

MHRA TEXTS AND DISSERTATIONS
VOLUME 38

BITHELL SERIES OF DISSERTATIONS
VOLUME 19

*Horace's Epistles, Wieland
and the Reader:
A Three-Way
Relationship*

JANE VERONICA CURRAN

Published by
W. S. MANEY & SON LTD
for the
MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION.
and the
INSTITUTE OF GERMANIC STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

TEXTS AND DISSERTATIONS

(formerly Dissertation Series)

VOLUME 38

INSTITUTE OF GERMANIC STUDIES

(University of London)

BITHELL SERIES OF DISSERTATIONS

VOLUME 19

Editorial Board

E. M. Batley, P. V. Brady, John L. Flood, Leonard Forster,
M. W. Swales, J. J. White, R. A. Wisbey, W. E. Yates

HORACE'S *EPISTLES*, WIELAND
AND THE READER:
A THREE-WAY RELATIONSHIP

HORACE'S *EPISTLES*, WIELAND
AND THE READER:
A THREE-WAY RELATIONSHIP

JANE VERONICA CURRAN

Published by
W. S. MANEY & SON LTD
for the
MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
and the
INSTITUTE OF GERMANIC STUDIES
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

This PDF scan of this work is licensed under CC BY-NC 4.0
© Modern Humanities Research Association 2024

ISBN 978-1-83954-676-1
doi:10.59860/td.b161d2a

Published by
W. S. Maney & Son Ltd
for the
Modern Humanities Research Association
and the
Institute of Germanic Studies
(University of London)

HONORARY TREASURER, MHRA
KING'S COLLEGE, STRAND
LONDON WC2R 2LS
ENGLAND

ISBN 0 901286 47 8
ISSN (Bithell Series of Dissertations) 0266-7932

© 1995 The Modern Humanities Research Association and the
Institute of Germanic Studies, University of London
All rights reserved

This publication is copyright under the Berne Convention and the International Copyright Convention. All rights reserved. Apart from any copying under the UK Copyright Act 1956, part 1, section 7, whereby a single copy of an article may be supplied, under certain conditions, for the purpose of research or private study, by a library of a class prescribed by the UK Board of Trade Regulations (Statutory Instruments, 1957, No. 868), no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form without the prior permission of the copyright owners. Permission is not required to copy abstracts of papers or articles on condition that a full reference to the source is shown.

Multiple copying of the contents of the publication without permission is always illegal.

Printed in England by
W. S. MANEY & SON LIMITED

To the memory of my father and mother

CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	ix
<i>Abbreviations</i>	x
INTRODUCTION: AN ORIGINAL EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY HORACE	1
PART ONE: CONTEXTS	
CHAPTER I: HORACE IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY GERMANY	11
Editions	12
Translations	13
Appreciations	21
The Horatian Tag	28
CHAPTER II: HORACE AND WIELAND	37
CHAPTER III: IMITATION AND ORIGINALITY	57
CHAPTER IV: WIELAND'S TRANSLATION STRATEGIES	67
PART TWO: INTERPRETATIONS	
CHAPTER V: DICTION	81
CHAPTER VI: PROSODY	98
CHAPTER VII: TEXTUAL PRESENTATION	112
CHAPTER VIII: CRITICAL APPARATUS	126
Introductions	127
Commentaries	135
CONCLUSION: RESTORING WIELAND'S <i>HORAZ</i>	146
A Reading of <i>Epistles</i> 1.3.8–17	
<i>Bibliography</i>	157
<i>Index</i>	168

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I should like to express deep gratitude to Professor Alan Menhennet for his assiduous and patient supervision of this work. I am also deeply indebted to Professor David West for showing me how to read Horace. During a visit to the Wieland-Archiv in Biberach, and subsequently, I profited greatly from Frau Viia Ottenbacher's assistance.

Without the support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, this work could not have been undertaken.

I should also like to express my thanks to the University of London Institute of Germanic Studies for accepting this book for publication in the Bithell Series of Dissertations and to the Modern Humanities Research Association for its support.

Dalhousie University
1994

J. V. C.

ABBREVIATIONS

AA	<i>Plinius, Horaz, Lucrez</i> , vol. II/4 of <i>Gesammelte Schriften</i> (Akademie Ausgabe), ed. by Paul Stachel (Berlin, 1913; Hildesheim, 1987)
Engelmann	<i>Bibliotheca scriptorum classicorum et graecorum et latinorum</i> , ed. by Wilhelm Engelmann, 7th edn (Leipzig, 1858)
Fuhrmann	<i>Übersetzung des Horaz</i> , in <i>Wieland Werke</i> , IX, ed. by Manfred Fuhrmann (Frankfurt am Main, 1986)
Hellmuth/Schröder	<i>Die Lehre von der Nachahmung der antiken Versmaße im Deutschen</i> , ed. by Hans-Heinrich Hellmuth and Joachim Schröder (Munich, 1976)
Jugendwerke	<i>Prosaische Jugendwerke</i> , vol. I/4 of <i>Gesammelte Schriften</i> (Akademie Ausgabe), ed. by Fritz Homeyer and Hugo Bieber (Berlin, 1916; Hildesheim, 1986)
Kiessling/Heinze	<i>Horaz Briefe: Erklärt von Adolf Kiessling</i> , 5th edn, ed. by Richard Heinze (Berlin, 1957)
Lachmann/Muncker	<i>Lessing Sämtliche Schriften</i> , v, ed. by Karl Lachmann and Franz Muncker (Stuttgart, 1890)
Manger	<i>Geschichte des Agathon</i> , in <i>Wieland Werke</i> , III, ed. by Klaus Manger (Frankfurt am Main, 1986)
Martini/Seiffert	<i>Wieland Werke</i> , 5 vols, ed. by Fritz Martini and Hans Werner Seiffert (Munich, 1964–68)
Monecke	Wolfgang Monecke, <i>Wieland und Horaz</i> (Cologne and Graz, 1964)
Reuter	Hans-Heinrich Reuter, 'Die Philologie der Grazien' (1967); repr. in <i>Christoph Martin Wieland</i> , ed. by Hansjörg Schelle (Darmstadt, 1981)
Sengle	Friedrich Sengle, <i>Wieland</i> (Stuttgart, 1949)
Verzeichnis	<i>Verzeichniß der Bibliothek des verewigten Herrn Hofraths Wieland . . .</i> (Weimar, 1814)
Weltliteratur	<i>Weltliteratur: Die Lust am Übersetzen im Jahrhundert Goethes</i> , ed. by Reinhard Tgahrt (Marbach am Neckar, 1982)

INTRODUCTION

AN ORIGINAL EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY HORACE

Ich sehe mich daher gern bei fremden Nationen um und rate jedem, es auch seinerseits zu tun. Nationalliteratur will jetzt nicht viel sagen, die Epoche der Weltliteratur ist an der Zeit, und jeder muß jetzt dazu wirken, diese Epoche zu beschleunigen.

(*Goethes Gespräche mit Eckermann*: 31 January 1827)

Als Präger des Wortes *Weltliteratur*, und damit auch als Schöpfer des Begriffs, gilt allgemein Goethe, bei dem es zum erstenmal im Juli 1827 [*sic*] vorkommt. Wir werden jedoch künftig, mindestens für die Wortbildung, Christoph Martin Wieland (†1813) den Vorrang einräumen müssen.*

(Hans-J. Weitz, *Arcadia*, 22, 1987)

This study was undertaken to examine the nature of C. M. Wieland's relationship with the Roman poet Horace as this is revealed in his translation of Horace's *Epistles* (which were written in 20–13 BC). The source text is the recent edition of Wieland's *Übersetzung des Horaz* which was published by the German classicist Manfred Fuhrmann in 1986.¹ After publishing some sample translations of Horace's *Epistles* in the *Teutscher Merkur*, Wieland published his first complete translation of the *Epistles* in 1782. He then brought out a revised edition of his translation in 1790 with the very substantial addition of the complete Latin text. Minor corrections were undertaken for the final, posthumous edition of 1816.

Fuhrmann's edition reproduces the text of the Akademie-Ausgabe,² which was compiled from the 1782 and 1816 editions. He offers the complete text, with all the components unabridged, and reintroduces the text of the Latin original. Furthermore, Fuhrmann has annotated his edition in a Wielandian spirit — mediating between Horace, Wieland and the non-specialist reader. The publication of this new edition by Fuhrmann³ represents a considerable advance

over the hitherto authoritative Akademie-Ausgabe; it makes Wieland's translations available to a contemporary readership in precisely the way that Wieland intended. The Akademie-Ausgabe did not see fit to include the original Latin, towards which Wieland consciously wished to entice the reader.

To date, the only substantial study of these Horace translations is the one undertaken by Wolfgang Monecke in 1964.⁴ From the perspective of this study, his book, entitled *Wieland und Horaz*, no longer serves the needs of contemporary Wieland scholarship, principally because of its unsystematic relation to theories of interpretation and historiography.⁵ Monecke's study is still of use because it is an exhaustive survey of the field, but this unfortunately becomes an attempt on his part to uncover Horatian influence in all of Wieland's work, so that what aims to be comprehensive simply becomes diffuse. It is difficult to trace a single argument in his vagaries through Wieland's entire opus and too often he offers assumptions rather than demonstrations or analyses. Monecke's work does not restrict itself to the study of the *Epistles*, but tackles the *Satires* as well. But in neither case does he clearly characterize the work generically or in its particularity. I shall concentrate on the *Epistles* as belonging to a genre which is richer in the personal details which permit a closer acquaintance with Horace.⁶ It is time to re-examine the issues because Monecke, unable to detect coherent theories of translation or history in Wieland, fails to appreciate what can be gleaned from the practices within the text of the translations; also because he shows little interest in the effects of metre and none at all in the physical appearance of the text.

In order of importance, the next item of secondary literature is Hans-Heinrich Reuter's article 'Die Philologie der Grazien: Wielands Selbstbildnis in seinen Kommentaren der Episteln und Satiren des Horaz'.⁷ Reuter usefully demonstrates the presence of a Rococo tone in Wieland's *Horace* and displays sensitivity to the movement and spirit of the translations. He also identifies Wieland's attitude towards history as a playful and idiosyncratic one, disdaining professional scholarship. As is evident from the article, Reuter has a very definite point he wishes to make. But because this article was originally delivered as a lecture, Reuter's argument suffers from being formulated in a rhetorical style. His emphasis on Horace as Wieland's *alter ego* is expressed in exclamations and reduces the subtleties of the relationship to a formula — which has the further drawback of being one-sided.

A painstaking study, 'Wielands Horaz in seiner ersten Fassung'⁸ was undertaken by Franz Haller in 1927. This is a very useful work to consult as it collects together material relevant to Wieland's principles of translation, his use of editions of Horace and divergences from them, and differences between versions printed in the *Teutscher Merkur* and those printed in book form. His stylistic comparisons are meticulous and detailed but, although he summarizes his findings, there is an almost total absence of analysis.

Walter Jens has also printed a lecture, 'Bis heute nicht überholt: Wieland als Übersetzer'.⁹ Despite its proposed breadth of topic, much of the discussion pertains to Horace. Jens is interesting on the self-expression with which Wieland imbued his translations — the phenomenon we shall examine as 'originality'. He praises Wieland's German style, notes his dialectical approach to translation and stresses that the feeling of sympathy with Horace was a necessary precondition of the translator's success. Jens has clearly read the text carefully, as the accuracy of his observations indicates. Demonstration of these observations through examples would have added a great deal and given a flavour of the work. It is a stimulating but unscholarly piece.

Fuhrmann has published two articles in conjunction with his task of editing the text. In the first, 'Von Wieland bis Voss: Wie verdeutscht man antike Autoren?'¹⁰ he sets out Wieland's general principles very clearly and situates them within the context of eighteenth-century discussions about prosody, language, translation and history. The second, 'Wielands Horaz: Ein philologischer Weg',¹¹ provides a brief history of Horace reception before demonstrating Wieland's aims and contrasting them with those associated with Johann Heinrich Voss in an example from *Epistles* 1.4. A short passage from the commentary is quoted and Fuhrmann pinpoints Wieland's characteristics as commentator. Still using the same epistle, he introduces the ideal of urbanity and uses it as an indication of the affinity between Wieland and Horace. The present study proceeds along similar lines, continuing the work begun by Fuhrmann in these articles, but with added areas of interest in the theoretical discussions of originality and the presentation of the text.

The works which have provided insights to the discussion of individual topics are too numerous to mention here so that it only remains to note more general works which have contributed through useful sections on Wieland as translator. Foremost in this category is Friedrich Sengle's chapter 'Literarische Mitteltätigkeit'¹² which explains the factors determining Wieland's increased inclination towards translation in his later years. Bantel's dissertation, 'Christoph Martin Wieland und die griechische Antike' has a chapter on Wieland and Horace which competently discusses the main issues in twenty pages.¹³ Dahinten's dissertation on eighteenth-century translations of Homer's *Iliad* in the light of contemporary translation theory has a section on Wieland¹⁴ which adopts a more practical approach to the issue than Monecke managed to develop. Still on the topic of translation theory and practice, the editorial remarks made by Martini in the five-volume Wieland collection he edited are brief but acute.¹⁵ Among the older works, Ischer's 'Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis von Wieland's Übersetzungen'¹⁶ touches on the main issues but also refers to specific epistles; Stemplinger clearly identifies strains of Horatian influence in his article 'Wielands Verhältnis zu Horaz'¹⁷ and Weizsäcker alone provides a study of Wieland's youthful attempt at translating Horace.¹⁸

The secondary literature does not include any work which brings the interpretative tools of the post-hermeneutical era to the task of analysing Wieland's *Horace*, his translation and commentary, and their interaction. This study narrows the field to the *Epistles* and thereby allows a more personal and circumscribed Horace to emerge. It also considers all aspects of the text but only those of Wieland's other works which contribute to the discussion of an aspect of his *Horace*.

The structure divides into two parts, each comprising four chapters. The first two chapters deal with Horace — his reception and the genres in which he appeared in the Germany of Wieland's day, and the various forms of his presence in Wieland's other works. The two chapters which follow these pursue the less concrete issues of originality and translation theory. This completes the first, more general section. The second, lengthier part of the study turns the focus on the text of Wieland's translations of Horace's *Epistles*. Detailed observations as to style and usage make up the chapter entitled 'Diction'. The next chapters follow an outward movement, from the particularity of linguistic detail to the sustained effects wrought by metre, the impact of the way in which the text as a whole is compiled and presented, and the contributions to the interpretation of the enterprise which introductions, footnotes, and commentary can provide. The conclusion reviews the categories in reverse, approximating the order in which the discerning, contemporary reader would have read the text, and applies them, by means of cross-referencing, to a sample passage.

In Chapter VIII Wieland's introductions to each individual epistle demand our attention because of the regularity of their structure and the skilful way in which they whet the reader's appetite. They do this by providing just enough general information to intrigue but not overload the eighteenth-century general reader: i) they sketch the ambience in which the epistle was written; ii) they provide salient psychological details about the addressee, Horace, and their mutual relationship; and iii) they announce the presence of various notable features within the poem. The function of the introduction is to present Horace in his own historical and psychological setting in a way that allows the modern reader to enter into the frame of mind to which expression is given in the *Epistles*. This present introduction could do worse than to follow these Wielandian guidelines, adapting them to the task of presenting Wieland's translations of Horace's *Epistles* as a work whose neglect is undeserved and whose merits deserve consideration.

After the publication of the epic poem *Oberon* in 1781, Wieland was disappointed in his failure to create a modern-day classic. He contemplated retiring from the field, withdrawing from the literary scene altogether. In this, as Sengle rightly observes, Wieland looked to Horace's advice and example, as he so often did.¹⁹ In the introduction to *Oberon*, he identifies the three sources from which the tale is taken. He adopts a defensive stance and anticipates a hostile reception

for the work. But his defence touches on two of the themes which relate to the Horace translations as well: the demand for 'originality' and the active involvement of the reader.

Aus dieser auf wechselseitige Unentbehrlichkeit gegründeten Verwebung ihres verschiedenen Interesse entsteht eine Art von Einheit, die, meines Erachtens, das Verdienst der Neuheit hat, und deren gute Wirkung der Leser durch seine eigene Theilnehmung an den sämtlichen handelnden Personen zu stark fühlt, als daß sie ihm irgend ein Kunstrichter wegdisputieren könnte.²⁰

'Originality' in its strictest sense is unattainable; to imagine composing a work with no link to tradition whatsoever is an empty conceit. Indeed, Wieland consistently exhibits an actual preference for expressing himself through or in relation to others. But Wieland's translations of Horace — a genre not generally associated with originality — read like original works. This is partly due to the important fact that Wieland was a poet in his own right²¹ — ironically enough, since he was turning away from composition — and partly due to his relationship with Horace. They are kindred spirits.

Wieland was an industrious and prolific translator at several stages of his career. But if he approaches an author and a genre where this feeling is lacking, the result is not as spectacular as it is with Horace's *Epistles*. When he translates Aristophanes, it is into a more literal, less idiomatic German style, and when he translates Shakespeare, he does so with less than adequate attention to tone and detail.²² Wieland was not a born dramatist;²³ his translations of drama display his own discomfort with the genre. He turned now to Horace's *Epistles* and then the *Satires*, not the *Odes*: he himself was not a lyric poet.

The style of translations — confident, idiomatic, vigorous — owes as much to Wieland's envisaged reader as it does to Horace and his style. Wieland's perception of the reader's needs: a colloquial tone, a sophisticated but unobtrusive rhythm, a more detailed syntactical and logical structure than Latin offers, informs the whole enterprise. But the reader and Horace do not simply contribute two halves to make up a whole. Our imagery must be less static if it is to depict the true spirit of the work. The reader is constantly transported (or translated), by various means, into Horace's world and back again, and Horace, likewise, is sometimes surprised to find himself in the eighteenth century, expressing his views in Rococo mood.²⁴

This dynamic and cosmopolitan experience is of course both induced and shared by Wieland himself. As so often in his other works, he adopts a multiplicity of perspectives. This description of his enterprise as fundamentally active accords with the image he had of accompanying Horace on a walk, conversing on the way.²⁵ The aspect of conversation or dialogue constantly recurs in what follows. Horace, Wieland, and the reader are seen as involved in a three-way dialogue.²⁶

The movement which Horace, the reader and Wieland engage in is not restless or agitated. Wieland, on leaving behind the trials of his literary career and the upsets of a mixed reception at the hands of the critics, goes for a gentle walk with a close friend, Horace, as a form of relaxation. He aims, through translation and commentary, to include the reader in the companionship he feels with Horace. The translation of Horace demands active participation from Wieland's contemporary reader: the movement and dialogue spring from the close fellow-feeling Wieland experienced with Horace, and it is this which stamps Wieland's *Horace* with the mark of originality and sets it apart from the forms of Horace reception apparently finding favour in his own day.

NOTES TO INTRODUCTION

- * Wieland — in discussing Horace's urbane and cosmopolitan nature in his *Zueignungsschrift* to his translations of the *Epistles* — was impelled to add this neologism to the printed copy in his own hand.
- 1. Christoph Martin Wieland, *Werke*, ix: *Übersetzung des Horaz*, ed. by Manfred Fuhrmann (Frankfurt am Main, 1986). This edition forms part of a project instituted by the Deutscher Klassiker Verlag which will perform the useful service of re-editing Wieland's works in twelve volumes, with historical-critical material provided by acknowledged scholars. Future references to this volume will be made in the form of *Fuhrmann*, followed by page number.
- 2. *Gesammelte Schriften*, herausgegeben von der Deutschen Kommission der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, II/4: *Plinius, Horaz, Lucrez*, ed. by Paul Stachel (Hildesheim, 1987; reprint of the 1st edn, Berlin, 1913). Vol. II/4 hereafter referred to as *AA*.
- 3. See my review of Fuhrmann's edition in *Lessing Yearbook*, 19 (1987), 338–40.
- 4. Wolfgang Monecke, *Wieland und Horaz* (Cologne and Graz, 1964). Hereafter referred to as *Monecke*.
- 5. Cf. Klaus Kanzog's review of Monecke's work in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 87 (1966); 4: 'Der Abschnitt "Wielands historische Sicht im Geschichtsdenken seiner Zeit" befriedigt nicht ganz, da Monecke eine genaue Fixierung Wielands im historischen Denken seiner Zeit nicht möglich erscheint'.
- 6. This decision was supported by Fuhrmann's negative judgement about the *Satires*: 'dieser zweite Teil seines "Horaz" scheint etwas mehr von der Routine und etwas weniger von innerer Anteilnahme diktiert zu sein als der erste', *Fuhrmann*, p. 1085.
- 7. Hans-Heinrich Reuter, 'Die Philologie der Grazien: Wielands Selbstbildnis in seinen Kommentaren der Episteln und Satiren des Horaz'. First published in 1967 and reprinted in *Christoph Martin Wieland*, ed. by Hansjörg Schelle (Darmstadt, 1981). Hereafter referred to as *Reuter*.
- 8. Franz Haller, 'Wielands Horaz in seiner ersten Fassung' (dissertation, University of Vienna, 1927).
- 9. Walter Jens, 'Bis heute nicht überholt: Wieland als Übersetzer', in *Börsenblatt für den deutschen Buchhandel*, 35 (Frankfurt am Main, 1979).
- 10. Manfred Fuhrmann, 'Von Wieland bis Voss: Wie verdeutscht man antike Autoren?' *JFDH*, 29 (1987).
- 11. Manfred Fuhrmann, 'Wielands Horaz: Ein philologischer Weg', in *Gymnasium*, Beiheft 9 (1988).
- 12. Friedrich Sengle, *Wieland* (Stuttgart, 1949). Hereafter referred to as *Sengle*.
- 13. Otto Bantel, 'Christoph Martin Wieland und die griechische Antike' (dissertation, University of Tübingen, 1953). Bantel's review of Monecke's book in *Gnomon*, 37/38 (1965), p. 841, provides a clear summary of the work.
- 14. Egon Dahinten, 'Christoph Martin Wieland, Theorie der Übersetzung', in his 'Studien zum Sprachstil der Iliasübertragungen Bürgers, Stolbergs und Vossens unter Berücksichtigung der Übersetzungstheorien des 18. Jahrhunderts' (dissertation, University of Göttingen, 1956).
- 15. Christoph Martin Wieland, *Werke*, 5 vols, ed. by Fritz Martini and Hans Werner Seiffert (Munich, 1964–68). Hereafter this edition will be referred to as *Martini/Seiffert*.

16. Rudolf Ischer, 'Ein Beitrag zur Kenntniss von Wielands Übersetzungen', *Euphoriion*, 14/2 (1907).
17. Eduard Stemplinger, 'Wielands Verhältnis zu Horaz', *Euphoriion*, 13 (1906).
18. Paul Weizsäcker, 'Wieland und die Antike', *Korrespondenzblatt für die Gelehrten- und Realschulen in Württemberg*, 39 (Tübingen, 1982).
19. 'So verstummte er im Gedanken an Horazens Mahnung, rechtzeitig aufzuhören' (Sengle, p. 377).
20. Christoph Martin Wieland, *Epen und Verserzählungen*, vol. 1 of *Ausgewählte Werke*, ed. by Friedrich Beißner (Munich, 1964), p. 8. (Wieland's three sources are: Huon de Bordeaux, Chaucer and Shakespeare.)
21. Because Wieland unifies the offices of poet and translator, Sengle is right to speak of the 'Übereinstimmung von Dichter und Übersetzer' in the relation of Horace to Wieland (Sengle, p. 396).
22. Cf. Kenneth E. Larson, 'Wielands Shakespeare: A Reappraisal', *Lessing Yearbook*, 16 (1984). Larson discusses the stylistic weaknesses of Wieland's translation, which, in parts, hovers uncertainly between slavish fidelity to the original and a tortuous Enlightenment syntax.
23. Cf. Johann Wilhelm Loebell, *Die Entwicklung der deutschen Poesie von Klopstocks erstem Auftreten bis zu Goethes Tod* (Braunschweig, 1858). Loebell says of Wieland's Aristophanes translation (p. 129): 'Er hatte die Nothwendigkeit gefühlt, sich etwas mehr an die Formen anzuschliessen, als er im Horaz gethan [...]'.
 24. Cf. Erich Aron, *Die deutsche Erweckung des Griechentums durch Winckelmann und Herder* (Heidelberg, 1929). Aron speaks (p. 58) of Horace's attraction for Wieland as due to his belonging in the 'dem Rokoko ja leis verwandte Zeit des untergehenden Griechentums [...]'.
 25. See Fuhrmann (p. 589): Wieland's 'Einleitung' to *Satires* 1.1: 'Der Gang seiner Gedanken ist auch hier, wie beinahe in allen seinen Werken, einem Spaziergang ähnlich, wo man sein Vergnügen daran findet kleine Umwege zu nehmen [...]'. Cf. Loebell, p. 128. 'Er sah dies weniger als eine Arbeit an, wie als eine Erholung von der durch eigene Schöpfung verursachten Anstrengung [...]'. The same image of a walk is, of course, adopted by Hagedorn in his poem 'Horaz', which will be discussed below (pp. 25–28).
26. This is in stark contrast to the other major translator of Horace, Johann Heinrich Voss, whose versions will often be examined in these pages and who has been referred to as 'monologisierend' by Michael Buselmeier in *Die Zeit* ('Ein Mann wie Voß', 12 July 1991, p. 42).

PART ONE

CONTEXTS

CHAPTER I

HORACE IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY GERMANY

Wieland's Horace translations were published during the wave of enthusiasm for antiquity which swept the German world of letters in the eighteenth century. The status of ancient writers became a burning issue for lively debate; both Greek and Roman poets continued to provide myths, settings, issues, characters and general inspiration as well as forms and techniques for large numbers of original modern works. Wieland was prominent among those who borrowed from the ancient heritage, as we can see from his *Geschichte des Agathon*, *Musarion*, and *Geschichte der Abderiten*, to name but three.

The eagerness with which translations from ancient texts were undertaken and published was a significant manifestation of that enthusiasm. Wieland, in translating Horace, was not offering his readers something they would otherwise have been unable to procure; Horace was well known and widely read, both in the original and in German translations. And yet Wieland's translations of Horace's *Satires* and *Epistles*, with their curiously personal style and tone occupy a rather special place in the market. Wieland's *Horace* distinguishes itself from other forms in which the poems were available at the time through a number of notable features. These features provide the basis for an interpretation and will be examined in turn in the chapters which follow. Meanwhile, it will be useful to identify Horace in his eighteenth-century setting.

A thorough chronological account of writers who imitated or translated Horace, or who expressed their debt to him in some other way, may well be a desideratum,¹ but it is not the aim here. The principle of organization in this section is not chronological but generic. To visualize the Horace renaissance in eighteenth-century Germany as a chain from Hagedorn to Lange and Uz, through Lessing and Ramler, as far as Wieland,² is to simplify the material by glossing over its heterogeneity and imposing a unitary pattern upon it.³ In dividing the material to show a different cross-section, we shall not be situating Horace against a historical backdrop, although this is obviously a factor, but viewing Wieland's relationship to Horace within a structure of more or less contemporary works which either confront Horace directly, such as translations, or show Horatian influence in their form or content in a great variety of

ways. These are organized into the following groups: editions of Horace in the original, translations, appreciations and imitations. Finally, the Horatian tag provides evidence of Horace's ubiquity on a smaller scale.

There is every indication that, contrary to that of our own age, when Classical texts in their original languages are read only by a small proportion of the reading public, with a specialized interest, the eighteenth-century German market could sustain a proliferation of texts by certain Classical authors. Horace was among the most popular;⁴ a brief survey will demonstrate that Horace's poetry was being made available to a wide spectrum of readers from schoolboys to scholars. Accessibility was ensured by the immense assortment of versions and forms of presenting the poems. The Latin text could be subjected to differing editorial policies; translations and imitations assumed a vast number of possible forms; essays and articles on Horace discussed a variety of topics, and it was fashionable for single lines from Horace to be used in other texts as mottoes or tags.

EDITIONS

Wieland's versions of Horace's *Satires* and *Epistles* are loosely tied to the influential 1711 edition prepared by Richard Bentley.⁵ But he was evidently not entirely satisfied with this version of the text. There are passages in his commentary which praise Bentley, and there are also very frequent examples of divergence from Bentley's readings, either tacit or declared.⁶ Wieland's long-standing familiarity with Horace⁷ gave him the confidence to introduce his own alternative interpretations.⁸ He made good use of other editions, too. William Baxter's edition with scholia and notes in Latin had been reworked in 1772 by Gesner; Wieland consults this volume throughout and sometimes takes strong exception to the interpretations he finds in it.⁹

The contemporary reader had a very wide range of Horace editions to choose from. In 1724, Caspar Gottschling prepared a text without translation, but with notes in German: 'mit auserlesenen philologischen und historischen Anmerkungen'.¹⁰ This editorial policy would make the text accessible to less learned readers, daunted by the prospect of an entirely Latin edition. A similar wish appears to have moved Johann Heinrich Martin Ernesti in 1800 to produce an edition 'mit erklärenden Anmerkungen für Studierende' (Engelmann, p. 475). Then there are examples of volumes containing only a part of the Horatian corpus — the *Odes*, or the *Epistles* — and there are scholarly commentaries devoted to single poems. The *Epistula ad Pisones* was widely consulted as a literary handbook, which led to the appearance of several editions of this work.¹¹ In 1772, Johann Joachim Eschenburg even published an Englishman's commentary on this poem and one other great literary epistle from Book II, addressed to Augustus. Eschenburg printed the Latin text, but translated

Richard Hurd's English commentary into German and added his own observations.¹² Thus, the eighteenth-century German reader was not restricted to editions with a commentary in Latin or German. Important editions in other languages were being made available as well.

For the professional scholar, there were so-called 'variorum' editions, offering a variety of commentaries and interpretations in Latin, compiled into one volume. Wieland's library contained a volume of the variorum edition of the complete works of Horace edited by Christian David Jani.¹³ In complete contrast to this edition, a year after Wieland's revised translation of the *Epistles* came out, his friend Böttiger collaborated with J. H. J. Köppen to produce an anthology of selected odes with notes, for use in schools.¹⁴ A year after that, C. G. Mitscherlich produced a Latin critical edition of one poem: *Odes* 1.4.¹⁵ And the year after Wieland's death, a school edition of Horace was produced by August Christoph Borheck, equipped with every possible aid: 'mit Einleitungen, Anmerkungen und einem mythologisch-historisch-geographischen Wörterbuch'.¹⁶ In short, the choice was immense; one could read the whole works of Horace or only a part and readers were free to choose the level of commentary which suited them best.

Despite the increased interest in translations which characterizes this period,¹⁷ there does not appear to be any lack of willingness to study Latin editions. Translations were not designed to take over from editions in the original language and meet a new need; on the contrary, new Latin editions appear in undiminished numbers well into the nineteenth century. The steady demand for both editions and translations seems to indicate an increasingly literary public from an ever broader based spectrum of society. And while translating the ancients first became a passion with the Anacreontics and then particularly with the Schlegel circle, there is every indication that translations were undertaken and read with enjoyment much earlier in the century as well.¹⁸

TRANSLATIONS

In our sampling of Horace editions there was evidence of a concern to provide varying 'degrees of difficulty' to suit different levels of competence in the reader. In the case of translations, there is an additional feature besides introductions and commentaries which offers the reader help of a different sort. A volume which includes the original with the translation anticipates another kind of involvement with the text from one in which the translation alone has been printed. Johann Heinrich Voss published his translation of the complete works of Horace in 1806. Even though this was sixteen years after the publication of Wieland's revised translation of the *Epistles* (the revision in which the Latin text had been added), Voss does not see fit to follow Wieland's example: he omits the original Latin.¹⁹ A year before Voss's translation, C. F. Preiß had also brought out a

verse translation of the complete works of Horace. He provides careful introductions and includes the original on the left-hand page. Preiß contrasts the intentions behind the Latin edition prepared by Mitscherlich with his own translation:

Weil indeß Herr Mitscherlich den Horaz lateinisch und folglich bloß für Gelehrte, ich hingegen deutsch und für alle Klassen gebildeter Leser meines deutschen Vaterlandes bearbeite...²⁰

The difference between their respective readers is that between 'gelehrt' and 'gebildet'.

Preiß is succinctly characterizing two levels of education in German society in the second half of the eighteenth century. The reader who is 'gelehrt', who is professionally engaged with Latin texts in his scholarly work, is not a new phenomenon. But the concept of 'Bildung' took on new substance as society moved towards the cult of the thinking individual involved in a free exchange of ideas.²¹ The parallel maturation of the German language into a developed and stable form²² contributed to the status of translations as valid ways of reading ancient works. The term 'gelehrt' comes to be associated with narrowness and eventually embodies all that is opposed to the ideals of urbanity and taste.²³ We find Wieland criticizing the commentaries of Baxter and Gesner with the insinuation that these scholars were 'gelehrt' and therefore uninspired.

Among eighteenth-century translators there are some who, while recognizing a pedantic tendency in the professional scholar, nevertheless make it their ambition to translate for philologists as well as students.²⁴ And there are even 'Gelehrte' who recognize the inequity between the two groups and the need for the reader who is 'gebildet' to consult introductory reference works. Johann Georg Sulzer's *Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste*²⁵ is one such work. It provides definitions and short, informative articles, while the *Nachträge zu Sulzers allgemeiner Theorie der schönen Künste* (Leipzig, 1792) concentrate on literary history, as the title page indicates: 'Charaktere der vornehmsten Dichter aller Nationen; nebst kritischen und historischen Abhandlungen über Gegenstände der schönen Künste und Wissenschaften von einer Gesellschaft von Gelehrten.'

The Hexameter Debate

The individual translator's decision to use verse or prose for his translation of Horace's hexameter verse is a very vexed issue and will receive more detailed treatment later. The real difficulty is one of divided loyalties: fidelity to the original could suggest technical perfection — not only verse, but the reproduction of ancient hexameters in the German version.²⁶ Alternatively, concern for the contemporary German reader's comfort and ease would counterindicate this rigidity for the translator whose preoccupation was with the requirements

of his own language; he could then compromise with an iambic pulse instead of a dactylic one. Thirdly, the translator might feel that an accurate Horatian tone is primary and that he could only capture it in a freer metre or, indeed, in prose. All three positions find convinced exponents among eighteenth-century translators.

Technical fidelity to the original was J. H. Voss's choice; having achieved acclaim for his first translation of Homer's *Iliad* — into hexameters — in 1781, Voss went on to revise this for a second edition; Wieland's detailed criticisms of this revision in the *Teutscher Merkur* will be treated later as translation theory. Voss's Horace translations, in 1806, show that Voss was not deterred by observations on the artificiality of his style as translator: his adherence to Horace's metre and the desire to honour other features such as the Latin word order, result in a very stilted style, especially apparent when set alongside Wieland's freer rhythms and more comfortable tone. There will be ample opportunity to compare Voss and Wieland more closely later; here it is important to establish why metrical fidelity as a theoretical position is beset with difficulties in practice.

The main difficulty is naturally posed by the contrast between the ancient and the modern languages. Metre in ancient Classical verse depends on the length of the syllables for the distinction of the rhythmical pattern of the basic metrical unit, or foot. Temporal length, rather than degree of stress, is thus the deciding factor in ancient prosody. But most modern languages, including German, calculate metre according to a system based on stress.²⁷ Ancient metrical rules are therefore more strictly mathematical than modern ones: the substitution of one long syllable for two short ones is perfectly permissible in Latin; in German it spoils the regularity of the rhythm. The correspondence between a long syllable in Latin and a stressed syllable in German, as suggested by Klopstock and accepted by Voss, is not a straightforward one. The difficulty of finding two adjacent stressed syllables to imitate a Latin spondee is just one of the pitfalls encountered when striving towards this ideal.

Voss does not equip his Horace translation with any sort of preface or editorial comment. But we can gather the essentials of his position from the preface to his translation of Virgil's *Georgics*, published after his *Homer* and before his *Horace*, in 1789. Voss will make no concessions to his German reader: he must appreciate that the ancient hexameter is more refined and ought to be emulated in German:

Der Kunstliebhaber wird aus der Uebersetzung von selbst wahrnehmen, daß die natürliche Länge und Kürze nicht nur, sondern auch die Verlängerung und Abkürzung der Mittelzeit, weniger nach dem Gutachten des nordischen Ohrs, dem ein durch den größeren Sprachton ungefähr abgezähltes Gehämmer schon genügen soll, bestimmt worden ist [...]²⁸

The translator who is more solicitous of his reader and of the conventions of the language into which he is translating, has a number of options. A German Alexandrine, that is to say, six iambic feet per line, is less cumbersome than a

dactylic hexameter. More suitable still, some thought, was a shorter line, an iambic pentameter, and others chose to introduce rhyme as well. Paradoxically, concern for the reader can result in a rigid fidelity. At the instigation of Breitinger, in his *Critische Dichtkunst*, some translators were determined to compel the German reader to experience the same impact which the poem had had on its original readers. The attempt to do so by reproducing features of the Latin verse style (for example, the compactness of the syntax, and the flexibility of the word order) has an unintentionally alienating effect on the reader who is unfamiliar with the original. Another method, which we shall often encounter in Wieland's translation, is to try to engineer the same varied and natural style in German as the Latin had for a Roman ear, by substituting for the Latin metrical techniques German devices more easily accommodated in a German line.

Some translators saw their essential task as the re-creation of Horace's tone, with his sudden retreats into irony and belittlement of himself. The adage formulated by Venzky,²⁹ that a translation should read as though Horace had been alive to write in German, can of course sustain a variety of interpretations. A translator might feel that nuances would have to be sacrificed if he imposed the restraints of verse on his translation. If Horace's subtle language seems more expressive to him and the contribution made by metre less important, he will translate into prose.

Wieland's choice is the 'free iamb',³⁰ an iambic pentameter which permits variation from ten to thirteen syllables per line. In this choice, his own need as translator is met: to avoid hexameters, for which he claims, with a light touch of irony, that he has lost the knack. He, too, is faithful to Horace, but in a less obvious way, conveying by other means the variety of rhythm which Horace creates by mathematical substitution of spondees for dactyls and which, translated into the German stress-based system, would not produce a satisfactory result. Because these translations manage to preserve the natural syntax and rhythm of prose within a verse form, they offer the reader neither difficult patterns nor dull and regular ones.

Our analysis of the metrical question has divided the translator's priorities into three spheres: fidelity to the original metre; meeting the reader's requirements; and recognition of what the translator himself considers feasible in a situation where not all features can be honoured. But translation theory can also be reduced to one central issue: the incommensurability of the two languages, as an English edition dated 1750 makes clear. The title runs: *The Works of Horace, Translated into English Prose, As near as the Propriety of the Two Languages will admit*.³¹ Just as in our own century, there is no agreement as to how to solve these intractable problems.

'Ars Poetica'

The first notable translation of the *Epistula ad Pisones* or *Ars Poetica*³² was by Johann Christoph Gottsched, who used it as a preface to his own *Versuch einer*

critischen Dichtkunst.³³ Gottsched translated the epistle into rhyming Alexandrines and apologized in a preface for having had to use almost seven hundred German lines to translate five hundred Latin ones. Footnote numbers refer to lines in the translation, not to the Latin text (which appears, rather cramped, below the German version), and Gottsched's explanations and interpretations are provided at the bottom of each page. Gottsched's aim is an Horatian one: to instruct and delight at once (*prodesse* and *delectare*). And yet his aim as translator is not to achieve a Horatian tone, but rather to make Horace's poem intelligible to his readers. This is implied in Gottsched's description of the type of reader he imagines for this work:

Es ist nicht eines jeden Werk, sich mit dem Lateine der alten Poeten so bekannt zu machen, daß er seinen Horaz ohne Mühe verstehen, geschweige denn mit Lust lesen könnte. In deutscher Sprache wird er also vielen verständlicher seyn, und auch Anfänger auf einen guten Weg weisen [...] (Gottsched, p. 7)

By Gottsched's time there was apparently already a category of reader interested in reading Horace but unable to consult him in the original with ease.

If we compare a short passage from the *Ars Poetica* (lines 131–34), in Gottsched's and in Wieland's translations, their respective aims in translating the poem become very apparent.

Publica materies privati juris erit, si
nec circa vilem patulumque moraberis orbem
nec verbum verbo curabis reddere, fidus
interpres; nec desilies imitator in artum [...]

Features to note in the Latin include the parallel construction (adjective–noun, adjective–noun, with alliteration to highlight it), 'publica materies privati juris', the emphatic placing of the monosyllable 'si' at the end of the line, the two parallel clauses introduced by 'nec', and the polyptoton, or repetition in different grammatical forms of 'verbum'.

Gottsched translates:

Es steht ja Dichtern frey, sich aus bekannten Sachen,
Durch Witz und Kunst und Fleiß ein Eigenthum zu machen:
Dafern die Feder nur nicht allzu sklavisch schreibt,
Und Uebersetzern gleich, an Worten kleben bleibt.

Gottsched is not interested in the exact preservation of subtleties in Horace's style. The passage also becomes more descriptive and less prescriptive; it is not addressed to the second person singular, as the Latin is, but becomes a statement about poets in general. Gottsched's second couplet introduces a new image, a metonymy, in which 'the pen' takes the place of 'poets'. Horace's warning against dallying in the much-used public arena, in line 132, is omitted altogether; this image is replaced by the more encouraging suggestion that traditional,

public material can become one's own if one exercises the qualities of 'Witz und Kunst und Fleiß'. This is pure Gottsched and bears no relation to the Latin.

The lines 133–34, in which Horace cautions the poet against behaving like a faithful translator, are somewhat closer to the original than the others in Gottsched's version. The image is preserved, although the translators are plural and the expression 'an Worten kleben' is only an approximation of Horace's formulation. The adjective 'fidus' disappears, although 'sklavisch' could be regarded as compensating for its loss.

Gottsched simplifies Horace's lines; he decides what their essential import is and communicates it unambiguously. His regular iambs work together with the rhyming couplets and end-stopped lines to give an uncomplicated feel to the whole. The first rhyming couplet quoted contains an extra syllable in each line, the second is also a perfect match in that neither line has an extra syllable. Simplicity is the rule, in metre, rhyme and content. His footnotes, too, ease comprehension for the contemporary reader, by drawing examples from modern works. A footnote explaining 'bekannten Sachen' points, among other examples, to the story of Oedipus, which, as Gottsched says, has been treated by Sophocles, Corneille and Voltaire. Lastly, the appearance of the text on the page is telling: each Latin line begins with a capital letter, according to the modern custom for printing poetry.

Wieland translates as follows:

Ein Stoff, auf welchen jeder gleiches Recht hat,
wird wieder Eigentum, wenn du dich weder
auf einem Plan, der zum Gemeinplatz schon
geworden, tummelst, noch, als ein getreuer
demüt'ger Übersetzer, Wort für Wort
dem Griechen* nachtrittst; [...] (*Fuhrmann*, p. 522)

Wieland is at pains to preserve Horace's imagery where possible and amplify it at the same time, for the benefit of his contemporary readers. As a result, his passage is half as long again as the original, whereas Gottsched, for all his apologies, has the same number of lines as Horace has in this passage.

The first line in Wieland's version comprises an entire phrase to translate 'publica materies'. The alliterated 'w' of the first two lines recalls the alliterated 'p' in Horace's phrase. The position of 'weder', at the end of the line, introduces the two negative examples, just as 'si' had done in the Latin, and both the arena and the faithful translator are preserved. But his choice of the word 'Gemeinplatz' draws attention to the double meaning of 'Plan': initially it suggests an arena, like the Latin 'orbem', but then it takes on the figurative sense of a literary structure, the plot of a play for instance, which has become a commonplace. In this way, Wieland both translates the original, and adds explanatory detail. He also expands the description of the translator, adding the adjective 'demüt'ger',

perhaps to substitute for the loss of the sense of carefulness expressed by the Latin verb 'curabis', which Wieland does not translate. Instead, he describes the action as walking behind the Greek poet, 'nachtrittst'. The idea of walking is not in the Latin at this point, but reminds us of the action in the arena image earlier on. In addition, Wieland has inserted the adjective 'Griechen', as an extra aid to the reader who might have lost his way through the examples. But his footnote below immediately manoeuvres the reader away from antiquity again: 'Oder, dem ersten Autor, der das nämliche Süjet vor dir bearbeitet hat'. The phrase 'Wort für Wort' does adequate justice to 'verbum verbo' without causing any difficulties in German, and typographical emphasis is brought to bear on the most important word 'Eigentum'.

The fact that Wieland maintains the two negative conditions in Horace's advice and that Gottsched's alterations make the passage much more encouraging, is surely not incidental. Gottsched's aim is to preface his own literary treatise with Horace's poem, and he shares the widespread view that this epistle is also designed as a handbook. However, Wieland's interpretation deviates from the standard; he is of the opinion that the epistle was meant to discourage the younger Piso from his poetic ambition, so that, under the guise of a handbook, it emphasizes the difficulties of being a poet.

Gottsched had explained that his version was necessarily longer than the original because of the conventions imposed by the verse form; prose translations would be better equipped to maintain the same number of lines as the original. But if we now turn to the prose translation of the complete works of Horace by Johann Peter Uz,³⁴ we find a less optimistic view of what can be accomplished by the translator who frees himself from the rules of verse. Uz formulates a clear translation theory: he believed that a German verse translation could never do justice to Horace's character or to his precision and brevity of style. But although prose is in his view the only conceivable medium for translating Horace, he asks the reader not to judge his version too harshly; the original will always surpass the translation:

Mit Recht können wir erwarten, daß man nicht allzuviel fordere: aber daß nichts, auch die kleinste Nüance nicht, auch der Numerus des lyrischen Dichters nicht, in unserer Prosa verlohren gehen sollte, ist gewiss zu viel gefordert, und wird niemals von Jemandem geleistet werden.³⁵

Johann Heinrich Voss

For a hexameter verse translation, which none the less differs enormously from Gottsched's, we return to Voss. Voss's hexameter does not use the regular iambic rhythm of the Alexandrines which we find in Gottsched's lines, neither does he indulge in rhyme. He adheres strictly to the dactylic hexameter rules of the Latin original. Similarly, in his versions of the *Odes* he reproduces the metrical pattern of the original. Unlike Gottsched or Wieland, Voss achieves an

exact correspondence in the number of lines and even strives to respect the Latin word order wherever possible.

The really sharp contrast is between Voss and Wieland as translators and this was widely recognized at the time.³⁶ Voss's translation will serve us as a foil to Wieland's in our analysis in the chapters to follow. For the moment, let us consult a contemporary reviewer about the type of readership aimed at by Voss's translation.³⁷ There are three categories, of which the first is the reader with a superior understanding of culture, who will be interested by the ancient character of the work. The completely consistent principles with which Voss carried out his task will be appreciated by those who have not yet fixed their views on translation methods; but also by those who have very fixed views on the ancient versus modern debate — who judge their contemporaries solely on the degree of familiarity with antiquity (and their translations by proximity to the originals) — such will approve of this translation wholeheartedly.

The same reviewer of Voss's works praises both Karl Wilhelm Ramler and Wieland as well. According to his account, first Ramler and then Wieland translated Horace in a manner entirely suited to prevailing tastes. With a certain degree of hermeneutical acuity, the reviewer states that different styles of translation suit different ages. In 1807, the enthusiasm for Ramler's *Odes* published in 1769 is merely a memory, and the 1780s, when Wieland's *Epistles* and *Satires* appeared, would not have been ready for a translation such as the one Voss laid before his readers:

Weder Horazens sinnsschwere Kürze, noch der Ernst des urbanen Gesprächstons, noch die hexametrische Form seiner Gedichte konnten dem damaligen Zeitgeschmacke gefallen. (*Jenaische* [...] *Zeitung*, p. 466)

Ramler's prose translation of the *Ars Poetica* was published in 1777 and presented to the public in glowing terms by the editor, Heinrich Sautier.³⁸ Interestingly, in 1789, Sautier brought out a new edition of this work (again not without its share of praise), which included Wieland's verse translation as well.³⁹ In addition, the practice of publishing translation as the result of collaboration appears to have been fairly common. This comes to its logical conclusion in the publication of anthologies, another expression of the eighteenth-century enthusiasm for antiquity, and one which persists into the nineteenth century.⁴⁰

The principle at work in an anthology is that variety in form and style is an essentially desirable feature which will be appreciated by readers. This same taste for variety is displayed by the array of German styles into which Horace was translated in the eighteenth century. Some very rigid positions were adopted by both purists and modernists in the hexameter debate, and Wieland himself had evolved a translation method based on principles which he held with some conviction. And yet, especially as editor of the *Teutscher Merkur*, he gained respect for encouraging translators in undertakings based on quite

different principles. In 1792, Karl Ludwig von Knebel was spurred on by a challenge from Wieland to produce a hexameter translation of Lucretius with the same number of lines as the original. Neither of these was a goal Wieland considered worth pursuing in his own Horace translations.⁴¹ Johann Jacob Harmsen also refers to the approval he received from Wieland, in the preface to his translation of the *Satires*. He called Wieland 'der Vertraute des Horazischen Geistes' and quotes from a letter received from him:

[...] ich bin versichert, daß Sie durch eine Übersetzung aller Satiren und Briefe des Horaz in diesem guten Ton, mit dieser Laune, Leichtigkeit und Zierlichkeit, die in gegenwärtiger Probe herrschen, Ehre und Dank von dem gebildeten Theil unsers Publikums einärnten werden. (*Horazens Satyren*, p. iii)

This translation is metrically similar to Wieland's and clearly owes him a debt. But Harmsen does not include the original Latin, and he uses rhyme. This earned him scorn from another translator: in 1804, Eduard Loder published his translation of *Satires* 1.9, referring, in his preface, first to Harmsen's excessive indebtedness to Wieland, and then continuing, 'und wer kann es loben, daß er des Dichters freispielende Gedankenglieder in das enge Röckchen des Reims zwingt?'⁴² But Wieland appears not to have had any adverse reaction to the rhyme in this translation; although he chooses not to avail himself of rhyme in his own version, Wieland makes no reference to this decision in any preface.

Loder publishes one satire translated in the original metre, with copious notes; Harmsen publishes the complete *Satires* in iambic pentameter, with rhyme; Gottsched and Ramler translate only the *Ars Poetica*, the former into rhymed Alexandrines, the latter into prose; Voss translates the complete works into the original metres, and he eschews extra aids for the reader, and Uz translates the complete works of Horace into — for him, the only practical medium — prose. Here we have enough variety to fill an anthology and enough of a spectrum with which to contrast Wieland's translations in due course.

APPRECIATIONS AND IMITATIONS

Horace was further honoured in other forms during the same period: translators who were often primarily poets also brought their Roman model alive in poems in the style of Horace, and in poems in praise of Horace. And the issues raised by both translations and imitations of Horace gave rise to contemporary essays on broader questions concerning language, morals, and the reception of ancient literary forms.

Lessing

It was a translation of Horace's *Odes*, published in 1752, which gave rise to the first truly shattering piece of criticism to come from the pen of Lessing. The

translator in question was Samuel Gotthold Lange,⁴³ a pastor who had earned himself a position of great respect for his talent as a lyric poet; he held the balance between the Horatian ode as a model and the more modern stanzaic forms which he was committed to introducing. But Lange soon lost his initial spark and his output became superficial. Those, such as Bodmer, who had formerly praised his skill, now scorned his lack of taste and insufficient dedication to the task at hand. His verse translation of Horace was a colossal disappointment in all respects. Lange's former artistry is not in evidence in the verses; his German style is not natural and the Latin text he prints is not up to contemporary standards of editing. Lessing's initial review (of 1753) both complains about the wholly inadequate treatment of Horace's person, and ridicules Lange's purely philological slips. Lange defended himself against this attack (which Lessing had not at first intended for publication),⁴⁴ thereby provoking a retaliation from Lessing (his 'Ein *Vade mecum* für den Hrn. Sam. Gotth. Lange' of 1754).

Lessing claims to fear the effects and potentially adverse influence over the reading public which a misguided translation from Horace might have. The passion and urgency with which he expresses himself testify to the impact which could have been anticipated for such a work. By our standards, it seems curious that he is not warning against, for instance, a romance in questionable taste; it is merely an inaccurate translation of ancient verse:

Noch bis jetzt, dachte ich bei mir selbst, hat niemand das Publikum für diese Mißgeburt gewarnt; man hat sie sogar angepriesen. Wer weiß, in wie vielen Händen angender Leser des Horaz sie schon ist; wer weiß, wie viele derselben sie schon betrogen hat?⁴⁵

But the type of damage Lessing has in mind is not moral; his very detailed criticisms of Lange's translations are linguistic. He pours scorn on Lange's misconceptions — sometimes of a single word, sometimes of a short phrase, and thereby displays his own minute knowledge of the text and familiarity with standard commentaries. Lessing's essay is vindictive; there is more scorn for Lange than concern for Horace's reputation expressed in lines like these:

Ich habe Ihnen gezeigt, daß Sie weder Sprache noch Kritik, weder Alterthümer noch Geschichte, weder Kenntniss der Erde noch des Himmels besitzen; kurz, daß Sie keine einzige von den Eigenschaften haben, die zu einem Übersetzer des Horaz notwendig erfordert werden. (Lachmann/Muncker, p. 260)

Here we have a list of requirements for a good translator of Horace, provided by an evidently industrious student of Horace's verses, but not himself a translator of them. Lessing (unlike Wieland, Hagedorn, and perhaps also Ramler), was not, so to speak, in communion with Horace. Although, like many of his contemporary men of letters, Lessing too engaged in the activity of translation (the plays of Diderot, for example), one does not picture him stepping inside another personality.⁴⁶ But from Lessing, we have learnt how much interest a Horace translation could arouse and what sorts of feelings it could stir.

As Lessing's *Rettungen des Horaz* (Lachmann/Müncker, pp. 272–309) are directed mostly against the ancient historian Suetonius, there is less point in his giving vent to personal invective in these pages; as a consequence, Horace receives a less polemical treatment. Here, Lessing is concerned to defend Horace's moral reputation and, in doing so, to undermine the view that readers of Horace might be submitting themselves to a corrupting influence. To the charge of immorality levied against Horace (by Suetonius), Lessing pleads for a broader view to be taken, and gives an insight into the relativity of moral standards: 'Allein die Liebe, hat sie nicht jedes Jahrhundert eine andere Gestalt?' (p. 283). He then bolsters this defence with the reminder that Horace was merely borrowing from beautiful and moving passages which he admired in Greek verse: 'Weg also mit allen den Wendungen, die man von den Gedichten des Horaz auf den moralischen Charakter desselben oft genug gemacht hat!' (p. 284).

Lessing then turns to the much discussed charge of cowardice allegedly displayed by Horace in fleeing from battle at Philippi. Again he suggests that poetry should not be interpreted as recounting the poet's life with a historian's standards of accuracy. And again, Lessing points out that Horace imitated and borrowed from the Greeks. Here, he reminds us of Homer's image of the hero being enveloped in a thick cloud and thus preserved by divine intervention in the heat of battle. Lessing wants us to see this as analogous to the shield which Horace cast away. Horace's discarded shield does not need to be any more literally true than the cloud provided by Mercury for the Homeric hero. This defence seems somewhat forced, but it does serve Lessing's principal aim in this essay: to exhort scholars to guard against excessive literalism and allow Horace's humour to show through. Even so, for all Lessing's thorough knowledge of Horace's *Odes*, we miss the pure affection for the poet himself which is unmistakable in Wieland's translations of the *Epistles* and *Satires*.

Herder

Herder's writings abound with references to and quotations from Horace. In his prize essay of 1778, *Über die Wirkung der Dichtkunst*, he praises Horace's humour, just as Lessing had: 'Horaz gab dem römischen Scherze, der römischen Muse eine Urbanität, die bisher nur die atheniensische gehabt haben sollte . . .'.⁴⁷ On the moral question, he suggests that Horace's sense of humour may explain the offensive lines:

Horaz . . . hat auch sittlich herrliche Oden, schildert die alten oder zu bessernde Sitten Roms vortrefflich; wenn man indessen andere Stellen lieset, so sollte man denken, daß auch jenes Dichterglut und nicht sein Ernst war. (VIII, 384)

Praise for Horace, and differences of opinion with his commentators and translators, are scattered throughout Herder's considerations of more general

questions about literature, language, and society. But there are also writings dedicated to Horace alone. Herder's title, *Briefe über das Lesen des Horaz, an einen jungen Freund*, reminds us a little of the *Epistula ad Pisones*, just as Wieland's essay title, *Briefe an einen jungen Dichter*, does. Herder's work consists of seven 'letters' in which the structure and beauty of Horace's *Odes* are presented, with a minimum of polemic against misguided commentators. There is fulsome praise for Horace's character and literary style. Certain German translators and imitators of Horace earn Herder's praise as well. Klopstock, for instance, is said to capture the balance of jesting with earnestness in the tone of the *Odes*, just as Wieland does in his translations of the *Epistles* and *Satires*.⁴⁸ Hagedorn and Uz are also mentioned with approval.

These and other commentators receive a more lengthy discussion in the essay *Über Horaz und über einige Horazische Rettungen und Erläuterungen*. As in the *Briefe über das Lesen des Horaz*, Herder is principally interested in Horace's *Odes*. With encouragement from Bodmer and Breitinger,⁴⁹ the Horatian ode form had gained great popularity, and numerous imitations were being written. Herder dismisses this fad, but reserves praise for Gleim and Uz. Although Herder believes in the superiority of German over Romance languages or English for the purpose of translating Horace, he has little respect for the artificial character of contemporary German imitations and paraphrases of Horatian odes:

Seitdem wir in Deutschland diese künstliche Odenform mit ihrem abgebrochenen Anfange, und ihren schönen Strophen-Übergängen, und artigen Enjambements recht handwerksmäßig geformet und gegossen, seitdem ist wenig Neues im Geist hoher Oden erschienen.⁵⁰

Herder appears to value Horace's humour and has complete admiration for his artistry in the *Odes*. Yet Herder also easily succumbs to the temptation to devote a considerable portion of his energy to the criticism of his contemporaries, rather than to the analysis and appreciation of the poems and their poet. He dismisses mediocre imitators who imagine they have reproduced the 'Manier Horaz' (XI, 115), and generally spends more time listing failed efforts than enlightening his reader as to the true Horatian essence and style.

As with Lessing, especially in his *Vade mecum*, one feels that the discussion of Horace is not essentially for Horace's sake, but is a means of exposing weaknesses in contemporary commentators and imitators. The motive is not to ensure that Horace's qualities are seen in their true light, but to expose fanciful misrepresentations; the appreciation for Horace seems almost marginal. This attitude is not very far removed from that of the scholarly commentators whom Wieland frequently scorns; they are so concerned with philological exactitude that Horace's moods, his humour, irony, and lightness of tone escape them completely.

