel ist, als ein Gedichte von einer Trauer. In dieser Trauer eines Vaters hatte ich nun geschrieben: Die Einsicht wischet ihm die Trauer von den Wangen.
Worauf sich auch die nächst darauf folgenden Zeilen schichen: Die meinen dunkeln Geist mit Aengsten hat umfangen;/ Und nicht verlassen wird. - - - -

Ohne Zweifel aber hatte das Bild, die Trauer von den Wangen wischen, den Herausgeben zu seltsam gedacht, daher er vor dasselbe gesetzet: Die Einsicht wischet ihm die Thränen von den Wangen.

Wunderbare in diesen Redensarten entsteht daher, daß Dinge, die keinen Körper haben, die sich nur empfinden und gedenken lassen, als Sachen vorgestellet werden, welche materialischer Zufälligkeiten und Veränderungen fähig wären. Nun ist dieses eine Freyheit, welche die Nothwendigkeit selbst in der gemeinen Rede eingeführt hat. Es kommt nur darauf an, daß diese cörperlichen Bilder bequem seyn, die Beschaffenheit, die Folgen und die Eindrüke der empfundenen und gedachten Sachen durch ihre Uebereinstimmung in das Gemüthe zu bringen. Da nun die Natur sich selbst in allen Ländern gleich ist, dürffen wir dieser und aller andern Metaphoren und Figuren halber, welche auf Aehnlichkeiten beruhen, so in der Natur vorhanden sind, gegen gewisse furchtsame


Mithin muß ich auch noch mit wenigem dieses erinnern. Wenn die Metaphoren, sie mögen auf natürliche Werke oder auf Gewohnheiten der Nationen sehen, in der Uebersetzung geschickt klingen sollen, muß man vielmehr auf den Grund derselben, der in der Aehnlichkeit lieget, Achtung.
geben, als nur allein darauf bedacht seyn, daß man sie mit denen Wörtern gebe, welche in den Wörterbüchern als gleichgültig mit denselben hingesetzt werden. Denn es geschicht allzu gerne, daß die Wörter, welche in verschiedenen Sprachen vor gleichgültig unter einander gehalten werden, wiewohl sie in dem Hauptbegriffe eines sagen, dennoch durch gewisse Nebenideen, so sich daran anzuhiingen pflegen, unvermerckt davon abgeführt, und nach und nach hauptsächlich verändert werden. Diese Behutsamkeit wird desto nothwendiger, weil es in den Sprachen gewisse angenommene Metaphoren und Formen der Rede giebt, welche blosse Anomalien sind, indem sie nur auf irgend eine äusserliche und zufällige Ähnlichkeit, oder den willkürlichlichen Eigensinn eines Volkes gegründet sind. Dergleichen Metaphoren in der Uebersezung beybehalten, wird sie eben so ungereimt machen, als sie in der Grundsprache selbst sind, und jedermann so vorkommen würden, wenn sie nicht durch den langen Gebrauch wären vor bündig erkannt worden, so daß sie izzo vor eigentliche Wörter gehalten werden, nachdem ihre unächté Geburt ins Vergessen gekommen ist.

[end of page 113 – middle of page 130 omitted]

Man kan hieraus wohl abnehmen, was vor Schwierigkeiten es giebt, Miltons Schreibart im Deutschen mit Nachdruck und Klarheit ohne Mattigkeit zu geben; nicht nur die Gedanken nach ihrem flüchtigen Umfange, sondern auch ihre Form, wodurch ihre Grade bestimmet werden, auszudrücken. Denn ohne diese Sorge muß man nothwendig in eine periphrastische Kaltsinnigkeit und Flüchtigkeit verfallen, dergleichen man dem Poeten Schuld gegeben, der Popens Versuch von dem Menschen in deutschen Versen übersezet hat; man wird nur Uebersezungen machen, die gegen die Originale gestellt das seyn werden, was umgekehrte Türkische Tapeten. Einige haben zwar dieses Gleichniß auf alle Uebersezungen ohne Unterscheid, auch die möglichbesten erstreken wollen, worinnen sie aber zu weit gegangen sind. Ein Verstand, ein Geist, kan ohne Zweifel dem andern seine Gedanken durch die Rede mit einer Genauigkeit zu verstehen geben, daß die Ähnlichkeit