Hans-Heinrich Reuter (*Reuter*, p. 260f.) sees a strong similarity between Herder and Wieland in this one aspect: they both use a commentary on an

ancient poet as a means of giving vent to critical views of their contemporaries. But whereas this is a large component of Herder's study of Horace, for Wieland it is only one small part of a multi-faceted translation project: Herder and Wieland are not simply united by a common goal, the only difference being one of method. The unscholarly air of Wieland's *Horace* is not indicative of a lack of knowledge of the available scholarly material on Wieland's part, but of a rather special attitude. Wieland does not care to be cast as a pedantic 'Gelehrter', but at the same time, he gives ample evidence in his commentary that he could step into this role if he chose to. We shall see more of this ambivalent, oscillating stance in what follows and especially in the final chapter which treats Wieland's contemporaries.

Hagedorn is given first place in Herder's list of those German Horace imitators who have most clearly perceived the subtlety of the Horatian ode form and the tone it is able to express. His success can be seen in the poem *Horaz* (1751), which evinces an aura of friendship and shared sympathies. The first line (also used by Herder) openly assumes a familiar relationship between Hagedorn and Horace, and we begin to detect a similarity with that existing between Wieland⁵¹ and Horace: 'Horaz, mein Freund, mein Lehrer, mein Begleiter'.

Hagedorn

Hagedorn weaves together the Horatian themes most beloved of the Rococo and Anacreontic poets to form his own poem: love for country life and a sense of harmony with nature; warnings against the attractions of personal glory, satisfaction with modest means, distaste for city life and its concerns. Explicit reference is also made to various satires and epistles with the actual naming of Horace's characters such as Arellius, Menenius, Nasidienus, and the 'Schwätzer'. Hagedorn identifies the poems from which he takes these names in his footnotes. The work is not direct translation, neither does Hagedorn consider adopting or even approximating Horace's metre. In a Rococo style, he appropriates the themes and Horace's light touches of wit to convey a familiar mood rather than a technical artifice.⁵² Hagedorn shares with Wieland an interest in the *Satires* and *Epistles*; both poets help their readers by providing footnotes and both prefer fidelity of tone to reproduction of the Latin's original metre.

Monecke speaks of Hagedorn's desire to create the impression of an 'apocryphal' Horatian poem.⁵³ And Wolfgang Pietsch alerts us to the same quality when he says:

Horaz ist Hagedorn, Hagedorn ist Horaz [...] Doch vollzieht sich dieser Übergang von der zweiten zur ersten Person kaum merklich, der Dichter hält geradezu in Schweben, ob von ihm selbst oder vom Römer die Rede ist.⁵⁴

And yet the poem divides quite clearly into descriptions of the scene — peopled in Hagedorn's imagination with Horace's contemporary characters — and remarks, mostly addressed directly to Horace. This means that it resembles a

Horatian epistle to some extent. Here, as there, we encounter no confusion of persons, neither is there any doubt that, in Hagedorn's poem, both characters are imagined in eighteenth-century Hamburg, walking together and conversing as friends ('Und Harvstehud ist heute mein Tarent'). Hagedorn communicates Horace's ideals, sometimes directly, sometimes by means of an allusion, using a collage of characters and themes from his *Satires* and *Epistles*. The poem, which might otherwise have seemed an artificial construct, succeeds thanks to Hagedorn's ability to depict Horace in eighteenth-century surroundings. Hagedorn endorses Horace's values and makes them appear timeless, by transporting Horace into a contemporary setting, without making him forfeit the circumstances in which his views were first formulated. This is a dialectical method, which does not aim to do away with historical distance entirely. Hagedorn initially feels drawn to Horace in his own, ancient world, and understands the issues which recur in Horace's poetry. Then the dialectic is completed by Horace's presence as Hagedorn's companion in Hamburg. Their talk is of common interests; there is no attempt to weight the question in Hagedorn's favour by use of travesty, springing Horace from his own circumstances and presenting him as an eighteenth-century figure. Hagedorn's ability to enter into Horace's world makes this poem possible; but he neither adopts Horace's *persona*, in order to act as his spokesman (as a truly apocryphal poem would do), nor does he disguise their differences on inviting Horace into his own world.

We shall recognize Hagedorn's attitude again in Wieland's *Horace* commentary, in the guise of the much-prized quality of 'Urbanität'. Horace exhibits this urbanity, when he grasps the character of his addressee and designs his epistle in a way which will appeal to him. For example, Wieland comments on *Epistles* 1.1: 'Aber eben darum geziemte es seiner Urbanität, mit einem Manne wie Mäcenat nicht den Schulmeister zu machen [. . .]' (*Fuhrmann*, p. 69). Urbanity describes Hagedorn's ability to transport himself, in imagination, into Horace's situation, and the Roman into the eighteenth century, without there being any sense of intrusion on either side. And Wieland echoes Horace's urbanity when he chooses a contemporary German idiom to translate a Latin one, not with literal fidelity but with his characteristic concern to capture tone and nuance. With one stroke, Wieland manages to side both with his contemporary readers in making the text accessible, and to show solidarity with Horace. Similarly, his footnotes and commentary are sympathetic and appreciative when they seek to explain Horace's attitudes. For example, Wieland identifies the main thrust of *Epistles* 1.20 with the words: 'Ein eben so feiner als drollichter Scherz über seine eigene Torheit, sein Buch herauszugeben, ohngeachtet er die leidigen Schicksale, die ihm bevorstanden, vorhersah' (*Fuhrmann*, p. 326). Wieland identifies with the situation and grasps the joke, which he also wants his reader to be able to understand.

Hagedorn's footnotes stand in a different relation to the text — understandably, since his text is not a translation. Whereas Wieland's readers have only to glance to the bottom of the page to consult the Latin text in full, Hagedorn's readers have the footnotes to identify each of the references to passages in Horace which have been sewn into his poem. But neither Hagedorn nor Wieland is attempting to realize a metamorphosis, to become the 'deutscher Horaz', as Ramler was often called. Hagedorn identifies with Horace, and pictures Horace as taking part in his own life; but this illusion of fluctuation between Rome and Hamburg is broken by the solid presence of the footnotes, which, in quoting the corresponding Latin lines, effect a clear division of past from present.

Klopstock

Klopstock's poetic development is marked by the stages of an evolving attitude towards ancient verse forms and their assimilation into German compositions. In 1771, he composed 'Der Lehrling der Griechen'. The metrical form is Horatian and echoes that of Horace's *Odes* 1.1:

Wen des Geniüs Blick, als er geboren ward [. . .]

The form of expression is modelled on Latin: concise, and poignant without sentimentality; but the word-order is unnatural for German, and the poem does not read as easily as Hagedorn's, as the following lines demonstrate:

Wo kein mütterlich Ach bang bei dem Scheidekuß,
Und aus blutender Brust geseufzt,
Ihren sterbenden Sohn dir, unerbittlicher,
Hundertarmiger Tod, entreißt [. . .]

In these lines, the position of the word 'dir' is awkward and unidiomatic: it has been forced into this position for the sake of the Asclepiad.⁵⁵ Normal German idiom has also been sacrificed in the first line for the sake of the metre. Here the word-order of 'des Genius Blick' and the position of the adjective 'bang' strike us as unnatural. One also finds it hard to dismiss the thought that adjectives such as 'unerbittlicher' and 'hundertarmiger' were selected at least in part for their rhythmic potential: the epithet 'hundertarmig' is unidiomatic and evokes the Latin *centimanus* from Horace's *Odes* 2.17, line 14. The opening two syllables of each line are chosen with care, to ensure the maximum emphasis on the second, and to approximate a spondee as closely as possible. This concentration on metre all but obliterates the effect of enjambement, which is in any case hindered by commas. The comma at the end of the first line, after 'Scheidekuß', is unnecessary, what it *does* achieve is the sensation that one metrical unit is complete and that we are to start again in the next line. Klopstock's subject matter is the immortal glory won by those whose stars determine they will become poets. This too is Horatian in its inspiration, although the poem is not

an example of pastiche or patchwork translation. In comparison with Hagedorn's poem, it is closer to Horace in metre and further from him in content.

By contrast, Klopstock's 'Der Kamin' is an example of a poem written in a non-Classical metre, but taking over the subject matter and structure from Horace's second *Epode*. In freeing his verse from the Latin metrical pattern and devising one of his own, more suited to German, Klopstock also composes in a more natural German style:

Ein Städter, sein Freund, verließ
Den Kamin früh. Er entdeckt von dem hohen
Roß in der Ferne schon
Den Landmann, wie er schwebt, und den Kristall
Hinter sich tönen läßt.

Although Wieland was no less an admirer and disciple of Horace's than Hagedorn, Klopstock, or his fellow translator Ramler,⁵⁶ he chose to pay his respects by different means. There is no lack of evidence that he knew the *Odes* very well, but he did not aspire to composing odes, either in imitation of Horace or in praise of him. The closest he came to this genre is a type of imitation of the epistle rather than the ode: hexameter composition with Horatian calques, such as the 'Zwölf Moralische Briefe', discussed in the next chapter.

THE HORATIAN TAG

Classical quotation is the *parole* of literary men all over the world.
(Dr Johnson, 8 May 1781)

The widespread practice of choosing a quotation to introduce a work and set the tone is not peculiar to the eighteenth century; less common, today, is the expectation that the reader will be persuaded more easily if, as part of a discussion, he⁵⁷ is provided with a quotation from an ancient author who expresses a similar idea. Partly, the reason for this is that the general reader is no longer as familiar with Classical literature. In the eighteenth century, a large proportion of readers, those regarded as 'gebildet', would be at home with Latin, after a thoroughly Classical training, and could be counted on to recall the affection for the ancient poets which they gained as pupils. Thus, relying on their shared knowledge, the modern author and reader enter into a more intimate relationship, which they are able to do through the mediation of the ancient author — in this case, Horace.

There are more facets to the use of a 'tag' than might at first appear: it can be a compliment or source of pleasure to the reader who recognizes the phrase; it can be a show of learning or a sign of sloth on the part of the author; it can be a call to arms or a means of ridicule. Herder cites Horace on the title page of his *Ueber die*

Wirkung der Dichtkunst auf die Sitten der Völker in alten und neuen Zeiten (Werke (Suphan), VIII, 334). The quotation reads: 'Utcunque defecere mores / Dedecorant bene nata culpa'. These lines are from *Odes* 4.4 and speak of the detrimental effect of a decline in morals upon the nobly born. Herder identifies the author, but not the ode. Although the lines from Horace make no specific mention of *poetry's* effect on morals, these lines do contribute a serious tone, and we are given the impression that we shall find a trustworthy point of view in the essay which follows. In using the quotation as a motto underneath the title, Herder has avoided inserting lines from Horace into his discussion, a technique of which he vehemently disapproves in his *Über Horaz und über einige Horazische Rettungen und Erläuterungen*:

Der zweite Abweg, Horaz zu lesen, ist wenn sie Hauptgeschmack wird, die Parallelenmacherei. — Eine solche Arbeit ist bei einer mäßigen Belesenheit, oder einem mäßigen Gebrauche von Registern, Anthologien, Florilegiis, und wie die Sammelplätze mehr heißen, ziemlich leicht [. . .] Das schönste Bild eines Autors muß mit den Worten, an der Stelle, das schönste seyn, da er's saget, da es stehet [. . .] (Werke (1829), XI, 119f.)

Herder is justifiably critical of those who do not borrow from works which they know and love, but from anthologies, and with the sole purpose of appearing learned. And yet the habit of quoting from Classical sources must have arisen from the honourable view that there was no point in trying to become a poet without first being well versed in the ancients. This view is supported by Opitz, a devotee of quotation from the Classics, who chooses lines from Horace's *Ars Poetica* for the title page of his *Buch von der Deutschen Poeterey*.⁵⁸ A thorough exposure to Horace, or to any other poet, was bound to show through in the style of a writer, in any variety of ways. As one might expect, when Wieland embeds a phrase from Horace, translated into German, into his own work, he achieves a natural, easy flow. Horace is not actually identified, but the expectation is that the reference will be recognized if he refers to 'Bücher, in denen die Wahrheit mit Lachen gesagt würde' (at the beginning of Part Two of *Don Sylvio von Rosalva*).⁵⁹ When he does identify Horace, Wieland manages to avoid the scholarly reverence of a 'Gelehrter' as, for example, in *Geschichte des Agathon* V.9: 'Die Tugend (pflegt man dem Horaz nachzusagen) ist die Mittelstraße zwischen zween Abwegen'. By his use of the word 'man', Wieland alludes to the common, well-known practice of referring to Horace, and implies that the reader is sufficiently 'gebildet' to be among this number. Even when Horace is cited in the original, this need not have an abrupt impact on the continuity of the German sentence. In the curiously ahistorical milieu of *Agathon*, where suspension of belief in the historical setting is encouraged, where the ancient and the contemporary happily coexist, there is no difficulty about the narrator quoting from Horace:

Sich über einen so natürlichen Zufall zu verwundern, würde unserm Bedünken nach, eine große Sünde gegen das nie genug anzupreisende *Nil admirari* sein, in welchem (nach

der Meinung erfahrner Kenner der menschlichen Dinge) das eigentliche große Geheimnis der Weisheit [...] verborgen liegt. (*Agathon* X.2)

The absolute validity of this well-known admonition makes it suitable advice both in Wieland's century and in Agathon's. And Wieland has recommended it in a persuasive way by first preparing the ground for the Latin message with his use of the German verb 'verwundern'. The parenthetical remark softens what would otherwise be a harsh, categorical statement. There is also an urbanity about the use of the word 'Kenner'. The reader is to identify with this category and is pleased to be able to communicate with Horace and with Wieland on this level.

There are, of course, differences between the deception involved in using Horace to make one's own argument, as a sort of shorthand, and the use of Latin phrases which have acquired the status of commonplaces — or even quoting Horace in translation and relying on the reader to catch the allusion, a device often used in letters to compliment the correspondent.⁶⁰ But even the practice condemned by Herder, in which the danger is to introduce Horace in an inapposite way, approaching travesty, can be used to comic effect when well handled. Gottsched, speaking about the critic of his *Critische Dichtkunst* (p. vii), enlists some ancient help from Cato and Horace: 'seine Rachgier rief ihm unaufhörlich ins Ohr: *Carthaginem esse delendam!* die kritische Dichtkunst müßte ausgerottet werden. *Hinc illae lacrimae!*' There is bathos involved in comparing the destruction of Carthage with the criticism of a book, and this is further emphasized by Horace's words ('*this is the reason for the tears*') which add to the suggestion that the critic has grossly exaggerated the adverse effects of Gottsched's work. An almost conspiratorial relationship is being set up, between Gottsched and the reader who recognizes the quotations and their contexts. The wit is more 'gelehrt' than Wieland's; the lack of aid for the reader suggests that Gottsched aims his remarks at an élite group. Gottsched is ridiculing the strong reaction of his critic, but at the same time, through intertextuality,⁶¹ establishing a guarantee for his own work: he continues to associate himself with Horace, as he did by including his translation of the *Ars Poetica* as a preface to the *Critische Dichtkunst*.

Thus, two things in particular are brought about by quoting from Horace: a special understanding arises between author and reader, and a guarantee of reliability adheres to the text, when it is associated with a Horatian poem whose excellence is beyond dispute. This latter function is most obviously at work when lines from Horace's *Ars Poetica* are evoked.

Lessing's *Laokoon* is liberally sprinkled with Latin and Greek, but the fundamental principle which Lessing opposes is Horace's 'ut pictura poesis', particularly as embraced by Breitinger's *Critische Dichtkunst* and the followers of the Swiss school. In opposing an influential precept from Horace, he creates for himself a position of comparable importance in the realm of aesthetic theory:

Sections VI and VII of *Laokoon* both open with allusions to, if not translations of, Horace's famous phrase: 'Meine Voraussetzung, daß die Künstler dem Dichter nachgeahmt haben [. . .]' (VI); 'Wenn man sagt, der Künstler ahme dem Dichter oder der Dichter ahme dem Künstler nach [. . .]' (VII).

Another influential text for the Enlightenment, which used Horace as guarantor, was Kant's essay, 'Was ist Aufklärung?', which begins with a line from *Epistles* 1.2: 'Sapere aude! Habe Mut, dich deines eigenen Verstandes zu bedienen!' (cited in *Fuhrmann*, p. 171). The pithy, positive tone of this motto earned pride of place for a poet, where one might have expected to encounter a philosopher. Besides this motto, there are instances in the *Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik* where Horace is useful to Kant. Horace's image of the rustic, waiting for the river to cease flowing, is invoked as an instance of the attitude of fruitless opposition which Kant is describing. He gives the Latin (*Epistles* 1.2, line 42f.) at the foot of the page. Kant also uses a line from Horace's *Ars Poetica* (line 188) to express his own rejection of arguments divorced from common experience: 'Quodcunque ostendis mihi sic, incredulus odi.' The effect of this insertion into the text is to alleviate the tone of the passage a little by allowing the reader to hear another voice speaking directly, rather than filtered through Kant.⁶²

Herder himself does not entirely avoid quoting from Horace in the body of his text. Indeed, 'intertextuality' is a prominent characteristic of his style. But there is a tremendous difference, he would claim, between the writer who has culled an appropriate line from an anthology, and the writer who is in close communion with the ancient poet and whose quotations consequently appear as natural extensions of his own thoughts. Herder frequently turns to Horace for an example:

In den ersten Zeiten, da Rom in Armut, im Kampfe und immerwährenden Drange der Not war und wie Horazens *duris illex tonsa bipennibus* unter harten Stürmen erwuchs, waren sie zu beschäftigt und zu roh, als daß sie dichten und Gedichte empfangen konnten. (*Werke* (Suphan), VIII, 379)

There can be few examples in which Horace is quoted in a more appropriate context!

An interesting illustration in Wieland involves his use of a line not from Horace, but from Terence. In his essay on Erasmus, Wieland commends to us the habit of mind, which elsewhere he calls 'Urbanität', with these words:

Das goldne Tu si hic esses aliter sentias! legt uns als Pflicht auf, uns so viel nur immer möglich an den Platz und in den ganzen Zusammenhang der Person hineinzudenken und hineinzufühlen, über die wir urteilen wollen.⁶³

Again, the path is made smooth. First, the Latin direct appeal in the second person singular both alerts and involves the reader. Then, Wieland goes on to

advocate the habit of placing the self in the position of the other, thereby offering an indication of the import of these lines. Whereas Herder might quote Latin without either translation or elaboration, Wieland is invariably led to comment further and make even clearer the sentiment in the Latin he has cited.

A final example of a Latin tag fitting naturally, both from a syntactical and from a logical point of view, into a German sentence, occurs in a letter Wieland wrote to Meusel in 1773.⁶⁴ The authors under discussion are Kretschmann and Denis:

Für wen aber schreiben diese Leute jetzt? Wer liest sie? Fingal war ein göttlicher Mann; aber wer den Bardenton im Jahr 1773 anstimmt, naviget anticyram!

The point would be made much less effectively in German, even if a verb with Latin origins were to be chosen, such as 'navigieren'. Wieland's rather bold statement communicates to those who know the proverb in Horace's *Satires* 2.3, that these people are mad and in need of hellebore as a herbal cure, available in Anticyra.⁶⁵

There is one more, rather paradoxical, effect of the tag, which Wieland again can illustrate for us. His *Comische Erzählungen* are given a motto from the *Ars Poetica*: 'Ex noto fictum carmen sequar, ut sibi quisvis / speret idem' (line 240). Wieland's subsequent translation would render this:

Aus lauter jedermann bekannten Wörtern
wollt' ich mir eine neue Sprache bilden, so,
daß jeder dächt', er könnt' es auch, [...] (*Fuhrmann*, p. 533)

In his use of this short quotation, Wieland alerts the reader to his intention of using everyday modern language within the settings, and for the characters, from the ancient sources which he has chosen. But he is far removed from the practice of quoting Horace out of context, to which Herder made such strong objection. The effectiveness of the quotation above is heightened if the reader goes to its source and informs himself of the fuller context. Wieland is not simply attaching a Horatian maxim to his poems, whether to provide the reader with a momentary pleasure, to help the argument, or to impart an air of respectability aimed at predisposing the reader in favour of his own work. Indeed, the context furthers Wieland's cause: Horace speaks of the labour involved in creating a work in which no artistry is apparent — an aim with which Wieland is in complete accord.⁶⁶

Instead of using Horace's lines to enhance his own work in the eyes of the reader, Wieland is, in a sense, composing a work which, if it successfully fulfils the promise of its motto, will also recommend Horace as a readable poet, and diminish the view of the Horatian corpus as merely a collection from which useful phrases may be culled. The next chapter will show the range of Wieland's references to Horace's work in all its diversity.

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. Thus Herbert Zeman, *Die deutsche anacreontische Dichtung: Ein Versuch zur Erfassung ihrer ästhetischen und literarhistorischen Erscheinungsformen im 18. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1972), p. 354: 'Eine der gegenwärtigen Forschungslage entsprechende, zusammenfassende Sichtung nicht nur der Entwicklung der Horazischen Ode in Deutschland, sondern auch der aus verschiedenen Aspekten erfolgten Auseinandersetzung mit Horazens Persönlichkeit und Dichtung fehlt.'
2. Cf. Zeman, p. 211.
3. This lack of homogeneity is apparent in Fritz Martini's article, 'Modern, die Moderne', in *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte*, 2nd edn (Berlin, 1965), II, 391-415; here p. 394: 'Die Lockerung des Verhältnisses zu der alten Literatur in der Übergangszeit von Barock zur Aufklärung und in der Zeit der frühen Aufklärung deutet auf mehrere Gründe [...] Diese Auseinandersetzung mit dem Klassizismus ist in der Diskussion der Ästhetik und Poetik des ganzen 18. Jhs mit zunehmenden Verschärfungen und Vermannigfaltigungen der Positionen und ihren Begründungen [...] lebendig geblieben.'
4. Once Horace became popular in Germany, no other ancient author was translated as often, according to Eduard Stemplinger, *Horaz im Urteil der Jahrhunderte* (Leipzig, 1921), p. 114. And in discussing Lessing's relationship to Horace, Erich Schmidt refers to Horace as 'der kluge Lieblingspoet des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts'. See his *Lessing: Geschichte seines Lebens und seiner Schriften*, 4th edn (Berlin, 1961), I, 226.
5. Q. Horatius Flaccus, *ex recensione et cum notis atque emendationibus Richardi Bentleyi* (Cambridge, 1711). For the *Satires*, Bentley's text forms the basis, but is considerably emended. For the *Epistles*, an unidentified vulgate edition appears to have been revised, using some of Bentley's readings. See Fuhrmann, p. 1097 and Monecke, p. 213.
6. In his edition of Wieland's translations of the *Epistles*, Gerhard Wirth has collated the passages in which Wieland's text differs from Bentley's. *Horaz, Episteln: Lateinisch und Deutsch; übersetzt und erläutert von C. M. Wieland*; Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Gerhard Wirth (Hamburg, 1963), p. 281f.
7. Wieland's first efforts as translator of Horace, as a schoolboy ('Klosterbergisches Schulheft', 1748), are preserved in *Wieland Gesammelte Schriften*, herausgegeben von der Deutschen Kommission der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, vol. 1/4: *Prosaische Jugendwerke*, ed. by Fritz Homeyer and Hugo Bieber (Hildesheim, 1986; reprint of the 1st edn, Berlin, 1916), pp. 667-81. Hereafter referred to as *Jugendwerke*.
8. Wieland's alterations to Bentley's text meet with approval in C. O. Brink, "'A great genius of our own" and Horace's *Ars Poetica* in the Eighteenth Century', *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 8 (1985), 74: 'I find his translation, or rather paraphrase, of the *Satires* and *Epistles* a pleasure to read, his Latin text reasonable and occasionally more convincing than what the professionals had to offer, and his notes intelligent and incisive.'
9. Horatii, Q. Flacci, *Opera una cum schol. perpetuis tam vet. quam novis adjecit ubi visum est, et sua, textumque restituit Guil. Baxter, ad cujus secundam ed. recudi curavit et varietate lectionis suisque observat. auxit Jo. Matth. Gesnerus* (Leipzig, 1752). The catalogue prepared for the auction of Wieland's library after his death lists the Baxter/Gesner edition (p. 17), but not the Bentley. See *Verzeichniß der Bibliothek des verewigten Herrn Hofraths Wieland: Welche den 3. April 1815 und die folgende Tage, gegen gleich baare Bezahlung zu Weimar öffentlich versteigert werden soll* (Weimar, 1814). Hereafter referred to as *Verzeichnis*.
10. This edition which was published in Halle is listed in Wilhelm Engelmann, *Bibliotheca scriptorum classicorum et graecorum et latinorum*, 7th edn (Leipzig, 1858), p. 475. Hereafter referred to as *Engelmann*.
11. Cf. J. Bintz, 'Der Einfluß der *ars poetica* des Horaz auf die deutsche Literatur des XVIII. Jahrhunderts', in *Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Wilhelmgymnasiums in Hamburg* (Hamburg, 1892). Bintz has several references to Wieland.
12. *Horazens Episteln an die Pisonen von der Dichtkunst, und an den Augustus mit Commentarien und Anmerkungen, nebst einigen kritischen Abhandlungen von Rich. Hurd*. Aus dem Englischen übersetzt und mit eigenen Anmerkungen begleitet von Johann Joachim Eschenburg, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1772).
13. *Horatii Opera*; cura Jani, I (Leipzig, 1778). Cf. *Verzeichnis*, p. 17.
14. *Ausgewählte Oden und Lieder [des Horaz]: Zum Gebrauch auf Schulen*, herausgegeben von Joh. Heinr. Just. Köppen (Braunschweig, 1791): *Erklärende Anmerkungen*, 1. Theil, herausgegeben von J. H. J. Köppen; 2. Theil, herausgegeben von C. Aug. Böttiger; *Engelmann*, p. 479.
15. *Libri I. Carmen IV*: adnot. perpetua et observat. criticis instr. edendorum eiusdem operum spec. loco proposuit Christ. Guil. Mitscherlich (Leipzig, 1792); *Engelmann*, p. 479.

16. *Horatii Opera*. Zum Schulgebrauch von Aug. Chr. Borheck (Lemgo, 1814–17); *Engelmann*, p. 475.
17. The immense popularity of translation in this period is well documented in the exhibition catalogue *Weltliteratur: Die Lust am Übersetzen im Jahrhundert Goethes*, Marbacher Katalog 37 (Marbach am Neckar, 1982). Hereafter referred to as *Weltliteratur*.
18. For more detail, see Walther Killy's essay 'Über den deutschen Horaz', in *Schreibweisen — Leseweisen* (Munich, 1982). For a discussion of the earliest Horace translations, see E. Schwabe, 'Zur Geschichte der deutschen Horaz-Übersetzungen', *Neues Jahrbuch für Philologie und Pädagogik* (II. Abt.), Heft 7 (1896).
19. *Des Quintus Horatius Flaccus Werke* von Joh. Heinrich Voss (Heidelberg, 1806).
20. *Des Q. Horazius Flakkus Werke*: Metrisch übersetzt und ausführlich erklärt von C. F. Preiß (Leipzig, 1805), I, p. xviii.
21. See *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, I, ed. by Joachim Ritter (Darmstadt, 1971), col. 921.
22. Cf. Johann Heinrich Voss, *Zeitmessung der deutschen Sprache: Beilage zu den Oden und Elegien* (Königsberg, 1802). Voss refers to the German language (p. 259) as '[eine] von den gebildeten neueren'. In a famous lecture on methods of translation delivered in 1813, Friedrich Schleiermacher (an experienced translator of the Platonic dialogues) suggested a special affinity of the German language for translation: '[...] wegen seiner Achtung für das fremde und seiner vermittelnden Natur [...] alle Schätze fremder Wissenschaft und Kunst mit seinen eignen zugleich in seiner Sprache gleichsam zu einem großen geschichtlichen Ganzen zu vereinigen [...]' ('Ueber die verschiedenen Methoden des Uebersetzens', in *Sämtliche Werke* (Berlin, 1838), III/2, 243).
23. Sven-Aage Jørgensen speaks of 'der Gegensatz zwischen dem Philologen und dem Mann von Geschmack [...]' in his 'Wieland zwischen Bürgerstube und Adelsalon', in *Bürger und Bürgerlichkeit im Zeitalter der Aufklärung*, ed. by Rudolf Vierhaus (Heidelberg, 1981), p. 208.
24. See the introduction to Johann Jacob Harmsen's translation of *Horazens Satyren* (Halle, 1800), p. vi: 'Ich bin zwar eingenommen genug von meiner Arbeit, um zu behaupten, daß sie nicht nur Studierenden, sondern auch Lehrern, und namentlich solchen Philologen nützlich seyn werde, die ihr Gehirn nicht
mit Wörtern so belasten,
daß selbst Homer für sie nur Wörter schreibt.
25. *Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste in einzeln, nach alphabetischer Ordnung der Kunstwörter auf einander folgenden, Artikeln, abgehandelt von Johann Georg Sulzer* (Leipzig, 1771).
26. Cf. Conrad Gottlob Anton, 'Abhandlung von der genauesten Nachahmung des alten Sylbenmaasses, deren unsre Sprache in treuen Uebersetzungen fähig ist' (1772; reprinted in *Die Lehre von der Nachahmung der antiken Versmaße im Deutschen*, ed. by Hans-Heinrich Hellmuth and Joachim Schröder (Munich, 1976), p. 125: '[...] so ist es nicht weniger offenbar, daß ein poetisches Stück, dem man in einer metrischen Uebersetzung ein anderes Sylbenmaaß gibt, als ihm der Verfasser gegeben hatte, seinem Originale noch sehr unähnlich ist [...]' (Hereafter this volume will be referred to as *Hellmuth/Schröder*.)
27. 'Many tried to formulate rules for the fixation of quantity or length in German, when by "length" they really meant stress value; but in German this normally depends not solely on any syllable itself, but on its relation to the syllables before and after it': W. Bennet, *German Verse in Classical Metres* (The Hague, 1963), p. 18.
28. *Publii Virgilii Maronis Georgicon; Des Publius Virgilius Maro Landbau* (Libri quatuor; Vier Gesänge), Übersetzt und erklärt von Johann Heinrich Voss (Eutin and Hamburg, 1789), p. xiii.
29. Georg Venzky, 'Das Bild eines geschickten Uebersetzers', in *Beyträge zur Critischen Historie der deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit*, 3 (1734), 58ff.
30. Wieland justifies his choice in the preface ('An den Leser') to his translation of the *Satires*: '[...] da hingegen (wenigstens meinem Ohre nach) der freie Jambus geschickter scheint, dem Leser einen Begriff von der Leichtigkeit, Kunstlosigkeit und oft mit Fleiß gesuchten Nachlässigkeit des Horazischen Hexameters zu geben [...]' (*Fuhrmann*, p. 581).
31. *The Works of Horace* [...] Begun by David Watson, Revised, Carried on and Published by S. Patrick, 2 vols (London, 1750).
32. A very influential title not given to the poem by Horace; it dates from Quintilian.
33. Johann Christoph Gottsched, *Versuch einer critischen Dichtkunst*, 4th edn (Leipzig, 1751; first published in 1730).
34. *Die Werke des Horaz, aus dem Lateinischen übersetzt* (Ansbach, 1773 and 1775).
35. A quotation from a letter to Gleim written by Johann Peter Uz on 6 April 1773, and cited by the editor (A. Sauer) in his introduction by *Uz's Sämtliche Poetische Werke*, Deutsche Literaturdenkmale des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts in Neudrucken (Stuttgart, 1968), p. lxxiii.

36. For example, a contemporary reviewer referred to 'diejenige Manier des Übersetzens [...] welche man nun im Gegensatz der Wielandischen, die Vossische zu nennen anfängt [...]', *Neue allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek*, 84 (1803), 525f. Cited in *Weltliteratur*, p. 269.
37. *Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, No. 135, 10 June 1807, p. 468.
38. *Die Dichtkunst des Horaz*, übersetzt von Karl Wilhelm Ramler (Basel, 1777). In the preface, Sautier presents Ramler's translation as: 'Eine Uebersetzung, die ich allen hundert Commentarien, so unsere Welt bisher belastet haben, allein vorziehe', page unnumbered.
39. *Die Dichtkunst des Horaz*, übersetzt und erklärt in Prosa von K. W. Ramler; in Versen von C. M. Wieland; herausgegeben von Heinrich Sautier. Zweyte, mit dem Entwurf einer Dichtkunst nach Horaz vermehrte Auflage (Basel, 1789). According to *Weltliteratur* (p. 260), Sautier is now offering his readership in a combined volume: 'ächte Meisterstücke der zween größten Dichter Deutschlands'.
40. Both Wieland and Voss find their way into a polyglot edition compiled by the French scholar Jean-Baptiste Monfalcon, *Oeuvres complètes d'Horace* (Paris and Lyon, 1834). Monfalcon praises Wieland's introduction to the *Ars Poetica* with its unusual interpretation of the epistle as designed to discourage poetic aspirations. This view differs from Ramler's, and Sautier (see the note above) suppressed Wieland's comments on this question.
41. Cf. *Der Neue Teutsche Merkur* (March, 1793), p. 234. H. B. Nisbet refers to this in his article, 'Karl Ludwig von Knebel's Hexameter Translation of Lucretius', *GLL*, 41 (1988), 418f.
42. Q. Horatii Flacci Satira Nonā libri primi; Des Q. Horatius Flaccus neunte Satire des ersten Buches, übersetzt und erklärt von Eduard Loder (Hamburg, 1804), page unnumbered.
43. Samuel Gotthold Langens Horatische Oden nebst Georg Friedrich Meiers Vorrede vom Werthe der Reime (Halle, 1747). This translation was published again in 1752 as 'eine zweisprachige Ausgabe' (*Weltliteratur*, p. 253), and it is thus this edition which provoked Lessing's wrath.
44. See the editor's comments (p. 773) in Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Werke*, III: Frühe kritische Schriften, ed. by Karl S. Guthke (Munich, 1972).
45. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Sämtliche Schriften*, ed. by Karl Lachmann and Franz Muncker (Stuttgart, 1890), v, 226. Hereafter this volume will be referred to as *Lachmann/Muncker*.
46. Cf. Erich Schmidt, *Lessing*, I, 187: 'Die Gabe leichter Empfängnis, wie man sie an Wieland oder W. Schlegel kennt, dies weibliche Naturell eines berufenen Mittlers fehlt ihm ganz.'
47. *Ueber die Wirkung der Dichtkunst auf die Sitten der Völker in alten und neuen Zeiten*, in Johann Gottfried Herder, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by Bernhard Suphan (Hildesheim, 1967; reprint of Berlin edition, 1892), VII, 384.
48. *Briefe über das Lesen des Horaz, an einen jungen Freund: (Vierter Brief)*, in Johann Gottfried von Herder, *Sämtliche Werke* (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1829), XI, 88.
49. See Rolf Zuberbühler, 'Drei Oden: Widmungsgedichte bei Horaz, Klopstock und Hölderlin', *Hölderlin Jahrbuch*, 24 (1984/85), 24.
50. *Ueber Horaz und über einige Horazische Rettungen und Erläuterungen*, in *Sämtliche Werke* (1829), XI, 118.
51. Monecke, p. 201: 'Die Berührungspunkte mit dem Horaz Wielands sind nicht wenige [...]'.
 52. On the subject of Horace as inspiration for the Rococo poets, see Alfred Anger, *Literarisches Rokoko* (Stuttgart, 1962), esp. p. 26.
 53. Monecke (p. 200) speaks of the desire, 'wie ein apokryphes Werk Horazens selbst empfunden zu werden'.
54. W. J. Pietsch. 'Friedrich von Hagedorn und Horaz' (dissertation, University of Graz, 1985), p. 160.
55. In this poem, the Asclepiad (— — — UU — — UU — — alternates with the Glyconic (— — — UU — —)) in imitation of Horace's *Odes* 1. 3; 1. 13; 1. 19; 1. 36, etc.
56. Cf. A. Lehnerdt, *Die deutsche Dichtung des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts in ihren Beziehungen zu Horaz* (Königsberg, 1882). Lehnerdt (p. 2) sees Ramler and Klopstock as a contrasting pair: Ramler adheres strictly to the metre of the Horatian ode and chooses a subject related to Horace's; Klopstock comes to reshape the ancient metre by degrees and use it to express a quite different content.
57. The reader is referred to throughout by the pronoun 'he'. This is used in the generic sense and is not intended to exclude female readers. However, Wieland does not address himself to 'Leserinnen' anywhere in this work.
58. Opitz considers it pointless 'wenn sich jemand ans Dichten machen wolle, der in den griechischen und lateinischen büchern nicht wol durchtrieben ist, und von ihnen den rechten grieff erlernt hat'. See *Gesammelte Werke*, ed. by George Schulz-Behrend (Stuttgart, 1978), n/i, 359.
59. *Die Abenteurer des Don Sylvio von Rosalva*, 'Zweyter Theil', in C. M. Wieland, *Sämtliche Werke* (Hamburg, 1984; reprint of Leipzig: Göschel, 1795), IV/12, 9.

60. Stemplinger (*Horaz im Urteil der Jahrhunderte*, p. 155) mentions Goethe's letter to Kestner (10 April 1773) which contains no Latin, but it does make an allusion to *Satires* 1.2; he also mentions a similar instance on 25 September 1792, when Goethe alludes to the *Ars Poetica* in similar fashion.
61. Today's discussions of intertextuality refer to this function: 'L'Intertextualité est [...] le mécanisme propre à la lecture littéraire. Elle seule, en effet, produit la signification, alors que la lecture linéaire [...] ne produit que le sens', Michael Riffaterre, 'La trace de l'intertexte', *La Pensée* (Octobre, 1980); cited by Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes: La Littéraire au second Degré* (Paris, 1982), p. 9.
62. The passage from *Epistles* 1.2 appears in the *Vorrede* to the *Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik die als Wissenschaft wird auftreten können* (Berlin, 1957), p. 3. The line from the *Ars Poetica* appears in the *Prolegomena* proper, p. 27.
63. 'Ein Fragment über den Charakter des Erasmus von Rotterdam', in Martini/Seiffert, III, 353, ed. by Fritz Martini and Reinhard Döhl (1967). Erasmus and Wieland share a love for the ancient poets, particularly Horace. Cf. Erika Rummel, *Erasmus' 'Annotations' on the New Testament: From Philologist to Theologian* (Toronto, 1986), p. 3: 'His earliest letters bear witness to his love of literature. They are sprinkled with quotations from classical authors, notably the poets Ovid, Horace, Virgil and Juvenal. His own poems, too, are modelled on their example and reflect the classical age in subject-matter, imagery and metre.'
64. *Wielands Briefwechsel*, 5 vols, ed. by Hans Werner Seiffert (Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaft, 1963–83). Vol. v: *Briefe der Weimarer Zeit* [21. September 1772–31. Dezember 1777], Brief 55 [An Meusel in Frankfurt; Weimar, den 8. Januar, 1773], p. 46.
65. *Anticyra*: 'Der Ort war berühmt durch den dort wachsenden Helleborus, der gegen Wahnsinn gebraucht wurde. Daher *Hor. sat.* 2, 3 166 *Naviget Anticyram*, er ist verrückt.' A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und Sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer* (Hildesheim, 1964; reprint of the Leipzig edition, 1890), p. 27.
66. See Liselotte Kurth-Voigt's *Perspectives and Points of View: The Early Works of Wieland and their Background* (Baltimore and London, 1974), esp. pp. 141–43.

CHAPTER II

HORACE AND WIELAND

It has been widely observed — in works on Wieland, in the remarks of his contemporaries and not least by Wieland himself — that his was the sort of intellect which thrived on the stimulus of other writers and thinkers and their works.¹ Among his favourites there is a preponderance of ancient figures, including Socrates, Aristippus, Xenophon, Menander, Terence, Horace, and Lucian. When we find ourselves, with Wieland, in the company of one of these, or of one of the modern authors to whom he was partial, such as Erasmus, there is a remarkable feeling of close solidarity transcending historical distance, while at the same time remaining conscious of that distance. This is naturally all the more remarkable in the case of ancient writers, in whom we are most interested here. So many of his works are a tissue of anachronisms that Wieland's attitude towards history and his hermeneutical stance will need to be more fully discussed later.

The commentary to his Horace translations alone furnishes ample evidence of the breadth of Wieland's familiarity with the Classical world and of his competence as a philologist.² This combination in Wieland of receptivity to, or perhaps even assimilation of, the spirit inhabiting the works of others, and his thorough and dedicated devotion to the Classics, produced in him a talent for presenting ancient figures sympathetically.³ This talent includes a particular type of expertise in cross referencing, so that he not only sees the Socratic in Horace, but the Horatian in Erasmus, the Rococo potential in Lucian (in the *Göttergespräche* and *Comische Erzählungen*), the framework for 'ein moralisches Gedicht' in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, and Democritus as a citizen of Biberach. (Biberach is, of course, the town he satirizes in *Geschichte der Abderiten*.) This practice is not restricted to the actual placing of an ancient figure in an anachronistic setting; Wieland also freely quotes from his favourite writers in the most varied contexts.

Monecke was surely right to observe that Horace's was a continuous presence in Wieland's work, with different aspects coming to the fore at different points, whereas other writers marked definite stages in Wieland's development:

Horaz ist für Wieland ein seit frühester Jugend vertrauter Besitz [...] Was Horaz für Wielands Entwicklung bedeutet hat, ist darum nicht weniger fest zu greifen als bei anderen Autoren, die ihm später begegneten. (Monecke, p. 3)

Monecke describes the threads which bind Wieland to Horace as being so fine as to be almost undetectable while, taken together, they form a compact, thick weave. It is this elusive presence of elements in the Horatian spirit which interests Monecke in his first chapter. As Wieland's own style developed, so the various sides to Horace's *persona* had a stronger or weaker appeal for him. Whether Wieland was writing a moral poem or a philosophical novel, or was in didactic, cynical or humorous mood, one could sense his kinship with Horace. Typical of Monecke's study is his sensitivity to Horace's presence, even amongst the sparse findings of his reading of Wieland's *Theorie und Geschichte der Red-Kunst und Dicht-Kunst* (1757):

An dieser versteckten Stelle sieht man, wenn auch undeutlich, jene Züge sich abzeichnen, die für viele Werke Wielands und insbesondere die Horaz-Übersetzung charakteristisch sind. (Monecke, p. 15)

Whereas Monecke's sensors are trained on the overall Horatian 'feeling' of the respective works, we shall be examining more concrete and explicit evidence in the form of allusions, epigraphs, calques and, of course, the imitation of individual features of Horace's poetic forms in the epistle and the dialogue.

Schulheft (1748)

The prose translation of a passage from the *Ars Poetica*, which Wieland wrote as a schoolboy, already shows signs of his ability to translate Horace into German without losing the easy intimacy of a personal letter (*Jugendwerke*, pp. 679–81). The epistle opens with a question, addressed to the Pisones, with the verb in the second person plural: 'teneatis'. The young Wieland chooses the first person plural to translate this: 'Würden wir nicht', and, in doing so, sets a friendly tone, drawing the reader in from the start. Nowhere in this passage does the German style suffer from an excessive desire to be faithful to the Latin. We find, for example, 'sed nunc non erat his locus' (line 19) translated in a very natural, easy way: 'Ja freilich, da ist alles gut; es schickt sich nur nicht hierher.'

There are other signs of confidence in this youthful version: short phrases are inserted for the purposes of clarification. Doell admires this promising feature:

Ungeachtet mancher Mangel bleibt der Uebersetzung der Vorzug einer gut erfassten Interpretation; dieses zeigt sich besonders an den Uebergängen, worauf, wie auch in den Uebersetzungen der späteren Zeit, zur Wahrung des Zusammenhangs und zur Erleichterung des Verständnisses großes Gewicht gelegt wird.⁴

The opening line contains the first example of an explanatory insertion, an aspect which we shall come to know well on examining the later translations. The young Wieland starts with an interpreted rather than a directly translated

line: 'Würden wir nicht, ihr Pisonen, die Abgeschmackte Erfindung eines Malers belachen [...]'. There is nothing in the Latin to correspond to 'abgeschmackte Erfindung', but the elaboration is helpful and does not jar. Sometimes, however, this sort of insertion is ill-judged. The Latin lines (12–13),

sed non ut placidis coeant immitia, non ut
serpentes avibus gementur, tigribus agni [...]

speak first of the qualities 'mild' and 'savage', and then of the pairs of animals which embody them, serpents and birds, tigers and lambs. The young Wieland changes the emotional qualities to sensual ones, 'saures und süßes', thus forfeiting the poetic logic and spoiling the unity. He has preferred to use a handy turn of phrase in order to underline the advice against combining disparate elements:

[...] aber der Trieb zum neuen und seltenen muß nicht so hoch getrieben werden, daß man saures und süßes zusammenseze, Schlangen mit Nachtigallen vermische, und die Schafe mit den Tigern zusammenkuple.

The older Wieland omits the qualities specified by Horace entirely, but clarifies the point in a straightforward way, more suited to Horace's succinct style:

— Nur nicht, daß man paare,
was unverträglich ist, nicht Schlang' und Vogel,
nicht Lamm und Tiger in einander menge! (*Fuhrmann*, p. 509)

On the whole, the young Wieland appears to concentrate on the function of the *Ars Poetica* as a handbook. Accordingly, he suppresses the direct speech of the imaginary interlocutor of Horace's lines 9–10:

— 'Pictoribus atque poetis
quidlibet audendi semper fuit aequa potestas.'

Wieland replaces this direct speech with a more prescriptive tone: 'Es ist zwar an dem, daß Malern und Poeten in den kühnsten Erfindungen keine Grenzen gesetzt sind.' He has failed to appreciate Horace's gift for lively dialogue which was to impress him so favourably in later years. The later version, as we would expect, restores this animation:

'Wie? Ist den Malern und Poeten nicht
von jeher freigestanden, alles, was sie wollen,
zu wagen?' (*Fuhrmann*, p. 508f.)

A curious omission from the youthful version occurs among Horace's examples of 'purple patches' which a poet might insert, but which would be out of place in the context. The poet might suddenly provide a description of the River Rhine, 'flumen Rhenum', says Horace. The young Wieland, feeling perhaps that for his own German setting the Rhine is an unfortunately domestic choice and would fail to exemplify the exotic quality of a purple patch, omits all mention of it. Here he shows something of the percipient and sensitive nature of the translator

he was to become.⁵ Notwithstanding, the later version confronts this problem by extending the Latin reference, which is, after all, a bare mention, by describing the Rhine as a very domestic figure indeed:

und Vater Rhein auf seiner Urne liegend,
gar prächtig hingepinselt; [...] (*Fuhrmann*, p. 509)

Although no longer an exotic image, this portrait has been made to seem out of place by the manner in which it is presented: Wieland has turned it into an elaborate allegorization which would not appeal to the climate of the German Enlightenment.

Of considerable interest is the image of the vessel which begins as a wine jar but, by the time the artist has completed his work, has acquired a different size and shape:⁶

[...] Amphora coepit
institutui, currente rota cur urceus exit? (lines 21–22)

Wieland's youthful version runs: 'Man fangt [*sic*] an einen Eimer zu treiben, und am Ende kommt [*sic*] ein Suppentopf heraus.' The particularity of the process described by 'currente rota' has apparently not attracted him, but the verb 'exit' is translated into a comfortable, natural idiom, and the point of Horace's rhetorical question has not been lost, although the interrogative element has disappeared. The older Wieland restores the detail of the potter's wheel:

Du fingest eine prächt'ge Vase an
zu drehn, und da die Scheibe abläuft, kommt
ein halber Topf heraus! (*Fuhrmann*, p. 509f.)

He has also made a more vivid contrast between the two artefacts, not only in the choice of vocabulary to translate the objects themselves, but also by inserting the adjective 'prächtig' and the colloquial 'ein halber'.

'Agathon'

This passage leads us into a discussion of another manifestation of Wieland's relationship with Horace. W. Daniel Wilson has analysed the use of the passage discussed above to bolster two different positions which Wieland takes as 'editor' of *Agathon* in the 1766–67 and 1794 versions.⁷ In the earlier version, Wieland as editor quotes Horace's lines and rejects them; Wieland distances himself from 'the Greek author's' desire for unity, but by 1794, the novel has been extended and the same Horatian precept is again called into play, this time to justify the more complete conclusion to the novel. The situation is, of course, complicated because Wieland enjoys playing both roles, author and editor, and with typical Horatian humour, advocates a position which he will afterwards playfully dismiss. A Horatian touch is certainly in evidence, but it does not lie in simple adherence to Horace's aesthetic precept. The ironic retreat from a

position Wieland earlier advocated is typical of Horace as well. This habit of using Horace as a spokesman and then changing the tone or emphasis to suit his own purposes — which may only have a tenuous connection with Horace's — constitutes Wieland's method in *Agathon*.

The Horatian epigraph to the novel, '— quid Virtus, et quid Sapientia possit / Utile proposuit nobis exemplar. —' comes from Horace's *Epistles* 1.2, line 17f. Horace has been rereading Homer and is recommending that his correspondent, Maximus Lollius, do the same. It is the figure of Ulysses which offers an example of what can be achieved by wisdom and virtue. Horace speaks of the benefits to be derived from a study of the Greek poets, a recurring theme of his. Wieland, whose novel is presented as a palimpsest of an ancient Greek fragment, follows Horace's example in turning back to ancient Greece for his inspiration. But for his reader, Wieland recommends reading *Agathon* and judging this latter-day 'hero' by juxtaposing him with the epic hero. There is doubtless also a degree of serious intent here, since the novel is concerned with moral questions, but there is certainly an ironic ingredient detectable in the bathos of juxtaposing Homer's Ulysses and Wieland's *Agathon*.

All mentions of Horace in *Agathon* presuppose an erudite reader who has no need to be given line references to the original. This reader will also derive enjoyment from recognizing the passage, sometimes from the scantiest of hints, and will appreciate the new slant offered by the context. In *Agathon* I. 5, a figure is described in the following terms:

[...] in der Tat hatte er in seiner Gesichtsbildung [...] etwas so jungfräuliches, daß er, gleich dem schönen Liebling des Horaz, in weiblicher Kleidung unter seiner Schar von Mädchen gemischt, gar leicht das Auge des schärfsten Kenners betrogen haben würde.⁸

The reference here is to *Odes* 2. 5, and its point is twofold. It gives the superficial appearance of granting respectability and validity to the narrative, a function we have already encountered in our survey of the Horatian tag. Two features undermine this function: first, *Agathon* belongs to Socrates's rather than Horace's world, so that reliance on Horace becomes rather absurd. This is Wieland under Sterne's influence, giving the lie to his own narrative artifice.⁹ Secondly, we also find, on examining the Latin, that, while some features have been paraphrased rather accurately, significant extra detail has also been added. Horace's lines read as follows:

Quem si puellarum insereres choro,
Mire sagaces falleret hospites
Discrimen obscurum, solutis
Crinibus ambiguoque vultu.

'Sagaces' is nicely translated as 'schärfsten Kenner'; 'falleret' becomes 'betrogen haben würde', with complete accuracy, and the meaning of the phrase 'ambiguoque vultu', although not exactly translated, is not missing from

Wieland's description. The most telling extra detail is provided by the narrator imagining the figure in women's clothing; this heralds the revelation that the slave-boy is indeed a girl, Psyche. Wieland has used an idea from Horace and then cancelled its impact entirely; this reversal demonstrates a familiarity with Horace, on such a sure footing, that Wieland can make unrestricted use of Horace's imagery for his own comic purposes, in the confidence that his readers will be adequately prepared for this.

In *Agathon* IX. 4, part of a short phrase from Horace is quoted in the original, the remainder being given in German. Wieland is being critical of Plato:

[. . .] er bewies durch sein Exempel, daß keine Leute mehr durch den Schein der Dinge hindergangen werden, als eben diejenige welche ihr ganzes Leben damit zubringen, *inter Sylvas Academi* dem *was wahrhaftig ist* nachzuspähen. (*Manger*, p. 382)

Horace is talking of his education in *Epistles* 2. 2, line 44f.:

scilicet ut possem curvo dignoscere rectum,
atque inter silvas Academi quaerere verum.

His tone is mildly self-mocking when speaking of his philosophical achievements; Horace leaves us with the impression that his search for the truth was somewhat directionless while it was being conducted within the woods of the Academy. Wieland has heightened this irony and extended it in order to show the weakness of otherworldly philosophers like Plato. As in the previous examples, Wieland is not simply throwing in a tag to show off his learning; he detects an ironic flavour in the original and makes a genuine association in developing it to suit his own purposes.

The structure of *Agathon* involves the original Greek manuscript and the narrative supposedly based on it; we are already being asked to think on two historical levels. When Horace is called upon as well, an anachronistic situation has been set up, whichever way we look at it. Horace's entrances are either for comic effect or they are used to provide instances of a situation resembling the one being related in the novel. This three-way perspective involving historical distance is very common in Wieland's works even where there is no narrative artifice, as for example in the poem *Musarion*.

'*Musarion*'

Musarion is a smaller, less ambitious and more complete work than *Agathon*. It is also considerably lighter in tone, a feature brought about by the confident style, which includes variety in the length of lines and in rhyme patterns, while plentiful enjambement makes for fluent readability. Wieland writes in the Rococo mode but his comic interventions undermine the values which the Anacreontics, in particular, extolled in a consciously artificial way.⁹ The description of *Musarion*'s appearance before Phantias, for example, makes use of the conventional rosy-cheeked image, but cancels the topos by making it into a

negative. This draws attention to the fact that it is a stock phrase, lacking in originality:

Gefallend, wenn sie schwieg, bezaubernd, wenn sie sprach:
Dann hätt' ihr Witz auch Wangen ohne Rosen
Beliebt gemacht; [. . .] (lines 150–52)

Musarion is physically attractive, but her intellect is still more highly praised; this sets her apart from the conventional heroine.

The central idea of the poem, the principle of moderation, or the golden mean, ties in very directly with the ancient world, especially with Horace.¹⁰ Wieland's predilection for anachronistic elements can be seen at work again: the characters and their setting belong to ancient Greece, but the narrator feels free to make several references to Horace. Indeed, despite the ostensibly Greek setting, *Musarion* does not seem to be firmly anchored in any one particular society, and references to both Greek and Roman figures abound.¹¹ As moderation is the principle behind both the form and the content in this poem, any earnest or extreme positions must be counterbalanced or undermined. Even Horace, himself a chief exponent of this principle, is teasingly taken to task:

Schön, süß sogar — zum mindesten singet so
Ein Dichter, der zwar selbst bey dem ersten Anlaß floh, —
Süß ist's, und ehrenvoll fürs Vaterland zu sterben, [. . .] (lines 87–89)

The praise of heroism becomes ironic in the observation that Horace's actions on the battlefield did not match his patriotic sentence in *Odes* 3. 2, line 13: 'Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori'. The generally frivolous nature of the story and the characters already provides a contrast, so that references to Horace are bound not to appear learned but playful. This does not mean that the reader can afford to ignore their import, however.¹²

This literary convention (of inapposite quotations from Classical authors) is even more clearly mocked in the playful letter to Weisse which appears as a preface ('An Herrn Creyßsteuereinnnehmer Weisse in Leipzig):

[. . .] daß ich erfreut bin, meine Absicht nicht verfehlt, und nach so vielen allzu unvollkommenen Versuchen endlich etwas hervorgebracht zu haben, dem ich Leben genug zutrauen darf, um alsdann noch zu seyn, wenn wir gekommen seyn werden, quo pius Aeneas, quo Tullus dives et Ancus.

A very simple concept becomes a riddle for the reader who knows his Horace. The reference in *Odes* 4. 7 is to the finality of death. But Wieland is not making any profound statement about life and death; he simply uses the phrase instead of a more straightforward one: he hopes that *Musarion* will still be read 'after we are dead'. Into the bargain, Wieland is making fun of grandiose works laden with solemn and weighty quotations from the Ancients, where a simple phrase would have done. The context here shows the notable heroes in the quotation to be a glorious irrelevance, and the whole device an elaborate euphemism. The

stage has now been set for *Musarion*: the reader has received the message that this is not to be a work of baroque sententiousness.¹³

In some instances, when Wieland either cites or refers to Horace, one has the impression that a passage in Horace has simply sprung to mind (where the circumstances are akin to those Wieland wishes to describe), and this releases Wieland from the task of providing his own imagery. Once again, we have the impression that Wieland adopts Horace's idiom as a matter of course: Horace is introduced in such a natural way that we, the readers, are not aware of any historical discrepancy. Rather than choosing a parallel from day-to-day life for his comparison, Wieland cites or refers to the Roman poet who is, for him, an ever-present and familiar source of inspiration.¹⁴ In speaking of Kleanth, Wieland says:

Ihm hängt, wie dort Horaz, dem tragen
Lastbaren Thiere gleich, sein Lehrling, weil er muß
Verzweiflungsvoll ein schläfrig Ohr entgegen, [. . .] (lines 1045–47)

This particular reminder of an incident in Horace's *Satires* 1. 9 ('Demitto auriculas [. . .]') does not contribute anything to the struggle to establish moderation and equilibrium, but is a quick comic intervention which reminds us of Horace's presence.

We are far removed from the baroque world of showy and formal recourse to the ancient poets. Wieland chooses a tone which makes it easier for his reader to derive pleasure than to experience awe at his erudition. It is Wieland's special gift to be able to turn to his favourite writers without confronting his readers with a show of learning for its own sake.

Wieland later added footnotes to the poem (*Musarion* is given its authoritative form in Volume IX of Wieland's *Sämmtliche Werke*, 'Ausgabe letzter Hand', 1795), in which he explains some of the references and gives their sources. But even without this aid, the reader can quite easily understand the Horatian point from within the context of the poem. Wieland's narrative technique, charged as it is with concern that the reader should be on an equal footing with him, is most often discussed with reference to his novels, but is of great importance here as well. Even a reader who knew nothing of Horace's legendary neighbour (*Satires* 2. 6) or of his Sabine life would grasp from the idyllic circumstances conjured up in the following lines from *Musarion*, that this neighbour was to be seen as a sympathetic person:

Wo, zu der Freundin Kuß, der Saft der Purpurtraube,
Den Thasos schickt, ihm wahrer Nektar däucht;
Ein Nachbar, der Horazens Nachbar gleicht,
Gesundes Blut, ein unbewölkt Gehirne, [. . .] (lines 1392–95)

The lighthearted spirit of the work determines that, in contrast to the situation in *Agathon*, it is somewhat less important in *Musarion* for the reader to be familiar

with the context from which the quotation comes. The epigraph to *Agathon* (see p. 41 above) is considerably more instructive if the reader is aware that, in the original poem, Horace is extolling the benefits to be derived from reading Homer. But the prefatory letter in *Musarion*, for example, is simply concerned with exhibiting a Latin calque, the particular details of which are of little importance. Wieland identifies Horace as his source more often here than he does in *Agathon* and he does so, not to guarantee the argument's validity, but to ensure the reader's enjoyment is not marred by obscurities or arcane features.¹⁵

'*Moralische Briefe*' (1752)

Musarion is a work which does not imitate any of the Horatian forms and it contains only a small helping of actual references to Horace. None of these is a quotation in the original Latin, except the line which appears in the prefatory letter (see p. 43 above). These features contrast sharply with those of the earlier work, *Zwölf Moralische Briefe in Versen* (1752). Where the light and flexible style and the Horatian moral of *Musarion* are a successful tribute to the Roman poet, this earlier attempt at formal imitation, hexametrical and epistolary, falls short of its aim, as Wieland himself acknowledged in a preface to the much later final edition of 1798:

Man merkt es, besonders an den vordersten Briefen, noch stark, daß die Alexandrinische Versart und der Reim für den Geist des jungen Dichters Fesseln sind, die er, mit guter Art zu tragen, noch nicht Geduld und Geschmeidigkeit genug hat [. . .]¹⁶

The didactic tone of the poems owes something to the *Lehrgedicht* as practised by Haller and Gellert. The avowed model is the *Epîtres Diverses* of Georg Ludwig von Bar, but the Horatian epistle is clearly at the forefront of Wieland's mind: three of the *Briefe* carry epigraphs from Horace, but Wieland gathers his moral examples from all corners. The poems are peopled with figures, real and fictional, from both the ancient and modern worlds as we see from the following lines, in which Gottsched is disguised as Stentor:

Ist Stentor nicht ein Sklav, der Bodmers Trefflichkeit
Mit beiden Augen sieht, und doch aus Neid verschreyt?