[page 131]

derselben in beyder Kopfe ungleich vollkommener wird, als sie zwischen den beyden Seiten Türkischer Tapeten ist; die Dinge mahlen gleiche Bilder in gleichbeschaffenen Geistern, und die Säze haben eine gleiche Wahrheit in einem jeden gesunden Verstände, der sie begreift: Darum kan man nicht sagen, daß ein Bild, oder ein Satz, der von einem Menschen in den andern gebracht wird, umgekehret werde, wie mit den umgekehrten Tapeten geschieht. Wenn nun die Bilder und Begriffe erstlich diese vollkommene Ähnlichkeit in dem Kopfe des Uebersezers und des Urhebers haben, so wird er sie dann mit der Genauigkeit liefern können, als er fähig ist, wenn er selbst der Urheber und Erfinder davon gewesen wäre.

Ausdrückung derselben gewissen Sprachlehrern unddeutsch scheinen würde; welchen Opitz selbst wegen einiger geschickt nachgemachten Metaphern aus den Griechischen und Lateinischen Scribenten, barbarisch geschenien hat. (*) Ich zweifle nicht, wenn ich mit meinen Erklärungen der Erfindungen Miltons die Leser etwas tiefer in sein Vornehmen und dessen Gründe hineingeführt habe, daß die Miltonische Sprache ihnen schon leichter und fliessender vorkommen werde. Sollte dennoch ungeachtet aller meiner Bemühungen das verlohrne Paradies den Iztlebenden die Lust nicht machen, welche meine Anmerkungen davon verheissen, und zwar auf diejenigen, die es im Englisichen lesen können, eben so wenig Eindruck thun, als auf andre, die es nur in meiner schwachen und prosaischen Uebersezung lesen, so ist dieses ein Uebel, das in dem Laufe unserer menschlichen Welt nur allzu gemein ist. Es ist so hergekommen, und wird ferner so seyn, daß der Verstand mit dem Unverstand, der Geschmack an dem Schönen mit dem Geschmack an dem Schlechten und Mittelmässigen in einem schweren Streit stehen, ja daß der Irrthum öfters eine grössere Anzahl Anhänger hat, als die Wahrheit. Aber eine Zeit mag kommen, da die poetische Herrschaft, welche bis dahin den Gedichten in Deutschland mit ihrem Ansehen ein Schicksal nach ihrem Belieben zuweggebracht hat, wird gestürzet werden. Ein folgendes Ge-

(*) Z. Ex. in dem Verse des Lobgedichtes von Mars: Dann ist es gar zu spat den Esel auszuschlagen. Welches das Lateinische excutere asimun ist.

schlecht Menschen wird seiner Phantasie einen weiten Kreis vergönne, sich darinnen umzusehen und zu üben, als diese enge Erde, oder auf dieser Erden die schmale Wissenschaft eines Hochzeitsängers, oder eines Liebesdichters, oder die matten Empfindungen eines Lehrers der Rhetorischen Figuren. Und diese erweiterte Phantasie wird ein höher Verstand in ihrem Fluge regieren, wie bey Milton geschehen ist. In demselben Weltalter wird Milton die Lust und das Wunder der Deutschen seyn, und die Iztlebenden, welche Miltons Stoff, Erfindungen, und Vorstellungen so unnatürlich und ausschweifend heissen, werden dann
nicht nur ihren Schriften sondern auch dem Namen nach todt und vergessen seyn. Und vielleicht wird dieses Weltalter unmittelbar auf das unsrige folgen, so daß eine gute Anzahl von den Iztlebenden dasselbe noch erleben wird.
Appendix IV:

Bodmer’s 1732 and 1742 translations

Johann Jacob Bodmer made major revisions to his first translation of Paradise Lost before publishing it again in 1742. The passage from Book I reproduced here in both the first and second translations describes how God flung Satan out of Heaven to leave him languishing in ‘ever-burning sulphur’.

In the case of the extract from the first translation, published in 1732, I have also transcribed the handwritten corrections to be found in Bodmer’s own copy of the translation held at the Zentralbibliothek in Zurich (underlinings, deletions in the text, corrections in the margin). Where the German ‘delete’ character used in editing appears in Bodmer’s text, I have indicated this in the ‘corrections’ column with the words ‘delete sign’. Some of the handwritten corrections relate to Bodmer’s Swiss spelling conventions (see chapter six, section 4.3). In this extract we also note the underlining of the word ‘speisen’, used here in a metaphorical sense, which would appear to indicate that this metaphor was problematic (see chapter seven, section 5.5). In the corresponding extract from the 1742 translation we note that a different image – ‘sich unterhalten’ – has been selected.

A marked feature of the corresponding extract from the second translation of 1742 are the long footnotes (see chapter six, section 3.3), in this case referring specifically to criticisms of Paradise Lost made by Voltaire and Magny. Comparison of the 1742 text with that of 1732 also shows that the revisions made by Bodmer went far beyond the corrections marked in his 1732 copy.

The words reproduced in bold print in this transcript correspond to the use of bold print in the original text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1732 translation</th>
<th>margin corrections</th>
<th>1742 edition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[page 3] Die allgewaltige Macht stürzte ihn auf den Kopf aus der etherischen Luftbühne mit einem scheußlichen Fall und Brand in das bodenlose Verderben hinunter, damit der den Allmächtigen zum Streit ausfordern dürfen, daselbst in demantenen Ketten und</td>
<td></td>
<td>[page 3] Die allmächtige Kraft warf ihn von der etherischen Bühne mit einem gräßlichen Fall und Brand flammend in das bodenlose Verderben hinunter; daselbst sollte derjenige in diamantenen Ketten und einem straffenden Feuer wohnen, welcher den Allmächtigen zu einer Schlacht</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
peinlichem Feuer wohnte. Neunmahle so lang als das Maß von Tag und Nacht bey sterblichen Menschen, lage er mit seiner gräßlichen Gesellschaft, und waltete sich in dem feurigen Meerbusen herum, der Sinnen beraubet, doch stets unsterblich. Aber das Straßgericht hobe ihn zu


Waltzte in dem feurigen Meerbusem sinnlos, obgleich unsterblich) Magni beschuldiget den Poeten, daß er hier die Beraubung der Sinne mit den feurigen Wellen zusammengereimet habe. Allein das Herumwältzen Satans und seiner Gesellen war nicht eine Wirkung einer innerlichen Kraft derselben, sondern der Gewalt, womit sie von diesem wütenden Sturmfeger in dem Pfuh hin und her geschlagen wurden. Eben so wohl reimet sich die Ohnmacht derselben mir ihrer Unsterblichkeit. Von der Beraubung der Sinne ist zwar nur noch ein Schritt bis zum Tod, doch ist sie noch nicht der Tod selbst. Der Poet konnte die Erschlagung
mehr Quaal auf; und jetzo peinigen ihn die Gedancken, die auf einmal ihm die verlohrne Glückseligkeit und langwierige Pein vorstellen; Er wirft rund herum seine Gifftvollen Augen, die von einer tiefgesessenen Betrübnis und grosser Mächtslosigkeit, wormit doch ein hartnäckiger Hochmut und stetiger Haß vermischet ware, Anzeige gaben. Er übersiehet auf einmal, als fern Englische Blicke reichen, den traurigen wüsten und wilden Ort; Ein greuliches Gefängniß flammet rings herum auf allen Seiten wie ein grosser Ofen, aber von diesen Flammen schosse kein Licht, sondern vielmehr eine sichtbare Dunkelheit, die allein dienete schmerzhliche Anblicke, betrübte Gegenden, traurige Schatten-Bilder zu entdecken, wo Frieden

Ohnmacht
so

Blicke reichen mögen, die traurige, wüste und wilde Gegend. Eine greuliche Tiefe, die zu allen Seiten rund herum, wie ein grosser Ofen, in Flammen stund; jedoch schoss kein Licht von diesen Flammen, sondern vielmehr eine sichtbare Dunkelheit, bey welcher man Gesichter voll Jammers, Landschaften voll Kummers, erschreckliche Schatten, erblickte; wo Friede und Ruhe