Schreib göttlich wie Horaz, find auf der Alten Spur
Mit Hagedorns Gefühl die reizende Natur;
Bist du sein Schüler nicht, er wird gebietrisch tadeln,
Nur seine Jüngerschaft kann matte Reime adeln! (*Brief* 8)

Here, in the midst of coded adverse commentary on his peers, Wieland throws up the names of Horace and his disciple Hagedorn, urging the reader to choose them as models. Once again, the tableau presents a confusion of different historical milieux. The second *Brief* is positively laden with references to Horace:

Im Vorurtheil berauscht und in Falerner-Wein,
Wälzt sich dort Nomentan, ein epikurisch Schwein.

Wär ohne Vorurtheil Thrax ein Papinian?
Pantil so liederreich, und Jourdain Edelmann? (*Brief 2*)

These four lines (with two lines in the middle excerpted!) give just a passing indication of Wieland's amazing eclecticism — not only as regards Horace, but also modern sources. Our particular interest in this passage is the way in which a character who appears in the *Satires* could be drawn into the Epicurean pigsty of *Epistles* 1.4. Horace had ended that epistle by referring to himself in an amusing and ironic way. Here Wieland has diluted the original image of a pig from Epicurus's sty to make it serious and straightfaced; later, as translator of the *Epistles*, Wieland took the irony a step further, adding a pejorative adjective: 'aus Epikurs verschrienem Stalle' (*Fuhrmann*, p. 102; my emphasis).

The superabundance of outside references (in the *Moralische Briefe*) to a most impressive display of works from the whole of literary history is doubtless a sign of the young Wieland's insecurity. For all his criticisms of contemporary champions like Gottsched, Wieland's lack of confidence shows through. Experience, in his later works, brings with it the desire to entertain the reader more than these poems do. Here we wade through recondite verses, whereas in *Musarion* we are able to trip along at a much lighter pace. Partly this is due to the difference in metre. Although a less ambitious imitation of ancient metre than those we encounter in Klopstock and Voss, the rhyming Alexandrines (of the *Briefe*) do not handle with the lightness required for an imitation of Horace. If we turn to Hagedorn's *Horaz* again and remember that Hagedorn was complimented in Wieland's seventh *Brief*, we find a poem similarly bulging with Horatian figures and situations (from the *Satires* and *Epistles*), and one that is roughly contemporary with Wieland's *Moralische Briefe*.¹⁷ But Hagedorn has been less ambitious: he has not tried to reproduce Horace's hexameter, neither has he encumbered his poem with frequent allusions to other works. Wieland, by contrast, has not yet perfected his allegiance to Horace's tenet 'ars est celare artem' as he will later do; he has laboured hard at these poems and it shows.¹⁸

The epistolary device of the *Moralische Briefe* is to address them to 'eine Freundin', variously referred to as Doris or Diotima, and in whom we are presumably to envisage Sophie Gutermann (later to become the famous Sophie von La Roche). This adds a dimension of personal appeal to the predominantly moral tone:

O Freundin, der den Werth der Dinge richtig schätzet,
Und den nicht jeder Glanz gleich in Erstaunen setzet.
Gleichgültig, wenn ein Geck von Wunderdingen spricht,
Lobt er was Lob verdient, doch er bewundert nicht.

This fifth *Brief*, which carries an epigraph from the opening of Horace's *Epistles* 1.6, is clearly an adaptation of the theme of that epistle: not to be distracted by the glitter of false gold. This addressee, unlike Horace's, is not personally in need of moral instruction; her presence has a softening effect of benefit to the reader. Wieland is most successful in imitating the atmosphere in Horace's poems where he is least ambitious, as in these lines from the eighth *Brief*, which is also introduced by an epigraph from *Epistles* 1.6:

Den Pöbel wundert dieß. Ich bin nicht groß, nicht reich,
Ein jeder Erdensohn ist mir an Stande gleich,
Kein König weiß von mir, auch bin ich überhoben
Mecänen und August, wie mein Horaz, zu loben; [...]

The expression 'der Pöbel' evokes the ancient Roman social structure and does not really apply to Wieland's German situation. He has adopted the same technique as Hagedorn here by briefly entering Horace's world. The modest sentiments and especially the reference to social standing are also reminiscent of Horace.¹⁹ Hagedorn's affection for Horace is echoed in Wieland's possessive: 'mein Horaz'. The illusion comes to an end with the observation that, unlike Horace, Wieland is not required to write poems in praise of patrons; however, by mentioning this single difference, he implies similarity between himself and Horace in other respects, thus casting aside his modesty with a stroke characteristic of Horace himself.

The *Moralische Briefe* have their genuine Horatian moments, as we have seen, but on the whole their weakness is that of a young poet anxious to show his learning and to shake off the yoke binding him to the style of great poets of his day. That Horace was his true model is clear from Wieland's 'Vorbericht' to the third edition of 1770:

Wenn Gedichte dieser Art leisten sollen was man von ihnen zu fordern berechtigt ist, so muß ein reifer und durch Erfahrung gebildeter Verstand, ein gereinigter Geschmack, Kenntniß der Welt, tiefe Einsicht in die moralischen Dinge, Feinheit des Witzes, und die Gabe des sanften Sokratischen Spottes, der durch Nachsicht und Gefälligkeit gemildert wird; kurz, so müssen die Eigenschaften, die den Philosophen und den Weltmann ausmachen, mit den Talenten der Dichtkunst in ihrem Verfasser vereinigt seyn; d. i. man muß ein Horaz seyn, um poetische Briefe zu schreiben, wie Horaz.²⁰

'Briefe an einen jungen Dichter'

With the *Moralische Briefe*, we have moved on from the discussion of works which display echoes or insights from Horace within a non-Horatian form or dramatic setting (*Agathon*, *Musarion*) to works which are more definitely inspired, in a formal way, by Horace. Horace's *Epistles* could conceivably be regarded as the model for both the *Moralische Briefe* and the much later *Briefe an einen jungen Dichter* — and yet these two works differ vastly. Despite their common ground, they are markedly unlike in tone, technique, message, and

content, while one is in verse and the other in prose. If we were to ask the question which will concern us in the next chapter, which of the two works is the more original, and which displays signs of being more heavily influenced, we would be bound to point to the later work as the more relaxed, as the one which is freer from what has been called 'the anxiety of influence'.²¹

These three essays (1782–84) on literary matters, letters presenting themselves as advice to a young poet, inevitably call to mind the *Epistula ad Pisones* (the third of the three lengthy poems which comprise the second book of Horace's *Epistles*). Nevertheless, one could equally well classify the *Briefe an einen jungen Dichter* alongside essays by Herder, Lessing, Schiller, or Goethe which treat of similar themes and share the contemporary interests of the German literary world. The main reason for this is that these essays are not fiction: there is no dramatic setting beyond the creation of the young poet with whom Wieland is purportedly corresponding.²² We are not transplanted to another historical milieu or even to an ahistorical one or one which moves between a number of different historical periods — all these situations can be encountered in Wieland's various works of fiction. We are firmly rooted in the present and circumstances have changed from those pertaining in Horace's day: 'Zu Horazens Zeiten war die Poesie, zufälligerweise, der Weg eine Art von Glück zu machen [. . .] Bei uns, fürchte ich, ist's just umgekehrt [. . .]'. But the argument is not confined to the present: 'Vielleicht erleben Sie eine glücklichere Zeit für die deutschen Musen' (*Martini/Seiffert*, III, 445). It is not a narrator speaking, but Wieland himself responding to an appeal for advice, which, although it was of his own creation, accurately reflected numerous actual requests he did receive from young aspirants.²³

Like Horace's *Ars Poetica*, this is a work occasioned by an established poet being approached for advice beneficial to a younger one. Both Horace and Wieland also intended a wider circulation for these epistles.²⁴ Indeed Wieland, acting as editor of the *Teutscher Merkur*, even incorporates the announcement of a translation competition, with prize, into the text of the *Briefe*. And yet, parallels with Horace's *Epistula ad Pisones* are confined to general matters, such as the concentration on drama and on the refining of language. In fact, Wieland's interpretation of this *Epistula*, as a document designed more to discourage than to promote poetic aspirations, does not find its reflection in his own advice to the young German poet.²⁵

Wieland's translations of Horace belong to the same years in which these *Briefe* were composed, and it is thus not surprising that we should find references to various Horatian poems. The *Ars Poetica*, however, is strikingly under-represented;²⁶ by contrast, Horace's *Epistles* 2.2 makes several appearances in the *Erster Brief*. Wieland offers a free paraphrase of the passage in this epistle, where Horace speaks of the suffering caused by being a celebrated poet, caught up in the life of the court: Horace wished for enough peace of mind just to allow

him to sleep, let alone to write poetry. Displaying a slight touch of ironic modesty, Wieland continues with a barely disguised recommendation of his own commentary on this epistle and on *Epistles* 1.19:

Lesen Sie, mein Lieber, was dieser liebenswürdige Dichter, [...] an vielen Stellen seiner Briefe, besonders im Neunzehnten an Mäcen und im Zweiten an Julius Florus, von den Ungemächlichkeiten und Drangsalen des Poetischen Berufs sagt; und lesen Sie, wenn Sie wollen, auch die Zusätze seines neuesten Commentators [...] (*Martini/Seiffert*, III, 440)

The suggestion to consult Wieland's own commentary is interesting in that the commentary reveals a real similarity of style with that of the *Briefe*. This is somewhat surprising because the commentary is tied to the lines in the poem which require elucidation, whereas the *Briefe* are free to elaborate on a loose theme. But Wieland, as commentator, eschews scholarship for its own sake and is motivated by the same popularizing tendencies as ruled his work for the *Teutscher Merkur*. And Wieland, as essayist, speaking primarily of his own experience in establishing a literary career, is inevitably drawn to mention the situations in Horace's life which he recognized as parallel to his own. Accordingly, similar expressions occur in the *Erster Brief* and in the commentary to *Epistles* 2.2. Under the pressures resulting from renown, Horace needed to escape and rest; Wieland discusses this, first, in the *Briefe*: 'der H-r sollte ihn holen, wenn er seine Zeit nicht lieber verschlafen als Verse machen wollte' (*ibid.*). And then in the commentary:

[...] daß er nunmehr, da er habe, was er brauche, der unheilbarste aller Narren sein müßte, wenn er nicht lieber seine Zeit verschlafen, als aufs Versmachen anwenden wollte. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 471)

These are both close paraphrases of the Latin original,²⁷ but they are not identical. The *Briefe* are not, in their Horatian passages, a recycling of the commentary; Wieland is not plagiarizing himself — each time, he relives the sentiment afresh.

The references are by no means confined to passages where Horace speaks of his life as a poet. For instance, there is a quotation from *Epistles* 1.18 (erroneously identified by Wieland in his footnote as being from *Epistles* 1.12). Wieland is warning his correspondent about the consequences of his possessing poetic talent; he will no longer be left alone to enjoy the simple pleasures:

Der unbemerkte schmale Pfad durchs Leben
der ewige Wunsch aller Seelen die zum stillen Genuß der Natur und zum Leben mit ihren
eigenen Ideen geboren sind, wird für Sie der Baum des Tantalus werden.²⁸

The original context is not the life of the poet at all; it is advice on how to live with the great. Wieland has simply assimilated the image and used it in a new setting. He does not go to the *Ars Poetica* for material, but gives new functions to images which spring to his mind. Again, when speaking of the qualities of a poetic work, he cites Horace: 'Wenn ein Poetisches Werk, neben allen andern

wesentlichen Eigenschaften eines guten Gedichtes, das ist was Horaz totum teres atque rotundum nennt [...]’ (*Martini/Seiffert*, III, 441f.). This phrase comes from *Satires* 2.7, line 86, and is a description of the Stoic philosopher’s equilibrium and his freedom from external circumstances. Wieland’s appropriation of this phrase is creative reinterpretation: in no way derivative, it constitutes a homage to Horace’s way with words. We would naturally think here of the important opening theme of the *Ars Poetica*, in which the necessity to make the parts form a whole and unified work of art is stressed at some length. But Wieland does not choose this passage to paraphrase, instead, he gives his readers a surprise by adopting a phrase from quite a different context.

As so often, Wieland does not translate the Latin phrase he quotes, but trusts that his reader is sufficiently familiar with Horace to be able both to read it with comprehension, and to recognize that the phrase has been re-employed to fit into a different context. And the remainder of this paragraph is full of concealed, possibly even unconscious, allusions to Horace’s aesthetic principles. Even when Wieland speaks of the art of rhyme, which was obviously not one of Horace’s interests, he emphasizes the necessity to be subtle, and the reader who is familiar with Horace is reminded again of the Horatian *ars est celare artem*:

wenn [...] der Reim sich immer von selbst, und ohne daß man ihn kommen sah, an seinen Ort gestellt hat; [...] so kann man sich sicher darauf verlassen, daß es dem Dichter, wie groß auch sein Talent sein mag, unendliche Mühe gekostet hat. (*Martini/Seiffert*, III, 442)

And Wieland says that ‘der Ausdruck’ must be ‘angemessen’, just as Horace in the *Ars Poetica* had opposed displays of the poet’s virtuosity inappropriate to a given context.

An echo of the opening theme in the *Ars Poetica* can be heard in ‘Alles wie mit Einem Guß gegossen, oder mit Einem Hauch geblasen [...]’ (*ibid.*). Further on, Wieland speaks of ‘Glätte und Rundung’, which is in fact a translation of ‘teres atque rotundum’ which he had quoted earlier. Finally, the prediction of the poet’s poor treatment at the hands of the general public is imbued with Horace’s experiences.²⁹ Wieland’s ‘Haufe’, like Horace’s ‘plebs’, is quite ignorant of the effort which lies behind a subtle and modest style. Wieland will go on to quote Horace’s dismissive attitude towards critics in *Epistle* 19: ‘Non ego ventosae plebis suffragia venor, &c.’ (*Martini/Seiffert*, III, 444); putting this into contemporary terms, he stresses the benefit to a poet’s career of belonging to a clique and gathering a group of supporters around him, who will defend him against his patron’s expressions of disapproval. Wieland is ironically and cynically recommending a course of action which Horace himself rejected; consequently, Horace had to forfeit the universal acclaim he might otherwise have enjoyed. Even when Horace is not being cited directly, his presence is discernible in Wieland’s phrasing, themes and points of view. Wieland is careful not to erase the differences between conditions for establishing a poetic career in

Horace's time and in his own (see p. 37 above). In general, Horace's advice should be heeded, but with the proviso that altered circumstances of the eighteenth century must be taken into account.

It is not always to Wieland himself that the quotation from Horace is made to apply, despite the great affinity which Wieland felt for the Roman poet. In the *Zweiter Brief*, Horace is quoted, in Latin, on the foibles of old age, and Wieland uses the lines to comment on Bodmer. In a footnote, Wieland provides his own translation, complete with page reference:

Schwer zu befried'gen, hat er immer was
zu klagen, ist der ew'ge Leichenredner [. . .]

This translates:

difficilis, querulus, laudator temporis acti [. . .]
(*Martini/Seiffert*, III, 464)

Incidentally, the translation was to become more polished:

verdrießlich, übeltrauend, hat er immer was
zu klagen, ist der ew'ge Leichenredner [. . .] (*Fuhrmann*, p. 526)

This later version, from Wieland's published translations, is formally closer to the Latin in that it employs two adjectives corresponding to the Latin ones in the first line. The provision of a page reference to his own translations suggests that one of Wieland's purposes may have been to boost his sales through advertising!

The *Dritter Brief* is mostly concerned with contemporary drama and thus involves Horace less. There is one passage about imitation, which incorporates a well-known Horatian tag (*servum pecus*):

Das Vorbild mag ein Shakespear oder ein Corneille, ein Raphael oder ein Rembrand sein, wenn derjenige, der sich nach ihm bilden will, ein *servum pecus* oder ein Affe ist, so kann nichts Taugliches herauskommen. (*Martini/Seiffert*, III, 471)

In this instance, Wieland's employment of Horace is less than successful, because 'derjenige', a singular pronoun, sits uneasily (syntactically speaking) next to '*servum pecus*', a collective singular.

This third, and later, epistle is of less interest for a study of the Horatian presence in Wieland's works, but it is evidently the basis for the high regard in which the *Briefe* are held, and for their contribution to the history of German literature. Sengle, for example, makes particular mention of drama:

Die 'Briefe an einen jungen Dichter' gehören trotz ihrer Schlichtheit zu den wichtigsten Marksteinen der deutschen Literaturgeschichte und veranschaulichen, wie bruchlos die humoristisch-epische Klassik in die dramatisch-tragische Goethes und Schillers hinüberglitt. (*Sengle*, p. 380)

Hermann Müller-Solger tells us that it is seen by many as Wieland's 'poetologisches Vermächtnis'³⁰ and Meessen calls it 'a major document of German literary history'.³¹ And yet, despite the paucity of explicit references to Horace's

Ars Poetica in this *Dritter Brief*, we can point to a parallel interest: Horace too sets a great store by the discussion of drama, although he himself wrote nothing for the stage. As Fuhrmann notes:

Horaz hat die Beschränkung auf das Drama von langer Hand vorbereitet: dem Drama entnahm er meist seine Beispiele, und für das Publikum diente der Zuschauer im Theater als bildhaftes Modell.³²

During the break which separated the first two *Briefe* from the third, Wieland had published his Horace translations. The *Dritter Brief*, perhaps as a consequence of the intervening period and the intense work on Horace which filled it, is quite different from the first. The pretence of addressing an interlocutor and the personal, epistolary style have all but disappeared; Wieland now turns to a discussion of the contemporary German stage and compares it with foreign classics. The initial respect for the French classics soon turned to scorn in those who despaired of creating their equal in German, just as inept imitations of Shakespeare have done more harm than good for the development of German drama. Wieland speaks of 'unverständige Nachahmungen Shakespears' and 'schülerhaften Übersetzungen und Nachahmungen französischer Muster' (*Martini/Seiffert*, III, 469). This is another interest which Wieland shares with Horace: the desire to differentiate unacceptable imitation from the kind which honours the original by making it sound natural in its translated form. We shall have more to say on this topic in the next chapter. Meanwhile, to borrow a musical term, these three *Briefe*, as they relate to Horace, can be styled a 'contrafacture' (Charles Wright, p. 18): they take up some of the Horatian themes, but the resemblance in form is only superficial.

We have looked at a few works in which Horace's influence is clearly discernible, but have by no means exhausted the whole field. Wieland cites Horace as an authority, either seriously or playfully, in works as different as *Der Neue Amadis* and *Der Goldene Spiegel*. There is never any hesitation about consulting Horace in a situation or setting which is at a vast historical distance from ancient Rome, but Wieland neither ignores nor negates this distance. As we have seen, sometimes Horace is quoted in the original, and, at other times, the reader is provided with a translation accompanied by aids to interpretation or references for further reading.

Magister Ardelio

Of the Horatian genres, Wieland did not only try his hand at the epistle: several works in dialogue form are both the result of Lucian's influence and bear the marks of Wieland's fondness for Horace's *Satires* as well.³³ The *Odes*, although not imitated or translated by Wieland, appear nevertheless to have been very familiar to him, as we have already seen.³⁴ And it is the *Odes* to which Wieland turns in a brief review (1754) of an edition of Horace's works for which he gives the previous year as publication date, but which never in fact, existed at all. This

fictional edition, by 'Magister Ardelio', is purportedly prepared for the benefit of young people, and Wieland provides a number of entries from this counterfeited commentary. The points made in them are in general otiose or ridiculous, with their literalisms and anachronisms:

proprio conditur horreo etc.] was es eigentlich für Getraide gewesen, ob Waitzen oder Gersten oder Erbsen wird nicht gemeldet.

sublimi feriam sidera vertrice] Es wäre absurd wenn man dieses dem Wortverstand nach nehmen wollte, denn so hätte ja Horaz den Kopf zerschmettern, oder sich wenigstens die Haare oder *Peruque* verbrennen können. (*Jugendwerke*, p. 63f.)

Before 'quoting' these items, Wieland bestows lavish and, as it turns out, ironic, praise on the footnotes: they are so useful, clear and important that they make this edition better than all others and ought to be used as a model for subsequent commentaries. He compares them very favourably with a real biblical commentary by Herr Magister Sievers:

Ich will doch einige Anmerkungen zur Probe hersetzen, damit die Leser sehen, daß der geschickte Herr Mag. Ardelio seinen großen Vorgänger nicht nur erreicht sondern, wenn es nicht zu kühn ist zu sagen daß ein so gelehrter Mann übertroffen werden könne, es ihm manchmal gar zuvor gethan habe. (*Jugendwerke*, p. 63)

The examples which follow are for the most part anything but 'gelehrt'; the irony points to a subtle fabrication. The 'Ardelio edition' of Horace was constructed as a means of lampooning the Sievers biblical commentary. A brief report by Albert Leitzmann mentions the efforts made in the direction of identifying Magister Ardelio and then comments:

Wieland würde ins lästchen lachen, wenn er sähe, dass er noch die gelehrten einer späten nachwelt mit seiner rezension genarrt hat. Es gibt weder einen Greifswalder Horaz von 1753 noch überhaupt einen magister Ardelio [*sic*].³⁵

Wieland has evidently enjoyed himself while composing this piece of oblique satire, and it is no accident that he chose an edition of Horace, rather than of any other writer, for this purpose. Fuhrmann calls the review 'ein vergnüglicher Beweis für die ständige Nähe des Horaz'.³⁶ It is not merely a display of the fact that Horace was never far from Wieland's thoughts: Horace's expertise as satirist and his mastery of the ironic phrase render this choice even more appropriate. However, lest we should give the false impression that Horace's poems significantly outweighed works by others as the source of Wieland's inspiration, we shall now turn to the question of originality in general and Wieland's particular attitude towards it.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. This aspect of Wieland's character is variously judged and will be examined in more depth in the chapter on originality. Fritz Martini (*Deutsche Literaturgeschichte*, 18th edn (Stuttgart, 1984), p. 208) speaks impartially of '[...] seine Nähe zu einer sinnlich-anmutigen Antike, zu

- den romantischen Dichtern, zu einem romantischen Mittelalter, zu französischem Esprit [...]'. Stemplinger refers to the attack on Wieland launched by the Schlegel circle: 'Es bedurfte nicht erst der berühmigten *citatio edictalis* in Schlegels Athenäum (1799, S.340) um der gebildeten Welt kundzutun, wie sehr sich Wieland von der zeitweiligen Lektüre beeinflussen ließ [...]'. See his 'Wielands Verhältnis zu Horaz', *Euphorion*, 13 (1906), 473. Cf. also Carl Leo Cholevius, *Geschichte der deutschen Poesie nach ihren antiken Elementen* (Leipzig, 1854), p. 592; 'Wie die feinen Weltleute ihre Briefe mit französischen Phrasen schmückten, so durchflocht er seine Briefe und Abhandlungen mit Sentenzen und Phrasen der alten Schriftsteller, weil er bei seinem Sinnen und Treiben sich stets mit ihnen im Zusammenhang fühlte.' And Friedrich Gundolf, rather uncharitably, adds, 'Weil er alles was auf ihn wirkte von den Griechen bis zu den Briten nachzuahmen versuchte [...]', *Shakespeare und der deutsche Geist*, 2nd edn (Berlin, 1914), p. 161.
2. 'Wieland [...] hat [...] keine Texte ediert, allerdings hat er ernste antiquarische Forschungen betrieben, die in Gegensatz zu manchem Philologen seiner Zeit gut fundiert, sehr gründlich und auf Grund seiner großen Belesenheit durch zahllose Textstellen aus antiken Autoren belegt sind', Otto Bantel, 'Christoph Martin Wieland und die griechische Antike', p. 18.
 3. In his discussion of Wieland's Singspiel *Alceste*, Hermann Bünemann refers to this talent: 'Es ist Wielands Verdienst, die Antike aus dem Bereich der gelehrten Beschäftigung, aus dem der bloßen Begriffe und Allegorien herausgeführt und zum Leben gerufen zu haben', in *Elias Schlegel und Wieland als Bearbeiter antiker Tragöden: Studie zur Rezeption der Antike im 18. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1928), p. 132.
 4. Matthäus Doell, 'Wieland und die Antike' in *Beitrag zur Geschichte der Entwicklung der deutschen Literatur im 18. Jahrhundert*. Munich, Ludwigs-Gymnasium (1895-96), p. 12. Cf. Franz Haller, 'Wielands Horaz in seiner ersten Fassung', pp. 69-71.
 5. Stemplinger, without offering any examples, expresses the same view: 'Das Schulheft des 14 jährigen Knaben [...] bekundet uns außerdem, daß der Junge eine für sein Alter gediegene Kenntnis des römischen Poeten besaß, insbesondere zeigt dessen teilweise Übersetzung der *ars poetica* schon die Tatzen des Loewen' ('Wielands Verhältnis zu Horaz', p. 474.)
 6. Cf. *The Ars Poetica of Horace*, ed. by Augustus S. Wilkins (London, 1939), p. 38: 'The *urceus* or "pitcher", though not necessarily smaller than the *amphora*, was so as a rule: and the sentence gains in point if we suppose that to a vessel of the size of an *amphora*, the shape of an *urceus* was given; at any rate, it was something very different.'
 7. William Daniel Wilson, "'Prächt'ge Vase" or "halber Topf"? Horatian poetics in Wieland's *Agathon*', *MLN*, 95 (1980), 664-69. Wilson quotes both Wieland's earlier and his later translations of the line, but does not comment on them. Literature on Horace and Wieland tends to acknowledge the *Schulheft* translation but refrain from closer scrutiny of it. Paul Weiszäcker makes a brief exception to this rule by citing the line from the young Wieland's translation of the *Ars Poetica* which talk about sculpture. The translation is described as 'ebenso treffend wie verständnisvoll' and is said to show 'Spuren eines nicht gewöhnlichen Verständnisses für künstlerische Dinge' ('Wieland und die Antike', p. 196.)
 8. *Geschichte des Agathon*, in vol. III of *Wieland Werke* (Deutscher Klassiker Verlag), ed. by Klaus Manger (Frankfurt am Main, 1986), III, 28. Hereafter this volume will be referred to as *Manger*.
 9. William E. Yuill describes this method as 'ironising conventions that are themselves ironical': Christoph Martin Wieland', in *German Men of Letters*, vol. 6, ed. by Alex Natan (London, 1972), p. 105.
 10. Cf. *Sengle*, p. 203: 'Was die Dichtung inhaltlich und formal bestimmt, ist die Idee des Maßes. Sie hat damit einen echten Bezug zur Antike, wenn es auch nicht das fromme Maß der Tragiker, sondern die rational-humane Beschränkung Epikurs, Horazens und der humanistischen Philosophen, vor allem Shaftesburys, ist.' S.-A. Jørgensen evidently finds it difficult to discuss *Musarion* without bringing in Horace, cf. 'Wieland zwischen Bürgerstube und Adelsalon', p. 211: 'Musarions Lehren [...] sind die altbekannten der "aurea mediocritas", "beatus ille", "bene vixit, qui bene latuit" usw.' (The first two quotations are from Horace, the third from Ovid's *Tristia*.) See also Jørgensen's 'Ist eine Weimarer Klassik ohne Wieland denkbar?', in *Unser commercium: Goethes und Schillers Literaturpolitik*, ed. by Wilfried Barner et al. (Stuttgart, 1984), p. 197: 'Das Verhältnis zwischen Form und Inhalt, Botschaft und Medium, prodessu und delectare [...]'.
 11. As Emil Staiger says, 'Seine Schriften sind gespickt mit geschichtlichen Kenntnissen aller Art. Sogar die kleine Erzählung, mit der wir uns beschäftigen, wimmelt von lateinischen und griechischen Namen und von versteckten Anspielungen auf Lehren und Meinungen alter Denker'; see his 'Wieland: "Musarion"', in *Christoph Martin Wieland*, ed. by Hansjörg Schelle (Darmstadt, 1981), p. 105.
 12. Cf. Herbert Rowland, 'Musarion' and Wieland's Concept of Genre (Göppingen, 1975), p. 48: 'The playful manner in which the allusion is made should not hide its seriousness [...]'. Rowland is

- discussing a different principle, i.e. the Delphic oracle's advice to 'know thyself'; but the point he makes is applicable to the work in general.
13. Staiger (p. 105) goes on to mention Wieland's (contrasting) lightness of touch: 'Und niemand gewinnt den Eindruck, Wieland krame mühsam Gelehrsamkeit aus'.
 14. Cf. Karl Heinz Kausch, 'Die Kunst der Grazie: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis Wielands', *JDSG*, 2 (1958), 22: 'Überhaupt ist das, was der Sprache anderer Dichter die Metapher leistet, der Kristallisationskern aller Redeweisen, bei Wieland die Anspielung [...]'.
 15. Cf. Kausch, pp. 22-23, for other examples of 'Kunstgriffe, die Wieland anwendet, damit der durchschnittlich belebte Teilnehmer nicht gezwungen ist, unbelustigt das Fest zu verlassen'. The same point is made by Charlotte Köppe, 'Christoph Martin Wielands Beziehungen zur Antike in der Verserzählung "Musarion"', in *Wieland-Kolloquium*, ed. by Thomas Köhle (Halberstadt, 1983). Wieland's concern for his readers is noted (pp. 146-47): 'Wieland war sich der Tatsache bewußt, daß viele der zeitgenössischen Leser nicht in der Lage waren, die im antiken Gewande vorgestellten Ideale in ihrem vollen Bedeutungsgehalt zu erfassen und als Anregung für die eigene Lebensgestaltung aufzunehmen'. But the measure of his success in providing for this is evident in her statement, 'Wieland hat mit seiner Verserzählung "Musarion" ein Werk geschrieben, das auch heute den Leser erreichen kann'.
 16. 'Zusatz bey der gegenwärtigen Ausgabe', *Moralische Briefe: In Versen*, in Wieland, *Sämmtliche Werke* (Hamburg), xiii/1, 293.
 17. Hagedorn's *Horaz* is again mentioned in Wieland's *Der Neue Amadis* (16.7), but this time as an example of a poet following Horace's example, but then allowing his own imagination too much freedom.
 18. James W. Marchand says of Wieland's later style: 'Wieland was, however, too good a student of Horace and Quintilian not to realize that *ars est celare artem*' ('Wieland's Style and Narratology', in *Christoph Martin Wieland: Nordamerikanische Forschungsbeiträge zur 250. Wiederkehr seines Geburtstages*, ed. by Hansjörg Schelle (Tübingen, 1984), p. 18).
 19. Cf., for instance, *Epistles* 1.20, lines 20-23. Wieland translates:
 [...] da ich, eines Freigelaßnen Enkel,
 mit magerm Erbteil, meine Federn über
 mein kleines Nest herausgestreckt — und, kurz,
 was mir an Ahnen abgeht, gib mir immer
 an eignem Wert, und setze noch hinzu,
 ich sei den ersten Männern Roms, im Krieg
 und Frieden, lieb gewesen [...]. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 324)
 20. 'Vorbericht der dritten Ausgabe', *Moralische Briefe: In Versen*, in Wieland, *Sämmtliche Werke* (Hamburg), xiii/1, 278.
 21. Harold Bloom's title masks the positive aspects of poetic influence which, he says, 'need not make poets less original; as often it makes them more original, though not necessarily better': *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (New York, 1973), p. 7.
 22. H. J. Meessen does not seem to think that there is much fiction involved, even here: 'The first letter is personal: it is Wieland's appraisal of and advice to himself' ('Wieland's *Briefe an einen jungen Dichter*', *Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht, deutsche Sprache und Literatur*, 47 (1955), 198).
 23. Cf. Hans Wahl, *Geschichte des Deutschen Merkur: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Journalismus im 18. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1914), p. 154: 'Auch Wieland sah mit wachsender Besorgnis das Heer der jungen Dichter anschwellen und glaubte nach wiederholten Warnungsrufen, daß es an der Zeit sei, etwas Abschließendes zu sagen. Das geschah in den "Briefen an einen jungen Dichter" [...]'.
 24. Cf. E. P. Morris, 'The Form of the Epistle in Horace', in *Yale Classical Studies*, 2 (1931), 113: '[...] they are not letters; for a letter is written to one person, an epistle is written as if to one person, but with the expectation that it will be read by many'. For evidence on formal grounds, see A. W. Dilke, 'The Interpretation of Horace's Epistles', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, ed. by W. Haase (Berlin and New York, 1981), II/31-iii, 1844: 'The genre of verse letters never attained great productivity. By Horace's day, if not earlier, it was purely artificial, since normal correspondence, in which he was also engaged, was in prose'.
 25. Charles Wright uses this as evidence for his disclaimer that the *Ars Poetica* was Wieland's model: '[...] the hypothesis that Horace's "Epistle" is a structural model for Wieland's "Briefe", or even for the first of them is untenable [...] the intent of the "Epistle", as Wieland understood it, was the opposite of his own [...]' 'Christoph Martin Wieland's "Briefe an einen jungen Dichter": An Analysis and Commentary' (dissertation, University of Chicago, 1975), p. 18).

26. This despite Stemplinger's claim that 'Die *ars poetica* bleibt sein "literarisches Gesetzbuch" zeitlebens [...]' ('Wielands Verhältnis zu Horaz', p. 476).
27. *Epistles* 2.2, line 54: 'ni melius dormire putem quam scribere versus?'.
28. Martini/Seiffert, III, 438: the variation in typography is reproduced from the source.
29. Cf. *Epistles* 1.19, line 35f.:
 Scire velis, mea cur ingratus opuscula lector
 laudet ametque domi, premat extra limen iniquus?
30. Hermann Müller-Solger, *Der Dichtertraum: Studien zur Entwicklung der dichterischen Phantasie im Werk Christoph Martin Wielands* (Göppingen, 1970), p. 17.
31. H. J. Meessen, 'Wieland's *Briefe an einen jungen Dichter*', p. 198.
32. Manfred Fuhrmann, *Einführung in die antike Dichtungstheorie* (Darmstadt, 1973), p. 111.
33. Marga Barthel identifies the dialogue as a method of expression fundamental to Wieland. She refers to the 'immanent dialogische[r] Charakter von Wielands Stil', even perceptible in his commentaries on Horace, Cicero, and others. (*Das 'Gespräch' bei Wieland: Untersuchungen über Wesen und Form seiner Dichtung*, 2nd edn (Hildesheim, 1973), p. 27).
34. Stemplinger, 'Wielands Verhältnis zu Horaz', p. 485: 'Man gäbe sich indes einer Täuschung hin, wenn man meinte, Wieland habe die Episteln oder Satiren des Horaz gegenüber den Oden bevorzugt'. Wieland knew that his talent lay elsewhere than in the lyric form and therefore did not attempt to translate the *Odes*.
35. Albert Leitzmann, 'Magister Ardelio', *ZDP*, 50 (1926), 92f.
36. Fuhrmann (p. 1083) translates 'ardelio' as 'geschäftiger Müßiggänger', whereas the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1968) offers the less complicated 'a busy-body, fusser'. There is doubtless another mischievous touch of Wieland's here.

CHAPTER III

IMITATION AND ORIGINALITY

The feature of his literary make-up which caused Wieland to be drawn to certain writers, and to adopt their styles of writing or their material — as sources for his own works — earned him considerable notoriety.¹ Wieland was perfectly frank about this feature in himself, and argued that it placed him in the company of the greatest of poets:

Man macht mir den Vorwurf, ich sei nicht originell. Man sollte doch finden und erfinden unterscheiden. Was ist überhaupt der Stoff unserer Gedichte? Fast Alles läßt sich bis auf die entfernteste Periode des Menschengeschlechts zurückführen . . . Haben nicht Shakespeare und Milton fast allen Stoff entlehnt?²

Yet the contemporary critical view was inclined to see this practice, in Wieland's case, as lack of originality, or even plagiarism.³ Lessing's *Literaturbriefe*, for instance, include an amusing review of Wieland's play *Lady Johanna Gray*. The conceit Lessing uses is to make out that the English dramatist, Nicholas Rowe, plagiarized Wieland's version when writing his own. Ultimately, Lessing reveals his hand; the roles were in fact reversed: 'Was kann Herr Wieland dafür, daß Nicholas Rowe schon vor vierzig und mehr Jahren gestorben ist?'⁴ Lessing does not object to the fact that Wieland has imitated Rowe's play, but rather to the lack of any mention that he has done so. This is in effect an accusation of plagiarism.

Lessing also complained in the *Literaturbriefe* that Wieland's version reduces the characters to a uniform blandness and alters the setting from the majestic to the mundane. As Sengle points out, Lessing undermines his own position: 'Damit ist zugegeben, daß dem Stück, trotz der Entlehnungen, die Lessing nachgewiesen hat, ein gewisses Maß von Originalität nicht abzusprechen ist.'⁵ Furthermore, the iambic metre in which the play was composed, and to which Lessing seems indifferent, was innovative for the German stage, and its effects will capture our interest when we come to analyse prosodic issues arising from the Horace translations.

It is drama once again which causes Wieland's downfall in the controversy over his Singspiel *Alceste*. Here Wieland adopts a model from a favourite ancient

dramatist, Euripides.⁶ An ancient model is liable to present additional pitfalls for a modern version: the danger of making the characters appear ridiculous is always present.⁷ The chief detractor from Wieland's success was Goethe, who (with a bottle of Burgundy at his elbow) dashed off a farce, viz., *Götter, Helden und Wieland*,⁸ in which he paid him the back-handed compliment of employing one of Wieland's favourite forms, the Lucianic dialogue. Here, in the underworld, we meet insipid, puppet-like characters, who represent Wieland's Admet and Alceste. Euripides appears, only to be told that Wieland has improved on his play and that it was a function of the age in which he lived that he failed to avoid certain dramatic weaknesses. Wieland himself shuffles onto the stage in his nightcap.

Goethe's argument is primarily with the inflated claims which Wieland published in the *Teutscher Merkur* in five *Briefe über das deutsche Singspiel Alceste*. Wieland does indeed claim there that his production is in some respects an updating of Euripides's original, but one of which he would have approved, had he been Wieland's contemporary.⁹ Goethe's attitude towards Wieland's *Alceste* is, in fact, more complex than appears from his farce alone. He recognized, it seems, that the verse form of *Alceste* could be usefully adopted in his *Iphigenie* and even had a discussion with Wieland about it.¹⁰

The most famous evidence for the prosecution is A. W. Schlegel's indictment of Wieland in the *Athenäum*:

Citatio edictalis.

Nachdem über die Poesie des Hofrat und Comes Palatinus Caesareus Wieland in Weimar, auf Ansuchen der Herren Lucian, Fielding, Sterne, Bayle, Voltaire, Crébillon, Hamilton und vieler andern Autoren Concursus Creditorum eröffnet, auch in der Masse mehreres Verdächtige und dem Anschein nach dem Horatius, Ariosto, Cervantes und Shakespeare zustehendes Eigentum sich vorgefunden: als wird jeder, der ähnliche Ansprüche titulo legitimo machen kann, hiedurch vorgeladen, sich binnen Sächsischer Frist zu melden, hernachmals aber zu schweigen.¹¹

The exaggeration and lack of charity of this judgement take no account of Wieland's true assertion that he was simply allying himself with the great poets of all ages, for whom extensive literary borrowing was just part of their stock-in-trade (see p. 57 above). As Rainer Warning, using the terminology of the rhetorical tradition, puts it: 'Eine ars aber ist nicht denkbar ohne imitatio, ohne Nachahmung sei's eines Lehrers, sei's eines als Vorbild dienenden Werkes.'¹²

Where adaptation belittles the original or adheres to it too closely, criticism is justified. But where material has been borrowed and refashioned in an imaginative way, the accusation that the work is unoriginal falls short of the truth. A spirited apology of the imitator appears in Wieland's early essay on Bodmer's *Noah*:

Der Nachahmer steht nicht nur dem Erfinder nicht nach, er wird sogar selbst der eigentliche Erfinder und geistige Eigentümer, sobald er den übernommenen Stoff besser behandelt.¹³

However, when Wieland feels himself to be under attack, his justification sometimes takes on a rather defensive tone, as when he stresses the importance of the new form given to adopted material in his use of themes from three different sources in *Oberon* (see p. 4f. above): the originality lies in his arrangement of the source material. It is thus not to the fact that Wieland has incorporated pre-existing material that one should look, but to the manner in which he has worked it into a new shape, to produce a different effect. Certainly Friedrich Gundolf, in his study of Shakespeare in Germany, does not feel that the Shakespearean element in *Oberon* makes it a derivative work: '[...] Wielands Oberon ist ein Wesen von anderem Gewicht, anderer Geste, anderer Faserung, anderer Färbung als der Shakespeares'.¹⁴

An amusing discussion (which examines the same issues) occurs in the fifth book of Wieland's *Beiträge zur geheimen Geschichte des menschlichen Verstandes und Herzens* (1770), where the narrator is interrupted by a critic who accuses the 'Herr Autor' of writing in various borrowed styles and idioms, and thus of violating the well-known Horatian principle of unity:

*Humano capiti cervicem pictor equinam
Jungere si velit, &c.*

vom Kopfe bis zur Brust, Helvetius, von der Brust bis zum Nabel, Yorick, und vom Nabel bis zum Fischschwanz Montagne, oder Brantome, oder so was! Sehen Sie, daß wir Sie ausfindig gemacht haben? Und wie konnten Sie Sich auch einbilden, daß Leute, wie wir, so einfältig sein würden, Sie für ein Original zu halten?

Wieland's answer as 'Herr Autor' is admirably pithy and to the point: 'Lernen Sie, wenn ich bitten darf, daß ein kleiner Unterschied zwischen original sein, und ein Original sein ist!'¹⁵ Wieland strives for originality, even where poor Yorick provides the frame.¹⁶

For a view untainted by the desire to defend a work of his own, or to respond to criticism, we return to the *Briefe an einen jungen Dichter*. In the *Dritter Brief*, we find Wieland at his most forthright in the advocacy of imitation: 'Ungeachtet der ausgebildete Mensch alles was er ist, gewissermaßen durch Nachahmung wird [...]' (*Martini/Seiffert*, III, 471). This strong statement is then refined by the proviso that imitation can only be practised discreetly and wisely by those who have true artistic talent. Imitation is only to be condemned when it is undertaken in a misguided way.

'Briefe an einen jungen Dichter'

Wieland is as impatient here as some of his literary contemporaries when he thinks of the attempts to imitate Shakespeare or the French dramatists on the

German stage; he was far from being oblivious to the distinctions between acceptable and unacceptable forms of imitation:

[...] nicht darin daß wir schlechte Muster genommen, sondern daß wir ihnen größtenteils auf einem verkehrten Wege und auf eine verkehrte Art nachgeahmt haben, liegt das Übel [...] (III, 472)

It takes the natural genius of a Goethe for the spirit of Shakespeare to be reborn,

[...] die Iphigenia in Tauris, eine noch ungedruckte Tragödie in Jamben, von eben diesem Verfasser, eben so ganz im Geiste des Sophokles als sein Götz im Geiste Shakespears geschrieben [...] (III, 474)

and this is only achieved by means of tremendous sensitivity towards different times and societies, and to what is natural to man: '... durch Verbindung der Natur, welche die Seele von Shakespears Werken ist' (III, 474).

In short, the German stage is in a sorry state: the public has learned to accept imitations devoid of talent or taste, and the new dramatic works of genius have been too few to turn the tide. Lessing, for example, is singled out as having composed plays which had the *potential* to be used as models for other playwrights. The fact that they failed to perform this role is partly due, once again, to the lack of imagination of '[die] armen Nachahmer' (III, 476).

Our initial discussion of the *Briefe an einen jungen Dichter*, in the previous chapter, drew attention to the passage (see p. 51 above) in which Horace's phrase *servum pecus* is insinuated into Wieland's paragraph. The phrase comes from *Epistles* 1.19 and forms part of a passage demonstrating the dangers awaiting the unskilful imitator of Shakespeare:

[...] und seine Fehler bleiben Fehler, wiewohl sie Fehler eines großen Mannes sind [...] und es ist lächerlich, diese nachzuäffen. Aber was könnte denn auch das *servum pecus* geistloser Nachahmer an einem Shakespear sonst nachahmen als seine Fehler? Sein Genie läßt sich freilich nicht nachmachen. Indessen sind es doch bloß die Affen Shakespears... (III, 471)

The imitator is condemned, not because he is imitating, but because he is doing so 'auf einem verkehrten Wege und auf eine verkehrte Art...' (III, 472). The quotation from Horace, unobtrusively introduced into Wieland's paragraph, signals a parallel between Wieland's thinking and the Roman school of thought, especially as this is expressed in Horace's poems. Wieland is asserting the Horatian nature of his stance.

Imitation, in theory and practice, was widespread in Roman times,¹⁷ a fact of which the German literary world was well aware. Breitinger's assessment of the Roman attitude towards their Greek heritage was entirely positive. In his essay 'Von dem Neuen', he wonders how the Romans could have composed their own immortal works without having had Greek models to work from.¹⁸ In a light-hearted mood, Lenz composed the following lines:

Horaz nennt jedes Nachbild — Vieh.
Mit Unrecht scheint: die Not, die Sympathie
Zwingt 100 Selbstgenies auf Erden
Nachbilder fremden Werts zu werden.¹⁹

'Epistles' 1.19

Not surprisingly, the Roman attitude towards this phenomenon was complex and subtle. The two principal sources from which we may extract an indication of Horace's views are the *Ars Poetica* and *Epistles* 1. 19. In Wieland's commentary on *Epistles* 1. 19, we find a passage which demonstrates the degree to which Wieland felt that his own attitude coincided with Horace's:

Jeder wahre Künstler ahmt, in gewissem Sinne, seine Vorgänger nach; [...] Das, was den wahren Meister macht, ist nicht die Erfindung eines unerhörten Sujets, unerhörter Sachen, Charaktere, Situationen u. s. f., sondern der lebendige Odem und Geist, den er seinem Werk einzuatmen, und die Schönheit und Anmut, die er darüber auszugießen vermag. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 315)

Wieland sets out to analyse a particular passage in Horace's poem and, as a result of being in complete agreement on this point, has slipped into language which expresses a general principle.

Horace's epistle (1. 19) opens not with 'the formal device of starting at some distance from the first main topic' as McGann would have it,²⁰ but directly with one of the issues of literary originality: *Prisco [...] si credis [...] Cratino* — already we have an appeal to the traditional view as represented by an ancient poet, who is mentioned by name. The very first question Horace asks, in other words, is whether we should adopt the received view (of Cratinus) that poetry cannot be composed by drinkers of water, or whether we ought to examine (and possibly reject or reformulate) this view. More arguments along these lines follow: Homer and Ennius are canvassed for their views on the link between wine-drinking and good poetry. Horace reports that his own utterances on the question led poets to take up relentless drinking.²¹ The mere fact that another poet holds this view lends it authority and makes it worthy of imitation — this is the attitude to which Horace and Wieland are so strongly opposed.

In this epistle, Horace states quite clearly that he is an original writer: '*Libera per vacuum posui vestigia princeps / non aliena meo pressi pede [...]*' (line 21f.).²² His merit lies in his having been the first Roman who *dared* to write in the manner of Archilochus and Alcaeus.²³ This is his essential quality; by contrast, Horace's imitators have fastened on to his accidental features and reproduced them slavishly. If he were to have a pale complexion, his imitators would eagerly drink cumin in order to produce the same effect in themselves. This example is reinforced immediately by Horace's famous image of the herd of imitators:

[...] quod si
 pallerem casu, biberent exanguie cuminum.
 O imitatores, servum pecus, [...] (lines 17–19)

In so far as Horace offers his own praise as an example, he recommends imitation, but only of a certain kind. His understanding of acceptable imitation embraces only *some* aspects of the original.²⁴ In imitating Archilochus, Horace has reproduced the rhythms and spirit, but not the content of the poems or the motives behind them:

[...] Parios ego primus iambos
 ostendi Latio, numeros animosque secutus
 Archilochi, non res et agentia verba Lycamben. (lines 23–25)

This form of imitation does not need to exclude originality.²⁵

'Ars Poetica'

The *Ars Poetica*, our second source for his thoughts on imitation, is very much preoccupied with Horace's relation to his Greek forbears. In lines 131–35 (which we have already examined in Gottsched's version — see pp. 16–19 above), he lists the attitudes to be avoided, if a poet is to make pre-existing material into something truly his own:

Publica materies privati iuris erit, si
 nec circa vilem patulumque moraberis orbem,
 nec verbum verbo curabis reddere fidus
 interpret, nec desilies imitator in artum,
 unde pedem proferre pudor vetet, aut operis lex.

This passage, despite the famous expression 'fidus interpret', is not in the first instance about translation: it treats poetic assimilation as a whole. Our current topic for discussion, imitation, and the one which will chiefly concern us in the next chapter, translation, are both covered. The faithful translator, anxious not to deviate too far from the original, is only one example of how not to go about the business of giving traditional material one's own personal stamp. One should also avoid circling around the beaten track or leaping into a confined space, through lack of confidence in one's own abilities as imitator.²⁶ Horace is not directly condemning either the practice of imitation or of translation, but he is discussing them in close juxtaposition, which indicates that they are guided by the same principle.

If we now turn to Wieland's German version of these lines, we find an illustration of the fact that translation is also relevant to the discussion of originality. The accusation of plagiarism is manifestly not applicable to translation — the source material is clearly not original to the translator. But his aims, and thus his methods of translating, are capable of displaying a high degree of

originality. Wieland's translation of these lines accords with the advice contained in them. Even more here than elsewhere, he is anxious to convey the sense and relegates the reproduction of poetic devices to a position of secondary importance:

Ein Stoff, auf welchen jeder gleiches Recht hat,
wird wieder Eigentum, wenn du dich weder
auf einem Plan, der zum Gemeinplatz schon
geworden, tummelst, noch, als ein getreuer
demüt'ger Übersetzer, Wort für Wort
dem Griechen* nachtrittst; noch, als bloßer
Nachahmer, dich so sehr zusammendrückest,
daß, etwas wegzulassen, dir die Scham,
hinzuzutun, die Regel dir verbietet**. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 522)

Wieland does not translate word for word or deny himself the freedom to amplify the original in order to emphasize certain points. The first line is a free paraphrase which tones down the quasi-legal language in the Latin and makes the point in a plain, almost pedestrian style. The image of the arena is preserved (*orbem* = *Plan*), but in order to insist on the application of the image, Wieland uses the word 'Gemeinplatz' which has come to mean a 'common-place' *expression* rather than a 'place' in the physical sense. But then Wieland extends the image of imitation as progression — albeit slow — which began with Horace's 'circa [. . .] moraberis orbem'. The German verb 'nachtrittst' has no equivalent in the Latin, neither does Horace make any mention of the Greek model at this point. Wieland has added this for purposes of clarity; the reader must not be allowed to forget what the passage is really about. The translator's limits are intensified by the use of two adjectives in German: 'getreuer/demüt'ger'; and the adjective 'bloßer' is coupled with the imitator, so as to ensure that he is assigned a suitably lowly status. The image of the narrow space into which the imitator leaps is omitted, and the alliteration of 'pedem profferre pudor' is thus lost as well.

The impression that Wieland is especially anxious in this passage to convey the meaning in an unambiguous way is clearer still when one consults the footnotes. There is no commentary item at the end of the poem, but two footnotes appear directly at the bottom of the page. Their position is important (as will be shown in the penultimate chapter): they are harder to overlook if the reader is not even required to turn the page, and the dialogue between Horace, Wieland, and the reader takes on a degree of urgency. The first of these notes refers to the Greek model, which is one of Wieland's own additions to the passage: it serves to locate Horace in his historical context. The footnote reads: 'Oder, dem ersten Autor, der das nämliche Süjet vor dir bearbeitet hat.' The point here is to move away again from the specific scene which Wieland himself had painted, and to show that Horace's advice applies to a poet in any age. With

great flexibility, Wieland manoeuvres the reader into Horace's world, by the addition of a detail, and then moves back into the modern setting for his footnote.

The next note paraphrases what is rather a concise and formulaic line in the translation. It explains the meaning of this line as:

d. i. daß die Furcht vor Tadel dir nicht erlaubt etwas wegzulassen, noch die Regeln (z. B. der Einheit des Orts und der Zeit, oder der fünf Akte) etwas hinzuzutun gestatten.

Lest the reference in the translation to 'die Regel' should seem obscure, Wieland offers some examples of literary rules. These examples, in turn, place the reader firmly in the contemporary literary scene. Indeed, the Latin had been more explicit at this point, with '*operis lex*' (my emphasis), 'the rule(s) of the work', whereas Wieland's version omits all mention of the *opus*. There can be no ambiguity about the kind of rule Horace has in mind. Wieland's footnotes strive to make up for any inadequacies in his translation.

If we consider translation as a natural extension of imitation, or even perhaps as the strictest form of imitation, we would logically expect severe restrictions on the scope for originality in translators.²⁷ But if we side with Wieland and maintain that it is not the provenance of the material which carries most weight in discussions of originality, but rather the treatment it receives, we can see that there is liberal opportunity for a translator to achieve originality.²⁸ The translator who shows originality will produce a version which, for instance, demonstrates the freedom to replace an original trope with a trope from his own language, instead of a literal rendering of the original which fails to bring about the desired effect.

Wieland's Horace translations are a good defence against the charges of lack of originality. At the same time, they make a substantial contribution to the eighteenth-century discussion of language and translation.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. A number of critical comments on Wieland are rehearsed in Klaus Oettinger, *Phantasie und Erfahrung: Studien zur Erzählpoetik Christoph Martin Wielands* (Munich, 1970). His introduction, 'Zur Wirkungsgeschichte Wielands', provides a range of adverse contemporary views and shows how their influence persists well into the nineteenth century; the effects of these views can still be traced in general histories of German literature.
2. K. A. Böttiger, *Literarische Zustände und Zeitgenossen*. Vol. 1, ed. by K. W. Böttiger (Leipzig, 1838), p. 254.
3. In his discussion of plagiarism, Rudolf Ischer does not see Wieland's lack of originality as reprehensible. Indeed, he maintains that Wieland even plagiarizes himself! See *Kleine Studien über Wieland* (Berlin, 1905), p. 33: 'Dabei wiederholt er sich sogar selbst und wird sein eigener Plagiator.'
4. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, *Sämtliche Schriften*, ed. by Karl Lachmann and Franz Muncker (Stuttgart, 1892), viii, 63f.
5. Sengle, p. 104. Herder, in his *Briefe zu Beförderung der Humanität* (1793) is far from taking exception to Wieland's imitations: 'um so reicher sind wir durch ihn worden. Die Ananas, die tausend feine Gewürze in ihrem Geschmack vereint, trägt nicht unsonst eine Krone.' See *Werke* (Suphan), xvii, 114f.

6. Humphrey Trevelyan, *Goethe und die Griechen* (Hamburg, 1941), p. 86: 'Wieland hat jahrelang eine Aneignung zur Antike gehabt und sich mit ihr beschäftigt. Außerdem hat er Euripides zu seinen Lieblingsdramatikern gezählt.'
7. Doell associates Wieland's early works with the seventeenth-century standpoint of which this was characteristic: 'man [griff] Stoffe heraus und kleidete sie in zeitgemässes Gewand' ('Wieland und die Antike', p. 24). Cf. Hans-Dietrich Dahnke, "'Die Götter im Negligé': Zu Wielands *Göttergesprächen*", in *Wieland 1983*, ed. by Thomas Höhle (Halberstadt, 1983). Dahnke states (p. 105) that, despite their indebtedness to Lucian, these dialogues show 'eine erhebliche innovatorische Leistung' and Wieland's 'poetische Eigenständigkeit und Schöpferkraft'. For a justification of the technique of adopting an ancient myth, see Manfred Fuhrmann, 'Mythos als Wiederholung', in *Terror und Spiel: Probleme der Mythenrezeption. (Poetik und Hermeneutik, vol. 4, ed. by Manfred Fuhrmann)* (Munich, 1971), p. 130: 'Wer eine antike Struktur in modernem Gewande darstellt [...] bestätigt [...] die Gültigkeit des Mythos'.
8. *Götter, Helden und Wieland* was written in 1773 and published in March, 1774. Wieland's *Teutscher Merkur* even published an *Anzeige* for Goethe's parody: 'Der Herr D. Göthe, Verfasser dieses Werkleins, nachdem er uns in seinem Götz von Berlichingen gezeigt hat, daß er Shakespear seyn könnte, wenn er wollte: hat uns in dieser heroisch-komisch-farcicalischen Pasquinade gewiesen, daß er, wenn er wolle, auch Aristophanes seyn könnte [...]', 6 (1774), 351.
9. 'Ich verlange also keinen Verdienst daraus zu machen, daß ich hier von Euripides abgewichen bin, denn was hab' ich getan, als was er selbst, hätt' er sein Drama 2200 Jahre später zu verfertigen gehabt, auch gethan haben würde?' *Der Teutsche Merkur* (1775), 3. Heft, p. 48.
10. See Friedrich Sengle, 'Wieland und Goethe', in *Begriffsbestimmung der Klassik und des Klassischen*, ed. by Heinz Otto Burger (Darmstadt, 1972), p. 259.
11. Cited in Sengle, p. 509. Cf. Kurth-Voigt, *Perspectives and Points of View*, p. 4: 'Although this condemnation, in effect a rejection of the adaptive method, was primarily intended as a specific disapproval, it implies a broader renunciation of traditional principles and values. The criticism is essentially directed against eighteenth-century theories of poetic imagination and the corresponding practice of borrowing subject matter, motifs, or configurations from literature and mythology.'
12. Rainer Warning, 'Imitatio und Intertextualität: Zur Geschichte lyrischer Dekonstruktion der Amorteologie. Dante, Petrarca, Baudelaire', in *Kolloquium Kunst und Philosophie*, vol. 2, ed. by Willi Oelmüller (Paderborn, 1982), p. 169.
13. Cited from Julius Steinberger, 'Wielands Originalität', in *Allgemeine Zeitung* (Beilage), No. 134 (Munich, 1902), p. 483. Steinberger provides a useful collection of comments about Wieland's originality, from Wieland himself and others, but concludes simply that Wieland was a very contradictory character.
14. Friedrich Gundolf, *Shakespeare und der deutsche Geist*, p. 181.
15. Martini/Seiffert, III, 235f. (The Horatian reference comes from the *Ars Poetica*; see Fuhrmann, p. 508).
16. Cf. Martini/Seiffert, III, 238; Horace also found himself in the dock for a lack of originality: 'Aber, — eh ichs vergesse — wollten Sie nicht von der Güte sein, und uns mit ihrer besten Gelegenheit erklären, woher es wohl kommen möge, daß dieser nämliche Vorwurf der Nachahmung und Nichtoriginalität den Virgilen, Horatzen, Boileauen, Racinen, Popen, u.s.w. [...] ihrer Zeit auch gemacht worden ist?'
17. See, for example, *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, ed. by David West and Tony Woodman (Cambridge, 1979).
18. Johann Jacob Breitinger, 'Von dem Neuen', in *Critische Dichtkunst* (Stuttgart, 1966; reprint of the 1740 edn), II, 115.
19. J. M. R. Lenz, *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. by L. Tieck (Berlin, 1828), III, 296.
20. M. J. McGann, *Studies in the First Book of Horace's Epistles* (Brussels, 1969), p. 82. And yet, on the same page, McGann also calls this 'the only epistle concerned exclusively with literary matters'.
21. In his first version of this epistle (published in the *Teutscher Merkur* (March, 1782) p. 85), Wieland suggests that this Horatian 'edict' should, in fact, be attributed to Ennius. He therefore provides the variant reading 'edixit' (3rd person); this becomes 'edixi' (1st person) in the complete published translation, whereby this view is once again restored to Horace.
22. Cf. Anthony J. Woodman, 'Horace, Epistles 1.19, 23-40', in *Museum Helveticum* (Basel), 40 (1983), 77: 'Horace then begins the second half of the poem by first claiming, not (as we might have expected) that he himself is an ideal imitator, but that he is an original poet (21-23); then [...] he explains with a further twist that his originality consisted in being the first to imitate Archilochus (23-24).'