Eine sichtbare Dunkelheit) Die Dunkelheit ist eigentlich unsichtbar, indem darinnen weder Maß noch Gestalt zu erkennen ist; wenn sie sichtbar werden soll, so daß man die Dinge einigermassen unterscheiden kann, muß sie von ihrer Dicke vieles verleihen. Also schwächt das Beywort Sichtbar die Kraft der Bedeutung in dem Worte Dunkelheit.
| und Ruh nimmer wohnen kan,  
| Hoffnung nimmer hinkömmt, die  
| an alle Orte hinkömmt; sondern  
| Qual ohne Ende, und eine  
| feuerige Glut stets tobet, welche  
| von ewig brennendem Schwefel,  
| der sich nicht verzehret, gespeiset  
| wird.  |

| delete sign |

| [page 6]  
| niemahls wohnen kan, die  
| Hoffnung, die an alle Orte kömmt,  
| sich niemahls einfindet; sondern  
| Qual ohne Ende unaufrhörlich auf  
| die Einwohner zuschlägt, und eine  
| feurige Sündflut ströhmt, welche  
| sich von einem ewigbrennenden  
| Schwefel, der niemahls verzehret  
| wird, unterhält.  |
Appendix V:

Brockes’ translation of a fragment from *Paradise Lost*

The Hamburg poet Barthold Heinrich Brockes is likely to have translated part of Book V of Milton’s ‘Paradise Lost’ at about the time that Bodmer published his first translation of the same work, although the Brockes translation was not published until 1740. It is therefore most unlikely that Bodmer knew of it or had seen it when he did either his first or second translation. This makes a comparison between the two translations particularly interesting (see chapter two, section 5.3, and chapter seven, section 4).

The transcript that follows reproduces the first 29 lines of Brockes’ text (to the middle of line 29). Brockes’ translation was published opposite its English source text.

[page 145]

*Miltons verlohrnes Paradies*

**V. Buch.**

Kaum hatt’ Ostenwerts der Morgen seinen Rosen-Schritt gesetzt
Und, mit einem Perlenhau, das beblühnte Feld genetzt;
Als, zu der gewohnten Zeit, Adam schon vom Schlaf erwachte,
Welcher leicht war, wie die Luft, (So die reine Däüung machte,
Woraus reine Dünste quillen) und sich leicht vertrieben ließ,
Durch der Bäch’ und Blätter Säuseln, das Aurora von sich bließ,
Oder durch der Vögel Singen, auf den Zweigen: Und daher,
Weil er dessen ungewohnt, wundert’ er sich desto mehr
Eva noch im Schlaf zu finden, mit unordentlichem Haar
Und mit glühendem Gesicht, welches ihm ein Merkmaal war,
Einer unterbrochen Ruhe, drauf er sich an ihrer Seiten
Halb erhoben überlehnte. Mit verliebt- und süßen Blicken
Einer inniglichen Neigung, hing er gleichsam mit Entzücken
Über sie, besah die Schönheit, die, besondre Lieblichkeiten,
Ob sie wacht’ oder schlief, von sich stralt; und lispelt ihr
So gelind, als wenn die Flora ihres Zephirs Hauch verspüret,
(Da er sanft, zu gleicher Zeit, ihre weiche Hand berühret)
Diese Worte freundlich zu: Meine Schöne! meine Zier!
Auf! erwache, liebste Braut, **Gottes** letz und best Geschenke,
Woran ich mit inniglich- und stets neuen Freuden denke!
Aufl! erwach! Es scheint der Morgen, und uns ruft das frische Feld!
Wir verlieren sonst das Beste, nemlich, mit Bedacht zu sehn
Die von uns gepflanzten Kräuter allgemeinlich sich erhöhn
Von dem glänzenden Orangen, das begrünte Blätterzelt,

[page 146: English text]

[page 147]
Voll ambrirten Bluhmen blühn. Wie von Myrren, Balsaminen,
Ein so köstlich Gummi tröpftelt, wie Natur die Farben mische,
Und wie auf bethaute Bluhmen, das beschäftig’ Heer der Bienen,
Bald sich setzt, bald ämsig schwebt, mit sanft murmelnndem Gezische,
Und den feuchten Zucker sauge!
Bibliography

This bibliography comprises three parts. The first part encompasses Bodmer’s published and unpublished works and correspondence, including archival sources and collections of correspondence included in works relating to other topics.

The second part lists relevant journals of Bodmer’s period, while the third part contains other works consulted for this research project.

Where the name of the author is enclosed in square brackets, this indicates that although he is known to have been the author, his name was not given on the original publication itself.

1. Bodmer’s published and unpublished works, and his correspondence

1.1. Main corpus used for this research project

[Bodmer, Johann Jacob] (trans) (1732) Johann Miltons Verlust des Paradieses. Ein Helden-Gedicht. In ungebundener Rede übersetzt, 2 vols, Zurich: Marcus Rordorf [Johann Jacob Bodmer’s own copy held at the Zentralbibliothek Zurich with hand-written annotations by the author]


1.2 Other publications by Bodmer

[Bodmer, Johann Jacob] (1727) Von dem Einfluß und Gebrauche der Einbildungs-Krafft; Zur Ausbesserung des Geschmackes, Frankfurt & Leipzig [no publisher indicated]


Bodmer, Johann Jacob (1736) Brief-Wechsel von der Natur des poetischen Geschmackes. Dazu kommt eine Untersuchung, wie fern das Erhabene im Trauerspiele Statt und Platz
haben können, Zurich, Conrad Orell und Comp., facsimile reprint of 1966 by J.B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Stuttgart

Bodmer, Johann Jacob (1740b) Critische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren in der Poesie und dessen Verbindung mit dem Wahrscheinlichen, Zurich, Conrad Orell und Comp., facsimile reprint of 1966 by J.B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Stuttgart


Bodmer, Johann Jacob & Breitinger, Johann Jacob (eds) (1746) Der Maler der Sitten, Zurich: Conrad Orell und Comp., facsimile reprint of 1972 by Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim & New York

1.3 Unpublished correspondence

Bodmer Archive, Zentralbibliothek, Zurich, Switzerland: Large collection of Johann Jacob Bodmer’s correspondence together with a number of documents

Zellweger Archive, Staatsarchiv, Kantonsbibliothek Appenzell-Ausserrhoden, Trogen, Switzerland: Collection of Laurenz Zellweger’s correspondence, including that conducted with Johann Jacob Bodmer

In particular the following unpublished letters held at the Zentralbibliothek in manuscript form:

Bodmer, Johann Jacob (1720) Undated letter to Breitinger with handwritten comment ‘ist zeitlich in 20 geschrieben’

Clauder, Johann Christoph (1731) Letter to Johann Jacob Bodmer dated 6 December 1731

Clauder, Johann Christoph (1732) Letter to Johann Jacob Bodmer dated 19 October 1732

Clauder, Johann Christoph (1733) Letter to Johann Jacob Bodmer dated 27 February 1733

König, Johan Ulrich (1725) Letter to Johann Jacob Bodmer dated 30 April 1725

Zellweger, Laurenz (1724) Letter to Johann Jacob Bodmer dated 1.10.24

In particular the following unpublished letters held in Trogen in manuscript form:

Bodmer, Johann Jacob (1740a) Letters to Laurenz Zellweger dated 23.6.1740, 29 Augst, 1740’ and ‘2. Weinmonat 1740’

Zellweger, Laurenz (1740) Letters to Johann Jacob Bodmer dated 5.9.40 and 13.10.40

210
1.4 Correspondence in published form

[Bodmer, Johann Jacob] (1781) Litterarische Pamphlete aus der Schweiz nebst Briefen an Bodmer, Zurich: David Bürgkli

Boldini, Rinaldo (1964) Lettere a J.J. Bodmer, Bologna: Commissione per i testi di lingua


Brandl, Alois (1878) Barthold Heinrich Brockes, Innsbruck: Verlag der Wagner'schen Universitäts-Buchhandlung [letters from König to Bodmer]


Körte, Wilhelm (ed) (1804) Briefe der Schweizer Bodmer, Sulzer, Geßner, aus Gleims litterarischem Nachlasse, Zurich: Heinrich Geßner


Meister, Leonhard (1783) Ueber Bodmern, nebst Fragmenten aus seinen Briefen, Zurich: Orell, Geßner, Füßli und Compagn.