23. Cf. Q. Horatius Flaccus, *Briefe: Erklärt von Adolf Kiessling*, 5th edn, ed. by Richard Heinze (Berlin, 1957), p. 183. (This is the standard critical edition and will hereafter be referred to as *Kiessling/Heinze*). On line 21, the summary reads: 'Meine *virtus* ahmt ihr nicht nach: die besteht darin, daß ich eben nicht bin wie ihr, sondern meinen eigenen Weg ging [...] denn noch niemand vor mir hat es gewagt, Archilochos oder Alkaios nachzubilden [...]'.
24. Cf. Arno Reiff, *Interpretatio, imitatio, aemulatio: Begriff und Vorstellung literarischer Abhängigkeit bei den Römern* (Würzburg, 1959), p. 58: 'Ähnlich wie für Cicero die *interpretatio* in der Regel mit einem Nebensinn des Abschätzigen verbunden ist, tritt bei Horaz eine positiv zu bewertende *imitatio*, die sich einem Vorbild ganz anschlösse, gar nicht in den Gesichtskreis.'
25. Klaus Dockhorn, 'Epoche, Fuge und *Imitatio*: Rhetorische Komponenten des Historismus', in *Macht und Wirkung der Rhetorik: Vier Aufsätze zur Ideengeschichte der Moderne* (Bad Homburg, 1968), p. 117: '[...] was am Vorbild nachgeahmt werden soll, ist seine Originalität'. This remark, which falls in a discussion about Quintilian, applies equally to Wieland's situation. See also how C. O. Brink lists the *Ars Poetica* with *Epistles* I. 19, in his *Horace on Poetry*, vol. II: *The 'Ars Poetica'* (Cambridge, 1971), p. 211: 'While in one sense of the word no literature is more imitative than Augustan poetry, in another none is more creative than Virgil's or H.'s work. That is the sentiment which inspired *o imitatores, servum pecus* (*Ep.* I. 19, line 19, cf. *ibid.*, 12ff.) and *libera per vacuum posui vestigia princeps*, etc. (*ibid.*, 21ff.)'.
26. Cf. Glyn P. Norton, *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and their Humanist Antecedents* (Geneva, 1984). I found this work especially helpful for its survey of the history of the interpretation of these lines.
27. See Gian Biagio Conte, *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*, ed. by Charles Segal (Ithaca, New York and London, 1986), p. 82: 'Closeness to the original is an essential requisite, but a translator nursing artistic ambition will not be able to stifle the dialectical impulse to create a new organic text.'
28. Although Edward Young's work is not strictly about translation, the following remarks seem apposite: 'It is significant that Edward Young's *Conjectures on Original Composition*, which produced the doctrine that one should imitate great models by being as original as they were in their own day, should have been twice translated into German within two years of its first appearance', Edna Purdie, *Studies in German Literature of the Eighteenth Century: Some Aspects of Literary Affiliation* (London, 1965), p. 127.

CHAPTER IV

WIELAND'S TRANSLATION STRATEGIES

Wieland offers us no systematic, self-contained theory of translation, nor does he outline any scheme which could then be tested against his principles as a translator.¹ The main sources for his views on translation are reviews of others' work, and prefaces to his own translations. If Wieland is included at all in histories of eighteenth-century translation theory, the reference will be to one of his reviews.² Wieland's thoughts on various aspects of translation, whether occasioned by a review or a preface, may appear to be expressed abstractly, but they always apply to a particular work; they are essentially pragmatic: 'Wieland ist nicht der große Theoretiker, sondern der große Praktiker der Übersetzung', as Dahinten puts it (p. 33). A comparison of their respective principles will disclose contradictions between his various statements, because the factors which interested Wieland and affected his judgement differed in each case. Rules must arise from the nature of the material: Democritus, in the novel *Geschichte der Abderiten*, encapsulates the rules for drama by claiming that it requires 'weder mehr noch weniger, als die Natur und Absicht der Sache mit sich bringt'.³ Accordingly, it was contrary to Wieland's type of intellect to draft a universal theory of translation. As Gundolf says of Wieland's 'Vernunft',

sie machte nicht, wie die Lessings, seine Gesetzlichkeit aus, hatte keine gesetzgebenden Rechte, suchte keine ewigen Normen, drang nicht ins Werden und Sollen ein, sondern beschränkte sich auf die Selbstkritik.⁴

To isolate a particular technique from the context of the translation under consideration and elevate it to a principle is risky; a proviso may soon have to be added. And summaries of Wieland's 'translation theory' are likely to be fraught with similar difficulties. Fuhrmann points out that his feeling for language and expression was what determined Wieland's translation work, much more than his theoretical statements.⁵

Monecke has performed a very useful service in collecting together the statements about translation in Wieland's various reviews and prefaces and amply quoting from them. His own view, however, is that they do not shed much light on the Horace translations, because most of them were written at a

later date. He, too, stresses Wieland's untheoretical nature: 'Es lief Wielands Natur durchaus zuwider, die Arbeit des Übersetzens nach entschieden und eindeutigen Grundsätzen vorzunehmen oder auch nur das Geleistete analysierend durchzudenken.' Furthermore, he finds in this collected material much that is unclear, commonplace, or illogical, but wishes to examine it 'gerade um ihres Konfliktgehalts willen' (Monecke, p. 75).

The principal reason for these contradictions is not that Wieland's theoretical stance changed over the years:⁶ just as each review or preface referred to a new translation, so each original author is viewed as having slightly different requirements, when presented in translated form. Monecke singles out this important principle as enunciated in Wieland's discussion of a translation of Pope's *Essay on Man*:

Die wichtigste Folgerung dieses Schreibens ist die Einsicht, "daß Virgil anders als Homer, Ovid anders als Virgil, Lucian anders als Xenophon, Ariost anders als Tasso, kurz, daß beinahe jeder gute Schriftsteller auf seine eigene Art übersetzt werden müsse." (Monecke, p. 99)

Because it is so important to capture the character and individual style of the author to be translated, Wieland gives way to occasional expressions of despair: the discrepancies between the capacities of the German language and those of the original make some authors seem untranslatable: 'Xenophon ist unübersetzlich; er sagt immer mit drey Worten, was ich auf Teutsch mit dreymal so viel sagen mußte'.⁷ Virgil, too, poses the same sort of problem for the translator:

Vergil scheint für Wieland Höhepunkt lateinischer Sprache zu sein. Nicht getreu kann er übersetzt werden, denn "jedes Wort, das man ihm nimmt, ist Verlust einer Schönheit".⁸

Wieland considers the task of the translator to be more than capturing the style of a text: he demands that the character of the author be revealed by the same process. It is of course inevitable that the economy of the Latin syntax will suffer at the hands of a German translator, but despite this the author's individual characteristics must survive. If an attempt is made to preserve the Latin syntax in German, these characteristics will surely be forfeited in the awkward style which results. Wieland's lament is for the nuances which depend on a concise Latin formulation for their effect.

A common practice among Wieland's contemporaries was to compliment a successful translator by dubbing him 'der deutsche Homer' or 'der deutsche Horaz' (Karl Wilhelm Ramler).⁹ This is clearly linked to the translator's ideal, also commonly held at the time, that an ancient author ought to be translated into a style which gives the impression that the work had, in fact, originally been written in German. A statement by his secretary confirms this to be Wieland's view:

Wieland hielt bei Verdeutschung alter Dichter ihren Geist für die Hauptsache und behandelte ihre Sprach- und Versformen bald mehr, bald weniger frei, indem er sich vor

allem fragen zu müssen glaubte: wie würde der alte Dichter, wenn er deutsch reden sollte, sich wohl in jetzigem guten gangbaren Deutsch ausdrücken.¹⁰

Wieland praises a new hexameter translation of Homer's *Iliad* for being able to present the 'Schein des Originals':

Aber freylich — dem Homer nichts nehmen, nichts leyhen, ihn nur singen lassen, wie er gesungen hätte, wenn unsre deutsche Sprache seine Sprache gewesen wäre — es ist bey nahe das unmögliche gefordert!¹¹

Wieland's preface to his own translation of Lucian's 'Panthea' (1780) concedes that, among translators, 'jeder seine eigne Weise [hat]' and continues:

Ich meines Orts würde zufrieden sein, wenn ich den Lucian so reden lassen könnte, wie er sich etwa ausgedrückt haben möchte, wenn er ein Deutscher — aus meinem Antheil an unserm achtzehnten Jahrhundert — und demungeachtet Lucian gewesen wäre. (Monecke, p. 76)

In other words, the German style of the translation is absolutely contemporary, but a technique must be devised so that the ancient figure who is to be translated is clearly discernible: Lucian must survive, and so cannot be *completely* metamorphosed into an eighteenth-century German writer.

Late in life, when Wieland turned to his final project of translating Cicero's letters, the ideal of creating such an illusion had shifted slightly. Wieland now concentrates on the indivisibility of character and style. His translation is still to reflect his own contemporary idiom, but Cicero will retain his own character even more firmly than was considered possible in the cases of Xenophon and Virgil:

Indem ich dem Cicero so gutes Deutsch, als ich selbst gelernt habe, leihe, bin ich weit von dem Gedanken entfernt, ihn schreiben zu lassen, wie er vielleicht geschrieben hätte, wenn er ein Deutscher unsrer Zeit, zumal der neuesten, gewesen wäre.¹²

Homer seems to have constituted an exceptional case. Wieland's own Horace translations demonstrate how important it was to him that a translation should be readable and should avoid placing stumbling blocks in the reader's way. In most instances involving poetry originally composed in hexameters, this meant that the translation should be in some other metre or even in prose.¹³ But because so much is determined by the individual style and character of the author, there are no equations available, as for example,

iambic pentameter: prose = dactylic hexameter: iambic pentameter.

Homer's *Iliad*, in the unrevised translation by Voss, met with Wieland's approval, even though it was in hexameters. This did not give free rein to all translators to use hexameters whenever they pleased, however. Wieland makes this clear in a review of an anonymous Lucretius translation (1792):

Unser Unbekannter hat also, was sich andere, was selbst ein Dichter und Philolog wie Voß (freylich mit mehr Bescheidenheit und Geschmack) sich erlaubte, auch ihm für erlaubt gehalten [. . .]. (AA, p. 703)

There is, then, no absolute rule pertaining to the use of hexameters — in certain cases they produce the desired effect. Homer's hexameters are different from Virgil's or Horace's; with Homer, Wieland's resistance to translation into anything other than natural German weakens a little. Monecke reports of Wieland (p. 78):

er verlangt sogar, man müsse Voß "die Freiheit zugestehen, sich so viel als die Natur unserer Sprache nur immer zuläßt, eine eigene Homerische Sprache aus ihr zu bilden; eine Sprache, die freilich in Deutschland nirgends so gesprochen, aber doch von jedem Deutschen verstanden wird".

This is the clearest instance of Wieland's propensity to regard each author as a separate case. Homer is the one example of an author so ancient as to merit an idiom of his own.¹⁴

A slightly different case, in which hexameters are used, can be seen in Wieland's translation of Aristophanes's *Clouds*. In his introduction, Wieland goes into considerable detail on the subject of versification. As usual, his ruling instinct is to make choices which will suit the German language. He pronounces himself 'überzeugt, daß *Aristofanische Anapäst*en eine für unsre Sprache ganz und gar nicht passende Versart sind [. . .]'.¹⁵ There follows a modest confession that the reproduction of Aristophanes's anapaests would be beyond his capacities anyway, but then the real reason for not attempting to do so emerges: it would not produce an accurate effect.

Ich habe also den *Hexameter*, der unserm Ohr und unsrer Sprache angemessener ist, und, wenn die Daktylen, so viel möglich, gehäufft werden, beynahe eben denselben Effekt macht, wie der tetrametrische Anapäst, an dessen Stelle gesetzt, und glaube wohl daran gethan zu haben. (p. 65)

For each separate problematical metre in the original, Wieland has found a solution which is, in his judgement, able to create a parallel impression in German.

When he speaks of his own translations, Wieland's feeling for the character of the work and its author is the deciding factor whenever a choice must be made. Even two poets who both wrote in the same metre must be translated each in his own way, 'auf seine eigene Art' (see p. 68 above). His whole aim is to give the essence of the author to be translated in terms accessible to the contemporary reader. This involves very careful choices at every step: 'Ich könnte für jede Periode, jede Zeile, jedes gewählte Wort meine Gründe angeben [. . .]' (Monecke, p. 109). That Wieland has proceeded with such a degree of care will be assumed in our detailed examination of his translation of Horace's *Epistles*.

Because he set the standards for his own translation work so high, Wieland was justified in using a fine tooth-comb in his review (1795) of Voss's revised *Odyssey* translation. Wieland approves Voss's use of hexameters, but finds frequent examples of Homer's dactyls being replaced by spondees in Voss's version.¹⁶ One of his substantial criticisms is of Voss's determination to construct parallels for Greek idioms. The adverse results include excessive use of the genitive, and of pronouns such as 'jener' and 'solcher'.¹⁷ The other great weakness is apparent when Voss sacrifices normal German style for the sake of metre. He sometimes has to add a 'fürwahr' or a 'zuvor' — 'Flickwörter', Wieland calls them (p. 420). At other times, he alters the word order (p. 418), which makes the German style unnatural. In Wieland's view, most readers would not be able to appreciate the way in which fidelity to the Greek hexameters was skilfully heightened as a result of this distortion of German style. And he frequently questions whether this type of absolute fidelity to the original form should be recommended to translators at all. Referring to Horace's authority, Wieland suggests leaving the occasional particle untranslated instead: 'Horaz wenigstens würde sich [...] kein Gewissen daraus gemacht haben, um mit dem griechischen Dichter gleichen Schritt zu halten, ein Beywort aufzuopfern' (p. 404).

As always, Wieland concerns himself with details arising from his principle of fidelity to the spirit of the author. A polished style and an opportunity for the reader to be engaged, rather than alienated, were essential for translation in his view. Nevertheless, the 'Briefe über die Vossische Uebersetzung des Homers' (Wieland's review discussed above) were not without influence, despite their lack of actual theoretical content. Closely followed by an equally critical review by August Wilhelm Schlegel in the *Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, they set in motion a wave of hostile opinion which would culminate in the turning of the tide against Voss as a translator.¹⁸

Although Wieland was not a theorist, he was none the less fully aware of all the issues thrown up by the actual translations being undertaken by his contemporaries (a veritable industry in eighteenth-century Germany).¹⁹ In the context of a discussion of Wieland's Shakespeare translations, one critic is able to summarize his involvement in this way:

Kein Übersetzer lebt in einem Vakuum, sondern fühlt sich — mehr oder weniger bewußt — seiner Generation, seiner Sprache und den jeweils herrschenden ästhetischen, philosophischen und sonstigen Auffassungen verpflichtet.²⁰

Wieland's role as editor of the *Teutscher Merkur* and the *Attisches Museum* led to his achieving prominence as a promoter of translations, especially from the ancients.²¹ He was conversant with what was being thought and said in an atmosphere of universal enthusiasm for translation. Monecke sees Wieland as continually returning to d'Alembert's view that translators have the right to

interpret the original critically. This would mean that he dissociated himself from Gottsched's contention that a translator should restrain himself from interpreting the text. We might also conclude from Wieland's 'Briefe über die Vossische Uebersetzung des Homers' that he shared Georg Venzky's insistence on the principles of clarity, accuracy, and adherence to the rules of the translator's language.²² But these conclusions are drawn in the absence of explicit evidence that Wieland allied himself to any of these theorists.

Translation theory presupposes a view of how language as a whole operates,²³ and the 'Briefe über die Vossische Uebersetzung des Homers' do contain a good deal about the differences between languages, in this case, ancient Greek and modern German. Again, in a review of Garve's translation of Cicero in *Der Teutsche Merkur*, Wieland speaks of Cicero's turns of phrase, impressive in the breadth of meaning they embrace, but which one could really only hope to translate accurately into another Romance language (February, 1784; p. xviii). Similarly, in the course of his own translations, he sometimes laments the inadequacy of German when confronted with Horace's style.²⁴

As always, Wieland is interested in comparing details, not in examining the question of the relationship between words and thoughts or words and things. From this we can conclude that Wieland was far removed from the Enlightenment view, represented by Wolff, that language is an arbitrary system of signs. This view of language developed into a theory of translation as a straightforward operation in which one set of arbitrary signs is replaced by another. The difficulty arises when a phenomenon or an expression in one language has no correspondent in the other. This leads the translator either to the acceptance of inexact translation or to the conclusion that translation is in fact impossible.²⁵

When Wieland speaks of the impossibility of translating Lucretius or Virgil, he means something rather less abstract:²⁶ character and style cohere in an author and he is anxious not to honour one at the expense of the other. But if the author's character is to remain, and if the translator's idiom is to be natural, inevitable losses will occur: Wieland is fully conscious of the difficulties which derive from concepts or expressions which are lacking in the translator's language. He is also, as we have seen, very aware of the barriers imposed by differing speech systems. Yet Wieland assesses these difficulties and does not find them insurmountable. It is precisely because he does not regard language as an arbitrary system of signs, that he is confident of overcoming national and historical differences which have linguistic repercussions. Where he is truly at a loss to render an expression accurately and with the right tone, Wieland has recourse to his commentary, to make good the shortcoming.

Translation theory in eighteenth-century Germany would appear to revolve around the axis of a fundamental dichotomy. Early on in the century, Venzky and Bodmer enunciate two guiding principles which we find more fully delineated (independently) by both Goethe and Schleiermacher in 1813.²⁷ It is

worth noting that this clarity is achieved in the year of Wieland's death, and in Goethe's case, with explicit reference to Wieland's achievement. The translator's responsibilities span two types of fidelity: to the content and style of the original and to the rules and idioms of his own language. Venzky combines two authoritative sources²⁸ to establish his principles for a good translator, thus constructing an apparent contradiction about which he seemed quite unconcerned:

Es ist eine große Tugend und Geschicklichkeit, in der Übersetzung einem Verfasser seinen Mund, sein Gesicht, seinen Verstand, seine Stirn oder seine Gestalt, die er unter einer andern Himmelsgegend hatte, zu geben.²⁹

This is the first axiom, closely to be followed by the second: 'Man muß so übersetzen, daß der Autor eigentlich scheine, unser Landsmann geboren, nicht geworden zu sein.'³⁰ This second principle, in which the original author appears in the guise of a contemporary German, is one which we have come across already, as expressed by Wieland himself (see p. 69 above). And Wieland's adherence to the first principle will also become apparent in the detailed examination of the Horace translations.

It is more likely that Wieland encountered these two types of fidelity in Bodmer's writings (during his apprenticeship in Zürich) than that he was familiar with them from Venzky.³¹ A contribution of Bodmer's to the *Mahler der Sitten* in 1746 states:

[...] ist die Absicht, die in der Urschrift enthaltene Materie in einer andern Sprache der Welt einfältig mitzuthellen, so liegt dem Übersetzer ja ob, alles auf das klärste und deutlichste nach dem Genius seiner Sprache vorzutragen: Will man aber eine genaue Übersetzung haben, die nicht nur die Gedanken der Urschrift vorlege, sondern auch alle die Arten und Weisen, die der Urheber gebraucht, seine Gedanken an den Tag zu geben, beybehalte, so muß auch solches ganz genau bewerkstelliget werden [...]³²

Bodmer, who had his experience of translating *Paradise Lost* to draw on, speaks of two alternative aims, leading to two alternative methods. Venzky, on the other hand, seems to be caught in the trap of advocating two mutually contradictory positions. Bodmer's innovation was to separate these two methods. The first method begins with the interpretation of the original content and seeks to render it as clearly as possible in the language of the intended reader. The second method is intent on honouring the formal individuality of the original text more exactly by means of slight adjustments to the translator's idiom.

An overview of eighteenth-century translation theory is relevant to a study of the non-theoretical intellect which was Wieland's,³³ in a manner made clear for us by Goethe. His assessment of Wieland's Horace translations suggests that the two principles outlined above, which could be seen as a theoretical contradiction, might be overcome in practice — that was Wieland's aim and he was to a large extent successful. Goethe writes to Knebel in 1782:

Hast du Wielands Übersetzung der Horazischen Episteln gesehen? Wenn man sie laut in Gesellschaft liest, fühlt man, wie glücklich er mit dem einen Fuß auf dem alten Rom und mit dem andern in unsrem deutschen Reiche stehet, und sich angenehm hin und herschaukelt.³⁴

The two possible methods are no longer mutually exclusive: both Wieland's feet are firmly planted, one in each civilization, and the oscillation ensures that both are honoured equally. In Goethe's view, Wieland aims to be as faithful to the original, as he is to the rules of his own language. Goethe's image was penned just as the Horace translations were first appearing; the same two principles reappear in Goethe's eulogy on the death of Wieland in 1813, which has become one of the standard texts in the history of translation theory:³⁵

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 [. . .] Unser Freund, der auch hier den Mittelweg suchte, war beide zu verbinden bemüht [. . .]³⁶

These are maxims which date back to Venzky and Bodmer, but here they are not simple alternatives any more. Wieland's technique was to combine the two in his constant 'swinging' motion, as Goethe imagined it, or in his 'dialogue' with Horace *and* the reader, as we shall prefer to put it. Coincidentally, in the same year as Goethe paid his tribute to Wieland, Schleiermacher, the theologian and translator of Plato, formulated a theory of translation, in which the two principles again appear:

Entweder der Übersetzer läßt den Schriftsteller möglichst in Ruhe, und bewegt den Leser ihm entgegen; oder er läßt den Leser möglichst in Ruhe und bewegt den Schriftsteller ihm entgegen [. . .]³⁷

For Schleiermacher, these are the only methods possible, and they either collapse into one, that is, into the middle position represented by the translator himself, or one principle is subsumed by the other. In view of the practical difficulties of transporting an ancient author, whose language was nurtured in historical circumstances so different from the translator's, it is preferable to offer the reader a comparable experience to the one which the translator had when reading the original language. In practical terms, this means that something of the original's foreign nature should still be perceptible in the German version.³⁸

The diction to which attention had been drawn so many decades earlier persists, although, for Schleiermacher, a resolution of the tension between the two sides is inevitable. His own suggestion as to a resolution is not the same as the one which Goethe attributes to Wieland. The passage from the 'Trauerrede', cited above, continues: ' . . . doch zog er als Mann von Gefühl und Geschmack in zweifelhaften Fällen die erste Maxime vor'. That is to say, Wieland preferred the foreign author to be transported into the translator's world.³⁹

By 1819, in his introduction to the 'West-östlicher Divan', Goethe has isolated three types of translation. Wieland is again mentioned; he belongs to the second category:

Eine zweite Epoche folgt herauf, wo man sich in die Zustände des Auslandes zwar zu versetzen, aber eigentlich nur fremden Sinn sich anzueignen und mit eigenem Sinne wieder darzustellen bemüht ist [...] Wielands Übersetzungen gehören zu dieser Art und Weise; [...] Dieser vorzügliche Mann darf als Repräsentant seiner Zeit angesehen werden; er hat außerordentlich gewirkt, indem gerade das, was ihn anmutete, wie er sich's zueignete und es wieder mitteilte, auch seinen Zeitgenossen angenehm und genießbar begegnete.⁴⁰

Goethe goes on to describe the third method, in which translation remains as close as possible to all features of the original in an attempt to stand in its stead: Voss is the natural choice to represent this method. Because of the constraints of this schema, Goethe here makes no mention of Wieland's oscillating movement to and fro between original and translation, between ancient Rome and modern Germany. Here, therefore, Goethe chooses to emphasize Wieland's sensitivity with reference to his contemporary reader.

With Schleiermacher's 'methods of translation', the elements of which were already available early in the eighteenth century, and with Goethe's assessment of Wieland as a translator who actually represented his age, we have already moved into the realm of the practical. The second half of this book will examine the practical details of Wieland's Horace translations. We start with what is loosely termed 'diction': Wieland divides his loyalties between the language of the original and German idiom, and the frequency with which the latter takes preference over the former will help us to appreciate Goethe's judgment of him. Likewise, the instances in which Wieland transmits the spirit of Horace's phrase by using quite different figurative language will underpin our apparently contradictory contention (in the previous chapter) that when Wieland translates well, he is at his most original.⁴¹

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. The recognition of this fact does not discourage chapter headings such as, 'Wieland als Theoretiker des Übersetzens' (Monecke) and 'Christoph Martin Wieland, Theorie der Übersetzung' in Egon Dahinten's Göttingen dissertation.
2. See e.g., Anneliese Senger, *Deutsche Übersetzungstheorie im 18. Jahrhundert (1734–1746)* (Bonn, 1971). Senger lists Wieland's review of Voss's Homer, published in *Der Neue Teutsche Merkur* (1795). Haller refers to this piece as 'seine ausführlichste Aeusserrung auf dem Gebiet der Übersetzungstheorie' in 'Wielands Horaz in seiner ersten Fassung', p. 25.
3. 1/8 of *Geschichte der Abderiten*, ed. by Karl Hans Bühner (Stuttgart, 1980), p. 50.
4. Friedrich Gundolf, *Shakespeare und der deutsche Geist*, p. 161. On p. 163 he adds: '[...] so konnte er Shakespeare heute vergöttern und morgen benörgeln, und seine Einzeleindrücke auf ein Grundprinzip zurückzuführen kam ihm nicht in den Sinn'.
5. 'Seine Sensibilität für Ausdrucksnuancen war dem, was er als theoretische Richtschnur anzugeben vermochte, weit voraus, und auch die Gedanken zur Problematik des Übersetzens, die er in zahlreichen Vorworten, Rezensionen und Briefen geäußert hat, vermitteln ein differenzierteres, von den Überzeugungen der rigorosen Aufklärer beträchtlich abweichendes Bild.' Manfred Fuhrmann, 'Von Wieland bis Voss', op. cit., p. 5.

6. Monecke and Sengle are agreed that Wieland's position on translation displays no significant developments or alterations. See *Sengle*, p. 399: 'Hier bleibt die Aufgabe, seine allgemeinen Übersetzungsprinzipien zusammenfassend zu charakterisieren, denn sie verändern sich nicht wesentlich.' And *Monecke*, p. 75: 'ein wirklicher Wandel ist [...] nirgends erkennbar'.
7. Cited from Ernst Richter, 'Wielands sprachliche Ansichten im *Teutschen Merkur*', *ZDP*, 58 (1933), 284.
8. Richter, p. 285. For a short summary of Wieland's views on the qualities of various languages, see Eric A. Blackall, *The Emergence of German as a Literary Language 1770-1775* (Cambridge, 1959), p. 425.
9. According to *Weltliteratur* (p. 258) this nomenclature is ambiguous in intent: 'eine teils anerkannte, teils befehdete Autorität'. Heinz Berthold reports that 'Johann Friedrich Degen [spricht] von Wieland als dem Lucian der Deutschen [...]' ('Christoph Martin Wieland und die Nöte des Übersetzens', in *Wieland und die Antike: Beiträge der Winckelmann-Gesellschaft*, 14, ed. by Max Kunze (Stendal, 1986), p. 36).
10. Bernhard Seuffert, *Prologomena zu einer Wieland-Ausgabe* (Berlin, Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1905), p. 4.
11. See *Monecke*, p. 72: '1781 [...] in der Anzeige einer neuen Hexameter-Übersetzung der Ilias (wahrscheinlich der von Wobeser) [...]'.
12. See *Monecke*, p. 111f.; *Sengle* (p. 549) refers to the translation of the Cicero letters as Wieland's 'letzte Arbeit'.
13. Cf. *Sengle*, p. 401: 'Also müssen gerade dann, wenn der gleiche Eindruck erreicht werden soll, andere Mittel gewählt werden.'
14. Cf. *Fuhrmann*, p. 1091: 'er bekannte sich zu der Formel, der übersetzte Autor müsse so reden, wie er geredet hätte, wenn er ein Deutscher gewesen wäre — wovon er freilich im Alter vor allem angesichts des Phänomens Homer ein wenig abrückte.' See also *Monecke*, p. 79: 'Es ist denkbar, daß Wieland für einen in weltenferne Vorzeit entrückten Homer das artifizielle Sprachkleid wirklich als angemessen empfand.' See also Haller, 'Wielands Horaz', p. 14f.
15. 'Die Wolken des Aristophanes: Übersetzt von W.', *Attisches Museum*, 2 (1798), 64.
16. For other instances of discrepancies between the original Greek and Voss's hexameter translation, see Günter Häntzschel, 'Die Ausbildung der deutschen Literatursprache des 18. Jahrhunderts durch Übersetzungen: Homer Verdeutschungen als produktive Kraft', in *Mehrsprachigkeit in der deutschen Aufklärung*, ed. by Dieter Kimpel (Hamburg, 1985).
17. 'Briefe über die Vossische Uebersetzung des Homers', *Der Neue Teutsche Merkur* (May, 1795), p. 422f.
18. See Chapter 7 ('Ein steinerner Homer'), in Adalbert Schroeter, *Geschichte der deutschen Homer-Übersetzung im 18. Jahrhundert* (Hildesheim, 1978).
19. For this reason, the *Weltliteratur* exhibition organized by the Schiller-Nationalmuseum (Marbach am Neckar) was given the subtitle: *Die Lust am Übersetzen im Jahrhundert Goethes*.
20. Kyösti Ikonen, *Die Shakespeare-Übersetzung Wielands 1762-1766* (Jyväskylä, 1971), p. 15.
21. See H. B. Nisbet's discussion of von Knebel's Lucretius translation (which was encouraged by Wieland): 'Karl Ludwig von Knebel's Hexameter Translation of Lucretius', *GLL*, 14/4 (1988), esp. p. 424, fn. 13.
22. Georg Venzky, 'Das Bild eines ungeschickten Uebersetzers', p. 59f. See also Friedmar Apel, *Literarische Übersetzung* (Stuttgart, 1983), p. 42.
23. Cf. Senger, *Deutsche Übersetzungstheorie im 18. Jahrhundert (1734-1746)*, p. 34: 'Die Auffassung vom Übersetzen beruht auf der Grundlage der Sprachtheorie.'
24. Cf. *Fuhrmann*, p. 302: 'Nur schade, daß die körnichte Kürze, die eine Hauptschönheit des Originals ist, in der Übersetzung der Deutlichkeit aufgeopfert werden mußte.' This is the concluding sentence of Wieland's introduction to *Epistels* 1. 19.
25. Senger, p. 39f., demonstrates the kinship between Enlightenment translation theory and modern positions such as that of José Ortega y Gasset. Ortega concludes from this sort of difficulty that translation is a hopelessly utopian activity.
26. Cf. *Fuhrmann*, p. 1090: 'Wieland blieb auf dem Felde der Übersetzungstheorie und-praxis dem 18. Jahrhundert verhaftet: er wußte noch nichts von der prinzipiellen Unübersetzbarkeit fremder Literaturwerke.'
27. Cf. Winfried Sdun, *Probleme und Theorien des Übersetzens in Deutschland vom 18. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1967), p. 29. Sdun refers us to a line of succession drawn between Wieland's practice and Goethe's and Schleiermacher's theoretical statements.
28. Cf. *Monecke*, p. 63: 'Venzky zitiert [...] den seinerzeit berühmten Orientalisten und Polyhistor Herman von der Hardt [...] und in einem Atem mit ihm den Theologen und Poeten Johann Jakob Rambach [...]'.
29. Cited in Walter Fränzel, *Geschichte des Übersetzens im 18. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1913), p. 39.

30. Cited in *Monecke*, p. 63; Monecke adds: 'Dieser Widerspruch, den Venzky auf sich beruhen läßt — oder nicht gewahrt wird, wie Fränzel meint — enthält bereits das Grundproblem aller Übersetzungskunst im achtzehnten Jahrhundert.'
31. Cf. Fritz Budde, *Wieland und Bodmer* (Berlin, 1910), p. 163: 'Wielands kritisch-theoretische und polemische Schriften sind mehr noch als irgendwelche seiner Dichtungen eine Frucht der Verbindung mit Bodmer und des Zürcherischen Geistes.'
32. Cited in Senger, p. 67, who views this as a new and striking development: 'dann muß man das Neue und Außerordentliche von Bodmers Gedanken sehen'.
33. Cf. Budde, p. 164: 'Wieland war eine Natur ohne eigentliche kritische Begabung, im allerwenigsten verstand er zu systematisieren. Sein poetisches Schaffen ist naiv, es vollzieht sich unter der Regie eines gegenwärtigen, von außen empfangenen Eindrucks'.
34. Thomas C. Starnes, *Christoph Martin Wieland: Leben und Werk*, 3 vols (Sigmaringen, 1987), I, 717.
35. It is included, for instance, in Hans-Joachim Störig (editor), *Das Problem des Übersetzens* (Darmstadt, 1963).
36. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, 'Zum Brüderlichen Andenken Wielands', in *Bibliographische Einzelschriften*, 12 (Zurich, 1962; 2nd edn), 705.
37. Friedrich Schleiermacher, 'Ueber die verschiedenen Methoden des Übersetzens', p. 218.
38. Cf. Senger, p. 87: 'Schleiermacher [...] fordert die Übersetzung, in der das gleichsam gebilligte Original "durchscheinen" soll [...]'.
39. Sdun, p. 29, surely has Goethe's remarks in mind when summing up Wieland's position as translator: 'Ihm fehlte es keineswegs an Annahmefähigkeit und Einfühlungsgabe sowie an einem feinen Sinn für Formen, doch er übersetzte im Geschmack seiner Zeit'.
40. *Goethes Werke*, ed. by Erich Trunz, 2nd edn (Hamburg, 1952), II, 255f.: 'Noten und Abhandlungen: Übersetzungen'.
41. Cf. Sengle, p. 403: 'Freilich ist es bei Wieland stets eine mißliche Sache, Originalwerke und Übersetzungen streng voneinander sondern zu müssen [...] Man müßte [...] vier bis fünf konzentrische Kreise unterscheiden, je nach dem Grade ihrer Originalität, und es wäre dann vielleicht seine Horazübertragung zentraler zu stellen als seine Verserzählung Geron.' Wieland's *Geron der Adlige* is a rather uncharacteristic endeavour to take his readers into the medieval world by resisting all temptations towards modernizing effects. See James W. Marchand, 'Wieland and the Middle Ages', in *Christoph Martin Wieland: Nordamerikanische Forschungsbeiträge zur 250. Wiederkehr seines Geburtstages*, ed. by Hansjörg Schelle (Tübingen, 1984), pp. 33–52.

PART TWO

INTERPRETATIONS

CHAPTER V

DICTION

Wieland's approach to the translation of Horace makes its own unique contribution, when placed beside the other versions that were discussed in the first chapter. As regards prosody, with his choice of a loose iambic pentameter, he steers a middle course between the rigidity of the hexameter, whether dactylic or Alexandrine, and the seemingly easier task of prose translation. He alone among contemporary Horace scholars provides prefaces, commentary, and footnotes, all in German. And he arranges for the original and his translation to be printed on the same page, with their respective distinctive typefaces. This emphasizes the movement between the two quite different cultures present in these pages. Wieland is not trying to supersede Horace: he is engaged in an exchange with him. All these points make Wieland's translation interesting, but it is the interplay of preface, Horatian verse, translation, footnotes and commentary which distinguishes Wieland's from all other translations of this period or earlier.

The requirements of a wide diversity of readers are met by the complex disposition of text, footnotes and commentary in Wieland's edition. Reuter refers to this, beginning with the footnotes:

Diese Fußnoten [...] sind zu unterscheiden von den "Einleitungen" und von den "Erläuterungen" zu den einzelnen Episteln und Satiren, so daß wir — die recht freie Übersetzung [...] eingerechnet — einen *vierfach* gebrochenen Kommentar vor uns sehen.¹

Numbers in the German text refer to the commentary at the end of each poem, which constitutes a series of articles of varying lengths. Lower case letters, again in the German version, refer to points treated briefly in footnotes at the base of the page. The information they impart varies tremendously, but it is here in these footnotes, rather than in the commentary, that the reader will find brief aids to comprehension, if he is reading the Latin as well. The commentary too is provided with footnotes, as are some of the introductions, where a brief reference would have disrupted the flow of the syntax. This and other features of the text's appearance will be discussed in Chapter VII, below. The intricacy of this system of cross-referencing earns Fuhrmann's respect as well:

[...] er hat die horazischen Originale und ihre brillante Verdeutschung geradezu eingebettet in seine interpretierende und kommentierende Tätigkeit. [...] ein kunstvolles Arrangement, an dem schon die dort praktizierte Organisationskunst beeindruckt.²

By equipping the poems with several levels of interpretation, Wieland strikes a balance between fidelity to the original text, or indeed to Horace himself, and the desire to accommodate his readers. He also creates an edition which will, as far as possible, not be restrictive in its appeal to its readership. It is clearly the work of an able scholar and yet it is not dry; on the other hand, it bears the mark of Wieland the journalist, the 'populariser',³ and yet it never adopts a condescending or patronizing tone. Each individual can read it at his or her own level of understanding; the scholar can probably dispense with parts of the introduction, while the general reader may not wish to grapple with the original Latin.

Just as Wieland strikes a balance between the strictness of metre and the flexibility of prose, and between the interests of the scholar and those of the average reader, so balance is again the dominant feature of his style in the translation. During this period he also seems to have shared the much-vaunted ideal of 'the semblance of an original': a translation resurrects an ancient text in the style of an original German work, without archaic effects, so that it accurately conveys the original spirit in a natural, unforced way.⁴

Wieland achieves the effect of an original by balancing the imitation of Horace's style and tone with the exigencies of his own language. He expresses Horace's meaning as clearly as possible — banishing obscurities — but counter-balances this with the attainment of a pleasing style in German; he also respects the Roman historical setting without letting its unfamiliarity disturb the mood or intrude upon his contemporary reader's enjoyment. This idea of balancing finds expression in Goethe's 'angenehm hin und herschaukeln'.⁵ As suggested by Goethe's wording, we should not expect a rigid inertia, but rather a graceful movement occasioned by constant shifting and adjustment in order to restore the balance. It is an act of balancing, not a state of equilibrium.

In our analysis and evaluation of the text, the balance and interaction of the translation and commentary must unfortunately be disturbed. In this chapter, we shall be examining the smallest units in Wieland's style as translator. Wieland has not dedicated himself to reproducing Horace's every image or figure of speech with precision; the overall tone is more important to him than syntactical or lexical exactitude. As was seen in the chapter on translation strategies, Wieland was never inclined to adhere to any system; system militates against movement, and hence against the balance which characterizes his translation, since movement and flexibility are essential ingredients in this balance. When Wieland translates, he does not force Latin idioms into German, but strives to make up for any losses incurred by his preference for a natural style in the modern language. We shall find that he recognizes and appreciates many of the

finer points of Horace's diction, even when he does not attempt to register them by forging an exact parallel in German. There are frequent indications of this: where Horace's alliteration does not find its equivalent in German, we may find that anaphora has been used in its place. Or when Horace uses an abrupt monosyllabic opening to a line, we may find that Wieland has achieved the same effect by an unusual placement of a caesura. Consistent with this flexibility, this policy of compensation, there is also no absolute system of equivalence:⁶ alliteration is not *always* replaced by anaphora; an exclamation may sometimes do the work of a Latin monosyllable.

A translation which sought to adhere to a system of equivalence would inevitably sacrifice German idiom and sound awkward to the German ear. Particularly in the choice of metre, Wieland is above all concerned with the effect on the German ear. He constantly employs phrases such as 'wenigstens meinem Ohre nach', 'dieselbe Wirkung auf deutsche Ohren' and 'daß meine Ohren nicht dazu organisiert sind' (*Fuhrmann*, pp. 562 and 581). If we are to discover any translation theory implicit in Wieland's text, accessibility to the German reader is sure to be the overriding principle, and one that will be supported by the metre, the layout, the commentary, and Wieland's sense of history. He goes further than simply making the text comprehensible; he aims to forge an intimacy between the contemporary reader and the ancient poet — to initiate readers into an easy relationship to Horace which is similar to the symbiotic one Wieland himself enjoys. A translation is, by definition, an undertaking aimed at making a text in one language comprehensible for readers in another. But other priorities, arising from fidelity to the original, sometimes impede easy reading and generate an unnatural style, as we shall discover through comparing Wieland's version with the one prepared by Johann Heinrich Voss a quarter of a century later.

J. G. Gruber, Wieland's biographer, cannot see any point in a translation, except that it serves the needs of those who have not mastered the author's language. But a translation need not only be designed for those who are unable to understand the original — a fact eminently true in Wieland's case. Gruber explains the looseness of Wieland's translations by asserting that they are aimed at readers who know no Latin and who would have difficulty understanding a translation which was slavishly faithful to the original. By the same token, Gruber can find no purpose in a translation (e.g., Voss's *Horace*) which compels the reader to consult the original in order to understand it.⁷ This would be a fair criticism of misplaced fidelity to the original, but it is nevertheless not accurate to conclude that Wieland translates only for readers without Latin: he wishes to reach as broad a readership as he can, as his inclusion of the original indicates. The presence of the original Latin allows the reader with some competence in Latin to identify the wording which gave rise to Wieland's choice of phrase in each particular case. And the variety of problems posed by two such dissimilar

languages induces the readers to return to the original again and again, thereby establishing a dialogue between themselves, Horace and Wieland. The dialogue both recognizes the differences between original and translation and yet seeks to overcome them through the reader's participation.⁸

Wieland's *Horace*, as we have seen in the quotation from Reuter (p. 81 above), is commonly considered a 'very free' translation. There is definitely evidence to support this view, but the work is far from being some sort of invention based on Horatian themes. Wieland is faithful to Horace, but not with the rigid fidelity to form which we see in Voss. As one of the participants in Rudolf Borchardt's *Das Gespräch über Formen* expresses it:

Was Wieland gibt, ist die innere Formung, in der die Welt der horazischen Sermonen gefaßt ist, und die er als ein Vertrautes, nicht mehr Fremdes geben kann, weil er sein Gefühl für sie in eigene Kunstformen umzusetzen schon lange gewöhnt ist.⁹

As suggested in Chapter III, the translations are to be viewed as a logical extrapolation from, or natural extension of, those of Wieland's other works which display Horatian influence in whatever form. He had worked on a narrative style in his Rococo phase of the 1760s and early 1770s, which allowed for frequent dialogue with the reader. Since a Horatian tone had so often been his aim in the earlier works, Wieland had already adopted ideals which would stand him in good stead in the task of translating Horace. And he repeatedly finds his own Rococo stylistic ideals, viz., 'Grazie' and 'Reiz der Manier und Ton', in the *Epistles* (Fuhrmann, p. 441).

The Rococo poetic tradition, of which many of Wieland's works are exceptionally fine examples, regarded Horace as its 'great model'.¹⁰ The admixture of the philosophical or moral with the sensuous and playful, and a graceful style offset by an ironic, gently mocking stance form part of this Horatian inheritance, as it was received and interpreted by the Anacreontic and Rococo writers of the first half of the eighteenth century. But Rococo traits persist in Wieland's post-Biberach verse tales, such as *Ein Wintermärchen* (1777), *Gandalin oder Liebe um Liebe* (1777) and *Clelia und Sinibald oder Die Bevölkerung von Lampeduse* (1787). The elements of Wieland's translation which could be called 'free' need to be read with this Rococo-Horatian stylistic ideal in mind. Then it becomes clear that Wieland's apparently loose translation remains a faithful one: faithful to the tone, not to the letter.

As we have seen, a Horatian element is already in evidence in *Musarion*, where Wieland talks to his reader as he narrates, presents a moral ideal of equilibrium, and clearly assumes a familiarity with Horace. The overriding attention paid to perfecting a lightness of style in works such as *Musarion* or *Idris und Zenide* is still a discernible preoccupation in Wieland's — much later — Horace translations. The point of translating Horace was certainly not merely utilitarian; the translations were undertaken for a public who already knew Horace well: 'Denn

diese Übersetzung, aus einer Gesellschaft hervorgegangen, die den Horaz auswendig wußte, war gewiß nicht dazu bestimmt, ihn, für wen immer, zu ersetzen' (Borchardt, p. 39).

The content of the text to be translated is given; the translator, like the Rococo poet (who also frequently chooses to rework an old theme), must dedicate himself to shaping his version into a pleasing style. The context is obviously different, but there are definite parallels. Neither in Wieland's Rococo works, nor in his Horace translations, is there any hint of an antiquarian flavour. Rococo uses an ancient setting to tell its story, and its characters are at one and the same time ancient and modern. Similarly, Wieland translates ancient poems into a contemporary idiom; both in composition and in translation, Wieland deliberately moves to and fro between antiquity and modernity. And in both contexts, there are frequent remarks made to the reader. In Wieland, the Rococo poet and the gifted translator meet in a happy combination.

'Epistles' 2. 1

When Wieland has to make an adjustment or sacrifice a feature of the Latin, he sometimes explains his action as part of the commentary. Commentary items of this kind are very informative about his attitude towards the activity of translation. At *Epistles* 2. 1, line 144,

Tellurem porco, Silvanum lacte piabant,
floribus et vino Genium, memorem brevis aevi.

Wieland translates:

mit Opfrung eines Mutterschweins die Erde,
mit Milch den Waldgott, und mit Wein und Blumen
den Genius des Lebens sich gewogen²¹. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 381)

Wieland's undeniably pleasing little phrase omits any reference to the thought of how brief life is, the Epicurean principle. Commentary item 21 makes profuse apology:

Es liegt eine unbeschreibliche Schönheit in dem Beiwort:

Genium memorem brevis aevi,

und gerade diesen schönen Zug — worin die so natürliche und auf eine so rührende Art zur Freude aufmunternde Empfindung liegt: Wer weiß, wer übers Jahr noch lebt? [...] — mußte ich weglassen, weil er nur durch eine Umschreibung, die den Perioden schleppend machte und dadurch das ganze Gemälde verderbte, zu übersetzen war. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 421)

The interaction of original, translation and commentary is on display here in all its intricacy. In the commentary, Wieland demonstrates the Epicurean content in a paraphrase, but asserts at the same time that style and content are so closely allied that, if his translation were to ignore rhythmical necessities for the sake of precisely capturing the thought, we would not be true to Horace. If Wieland *had*

allowed the tone to become 'schleppend' the 'Aufmunterung zur Freude' (reminiscent of Hagedorn's poem 'Aufmunterung zum Vergnügen') would have sounded more like a melancholy *Memento mori*! The importance of tone is stressed, and Wieland is keen to portray the scene as a whole, rather than regarding each separate line as a linguistic and metrical challenge. Voss's translation adheres too strictly to the Latin line division:

Blumen und Wein dem Gemahner an flüchtige Zeit, dem Geburtsgott.

Unlike Wieland, Voss shows no regret at having upset Horace's ascending tricolon. Voss has kept to Horace's rhythm and word order. The fine construction of the period (so much admired by Wieland) is not his concern.

Wieland's view of fidelity is anything but narrow; his translation must be faithful in its overall effect more than in any individual feature. In this instance, a paraphrase would have been necessary to do justice to the thought, and the image would have been destroyed. Wieland is confident that the tone he has adopted throughout this passage creates the right emotional effect: 'Ich habe mich aber bemüht, die Wirkung dieses Zugs auf das Gemüt durch den Ton, den ich dem ganzen Gemälde gegeben habe, hervorzubringen [...]'. He fully expects the discerning reader to conclude that the essential Horace has been preserved by these means. In order to judge this properly, we need to restore the line above to its original context:

Wenn unsre alten, biederherzigen,
mit wenigem vergnügten Ackerleute²⁰,
nachdem sie ihres Schweißes Früchte in die Scheunen
gebracht, am Erntefest mit ihren Kindern
und treuem Weibe, den Gehülfen ihrer Arbeit,
an Leib und Seele (denn auch diese trug,
in Hoffnung dieses Tages, ihren Anteil
der Last des langen Jahrs) sich gütlich tun
und pflegen und zur künft'gen Arbeit wieder
erfrischen wollten — machten sie vorerst
mit Opfrung eines Mutterschweins die Erde,
mit Milch den Waldgott, und mit Wein und Blumen
den Genius des Lebens sich gewogen²¹. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 381)

The term 'Gemälde' was certainly an apposite choice. Wieland has lovingly painted a scene of rustic celebration in the lines which lead up to the account of sacrifices to the gods. In the Latin, the celebrations are only described after the gods have received their due. But Wieland anticipates the feasting which will follow the sacrifices. An added phrase like 'ihres Schweißes Früchte' and the mention of 'Scheunen' and 'Erntefest' contribute to this Breugel-like scene. Commentary item 20 is full of enthusiasm:

Welch ein milder, lieblicher Geist von Natur und Humanität weht durch dieses ganze wildanmutige Landschaftsstück! Jedes Wort verdiente einen Kommentar, und würde durch einen Kommentar entweiht! (*Fuhrmann*, p. 421)

The added descriptive details have taken the place of a sober commentary. Indeed, these lines *enact* the carefree lifestyle of the Epicurean, instead of pedantically explaining his beliefs. Although 'freely' translated by conventional standards, the scene is nevertheless suffused with Horace's own spirit and love for the country life. And again there are glimpses of the pastoral Rococo style and of its Anacreontic and Horatian-Epicurean philosophy.

Wieland's love for the poems and their author is as much in evidence here as his desire to make a worthy translation. The principles of compensation and balance are both explicit; Wieland suggests that the delicacy of feeling with which he has imbued the passage as a whole will make good the loss of one brief meditative phrase. In keeping with the omission of the Epicurean element, the gods' proper names are translated: 'Tellus' becomes 'die Erde' and 'Silvanus', 'der Waldgott'; the offerings of a sow, milk, wine, and flowers, which suggest the rich abundance of nature, are mentioned *before* the gods to whom they are respectively offered. This very slight adjustment shifts the axis towards the harvest and the celebration — away from the act of piety.

Wieland conceded from the start that Latin succinctness of style could not be captured in German. The result is a translation which is roughly twice as long as the original. This is undoubtedly regrettable. Wieland himself expresses disappointment at being unable to maintain Horace's succinctness (*Fuhrmann*, p. 302): 'Nur schade, daß die körnichte Kürze, die eine Hauptschönheit des Originals ist, in der Übersetzung der Deutlichkeit aufgeopfert werden mußte.' This licence does, however, allow Wieland to adopt a number of successful solutions which he would otherwise have been denied. In *Epistles* 1. 2, lines 41–43 require almost six lines in German:

[...] Qui recte vivendi prorogat horam
rusticus expectat dum defluat amnis; at ille
labetur, et labetur in omne volubilis aevum.

*

[...] Wer recht zu leben eine Stunde nur
versäumt, gleicht jenem Bäu'rlein, das am Flusse
geduldig stehen blieb, zu warten, bis
das Wasser abgeflossen wäre! Tor,
die Zeit, die du verlierst, wie dort der Strom,
fließt fort, und fließt, und ewig wird sie fließen,
nur nie zurück! — (*Fuhrmann*, p. 78)

The principal cause of the additional length is to be found in the description of the river's flow.¹¹ Horace uses an onomatopoeic device, echoing the motion of the water with alliterated labials and liquids: 'labetur [...] labetur in omne volubilis aevum'. Wieland's alliterated phrase, 'fließt fort [...] fließt [...] fließen', is less evocative of the sound of flowing water. He compensates for this by accentuating the endless, unchanging quality of the river's flow. This is Horace's point; it is not some new element introduced by Wieland, but it is

expressed with greater emphasis and clarity by not adhering too exactly to Latin syntax. Wieland's treble polyptoton, 'fließt fort und fließt und ewig wird sie fließen', replaces Horace's 'labitur [. . .] labetur' and enacts the infinite activity of the river. It also approaches the sounds of 'volubilis aevum', thus going some way towards correcting the balance and making good the loss of Horace's phrasing.

Wieland frequently articulates, when he translates, and this too effects an increase in length. Here, not content with the phrase 'warten bis das Wasser abgeflossen wäre', he spells out the analogy with time, and replaces the metaphor with a simile, making time (not the river) the subject of 'fließen', and he ends with 'nur nie zurück!' — an abrupt halt. These changes illuminate and intensify the impact of Horace's image to the substantial benefit of Wieland's reader.¹² To put off changing one's life is to wait in vain for the right moment: just as the river never ceases flowing for the sake of the rustic waiting to cross, so the ideal movement for reform never arrives and lost moments, like the water which has made its way downstream, can never be retrieved. The use of the apostrophe in 'Tor' gives colourful dramatic content to the image of the peasant and approximates the break in the Latin before 'at ille'. Wieland's addition of 'geduldig' contributes both to the theme of time and to the reader's sense of the ambience.

Wieland then adds yet another explanatory sentence, returning the reader to the advice which led into the image: 'Allein, zum Unglück hat man so viel Nötigers zu tun!'. Wieland is no longer thinking of the rustic on the river bank; he is offering a psychological insight: this is how one tends to justify putting off a course of action. Wieland's additional sentence, which occurs immediately at the end of our passage, both returns us to its very beginning, and establishes a logical continuity to prepare the ground for the line which follows. Horace, without introduction, furnishes examples of the more important things which prevent us from changing. Wieland, unlike Horace, seldom leaves his reader to guess at the connections in such passages.¹³ Wieland's addition alerts the reader to the fact that we are now leaving the image behind and proceeding to the enumeration of the sorts of task which might seem to need more urgent attention. Horace's thought process has been brought to the fore and, at the same time, the easy conversational *Plauderton* allows the reader to participate in the sentiment expressed.

Franz Haller's study of the Horace poems which Wieland published in the *Teutscher Merkur* documents the instances of the respective rhetorical devices in the original and the translation. Sometimes Wieland maintains a device present in the original, sometimes he omits it, and sometimes he introduces one of his own creation. Haller's introductory remarks about proverbial sayings sum up this flexibility:

Sentenzen und sprichwörtliche Wendungen behandelt Wieland verschieden. Mitunter entspricht ihnen auch in der deutschen Uebersetzung eine Sentenz [. . .] Manchmal geht der sprichwörtliche Charakter gerade durch die wörtliche Uebersetzung verloren, da die

Wendung im Deutschen nicht sentiös wirkt [...] Unabhängig vom Original gebraucht Wieland sprichwörtliche Wendungen. (Haller, 'Wielands Horaz', pp. 276–79)

Haller's judgement in each separate case is open to dispute, this despite his laudable classification, which in itself accurately reflects the variety of methods employed by Wieland. The lines from *Epistles* 1. 2 discussed above are more or less introduced by this example furnished by Haller:

Dimidium facti qui coepit habet [...] (line 40)

which Wieland renders as:

Frisch angefangen ist schon halb getan.

Haller regards this as an example of the 'sprichwörtlicher Charakter' being put in jeopardy, when the original is translated literally. This might well have been the case if Wieland had done so; instead, he has chosen a German phrase with a sententious ring to it. The gnomic character of the phrase is preserved¹⁴ — aided by the strict pentameter — although the translation is not a syntactical parallel.

A proverb offers information or advice which has general applicability: it stands apart from the particular setting which gives rise to its expression. The proverbs and pithy remarks which Wieland is so fond of inserting are one of the ways in which he involves the reader. As in his earlier Rococo style, direct appeals to the reader are a favourite device of Wieland's.

Epistles 1. 1 (where Horace says that virtue ought to be valued more than money) has the clearest example of a distancing effect brought about by one of Wieland's gnomic insertions:

[...] — Freilich nicht zu Rom! Da gehts
aus einem andern Ton! — [...] (*Fuhrmann*, p. 43)

The mention of Rome indicates that we have been asked to take a step away from our immediate context in order to assess Horace's remarks. It underlines the reader's situation as an outsider, while simultaneously reinforcing Horace's point. And Wieland shares this fondness for the lapidary statement with Horace himself.

Monecke's analysis of this phenomenon is useful; he again mentions that Wieland is keen to make clear the logic of the poems, and sees this as one of the tasks of the inserted phrases: 'Sie stellen gedankliche Kohärenz her, indem sie Einschnitte setzen und dadurch das Ganze logisch und rhythmisch gliedern.' He also correctly views these as a way of involving the reader in a dialogue:

Es ist der wechselnde Aus- und Einblick gewährende Raum der Konversation, in den der Leser, der Zuhörer geladen, genötigt wird. Er soll sich als Gesprächspartner fühlen. Der Dialogkünstler Wieland bemüht sich um die Einbeziehung des Lesers. (*Monecke*, pp. 234–36)

In *Epistles* 1. 2 (where Horace reports that he has been rereading Homer), Wieland adds the phrase:

Welch einen Spiegel hält dies Buch uns vor! (*Fuhrmann*, p. 77)

Hereby he extends Homer's relevance to include his own contemporary German reader. The mirror is a metaphor typically used for eighteenth-century didactic works, such as Wieland's own *Der Goldene Spiegel*. But the remark does not lack suitability in the Horatian context either — it is simply a reiteration, with added emphasis, of the exercise upon which Horace is embarked: namely, seeking moral guidance from Homer.

Less obviously directed towards the reader is the phrase which Wieland inserts into *Epistles* 1. 4:

[...] — Dies Glück, Tibull, ist dein₂. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 102)

Horace, addressing Tibullus, sums up what he has just been saying. But Horace did not actually do this in his poem; the summary is Wieland's own. If we consult the lengthy commentary item 2 attached to this line, we are left in no doubt that Wieland intends to draw his readers in, to enable them to partake of Horace's friendship with Tibullus:

Eine innere Notwendigkeit zwingt uns immer unvermerkt, uns selbst unsre eigne Art zu denken und zu leben, zum Maßstab anzunehmen [...] Horaz scheint in dieser ganzen Epistel immer sich an Tibulls Platz gesetzt zu haben. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 106)

In effect, Wieland's reader is being exhorted to emulate Horace by trying to see things from the other person's point of view. Paradoxically, even a phrase which addresses Horace's correspondent by name contrives to involve Wieland's reader, with the result that the three-point dialogue continues.

Again, in *Epistles* 1. 6, Wieland condenses Horace's examples into a moral:

Wer etwas will, muß auch die Mittel wollen. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 126)

This embodies the substance of what Horace, by means of examples, has been demonstrating to Numicius (the addressee of this epistle). At the same time, by pointing to the timeless relevance of the advice in it, Wieland helps his own readers to interpret the epistle, as he had promised to do in his introduction:

Ich füge nur noch bei, daß ich mir in dieser Epistel, mehr als in den meisten andern, erlaubt habe, die Auslegung in den Text selbst zu bringen [...] (*Fuhrmann*, p. 123)

The translation of *Epistles* 2. 2 contains a phrase which is very reminiscent of Wieland's style, both in poems and novels. In this example, the phrase is suggested by a line of Horace's:

Vivere si recte nescis, decede peritis;

Wieland does manage to render this Horatian line quite accurately, but only after dividing the line (at the comma) by his own insertion. Horace's injunction

above has a very severe ring to it. Wieland has added a phrase which reduces the severity by adopting a more positive note:

[...] — Kurz, recht zu leben
ist eine Kunst, die wohl gelernt und strenge
geübt sein will. Verstehst du nichts davon,
so schleiche weg, und mach' den Meistern Platz! (*Fuhrmann*, p. 460)

The Wielandian hallmark is, of course, the word 'kurz', often used with comic effect to bring a lengthy passage to a close — ironically, this has the effect of lengthening it further by tacking on one more clause. In our illustration, it introduces the sentence which will distil the message from all the examples given. A few lines above, Wieland had already used the same formula, 'kurz die Wunderdinge alle', in order to unify another catalogue of vices. In both instances, the reader has been alerted to the substance of Horace's argument by means of one of Wieland's favourite stylistic devices. But the message for the reader is not simply an invention on Wieland's part — it is a guide to Horace's way of thinking. Commenting on an extension to a different passage in this poem, Wieland explains how his inserted phrases do not constitute any lack of fidelity to Horace:

Ich habe mir bei Übersetzung dieser Periode, die im Original nur drei Verse macht, etwas mehr Freiheit, als gewöhnlich, im Ausdruck erlaubt: ohne, wie ich glaube, den Horaz etwas anders sagen zu lassen, als was er in seiner Sprache sagt und sagen wollte. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 477)

This rather self-serving explanation, which downplays the quite remarkable freedom of this passage of the translation, nevertheless constitutes a fair defence against anticipated criticism.

Haller catalogues those instances in which Wieland uses a 'sprichwörtliche Wendung' where there is none in the original. *Epistles* 1. 2 contains a good example of this. In line 6, Horace's perfectly factual 'propter [...] amorem', the reason for the Trojan war, is translated by Wieland as 'zwei schöner Augen wegen' (*Fuhrmann*, p. 75). This expression is not only proverbial, it is also, and more interestingly, lightly jocular and iconoclastic in the Rococo manner. This is explained by the purpose of the epistle as a whole. Horace writes to a young friend about how instructive the reading of Homer can be. The general tone is thus more moralizing than it is in some of the other epistles, as Wieland mentions in his introduction (*Fuhrmann*, p. 74): 'Der ihm sonst so gewöhnliche ironische Ton ist aus diesem Briefe, wo er keine gute Wirkung tun konnte, gänzlich verbannt'. But the jocular, which Wieland introduces, suits the friendly relations between Horace and his correspondent: Homer is more fun to read than the philosophers, and Horace does not wish to put off his young friend by seeming too doctrinaire. Wieland's introduction tells us that in this epistle we will find morals presented in an affectionate and sympathetic way:

Der Ton [...] beweiset, daß Horaz in dem Hause des M. Lollius [...] auf einem freundschaftlichen Fuß gestanden. [...] Es ist der Ton eines Vaters, der einen geliebten und hoffnungsvollen Sohn [...] durch guten Rat und heilsame Warnungen [...] verwahren möchte. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 73)

Wieland's translation concentrates on producing the right tone. He makes certain that the story of the Trojan war sounds exciting:

[...] Betörter Fürsten
und blöder Völker tolle Hitze schildert
die Fabel uns, worin wir Griechenland
und Barbarei zwei schöner Augen wegen
in zehnjähr' gem Krieg zusammenstoßen sehn.

Additional adjectives have intensified the dramatic impact, and the inversion involving 'uns' brings the word 'Fabel' into prominence through a crucial break in the rhythm. Horace too makes 'fabula' conspicuous:

Fabula, qua Paridis propter narratur amorem
Graecia Barbariae lento collisa duello
stultorum regum et populorum continet aestus. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 75)

In Horace's lines, the long-drawn out war is suggested by long vowels, while the remainder of the passage is simple and straightforward. The elements appear in a quite different order in Wieland's version; there is no mention of Paris by name, and the number of years the war lasted has been added. These diversions from the original manage to reproduce the rapport between Horace and Lollius by referring to things they would have taken for granted in their conversations. The omission of Paris's name does not in itself contribute to the overall plan, but here we can call on Franz Haller for a defence of Wieland, in one of his rare assessments of the work:

Ueberaus zahlreich sind die Fälle, wo Wieland einzelne Wörter auslässt, ohne dass er damit eine bestimmte Absicht zu verbinden scheint, ein Verfahren, das ihm nur kleinliche Pedanterie als Verstoß gegen die Treue ankreiden könnte. (Franz Haller, p. 174f.)

'Epistles' 1. 19

Wieland's rendering of Horace's famous scornful outburst against imitations in *Epistles* 1. 19, line 19f., encapsulates the flexibility of the translator's method:

O imitatores, servum pecus, ut mihi saepe
bilem, saepe iocum vestri movere tumultus!

*

[...] O du leidige
Nachahmer-Schar, zum Tragen und zum Folgen
gebornes Vieh! wie oft hat euer Lärmen
und Jähnen bald zum Lachen mich und bald
zur Ungeduld gereizt! — [...] (*Fuhrmann*, p. 304)

The additional length can be accounted for by the extension of Horace's image; the image is amplified in order to transmit the full force of Horace's exclamation. Distaste for the imitators is expressed by the adjective 'leidige' and the dual slavish and bestial qualities which make the image appropriate are spelled out by the phrase 'zum Tragen und zum Folgen/gebornes Vieh!' On the whole, Wieland has managed to sustain the double comparison of Horace's dense phrase; he achieves close similarity in some phrases and has compensated for a loss in others; in this way he restores the balance. Horace's 'saepe [...] saepe' is rendered by 'bald [...] bald', and Wieland has even placed his second 'bald' at the end of a line, in imitation of Horace's positioning of the first 'saepe'. However, this is achieved at the expense of having to reverse the order of 'bilem [...] iocum': Wieland has 'Lachen [...] Ungeduld', and he has adopted an unidiomatic position for 'mich'.

'Nachahmer-Schar' is an unusual formulation in German, but it captures both 'imitatores' and 'pecus'. The Latin 'servum' has been sacrificed in favour of a description of the behaviour of a herd. Compensation comes into play when Wieland recognizes the onomatopoeic power of 'movere tumultus' and responds with an equally amusing onomatopoeic neologism, 'Jahnen', instead of trying to reproduce Horace's actual combination of consonants and vowels more closely. Horace's exasperation at the unintelligent behaviour of his imitators has an amusing aspect as well — and Wieland has missed neither of these features. In the translation of this single image, we encounter: i) some of the imaginative details which Wieland uses to embellish the narrative and which extend the concise original; ii) some examples of admirable fidelity; iii) one or two losses; and iv) some compensation to restore the balance.

The idea of balance or of Rococo equilibrium is implicit in a very accurate list of characteristics given by Egidius Schmalzriedt. In a review of the Fuhrmann edition in the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* (30 September 1986), he says of Wieland:

Er paraphrasiert, erweitert, kürzt, retuschiert, expliziert, ergänzt, wo immer es seiner Meinung nach dem Verständnis förderlich ist. Aus Horazischen Pointen werden kleine Szenen, harte Übergänge werden durch resümierende Überleitungen geglättet [...]

In this summary, the diversity of techniques employed by Wieland becomes apparent. This diversity eludes the standard observations about Wieland's practice of bridging the gaps between Horace's phrases. Monecke, for instance (p. 233), says the lack of logical connections endemic to the conversational style of the *Epistles* and *Satires* disturbs Wieland:

Wieland [...] fühlt sich durch die oft schwer zu durchschauende, zuweilen auch fehlende Logik im Aufbau von Brief und Satire geniert. Er will ein Gerüst fühlen und fühlen lassen; er sucht nach Klammern, die das Ganze innerlich zusammenhalten, nach einzelnen Bausteinen, die unauffällig eine Lücke schließen oder, durch ein ornamentales Zeichen geschmückt, einen Punkt als Wendepunkt markieren.

It is not simply that Wieland finds Horace's style inconvenient; this could hardly be true of one who felt such affection and admiration for the Roman poet. And it is not simply that he is intent on making Horace's poetry clear for his reader ('um den Gesprächspartner mit Leichtigkeit, mit Vergnügen folgen zu lassen', says Monecke, and Schmalzriedt speaks of 'Verständnis'); Wieland is intent on doing Horace justice as well. While it is true that Wieland likes to expound the logic of the poems ('eine Logik aus Geselligkeit', says Monecke, in order to differentiate it from the logic of thought), he also observes, and either faithfully recreates or compensates for the loss of, many of the ornaments of Horace's style. This dual ambition prompts an unusual display of flexibility. Loath to leave his reader with an impression of Horace as an opaque writer — an impression which a closer rendering might make — Wieland introduces adjustments wherever necessary. As Schmalzriedt indicates, this can mean expansion of some passages and abbreviation in others.

'Epistles' 1. 7

Perhaps the most unusual and daring addition to a translation¹⁵ — and the most characteristic one for Wieland — is the creation of an extra, imaginary scene. *Epistles* 1. 7 opens with the lines:

Quinque dies tibi pollicitus me rure futurum,
Sextilem totum mendax desideror [. . .]

Wieland translates:

Fünf Tage nur, Mäcen, versprach ich dir
auf meinem Gütchen frische Luft zu schöpfen,
nun läßt den ganzen Erntemonat durch
der lügenhafte Mensch vergebens sich erwarten! (*Fuhrmann*, p. 152)

Out of Horace's one word 'rure', Wieland forms a picture of Horace enjoying the fresh air on his farm. This device is both imaginative and informative: the reader is given an idea of the attractions of remaining in the countryside — one of Horace's constantly recurring themes — and he is also told that Horace had a farm. This is tantamount to inserting a commentary item into the text itself; Wieland is motivated by the desire to draw an appealing portrait of Horace. The designation 'Erntemonat' adds to the imaginary scene in a way that 'August' could not. The Latin name for the month would be uninformative for a German reader, and too antiquarian for Wieland's taste, whereas the mention of harvest suggests a possible further reason for Horace's prolonged absence. 'Vergebens' gives us a glimpse of Maecenas's impatience — an extra little dramatic detail in the narrative.

There are more features worth noting here. The inclusion of the addressee's name, 'Mäcen', is a friendly addition to the tone of the opening; its shortened form has advantages for the metre. 'Nur' emphasizes the brevity of the period

Horace originally mentioned, and 'durch' the length of time he has actually been away — something Horace himself underpins by means of the seven long Latin syllables with which this epistle begins. 'Vergebens' also has no correspondent in the Latin, although it is implied in 'desideror'; the German adverb stresses the fact that Horace has still not returned after a whole month. These additions work together to sharpen the contrast between what Horace has promised and his actual behaviour.

Where Wieland adds informative and imaginative details to an unadorned Latin passage, Voss keeps this type of liberty to a minimum. His version reads:

Da fünf Tag' auf dem Land' ich dir zu verweilen gelobet,
Werd' ich den ganzen Sextilis vermißt als Täuschender [...]

Voss has succeeded in restricting his version to precisely the same length as the original: just under two lines. This has undoubted benefits for the careful reader who wants to compare original and translation in a systematic way. In contrast to Wieland, he offers no help with the month 'Sextilis', but there are some concessions to the German idiom. For example, Voss has spelt out the logical connection between these lines by using the construction which begins with 'da'. This explains that Horace is dishonest ('mendax' = 'Täuschender'), *because*, having promised to stay away for only five days, he has been absent a whole month. The verb 'verweilen' also adds colour to Horace's more neutral 'futurum'. Rather than simply 'being' in the country, Horace has 'stayed on' or 'lingered' in Voss's version. But coupled with 'gelobet' it undermines the logic here — Horace would not have promised to stay *beyond* time.

Metre is not our topic here, except insofar as it affects diction. These two lines display three contractions: 'Tag'', 'Land'' and 'werd'', — an inordinate number for such a short passage. While it should not be forgotten that contractions lend a relaxed and friendly tone,¹⁶ which is certainly a characteristic of Horace's style in the *Epistles*, this is surely a case in which the rhythm of the hexameter has overruled other conventions. We see this occurring again: 'ich' has been divorced from 'da', contrary to the rules of syntax, and in the second line 'vermißt' has been brought forward from its proper place; 'fünf Tage' would be placed next to 'verweilen' in a normal German phrase, but here Voss imitates the Latin word order by the insertion of 'dir', and 'als Täuschender' is clumsy as well. So determined is Voss to reproduce the hexameter that he sacrifices both the tone of the original and the syntax of his own language.¹⁷

Goethe's astute perception that Wieland's translation technique involved constant oscillation between Horace and the eighteenth-century reader has been borne out by our observations at the level of diction. On the most fundamental level, Wieland alternates between the antiquarian effect of incorporating a Roman proper name just as it appears in the Latin (e.g. Lollius in *Epistles* 1. 18), and the modernizing practices of translating it, abbreviating it (Tibull, Mäcen),

or omitting it altogether. The problem of syntactical dissimilarity between Latin and German confronts him in every line and his solutions, unsystematic as they are, show him to be a sensitive and agile translator. Horace speaks through Wieland in a lighthearted Rococo tone, but in Wieland's *Horace* there are surprisingly frequent examples of minute accuracy, and the whole is governed by compensation rather than licence.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. *Reuter*, p. 268. As will emerge, I do not subscribe completely to Reuter's pronouncement that the translation is 'recht frei'.
2. Manfred Fuhrmann, 'Wielands Horaz: Ein philologischer Weg', p. 199. The facsimile on p. 148 demonstrates the visual impact of this arrangement.
3. Cf. the section heading, 'Der Popularisator im Schneckenhaus', in *Sengle*; this forms part of the chapter entitled 'Literarische Mitteltätigkeit'.
4. *Monecke* (p. 72) cites Wieland's 1781 review of a new Homer translation in *Der Teutsche Merkur* (*Viertelj.* 3); the translator is warmly praised for having achieved this ideal. Walter Jens remarks on Wieland's own success in this regard: 'Zweite Originale [...] ein Ziel, das er erreichte, so oft er, dieser auf Sympathie angewiesene Schriftsteller, auf Einverständnis über die Zeiten hinweg einen Geistesverwandten übersetzte'; 'Bis heute nicht überholt: Wieland als Übersetzer', p. 2190.
5. For Goethe's remarks in more detail, see above p. 74. Indeed, balance is a guiding principle in Wieland's style on every level. In an article on Wieland and Claude-Joseph Dorat, Alan Menhennet speaks of 'the pointed balance of the phrasing', 'the balance between recognition of new values and preservation of the old values', and 'the balance which enables an artist to negotiate aesthetic [...] minefields unscathed'. See 'Wieland and Claude-Joseph Dorat (1734-1780): A Footnote to the History of Franco-German Literary Relations in the Eighteenth Century', *MLR*, 78 (1983), 864.
6. Just as with metre, there are no equations. See above, p. 69. The additional length of the poems in the German is not constant. A more recent translator of the Classics suggested the solution of two lines of English for every line of Catullus. This would have made it harder for Wieland to capture Horace's spirit. See James S. Holmes, 'Translating Martial and Vergil: Jacob Lowland among the Classics', in *Translating Poetry: The Double Labyrinth*, ed. by Daniel Weissbort (London, 1989).
7. J. G. Gruber, *C. M. Wielands Leben* (Hamburg, 1984; reprint of the 1st edn, Leipzig, 1828), III, 415.
8. The function of dialogue in Wieland's works has recently been analysed by Herbert Jaumann: 'Die allgemeinen Leistungen des Dialogs: Offenheit, Aufhebung von Fixierungen, Zulassung heterogener Elemente (Standpunkte, Urteile usw.) und dabei Auflösung starrer Antithesen, um nur eher "kognitive" Momente zu nennen, werden ihrerseits zum Träger von Bedeutung (Semantik und Form)'; 'Der deutsche Lukian: Kontinuitätsbruch und Dialogizität, am Beispiel von Wielands *Neuen Göttergesprächen* (1791)', in *Der deutsche Roman der Spätaufklärung: Fiktion und Wirklichkeit*, ed. by Harro Zimmermann (Heidelberg, 1990), p. 78.
9. Rudolf Borchardt, *Das Gespräch über Formen & Platons Lysis Deutsch* (Leipzig, 1905), p. 39.
10. Alan Menhennet, *Order and Freedom: Literature and Society in Germany from 1720 to 1805* (London, 1973), p. 93.
11. Cf. *Kiessling/Heinze*, p. 31: '[...] sowohl die weichen Konsonanten [...] wie die trochäische Cäsur sollen die Bewegung des Fließens malen'.
12. For an analysis of Horace's image, cf. *Kiessling/Heinze*, p. 30: "rusticus expectat = similis est rusticus qui expectat: H[oraz] liebt diese eigenthümliche Verkürzung des Gleichnisses". It is this 'eigenthümliche Verkürzung' which poses Wieland's greatest problem and most frequently necessitates the addition of an explanatory phrase. See below, p. 150.
13. Fuhrmann ('Wielands Horaz: Ein philologischer Weg', p. 201) judges Wieland's translations to be easier for today's readers than the original was for Horace's readers: 'sie präsentieren den heutigen Lesern nicht selten einen eingängigeren und gefälligeren Text, als ihn Horaz einst den Seinigen zugemutet hat'. Professor David West, the author of *Reading Horace* (Edinburgh, 1967), has explained that Horace deliberately affects these 'dislocations' or 'juxtapositions' (especially in the *Satires*) in order to convey a colloquial tone into his compositions.

14. Cf. the very similar phrase in *Die deutschen Sprichwörter*, ed. by Karl Simrock (Stuttgart, 1988; 1st edn. Frankfurt am Main, 1846), p. 156:

Frisch begonnen,
Halb gewonnen.
15. I wish to preserve the distinction between translation and imitation — a freer form. Alexander Pope's imitations of Horace, for example, present a situation in which the 'Horatian text is seen as a dynamic catalyst: not as containing fixed meaning but as creating new meanings within the intertextual field of the parallel poems': Frank Stack, *Pope and Horace: Studies in Imitation* (Cambridge, 1985), p. xv.
16. The poems addressed to Maecenas exhibit 'an easy relationship marked by a deep reciprocal concern for the well-being and feelings of each other': Ross S. Kilpatrick, *The Poetry of Friendship: Horace Epistles I* (Edmonton, Alberta, 1986), p. 8.
17. Wilhelm Herbst, Voss's biographer, is aware of the weakness in Voss's translation policy. 'Auch der Ton des Horazischen Hexameters, der in so bewusster und charakteristischer Weise die Schattierungen des Conversationstones nachbildet, ist wenig getroffen, auch hier die Schablone an Stelle des feineren Verständnisses': *Johann Heinrich Voss* (Bern, 1970; reprint of the 1st edn, Leipzig, 1876), II/2, 159.

CHAPTER VI

PROSODY

Any attempt to analyse poetic rhythm is inevitably caught up in a paradox: it is, unavoidably, an artificial undertaking¹ which isolates the rhythmic element of a poem, in order then to examine its workings and effects. If metre is considered to be separable from the specific words of a poem it becomes purely numerical: rhythm alone conveys very little expressive effect without being allied to the meaning and without reinforcing the sounds of words in their particular combination. On its own it could command only a very basic psychological or emotional response.²

For the sake of convenience, we may refer to two poems being written in the same metre, but we should not expect this to express anything of the individual rhythm, style, and tone of the two poems. In pointing to the identity of metre, we give the impression of being able to reduce to mathematical schemes something which eludes the category of quantity. The paradox of metre is that we cannot speak about it without using mathematical terms, but that our mathematical analysis exerts no power over a reader experiencing the flow and effects of the metre, while reading the poem. It is an accurate observation, made by Gerhard Storz, that Virgil and Horace, writing in the same metrical medium, the hexameter, produce very different results:

Der Hexameter Vergils in der Aeneis ist derselbe Vers wie der in den Episteln des Horaz und doch ein ganz anderer [...] Gleich ist hier wie dort das metrische Schema, verschieden ist Wirkung und Ausdruckskraft.³

Clearly these differences in effect are not contained by a mathematical analysis of the metre.

A metrical scheme, once traced in a poem, creates a certain expectation. If monotony is to be avoided, syntactical structure must sometimes be played against the metrical line, since a coincidence of the two leads to a tedious lack of variety. It is in varying the pattern and allowing it to interact with the spoken rhythm that the poet makes his mark: he thwarts the reader's expectations. Variety in the length of line and enjambement both interrupt the flow by setting themselves against the regular base pattern. An analysis of the

rhythm reveals the effective deviations from the basic metre. As I. A. Richards puts it:

Rhythm and its specialised form, metre, depend upon repetition and expectancy. Equally where what is expected recurs and where it fails, all rhythmical and metrical effects spring from anticipation.⁴

The task of *translating* verse brings another dimension to the prosody problem: of the various elements of the original poem, which a translator could possibly hope to imitate, the rhythmical quality of the poem is naturally one. Will he destroy the original balance of content and form if he transposes the poem into a different metrical form? Or will he jeopardize this balance still further by insisting on the same metre despite the change in language and conventions? The form is already changed through the act of translation; would the translator be compensating, if he adopted the original metre in an effort to temper the difference between original and translation? Might it be less of a distortion to choose a different metre, or even to translate poetry into prose, as Uz thought was the case when translating Horace (see p. 19 above).

The problem becomes clearer still when the translation is into modern German from an ancient language: metrical rules for ancient languages do not fit. When translating from an ancient language, the translator is faced with the additional problem of converting even the method of calculating metre from a quantity-based to a stress-based system. A translator may consciously aim for an archaic sound in a modern version, as Voss does. The historical gap appears to be completely bridgeable in this view. Wieland's method of translating, his editorial interventions, and his presentation of text and translation on each page, all indicate that the historical problem is more complex for him. The interplay between the ancient writer and his composition and the modern translator and his reader leads to the emergence of a concept of history which will come into its own in our final chapter.

Ancient metre depends on the length of the syllable for the distinction of the basic metrical unit, or foot. Time rather than degree of stress is thus the deciding factor. The rules for the dactylic hexameter determine that the first four feet may be either dactyls or spondees, that the fifth is almost always a dactyl and that the sixth may be either a spondee or a trochee.

--	--	--	--	}	The dactyls and the spondees are interchangeable in the first four feet, as are the spondee and the trochee in the last.
-uu	-uu	-uu	-uu		
-uu	-uu	-uu	-uu	}	
-uu	-uu	-uu	-uu		

In a German translation, exact mathematical fidelity to the ancient metrical scheme is thus not possible;⁵ this brings home the problem of reproducing an effect involving a combination of factors which fall outside any purely quantitative analysis of rhythm. Voss was well aware of the difficulty inherent in his undertaking:

Wer vom Hexameter des sokratischen Horaz etwas mehr weiß, als daß er weder den stolzen Schritt des virgilischen, noch die hüpfende Behendigkeit des ovidischen Verses hat: dem möchte der Wildling, auch unter solchen Händen, der Nachbildung kaum fähig scheinen.⁶

Horace sometimes creates a degree of solemnity by composing a line with four spondees in the first four feet (*Epistles* 1. 8, line 17):

Ūt tū | fōrtū | nām, sīc | nōs tē, | Cēlsē fēr | ēmūs.

Spondees are notoriously difficult to create in German and, despite his best efforts, Voss's line⁷ falls short of the weighty tone:

(Wie) | dū dās | Glück, sō | wērdēn auch | wīr dīch | trāgēn, ō | Cēlsūs.

Voss has forced a tension between the emphatic stress on the first five, monosyllabic words (spondaic in character) and the inclination to read them as a dactyl and a spondee, followed by another dactyl and spondee. The line does not actually open with a spondee, but, if we count the first, unstressed syllable as an anacrusis, the heavy emphasis which follows allows the wording to militate against the lightness of dactylic rhythm. The tension between metre and natural rhythm imposes undue stress on the word 'so', particularly as it follows a comma. In addition, the vocative in German is stiff and sounds foreign rather than solemn. This adoption of ancient usage joins forces with the subjection of natural rhythms to the constraints of ancient metre to produce an archaic version — a modern translation with artificial patina.

Less frequently, Horace uses a preponderance of dactyls. This maximizes the number of syllables in a passage where he is numbering endless possible guests he might invite and their numerous likely excuses (*Epistles* 1. 5, line 27):

ēt nīši | cēnā prī | ōr pōtī | ōrquē pū | ēllā Sā | bīnūm
detinet, assumam; locus est et pluribus umbris;

Voss achieves a tripping rhythm in the first line at the expense of a clash between natural stress and verse ictus at the end of the second line:

(Und) | sō kēin | frūhērēr | Schmäus unđ ēin | hōldērēs | Mādchēn ĩhn | ābhālt,
Noch den Sabin dir stellen; auch meheren Schatten ist Raum da.

Again, the first syllable must be ignored if the metrical count is to be numerically sound. There is another attempt here to create an effective spondee, despite the fact that Horace himself does not open with a spondee in this case. The quick succession of short syllables is successful, but in the second line cited, Voss's concentration on the penultimate syllable — long in Latin, therefore stressed in German — results in rhythmic awkwardness.

Mathematically speaking, the substitution of spondees for dactyls is a possibility for a Roman poet; this causes difficulties for Voss who has intonation and the natural emphases of words and phrases to contend with. Opitz⁸ was the first

to observe (in 1624) that the modern German poet works with a metrical system based on the rather elusive principle of stress; dactyls and spondees have entirely different stress patterns. Substitution and compensation are therefore already in practice, even when the translator means to adhere exactly to the ancient metre. The equivalence suggested by Klopstock and accepted by Voss was that stressed syllables be used in place of long ones in Latin or Greek and that unstressed German syllables be taken to correspond to the short syllables in ancient verse. But a succession of two equally stressed syllables in German is notoriously difficult to achieve. Klopstock's 'Grammatische Gespräche' contain the following remark about the German Hexameter, made by 'Spondeus': 'Wie oft bittet er seine Sprache vergebens auch nur um drey Längen, die sich folgen.'⁹ The ancient spondee must frequently be replaced by a trochee in German hexameter verse; e.g.:

Schwīndēlnd | trāgt ər dīch | fōrt āuf | rāstlōs | strōmēndēn | Wōgēn.¹⁰

The German hexameter had become a subject of heated debate among German men of letters in the eighteenth century (see pp. 14–16 above). Both as a metre for original composition and as a vehicle for translations of the ancient hexameter, the German hexameter had its energetic advocates and vocal opponents. F. G. Klopstock's *Messias* and Ewald von Kleist's *Der Frühling* pioneered the use of the hexameter in original composition. Klopstock recognized that German prosody could not adopt the same rules as ancient languages:

Es ist wahr, die Griechen unterscheiden die Länge und Kürze ihrer Silben nach einer viel feinern Regel, als wir. Wenn wir unsere Sprache nach ihrer Regel wollten, so hätten wir fast lauter lange Silben.¹¹

Nevertheless, he maintained his view of the Homeric hexameter as a kind of acoustic perfection which all other verse could only strive to achieve: 'Homers Vers ist vielleicht der vollkommenste, der erfunden werden kann [...] Sein Hexameter hat die angemessenste Länge, das Ohr ganz zu füllen' (p. 342).

But Klopstock's *Messias* did not convince Lessing, for one, that the hexameter was a wise choice: 'Beleidigt wohl die elendste Prosa so sehr, als hier die beständige Verlängerung der kurzen und Verkürzung der langen Sylben?'¹² Herder, in his *Briefwechsel über Ossian und die Lieder alter Völker* (1773), criticizes the hexameter specifically when it is used in translations. He is not opposed to the German hexameter purely and simply, but finds an incongruity in 'Klopstock's hexameters' being used to translate Ossian.¹³ The character of the Ossian text was too strong, masculine and fragmented for the flowing hexameter which Denis, a devoted disciple of Klopstock's, chose for his translation.

In 1781, Voss, following in Klopstock's footsteps, made it his task to translate Homer with exemplary fidelity to metre, and even to word order. His second edition of Homer's works in 1793 was a thorough reworking of the first, guided by a more radical determination to be faithful to the original, even observing the

word order and caesuras. This aim often led him to violate conventions of his own language, which occasioned severe criticism from some reviewers. Wieland finds that Voss's quest for strict fidelity on every level leads to a lack of attention to his own language — the cardinal sin of 'Unteutschheit'.

Wer kann z.B. einen Vers dulden wie dieser?

Dennoch nicht die Freund' errettet' er, eifrig bemüht zwar,

und wer wollte nicht lieber die erste Lesart,

Aber die Freunde rettet' er nicht, wie eifrig er strebte,

zumahl daß der Spondeus dennoch, durch doch hinlänglich [*sic*] ersetzt werden konnte, und die Schönheit des zwar (per) als Endsylbe des Verses wahrlich nicht groß genug ist, um uns für die unerträgliche Härte und Unteutschheit dieses Verses zu entschädigen; zumahl, daß bey allem diesem ängstlichen Streben [*sic*] nach Gleichförmigkeit dennoch das keinesweges müßige Wörtchen *ως* ausgelassen werden mußte [...] ¹⁴

Wieland explains his own choice of metre for the Horace translations in his introduction to the *Satires*. He decided against imitating the dactylic hexameter of the original and opted for what he calls 'der freie Jambus' (*Fuhrmann*, pp. 580–82). This is iambic verse in which the number of syllables per line varies between ten and thirteen — rather like the 'Madrigalvers' he had used so often before, but unrhymed. Wieland gives two reasons for his choice: the first is a modest evaluation of his own talents; he says he never was especially good at composing hexameters and, furthermore, is now out of practice. Composing hexameters is like playing a musical instrument, according to Wieland; the player needs to keep in practice, otherwise he will be too ashamed to play his instrument in public. If Wieland had used the German hexameter for his translation of Horace's hexameter poetry, he would not have been in a position to reproduce the appearance of ease given by the original.

Wieland is probably thinking of the hexameter verse he composed, at times rather unwillingly, during the period he spent as a protégé of Bodmer's in Zurich. To this period belong the *Briefe von Verstorbenen an hinterlassene Freunde* (1753), 'Der gepryfte Abraham' (1753) and 'Cyrus' (1757–59). His engagement with hexameter verse was rather short-lived, starting with the fragmentary epic 'Hermann' ¹⁵ in 1751 and ending with 'Cyrus'. The presence of Bodmer behind Wieland's submission to the discipline of the hexameter is evidenced in the opening song of 'Der gepryfte Abraham':

[...] O heilige Muse

Lass dich erbitten, auch mich zu deinem Priester zu weihen,

Wie du dir Bodmern geweiht hast, dass er die heilige Laute

Von Elihu geerbt zum Preis der Weisheit beherrschte. ¹⁶

Wieland's reference to a musician's performance was an illustration of his own development away from hexameter composition. His second reason for rejecting the option of using German hexameters in his Horace translations is that he finds them too artificial ('künstlich'). The free iamb is less contrived and has a

less majestic rhythmic effect in German. Adapting a phrase from *Satires* 2. 6, he says that for the '*musam pedestrem* des Horaz' the hexameter has 'einen zu prächtigen Schritt in unsrer Sprache' (*Fuhrmann*, p. 581). The function of the 'Horatian tag' here is to lend plausibility to his argument that by altering the metre, he is being faithful to Horace's tone. Wieland avoids an absolute rejection of the hexameter; he carefully qualifies his decision by emphasizing that he is speaking about translating Horace, and adds that the hexameter might otherwise have sounded right in a different context. This is sincerely meant, and should not be taken as a calculated means of deflecting the sparks flying out from the hexameter controversy raging among his fellow men of letters. An indication of his sincerity in making these remarks is provided by another translation undertaken by Wieland. Between the 1786 and 1804 editions of the *Satires*, Wieland translated Aristophanes's *Clouds* into hexameters. He says in the introduction to 'Die Wolken des Aristophanes' (p. 65) that he opted to use the hexameter (where appropriate) for this text because it is more suited to German than the anapaestic tetrameter would have been and, when enough dactyls are used, comes close to the original effect (see p. 70 above).

It is evidently not Wieland's view that the hexameter is intrinsically unsuitable for verse in German but rather that the psychological effect produced on the reader by any given metre is of primary importance. In Wieland's judgement, the German hexameter conveys the right effect for Aristophanes but not for Horace. A suitable choice of metre depends on the nature of the text involved. The free iambic metre conveys the lightness, apparent lack of artifice, and studied carelessness (reminding us of Rococo) for which Horace used the dactylic hexameter.

An apparent inconsistency in Wieland's policy as regards metre and translation is cited by Monecke.¹⁷ The occasion is Wieland's review of a translation of the *Aeneid*. Wieland first criticizes the translator for following too closely in Virgil's footsteps. But he also stresses how important it is, especially in the case of Virgil, to maintain as much of the original beauty as possible. He recommends a different kind of fidelity, one which is not realized through slavish imitation:

Aber zu einer solchen Treue wird mehr als guter Wille erfordert. Damit sie die Uebersetzung nicht ängstlich, gezwungen, undeutsch und nur zu oft auch sehr ungetreu mache, damit die Frischheit, die Wärme, der Glanz und die Grazie des Originals nicht durch sie verloren gehe, erfordert sie einen Mann, der nicht nur den ganzen Reichtum unsrer Sprache in seiner Gewalt habe, sondern auch in der Kunst, sie rein, richtig, edel, zierlich, kurz, mit Geschmack zu schreiben, Meister sei und ihr alle die Geschmeidigkeit und Politur zu geben wisse, deren sie fähig ist. Mit Virgil's Colorit, mit Virgil's Stil, mit seinem Vers- und Periodenbau geht Virgil selbst verloren.

The freshness, warmth, brilliance, and grace of Virgil, according to this statement, can indeed be maintained by a translator who is master of his own

language. It follows that the reference to '*Vers- und Periodenbau*' cannot be taken at face value to mean that the translator who fails to use Virgil's metre betrays Virgil altogether. Rather, it means that the effect produced by Virgil's prosodic mastery can be reproduced in German by the skilful and painstaking translator. It has often been observed that Wieland is above all interested in producing the right *effect* when he translates.¹⁸ His belief that this can only be achieved in a polished and idiomatic translation is the standard from which he judged Voss's Homer and found it wanting.

Epistles 1. 8

For an example of the artificiality and stiffness which set in when the German hexameter is used to translate Horace, let us compare the opening lines of *Epistles 1. 8* in Voss's hexameter version with Wieland's free iambic version (*Fuhrmann*, p. 170):

Celso gaudere et bene rem gerere Albinovano
Musa rogata refer, comiti scribaeque Neronis; (Horace)

*

Freude zum Gruß und Heil dem Celsus Albinovanus
Melde, gebetene Muse, dem Freund' und Schreiber des Nero. (Voss)

*

Geh, Muse, wenn ich bitten darf, und bring
dem Celsus, Nerons Freund und Schreiber, meinen Gruß,
und meine besten Wünsche. Fragt er dich, [. . .] (Wieland)

Voss, famous for his translation of Horace into German hexameters, has used a strict six-foot line and managed to produce an exact correspondence with the Latin number of lines. The epistle is seventeen lines long both in Latin and in Voss's German, but Wieland required twenty-nine lines, and these are markedly varied: the first and third have five feet and the second has six. The first sentence, which ends after two lines in Voss's and in Horace's versions, flows into the third line in Wieland's. For Voss it is important not to deviate from the exact number of lines in the original, and to use a metre as close as possible to the original. He is even keen to emulate the word order and sacrifices normal German diction in order to achieve these aims. Voss's two-line sentence, if written out as prose, is simply unacceptable. Wieland, on the other hand, has made certain that his sentence can stand as normal conversational prose.¹⁹ Both Voss and Wieland have strayed from the exact wording of the original — Voss adds 'zum Gruß' and Wieland 'meine besten Wünsche'. Wieland's addition, and the resulting extra length, are explained by his desire to keep to a light and varied conversational tone. Voss's addition, although not inappropriate in the context, is primarily added to help the metrical count. His use of the past participle in 'gebetene Muse' is, grammatically speaking, faithful to the Latin 'musa rogata' but very unconventional and clumsy in German — an example of what Wieland

calls 'Unteutschheit'. Wieland's expression 'wenn ich bitten darf' combines being polite and extremely natural with the function of elucidating a notoriously compact Latin construction.

Out of fidelity to the Latin hexameter, Voss begins each line with a stressed syllable, corresponding to the long syllable which belongs to Horace's line. This practice, recurring as it does in every line, has a repetitive quality in German verse and, indeed, it is often only achieved by artificial means. The first word of line 7 in the same epistle, for instance, shows this technique very clearly. The first two words are evidently intended to be read as a spondee:

Nēin, wēil | mīndēr ām | Geīste gē | sūnd, wīe ām | sām̄tlīchēn | Lēibē,

Wieland's flexible, free iambic metre, by contrast, would normally start with an unstressed syllable, but allows deviation as well. His translation of this line reads:

bloß wēil | ıch schwāch | ām gān | zēn Lēib', | ūnd leid | (er)
nōch schwā | chēr ām | Gēmūt, | nīchts hōr | en wīll.

The natural conversational intonation allows the first of these two lines to bear a stress on the opening syllable, while the second begins with an unstressed syllable, as one would expect in an iambic metre. The extra, unstressed syllable, or feminine ending to the first of these lines also contributes to the easy, variable tone.

In his introduction to the *Satires*, Wieland also explains why he was so keen to use the irregular, 'free' iambic metre. The regular iambic pentameter would naturally also have been an option, but one which Wieland considered to be, if anything, even less suitable than the hexameter. His aim was to create the impression of prose and the tone of everyday conversation but without any sign of artifice: 'eine kunstlose Rede in dem gewöhnlichen Gange der Sprache des Umgangs' (*Fuhrmann*, p. 581). The regular pulse of the pentameter would have been too formal to capture the unpredictable element present in speech. But Wieland also avoided the prose option; he wanted to give the reader the aural pleasure of recognizing metrical rhythm, a pleasure which increases when the combination of syllables displays greater variety. The regular iambic pentameter, in Wieland's view, would have sounded just as artificial as the hexameter: it is too solemn and serious and would have restricted the progression of Horace's thoughts; they require a rhythm much freer and closer to prose.

Once again, it is not the iambic pentameter *tout court*, either as a metre for original composition or as a vehicle for translation of ancient metre, to which Wieland wishes to voice his objection. Clearly, he is not opposed to the iambic pentameter in principle, he simply does not associate it with Horace's style. Gottfried August Bürger translated Homer's *Iliad* into iambic pentameters and gained Wieland's approval for his choice in a letter dated 22 April 1776. In this

letter, Wieland reports his discussions with Goethe; they agreed about the high quality of the translation, but differed on the question of metre:

Er bestand darauf; der Hexameter würde besser gewesen seyn; wir, Sie hätten Recht gehabt den Jamben vorzuziehen [. . .] Wir behaupten, Homers *Versification* verliehre in jeder Übersetzung nothwendig, würde aber in teutschen Hexametern noch weit mehr verlieren als im Jambischen Vers, der unsrer Meynung nach, das ächte, alte, natürliche, heroische Metrum unsrer Sprache ist. (*Hellmuth/Schröder*, p. 157)

As with Horace, and as with Aristophanes, Wieland's concept of fidelity to the author constitutes an endeavour to produce an *effect* in German equivalent to the *effect* of reading the original. His allegiance as translator consistently lies with the 'target' language of German.

Wieland's decision to translate Horace into free iambic verse isolates him a little from the contemporary debate — he has joined neither the hexameter nor the pentameter camp. But he had already used the same varied rhythm in the blank verse of his play *Lady Johanna Gray* (1758). This work, although not technically a translation, is closely based on Nicholas Rowe's *Tragedy of Lady Jane Gray* (1715). Here for dramatic purposes, Wieland needs a lively speaking tone, as he did for Horace. The frequent use of exclamation marks and dashes, and a varied metrical scheme combining blank verse with the occasional Alexandrine, both remind us of Horace translations:

O! mein zu schwaches Herz! Wie konnten mir
Northumberlands ehrgeizige Entwürfe
Verborgen bleiben! Wie bezauberten
Mich seine Künste! Ach! sein Stolz allein,
Sein Stolz, itzt seh ichs, ist die Quelle unsers Jammers!

(*Martini/Seiffert*, III, 44)

In addition to being associated with the stage, free iambs also make an interesting appearance in the epistolary genre which was popular in the eighteenth century. Johann Peter Uz, a devoted Horace imitator, with Anacreontic–Rococo experience as well, shows virtuosic flexibility in the epistolary poem, 'An Herrn Professor Kipping in Helmstädt' (1762):

Ich glaube, die Natur hat großes Recht zu schelten,
Wann wir, was sie für uns gethan,
Nur mit Verachtung ihr vergelten.
Doch weist uns auch die gute Mutter an
Und läßt die Lust für uns aus hundert Quellen fließen.

(*Uz, Sämtliche Poetische Werke*, p. 385)

The conversational rhythms of Wieland's Horace translation are missing from these lines. Nevertheless, Uz shows a rhythmical flexibility similar to Wieland's, which he achieves by varying the number of stresses per line, but within the more constricting framework of rhyme, which Wieland had also used in his earlier verse tales.

Of perhaps greater interest is Hölderlin's choice of iambic pentameter, unrhymed and without regard for the position of the caesura, in his verse version of 'Hyperion'. Hölderlin does not vary the number of stressed syllables per line, but he deviates from the norm of *vers commun* by varying the position of the caesura. Friedrich Beissner²⁰ actually suspects that Wieland's version of Horace's *Epistles* may have been influential in Hölderlin's decision to adopt a freer iambic metre for this work:

Indes darf hier die Übersetzung der Episteln des Horaz (1782) nicht vergessen werden, worin der lateinische Hexameter durch den Blankvers wiedergegeben wird. Vielleicht hat diese Übersetzung [...] anregend auf Hölderlin eingewirkt [...]

Wieland's *Horace* was a suitable influence for the verse form of 'Hyperion', since the poem was based on letters, and the same material would itself later be reworked into an epistolary novel.

Speaking of Wieland as a stylist, Cornelius Sommer indicates how important the mutual reinforcement of the individual elements is:

In der poetischen Praxis bilden Metrik, Reim und Syntax bei Wieland eine interpretatorisch kaum auflösbare Einheit [...] Das Wesen seiner stilistischen Meisterschaft erklärt sich aus der Harmonie [...] seit Jahrzehnten der erste [...] dem diese Balance gelingt [...]²¹

Enjambement

Sommer also describes Wieland's style as governed by a 'Dialektik von Freiheit und Bindung' — a phrase reminiscent both of the balance we have often observed, and of the dialogue aspect²² of the Horace translations. In Wieland's *Horace*, of course, rhyme is not an element, but stylistic balance comes more clearly to light when we examine metre and syntax working together in lines where Wieland has used enjambement to good effect. The decision to adopt a verse form which is close to prose, indeed to conversation, leads Wieland to introduce stylistic devices which militate against the stiffness of metrical restraints. Enjambement often contributes to this easy style: two or more successive lines are uninterrupted by punctuation to allow the grammatical sense to run on. The resulting effect is produced both by the flow and by the eventual, sometimes abrupt, halt.²³

The mimetic use of enjambement is easiest to isolate from the other syntactical and metrical features of a poem. The syntactical unit spills over beyond the line-end in imitation of the subject-matter. Longevity, durability or physical length can be imitated by use of enjambement, as in the following examples from the *Epistles*:

Wie einst Gargil, der einen langen Zug
von Jägersburschen, Eseln, Tüchern, Netzen
und Knebelspießen [...] (*Fuhrmann*, p. 129)

Wenn du, gelehrter Freund, dem alten Komiker
 Kratinus glaubst, so können keine Verse lange
 gefallen oder leben, die von Wassertrinkern
 geschrieben worden [...] (Fuhrmann, p. 303)

In the first example, where the initial line (as a metrical unit) would lead the reader to expect a break or punctuation after the word 'Zug', the train of the procession just carries on. This enjambement gives the impression of length but also of a slow pace, in which the frequent commas with which the *succeeding* line is punctuated play a part. In the second example, the idea of verses being long-lasting is emphasized by the additional length of the enjambed words (thirteen syllables each), by the placement of the word 'lange', and by the enjambement itself enacting duration.

The idea of repetition is sometimes reinforced by enjambement (Fuhrmann, pp. 533 ff.):

wenn ers versucht' und viel geschwitzt und lange
 sich dran zermartert hätte, doch zuletzt [...]

In this example, several stylistic devices work together to express the relentless repetition of effort: the repeated 'und', the alliteration of 'versucht' and 'viel', the lack of internal punctuation, and the enjambement carrying the sense through three more feet in the second line.

Paradoxically, enjambement can work to opposite effect sometimes; in this example it does not produce a flow, but instead a pause before an unexpected completion of the phrase:

[...] In der Tat ist nicht
 zu leugnen, daß [...] (Fuhrmann, p. 303)

With truly Horatian wit, Wieland playfully leads us to expect a straightforward negative statement, but by inserting the verb 'leugnen', he turns it around into a positive assertion.

In these examples, there is no indication that Wieland is reproducing or approximating a device he has seen and admired in the original. This does occur, but more frequently we find the principle of compensation at work. Horace repeats the conjunction 'nec' to highlight the parallel construction in the line which follows:

vivere nec recte nec suaviter: [...]

Wieland chooses not to imitate this repetition, but preserves the parallel options by other means:

[...] doch weder für die Weisheit
 noch fürs Vergnügen lebe — [...] (Fuhrmann, p. 170)

Wieland divides a parallel construction at the axis but counteracts the break by using enjambement. His construction differs syntactically from the Latin, but

he does preserve the polar relationship by making 'Weisheit' a counterweight to 'Vergnügen'.

In general, enjambement has an enticing effect upon the reader, which urges him on to the end of the syntactical unit. It is a liberty which Voss's attitude towards translation could not permit; there is a deliberate attempt to be stylistically closer to Latin verse than to spoken German. When Wieland, by contrast, seeks a light, colloquial tone, his instances of enjambement work against the formality of verse, and make the style resemble prose, which none the less maintains the character of poetry.

The 'Ars Poetica', line 99f.

Our preceding analysis has shown that no single feature of what is termed metre can be isolated from its context: syntactical and stylistic devices form part of the total impact of any verse. Components discussed under the headings of 'diction' and 'prosody' are simultaneously at work, as the following example from the *Ars Poetica* will demonstrate:

Non satis est pulchra esse poemata, dulcia sunt,
et quocumque volent animum auditoris agunto! (line 99f.)

*

Ein Dichterwerk sei schön, sei fehlerfrei,
dies ist sehr viel, allein noch nicht genug;
um zu gefallen, sei es lieblich auch,¹¹
und stehle sich ins Herz des Hörers ein, (*Fuhrmann*, p. 518)

Each of Wieland's lines has five beats: this regularity serves to underline the message. There is no unusually long line, but monotony has been avoided as well: only the first and last of Wieland's four lines is regular iambic pentameter. The word 'schön' receives emphasis from its position immediately before the caesura and from its long vowel sound, which echoes Horace's spondee 'sunto'. This verb form 'sunto' also occupies a position of emphasis at the end of a line and the conclusion of a clause. The rest of the line is Wieland's elaboration on the meaning of Horace's term 'pulchra' in this passage, as he confirms in footnote 11 at the base of the page.²⁴ The second line gives the delayed rendering of 'non satis est' with an added phrase which makes Horace's point clearer. Emphasis falls on the important words before the caesura, 'dies' and 'viel'; Wieland achieves this emphasis by replacing the first iamb with a trochee. The next line opens with three unstressed syllables which throw weight on to 'gefallen' as the dactyl reaches its completion. A strong caesura divides a foot, so that the imperative force of the subjunctive 'sei' is properly felt; the German 'sei' consequently gains the same impact as 'sunto'. These lines contain the verb form 'sei' three times, but only in its third appearance does it have the force of the imperative. Wieland's 'lieblich' — chosen to translate 'dulcia' — captures the importance of this adjective by a rhythmical combination, just as 'dulcia' does

by introducing the regular dactyl and spondee combination which ends in a line of Latin hexameter. By contrast, the fourth line displays no particular emphasis and contains no caesura. The effect here is a calculated *lack* of abruptness. Wieland wants to express the pleasing experience when a good poem steals into the human spirit and causes delight. Both the Latin and the German exemplify the 'sweetness' of a beautiful poem, and Horace alliterates 'a' and 's', while Wieland alliterates 'h'. Diction and rhythm are in masterly harmony.

The various facets of Wieland's *Horace* reinforce each other to produce a whole which meets Wieland's ideals. We have seen how this is achieved stylistically: a relaxed, colloquial manner conceals artistry and much polishing. Easy readability overrides literal fidelity, wherever a choice is forced. This translator is agile, oscillating between Horace and the needs of the contemporary reader in order to establish the dialogue which lends so much to the light and friendly tone. The next chapter moves away from poetic details to the overall appearance of the text; our object in doing so is to see how this too will contribute to the achievement of Wieland's aims.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1. The paradox which I am referring to is given apt expression by Mephistopheles's remarks to Faust's student in Part I, lines 1936–39, of Goethe's masterpiece:
 Wer will was Lebendigs erkennen und beschreiben,
 Sucht erst den Geist heraus zu treiben,
 Dann hat er die Teile in seiner Hand,
 Fehlt, leider! nur das geistige Band.
2. As Coleridge puts it: '... metre resembles (if the aptness of the simile may excuse its meanness) yeast, worthless or disagreeable by itself, but giving vivacity and spirit to the liquor with which it is proportionally combined'. Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria*, ed. by George Watson (London, 1975), p. 208.
3. Gerhard Storz, 'Ein Versuch über den Alexandriner', in *Festschrift Paul Kluckhohn und Hermann Schneider* (Tübingen, 1948), p. 231.
4. I. A. Richards, *Principles of Literary Criticism*, 2nd edn (London, 1928), p. 134.
5. This realization was slow to come to eighteenth-century poetics, but to the critic of today it seems self-evident. Cf. W. Bennett, *German Verse in Classical Metres* (The Hague, 1963), p. 27.
6. Johann Heinrich Voss, 'Aus der Vorrede zur Georgica-Übersetzung' (1789), in *Hellmuth/Schröder*, p. 247.
7. Voss's translations are cited from a nineteenth-century edition: *Horaz: Sämtliche Werke*, Übersetzt von Johann Heinrich Voß, Neue Ausgabe (Leipzig, Philipp Reclam jun., undated).
8. Martin Opitz, 'Buch von der Deutschen Poeterey', in *Gesammelte Werke*, ed. by George Schulz-Behrend (Stuttgart, 1978), II, i, 392.
9. Friedrich Gottlieb Klopstock, 'Aus dem Gespräche "Die Verskunst" (1794), in *Hellmuth/Schröder*, p. 258.
10. This is the pattern of Schiller's hexameter, provided by Gerhard Storz in his chapter on the hexameter in *Der Vers in der neueren deutschen Dichtung* (Stuttgart, 1973), p. 162. The advisability of using trochees in German hexameter was another popular topic of debate.
11. Klopstock, 'Von der Nachahmung des griechischen Sylbenmasses im Deutschen', in *Werke in einem Band* (Munich, 1962), p. 344.
12. Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, from the *Berlinische Privilegierte Zeitung* (1750), in *Sämtliche Schriften*, ed. by Karl Lachmann and Franz Muncker (Stuttgart, 1889), IV, 195.
13. *Herders Werke*, 6th edn (Berlin and Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag, 1982), II, 229f. But Denis, when translating Ossian, had had a different view of the matter: 'Ich habe den Hexameter der Griechen gewählt. Kein Sylbenmaass schien mir meinem Gegenstand angemessener!', *Welt-literatur*, p. 184.

14. 'Briefe über die Vossische Uebersetzung des Homers', *Der Neue Teutsche Merkur* (May 1795), p. 406.
15. Of Wieland's metrical artistry in 'Hermann', *Sengle* (p. 37) says: 'in den Hexametern bewegt er sich nur mühsam'.
16. C. M. Wieland, 'Der gepryfte Abraham' in *Deutsche Literatur* (Reihe Aufklärung), 7 (Leipzig, 1935), 205.
17. Monecke, pp. 99 ff. Cf. C. M. Wieland, 'Anmerkung und Beysatz des Herausgebers zu: Proben einer neuen Übersetzung der Aeneis', in *Kleine Schriften III: 1783–1791*, ed. by William Clark: *Gesammelte Schriften* herausgegeben von der Deutschen Kommission der Königlich Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften [& Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR] (Berlin, 1969), 1/23, 366 f. This review first appeared in *Der Neue Teutsche Merkur* in 1791.
18. Cf. *Sengle*, p. 401: 'Also müssen gerade dann, wenn der gleiche Eindruck erreicht werden soll, andere Mittel gewählt werden'.
19. Indeed, Walther Killy, in his essay 'Der Widerstand der Texte', cites Wieland's translation of Horace's *Satires* as though he were quoting prose, i.e., without line division (see p. 28 of Killy's *Schreibweisen—Leseweisen*). Conversely, Voss takes a passage from Wieland's commentary to *Epistles* 2. 1 and sets it out to read as hexameter verse — an exercise to demonstrate how little difference there is between this and some of the irregular hexameter verse composed by his contemporaries. See 'Aus der Vorrede zur Georgica-Übersetzung', in *Hellmuth/Schröder*, p. 249.
20. Friedrich Hölderlin, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by Friedrich Beissner (Frankfurt am Main, 1969), III, 501.
21. Cornelius Sommer, 'Europäische Tradition und individuelles Stilideal', in *Christoph Martin Wieland*, ed. by Hansjörg Schelle (Darmstadt, 1981), p. 355.
22. On the relation of dialogue to dialectic, see, e.g. my article 'The Rhetorical Technique of Plato's *Phaedrus*', *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 19/1 (1986).
23. Cf. Samuel Levin, 'The Conventions of Poetry', in *Literary Style: A Symposium*, ed. by Seymour Chatman (London and New York, 1971). Speaking of 'the line', he says (p. 182), 'it raises the expectation of progress through its length and arrest or pause at its end. It is this expectation that is played against by what is ordinarily called caesura and enjambement'.
24. In the *Ars Poetica* (*Epistles* 2. 3), Wieland varies his footnote markings: whereas in the rest of the translation, lower case letters are used to indicate notes at the base of the page, here Wieland employs Arabic numerals.

CHAPTER VII

TEXTUAL PRESENTATION

The manner in which a text is presented is expressive of the type of readership envisaged and can sometimes affect the reception of the work to a degree which is quite out of proportion to its merits or demerits. Jerome McGann, writing in the *London Review of Books*, cites the examples of Cantos One and Two of Byron's *Don Juan*, of which the first quarto edition was virtually identical to earlier (duodecimo) piracies. Critics were unable to detach themselves from their preconceptions about the types of book normally published in these particular formats, with the result that they allowed their judgements of the intrinsic qualities of the work to be influenced by the book's appearance. McGann says the differences are profound:

[...] as one realizes from a glance at certain early (conservative) reviewers, who are able to praise the wit and verve of the poem as it appears in the quarto text, but who feel compelled to denounce the duodecimo texts.¹

Two editions, with nearly identical contents, convey diverging impressions and make substantially differing impacts on the world of letters, merely on account of the physical form in which they are published. One might almost say that, in this case, the words themselves took on a differing meaning because of the change in presentation.

Not only is the reader affected by editorial decisions such as the use of headings or the placement of footnotes, but the text itself is, by means of these 'indicators', brought into an immediately visible relationship with other comparable works.² Thus, for example, the commentary with which Wieland equips his Horace translations reminds one of previous commentaries, but its position — at the end of each poem — deviates completely from the standard scholarly practice. This suggests to the reader that it is no ordinary commentary; it is not narrow and purely philologically based, as we shall see in the next chapter. This difference serves to underline the originality of Wieland's *Horace* within the genre.

The appearance, indeed, the shape of a poem on the page can be controlled by printing techniques, as was realized by the French Mannerists of the seventeenth

century, the German baroque composers of 'Bildgedichte' and George Herbert:³ they composed poems to be printed in the shape of their subject-matter — a wine-glass, a pyramid, or an altar. It is tempting to wonder whether Laurence Sterne, whose humorous style influenced Wieland,⁴ also impressed him by his effective arrangement of words on the page. Wieland does not go to such extremes, but in freeing himself from too strict an adherence to the form of the Latin original, he has been able to use the unit of the page as a framework, in which to present his work in a useful way, calculated to influence the reader's impressions.⁵ The choice of typeface is also far from arbitrary, as Wieland knew. It can affect the reader's reception of the work, and it can reveal some of the writer's aims and intentions.⁶ The main editions in which Wieland's Horace translations are available today differ enormously from each other on this point and, inevitably, from Wieland's ultimate wishes.