Quigley, Hugh (1921) Italy and the Rise of a New School of Criticism in the 18th Century (with special reference to the work of Pietro Calepio), Perth: Munro & Scott

Stäudlin, Gotthold Friedrich (ed) (1794) Briefe berühmter und edler Deutschen an Bodmer, Stuttgart: Gebrüder Mäntler


Wolff, Eugen (1895-97) Gottscheds Stellung im deutschen Bildungsleben, 2 vols, Kiel & Leipzig: Lipsius & Tischer

2. Eighteenth-century journals

Beyträge zur critischen Historie der deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit, herausgegeben von einigen Mitgliedern der deutschen Gesellschaft in Leipzig (1732-44) (from 1739: Beyträge zur critischen Historie der deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit, herausgegeben von einigen Liebhabern der deutschen Litteratur), Leipzig: Bernhard Christoph Breitkopf

Neue Zeitungen aus der gelehrten Welt. Zur Beleuchtung der Historie der Gelehrsamkeit; gesammelt von BIBLOPHILO (published in 1725 only), Zurich

Neue Zeitungen von gelehrten Sachen (1715-84), Leipzig

Sammlung critischer, poetischer, und anderer geistvollen Schriften zur Verbesserung des Urtheiles und des Witzes in den Wercken der Wolredenheit und der Poesie (1741-44), Zuich: Conrad Orell und Comp.

In particular the following articles from the ‘Beyträge’:


Gottsched, Johann Christoph (1732a) ‘IV. Das verlustigte Paradies, aus Johann Miltons, Zeit seiner Blindheit in Englischer Sprache abgefasstem unvergleichlichen Gedicht, in unser gemein Deutsch übergetragen und verleget durch E.G.V.B. Zerbst 1682. in 8.’, 1. Stück, 83-104

Gottsched, Johann Christoph (1732b) ‘Johann Miltons Verlust des Paradieses, ein Helden-Gedicht in ungebundener Rede übersetzt Zürich, gedruckt bey Marcus Rordorf, 1732. in 8. 240 Seiten’, 2. Stück, 292-305

Lerche, Martin (1744) ‘III. Gericht, welches über die Bodmerische Uebersetzung einer Stelle aus Virgils Aeneis gehet worden’, 32. Stück, 624-71


In particular the following articles from the ‘Sammlung critischer poetischer, und anderer geistvollen Schriften’:


[Bodmer, Johann Jacob] (1742b) ‘Abhandlung von der Schreibart in Miltons verlohrnen Paradiese’, drittes Stück, 75-133

[Bodmer, Johann Jacob] (1742c) ‘Ob es wahr sey, daß die Deutschen an Miltons verlohrnem Paradiese keinen Geschmack finden’, sechstes Stück, 54 et seq.

3. Other works consulted

Adelung, Johann Christoph (1793-1802) Grammatisch-kritisches Wörterbuch der hochdeutschen Mundart mit beständiger Vergleichung der übrigen Mundarten, besonders aber der Oberdeutschen, 4 vols, facsimile reprint of 1970 by Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim


Baechtold, Jakob (1892) Geschichte der Deutschen Literatur in der Schweiz, Frauenfeld: J. Huber


Bender, Wolfgang (1973) J.J. Bodmer und J.J. Breitinger, Stuttgart: Metzler

214


Bibel, die (1967), oder die ganze heilige Schrift des alten und neuen Testaments, nach der Übersetzung Martin Luthers, Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt


Bodmer, Hans (1895) Die Gesellschaft der Maler in Zürich und ihre Diskurse (1721-1723), Zurich University dissertation, Frauenfeld: J. Huber


Bodmer, Hermann (1897) Johann Jakob Breitinger, 1701-1776. Sein Leben und seine litterarische Bedeutung, Zurich University dissertation, Zurich: Zürcher & Furrer


Brandl, Alois (1878) *Barthold Heinrich Brockes*, Innsbruck: Verlag der Wagner'schen Universitäts-Buchhandlung

Breitinger, Johann Jacob (1740a) *Critische Dichtkunst*, 2 vols, Zurich: Conrad Orell und Comp., facsimile reprint of 1966 by J.B. Metzlerische Verlagsbuchhandlung, Stuttgart