It is well known and well documented that Wieland follows Horace's advice by diligently revising and polishing his texts. Revision was almost a compulsion with Wieland and one which was not restricted to his translations — his novel *Geschichte des Agathon* is the most obvious example of a repeatedly revised work (see p. 40f. above). In the case of Wieland's versions of the *Satires* and *Epistles*, this polishing included changes to the translations themselves,⁷ and additions to the commentary and footnotes at the base of the page. For the revised edition of the *Epistles* in 1790, Wieland made the significant decision to add to the text of the original, which had not been included in the selections which appeared in the *Teutscher Merkur* or in the first edition published in book form. The physical appearance of the text reinforces the findings of previous chapters: the features of the style of translation which brought the text to life, such as the impression of a dialogue, the constant oscillation between ancient and modern, and the conversational rhythm played off against the regular iambic beat, are reflected and to some extent produced by the particular order in which the text has been compiled for the revised publication.

The reader is first addressed directly in the introduction to each poem. This does not appear to have been a common practice, although the Dacier/Sanadon edition of Horace (1735), which Wieland consulted (but did not esteem too highly) provided a one-line summary of the content of each poem,⁸ as a sort of editor's headline — akin also to the chapter headings which summarize the events in eighteenth-century novels. Wieland's substantial introductions aim to meet a variety of anticipated needs: he summarizes the content of the poem and, wherever suitable, sketches the historical setting; he sometimes discusses problems of interpretation in a conversational way and frequently praises the wisdom of Horace's advice to his correspondent. In a couple of cases the introduction is expanded to incorporate an essay or profile. This policy is unlike that of a general introduction: through the use of these constant editorial interventions, Wieland is ever-present, preparing his readers and keeping them

in the right frame of mind. In accordance with one of Shaftesbury's precepts, Wieland helps the reader to imagine the type of person to whom Horace is writing,⁹ and to form a picture of Horace himself, his attitudes, and the subtlety with which he expresses them. The translation then follows, with the original Latin beneath. Markings which indicate commentary items occur in the translation rather than the original and refer us to the end of the poem. This implies that the reader is likely to begin with the German text, an impression reinforced by the layout. The more detailed content of Wieland's commentaries will be the subject of the next chapter; here we are interested in the order in which they occur within the general compilation of the work. The commentary item might typically explain a Roman custom in contemporary terms, and then make mention of the actual wording Horace uses; this might gently lead the reader to compare what he has read in the translation with the original. Scholarly commentaries in any language other than Latin were still something of a rarity in Wieland's day; they were generally placed in two columns below the text and/or translation, as, indeed, they often still are today.¹⁰

We know that Wieland intended these translations to be enjoyed by the ordinary reader.¹¹ It was important, therefore, to provide an aid to interpretation in the form of information about the recipient of each epistle *before* the reader embarked on the poems themselves. It was also important not to impede the enjoyment of reading the poems or to offend against aesthetic sensibilities with scholarly material inelegantly placed on the same page. A similar concern is voiced by Wieland in relation to the glossary in *Der Neue Amadis*:

Dem Ganzen wird eine Art von Index über die vorkommenden fremden Wörter und Anspielungen beygefügt, damit wir nicht nöthig haben, das Werk durch Noten unter dem Text zu defiguriren.¹²

In the case of the Horace translations, a physically intrusive commentary — one which encroached on the domain of the text itself — would also have destroyed the proportion of the conversational tone and adversely affected the rhythm and fluidity. The dialogue between Wieland and Horace, between Germany and Rome, between modernity and antiquity would not have been visible or audible. The introduction draws the reader into Horace's world, in Wieland's company. The function of the commentary items, on the other hand, is, broadly speaking, to return the reader to the eighteenth century. The position of the commentary item numbers — they refer to the text of the German translation rather than to the Latin — is a further indication that Wieland as commentator intends to transport the reader back to his own world. He does this by explaining proper names or situations, and by frequently employing an analogy with contemporary experience. For example, *Epistles* 1. 5 is an invitation to a meal. The guest is expected, as Wieland accurately translates, 'vor Sonnenuntergang'. The commentary explains why Horace had not issued an invitation to the

main meal of the day, which would have been earlier: 'nach unsrer Art die Stunden zu zählen, nach drei oder vier Nachmittags'. Wieland then provides a homely explanation, guaranteed to satisfy the most mundane curiosity about daily life in ancient Rome:

Die Ursache, warum Horaz seinen vornehmen Gast erst mit Sonnen-Untergang erwartet, oder vielmehr bis dahin auf ihn warten will, scheint nicht (wie Baxter meint) von seiner besondern Frugalität herzukommen: sondern bloß daher, weil er ihm Zeit genug lassen wollte, seine Geschäfte vorher abzutun, und weil die ganze Nacht in geselliger Fröhlichkeit zugebracht werden sollte. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 117)

Wieland's dismissal of Baxter's interpretation is based on internal evidence and, one suspects, on his confidence in his own ability to identify with Horace, and then to communicate to his readers the feelings and preferences which his intuition has led him to impute to Horace.

Lastly, there are the occasional short footnotes placed at the bottom of some pages, a position reserved for brief, urgent, or last-minute items. They can be encountered on pages containing introduction, translation, or commentary. The briefest among them constitute a shortened reference to a source: *Cic. de Legib. II. c. 14*, for instance. In the translation, urgently required information would normally be imparted in the text itself, but there are cases where Wieland has been prevented from doing this by metrical or other constraints. In *Epistles* 2. 2, Wieland uses the formula 'die Stadt Minervens' and the note at the foot of the page (*Fuhrmann*, p. 445), which in the commentary would probably have been a parenthesis, rather than a footnote, identifies it as Athens. The Latin simply has 'Athenae', but Wieland's mention of Minerva, the goddess of wisdom, is entirely appropriate, since Horace is recounting his arrival at the Academy, in pursuit of truth. A quick glance to the bottom of the page or to the original Latin, would clear up any doubts which the less well-informed reader might have. A most interesting example is the following note, which provides an absolutely up-to-date analogy with the end of the Roman republic:

Was wir in dem letzten Jahrzehend des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts erlebt haben, und die im Jahr 1804 ohne die geringste Schwierigkeit erfolgte Verwandlung des republikanischen Generals Bonaparte in den Kaiser Napoleon I. ist der beste Kommentar zu dieser Epoche der römischen Geschichte. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 32)

The first edition of the *Epistles* predates the event mentioned above by more than ten years. It was probably easier for the printer to add this observation at the base of the page of translation rather than to interpolate an extra item into the commentary.

Thus, the oscillation we noticed at the stylistic level is again apparent in the compilation of the text. The reader is led i) from the introduction forward to the translation, ii) either backwards or forwards in time, as we have seen, by the occasional footnote, iii) back again to the text of the original, and iv) then finally

the reader returns to his own world in the commentary, where features of Roman civilization are often explained in contemporary terms.¹³

Dual Language Edition

Wieland establishes a dialogue between himself and Horace,¹⁴ but he also draws his readers into the conversation, so that the dialogue takes on a triadic structure. His text has an advantage over the traditional dual language editions in which original and translation are placed on opposite pages and their comparison involves the reading eye in an unaccustomed lateral motion. Wieland's edition is laid out as a play would be, in which characters speak in turn to each other, but all the time they are in fact speaking for the benefit of the audience. Such a policy is consonant with the conversational tone and the lively, exclamatory remarks with which Wieland frequently adorns his *Horace*. This particular layout is unusual; when the original is included at all, it is generally on the page facing and preceding the translation. A notable contemporary exception is Ramler's translation of Horace's *Ars Poetica*. Both the first edition (1777) and the later one which includes Wieland's version (1789), follow the same pattern as Wieland chose for his own work. The Latin text, however, is printed with much smaller characters in the Ramler volume, so that the translation is granted greater prominence, and the Latin acquires the same appearance and perhaps also the same secondary status as a footnote. It may be consulted if necessary, but is unobtrusive.

To include the original on an equal footing is to invite comparison; Wieland does not expect his translation to capture Horace's spirit so completely that it can stand in place of the original poems. An archaic version which incorporated more faithfully the distinctive features of the original might have less need for the presence of the original and might, at most, profit from an interlinear layout. By this arrangement, the reader is asked to admire the technical fidelity of the translation. The general assumption seems to be that the reader without Latin will have a satisfactory experience if he reads a close translation, whereas the Horace scholar will be in a position to consult his own copy of the original. Despite the impression imparted in the opening chapter of this study that there was a proliferation of Horace editions on the market, it may not have been standard practice for *every* educated household to possess an assortment of Latin texts.¹⁵

Wieland's freer version may, in some sense, need the presence of the original as a kind of safeguard against the Rococo features of his translation. The reader he envisages is not a Classical scholar, but has some competence in Latin, although Wieland's *Horace* is in no sense intended to be exclusive. The variety of elements ensures that no interested reader is eliminated; it can be read in a number of ways with profit and enjoyment. Once again, Wieland is engaged in a balancing act: the freedom of his translation is set against the solid presence of

the original and held in check by it. Just as we observed at the stylistic level, this translation involves constant motion between Germany and Rome — and the Latin poems printed on each page constitute an integral part of this oscillation.

The parallel with Wieland's other works is clear. His fondness for conversational exchange is evident from the number of titles of his works which include the words 'Gespräch' or 'Dialog'.¹⁶ This points again to an affiliation between the Horace translations and the Rococo style. And the role Wieland adopts as translator is comparable to that of narrator in the novels. Klaus Oettinger, in his analysis of Wieland's narrative technique, might just as easily be describing Wieland's translations when he writes: 'Der Leser wird zu einem fortwährenden Standpunktwechsel veranlaßt — vom Erzähler zur Figur und wieder zum Erzähler zurück [...]'.¹⁷ Just as the movement between fiction and reality attempts to construct a different, all-embracing ahistorical reality in the novels, so the movement from translation to original to commentary seeks to compensate for the inevitable losses incurred in the act of translation. And Wieland's constantly changing roles as translator and commentator bring Horace and his world to life in a holistic rather than a fragmented way.

Gothic and Roman

Differentiation between the ancient and the modern, the Roman, and the German, is also brought about by the printed appearance of the text, and Wieland makes full use of the resources at his disposal. The introductions and commentaries are in Gothic lettering; foreign words may be conscripted into the text in Gothic (with *Sperrdruck*, e.g., 'Dilettanti', and without, e.g., 'Bon-Mot') or may be appropriated in Roman typeface (e.g., 'Bons-Mots' and 'Bureaux d'Esprits').¹⁸ Isolated Latin words may also conform to the German typeface, whereas whole phrases in Latin and in modern foreign languages revert to Roman characters, as was common practice in Baroque texts. So, for example, in *Epistles* 1. 19, commentary item 3, 'Sacrilegium' and 'Puteal' are in Gothic (and *Sperrdruck*), whereas 'Foro Romano' is in Roman type. Emphasis in the Gothic type is indicated in the traditional way by means of extra spacing, *Sperrdruck*, but italics are employed within passages from other languages which appear in Roman typeface.¹⁹ Wieland also avails himself of striking differences in type size, as, for example, between translation and footnote, and between an extended quotation and its commentary discussion.

The poems themselves are presented in such a way as to ensure maximum differentiation between the respective languages. The German characters are pointed and angular, and the Roman characters more rounded and upright. The lines in both translation and original begin with lower case letters, thus militating against the formality of verse: they do not *look* like poems. Here again we see that Wieland's aim is not the replacement of Horace — indeed, the reader is encouraged to read or reread him — but his revival and preservation.

Our contention, that the typography and the ordered compilation of the printed text are neither arbitrary nor incidental features of the work, is not widely held. Prior to the publication of the Fuhrmann edition in Deutscher Klassiker Verlag (1986), the authoritative source for Wieland's translations of Horace was the Akademie-Ausgabe of 1913. The *Epistles* alone were subsequently published in a paperback edition in 1963.²⁰ Both these editions display a format vastly different from the one chosen by Wieland and his publisher. The Akademie-Ausgabe cavalierly omits the Latin completely but does maintain the Gothic typeface, which indeed it employs throughout. Within the introductions and commentaries, the use of italics has been suppressed. The paperback edition of the *Epistles* does include the Latin original and does place it after the German version, but the translation is printed as a continuous whole followed by the original as a continuous whole poem. Both translation and original appear in Roman script and a smaller fount is used for the Latin. The commentary has been radically abridged.

The advantages of the Fuhrmann edition are evident. It is perhaps impossible to expect a publisher nowadays to print a modern critical edition in Gothic script, and this is the one feature deemed important by Wieland, which could not be preserved in this edition.²¹ Fuhrmann comments:

Das Druckbild der Wielandschen Originalausgaben zeichnete sich durch große Lebendigkeit aus, welche zuallererst auf dem Kontrast von Fraktur (für alles Deutsche) und Antiqua (für alles Fremdsprachliche) beruhte; die vorliegende Ausgabe ersetzt diesen Kontrast durch den Wechsel von steiler und kursiver Antiqua. (Fuhrmann, p. 1101)

The juxtaposition in this latest edition is obviously not as striking or expressive, but the German text does have a more expansive appearance, to which the *Sperrdruck* also contributes.²² As against the 1963 edition, the commentary is left unabridged. Fuhrmann reinstates the original, in sharp contrast with the Akademie-Ausgabe's omission of it. He feels the need to justify his inclusion of the original, because it accords with Wieland's final wishes, because of the very little extra space involved (is this directed to the publisher more than the reader?), and because without it some of the commentary items would not be comprehensible:

Es besteht kein Grund, diese Entscheidung Wielands nicht zu respektieren, denn der lateinische Text nimmt nur einen verhältnismäßig geringen Raum ein, und in vielen Fällen blieben Übersetzung und Kommentar ohne die von Wieland vorausgesetzte Textfassung unverständlich. (Fuhrmann, p. 1097)

The commentary to *Epistles* 1. 12 contains just such an example of the commentary being pointless without the original. Wieland states that Horace is making fun of Iccius's Stoic principles and then, without repeating Horace's wording, he continues:

Ich verstehe es so: "Wie? du bist ein Weiser, und klagst, daß du nicht reicher bist? Und wenn nun auf einmal alles, was du anrührst, zu Gold würde, was hättest du davon? [...]" (Fuhrmann, p. 203)

This elaboration continues for a few more lines, after which Wieland takes exception to Gesner's interpretation (see p. 12 above) of this passage, because it excludes the possibility that Horace is being playful and ironic. It makes little sense to discuss variant readings of Horace's line (which Wieland frequently does in his commentary) unless the reader is in a position to evaluate the respective positions by reading the Latin line for himself. Horace's wording, not Wieland's, is crucial here. Wieland's version, understandably, reflects his own interpretation — indeed, it has often been observed that Wieland is in the habit of consciously embedding the commentary into the text of his translation (see below p. 121).

The presentation of the text, which we have put forward as part and parcel of Wieland's *Horace*, and which requires interpretation just as much as the translations themselves, might well have been exclusively a matter for the publisher; but we know that Wieland was intimately involved in such decisions. For example, Klaus Manger, in his commentary to the *Deutscher Klassiker* edition of *Geschichte des Agathon*, covers several disputes over publishing contracts; often Wieland complains that smaller print has resulted in fewer volumes, so that he is to be paid less well (Manger, p. 824). But he objects to the proposed format on aesthetic grounds as well: 'es ist ohnehin nichts unangenehmers als ein Buch in grossem Format mit kleinen Littern [*sic*], und schmalen Rändern' (p. 825). Wieland was aware of the importance to the eye of the overall aesthetic effect; he was confident that his *Horace* was an important work, and he wanted it presented in a suitably impressive form.

As editor of the *Teutscher Merkur*, Wieland was obviously interested in, and had experience of, questions of layout and typeface. In fact, a number of discussions as to the relative merits of *Fraktur* and Roman script were published in the journal. An unnamed contributor submitted an essay with the title, 'Aufmunterung zu einem neuen Versuch die Teutschen Buchstaben mit den Lateinischen zu vertauschen'. The argument that the German characters are a traditional part of the national identity is rejected on the (rather vaguely expressed) grounds that the tradition does not really go back very far at all. There is, therefore, no compelling reason to cause such difficulty for foreigners interested in reading German works.²³ Another contributor penned an 'Apologie der teutschen Lettern' in which he claimed that the main reason for preferring German script to Roman was: 'sie ist den Augen angenehmer als die lateinische'.²⁴ Roman script, it appears, tires the eyes more easily! He goes on to explain which characteristics bring this about:

Mir scheint daher die wahre Ursach, warum die lateinische Schrift die Augen mehr angreift als die deutsche, ihre zu große Einförmigkeit, und zumahl ihre Neigung zum Zirkelrunden [...] (p. 104)

Fraktur, with its ovals and corners, and with its frequent use of capitals, is less taxing. By way of reply, Wieland writes suggesting that this matter could be settled by using less shiny paper, very black ink, and sharp and clear lettering of sufficient thickness. But he is not proposing that Roman typeface be used henceforth for all German works. It might perhaps be reserved for special purposes:

[...] die lateinischen Lettern können auch eine Uniform bleiben, wodurch sich Werke des Genius und Geschmacks, Bücher von vorzüglichem wissenschaftlichem Werth, [...] von dem übrigen großen Haufen der Drucksachen unterscheiden. (See 'Antwort des Herausgebers', p. 111)

Elsewhere, significantly for our text, Wieland refers to the attachment which Germans feel for their own script: 'Ich sehe immer mehr und mehr, wie sehr die Deutschen an ihren sogenannten eigenen Nationallettern hängen [...]'.²⁵ By contrast, as Hansjörg Schelle remarks, for Wieland the Roman script came to express the Classical age itself:

Die Wieland-Ausgabe im Druck der Göschen'schen Antiqua mit ihren [...] den römischen Schrifttypen nachgeschaffenen Lettern verkörpert auf dem Gebiet der Typographie das Zeitalter der Klassik.²⁶

The spirit of Wieland's German translation is thus appropriately expressed in a quintessentially German typographical form, whereas Horace's poems, printed in a Roman script, embody the Classical Age itself.

The first edition of the *Epistles* had, like the handful of translated poems printed in the *Teutscher Merkur*, appeared without the original. But Wieland, always concerned to revise and improve his texts, wrote to Philip Reich in 1785 with a request to alter this policy with regard to the publication of the *Satires*:

Da ich gerne in allem Betracht ein Classisches Werk liefern möchte, so finde ich zur Vollkommenheit des Ganzen nöthig, den lateinischen *Originaltext*, mit *Nonpareille* unter die teutsche Übersetzung drucken zu lassen, damit die Liebhaber das Vergnügen haben können, Original und Nachbild sogleich und ohne Mühe miteinander zu vergleichen.²⁷

From this extract it is evident that, without the original, the work seemed incomplete to Wieland, and we see his customary concern for the reader's convenience. By this arrangement, the reader feels encouraged to consult the original in order to make easy and frequent comparisons. Wieland also emphasizes the classical nature of the work: a German translation performs the role of modernizing the ancient text, but the presence of the original serves to restore the equilibrium. Wieland himself determined not only the typefaces, but the size of fount as well: the term 'Nonpareille' designates the second-smallest from a range of fourteen available type sizes.

The Reader

In using the term 'Liebhaber', Wieland may well be thinking of the French *amateur*, since this describes the readership he principally intends to attract. But he hoped for a broader appeal as well. In publishing a few of his translated poems on a trial basis in the *Teutscher Merkur*, he was certainly advertising the translations as suitable reading-matter for the recipients of that journal. And we know that subscribers to the *Teutscher Merkur* were a diverse group, which posed quite a challenge for its editor. In 1773, commenting on the journal's launch. Wieland writes:

Der deutsche Merkur macht gegenwärtig eines der literarischen Phänomene aus, welche die Aufmerksamkeit des lesenden Publikums beschäftigen. Ich habe etwas unternommen, das vielleicht über meine Kräfte geht; denn wie soll ich es anfangen, um eine so große Menge von Lesern, die an Fähigkeit, Denkart und Geschmack so unendlich verschieden sind, zugleich zu befriedigen?²⁸

The task Wieland sets himself here is to appeal to as many different interests and levels of appreciation as will be represented by his anticipated readers. The Horace translations are similarly all-inclusive; although Wieland claims to be aiming at the average rather than the scholarly reader, he nevertheless incorporates a considerable amount of discussion about the (Latin) scholarly commentaries he has consulted. This element of his commentary is more likely to arouse interest among, and possibly ward off criticism from, Horace scholars, than among readers with no more than general knowledge of ancient Rome. This applies to certain detailed discussions about interpretation but there are also those commentary items which provide more general information. On the whole, however, where Wieland judges it urgent enough, he insinuates his interpretation of the passage into the translation itself, by a careful choice of vocabulary or, indeed, by interpolating an explanatory phrase. This leaves the commentary to occupy its rightful position, in providing optional extra information, as Gérard Genette defines it:

Il faut surtout observer que, plus encore que la préface, les notes peuvent être statutairement de lecture facultative, et ne s'adresser par conséquent qu'à certains lecteurs: ceux qu'intéressera telle ou telle considération complémentaire, ou digressive, dont le caractère accessoire justifie précisément le rejet en note.²⁹

Wieland was no stranger to the habit of annotating works. *Musarion*, *Geschichte des Agathon*, *Geschichte des Weisen Danischmend und der drei Kalendar*, *Oberon* — all fiction, but representing a variety of genres — are equipped with notes, in varying degrees of seriousness. This indicates that Wieland was irrepressible as a commentator, incapable of restricting himself to those forms where it seems more apposite, such as his essays on serious topics of debate or of historical interest. It also brings his works of fiction into an interesting position *vis-à-vis* the translation.

Ideally, a work of fiction presupposes a reader with no outside knowledge which could be construed as relevant to the story. In other words, all essential information is contained within the covers of the work of fiction. If the author provides informative, as opposed to interpretative, footnotes, the status of the work shifts a little. A historical novel, for instance, makes use of actual historical detail within its fictional framework, whereas a work such as *Geschichte des Agathon*, whose relation to its historical setting fluctuates and is hard to define, provides further historical details as editorial interventions. The suggestion must be that the reader of this work would profit from having a certain amount of factual knowledge at his disposal. In *Agathon*, Wieland has crafted a work which stands on the borderline between fiction and non-fiction: its characteristics are i) this provision of historical detail; ii) the inclusion of imagined readers, who find their way into the action of the narrative (while continuing to inhabit the narrator's world); and iii) the device of claiming an ancient text as the basis of the novel.³⁰ With respect to the relations between the author and the reader *vis-à-vis* the subject-matter, *Agathon* moves closer to the Horace translations. These use up-to-date imagery and idiom to render an ancient text; they involve constant movement between the historical and the contemporary setting; and Wieland judges that their readers, like the readers of *Geschichte des Agathon*, may require clarification of historical points from time to time.

The features we have examined in this chapter have, when taken as a whole, two main functions. First, in accordance with Genette's categories, they place Wieland's Horace translations in a position unique for a translation with commentary. They stand closer to his fiction and further away from other Horace editions than one would have expected. The second function is to define the reader more closely. In his fiction and in his translations, in his choice of idiom and image, in his choice of metre, typeface, and layout, Wieland's motivation is the same: he is solicitous of the needs of the general reader and anxious to enlist his active participation. Wieland rejoices in the experience of being equally at home in antiquity and modernity and tries to provide this pleasurable experience for his readers. At all levels of interpretation, this appears to be his general aim.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII

1. Jerome McGann, 'Theory of Texts'. Review of D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (London, 1986), in *London Review of Books* (18 February 1988), p. 21.
2. Cf. Gérard Genette, *Palimpsestes*, pp. 7ff. Genette speaks of a textual transcendence 'qui le met en relation, manifeste ou secrète, avec d'autres textes'.
3. Surely, the most radical example of how the layout of a poem affects its content is provided by Robert Graves's 'Poem: A Reminder', when compared with his 'poem: a reminder' in the same collection (*Poems 1968-70*). The former appears to offer a harmonious 'reminder' of the constituent elements of successful poetry:

Capital letters prompting every line,
Lines printed down the centre of each page, [...]

This strait-jacket is mocked in the second version:
capitallett

-ers prompting ev

-eryline lines printed down the
cen

-tre of each page [...]

I am indebted to Professor David West (*The Times Saturday Review*, 3 August 1991) for bringing this striking illustration to my attention.

4. In the commentary to *Epistles* 2. 1, Wieland compares Horace's brand of humour to Sterne's: 'Und nun scherzt er in einer Shandyschen Manier über gewisse angebliche Vorteile, die dem Staat aus der Menge so harmloser und ungefährlicher Leutchen, als die Versemacher seien, zuwuchsen [...]' (*Fuhrmann*, p. 364). See also p. 41 above.
5. Cf. Georges Roditi's rather cryptic remark: 'Unity of style should go so far as *resemblance*: I mean that a book should resemble what it has to say', in *The Spirit of Perfection* (London, 1988), p. 74.
6. This, of course, is quite apart from the obvious practicalities. Walter Tracy refers to 'the traditional and sensible custom of providing the reader with a visual signal of the sudden change of language', in *Letters of Credit: A View of Type Design* (London, 1986), p. 114.
7. Examined in Chapter v of Monecke: 'Vergleichende Analyse von Wielands Horaz-Übersetzung' (pp. 222–95).
8. *Oeuvres d'Horace*, en latin, traduites en françois par M. Dacier et le P. Sanadon (Amsterdam, 1735). This edition, which Wieland mentions repeatedly in his *Horace*, carries the following motto, for example, as an introduction to *Epistles* 1. 19: 'Il montre la bêtise de quelques-un qui voulaient se mêler de l'imiter, & la jalousie de ceux qui cherchaient à le décrier'.
9. Shaftesbury was one of the few Horace commentators of whom Wieland wholeheartedly approved: '.... unless a Reader be in some measure appriz'd of the Characters of an AUGUSTUS, a MAECENAS, a FLORUS, or a TREBATIUS, there will be little Relish in those *Satirs* or *Epistles* address'd in particular to the Courtiers, Ministers, and Great Men of the Times' (Anthony Ashley Cooper, 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury, *Characteristicks of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times* (London, 1714; 2nd edn), III, 21).
10. Pierre Bayle's *Dictionnaire historique et critique* was a work Wieland often consulted. Josef Scheidl mentions it as a source for *Die Geschichte des Agathon*: 'Persönliche Verhältnisse und Beziehung zu den antiken Quellen in Wielands *Agathon*' (dissertation, University of Berlin, 1904), p. 28. And Erich Aron says of Wieland: 'sein Wissen um die Antike schöpft er zu nicht unbeträchtlichen Teilen aus Bayles *Dictionnaire*, in *Die deutsche Erweckung des Griechentums durch Winckelmann und Herder* (Heidelberg, 1929), p. 59. The *Dictionnaire* is a masterpiece of intricate columnar layout and it is conceivable that this impressed Wieland and contributed to his own ideas on layout.
11. Schelle is right to draw our attention to Wieland's own description of his Lucian translations (in a letter to Voss, 14 March 1788) as 'eigentlich mehr für die größere Leserwelt, als für die Gelehrten bestimmt' (*Ausgewählte Briefe von C. M. Wieland an verschiedene Freunde: In den Jahren 1751–1810 geschrieben, und nach der Zeitfolge geordnet* (Zürich, 1816), IV, 14). Schelle is surely right to suggest that this remark applies equally well to Wieland's translations from the Latin. See Hansjörg Schelle, 'Wielands Beziehungen zu seinen Leipziger Verlegern: Neue Dokumente' (Teil 1), in *Lessing Yearbook*, 7 (1975), 215, fn. 194. N.B. the Wieland source reads 'Leserwelt', not 'Lesewelt' as reproduced on p. 173.
12. Cited in Karl Buchner, *Wieland und die Weidmannsche Buchhandlung: Zur Geschichte deutscher Literatur und deutschen Buchhandels* (Berlin, 1871), p. 42.
13. Similarly, Wolfgang Iser describes the reader's 'recreative' role as a very active and mobile one: 'We look forward, we look back, we decide, we change our decisions, we form expectations [...]' this is the dynamic process of recreation'. 'The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Process', in *Reader Response Criticism from Formalism to Post-Structuralism*, ed. by Jane P. Tompkins (Baltimore and London, 1981), p. 62.
14. Hans-Georg Gadamer speaks of translation as, itself, conversation or dialogue, *Wahrheit und Methode*, 4th edn (Tübingen, 1975), pp. 361ff. Gadamer (who thinks of himself as 'ein dialogischer Mensch') has an instructive relation to Plato, which reminds one of Wieland's relation to Horace: 'Platon hatte für mich den Reiz, diese meine eigene Neigung, vom anderen her meine eigenen Denkmale zu gewinnen, in gewisser Weise zu unterstützen'. See 'Die Kunst, unrecht haben zu können: Ein Gespräch mit Hans-Georg Gadamer', in *Information Philosophie* (August, 1991), p. 23.

15. The von Knebel translation of Lucretius (1821) was issued with a companion volume containing the Latin text, since das Original '[...] in Deutschland noch selten ist' (*Welt-literatur*, p. 388).
16. Just by way of illustration: Wieland's 'Phaon: Ein Dialog im Elysium' and 'Gespräche über einige neueste Weltbegebenheiten' both appeared in the *Teutscher Merkur* in 1782.
17. Klaus Oettinger, *Phantasie und Erfahrung: Studien zur Erzählpoeitik Christoph Martin Wielands* (Munich, 1970), p. 31. Liselotte Kurth-Voigt's remarks about the *Comische Erzählungen* are also germane: 'Die Vielfältigkeit von Absicht und Aufgabe erforderte schon in den *Comischen Erzählungen* die in den späteren Werken zur Meisterschaft entwickelte Manipulation unterschiedlicher Erzähler Stimmen, die einen anspruchsvollen Perspektivismus bewirkt, der für Wielands Schriften typisch werden sollte'; C. M. Wielands Endymion: Variationen eines antiken Mythos', *MLN*, 97 (1982), 484.
18. These examples are taken from *Epistles* 1. 18, commentary item 2, and *Epistles* 1. 19, introduction and commentary item 1. Any real impression of what Wieland intended for the printed format of his *Horace* can only be achieved by consulting his *Horazens Briefe*, 3. Auflage (Leipzig, 1816) — which may be regarded as 'Wielands Ausgabe letzter Hand'. Despite Fuhrmann's genuine concern for fidelity, the differing appearance of these two editions (1816 and 1886) is quite staggering. For a reproduction from the 1816 edition, see my conclusion, p. 148.
19. Fuhrmann is not able to preserve the emphasis in Wieland's reference to Shaftesbury in the introduction to *Epistles* 1. 1; Fuhrmann (p. 35) reproduces the passage as follows: 'weswegen ihn Shaftesbury the most Gentleman-like of Roman Poets nennt'. Fuhrmann's typeface (which cannot incorporate the Gothic lettering of the first three words and the last word in the passage) leaves the editor with no option but to italicize all the English words. In fact, Wieland had more options; in moving to Roman type he was able to emphasize the passage as follows: 'the most Gentleman-like of Roman Poets'.
20. See n. 6 of the first chapter on p. 33 above.
21. Gothic script is surely hardly ever used nowadays, but editors of critical editions sometimes prefer to preserve it. A discussion of the now authoritative *Schleiermacher Kritische Gesamtausgabe* finds the edition inhibiting in this respect: 'Zum einen differenziert sie nicht zwischen Frakturschrift und Antiqua (bzw. deutscher und lateinischer Handschrift) des Originals — eine Differenzierung, die zwar oft belanglos sein mag [...] gelegentlich aber auch aussagekräftig sein kann — sofern man aus ihr ersehen kann, welche Wörter der Autor als fremdsprachig empfunden und in lateinischer Schrift geschrieben hat usw.'; Walter Jaeschke, 'Schleiermacher und Hegel: Neue Ausgaben und alte Fragen', in *Hegel-Studien*, vol. 23, ed. by Friedhelm Nicolini and Otto Pöggeler (Bonn, 1988), p. 332.
22. The publisher of the Fuhrmann edition has not been particularly generous with the spacing of his *Sperrdruck*. Words or phrases (with emphasis) which are embedded in the middle of a line or paragraph often require a second look.
23. 'An den Herausgeber des Teutschen Merkurs', in vol. 1/22 (*Kleine Schriften II: 1778–1782*), ed. by Wilhelm Kurrelmeyer, of *Gesammelte Schriften*, Akademie-Ausgabe (Berlin, 1954), pp. 571–75.
24. *Der Neue Teutsche Merkur* (3. Band, 1793), p. 100.
25. 'An Götschen' (24/25 November 1798), in Hansjörg Schelle, 'Wielands Beziehungen zu seinen Leipziger Verlegern: Neue Dokumente' (Teil 3), *Lessing Yearbook*, 9 (1977), 184. See also n. 779 on p. 249, where Schelle tells us: 'Am 15. 7. 1799 klagt Wieland erneut, daß Götschen für die *S[ämmtliche] W[erke]* lateinische Lettern verwendet habe und tritt im Hinblick auf die 2. Ausgabe nachhaltig für deutsche Lettern ein.' Schelle adds (p. 183f.): 'Nebenbei hat der Dichter auch einsehen müssen, daß sich seine mit der "Ausgabe von der letzten Hand" versuchte Orthographiereform nicht durchsetzen konnte.' Another German author, Arthur Schopenhauer, was more insistent on the exact appearance of his manuscript in print — even appending an admonition to his typesetter at the Brockhaus Verlag ('Weisung und Ermahnung an den Setzer', 7 September 1843):
Wir verhalten uns zu einander wie Leib und Seele, müssen daher, wie diese, einander unterstützen, auf daß ein Werk zu Stande komme, daran der Herr (Brockhaus) Wohlgefallen habe [...] und denken Sie nie, Sie verständen es besser; ich bin die Seele, Sie der Leib.
Cited by Ludger Lütkehaus in his 'Einleitung zur Schopenhauer-Ausgabe letzter Hand' (Zürich, Haffmans Verlag, 22 February 1988), p. 7f.
26. See Hansjörg Schelle, 'Wielands Beziehungen zu seinen Leipziger Verlegern: Neue Dokumente' (Teil 3), p. 183.
27. 'C. M. Wieland an Philipp Erasmus Reich' (28 October 1785), in Hansjörg Schelle, 'Wielands Beziehungen zu seinen Leipziger Verlegern: Neue Dokumente' (Teil 1), p. 180.
28. *Auswahl denkwürdiger Briefe von C. M. Wieland*, ed. by Ludwig Wieland (Vienna, 1815), II, 21f. (7 July 1773).

29. Gérard Genette, *Seuils* (Paris, 1987), p. 297.
30. Cf. Gerd Matthecka, 'Die Romantheorie Wielands und seine Vorläufer' (dissertation, University of Tübingen, 1956), p. 84: 'Hinfort wird Wielands Ästhetik eine doppelte sein: er wird Dichtung als Darstellung einer nichtwirklichen, idealen Überwelt im ästhetischen Spiel rechtfertigen, und er wird daneben die Forderung nach Wahrheit und Wirklichkeitsbeziehung im Roman erheben'.

CHAPTER VIII

CRITICAL APPARATUS

Wieland's principles as a commentator are very similar to those which guided his translation (and which were analysed in the fourth chapter above). His aim remains the same on every level of the enterprise: to put the reader first. In the translation, this meant removing possible obscurities, building bridges where Horace abruptly jumps from an observation to an image, adding colourful or dramatic details to aid the imagination — in short, doing all within his power to make Horace accessible to the eighteenth-century non-specialist reader.

The commentary, which includes introductions, footnotes, and short informative essays, carries on this work, but with an added dimension. There are notes and references to be found in the commentary which presuppose an occasional reader in touch with specialist issues, or a genuine scholar likely to take exception to the point Wieland is making. Just as with the readership of the *Teutscher Merkur*, Wieland wished to aim at the general reader, while also offering something for everyone, specialists included:

Der Merkur soll hauptsächlich unter den mittelmäßigen Leuten sein Glück machen und macht es auch [...] Ich möchte aber gern, wo möglich, für alle sorgen, und darum sollte ich von Zeit zu Zeit etwas recht Gutes für die wenigen haben.¹

Each poem is flanked by an introduction and a number of commentary items. The positioning of these indicates a certain difference in their functions, but there is none the less opportunity for communication between the two. Gerhard Wirth sums up this interconnection between introduction and commentary, and does not forget to mention the presence of the commentator:

Die Einleitungen [...] sollen die notwendige Aufgeschlossenheit sowohl für den Dichter wie für den Übersetzer bewirken. Der jedem Brief sich anschließende Kommentar dient dem Verständnis einzelner Begriffe und Namen; er hat aber nicht nur schwierige Textstellen zu erläutern, sondern auch im einzelnen den Beweis zu führen für das, was die Einleitung bereits im großen andeutete.²

However, the term 'Aufgeschlossenheit' is too passive for the reader we have discovered; he is being sent out on an active search for confirmation of the points

made in the introduction. These introductions stimulate the reader's participation by alerting him to features which will increase the lively enjoyment of the whole experience. This is sometimes indicated by a direct suggestion that the reader take a stand (*Fuhrmann*, p. 274): 'Da ich für schicklich halte, dem Leser das Vergnügen dieser Vergleichung selbst zu überlassen, so begnüge ich mich, Folgendes nur überhaupt anzumerken.' Wieland encourages the reader to be watchful and involved, but does not leave him unaided; he provides the necessary tools for the job. These include a profile of the recipient of the epistle and sometimes the comprehensive theme or moral contained in the epistle. This enables the reader to apply Horace's views to his own situation and elevates the discourse to another level, on which Horace and the eighteenth-century reader coexist as 'cosmopolitan' spirits. This is a 'kind of brotherhood', as Wieland puts it in his *Geschichte der Abderiten* (Book II, chapter 6) whose members can transcend barriers in 'close understanding and mutual trust' and whose membership is not confined to any one space — or time.³ The commentary items at the end of the poem explain details — of Roman life, for example — by analogy with parallel contemporary situations. Introductions and commentary have as their common aim to ensure that the historical gap between the contemporary reader and the ancient poet is not a stumbling-block.

INTRODUCTIONS

The first edition of Wieland's translation of Horace's *Epistles* is prefaced by a dedicatory note (to Herzog Carl August on 12 April 1782) which is, in fact, a general introduction to the work. It contains the following bald statement (*Fuhrmann*, p. 13): 'Ein Kommentar ist vielleicht bei keinem Produkt der alten Literatur weniger entbehrlich, als bei den Horazischen Episteln.' The sort of close relationship with Horace which Wieland enjoyed, and which he wanted to help his readers to approach, was evidently not to be attained through an uninformed perusal of the *Epistles*. The concept of urbanity is central here (see pp. 26 and 30 above), which means that the reader would gain, in the case of the Romans:

diesen Geschmack der Hauptstadt und diese feine Tinktur von Gelehrsamkeit, Weltkenntnis und Politesse, die man aus dem Lesen der besten Schriftsteller, und aus dem Umgang der kultiviertesten und vorzüglichsten Personen in einem sehr verfeinerten Zeitalter, unvermerkt annimmt — [...] (*Fuhrmann*, p. 13)

With the aid of Wieland's commentary, the reader is to move into Horace's world; he will enter a cosmopolitan atmosphere, converse with the learned and the great, and, through the subtleties of Wieland's translation, come to identify and appreciate the 'fine tincture', the 'Geschmack' of cultivated Rome. 'Politesse', ostensibly used to describe a Roman characteristic, brings the eighteenth-century horizon into the picture. The interaction on a verbal level — indicated

by this choice of vocabulary — points to a meeting between these two worlds, promoted by the establishment of a certain ambience which Wieland's commentary is to impart.

Despite all the work done on the poems by previous commentators, Wieland says he did not find the composition of his own commentary a particularly easy task. It is not difficult to see why this should be so: his aims and method are unique. He is not primarily interested in communicating facts about the ancient world; it is a state of mind into which his reader is invited. The result is that his views frequently clash with those put forward in the existing commentaries.

Each of Wieland's introductions offers a portrait of the recipient, based partly on such information as is available from historical accounts (hence, presumably, the designation *historische* Einleitungen') and, more importantly, based on the internal evidence from Wieland's interpretation of the poem itself. These two ingredients, fact and interpretative imagination, are always present, although in varying proportions, and Wieland, while availing himself of both methods in order to bring about the impression of unity of theme, also makes every effort to avoid confusion of the two. In the following quotation, the ironic tone and the parenthetical remark 'wie es scheint' signal the dearth of real facts about the addressee, Julius Florus:

Julius Florus [...] der den Namen Julius vermutlich als ein Klient des Julischen Hauses führte, übrigens aber eine unbekannte Person ist, befand sich damals in der Kohorte der Freunde des Tiberius Claudius Nero, Stiefsohn des Augusts durch seine Gemahlin Livia, als derselbe im Jahr 734 nach Armenien abgeschickt wurde, um den Tigranes in die königliche Würde einzusetzen. Aber, was ihm in den Augen der Nachwelt eine ganz andre Ehre macht, ist, daß er (wie es scheint) keine geringe Stelle unter den Freunden des Horaz einnahm, dessen Name durch die Zeit eben so glänzend — als der Name Tibers mit Schande gebrandmarkt worden ist. (*Fuhrmann*, pp. 85 ff.)

These signals, however, are embedded in a thick layer of historical matter, which is impressively learned, but upon closer examination, bears no relevance to the mystery person, to whom the epistle is addressed. There is a historical setting, from which Wieland is keen to dissociate Julius Florus, but the actual information about the character himself is based on a reading of the epistle. The character is Wieland's imaginative construction of a person to whom Horace would address these two epistles (1. 3 and 2. 2) and with whom he would adopt the warm and encouraging tone he adopts here. In the eyes of the 'Nachwelt', the principal cause for Julius Florus's fame is his friendship with Horace — and the 'Nachwelt' naturally includes Wieland's reader, to whom a signal is being sent.

'Epistles' 1. 6

The pattern we have just seen, in which the provision of historical information serves to contribute to our understanding of the atmosphere of life in Rome,

when nothing concrete is known about the addressee, is a recurring one. In the introduction to *Epistles* 1. 8, Wieland speaks of two well-known Roman families with 'Celsus' as a last name, but freely admits that nothing can be deduced about this particular Celsus from this fact (*Fuhrmann*, p. 168): 'Was wir von diesem Celsus gewiß wissen, ist also lediglich, was uns Horaz selbst von ihm sagt.' The most notorious instance of this method is to be found in the introduction to *Epistles* 1. 6, addressed to Numicius. There is very little in this epistle that could be termed personal and thus very little for Wieland to work with in drawing a profile. In view of this, Wieland has recourse to his imagination. He begins with these words (*Fuhrmann*, pp. 121 ff.): 'Da es bei so bewandten Umständen erlaubt ist, sich mit seiner Imagination zu helfen [. . .]'. Wieland's defence for having fabricated a personality for an obscure historical character is that he has created an entirely credible person. The world is full of people like Numicius and the reader can become wiser through reading about him (and them). Reuter sees this defence as the key to Wieland's attitude towards history. Reuter describes it as a matter of varying the proportions of two perspectives: the historical and the present, as they relate to one another. It is crucial that, for Wieland, they be related, and it is here that he parts company with the mainstream of Horace commentary, as Reuter shows:

Eine welt- und zeitfremde "Sagacität" beantwortet er mit einer wissenschaftlichen Haltung, die sich nicht scheut, die Vergangenheit aus den Erfahrungen der Gegenwart heraus zu deuten und dadurch zur Parabel für diese tauglich zu machen. (*Reuter*, p. 266)

But it is not simply a case of seeing history through modern spectacles, as Reuter suggests. Wieland wants to preserve Horace from misinterpretation:

Horaz sagt nicht: es ist gleich viel, ob du es mit der Philosophie des Mimnermus, oder mit der Philosophie der Ehrenmänner ad lanum medium, oder mit den Leuten, die alles, was gleißt, bewundern und haben möchten [. . .] hältst [. . .] Er sagt nur: erkläre dich für eins und bleibe dabei! (*Fuhrmann*, p. 123)

The character of Numicius was constructed in order to drive that moral home. Wieland's method was both to clarify what the Roman author was really saying, and to offer the modern reader a person whom he could recognize, in whom the fault to be avoided was personified. Wieland's emphasis in his programmatic statement on 'das Individuelle' (*Fuhrmann*, p. 13) as the key to the whole poem has been left out of Reuter's calculation. Reuter has focused on the epistle where the need for an individual recipient or interlocutor is most strongly felt, and yet his remarks suggest that the modern reader's needs are of prime importance. In fact, Wieland constructs Numicius in line with his understanding of Horace's purpose first, and then invites the modern reader into the common, cosmopolitan atmosphere. It is, as so often in Wieland's *Horace*, but as Reuter fails to recognize, a two-way movement.

Paradoxically, despite the necessity for the imaginative construction of a personality in some cases, the historical, factual aspect is still guaranteed, even where no more than scant information is available. The guarantee is provided by Wieland's statement in the dedicatory note that the *Epistles* were real letters — a view which is by no means commonly held among twentieth-century commentators:

[...] daß es größtenteils wirkliche Briefe sind, an Personen, mit denen er in besondern Verhältnissen stund, und meistens aus besondern Veranlassungen und mit besondern Absichten geschrieben [...] (*Fuhrmann*, p. 13)

It is because of Wieland's view that the *Epistles* were actually despatched to real people,⁴ that he believes the portrait of the addressee to be essential equipment for the reader, who wishes to appreciate the finer qualities of the poem. As mentioned in the previous chapter (see p. 114 above), Wieland agrees with Shaftesbury⁵ on this point:

Ich bin mit Shaftesbury völlig überzeugt, daß man, ohne mit den Charaktern eines August, Mäcen, Florus, Lollius u.s.w. genauer bekannt zu sein, an den Briefen, die an sie gerichtet sind, den Geschmack nicht finden könne, den sie sonst für jeden Leser, der zum zarten Gefühl des Wahren und Schönen organisiert ist, haben müssen. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 23)

It was vital for Wieland to hold this view because of the importance of a personal relationship as the basis, not only of these translations, but of all his works. It is the same need which induces him to address his reader in the novels, and it informs his predilection for the dialogue as well. But it is ultimately unimportant whether or not there were real letters and recipients, so long as Wieland manages to offer his reader the experience of Horace as a real person.

The historical component in the introductions is not a mere display of his admittedly impressive learning;⁶ rather, it is designed to enrich the experience of reading the poem. It is for the benefit of Wieland's readers, 'denen es darum zu tun ist' (*Fuhrmann*, p. 23), to facilitate their maximum participation in, and enjoyment of, the epistle. Wieland's scholarship is never allowed to weigh heavily on the style of the introductions. Information culled from a work of history is paraphrased and attributed to its source, but where there is a long title or more than one source, a note at the bottom of the page is used for quick reference. *Epistles* 1. 15 is addressed to Numonius Vala, whose name appears as an inscription on a coin, as Wieland discovered in the pages of a seventeenth-century numismatic work. Having also consulted the historian Velleius Paterculus, Wieland then explains the circumstances under which the coin came into use. But not wishing to overload his introduction with names and titles, he gives an abbreviated reference to this second source at the base of the page (*Fuhrmann*, p. 224).

Wieland generally shows respect for historians, and, moved by the same spirit that moved him while translating, he transmits information from them in his

own words, in his own readable style, without editorial contribution. Commentators, however, generally get very short shrift from Wieland. When he rejects or ridicules a commentator's theory, it is usually because it shows a lack of attention to the clues in other of Horace's poems, or indeed a careless or prejudiced reading of the poem. Torrentius, Baxter, and Gesner are accused of adopting an assumption for which very little evidence is given, in the case of *Epistles* 1. 17 and 1. 18. They all agree that the addressees of these two epistles are one and the same. But according to Wieland, the insignificant, nameless scholiast on whom this view is based, was guilty of collapsing the two individuals into one, merely because of the similarity in the content of the epistles. Wieland recommends his own method: all that is needed is a careful reading and comparison for the differences between the two epistles and between Lollius and Scaeva to become clear. This boosts the reader's confidence as well: no special tools are required. There is nothing mysterious about this method; it is based on the premise that the psychology of the addressee and the nature of his relationship with Horace are the keys to interpretation.⁷

It is not simply in the use of his imagination that Wieland sets himself apart from other commentators; he also uses different methods for his detective work. To support a careful reading of the poem in question, other works by Horace can be tapped for information about people and Horace's attitude towards them. In the introduction to *Epistles* 1. 10, commentators are again ridiculed for forming judgements without having referred to two other sources within Horace's works:

Die Scholiasten und Ausleger sind nicht einig, was sie aus diesem Aristius machen sollen. Dem einen ist er ein komischer, dem andern ein tragischer Dichter, dem dritten ein berühmter Rhetor, dem vierten ein Schulmeister, wie er selbst. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 179)

Wieland's own conclusions are drawn from the evidence of *Satires* 1. 9, in which Aristius is mentioned and *Odes* 1. 22, which is dedicated to him. Having established from this evidence that Fuscus Aristius was a jovial man and a very close friend of Horace's, Wieland asserts that this is all we need in order to find the epistle twice as interesting as it would have otherwise been. He congratulates himself on having provided '[...] die beste Silhouette und ein so gutes Bildnis, als irgend ein damaliger Porträtmaler malen konnte [...]' (*Fuhrmann*, pp. 179ff.).

The choice of imagery here is consciously anachronistic. The arts of silhouette⁸ and portraiture are applied to the ancient world with the light, slightly satirical humour which is Wieland's hallmark. His attitude towards the reader is not that of an instructor towards his pupil; it is assumed that the reader will be sufficiently informed to realize that Wieland intends this juxtaposition to be amusing. Indeed, Wieland as commentator is a companion to his reader, rather than a teacher. He includes the reader in his generalizations, and takes for granted that the reader is like-minded:⁹

Man bildet sich gewöhnlich ein, die Zeitgenossen eines Schriftstellers, dessen Wert und Ruhm eine lange Reihe von Jahrhunderten entschieden haben, hätten eben so von ihm geurteilt, wie wir. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 299)

Wieland's use of the first person plural and his tone in general flatter the reader and militate against the division between learned commentator and uninformed reader. Wieland himself shares the illusion outlined above, and it is one which the reader can allow himself to admit to without experiencing feelings of inferiority. Elsewhere, motivated by a similar instinct, Wieland encourages the reader to make further observations, with the implication that these would be just as valid as his own:

Wir begnügen uns hiemit bloß den Gesichtspunkt angegeben zu haben, aus welchem diese Epistel gesehen werden muß, und überlassen nun dem Leser das Vergnügen, seine eignen Betrachtungen hinzuzutun. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 151)

Wieland identifies the moral of each epistle and, more often in the commentary than in the introductions, sets himself the task of pointing out how the modern reader can profit in his own life from Horace's precepts, even though they were formulated in the historical setting of ancient Rome.¹⁰ He rephrases the message in universal terms instead of restricting it to the addressee:

Menschen, die nicht Mut genug haben, der Stimme des Gottes in ihnen getreu zu sein, dessen Beifall uns allein Ruhe und Gewißheit, daß wir sind, was wir sein sollen, geben kann, suchen sich eine Art von Ersatz dadurch zu verschaffen [. . .]. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 238)

This practice of offering a pragmatic, useful interpretation of the facts, rather than the bare details themselves, bears some resemblance to Wieland's aims in the introductions to his works of fiction. The reader of the *Epistles*, like the reader of the novels, is provided not only with historical facts as a background to his reading of Horace, but also with the key to using these facts to interpret the poem. Numicius, although there is no historical information available about his personality, is presented as a credible character in the introduction to *Epistles* 1. 6, discussed above (pp. 128 ff.). Iccius, about whom there is very little historical detail, was, on the evidence of *Epistles* 1. 12, a self-styled, but opportunistic, rather than committed, philosopher, and it is here that the true interest of the poem lies. Sven-Aage Jørgensen narrows down the theme of fiction's relation to historical fact in the novels to one central question: 'die Frage nach dem Sinn des Tradierten'.¹¹ This is quite clearly the same general question which Wieland asks his readers to put to themselves when reading his translations of Horace.

The 'Ars Poetica'

Epistles 2. 3, or the *Ars Poetica*, stands in a class of its own. Wieland does not share the Renaissance view of this epistle as a literary handbook; the title 'Ars Poetica' has misled generations of commentators. He is keen to dispel this view,

which would undermine his concept of Horace as a personable, not a polemical writer. The epistle must appear as 'ein Horazens würdiges Werk' (Fuhrmann, p. 495). Wieland's interpretation of the poem is based, consistently enough, on the same logical premise which he applied to the other epistles. This, like the other poems, is a real letter, addressed to an acquaintance of Horace's and it was occasioned by a real situation. Wieland stresses that he is still following Shaftesbury's principle that to know something of the addressee is to have the key to the epistle:

Die nämliche Verfahrungsart, die ich (einem Wink des vortrefflichen Lords Shaftesbury zufolge) bei allen übrigen Horazischen Briefen beobachtet habe, hat mich auch in diesem, wie ich glaube, auf den wahren Weg gebracht [...]. (Fuhrmann, p. 489)

Accordingly, the customary sketch appears in the introduction, where we learn from the administrative experience of the elder Piso, that he came from one of the best families in Rome and had strong motives for wishing to preserve his good name under the new government. The son was showing such an inclination towards poetry and was so keen to compose verses himself, that the father became worried for his future and the family's reputation. He did not wish his son to expose the family to ridicule — and Wieland incongruously uses the French word *Ridicule*, in Roman type,¹² to signal the relevance of these circumstances to Enlightenment Germany. The element of speculation, as we have seen in some of the other introductions, is frankly expressed as such.

Wieland does not (by a subtle choice of vocabulary) attempt to disguise hypothesis as fact:

Man kann von einem unsäglichen Jücken für die Musenkunst geplagt werden, ohne mit einem wirklichen Talent geboren zu sein. Dies ist sehr oft der Fall bei jungen Leuten, und wars vielleicht bei dem kleinen Piso auch. (Fuhrmann, p. 493)

This supposition is based on Wieland's own knowledge of young would-be poets, and the fact that, in his experience, an inclination towards poetry is frequently not accompanied by the possession of real talent. Wieland's *Briefe an einen jungen Dichter* take up this theme as well (see p. 60 above). Once again, the key to understanding the poem derives more from common experience than from historical evidence. Yet this is not how Wieland himself puts the matter: his view arose from a careful reading of the poem, during which he was struck by the negative, dissuasive element. Fully half the poem is made up of sarcastic remarks about the inferior poets of Horace's day, warnings about the false attractions of the muse, the dangers of thinking one has talent, and the strict conditions which a poet has to meet (see Fuhrmann, p. 496). On Wieland's reading of the poem, Horace does not enumerate the duties of an aspiring poet in a neutral manner. He emphasizes the difficulties, the pitfalls, the hard work and the lack of recognition — all under the guise of revealing the secrets of the trade

to the young man. This also explains the lack of system in the poem; it was written as a letter, not a literary handbook.

This epistle stands in a class of its own for two reasons. First, because of the vexation it has caused Horace scholars, who cannot agree about whether it should be examined as a treatise or a poem.¹³ Secondly, Wieland's interpretation, which started as a reaction against Hurd and Batteux and their view that its main topic was the Roman stage (see *Fuhrmann*, p. 488), isolates him from all but one other commentator. In 1783, an Englishman by the name of George Colman formulated a similar view:

I conceive that one of the sons of Piso, undoubtedly the elder, had either written, or meditated, a poetical work, most probably a Tragedy; and that he had, with the knowledge of the family, communicated his piece, or intention, to Horace: but Horace, either disapproving of the work, or doubting of the poetical faculties of the Elder Piso, or both, wished to dissuade him from all thoughts of publication.¹⁴

The parallels are remarkable — in both method and conclusion. There is much undisguised supposition here, as there is with Wieland's interpretation, and the situation depicted, and Horace's supposed attitude towards it, display marked resemblances to Wieland's description of them. Despite the dates, which coincide so closely, it is not thought that Colman can have known of Wieland's text, nor that the theory itself, despite its ingenuity, was destined to convince and thus change the face of Horace's scholarship.¹⁵

Wieland's disinclination to view the poem as a handbook is of a piece with the general lack of appeal that systems had for him. Just as we discovered him to be a practical translator, rather than a theoretician, so here too he prefers the idea of a practical discussion of poetry, rather than that of a handbook. In addition, he prefers to think that a poem with a stronger human factor suits Horace better.

At the start of this chapter we observed that Wieland's attitude and aims as commentator run parallel to those in operation when he translates. One important point needs to be made, however. The view put forward in the introduction does not colour the translation. To take the clearest example, this means that the manufactured personality of Numicius in *Epistles* 1. 6 is not then injected into the poem by Wieland as translator. We have noticed in the chapter on diction that Wieland was given to adding adverbs, adjectives, and exclamatory remarks to the text. But he does not impose a hypothesis on the text; it would have taken a much more systematic operator than Wieland to insinuate whole portraits, products of his imagination, into the translation. As a translator, he highlights what is there; when he writes his introduction, he sometimes has to construct a hypothetical character, who would have been in need of the advice contained in the epistle. This is to help the reader, who does not have the benefit of the unique acquaintance with Horace which results from working on the text as a translator (*Fuhrmann*, p. 488): 'Die Arbeit der Übersetzung setzte

mich natürlicher Weise in den Fall, ziemlich genau mit ihr bekannt zu werden [...]'. The introduction uses material from the epistle and elaborates upon it, but the elaboration is not then taken forward into the translation. Co-operation between introductions and translation does not go as far as this; between introductions and commentaries, however, there is more opportunity for cross-referencing and co-operation.

COMMENTARIES

Introductions and commentaries alike encourage the reader to participate, to interpret for himself, and to measure Horace's insights against his own experience. But it is the positioning of the commentary which actually allows this to take place. In the introduction to *Epistles* 1. 12, Wieland warns the reader that when Horace refers to Iccius's philosophical activities, he is being ironic and Wieland draws on two more examples of gentle criticism from the preceding epistles. In the one addressed to Aristius (1. 10), it is almost imperceptible, in the one addressed to Bullatius (1. 11), it is couched in humorous terms and yet Horace communicates the desire to help the correspondent. We are then left to read the poem as we bear these details in mind, and it is not until we consult the commentary that we are alerted to actual instances where Horace's irony is palpable. For example:

Horaz, um sich über die philosophischen Ansprüche des Iccius auf eine feine Art lustig zu machen, gibt sich scherzweise die Miene, als ob auch er zum Handwerk gehöre, und wartet ihm hier mit einem Dilemma auf, in welchem mehr Schalkheit, als es scheint, verborgen liegt. (*Fuhrmann*, pp. 202 ff.)

The reader has been prepared for the possibility that Horace may ironically express doubts about Iccius's sincerity. But the joke is only explained after the reader has had an opportunity to try and discover it for himself. Wieland is typically concerned that Horace's brevity of expression may lead to obscurity; his reader needs to be prepared for this joke, as he will be unaccustomed to the style. Wieland's own style in the commentary displays Rococo elements: 'auf eine feine Art [...] scherzweise [...] Schalkheit', just as we observed earlier, in the translation (see pp. 86 ff. above).