Breitinger, Johann Jacob (1740b) ‘Von der Kunst der Uebersetzung’ in Breitinger (1740b), vol 2, 136-99


Bürkli-Meyer, Adolf (1884) *Geschichte der zürcherischen Seidenindustrie*, Zurich: Orell Füssli


Dagut, Menachem (1976) ‘Can Metaphor be Translated?’, *babel*, 22/1: 21-33


Donati, L. (1900) 'J.J. Bodmer und die italienische Litteratur', in Stiftung von Schnyder von Wartensee (ed) (1900), 243-312

Doorslaer, Luc van (1995) 'Quantitative and Qualitative Aspects of Corpus Selection in Translation Studies', Target 7: 2: 245-60

Dorris, George E (1965) 'Paolo Rolli and the First Italian Translation of Paradise Lost', Italica, 42: 213-25


Ermatinger, Emil (1933) Dichtung und Geistesleben der deutschen Schweiz, Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck

Ernst, Fritz (1932) Die Schweiz als geistige Mittlerin von Muralt bis Jacob Burckhardt, Zurich: Verlag der Neuen Schweizer Rundschau


Fabian, Bernhard (1943) 'Englisch als neue Fremdsprache des 18. Jahrhunderts', Modern Language Notes, vol 58: 178-96


Fuchs, Gerhard (1935) Studien zur Übersetzungstheorie und -Praxis des Gottsched-Kreises, dissertation of the University of Freiburg im Üechtland

[Füssli, Johann Heinrich] (1783-84) 'Bodmer', in Schweiz. Museum, 7 parts

Gesellschaft der Mahler (1721-22) *Discourse der Mahlern*, Zurich: Joseph Lindinner


Holy Bible (no date), containing the Old and New Testaments, translated out of the original tongues: and with the former translations diligently compared and revised by His Majesty's special command, Oxford, New York & Toronto: Oxford University Press


Huber, Thomas (1968) Studien zur Theorie des Übersetzens im Zeitalter der deutschen Aufklärung 1730-1770, Meisenheim am Glan: Verlag Anton Hain


219


Lefevere, André (1977) *Translating literature: The German tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig*, Assen & Amsterdam: Van Gorcum


Opitz, Martin (1625) *L. Annaei Seneca Trojanerinnerin, deutsch übersetzt u. mit leichter Auslegung erklaret, durch Martinum Opitium*, Wittenberg


221


Quigley, Hugh (1921) Italy and the Rise of a New School of Criticism in the 18th Century (with special reference to the work of Pietro Calepio), Perth: Munro & Scott


Rener, Frederick M. (1989) Interpretatio. Language and Translation from Cicero to Tytler, Amsterdam & Atlanta GA: Rodopi


Rychner, Max (1925) Rückblick auf vier Jahrhunderte Entwicklung des Art. Institut Orell Füssli in Zürich, Zurich: Zum Froeschauer


Schneider, Karl Ludwig (1965) *Klopstock und die Erneuerung der deutschen Dichtersprache im 18. Jahrhundert*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag

Schöffler, Herbert (1925) *Das literarische Zürich, 1700-1750*, Leipzig: Haessel Verlag


Schulthess, Hans (1941) *Die von Orelli von Locarno und Zürich. Ihre Geschichte und Genealogie*, Zurich [no publisher indicated]


Steinbach, Christoph Ernst (1734) *Vollständiges deutsches Wörter-Buch*, reprint of 1973 by Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim

Steinmetz, Horst (ed) (1972) *Johann Christoph Gottsched, Schriften zur Literatur*, Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam


Vetter, Theodor (1891) *Zürich als Vermittlerin englischer Literatur im achtzehnten Jahrhundert*, Zurich: F. Schulthess


Viles, George Burridge (1903) *Comparison of Bodmer’s Translation of Milton’s Paradise Lost with the Original*, Cornell University thesis, Leipzig: Emil Glausch


224


Wehrli, Max (ed) (1943) Das geistige Zürich im 18. Jahrhundert, Zurich: Atlantis


Wolff, Eugen (1895-97) Gottscheds Stellung im deutschen Bildungsleben, 2 vols, Kiel & Leipzig: Lipsius & Tischer