Epistles 1. 20, the conclusion to Book 1, did not fit into the scheme for introductions discussed above on account of the uniquely inanimate nature of the addressee. It is addressed to the 'Book of Epistles' which it concludes. This does not, of course, prevent Wieland from writing an introduction describing a situation in distinctively eighteenth-century language: 'Sottise' (*Fuhrmann*, pp. 318 and 320), 'mit der besten Art [...] zu machen' (*Fuhrmann*, p. 320), nor from extracting a useful moral from the poem. It is with this that he opens, and his character sketch is of the author of the book, i.e., Horace himself:

Es ist ein zweideutiger Vorzug der Leute von Verstand, daß sie in allen menschlichen Dingen klärer sehen als andere, und demungeachtet im Leben selbst selten klüger handeln, als die andern denken. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 318)

This is a clear example of Wieland's practice of extrapolating the introduction from the text. Whereas his reader will follow the order, introduction — text — commentary, Wieland's *modus operandi* is to work outwards from the text: text — introduction — commentary.

Wieland's observation above was precipitated by the ambivalent and ironic attitude with which Horace sends his book forth into the public domain. He addresses it as though it were a slave boy begging to be allowed his freedom, and warns it of the misfortunes ahead. Horace says he will experience the bitter satisfaction of having predicted these misfortunes, when the book ends up worm-eaten, and soiled by the hands of the crowd. Horace compares himself to the man who laughed when his obstinate donkey fell into a ditch — until his anger turned to regret at having lost the donkey. Wieland annotates this passage and ties it in with his opening remark (cited above). It was after all Horace himself who sent his book off for publication, in full knowledge of how it might all end (*Fuhrmann*, p. 326): 'Ein eben so feiner als drollichter Scherz über seine eigne Torheit, sein Buch herauszugeben, ohngeachtet er die leidigen Schicksale, die ihm bevorstanden, vorhersah.'

In this way, introduction and commentary interact, but the delicate construction of the whole work allows the poems to be read without the benefit of the commentary at the end, should the reader so choose. The reader is left, after initial guidance, to discover some of the remarkable features of the poem himself. Wieland calculates the amount of information given in the introduction to make it sufficient for understanding the poem, and balances this against the needs of a reader who may have further questions after his reading. In this case (the introduction to *Epistles* 1. 20), Wieland draws attention to the two presences in the poem, the book and the youngster, but, after a sample of theories from other commentaries, leaves it to the reader to pursue this parallel further.

This description, concentrating as it does on how the scheme of commentaries works to the reader's benefit, may run the risk of suggesting that Wieland is solely interested in interpreting, recommending and fostering Horace's popularity. Indeed, Monecke (p. 192) detects a positively missionary spirit in the translation:

Nach ihrer Anlage und geistesgeschichtlichen Situation drängt diese Übersetzung darauf hin, Horaz zu einer Größe werden zu lassen, die den überlieferungstreuen Geistern das Nämliche hätte bedeuten können wie Shakespeare dem Sturm und Drang.

But this would be to ignore the ever-present translator and commentator himself. The eighteenth-century annotated text developed into a facility for embedding the commentator's social observations and other views in the

footnotes to an ancient work. In discussing 'the perspective of the footnote' with reference to Hagedorn, Liselotte Kurth-Voigt confirms the existence of this almost subversive role:

In new editions of older works and translations of foreign texts it also performed an important function because it enabled the editor or translator to present his own, occasionally quite different ideas.¹⁶

Annotation became excessive because of its extra breadth of scope and was even parodied in a sixty-page work by Gottlieb Wilhelm Rabener, which consisted of nothing but footnotes, *Hinkmars von Repkow Noten ohne Text* (see Kurth-Voigt, p. 61). Hagedorn light-heartedly defends his own weakness for excessive annotation in his *Schreiben an einen Freund* (1752):

Es giebt auch Einsichtsvolle, die, nach ihrer liebevollen Art zu urtheilen, mich in dem Verdacht haben, daß ich zu meinen Kleinigkeiten Anmerkungen mache, um meine Belesenheit zu zeigen [. . .]¹⁷

Wieland does display his learning, as we have seen, and he also falls prey to the temptation of expressing his own views in his Horace commentary. In the following example, he is openly and bitterly resentful of the contemporary literary critic:

Es gab zwar damals noch keine Journale und gelehrte Zeitungen, die sich im Namen des Publikums, kraft einer stillschweigenden Kommission, des Rechts, über alle neue Schriften und ihre Verfasser peinliches Gericht zu halten, angemaßt hätten [. . .]. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 316)

The implication is that his own relation to the public is a real one, which informs what he writes. He is not the sort of writer or critic who is content to function in the absence of any contact with the reader. At other times, his comments are more discreet and may simply be indicated by an anachronistic choice of vocabulary. For example:

Wir werden aus andern Briefen, und besonders aus dem zweiten an seinen Freund Julius Florus, sehen, wie viel Ursache ein Mann von seiner feinen Sinnesart hatte, kein *Bel-Esprit* von Profession nach damaligem Schnitt sein zu wollen [. . .]. (*Fuhrmann*, pp. 51 ff.)

The italics (Roman type originally) draw attention to the French expression and the point is made clearly enough, without having to be entirely explicit. Wieland is stating his disapproval of contemporary self-styled 'beaux esprits'.

The lines of demarcation between translation and commentary are not as clearly drawn as one would have expected in a work of this type. As we saw in the preceding chapter — and have continued to see in this one — the work is organized in such a way that the reader, guided by the order of compilation, and by references in the text, finds himself moving to and fro between its various component parts. Of necessity, the analysis regarded introduction, translation, original and commentary as separate entities, each with its own position. But, as

we saw in the chapter on Wieland's translation techniques, the commentary has a habit of finding its way into the text of the translation. For example, in *Epistles* 1. 2, Wieland adds: 'Welch einen Spiegel hält dies Buch uns vor!' (*Fuhrmann*, p. 77). This line bears no relation to the Latin, but serves to alert the reader to Horace's movement from recounting Homeric episodes to examples of their practical applications. If Wieland had imparted this information as a commentator rather than a translator, he would have risked creating a dry, scholarly tone — much less engaging for the reader.

The reverse procedure also occurs. Wieland sometimes banishes undesirable elements from the text of the translation, while freely confessing to having done so in the commentary. Commentators are perplexed by Wieland's apparently prudish refusal to translate the second half of *Satires* 1. 2. They contrast this attitude with the naughtiness of his own Rococo tales such as *Idris und Zenide*. Rudolf Ischer suggests that we can deduce something about Wieland's intended readership from the fact that he omits a salacious passage from a satire and a distasteful one from an epistle. Borrowing Wieland's wording with only a very slight adjustment, he refers to these as 'Weglassungen aus Anstandsrücksichten'.¹⁸ In Ischer's view, this points to non-Latinate readers, probably women. Walter Jens agrees with this supposition; it must have been out of consideration for the contemporary female reader that Wieland felt he must edit Horace to make him appear more restrained: '[. . .] ging der zu weit, holte ihn Wieland zurück'.¹⁹

'Epistles' 1. 15

The commentary item relating to the omission from *Epistles* 1. 15 is more useful for the solution of this problem than is the discussion of the bowdlerized satire. Horace is expressing enthusiasm for a dish which he calls 'vulva', a 'sow's womb'. Wieland translates this euphemistically as 'Schwartenmagen' (*Fuhrmann*, p. 230). But he does not make any attempt to obscure from the reader the fact that he has made this change:

Er war keine Möglichkeit, den römischen Leckerbissen, der hier im Texte genannt ist, dem deutschen Leser mit Anständigkeit aufzutischen; ich hoffe also, daß das *quid pro quo* Verzeihung finden werde.

He then goes on to explain that the Romans derived their taste for such delicacies from the Greeks, as he has learnt from Athenaeus's accounts of Greek comedies (*Fuhrmann*, p. 235): 'Wer neugierig ist, kann bei eben diesem Autor Nachricht von den verschiedenen Arten, wie die μητρά θεία zubereitet wurde, finden.' Far from concealing the true identity of the delicacy, which appears in Latin on the same page anyway, he goes so far as to direct the reader to a source for recipes! In editing the text in this way, he demonstrates a desire to rid the verse translation of rough edges, to banish bare, unadorned crudeness, to ensure that the

Enlightenment reader's taste and sensibilities are not offended. The potentially offensive item is not removed without trace, but it is banished to the commentary where it can be more safely discussed and more elegantly handled. It is a question of distribution: the translation must sound like natural, elegant German. The offence would not primarily arise from the naughty or distasteful phenomenon, but from its blunt and crude expression. Jürgen Werner sums up the general editorial policy in Wieland's translations in a rather amusing way:

Er übersetzt eine Stelle so, daß sich der Leser nichts Arges denkt; dazu macht er eine Anmerkung, daß sich der Autor hier leider in einer Weise ausgedrückt habe, die er für sein wohlgesittetes Publikum unmöglich exakt nachbilden könne; der französische Übersetzer X gebe die Stelle übrigens in ziemlich weitgehender Anlehnung an das Original soundso wieder, der englische Übersetzer Y soundso, etc., und so steht die anstößige Stelle unter Umständen gleich mehrfach da, vielleicht auch noch lateinisch, nur eben nicht deutsch.²⁰

History and Translation

In explaining such differences in matters of taste, Wieland assumes an implicit attitude towards the question of history. As with the question of translation theory, the absence of any theoretical writings on the topic obliges us to turn to the text itself to discover Wieland's views on history. A phrase like 'nach damaligem Schnitt' is a typical example of the express distinction Wieland draws between a present-day situation and a situation which pertained in ancient historical times. And yet a translation can be construed as an attempt to neutralize the historical gap, by allowing the modern reader to transcend it. As commentator, Wieland's attitude towards history is somewhat different. There is an essay in note form, 'Von den Requisitis zur Glaubwürdigkeit eines Geschichtschreibers und von den Kennzeichen der historischen Wahrheit' (*Jugendwerke*, pp. 630–33), in which Wieland analyses the operations of empirical perception and persuasion by witnesses. But Wieland as historian is an ambivalent concept. Reuter sums up this ambivalence in the contemporary climate:

Gemessen an *Herders* Ansprüchen [...] kann dem Kommentator der Episteln und Satiren des Horaz der Titel eines *Historikers* nicht zuerkannt werden. Gemessen an *Goethes* Entscheidung, hat er gerade durch sein Horaz-Werk denselben Titel in höchstem Maße verdient. (Reuter, p. 261)

Reuter is referring to Herder's disdain for detailed historical scholarship and to Goethe's transformation of his own life into a symbol in *Dichtung und Wahrheit*. But for Wieland the interest lies both in Horace as a factual historical figure and in the timeless ahistorical truth of human personality. Wieland makes an effort to understand characters in their historical context and maintains a distinction between habits and tastes pertaining in that context, as opposed to his own. The question of Wieland's attitude towards history is inevitably raised with relation

to Horace, and needs to be explored in these commentaries, where, more than in any of his works, he comes close to the role of historiographer.

If one looks at the introductions, in which Wieland concentrated on describing the historical character being addressed, one finds both elements: the character's historical circumstances are described and the ahistorical relevance of the epistle's content is also indicated. There is an easy movement from one to the other, but they are not to be confused, as in the following remark by Monecke (p. 209): 'Alles individuell Charakteristische bezieht [...] er auf typische Grundfiguren des menschlichen Verhaltens, und seine ganze Geschichtsbeachtung ist, in diesem Sinne, angewandte Psychologie.'

For Wieland, these two elements find their common ground in the cosmopolitan dimension, while still maintaining their differences. This is not an attitude which slots into the prevailing transcendental views of history in Wieland's day. Wieland does not concern himself with Herder's question in his 'Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit' about mankind's development towards an ideal, or with the all-embracing concept of 'Universalgeschichte' which Schiller would develop in an inaugural lecture and publish in the *Teutscher Merkur*.²¹ Wieland was not in step with contemporary historical concepts, but he may well have been subject to influences from much earlier sources. We have already discussed Shaftesbury, but we need to go further back than this. The ancient historians, whose works Wieland frequently refers to in the commentary, may also have suggested to him a method for composing introductions. Sallust's *Catilinarian Conspiracy* makes use of a method similar to Wieland's introductions; after a philosophical introduction, it launches into an account of Catiline's character. Gordon Williams explains why Sallust considers this relevant:

Sallust saw it as the task of the historian to narrate and explain historical events; but explanation was fundamentally to be given in terms of the characters of those who took part in those events.²²

Wieland is of course not writing a history, but his task as commentator on an ancient text is not very far removed from that of a historian. He explains to his readers the features of Roman life which are alien to contemporary experience and helps them to read each epistle by introducing them to the relevant character. Present in the commentaries is the recognition that there are fundamental differences between antiquity and modernity: changes in conditions have taken place. It is important to keep this in mind. However much Wieland may do violence to this principle in his novels, where he alludes to ancient characters in contemporary terms, and however unconcerned he remains while foraging antiquity for useful material, he does not merge past and present into one. Fuhrmann misleads somewhat when he states (p. 1080):

Bei alledem war die Antike für Wieland von fundamentaler Bedeutung. Da er die eigene Zeit durch ein gleiches sittliches, künstlerisches und intellektuelles Niveau, durch

dieselben moralischen und ästhetischen Maßstäbe mit ihr verbunden glaubte, konnte er desto unbefangener und gewissermaßen auf gleichem Fuße mit ihr umgehen.

If it were true that Wieland considered tastes to be unchanged since Horace's day, there would have been no need for him to suppress the salacious passage in *Satires* 1. 2 or the unappetising delicacy in *Epistles* 1. 15. The fact that he does so draws attention to the distance between Roman customs and eighteenth-century German ones. He would not have had to explain as many of the religious and social customs in his commentary, if the dialogue with Horace had taken place outside historical confines. Wieland does sometimes draw a parallel between the attitude towards poets in Horace's and in his own society, and it was this point which gave rise to the comment (*Fuhrmann*, p. 299): 'Es war auch in diesem Stücke vor 1800 Jahren zu Rom gerade wie bei uns und — allenthalben.' But examples in which Wieland tries to negate historical distance are far outnumbered by the occasions on which he finds it necessary to compose an essay on Epicureanism (*Epistles* 1. 4) or a short history of the ancient schools of philosophy (1. 1) or an explanation of the implications of eating nettles (1. 12). And all these aspects of life in the ancient world need clarification before the reader can enter a cosmopolitan atmosphere, precisely because standards and customs have changed so radically since then. Just as the translator oscillates between Rome and Germany with the reader in his wake, so the commentator, equally active, moves between the variable and the constant; he both affirms and strives to neutralize historical distance.

It is important to separate the variables from the constant. For Wieland, the constant is to be found in the characters, and this is true of commentaries as well as introductions. The commentaries are dominated by insights into Horace's sense of humour and character in general, and the beliefs, duties, and habits which formed life in ancient Rome. It is the social dimension which interested Wieland, and this was also most likely to intrigue the average reader. The human aspect of history was also considered crucial by an ancient historian, namely, Thucydides, who originally proposed the idea of history as a lesson for life.²³ He ascribed the usefulness of histories to the fact that 'historical events contain the ingredient of human nature' (Gordon Williams, p. 624). It is in the commentaries that Wieland's discussion broadens its scope from the individual to human nature in general.

In ancient histories, the character of the eyewitness is crucial, and it is preferable for the historian himself to have been present. This naturally results in a highly personal account, with the narrator very closely involved both in the events themselves and in their communication in a persuasive form. Here again there is a parallel with Wieland's commentaries. Not having been present himself, Wieland likes to offer instead a sort of personal guarantee, based on his own experience, his reading or his familiarity with Horace. Most engaging are

the instances in which Wieland points out a feature in Horace's style which he himself is fond of using as well:

Ich halte es für eine feine Art von Laune oder scherzhafter Wendung, daß Horaz in dieser schönen Stelle, worin er den mannichfaltigen Nutzen der Poesie in Ansicht ihres populären Gebrauchs herrechnet, Wahres und Eingebildetes unter einander mengt [...]. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 420)

Lucian

The aspect of personal guarantee or of the need for a reliable eyewitness is, of course, one which Wieland encountered while translating another of his favourite ancient writers, Lucian. His Lucian translations and commentaries were successful²⁴ in the same way as his Horace translations: Wieland felt a close communication with Lucian, just as he had with Horace, and Lucian's influence on Wieland was profound.²⁵ Naturally, it is most obvious in Wieland's own literary works. His satirical portrayals of human folly in the *Geschichte der Abderiten* and the dialogue form of his 'Gespräche in Elysium', *Neue Götter-Gespräche* and *Peregrinus Proteus* display the main Lucianic features Wieland admired.²⁶ Best of all, Lucian, like Horace, was an urbane and cosmopolitan spirit in connection with whom Wieland uses the same Rococo vocabulary we find him using to praise Horace's style.

Just as Wieland provided his Horace translations with a generous commentary, so the Lucian translations come equipped with the same sort of apparatus. The work which is most germane to our discussion here is, of course, 'Wie man die Geschichte schreiben müsse', and the first footnote in this translation reveals the warmth of Wieland's approval of the work:

Da alle Gelehrten älterer und neuer Zeit übereinstimmen, diesen Traktat für eine der besten und lehrreichsten Schriften unseres Autors zu erklären, so würde mir's übel anstehen, ihren Wert zu mißkennen [...]²⁷

Wieland concedes that the work lacks order and precision, but, like Horace, Lucian is 'urbane', and the lack of order in the work is no disadvantage when compared with Horace's *Ars Poetica*:

Demungeachtet wird Lukians Vorarbeit über diesen wichtigen Gegenstand immer klassisch und für den Geschichtschreiber ungefähr ebendas bleiben, was Horazens Brief an die Pisonen für den Dichter. Auch die Kritik, oder vielmehr die witzige und meist sehr urbane Verspottung verschiedener damals berühmter elender Skribenten, welche mehr als die Hälfte dieses Traktats ausmacht, kann zu einem Muster in dieser Art dienen [...]. (Lukian, *Werke*, III, 269, n. 1)

The methodological parallels are striking. Lucian follows Thucydides in looking to history for lessons drawn from universal human experience; Wieland selects for his commentary the sort of material which will allow him to give a psychological explanation of the Roman way of life acceptable to his

cosmopolitan ideal, without denying the gaps which are a matter of fact. For instance, he explains the deification of Augustus in the following way:

Man begreift also leicht, wie Augustus, ohne sich in den Augen der Römer einer Unbescheidenheit oder Gottlosigkeit schuldig zu machen, diese uns so anstößige Ehrenbezeugungen zulassen konnte. Sie wurden nicht sowohl der Person als dem Genius Augustus, und der Majestät des römischen Reichs, die nunmehr leibhaftig im ihm wohnte, erwiesen. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 397)

Just as Wieland keeps the needs of his readers — their receptivity and their level of general knowledge — uppermost, so Lucian stresses the importance of the reader: 'Diese Rücksicht auf die Nachwelt ist überhaupt die große Regel, die der Geschichtschreiber [. . .] nie aus den Augen verlieren darf [. . .]' (*Werke*, III, 276). If we were to draw Horace into the equation again, it would be in order to propose that the influence of his *Ars Poetica* on Wieland's *Briefe an einen jungen Dichter* is analogous to the role played by Lucian's work on historiography in the determination of the form which Wieland's 'historical' introductions and commentaries would take.

Contemporary responses to the Horace translations confirm that Wieland's innovative introductions and commentaries met a need in the reading public, and that their outstanding features were recognized. Franz Haller cites a review in the *Nürnbergische gelehrte Zeitung* (27 August 1782):

In den vorgesetzten Einleitungen werden nicht nur die Charaktere der Personen, an welche — und die Umstände — unter welchen diese Briefe geschrieben sind, mit einer eben so ausgebreiteten Gelehrsamkeit, als feinen Menschenkenntniß geschildert und entwickelt [. . .].²⁸

But it is not only contemporary opinion that approves of Wieland in his role as *cicerone*. Classicists like C. O. Brink, and Germanists like Jochen Schmidt,²⁹ both testify to the relevance of Wieland's commentary even for today's reader. This surely owes a great deal to Wieland's agility: he leads the reader in and out of ancient Rome and guides him through the text, while moving forwards and backwards from introduction to translation, original and commentary. It is in this perpetual motion and the artistry with which he constructs and balances the elements which make up this text, that we are able to discover the vibrancy of Wieland's *Horace* even now.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VIII

1. Hansjörg Schelle, 'Wielands Beziehungen zu seinen Leipziger Verlegern. Neue Dokumente (Teil 1)', p. 200, n. 17. Schelle cites part of a letter (2 November 1775) from Wieland to the philosopher F. H. Jacobi.
2. Gerhard Wirth, editor of Horaz, *Episteln: Lateinisch und Deutsch*, p. 280.
3. For a practical example, see Wieland's 'Ein Fragment über den Charakter des Erasmus von Rotterdam', in *Martini/Seiffert*, III.

4. But E. P. Morris takes the impersonal nature of *Epistles* 1.6 as a counter-indication of their authenticity as letters: '[...] the inclusion of this very impersonal Epistle [...] may properly suggest a doubt whether even the more personal Epistles can be regarded as letters' ('The Form of the Epistle in Horace', p. 89). Cf. p. 114 above and n. 24 of the second chapter.
5. Shaftesbury's influence on Wieland is widespread and well known. Cf. K.-H. Schwabe, 'Bemerkungen zur Wirkung Shaftesburys auf C. M. Wieland', in *Wieland-Kolloquium*, ed. by Thomas Köhle (Halberstadt, 1983).
6. *Fuhrmann* (p. 1077) refers to his 'umfassendes altertumskundliches Wissen'. *Reuter* (p. 262) makes the same point: 'Seine Kommentare, auf einer staunenswerten Kenntnis der antiken Schriftsteller fußend, ergeben in toto eine Enzyklopädie altrömischen Lebens [...]'.¹
7. Goethe, for one, appreciated this approach. A translation of Plato prompted the following exclamation: 'Welchen Dank würde der Übersetzer bei uns verdient haben, wenn er zu seinen unterrichtenden Noten uns auch noch wie *Wieland* beim *Horaz* die wahrscheinliche Lage des alten Schriftstellers, den Inhalt und den Zweck jedes einzelnen Werkes selbst kürzlich vorgelegt hätte!'. See 'Über Kunst und Alterthum' (1823–32), in *Werke* (Weimarer Ausgabe, 1903), xli/2, 170.
8. Stephen Bann has written an article on (among others) Etienne Silhouette, the eighteenth-century translator who allegedly gave his name to the art of cutting out profiles from projected shadows: 'Postscript: Three Translators — Silhouette, Barante, Rossetti', *Twentieth Century Studies*, 11 (1974).
9. See John A. McCarthy, *Crossing Boundaries: A Theory and History of Essay Writing in German, 1680–1815* (Philadelphia, 1989). In relation to Wieland's 'Sympathien / as Soul approaches Soul' (1756), he describes a similar relationship between Wieland and his reader: 'The affable quality of the author-reader relationship becomes clear in the very first letter. Wieland does not talk down to his interlocutor. Instead he treats him/her as an equal partner in a dialogue [...]' (p. 214).
10. *Reuter* (p. 259) calls Wieland's technique 'Geschichte als Parabel' and uses it as a title to a section of his work. Similarly, *Fuhrmann*, p. 1078: '[...] die Antike galt ihm als Repertoire exemplarischer Personen und Situationen [...]'. In another context, Gonthier-Louis Fink employs very similar imagery: 'Die Geschichte ist für ihn zuerst ein Reservoir allgemeiner Erfahrung und menschlicher Weisheit [...]' ('Wieland und die französische Revolution', in *Christoph Martin Wieland*, ed. by Hansjörg Schelle (Darmstadt, 1981), p. 419).
11. Sven-Aage Jørgensen, 'Warum und zu welchem Ende schreibt man eine Vorrede? Randbemerkungen zur Leserlenkung, besonders bei Wieland', in *Text und Kontext*, 4/3 (1976), 14. (This article is concerned with prefaces to Wieland's works of fiction.)
12. Although *Ridicule* appears in *Fuhrmann's* edition in italics (p. 493), a comparison with the 1816 edition reveals that the word only appears in unitalicized Roman type. (Part 2, p. 192). Incidentally, *Epistles* 2.3, or the *Ars Poetica*, shows a variation in annotation: Wieland had to adopt Arabic numbers for the footnotes, as there are more of these than there are letters of the alphabet (his usage everywhere else). Accordingly, for the commentary items in *Epistles* 2.3, he had adopted Roman numerals.
13. Gordon Williams sums up the two schools of thought as follows: 'The one tries to assimilate A[rs] P[oetica] to everything that can be known about technical treatises [...] The other view is that AP should be read with the rest of Horace's poetry, especially the *Epistles*, and that, just as that is an amalgam of eclectic reading and personal experience, so is AP'; *Horace, Greece and Rome: New Surveys in the Classics*, 6 (Oxford, 1968).
14. Q. Horatii Flacci, *Epistola ad Pisones, de Arte Poetica. The Art of Poetry: An Epistle to the Pisones*, ed. and trans. by George Colman (London, 1783), p. vi.
15. As Brink puts it: '[...] Wieland's own much-discussed theory (the whole poem to dissuade one of the highly aristocratic addressees, the elder of the two sons of Piso, *maior iuuenum*, from writing poetry which apparently was not his *métier*) has not met with much approbation, and can hardly do so, whatever gifts the *maior iuuenum* did or did not possess. ("A great genius of our own" and Horace's *Ars Poetica* in the Eighteenth Century', p. 74).
16. Liselotte Kurth-Voigt, *Perspectives and Points of View*, p. 60.
17. Friedrich von Hagedorn, *Sämmtliche Poetische Werke* (Hamburg, 1757), I, xxvii f.
18. Rudolf Ischer, 'Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis von Wielands Übersetzungen', *Euphoriion*, 14/2 (1907), 250. *Epistles* 1. 20 is another case in point. Whereas Horace's analogy is between the book and a slave boy who may be forced into prostitution on gaining his freedom, Wieland tones this down: in his introduction he refers to 'das Bild von Vater und Kind' (*Fuhrmann*, p. 320).
19. Walter Jens, 'Bis heute nicht überholt: Wieland als Übersetzer', p. 2191.
20. Jürgen Werner, 'Wenn Du Dir aus dem Messkatalog einiges aussuchst, so vergiss Wielands Lukian nicht', *Philologus*, 129/1 (1985), 126.

21. Schiller's lecture 'Was heißt und zu welchem Ende studiert man Universalgeschichte?' was held on the 26 and 27 May 1789, and was published in the *Teutscher Merkur* in November of the same year.
22. Gordon Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968), p. 623.
23. Cf. Elmar Herkommer, 'Die *topoi* in den Proömien der römischen Geschichtswerke' (dissertation, University of Tübingen, 1968), pp. 129 ff.: 'Die Betonung des Nutzens der Geschichtsschreibung geht auf Thukydides zurück, der behauptete, daß der Mensch aus der Geschichte der Vergangenheit für sein Verhalten in der Zukunft [...] lernen könne [...]'.
 24. Cf. Lukian, *Wie man Geschichte schreiben soll*, ed. and trans. by H. Homeyer (Munich, 1965), pp. 43 ff.: 'Die erste gültige, noch heute wertvolle Übertragung hat Wieland geschaffen; sein Verdienst geht weit über das eines bloßen Übersetzers und Kommentators hinaus [...]'.
 25. Cf. Christopher Robinson, *Lucian and his Influence in Europe* (London, 1979), pp. 157 ff.: 'Christoph Martin Wieland [...] was probably the writer the most profoundly influenced by Lucian in the whole history of European literature'.
26. Jürgen Werner, pp. 127 ff.: 'Was gestalterische Fragen angeht, so beeindruckt Wieland vor allem die von Lukian erfundene Dialog-Spezies: die Verbindung des philosophischen Dialogs à la Platon mit burlesken Komödienelementen; Wieland schrieb viele Dialoge, ja ganze Romane in Dialogform'.
27. 'Wie man die Geschichte schreiben müsse', in Lukian, *Sämtliche Werke*, III, trans. by C. M. Wieland and ed. by Hanns Floerke (Munich and Leipzig, 1911), p. 269, n. 1.
28. Franz Haller, 'Wielands Horaz in seiner ersten Fassung', p. 549.
29. Jochen Schmidt, 'Für und wider die Lust: Epikur und Antiepileptismus von der Antike bis zur Moderne: Mit einem Versuch über Hieronymus Boschs "Garten der Lüste"', in *Aufklärung und Gegenauflärung in der europäischen Literatur, Philosophie und Politik von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, ed. by Jochen Schmidt (Darmstadt, 1989). The following remark (p. 207, n. 3) testifies to the fact that Wieland's commentaries are still viable: 'Über die Ironie dieser Wendung [*Epicuri de grege porcus*] und ihren weiteren Zusammenhang ist immer noch Wielands Kommentar zu seiner Horaz-Übersetzung am lesenswertesten'.

CONCLUSION

RESTORING WIELAND'S *HORAZ* A READING OF *EPISTLES* 1.3, LINES 8–17

Each of the chapters of this study has examined a single aspect of Wieland's *Horace*, and isolated it from the other features of the *Epistles*, as far as this was practicable. The artificiality of maintaining this separation indicates the need to undertake an integrated look at one passage. Some of the material covered in the chapter on 'Horace and Wieland' inevitably reappeared in the discussion of 'Imitation and Originality' in Wieland's works; 'Diction' and 'Prosody' have a symbiotic relationship. By way of conclusion, a short reprise of the categories treated in each of the chapters will be brought to bear on a passage from *Epistles* 1.3, to Julius Florus, quoted below. This passage was chosen because it displays a good number of the notable features, although no one passage can encapsulate such a varied whole.

The order of treatment is reversed, so that we begin with the textual analysis, the focal point of the later chapters, and end by reinstating Horace in the more general context of the eighteenth century, so that the reader can meet the Roman poet in a world where the ancient myths and arguments were once again topical. In recapitulating the text-related half in reverse, we are to some extent following the course taken by the eighteenth-century German reader. We begin with the introduction, the apparatus which arouses our expectations and engages our participation. Then, following the sequence so carefully laid out by Wieland, we move on to the translation and Latin original, which body forth our analyses of prosody and diction in their close alliance.

This first section (of the conclusion) can be regarded as triangular: it moves from the general commentary up to the point of the particular linguistic detail. Again, in the first half of this study, the more general section, we moved, for instance, from the definition of originality, a theoretical area, to reflecting on the particular character of the individual eighteenth-century reader, and the concrete material available to him. In both cases there is a movement from the broad base to the apex of a triangle, the general or theoretical discussion to the particular examination. By reversing the order of the discussion, readers are invited to see this study take the shape of a kind of hourglass, with double (and

reversible) bases: a broad movement from the generality of the commentary to the particular details of verse translation back to an environment of enormous respect for Horace, which gave rise to the whole project in the first place.

If we follow in the footsteps of the reader of Wieland's *Horace*, we may end up forming a picture of this eighteenth-century amateur, his needs and expectations. Along the way, there are more triangles or tripartite structures involving two fixed points and a *tertium comparationis*. The reader is in conversation with the Horace introduced in the text, but also with Wieland, who presents him: a three-way dialogue. From a broader perspective, eighteenth-century Germany encounters first-century (B.C.) Rome, — and the medium, the translation, completes the triangle. On a textual level, the introduction and the commentary have the text of the translation as their central point of reference or apex and, finally, the German text and the Latin text have the imperfectly Latinate, German reader as their target. In what follows, we diverge from the experience of Wieland's reader for practical reasons, citing the poem first and then discussing the introduction together with the other critical apparatus.

Our extract is from *Epistles* 1.3, a poem which consists of a string of questions¹ about the activities of the young poets on a mission with Julius Florus under Tiberius Claudius Nero in Armenia. Horace's lines 15–20 are the lines devoted to Celsus, and the last three words of the extract lead into the questions about Julius Florus himself:

Epistles 1.3, lines 15–20 (*Fuhrmann*, p. 90)

- Was macht mein Celsus⁵, den ich oft ermahnt
und noch ermahnen muß, ein Eigentum
10 sich anzuschaffen, und die Schriften unberupft
zu lassen, die der Palatin'sche Gott
in seinen offenen Schatz gelegt⁶; damit,
wenn einst die Schar der Vögel ihre Federn
zurückzufordern kommt, nicht unversehens
15 entblößt von der verstohlenen Farbenpracht
die kleine Krähe zum Gelächter werde^b.
Du selbst, mein Julius, was hast du vor?

*

- 15 Quid mihi Celsus agit? monitus multumque monendus,
privatas ut quaerat opes et tangere vitet
scripta, Palatinus quaecumque recepit Apollo:
ne si forte suas repetitum venerit olim
grex avium plumas, moveat cornicula risum
20 furtivis nudata coloribus. Ipse quid audes?

b) Anspielung auf eine bekannte Äsopische Fabel. Die dem Horaz so gewöhnliche Unterschiebung des Subjekts der Vergleichung an die Stelle des Objekts gibt seinen Gleichnissen eine sonderbare Anmut.

Was macht mein Celsus (5)? den ich oft ermahne
und noch ermahnen muß, ein Eigenthum
sich anzuschaffen, und die Schriften unberupft
zu lassen, die der Palatin'sche Gott
in seinen offenen Schatz gelegt (6): damit,
wenn einst die Schaar der Vögel ihre Federn
zurückzufordern kommt, nicht unversehens
entblößt von der verflochtenen Farbenpracht
die kleine Krähe zum Gelächter werde b).
Du selbst, mein Julius, was hast du vor?

Quid mihi Celsus agit? monitus multumque monendus,
privatas ut quaerat opes et tangere vitet
scripta, Palatinus quaecunque recepit Apollo:
ne si forte suas repetitum venerit olim
grex avium plumas, moveat cornicula risum
furtivis nudata coloribus. Ipse quid audes?

b) Anspielung auf eine bekannte Hesiodische Fabel. Die dem Horaz so gewöhnliche Unverschiebung des Subjects der Vergleichung an die Stelle des Object's giebt seinen Vergleichnissen eine sonderbare Unnuth.

(5) Vermuthlich eben der Celsus von Albinova, an welchen der achte Brief geschrieben ist, und der damals einer von Tibers Geheimschreibern war.

(6) Drey Jahre nach der Schlacht bey Actium (A. V. 726.) weihte August in seinem Hause auf dem Palatinischen Berge dem Apollo einen Tempel, mit einer großen Gallerie, worin eine griechische und eine lateinische Bibliothek allen Geschlechtern offen stand. Daß August die prächtige Bibliothek des Lucullus, in welcher die Griechen, die nach Rom kamen, sich (nach Plutarch's Ausdruck) wie in einem Prytaneum oder gelehrten Rathhause zusammen fanden, in diese Palatinische habe bringen lassen, ist eine bloße, wiewohl wahrscheinliche, Vermuthung: aber daß er auch die solossallische dreßßig Ellen hohe Bildsäule des Apollo, welche Lucullus aus Apollonia im Pontus nach Rom ins Capitolium geschafft hatte, in der Palatinischen Bibliothek aufgestellt habe, wie der Abt Vellep versichert *) und sich deswegen auf das 7. Cap. des XXXIV. Buchs des Plinius beruft, davon sagt Plinius kein Wort.

*) Mémoires de Littérature. Tom. 45. p. 14.

CRITICAL APPARATUS

In his introduction, Wieland comments on the good-natured way in which Horace, an established master of the art of poetry, offers friendly advice in this epistle to aspiring young poets. Horace is the central character and the urbanity of this 'Meister' lifts him for a moment out of the ancient context. The epistle is addressed to Julius Florus, but Horace asks after Celsus and others. Wieland's introduction mentions Celsus in particular; the advice is rather negative in his case and is taken as an indication that Horace did not hesitate to speak candidly when necessary. With these observations, two more features of Horace's psychological profile have been filled in. The advice, whose content remains undisclosed at this stage, will have been unwelcome, supposes Wieland, but was no more than Celsus deserved, since he had so far ignored all advice proffered. This is the content of Wieland's sketch of Celsus, based on the evidence of these few lines. He also draws attention to an amusing image, 'das drolligste Gleichnis' (*Fuhrmann*, p. 88), through which the advice is communicated. The introduction, then, has provided two features to contribute to the portrait of Horace, which is slowly taking shape, and given subordinate portraits of Julius Florus, Celsus and others; it has aroused curiosity about the specific nature of Celsus's weaknesses and alerted the reader to watch for the evidence that he had been repeatedly warned; and it has advertised an amusing image, without revealing its content. The reader has quite a lot to look forward to in this short passage.

There is ample commentary on this passage as well. The first commentary item (5) is attached to the name 'Celsus', and it refers the reader to *Epistles* 1.8, addressed, it is assumed, to the same Celsus. This cross-reference will, of course, point the reader towards the additional information on Celsus to be found in the introduction to the later epistle. The next commentary item (6) is attached to the phrase 'in seinen offnen Schatz gelegt' and Wieland takes the opportunity to fill in some historical details about the library referred to in the text. He mentions Plutarch as a source and then, in a gesture typical of Wieland as commentator, reproduces a spurious account of some enormous pillars being transported to Rome for the construction of the library. The purpose seems to be to ridicule Belley (a French abbot and eighteenth-century classical scholar), the source of the mistaken information:

[. . .] aber daß er auch die kolossalische dreißig Ellen hohe Bildsäule des Apollo, welche Lucullus aus Apollonia im Pontus nach Rom ins Capitolium geschafft hatte, in der Palatinischen Bibliothek aufgestellt habe, wie der Abt Belley versichert² und sich deswegen auf das 7. Kap. des xxxiv. Buchs des Plinius beruft, davon sagt Plinius kein Wort. (*Fuhrmann*, p. 95)

The style of this item is reminiscent of Wieland's narrative style² — a long period, with inversions, suspense, final twist and general irrelevance to the topic

under discussion. But part of Wieland's self-ascribed function as commentator is to amuse his readers by knocking the established figures in the field of Horace scholarship down from their pedestals, and to criticize their methodology obliquely, through examples.³ Wieland is both enjoying himself and allowing the reader a confraternal feeling of superiority — provided by the colloquial expression 'kein Wort' and the appeal to the reader's sense of irony. An incidental display of his own learning is present too: the insinuation is that Wieland has read Pliny from cover to cover and can assure us that there is no such story contained there. Another nice touch is footnote 2, which refers us to the appropriate work by Belley, where this absurdity occurs. But the demonstration of his erudition is devoid of any pedantic heaviness; it is humorous and light, with the same Rococo lightness which characteristically accompanies Wieland's urbane relationship with Horace.

A true footnote (b) is attached to the German translation of the image of a flock of birds. Directly below the text, Wieland informs the reader that the image is a reference to a well-known fable of Aesop's. The footnote continues with praise for a characteristic feature of Horace's style, in which a comparison is entered into without introduction or warning.⁴ The bold technique of this image appealed to Wieland, but he was aware of the likelihood that it would be considered too obscure for Enlightenment taste by some pundits of style. The importance of the position of this note will be discussed in the following section.

TEXTUAL PRESENTATION

The element of commentary is skilfully divided between the introduction, footnotes and commentary items. The introduction entices the reader with hints, and gives him a general feeling for the types of characters to be encountered. The commentary items in this case provide i) a cross-reference to another epistle and its introduction, ii) historical background to explain the reference to the Palatine library, and iii) a joke at the expense of an old-style commentator. Usefully, in our example, we discover footnote references in the text and in the commentary: the first is placed on the page with the poem and refers to the image in the text, a means of continuing the discussion of 'das drolligste Gleichnis' begun in the introduction. Aesop is mentioned as the source, and then the reader is alerted to Horace's favourite stylistic device. This rapid reference in praise of Horace's style answers the urgent need to forestall charges of obscurity. The second note occurs at the base of the page of commentary and gives a simple reference to the unfortunate Belley's work, *Mémoires de Littérature*. The position of this reference at the base of the page allows Wieland's amusing, satirical style to flow uninterrupted. It also subtly supports the display of learning.

The advantages of the layout, viz., translation and original on the same page, are quite evident in our extract. The visual impact of the German lines, which

almost double the Latin in number, is a welcome one for the imperfectly Latinate reader. The footnote at the base of the page is in its rightful position: first, because it asks the reader to appreciate a feature in the Latin which can be checked without difficulty, but secondly, because on this occasion Wieland has succeeded in capturing the feature in his translation, and the reader can easily ascertain this by comparing the two versions of the image.

PROSODY

Wieland's line 10 is an Alexandrine and it leads into a strong enjambement 'unberupft / zu lassen'. Such a line, which more closely approximates to Horace's metre, can be viewed as a metrical compensation for the partial loss in alliterative effect of 'monitus multumque monendus' discussed in the next section. The striking metre joins forces with diction: Wieland's daring invention 'unberupft' is brought into prominence both by the Alexandrine and by its position at the end of the line. The enjambement echoes Horace's at line 16f., 'tangere vitet / scripta'.

Horace's forceful line 20 — the last line reproduced in our passage — opens, rather unusually, with two spondees, at the climax of the fable.⁵ Wieland's lines, for the most part, have five feet, with the occasional feminine ending. The beat is not an entirely regular iambic one, just as one would expect of a style which varies the pattern in the interests of a natural conversational tone.⁶ Wieland's line 15, which, like Horace's line 20, recounts the unfortunate *revelation* of the crow, is the only regular ten-syllable iambic line among those which are concerned with this fable. This metrical isolation lends a rhetorical force to match that of the Latin phrase 'furtivis nudata coloribus', with which Horace brings the fable to a resounding close.

In addition, the comparative regularity of the other lines concerned with the fable provides an appropriate backdrop for the subject-matter. The image is of a flock of birds reclaiming their feathers from the crow who has donned them. The crow is revealed in his unlovely, natural plumage and made an object of mockery. There is a preponderance of five-foot lines with feminine endings and no really striking features. Like the dull, uninspiring appearance of the crow, these lines provide a contrast to the regular iambic pentameter count of line 15, in which the stolen feathers catch the eye. This fable appeals to Wieland very strongly — he mentions it in the introduction, he remarks on it in a footnote, and he translates it with great care. It concerns a question close to his own heart — originality — and for this reason Wieland makes sure that the metre is as expressive as it can be.

DICTION

We have already explained that this epistle is a string of questions about the young poets on a mission with Julius Florus, and that Horace's lines 15–20 are

devoted to Celsus. The last three words lead into the questions about Julius Florus himself; the articulation is therefore important, and Wieland captures it in his translation: 'Was macht mein *Celsus* . . .?' Wieland shows characteristic alertness to Horace's affection for the young Celsus: 'mihi' becomes 'mein', a formula which is echoed at the end of line 17, where Wieland adds 'mein Julius' mainly to ease the reader's understanding, but also to interpret the 'ipse'. Horace is delicately suggesting that his love for Florus is just that little bit greater than his love for Celsus, and Wieland with his 'Du selbst' has not missed this. Horace's alliteration and polyptoton 'monitus multumque monendus' corresponds to the German 'oft ermahnt/und noch ermahnen muß'. The alliterated 'm' is less prominent, but the polyptoton has been recreated. The seriousness of the advice to do something of his own is intensified by the parallelism of 'oft [. . .] noch'.

Celsus has clearly offended: the crucial point comes first in the word *privatas* introducing a clause of such importance that it spills over into a striking enjambement incorporating 'scripta'. Wieland, by his own means, stresses 'ein Eigentum' as heavily as Horace stresses 'privatas', and suggests the force of Horace's enjambement by the only Alexandrine (line 10) in this passage. True, Wieland has not managed the wealth of 'opes', translated by the lamer 'Eigentum', but soon compensates with 'Schatz' in line 12.

In translating the phrase about the library, Wieland adds the adjective 'offnen'⁷ — his by now familiar way of insinuating a commentary item into the text. This helps the reader to imagine, in this case, an accessible collection of books, which Horace alludes to in order to suggest that Celsus has made excessive use of other works. Wieland's translation of 'grex avium', 'Schar der Vögel', echoes the passage in *Epistles* 1.19 which also deals with the topic of imitation and originality (*Fuhrmann*, p. 304). In that passage, Horace speaks not of 'grex', but of 'servum pecus', but Wieland translates 'pecus' with 'Schar' again: 'Nachahmer-Schar'.⁸ 'Schar' corresponds less closely to the Latin, in this case, which points to a conscious linking of the two passages in Wieland's mind. The term 'Schar', although it is used in *Epistles* 1.3 to designate those being imitated and in *Epistles* 1.19 for the imitators, nevertheless functions as thematic indicator. The bird image is translated to correspond very closely to the Latin. Wieland has forgone the temptation to provide a crutch for the reader within the text of the translation — for instance, he might have fitted Aesop's name into one of his lines. His unusual fidelity to Horace's phrasing is further evidence that this particular theme needs to be handled with extreme care in Wieland's estimation. The aesthetic pleasure Wieland experiences at the elegance of Horace's phrasing compels him to preserve that elegance faithfully, but in case any clarity has been sacrificed by his fidelity, he provides an instant footnote.

WIELAND'S TRANSLATION STRATEGIES

Here we must turn once more to Voss, whose fidelity to every aspect of the Latin always far exceeds any that Wieland might hope to achieve. The passage as a whole is just too painful to reproduce ('Was treibt Celsus mir denn?!'), but this is how he translates the bird-and-feather image:

Daß nicht, kommen einmal und nehmen sich ihre Gefieder
 Alle die Vögel zurück, ein Gespött dastehe die Krähe,
 Ganz der gestohlenen Farben entlediget. Selber was wagst du?

(*Horaz: Sämtliche Werke*, p. 183)

Fidelity to rhythm and fidelity to word order are incompatible aims when rendering Latin verse in German. Here, the no more than moderately successful attempt to uphold these two precepts simultaneously, has led Voss into inexactitudes of the type which normally accompany Wieland's method. He has not translated 'forte', which Wieland renders as 'wenn'. 'Repetitum' is more accurately returned by Wieland as 'zurückzufordern' than by Voss as 'nehmen [. . .] zurück'. There is no mention in Voss of a 'flock' of birds: 'alle die Vögel' is a poor (and clumsy) substitution for 'grex avium'. The diminutive 'cornicula'⁹ carries the sense of 'poor little crow', which is also lost in Voss's version. To say nothing of the violence done to the German language by 'Daß nicht [. . .] dastehe' or 'Selber was wagst du?!'

Whereas Voss's allegiance to an antiquarian principle of reproducing all features of the Latin, wherever possible, sometimes fails on every front, Wieland's decision to put the reader's enjoyment first does not always result in forfeiture of the notable features in the Latin, as we have just observed. Wieland, in his own way, is just as concerned as Voss, to recover every single detail of the *Horace*, but his genius is in honouring these details, not by the literal equivalents (as we have seen, by this method the poetry actually disintegrates), but rather by recreating these details in German expressions which are his very own.

IMITATION AND ORIGINALITY

The relevance of our extract to the theme of originality is obvious: Celsus, by means of the fable, is being told not to borrow other people's feathers. But this passage brilliantly relates to Wieland himself. We know that he turned to translation after disappointments experienced in the reception of his more 'original' works, and that he was an inveterate borrower himself. But there is in these translations something of lasting quality and much more profound than reflected or borrowed glory: in his *Horace*, he has provided himself with plumage which is uniquely his own, and fills all other birds with envy.

What are the examples of originality in the actual style of Wieland's translation? In the matter of vocabulary, we have admired the choice of the word

'Schar' for the flock of birds. It is a clever usage on two grounds: first, it will sound familiar when the reader comes to the treatment of this theme in *Epistles* 1.19, but, secondly, it functions as a subtle reminder (since it would more commonly be used of people) that this is an image, in which birds stand for human poets. There is a similar case, earlier in our passage: the verb 'unberupft' is less suggestive of borrowing books from a library (Voss has 'borgen') than of plucking feathers from a bird. As was indicated in the 'Prosody' section, attention is drawn to this usage by its placement at the end of an isolated Alexandrine. This is not fidelity to the Latin, but a stunningly original elaboration of Wieland's, which, despite its Wielandian origin, is no less typical of Horatian style and humour. The limits imposed by the genre of translation have actually fostered his ingenuity.

HORACE AND WIELAND

Wieland champions Horace in an incidental way in a variety of his works: *Zwölf Moralische Briefe in Versen*, *Musarion*, *Geschichte des Agathon*, *Briefe an einen jungen Dichter*.¹⁰ In some cases this is more or less unconscious — so deeply is he versed in Horace that to cite him or to allude to him seems the most natural course in a given context. But it is in the translations that his role as Horace's agent is most conscious.

Sengle speaks of Wieland's translations from Horace and Lucian as 'eine Art von historischer Transsubstantiation' (p. 394). But this should not suggest that a fusion or confusion of the two personae has taken place, that Wieland is a 'Horatius redivivus'.¹¹ Horace's presence was especially strong in Wieland during his work on the translations, as Böttiger reports:

Seine größte Stärke besteht darin, daß ihm seine Phantasie Alles bis zur höchsten Täuschung vergegenwärtigt. Darum konnte er auch den Horaz und Lucian so unnachahmlich verdeutschen. Seine dichterische Schwärmerei geht so weit, daß, als er den Horaz übersetzte, er oft im Ernst behauptete, die Seele des Horaz sei in ihm wohnhaft, und so auch beim Lucian.¹²

This granted him a sort of psychological affinity which helped him to see past the philologically based theories of the other commentaries and arrive at motives, intentions and perspectives attributable to a living poet capable of companionship with the reader, rather than 'Horace', an object of philological study. The reader can associate with Horace and does not need to forgo his individuality as an eighteenth-century German of good education and become a professional scholar. The affinity between the poet and his translator also allowed Wieland to embellish the text in a Horatian way, as we saw in the examples discussed above, and to transform the ancient poet into an identifiable personality whom his readers would come to know.

HORACE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

There seems to be no doubt that, for all his popularity in eighteenth-century Germany, Horace was unavailable in an edition suited to the non-specialist reader. Wieland, as editor of the *Teutscher Merkur*, had his finger on the pulse of the literate public and sensed that a hexameter translation of the poems without any commentary, or yet another edition annotated in Latin, were not what was required. A sympathetic profile of the poet (and of his friends) was needed, combined with a relaxed, easily readable and usefully presented translation, which also contained some historical background and contemporary analogies. An edition incorporating the principle of balance was needed, designed to accommodate the reader who had no knowledge of the original language, yet which provided enough critical material for those who were familiar with it. When all this was realised, Wieland could allow himself some fun exposing the shortcomings of the existing editions. All these ingredients interact to bring Horace into dialogue with Wieland *and* the eighteenth-century reader, and to manoeuvre the latter, in an easy motion, back and forth between ancient Rome and his own contemporary society.

Böttiger (an eighteenth-century reader) has testified to the fact that Wieland's Horace translations are 'unnachahmlich verdeutscht'. The present study proposes that this is certainly still the case. Horace's advice to Celsus could never apply to Wieland, because his translations are an *inimitable* version of Horace himself. Without Wieland's *Horace* this great Roman poet would have been destined to linger among the tomes of the classical philologists, which Wieland, following his beloved Erasmus, would have regarded as a kind of 'senility'.¹³

Wieland's *Horace* is designed to be read and enjoyed. From the point of view of style and rhythm, and from the way in which the text is presented and commented, the impression is the same. In the chapter entitled 'Horace and Wieland', we saw the ease with which Wieland quotes and refers to Horace throughout his other works, and his translations are intended to promote the *same* comfortable and intimate relationship between Wieland's eighteenth-century reader and the Roman poet. Our conclusion resketched the chapters in reverse order in an attempt to undo some of the unnaturalness which inevitably results from a formal analysis and to restore the experience of reading. Thus, for example, the passage was reproduced in the correct order — German version above Latin original — which was only rarely possible in the chapters themselves.

Our own encounter with the text proper began in the chapter on 'Diction' and became even broader and more general in perspective as we approached the analysis of Wieland's techniques as commentator in Chapter VIII, entitled 'Critical Apparatus'. But the eighteenth-century reader was intended to begin with the general — the introduction — and move towards the particular features

of the translation. Although we begin our journeys from opposite ends and move in opposite directions, we, and the eighteenth-century reader, participate alike in the dialogue with Horace and with Wieland: we both experience the active, almost restless, spirit of the work which repeatedly translates us from one cultural milieu to another.¹⁴

NOTES TO CONCLUSION

1. It is worth noting the textual variation in Fuhrmann's edition at *Epistles* 1.3 (German line 8 on p. 90). Whereas Fuhrmann reads: 'Was macht mein Celsus', the 1816 edition has a question mark in place of the comma. This, of course, reinforces our description of the poem as a string of questions.
2. The surprise element of this narrative technique is employed in *Geschichte des Agathon*; M. H. Würzner describes it this way: 'Der Erzähler ist sich dadurch bewußt, daß er den Erwartungshorizont vieler seiner Leser sprengen wird mit seiner Erzählung' ('Der Leser in Wielands *Geschichte des Agathon*', in *Christoph Martin Wieland*, ed. by Hansjörg Schelle, p. 103).
3. Cf. above p. 15 and p. 131 f. on the debunking of commentators.
4. See also Wieland's commentary item 15 to *Epistles* 2.2: 'Auch hier stellt unser Autor, seiner Gewohnheit nach, mit Weglassung der Vergleichungswörter, das Bild an den Platz der Sache' (Fuhrmann, p. 485).
5. See p. 99 above for an analysis of the Latin dactylic hexameter.
6. Cf. Fuhrmann, p. 581: in 'An den Leser', a preface to the *Satires*, Wieland writes that 'der freie Jambus' gives the impression of '[...] eine kunstlose Rede in dem gewöhnlichen Gange der Sprache des Umgangs [...]']'.
7. For further examples of adding adjectives in translation, see p. 92 f. above.
8. See my discussion of *Epistles* 1.19, on p. 69 f. above. A further case in point is the image in *Epistles* 1.4, 'Epicuri de grege porcus', where Wieland translates the collective noun as 'Stall'. This alters and confines the image somewhat. But he adds 'verschrienem' as a strengthener which restores the derogatory ring of 'Schar'. Cf. my discussion on p. 46 above and n. 29 of Chapter VIII.
9. 'Cornicula: the diminutive, not found elsewhere, expresses pity': Horace: *Epistles Book I*, ed. by O. A. W. Dilke (London, 1954), p. 86, n. 19.
10. These works are discussed in more detail in Chapter II; I begin with *Geschichte des Agathon* on p. 40.
11. Otto Bantel, 'Christoph Martin Wieland und die griechische Antike', p. 372.
12. K. A. Böttiger, *Literarische Zustände und Zeitgenossen*, I, 143.
13. See Hugh Trevor-Roper, 'Erasmus and the Crisis of Christian Humanism', in *Renaissance Essays* (London, 1985). Erasmus saw his work of editing, annotating and paraphrasing the New Testament as giving the sacred Scripture 'fresh vigour', but, of course, all the while time was running out (p. 66): 'while "I rescue it from senility", and restore it to its original splendour, "I cover myself with dust and cobwebs"'.
14. Cf. Wieland to Voss (Weimar, 14 March 1788): 'Von meinem Lucian, — der eigentlich mehr für die größere Leserwelt, als für die Gelehrten bestimmt ist [...]'; and Hansjörg Schelle's comment: 'Was Wieland am 14. 3. 1788 an Voß hinsichtlich der Lukian-Übersetzung schreibt, dürfte auch für seine übrigen Übersetzungen aus dem Lateinischen und Griechischen gelten'.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CHRISTOPH MARTIN WIELAND

COLLECTED WORKS

- Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by Hans Radspieler, 14 vols (Hamburg, 1984). *Faksimilie der Ausgabe letzter Hand* (Leipzig: Göschen, 1794 bis 1811).
- Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by J. G. Gruber, 53 vols (Leipzig: Göschen, 1824–28)
- Werke*, ed. by Gotthold Klee, 4 vols (Leipzig and Vienna: Bibliographisches Institut, 1900)
- Gesammelte Schriften*, herausgegeben von der Deutschen Kommission der Königlich Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften [and Akademie der Wissenschaften der DDR] (Berlin, 1909–75 and Hildesheim, 1986–87)
- Ausgewählte Werke*, ed. by Friedrich Beißner, 3 vols (Munich, 1964–65)
- Werke*, ed. by Fritz Martini and Hans Werner Seiffert, 5 vols (Munich, 1964–68)
- Werke*, ed. by Gonthier-Louis Fink et al., 12 vols (Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 1986ff.)

TRANSLATIONS

Horace

- 'Klosterbergisches Schulheft' (1748), in *Gesammelte Schriften* (Akademie der Wissenschaften), 1/4: *Prosaische Jugendwerke*, ed. by Fritz Homeyer and Hugo Bieber (Hildesheim, 1986; reprint of the 1st edn, Berlin, 1916)
- 'Horazens Briefe, übersetzt von Wieland'. Wieland's [incomplete] manuscript may be consulted at the Wieland-Archiv in Biberach an der Riss
- Der Teutsche Merkur*, ed. by C. M. Wieland (Weimar, 1773–89). The first publication of Wieland's translation of the *Epistles* appeared in his journal (2. Heft, 1781): 'Versuch einer Uebersetzung der ersten Epistel des Horaz'. The journal continued to provide 'puffs' for Wieland's Horace up to 1785
- Die Dichtkunst des Horaz*, übersetzt und erklärt in Prosa von K. W. Ramler; in Versen von C. M. Wieland; herausgegeben von Heinrich Sautier. Zweyte, mit dem Entwurf einer Dichtkunst nach Horaz vermehrte Auflage (Basel, 1789)
- Horazens Briefe: Aus dem Lateinischen übersetzt und mit historischen Einleitungen und andern nöthigen Erläuterungen versehen*, 3. Auflage, 1. und 2. Theil (Leipzig: in der Weidmannischen Buchhandlung, 1816)
- Gesammelte Schriften* (Akademie der Wissenschaften), 11/4: *Plinius, Horaz, Lucrez*, ed. by Paul Stachel (Hildesheim, 1987; reprint of the 1st edn, Berlin, 1913)
- Horaz, Episteln: Lateinisch und Deutsch*, trans. by C. M. Wieland and ed. by Gerhard Wirth (Hamburg, 1963). [N.B.: This edition purports to be based on Wieland's 'Ausgabe letzter Hand von 1804' (p. 279). This claim is misleading in two respects: i) the last edition of the *Epistles* to

appear in Wieland's lifetime was published in 1801; the equivalent edition of the *Satires* appeared in 1804; ii) In 1805 Wieland sent his publisher amendments for a proposed 'Ausgabe letzter Hand'; in the event this did not appear until 1816 (after his death). His publisher did not consult Wieland before printing the 1801 edition of the *Epistles*.]

Horazens Satiren, ed. by Hans Radspieler (Nördlingen, 1985)

Horazens Briefe, ed. by Hans Radspieler (Nördlingen, 1986)

Werke (Deutscher Klassiker Verlag), ix: *Übersetzung des Horaz*, ed. by Manfred Fuhrmann (Frankfurt am Main, 1986). Reviews by Egidius Schmalzriedt, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 30 September 1986 and by Jane V. Curran, *Lessing Yearbook*, 19 (1987), 338–40

Aristophanes, Lucian and Shakespeare

'Die Wolken des Aristophanes: Uebersetzt von W.', in *Attisches Museum*, 2 (1798), 49–175

'Wie man die Geschichte schreiben müsse', in Lukian, *Sämtliche Werke*, iii, trans. by C. M. Wieland and ed. by Hanns Floerke (Munich and Leipzig, 1911)

Gesammelte Schriften (Akademie der Wissenschaften), ii/1: *Shakespeares theatralische Werke*, 1. und 2. Teil, ed. by Ernst Stadler (Berlin, 1909)

WIELAND: INDIVIDUAL WORKS

'Apologie der teutschen Lettern, mit einer Antwort des Herausgebers', in *Der Neue Teutsche Merkur*, 3. Band (1793), 99–106

Ausgewählte Briefe von C. M. Wieland an verschiedene Freunde: In den Jahren 1751–1810 geschrieben, und nach der Zeitfolge geordnet, iv (Zürich, 1816)

Ausgewählte Prosa aus dem Teutschen Merkur, ed. by Hans Werner Seiffert (Marbach am Neckar, 1963)

Auswahl denkwürdiger Briefe von C. M. Wieland, ii, ed. by Ludwig Wieland (Vienna, 1815)

'Briefe über die Vossische Übersetzung des Homers', in *Der Neue Teutsche Merkur*, 2. und 3. Heft (1795) in Entwicklungsreihen, ed. by F. Brüggemann and Helmut Paustian

'Der gepryfte Abraham', in *Deutsche Literatur* 105–11 and 400–36 (Reihe Aufklärung), 7 (Leipzig, 1935), pp. 205–68

Geschichte der Abderiten, ed. by Karl Hans Bühner (Stuttgart, 1980)

Mit fliegender Feder: Ausgewählte Briefe, ed. by Heinrich Bock (Frankfurt am Main, 1990)

Moralische Briefe: In Versen (1752), in *Sämtliche Werke*, xiii/1 (Hamburg, 1984; reprint of Leipzig: Göschen, 1798)

Musarion oder die Philosophie der Grazien: Ein Gedicht in drei Büchern, ed. by Alfred Anger (Stuttgart, 1974)

Werke (Deutscher Klassiker Verlag), iii: *Geschichte des Agathon*, ed. by Klaus Manger (Frankfurt am Main, 1986)

Wielands Briefwechsel, ed. by Hans Werner Seiffert, 5 vols (Berlin: Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1963–83)

WIELAND: PARALIPOMENA

'Aufmunterung zu einem neuen Versuch die Teutschen Buchstaben mit den Lateinischen zu vertauschen: An den Herausgeber des Teutschen Merkurs', in *Gesammelte Schriften* (Akademie der Wissenschaften), i/22: *Kleine Schriften II: 1778–1782*, ed. by Wilhelm Kurrelmeyer (Berlin, 1954), pp. 571–75

'Anmerkung und Beysatz des Herausgebers zu: Proben einer neuen Übersetzung der Äneis' und Der Teutsche Parnaß', in *Gesammelte Schriften* (Akademie der Wissenschaften). I/23: *Kleine Schriften III: 1783–1791*, ed. by William Clark (Berlin, 1969), pp. 366 f.

EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS

HORACE

Eighteenth Century

Q. Horatius Flaccus, *ex recensione et cum notis atque emendationibus Richardi Bentleii* (Cambridge, 1711)
Oeuvres de Horace, en Latin, traduites en françois par M. Dacier et le P. Sanadon (Amsterdam, 1735)
 Samuel Gotthold Langens *Horatzische Oden nebst Georg Friedrich Meiers Vorrede vom Werthe der Reime* (Halle, 1747)

The Works of Horace, Translated into English Prose, As near as the Propriety of the Two Languages will admit [. . .] Begun by David Watson, Revised, Carried on and Published by S. Patrick, 2 vols (London, 1750)

Horatii, Q. Flacci, *Opera una cum schol. perpetuis tam vet. quam novis — adjecit ubi visum est, et sua, textumque restituit Guil. Baxter, ad cujus secundam ed. recudi curavit et varietate lectionis suisque observat. auxit Jo. Matth. Gesnerus* (Leipzig, 1752). [*Verzeichnis*, p. 17]

Horazens Epistel an die Pisonen von der Dichtkunst, und an den Augustus mit Commentarien und Anmerkungen, nebst einigen kritischen Abhandlungen von Rich. Hurd. Aus dem Englischen übersetzt und mit eigenen Anmerkungen begleitet von Johann Joachim Eschenburg, 2 vols (Leipzig, 1772)

Die Werke des Horaz, aus dem Lateinischen übersetzt [by J. P. Uz] (Ansbach, 1773: Erster Theil; 1775: Zweyter und Dritter Theil)

Die Dichtkunst des Horaz, uebersetzt von Karl Wilhelm Ramler (Basel, 1777)

Horatii *Opera*; cura Jani, I (Leipzig, 1778). [*Verzeichnis*, p. 17]

Q. Horatii Flacci, *Epistola ad Pisonem, de Arte Poetica. The Art of Poetry: An Epistle to the Pisones*, ed. and trans. by George Colman (London, 1783)

Ausgewählte Oden und Lieder [des Horaz]: *Zum Gebrauch auf Schulen*, herausgegeben von Joh. Heinr. Just. Köppen (Braunschweig, 1791); *Erklärende Anmerkungen*, 1. Theil, herausgegeben von J. H. J. Köppen; 2. Theil, herausgegeben von C. Aug. Böttiger

Libri I. Carmen IV: adnot. perpetua et observat. criticis instr. edendorum eiusdem operum spec. loco proposuit Christ. Guil. Mitscherlich (Leipzig, 1792)

Nineteenth Century

Horazens Satyren: In deutsche Verse übersetzt und mit kurzen erklärenden Anmerkungen versehen von Johann Jacob Harmsen (Halle, 1800)

Q. Horatii Flacci *Satira Nona libri primi. Des Q. Horatius Flaccus neunte Satire des ersten Buches*, übersetzt und erklärt von Eduard Loder (Hamburg, 1804)

Des Q. Horazius Flakkus Werke: Metrisch übersetzt und ausführlich erklärt von C. F. Preiß, I (Leipzig, 1805)

Des Quintus Horatius Flaccus Werke von Joh. Heinrich Voss; I: *Oden und Epoden*; II: *Satiren und Episteln* (Heidelberg, 1806). Review in *Jenaische Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung*, Nos. 135–37, 10–12 June 1807

Horatii Opera: Zum Schulgebrauch von Aug. Chr. Borheck (Lemgo: Meyer, 1814–17)

Oeuvres complètes d'Horace, ed. by Jean-Baptiste Monfalcon (Paris and Lyon, 1834)

Horaz: Sämtliche Werke, Übersetzt von Johann Heinrich Voß, Neue Ausgabe (Leipzig: Philipp Reclam jun., undated)

Twentieth Century

Horace: Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica, trans. by H. Rushton Fairclough (Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: The Loeb Classical Library, 1929)

The Ars Poetica of Horace, ed. by Augustus S. Wilkins (London, 1939)

Horace: Epistles Book I, ed. by O. A. W. Dilke (London, 1954)

Q. Horatius Flaccus, *Briefe: Erklärt von Adolf Kiessling*, 5th edn, ed. by Richard Heinze (Berlin, 1957)

Horace on Poetry, by C. O. Brink, II: *The 'Ars Poetica'* (Cambridge, 1971)

LUCIAN

Wie man Geschichte schreiben soll, ed. and trans. by H. Homeyer (Munich, 1965)

VIRGIL

Publii Virgilii Maronis Georgicon; Des Publius Virgilius Maro Landbau (Libri quatuor; Vier Gesänge), übersetzt und erklärt von Johann Heinrich Voss (Eutin and Hamburg, 1789)

GERMAN PRIMARY SOURCES

Böttiger, K. A., *Literarische Zustände und Zeitgenossen*, I, ed. by K. W. Böttiger (Leipzig, 1838)

Breitinger, Johann Jacob, *Critische Dichtkunst*, II (Stuttgart, 1966; reprint of 1740 edn)

Bürger, Gottfried August, 'Bürger an einen Freund über seine deutsche *Ilias*', in *Sämtliche Werke*, I (Leipzig, 1747), pp. 46–54

Eschenburg, Johann Joachim, *Beyspielsammlung zur Theorie und Literatur der schönen Wissenschaften*, v (Berlin and Stettin, 1790)

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang von, 'Plato als Mitgenosse einer christlichen Offenbarung' 'Über Kunst und Alterthum' (1823–32), in *Werke* (Weimarer Ausgabe), xLI/2 (Weimar, 1903), pp. 169–76

—, 'Zum brüderlichen Andenken Wielands', in *Bibliographische Einzelschriften*, xII (Zurich, 1962, 2nd edn), pp. 698–705

—, *Goethes Werke*, II, ed. by Erich Trunz (Hamburg, 1952, 2nd edn)

Gottsched, Johann Christoph, *Versuch einer critischen Dichtkunst*, 4th edn (Leipzig, 1751)

Hagedorn, Friedrich von, *Sämmtliche Poetische Werke*, I (Hamburg, 1757)

Hellmuth, Hans-Heinrich and Joachim Schröder [editors], *Die Lehre von der Nachahmung der antiken Versmaße im Deutschen* (Munich, 1976)

Herder, Johann Gottfried, *Sämmtliche Werke*, XI and XVI: 'Zur schönen Literatur und Kunst' (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1829)

—, *Sämmtliche Werke*, I, III, VIII, XVII, XXIV, ed. by Bernhard Suphan (Berlin, 1877–1913; reprint of this edition in Hildesheim, 1967)

—, *Herders Werke*, II, 6th edn (Berlin and Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag, 1982)

Hölderlin, Friedrich, *Sämmtliche Werke*, III, ed. by Friedrich Beissner (Frankfurt am Main, 1969)

- Kant, Immanuel, *Prolegomena zu einer jeden künftigen Metaphysik, die als Wissenschaft wird auftreten können*, ed. by Karl Vorländer (Hamburg, 1957)
- Klopstock, Friedrich Gottlieb, 'Grammatische Gespräche', in *Sämmtliche Werke*, ix (Leipzig, 1844), pp. 1–322
- , 'Von der Nachahmung des griechischen Sylbenmasses im Deutschen', in *Ausgewählte Werke*, ed. by K. A. Schleiden. 4th edn (Munich and Vienna, 1981), pp. 1038–48
- Lenz, J. M. R., *Gesammelte Schriften*, iii, ed. by L. Tieck (Berlin, 1828)
- Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim, *Sämmtliche Schriften*, iv, v, viii, ed. by Karl Lachmann and Franz Muncker (Stuttgart, 1889, 1890 and 1892)
- , *Werke*, iii: *Frühe kritische Schriften*, ed. by Karl S. Guthke (Munich, 1972)
- Lütkehaus, Ludger, 'Einleitung zur Schopenhauer-Ausgabe letzter Hand' (Zürich: Haffmans Verlag, 22 February 1988), pp. 7 f.
- Opitz, Martin, 'Buch von der Deutschen Poeterey', in *Gesammelte Werke*, ii/i, ed. by George Schulz-Behrend (Stuttgart, 1978)
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich D. E., 'Ueber die verschiedenen Methoden des Uebersetzens', in *Sämmtliche Werke*, iii/2 (Berlin, 1838), pp. 207–331
- Sulzer, Johann Georg, *Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste in einzeln, nach alphabetischer Ordnung der Kunstwörter aufeinander folgenden, Artikeln, abgehandelt* (Leipzig, 1771)
- , *Nachträge zu Sulzers allgemeiner Theorie der schönen Künste* (Leipzig, 1792)
- Uz, Johann Peter, *Sämmtliche Poetische Werke*, ed. by A. Sauer, Deutsche Literaturdenkmale des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts in Neudruck (Stuttgart, 1968)
- Venzky, Georg, 'Das Bild eines geschickten Uebersetzers', in *Beyträge zur Critischen Historie der deutschen Sprache, Poesie und Beredsamkeit*, 3 (1734), 59–114
- Voss, Johann Heinrich, *Zeitmessung der deutschen Sprache: Beilage zu den Oden und Elegieen* (Königsberg, 1802)

WIELAND: SECONDARY LITERATURE

- Baeppler, Klaus, *Der philosophische Wieland: Stufen und Prägungen seines Denkens* (Bern, 1974)
- Bantel, Otto, 'Christoph Martin Wieland und die griechische Antike' (dissertation, University of Tübingen, 1953)
- Barthel, Marga, *Das 'Gespräch' bei Wieland: Untersuchungen über Wesen und Form seiner Dichtung*, 2nd edn (Hildesheim, 1973)
- Berthold, Heinz, 'Christoph Martin Wieland und die Nöte des Übersetzens', in *Wieland und die Antike: Beiträge der Winckelmann-Gesellschaft*, vol. 14, ed. by Max Kunze (Stendal, 1986), pp. 31–43
- Boa, Elizabeth, 'Wieland's Musarion and the Rococo Verse Narrative', in *Periods in German Literature*, ii, ed. by J. M. Ritchie and Oswald Wolff (London, 1964), pp. 21–41
- Bock, Werner, *Die ästhetischen Anschauungen Wielands* (Berlin, 1921)
- Brender, Irmela, *Christoph Martin Wieland* (Hamburg, 1990)
- Buchner, Karl, *Wieland und die Weidmannsche Buchhandlung: Zur Geschichte deutscher Literatur und deutschen Buchhandels* (Berlin, 1871)
- Budde, Fritz, *Wieland und Bodmer* (Berlin, 1910)
- Bünemann, Hermann, *Elias Schlegel und Wieland als Bearbeiter antiker Tragödien: Studie zur Rezeption der Antike im 18. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1928)
- Dahnke, Hans-Dietrich, '"Die Götter im Neglige": Zu Wielands Göttergesprächen', in *Wieland 1983*, ed. by Thomas Höhle (Halberstadt, 1983), pp. 103–16
- Deetjen, Werner, 'Wielands Bibliothek', in *Funde und Forschungen*, ed. by Werner Deetjen (Leipzig, 1921), pp. 1–10

- Doell, Matthäus, 'Wieland und die Antike', in *Beitrag zur Geschichte der Entwicklung der deutschen Literatur im 18. Jahrhundert* (Munich, Ludwigs-Gymnasium, 1895–96)
- Fertig, Ludwig, *Christoph Martin Wieland der Weisheitslehrer* (Darmstadt, 1991)
- Fink, Gonthier-Louis, 'Wieland und die französische Revolution', in *Christoph Martin Wieland*, ed. by Hansjörg Schelle (Darmstadt, 1981), pp. 407–43
- Fuchs, Albert, *Les Apports français dans l'oeuvre de Wieland de 1772 à 1789* (Paris, 1934)
- Fuhrmann, Manfred, 'Von Wieland bis Voss: Wie verdeutscht man antike Autoren?', *JFDH*, 29 (1987), 1–22
- , 'Wielands Horaz: Ein philologischer Weg', *Gymnasium*, Beiheft 9 (1988), 193–210
- Gaycken, Hans-Jürgen, *Christoph Martin Wieland: Kritik seiner Werke in Aufklärung, Romantik und Moderne* (Bern and Frankfurt am Main, 1982). Review by Jane V. Curran, *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 11/1 (1988), 115–16
- Gruber, J. G., *C. M. Wielands Leben* (Hamburg, 1984; reprint of the 1st edn, Leipzig, 1827)
- Haller, Franz, 'Wielands Horaz in seiner ersten Fassung' (dissertation, University of Vienna, 1927)
- Hinderer, Walter, 'Wielands Beiträge zur deutschen Klassik', in *Deutsche Literatur zur Zeit der Klassik*, ed. by Karl Otto Conrady (Stuttgart, 1977), pp. 44–64
- Iktonen, Kyösti, *Die Shakespeare-Übersetzung Wielands 1762–1766* (Jyväskylä, 1971)
- Ischer, Rudolf, *Kleine Studien über Wieland* (Berlin, 1905)
- , 'Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis von Wielands Übersetzungen', *Euphron*, 14/2 (1907), 242–56
- Jaumann, Herbert, 'Der deutsche Lukian: Kontinuitätsbruch und Dialogizität, am Beispiel von Wielands Neuen Göttergesprächen (1791)', in *Der deutsche Roman der Spätaufklärung: Fiktion und Wirklichkeit*, ed. by Harro Zimmermann (Heidelberg, 1990), pp. 61–90
- Jens, Walter, 'Bis heute nicht überholt: Wieland als Übersetzer', in *Börsenblatt für den deutschen Buchhandel*, 35 (Frankfurt am Main, 1979), 2190–92
- Jørgensen, Sven-Aage, 'Warum und zu welchem Ende schreibt man eine Vorrede? Randbemerkungen zur Leserlenkung, besonders bei Wieland', in *Text und Kontext*, 4/3 (Copenhagen, 1976), 3–20
- , 'Wieland zwischen Bürgerstube und Adelssalon', in *Bürger und Bürgerlichkeit im Zeitalter der Aufklärung*, ed. by Rudolf Vierhaus (Heidelberg, 1981), pp. 205–19
- , 'Ist eine Weimarer Klassik ohne Wieland denkbar?', in *Unser commercium: Goethes und Schillers Literaturpolitik*, ed. by Wilfried Barner et al. (Stuttgart, 1984), pp. 187–97
- Kausch, Karl Heinz, 'Die Kunst der Grazie: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis Wielands', *JDSG*, 2 (1958), 12–42
- Köppe, Charlotte, 'Christoph Martin Wielands Beziehungen zur Antike in der Verserzählung "Musarion"', in *Wieland-Kolloquium*, ed. by Thomas Köhle (Halberstadt, 1983), pp. 143–53
- Kurth-Voigt, Liselotte, *Perspectives and Points of View: The Early Works of Wieland and their Background* (Baltimore and London, 1974)
- , 'C. M. Wielands Endymion: Variationen eines antiken Mythos', *MLN*, 97 (1982), 470–96
- , 'Wielands Geschichte des Agathon: Zur journalistischen Rezeption des Romans', in *Wieland-Studien*, 1, ed. by Hans Radspieler (Sigmaringen, 1991), pp. 9–42
- Larson, Kenneth E., 'Wieland's Shakespeare: A Reappraisal', *Lessing Yearbook*, 16 (1984), 229–51
- Leitzmann, Albert, 'Magister Ardelio', *ZDP*, 50 (1926), 92–93
- Marchand, James W., 'Wieland and the Middle Ages' and 'Wieland's Style and Narratology', in *Christoph Martin Wieland: Nordamerikanische Forschungsbeiträge zur 250. Wiederkehr seines Geburtstages*, ed. by Hansjörg Schelle (Tübingen, 1984). Review of this collection by Alan Menhennet, *Lessing Yearbook*, 18 (1986), 266–67
- Matthecka, Gerd, 'Die Romantheorie Wielands und seine Vorläufer', (dissertation, University of Tübingen, 1956)
- McCarthy, John A., 'Shaftesbury and Wieland: The Question of Enthusiasm', *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, 6 (1977), 79–95

- Meessen, H. J., 'Wieland's *Briefe an einen jungen Dichter*', *Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht, deutsche Sprache und Literatur*, 47 (1955), 193–208
- Menhennet, Alan, 'Wieland and Claude-Joseph Dorat (1734–1780): A Footnote to the History of Franco-German Literary Relations in the Eighteenth Century', *MLR*, 78 (1983), 862–68
- Miquet, Claude, C. M. *Wieland, directeur du Mercure allemand (1773–1789). Un dessein ambitieux, une réussite intellectuelle et commerciale* (Bern, Frankfurt, New York, Paris, 1990)
- Monecke, Wolfgang, *Wieland und Horaz* (Cologne and Graz, 1964). Reviews by Otto Bantel, *Gnomon* 37/38 (1965) and Klaus Kanzog, *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 87 (1966)
- Müller-Guttenbrunn, Adam (alias Ignotus), *Wieland und die Griechen* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1911)
- Müller-Solger, Hermann, *Der Dichtertraum: Studien zur Entwicklung der dichterischen Phantasie im Werk Christoph Martin Wielands* (Göppingen, 1970)
- Oettinger, Klaus, *Phantasie und Erfahrung: Studien zur Erzählpoetik Christoph Martin Wielands* (Munich, 1970)
- Preisendanz, Wolfgang, 'Die Muse Belesenheit: Transtextualität in Wielands Neuem Amadis', *MLN*, 99/3 (1984), 539–53
- Reuter, Hans-Heinrich, 'Die Philologie der Grazien: Wielands Selbstbildnis in seinen Kommentaren der Episteln und Satiren des Horaz', first published in 1967 and reprinted in *Christoph Martin Wieland*, ed. by Hansjörg Schelle (Darmstadt, 1981), pp. 251–306
- Richter, Ernst, 'Wielands sprachliche Ansichten im *Teutschen Merkur*', *ZDP*, 58 (1933), 266–96
- Rogan, Richard G., *The Reader in the Novels of C. M. Wieland* (Las Vegas, 1981)
- Rowland, Herbert, *'Musarion' and Wieland's Concept of Genre* (Göppingen, 1975)
- Scheidl, Josef, 'Persönliche Verhältnisse und Beziehung zu den antiken Quellen in Wielands *Agathon*' (dissertation, University of Berlin, 1904)
- Schelle, Hansjörg, 'Wielands Beziehungen zu seinen Leipziger Verlegern: Neue Dokumente' (Teil 1), *Lessing Yearbook*, 7 (1975), 149–219
- , 'Wielands Beziehungen zu seinen Leipziger Verlegern: Neue Dokumente' (Teil 3), *Lessing Yearbook*, 9 (1977), 166–258
- Schumann, Hanna Brigitte, 'Zu Literatur über Wielands Sprache und Stil', in *Studien zur neueren deutschen Literatur*, ed. by Hans Werner Seiffert (Berlin, 1964), pp. 7–31
- Schwabe, K.-H., 'Bemerkungen zur Wirkung Shaftesburys auf C. M. Wieland', in *Wieland-Kolloquium*, ed. by Thomas Köhle (Halberstadt, 1983), pp. 185–89
- Sengle, Friedrich, 'Von Wielands Epenfragmenten zum *Oberon*: Ein Beitrag zu Problem und Geschichte des Kleineros im 18. Jahrhundert', in *Festschrift Paul Kluckhohn und Hermann Schneider* (Tübingen, 1948), pp. 266–85
- , *Wieland* (Stuttgart, 1949)
- , 'Wieland und Goethe', in *Begriffsbestimmung der Klassik und des Klassischen*, ed. by Heinz Otto Burger (Darmstadt, 1972), pp. 251–71
- Seuffert, Bernhard, *Prologomena zu einer Wieland-Ausgabe*, Akademie der Wissenschaften (Berlin, 1905)
- Sommer, Cornelius, *Christoph Martin Wieland* (Stuttgart, 1971)
- , 'Europäische Tradition und individuelles Stilideal', in *Christoph Martin Wieland*, ed. by Hansjörg Schelle (Darmstadt, 1981), pp. 344–78
- Staiger, Emil, 'Wieland: *Musarion*', in *Christoph Martin Wieland*, ed. by Hansjörg Schelle (Darmstadt, 1981), pp. 93–108
- Steinberger, Julius, 'Wielands Originalität', in *Allgemeine Zeitung* (Beilage), No. 134 (Munich, 1902), 481–84
- Stempler, Eduard, 'Wielands Verhältnis zu Horaz', *Euphorion*, 13 (1906), 473–90
- Wahl, Hans, *Geschichte des Teutschen Merkur: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Journalismus im 18. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1914)

- Weitz, Hans.-J., 'Weltliteratur zuerst bei Wieland', *Arcadia*, 22 (1987), 206–08
- Weizsäcker, Paul, 'Wieland und die Antike', in *Korrespondenzblatt für die Gelehrten- und Realschulen in Württemberg*, 39 (Tübingen, 1892), 1–19
- Werner, Jürgen, 'Wenn Du Dir aus dem Messkatalog einiges aussuchst, so vergiss Wielands Lukian nicht', *Philologus*, 129/1 (1985), 121–32
- Wilson, William Daniel, "'Prächt'ge Vase" or "halber Topf"? Horatian poetics in Wieland's *Agathon*', *MLN*, 95 (1980), 664–69
- Wolffheim, Hans, *Wielands Begriff der Humanität* (Hamburg, 1949)
- Wright, Charles, 'Christoph Martin Wieland's "Briefe an einen jungen Dichter": An Analysis and Commentary' (dissertation, University of Chicago, 1975)
- Würzner, M. H., 'Der Leser in Wielands *Geschichte des Agathon*', in *Christoph Martin Wieland*, ed. by Hansjörg Schelle (Darmstadt, 1981), pp. 399–406
- Yuill, William E., 'Christoph Martin Wieland', in *German Men of Letters*, 6 ed. by Alex Natan (London, 1972), pp. 93–119

GENERAL SECONDARY LITERATURE

- Anger, Alfred, *Literarisches Rokoko* (Stuttgart, 1962)
- Anton, Conrad Gottlob, 'Abhandlung von der genauesten Nachahmung des alten Sylbenmaasses, deren unsre Sprache in treuen Uebersetzungen fähig ist' (1772), reprinted in *Die Lehre von der Nachahmung der antiken Versmasse im Deutschen*, ed. by Hans-Heinrich Hellmuth and Joachim Schröder (Munich, 1976), pp. 125–55
- Apel, Friedmar, *Literarische Übersetzung* (Stuttgart, 1983)
- Aron, Erich, *Die deutsche Erweckung des Griechentums durch Winckelmann und Herder* (Heidelberg, 1929)
- Bann, Stephen, 'Postscript: Three Translators — Silhouette, Barante, Rossetti', *Twentieth Century Studies*, 11 (1974), 86–101
- Bennet, W., *German Verse in Classical Metres* (The Hague, 1963)
- Bintz, J., 'Der Einfluß der ars poetica des Horaz auf die deutsche Literatur des XVIII. Jahrhunderts', *Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Wilhelmgymnasiums in Hamburg* (Hamburg, 1892)
- Blackall, Eric A., *The Emergence of German as a Literary Language 1770–1775* (Cambridge, 1959)
- Bloom, Harold, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (New York, 1973)
- Borchardt, Rudolf, *Das Gespräch über Formen & Platons Lysis Deutsch* (Leipzig, 1905)
- Brink, C. O., 'Horatian Poetry: Thoughts on the Development of Textual Criticism and Interpretation', in *Geschichte des Textverständnisses am Beispiel von Pindar und Horaz* (Wolfenbüttel, 1981), pp. 7–17
- , "'A great genius of our own" and Horace's *Ars Poetica* in the Eighteenth Century', *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 8 (1985), 67–75
- Buselmeier, Michael, 'Ein Mann wie Voß', in *Die Zeit*, 12 July 1991, p. 42
- Cholevius, Carl Leo, *Geschichte der deutschen Poesie nach ihren antiken Elementen* (Leipzig, 1854)
- Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, *Biographia Literaria*, ed. by George Watson (London, 1975)
- Conte, Gian Biagio, *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*, ed. by Charles Segal (Ithaca, N.Y. and London, 1986)
- Dahinten, Egon, 'Studien zum Sprachstil der Iliasübertragungen Bürgers, Stolbergs und Vossens unter Berücksichtigung der Übersetzungstheorien des 18. Jahrhunderts' (dissertation, University of Göttingen, 1956)
- Dilke, A. W., 'The Interpretation of Horace's Epistles', in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, II/31–iii, ed. by W. Haase (Berlin and New York, 1981), pp. 1837–65

- Dockhorn, Klaus, 'Epoche, Fuge und *Imitatio*: Rhetorische Komponenten des Historismus', in *Macht und Wirkung der Rhetorik: Vier Aufsätze zur Ideengeschichte der Moderne* (Bad Homburg, 1968), pp. 105–26
- Fränzel, Walter, *Geschichte des Übersetzens im 18. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, 1913)
- Fuhrmann, Manfred, 'Mythos als Wiederholung', in *Terror und Spiel: Probleme der Mythenrezeption; Poetik und Hermeneutik*, 4, ed. by Manfred Fuhrmann (Munich, 1971), pp. 121–44
- , *Einführung in die antike Dichtungstheorie* (Darmstadt, 1973)
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg, *Wahrheit und Methode*, 4th edn (Tübingen, 1975)
- , 'Die Kunst, unrecht haben zu können: Ein Gespräch mit Hans-Georg Gadamer', in *Information Philosophie* (August, 1991), pp. 21–23
- Genette, Gérard, *Palimpsestes: La Littérature au second degré* (Paris, 1982)
- , *Seuils* (Paris, 1987)
- Gundolf, Friedrich, *Shakespeare und der deutsche Geist*, 2nd edn (Berlin, 1914)
- Häntzschel, Günter, 'Die Ausbildung der deutschen Literatursprache des 18. Jahrhunderts durch Übersetzungen: Homer-Verdeutschungen als produktive Kraft', in *Mehrsprachigkeit in der deutschen Aufklärung*, ed. by Dieter Kimpel (Hamburg, 1985), pp. 117–32
- Herbst, Wilhelm, *Johann Heinrich Voss*, vol. II/2 (Bern, 1970; reprint of the 1st edn, Leipzig, 1876)
- Herkommer, Elmar, 'Die *topoi* in den Proömien der römischen Geschichtswerke' (dissertation, University of Tübingen, 1968)
- Hettner, Hermann, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur im achtzehnten Jahrhundert*, 7th edn (Braunschweig, 1925)
- Holmes, James S., 'Translating Martial and Vergil: Jacob Lowland among the Classics', in *Translating Poetry: The Double Labyrinth*, ed. by Daniel Weissbort (London, 1989), pp. 57–72
- Iser, Wolfgang, 'The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Process', in *Reader Response Criticism from Formalism to Post-structuralism*, ed. by Jane P. Tompkins (Baltimore and London, 1981), pp. 51–66
- Jaeschke, Walter, 'Schleiermacher und Hegel: Neue Ausgaben und alte Fragen', *Hegel-Studien*, 23, ed. by Friedhelm Nicolin and Otto Pöggeler (Bonn, 1988), pp. 327–32
- Killy, Walther, *Schreibweisen — Leseweisen* (Munich, 1982)
- Kilpatrick, Ross S., *The Poetry of Friendship: Horace, Epistles I* (Edmonton, Alberta, 1986)
- Lehnerdt, A., *Die deutsche Dichtung des 17. und 18. Jahrhunderts in ihren Beziehungen zu Horaz* (Königsberg, 1882)
- Levin, Samuel, 'The Conventions of Poetry', in *Literary Style: A Symposium*, ed. by Seymour Chatman (London and New York, 1971), pp. 177–96
- Loebell, Johann Wilhelm, *Die Entwicklung der deutschen Poesie von Klopstocks erstem Auftreten bis zu Goethes Tod* (Braunschweig, 1858)
- Macleod, C. W., 'The Poet, the Critic, and the Moralist: Horace, Epistles 1.19', *Classical Quarterly*, 27 (1977), 359–76
- Martini, Fritz, 'Modern, die Moderne', in *Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturgeschichte*, 2nd edn, II (Berlin, 1965), pp. 391–415
- , *Deutsche Literaturgeschichte*, 18th edn (Stuttgart, 1984)
- McCarthy, John A., 'Lektüre und Lesertypologie im 18. Jahrhundert (1730–1770): Ein Beitrag zur Lesergeschichte am Beispiel Wolfenbüttels', in *Internationales Archiv für Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur*, 8 (Tübingen, 1983), 35–82
- , *Crossing Boundaries: A Theory and History of Essay Writing in German, 1680–1815* (Philadelphia, 1989)
- McGann, Jerome, 'Theory of Texts' [Review of D. F. McKenzie, *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (London, 1986)], in *London Review of Books*, 18 February 1988, pp. 20 f.
- McGann, M. J., *Studies in the First Book of Horace's Epistles* (Brussels, 1969)

- Menhennet, Alan., *Order and Freedom: Literature and Society in Germany from 1720 to 1805* (London, 1973)
- , 'Hagedorn and the Development of German Poetic Style', *Lessing Yearbook*, 16 (1984), 179–91
- Morris, E. P., 'The Form of the Epistle in Horace', *Yale Classical Studies*, 2 (1931), 18 ff.
- Nisbet, H. B., 'Karl Ludwig von Knebel's Hexameter Translation of Lucretius', *GLL*, n.s. 41 (1988), 413–25
- Norton, Glyn P., *The Ideology and Language of Translation in Renaissance France and their Humanist Antecedents* (Geneva, 1984)
- Pietsch, Wolfgang Josef, 'Friedrich von Hagedorn und Horaz' (dissertation, University of Graz, 1985)
- Purdie, Edna, *Studies in German Literature of the Eighteenth Century: Some Aspects of Literary Affiliation* (London, 1965)
- Reiff, Arno, *Interpretatio, imitatio, aemulatio: Begriff und Vorstellung literarischer Abhängigkeit bei den Römern* (Würzburg, 1959)
- Richards, I. A., *Principles of Literary Criticism*, 2nd edn (London, 1928)
- Robinson, Christopher, *Lucian and his Influence in Europe* (London, 1979)
- Roditi, Georges, *The Spirit of Perfection* (London, 1988)
- Rummel, Erika, *Erasmus's 'Annotations' on the New Testament: From Philologist to Theologian* (Toronto, 1986)
- Schmidt, Erich, *Lessing: Geschichte seines Lebens und seiner Schriften*, 1, 4th edn (Berlin, 1961)
- Schmidt, Jochen, 'Für und wider die Lust: Epikur und Antiepileureismus von der Antike bis zur Moderne. Mit einem Versuch über Hieronymus Boschs "Garten der Lüste"', in *Aufklärung und Gegenauflärung in der europäischen Literatur, Philosophie und Politik von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, ed. by Jochen Schmidt (Darmstadt, 1989), pp. 206–19
- Schroeter, Adalbert, *Geschichte der deutschen Homer-Übersetzung im 18. Jahrhundert* (Hildesheim, 1978)
- Schwabe, E., 'Zur Geschichte der deutschen Horaz-Übersetzungen', *Neues Jahrbuch für Philologie und Pädagogik* (II. Abt.), Heft 7 (1896), 305–74
- Sdun, Winfried, *Probleme und Theorien des Übersetzens in Deutschland vom 18. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert* (Munich, 1967)
- Senger, Anneliese, *Deutsche Übersetzungstheorie im 18. Jahrhundert (1734–1746)* (Bonn, 1971)
- 3rd Earl of Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper, *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times*, III, 2nd edn (London, 1714)
- Stack, Frank, *Pope and Horace: Studies in Imitation* (Cambridge, 1985)
- Steiner, George, *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation* (Oxford, 1975)
- Stemplinger, Eduard, *Horaz im Urteil der Jahrhunderte* (Leipzig, 1921)
- Störig, Hans-Joachim, ed., *Das Problem des Übersetzens* (Darmstadt, 1963)
- Storz, Gerhard, 'Ein Versuch über den Alexandriner', in *Festschrift Paul Kluckhohn und Hermann Schneider* (Tübingen, 1948), pp. 231–42
- , *Der Vers in der neueren deutschen Dichtung* (Stuttgart, 1973)
- Tgahrt, Reinhard, ed., *Weltliteratur: Die Lust am Übersetzen im Jahrhundert Goethes*, Marbacher Katalog 37 (Marbach am Neckar, 1982)
- Tracy, Walter, *Letters of Credit: A View of Type Design* (London, 1986)
- Trevelyan, Humphry, *Goethe und die Griechen* (Hamburg, 1941)
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh, 'Erasmus and the Crisis of Christian Humanism', in *Renaissance Essays* (London, 1985), pp. 59–75
- Warning, Rainer, 'Imitatio und Intertextualität: Zur Geschichte lyrischer Dekonstruktion der Amorthologie. Dante, Petrarca, Baudelaire', in *Kolloquium Kunst und Philosophie*, 2, ed. by Willi Oelmüller (Paderborn, 1982), pp. 168–207
- West, David, *Reading Horace* (Edinburgh, 1967)

- , 'Reading a poem', in *The Times Saturday Review*, 3 August 1991, p. 22
- West, David and Tony Woodman, eds, *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature* (Cambridge, 1979)
- Williams, Gordon, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968)
- , *Horace, Greece and Rome: New Surveys in the Classics*, 6 (Oxford, 1972)
- Woodman, Anthony J., 'Horace, Epistles 1, 19, 23–40', *Museum Helveticum*, 40 (Basel, 1983), 75–81
- Zeman, Herbert, *Die deutsche anakreontische Dichtung: Ein Versuch zur Erfassung ihrer ästhetischen und literarhistorischen Erscheinungsformen im 18. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart, 1972)
- Zuberbühler, Rolf, 'Drei Oden: Widmungsgedichte bei Horaz, Klopstock und Hölderlin', *Hölderlin Jahrbuch*, 24 (1984–85), 229–51

REFERENCE WORKS

- Bibliographie der Wieland-Übersetzungen*, by Julius Steinberger (Göttingen, 1930)
- Bibliotheca scriptorum classicorum et graecorum et latinorum*, ed. by Wilhelm Engelmann, 7th edn (Leipzig, 1858)
- Christoph Martin Wieland: Leben und Werk*, 3 vols, by Thomas C. Starnes (Sigmaringen, 1987)
- A Concordance to the Works of Horace*, ed. by Lane Cooper (Washington, D.C., 1916)
- Dictionnaire historique et critique*, 6th edn, 1, by Pierre Bayle (Basle, 1741)
- Die deutschen Sprichwörter*, ed. by Karl Simrock (Stuttgart, 1988)
- The Harper Handbook to Literature*, ed. by Northrop Frye et al. (New York, 1985)
- Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, 1, ed. by Joachim Ritter (Darmstadt, 1971)
- Lemprière's Classical Dictionary* (London, 1865)
- 'Nachträge und Ergänzungen zur Wieland-Bibliographie' (Nos 1–6), by Hansjörg Schelle, *Lessing Yearbook*, 16–21 (1984–89)
- Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford, 1968)
- Die Sprichwörter und Sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, by A. Otto (Hildesheim, 1964; reprint of the Leipzig edition, 1890)
- Verzeichniß der Bibliothek des verewigten Herrn Hofraths Wieland: Welche den 3. April 1815 und die folgende Tage, gegen gleich baare Bezahlung zu Weimar öffentlich versteigert werden soll* (Weimar, 1814)
- Wieland-Bibliographie*, ed. by Gottfried Günther and Heidi Zeilinger (Berlin and Weimar, 1983)
- 'Wieland-Bibliographie 1983–1988', by Viiia Ottenbacher, in *Wieland-Studien*, 1, ed. by Hans Radspieler (Sigmaringen, 1991), pp. 185–235
- Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, ed. by Joachim Heinrich Campe (Braunschweig, 1808)

INDEX

- Aesop, 147–48, 150, 152
 Alcaeus, 61, 66n.
 Anger, Alfred, 35n.
 Anton, Conrad Gottlob, 34n.
 Apel, Friedmar, 76n.
 Archilochus, 61–62, 65n., 66n.
 Ariosto, Ludovico, 58, 68
 Aristippus, 37
 Aristius Fuscus, 131, 135
 Aristophanes, 5, 7n., 65n., 70, 103, 106
 Aron, Erich, 7n., 123n.
 Athenaues, 138
 Augustus, 12, 47, 123n., 128, 130, 143, 148

 Bann, Stephen, 144n.
 Bantel, Otto, 3, 6n., 54n., 156n.
 Bar, Georg Ludwig, 45
 Barthel, Marga, 56n.
 Batteux, Charles, 134
 Baudelaire, Charles, 65n.
 Baxter, William, 12, 14, 33n., 115, 131
 Bayle, Pierre, 58, 123n.
 Beißner, Friedrich, 107
 Belley, Augustin, 148–50
 Bennet, W., 34n., 110n.
 Bentley, Richard, 12, 33n.
 Berthold, Heinz, 76n.
 Bintz, Julius, 33n.
 Blackall, Eric A., 76n.
 Bloom, Harold, 55n.
 Bodmer, Johann Jakob, 22, 24, 45, 51, 58,
 72–74, 77n., 102
 Böttiger, Karl August, 13, 33n., 64n., 154–55
 Boileau, Nicholas Despreaux, 65n.
 Borchardt, Rudolf, 84–85
 Borheck, August Christoph, 13, 34n.
 Brantôme, Pierre de Bourdeilles, 59
 Breitingen, Johann Jacob, 16, 24, 30, 60
 Brink, Charles O., 33n., 66n., 143, 144n.
 Buchner, Karl, 123n.
 Budde, Fritz, 77n.
 Bünemann, Hermann, 54n.
 Bürger, Gottfried August, 6n., 105–06
 Bullatius, 135
 Buselmeier, Michael, 7n.
 Byron, George Gordon, 112

 Carl August, Duke, 127
 Cassius Scaeva, 131

 Catiline, 140
 Cato, 30
 Catullus, 96n.
 Celsus Albinovanus, 100, 104, 147–49,
 152–53, 155, 156n.
 Cervantes, Miguel de, 58
 Chaucer, Geoffrey, 7n.
 Cholevius, Carl Leo, 54n.
 Cicero, 56n., 66n., 69, 72, 76n., 115
 Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, 110n.
 Colman, George, 134
 Conte, Gian Biagio, 66n.
 Corneille, Pierre, 18, 51
 Cratinus, 61, 108
 Crébillon, Claude P. J. de, 58
 Curran, Jane V., 6n., 111n.

 Dacier, André, 113, 123n.
 Dahinten, Egon, 3, 6n., 67, 75n.
 Dahnke, Hans-Dietrich, 65n.
 d'Alembert, Jean le Rond, 71–72
 Dante Alighieri, 65n.
 Degen, Johann Friedrich, 76n.
 Democritus, 37
 Denis, Johann N. C. M., 32, 101, 110n.
 Diderot, Denis, 22
 Dilke, A. W., 55n., 156n.
 Dockhorn, Klaus 66n
 Doell, Matthäus, 38, 65n.
 Dorat, Claude-Joseph, 96n.

 Engelmann, Wilhelm, 12, 33n., 34n.
 Ennius, 61, 65n.
 Epicurus, 46, 54n., 85, 87, 141
 Erasmus, Desiderius, 31, 36n., 37, 155, 156n.
 Ernesti, Johann Heinrich Martin, 12
 Eschenburg, Johann Joachim, 12, 33n.
 Euripides, 58, 65n.

 Fielding, Henry, 58
 Fink, Gonthier-Louis, 144n.
 Florus, Julius, 49, 123n., 128, 130, 137,
 146–49, 151–52
 Fränzel, Walter, 76n., 77n.
 Fuhrmann, Manfred, 1, 3, 6n., 33n., 52–53,
 56n., 65n., 67, 75n., 76n., 81–82, 93, 96n.,
 118, 124n., 140–41, 144n., 156n.

- Gadamer, Hans-Georg, 123n.
 Garve, Christian, 72
 Gellert, Christian Fürchtegott, 45
 Genette, Gérard, 36n., 121–22, 122n.
 Gesner, Johann Matthias, 12, 14, 33n., 119, 131
 Gleim, Johann Wilhelm Ludwig, 24, 34n.
 Göschen, Georg Joachim, 124n.
 Goethe, Johann Wolfgang, 1, 7n., 36n., 48, 51, 58, 60, 65n., 72–75, 76n., 77n., 82, 95, 96n., 106, 110n., 139, 144n.
 Gottsched, Johann Christoph, 16–19, 21, 30, 34n., 45–46, 62, 72
 Gottschling, Caspar, 12
 Graves, Robert, 122n.
 Gruber, Johann Gottfried, 83
 Gundolf, Friedrich, 54n., 59, 67
 Guthke, Karl S., 35n.
- Hagedorn, Friedrich, 7n., 11, 22, 24–28, 45–47, 55n., 86, 137
 Haller, Albrecht von, 45
 Haller, Franz, 2, 6n., 54n., 75n., 76n., 88–89, 91–92, 143
 Hamilton, Anthony, 58
 Häntzschel, Günter, 76n.
 Hardt, Herman von der, 76n.
 Harmsen, Johann Jacob, 21, 34n.
 Heinze, Richard, 66n., 96n.
 Helvétius, Claude Arien, 59
 Herbert, George, 113
 Herbst, Wilhelm, 97n.
 Herder, Johann Gottfried, 7n., 23–25, 28–32, 35n., 48, 64n., 101, 123n., 139–40
 Herkommer, Elmar, 145n.
 Hölderlin, Friedrich, 35n., 107
 Holmes, James S., 96n.
 Homer, 3, 15, 23, 34n., 41, 45, 61, 68–72, 75n., 76n., 90–91, 96n., 101, 104–06
 Homeyer, H., 145n.
 Horace, *passim*
 Epistles 1.1 26–27, 89, 124n., 137, 141
 1.2 31, 36n., 41, 87–92, 138
 1.3 128, 146–55, 156n.
 1.4 3, 46, 90, 141, 156n.
 1.5 100, 114–15
 1.6 47, 90, 107, 128–29, 132, 134, 144n.
 1.7 94–95, 132
 1.8 100, 104–05, 108, 129, 149
 1.9 108
 1.10 131, 135
 1.11 135
 1.12 118–19, 132, 135, 141
 1.15 130, 138–39, 141
 1.17 131–32
 1.18 49, 95, 124n., 127, 131
 1.19 49–51, 56n., 60–62, 65n., 66n., 76n., 92–94, 108, 117, 123n., 124n., 132, 137, 141, 152, 154
 1.20 26, 55n., 135–36, 144n.
 2.1 85–87, 123n., 142–43
 2.2 42, 48–49, 56n., 90–91, 115, 128, 156n.
 2.3 12, 16–19, 21, 24, 29–32, 35n., 36n., 38–40, 48–50, 52, 54n., 55n., 56n., 61–64, 65n., 66n., 108–10, 116, 132–35, 142–43, 144n.
- Epodes* 28
Odes 27, 29, 35n., 41, 43, 52, 56n., 131
Satires 6n., 32, 36n., 44, 46, 50, 56n., 93, 96n., 103, 123n., 131, 138–39, 141
- Huon de Bordeaux, 7n.
 Hurd, Richard, 12, 33n., 134
- Iccius, 118–19, 132, 135
 Iktonen, Kyösti, 76n.
 Ischer, Rudolf, 3, 7n., 64n., 138
 Iser, Wolfgang, 123n.
- Jacobi, Friedrich Heinrich, 143n.
 Jaeschke, Walter, 124n.
 Jani, Christian David, 13, 33n.
 Jaumann, Herbert, 96n.
 Jens, Walter, 3, 6n., 96n., 138
 Jørgensen, Sven-Aage, 34n., 54n., 132, 144n.
 Johnson, Samuel, 28
 Juvenal, 36n.
- Kant, Immanuel, 31
 Kanzog, Klaus, 6n.
 Kausch, Karl Heinz, 55n.
 Kestner, Johann Georg Christian, 36n.
 Kiessling, Adolf, 66n., 96n.
 Killy, Walther, 34n., 111n.
 Kilpatrick, Ross S., 97n.
 Kleist, Ewald, 101
 Klopstock, Friedrich Gottlieb, 7n., 15, 24, 27–28, 35n., 46, 101
 Knebel, Karl Ludwig, 21, 35n., 73, 76n., 124n.
 Köppe, Charlotte, 55n.
 Köppen, J. H. J., 13, 33n.
 Kretschmann, Karl Friedrich, 32
 Kurth-Voigt, Liselotte, 36n., 65n., 124n., 137
- Lange, Samuel Gotthold, 11, 22, 35n.
 La Roche, Sophie, 46

- Larson, Kenneth E., 7n.
 Lehnerdt, A., 35n.
 Leitzmann, Albert, 53
 Lenz, Jakob Michael Reinhold, 60–61
 Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim, 11, 21–24,
 30–31, 33n., 35n., 48, 57, 60, 67, 101
 Levin, Samuel, 111n.
 Livia Drusilla, 128
 Loder, Eduard, 21, 35n.
 Loebell, Johann Wilhelm, 7n.
 Lollius, Maximus, 41, 92, 95, 130–31
 Lucian, 37, 52, 58, 65n., 68–69, 76n., 96n.,
 123n., 142–43, 145n., 154
 Lucretius, 21, 35n., 69, 72, 76n., 124n.
 Lucullus, 148–49
 Lütkehaus, Ludger, 124n.
 Lycambes, 62

 Maecenas, 26, 47, 49, 94–95, 97n., 123n., 130
 Manger, Klaus, 119
 Marchand, James W., 55n., 77n.
 Martial, 96n.
 Martini, Fritz, 3, 33n., 53n.
 Matthecka, Gerd, 125n.
 McCarthy, John A., 144n.
 McGann, Jerome, 112, 122n.
 McGann, M. J., 61, 65n.
 Meessen, Hubert Joseph, 51, 55n.
 Meier, Georg Friedrich, 35n.
 Menander, 37
 Menhennet, Alan, 96n.
 Meusel, Johann Georg, 32
 Milton, John, 57, 73
 Mimmermus, 129
 Mitscherlich, C. G., 13–14, 33n.
 Monecke, Wolfgang, 2, 6n., 25, 33n., 35n.,
 37–38, 67–68, 70–71, 75n., 76n., 77n., 89,
 93–94, 96n., 103, 123n., 136, 140
 Monfalcon, Jean-Baptiste, 35n.
 Montaigne, Michel de, 59
 Morris, E. P., 55n., 144n.
 Müller-Solger, Hermann, 51

 Napoleon Bonaparte, 115
 Nero, 104, 128, 147–48
 Nisbet, H. B., 35n., 76n.
 Norton, Glyn P., 66n.
 Numicius, 90, 129, 132, 134
 Numonius Vala, 130

 Oettinger, Klaus, 64n., 117
 Opitz, Martin, 29, 35n., 100–01
 Ortega y Gasset, José, 76n.
 Ossian, 101, 110n.
 Otto, A., 36n.
 Ovid, 36n., 54n., 68, 100

 Patrick, S., 34n.
 Petrarch, Francesco, 65n.
 Pietsch, Wolfgang, 25, 35n.
 Plato, 42, 74, 96n., 111n., 123n., 144n.,
 145n.
 Pliny the Elder, 148–150
 Plutarch, 148–49
 Pope, Alexander, 65n., 68, 97n.
 Preiß, C. F., 13–14, 34n.
 Purdie, Edna, 66n.

 Quintilian, 34n., 55n., 66n.

 Rabener, Gottlieb Wilhelm, 137
 Racine, Jean, 65n.
 Rambach, Johann Jakob, 76n.
 Ramler, Karl Wilhelm, 11, 20–22, 27–28,
 35n., 68, 116
 Raphael, 51
 Reich, Philipp Erasmus, 120
 Reiff, Arno, 66n.
 Rembrandt, 51
 Reuter, Hans-Heinrich, 2, 6n., 24, 81, 84,
 96n., 129, 139, 144n.
 Richards, I. A., 99
 Richter, Ernst, 76n.
 Riffaterre, Michael, 36n.
 Ritter, Joachim, 34n.
 Robinson, Christopher, 145n.
 Roditi, Georges, 123n.
 Rowe, Nicholas, 57, 106
 Rowland, Herbert, 54n.
 Rummel, Erika, 36n.

 Sabinus, 100
 Sallust, 140
 Sanadon, R. P., 113, 123n.
 Sautier, Heinrich, 20, 35n.
 Scheidl, Josef, 123n.
 Schelle, Hansjörg, 120, 123n., 124n., 143n.,
 156n.
 Schiller, Friedrich, 48, 51, 110n., 140, 145n.
 Schlegel, August Wilhelm, 13, 35n., 54n.,
 58, 71
 Schlegel, Friedrich, 13, 54n.
 Schlegel, Johann Elias, 54n.
 Schleiermacher, Friedrich Daniel Ernst, 34n.,
 72, 74–75, 76n., 77n., 124n.
 Schmalzriedt, Egidius, 93–94
 Schmidt, Erich, 33n., 35n.
 Schmidt, Jochen, 143, 145n.
 Schopenhauer, Arthur, 124n.
 Schroeter, Adalbert, 76n.
 Schwabe, E., 34n.
 Schwabe, K.-H., 144n.
 Sudn, Winfried, 76n., 77n.

- Senger, Anneliese, 75n., 76n., 77n.
 Sengle, Friedrich, 3, 4, 6n., 7n., 51, 54n., 57, 65n., 76n., 77n., 96n., 111n., 154
 Seuffert, Bernhard, 76n.
 Shaftesbury, Anthony Ashley Cooper, 3rd Earl of, 54n., 114, 123n., 124n., 130, 133, 140, 144n.
 Shakespeare, William, 5, 7n., 51–52, 54n., 57–60, 65n., 71, 75n., 76n., 136
 Sievers, Magister, 53
 Silhouette, Etienne, 144n.
 Simrock, Karl, 97n.
 Socrates, 37, 41, 47, 100
 Sommer, Cornelius, 107
 Sophocles, 18, 60
 Stack, Frank, 97n.
 Staiger, Emil, 54n., 55n.
 Starnes, Thomas C., 77n.
 Steinberger, Julius, 65n.
 Stemplinger, Eduard, 3, 7n., 33n., 36n., 54n., 56n.
 Sterne, Laurence, 41, 58, 113, 123n.
 Stolberg, Friedrich Leopold, 6n.
 Storz, Gerhard, 98, 110n.
 Suetonius, 23
 Sulzer, Johann Georg, 14, 34n.

 Tasso, Torquato, 68
 Terence, 31, 37
 Thucydides, 141–42, 145n.
 Tibullus, Albius, 90, 95
 Torrentius, 131
 Tracy, Walter, 123n.
 Trebatius, 123n.
 Trevelyan, Humphrey, 65n.
 Trevor-Roper, Hugh, 156n.

 Uz, Johann Peter, 11, 19, 21, 24, 34n., 99, 106

 Velleius Paterculus, 130
 Venzky, Georg, 16, 34n., 72–74, 76n., 77n.
 Virgil, 15, 34n., 36n., 65n., 66n., 68–70, 72, 96n., 98, 100, 103–04, 111n.
 Voltaire, 18, 58
 Voss, Johann Heinrich, 3, 6n., 7n., 13, 15, 19–21, 34n., 35n., 46, 69–72, 75, 76n., 83, 86, 95, 97n., 99–102, 104–05, 109, 110n., 111n., 123n., 153–54, 156n.

 Wahl, Hans, 55n.
 Warning, Rainer, 58
 Watson, David, 34n.
 Weiße, Christian Felix, 43
 Weitz, Hans-J., 1
 Weizsäcker, Paul, 3, 7n., 54n.

 Werner, Jürgen, 139, 145n.
 West, David, 65n., 96n., 123n.
 Wieland, Christoph Martin, *passim*
 Geschichte der Abderiten, 11, 37, 67, 127, 142
 Abhandlung... "Der Noah" (Bodmer), 58–59
 Geschichte des Agathon, 11, 29–30, 40–42, 44–45, 47, 54n., 113, 119, 121–22, 123n., 154, 156n.
 Alceste, 54n., 57–58
 Beiträge zur geheimen Geschichte des menschlichen Verstandes, 59
 Briefe an einen jungen Dichter, 24, 47–52, 59–61, 133, 143, 154
 Briefe über das deutsche Singspiel Alceste, 58, 65n.
 Briefe über die Vossische Uebersetzung des Homers, 71–72, 102
 Briefe von Verstorbenen, 102
 Briefwechsel, 32, 105–06, 123n., 124n., 143n., 156n.
 Clelia und Sinibald, 84
 Comische Erzählungen, 32, 37, 124n.
 Cyrus, 102
 Geschichte des Weisen Danischmend, 121
 Don Sylvio von Rosalva, 29
 Episteln (Horace), 6n., 111n., 113–117, 120, 127–28, 130
 Ein Fragment über den Charakter des Erasmus von Rotterdam, 31, 143n.
 Gandalin oder Liebe um Liebe, 84
 Der Gepryfte Abraham, 102
 Geron der Adlige, 77n.
 Gespräche in Elysium, 142
 Glaubwürdigkeit eines Geschichtschreibers, 139
 Der Goldene Spiegel, 52, 90
 Hermann, 102, 111n.
 Horazanzeige, 52–53
 Idris und Zenide, 84, 138
 Klosterbergisches Schulheft, 33n., 38–40
 Lady Johanna Gray, 57, 106
 Lukian-Übersetzung, 123n., 142–44, 156n.
 Lukrez-Übersetzung (Review), 70
 Musarion, 11, 42–47, 54n., 55n., 84, 121, 154
 Der Neue Amadis, 52, 55n., 114
 Neue Göttergespräche, 37, 96n., 142
 Der Neue Teutsche Merkur, 20–21, 119
 Oberon, 4–5, 59, 121
 Panthea (Lucian), 69
 Peregrinus Proteus, 142
 Satiren (Horace), 7n., 34n., 102–03, 105, 111n., 113, 120, 156n.
 Sympathien, 144n.
 Teutscher Merkur, 65n., 72, 96n., 113, 119–121, 124n., 126, 140, 145n., 155

- Theorie und Geschichte der Red-Kunst und Dicht-Kunst*, 38
Übersetzung der Äneis (Review), 103–04, 111n.
Ein Wintermärchen, 84
Die Wolken (Aristophanes), 70, 103
Zwölf Moralische Briefe, 28, 45–47, 154
 Wilkins, Augustus S., 54n.
 Williams, Gordon, 140–41, 144n.
 Wilson, W. Daniel, 40, 54n.
 Winckelmann, Johann Joachim, 7n., 123n.
 Wirth, Gerhard, 33n., 126
 Wobeser, E. W. W., 76n.
 Wolff, Christian, 72
 Woodman, Anthony J., 65n.
 Wright, Charles, 52, 55n.
 Würzner, M. H., 156n.
 Xenophon, 37, 68–69
 Young, Edward, 66n.
 Yuill, William E., 54n.
 Zeman, Herbert, 33n.
 Zuberbühler, Rolf, 35n.

Wieland's translations of Horace's *Epistles*, neglected until recently, demonstrate his skill in overcoming the bipolar relationship implied in the very idea of translation. Thanks to a strong, cosmopolitan fellow-feeling with the ancient poet, Wieland made judicious editorial choices in the areas of diction, prosody, layout, typography and scholarly apparatus. This most flexible of translators avoided collapsing the distinctions between his own world and Horace's, and achieved true communication with Horace, while simultaneously drawing the contemporary German reader into the dialogue. Translation techniques employed by Wieland's contemporaries are also discussed here, as well as Horace reception during the period, and the tensions between originality and imitation, and between ancient hexameter and modern metres.