Translation of Political Concepts in 18th-Century Russia

Strategies and Practices

Sergey Polskoy

In the words of Peter Burke, "If the past is a foreign country, it follows that even the most monoglot of historians is a translator. Historians mediate between the past and the present and face the same dilemmas as other translators, serving two masters and attempting to reconcile fidelity to the original with intelligibility to their readers."[1] This metaphor also reveals why the historian's and translator's task is so complicated: language is a means to establish cultural equivalence, whereas translation always exceeds the boundaries of the culture, not only performing the obvious functions of intercultural exchange but also overcoming differences in the *Weltanschauung* and "mental tools" of participants in this exchange.

Developing Burke's metaphor, one might suggest that a historian seeking to reconstruct the worldview of someone from the past should restore and describe that person's conceptual apparatus so as to comprehend the meaning behind his or her words and actions. Attempts to match elements of the historian's conceptual apparatus to those of the past, however, give rise to anachronisms. Only if we accentuate the dissonance of meanings and distinguish between concepts represented by the same word can we comprehend the behavior of a historical person. In particular, we need to watch for distorted interpretations of historical terms. Perhaps the most striking example of such dissonance in Russian history is the word "state." Since the mid-19th century, historians have become accustomed to applying this term in its modern meaning and have imposed this modern understanding of the

This study was implemented within the framework of the Basic Research Program at the National Research University–Higher School of Economics (HSE) in 2017.

[1] Peter Burke and R. Po-Chia Hsia, eds., *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 7.

state on historical figures of the past—most notably, Peter I. Historians have thus read 18th-century texts through their own lens rather than translating them. In this way, their interpretation has transposed the attitudes of 19th- and 20th-century political science to the past.

In this article, I explore the language of the 18th century to understand what the Russian people of the period had in mind when they spoke of "society" and "state." I consider translations of European political treatises as a key to their political views. The conceptual dissonance that emerged when Russians read books in foreign languages is especially striking when considering translations of political treatises. These writings manifest how complicated was the search for equivalents for the new, mostly abstract political vocabulary. Departing from translation as a metaphor for the historian's work, I direct attention to the translations themselves, as evidence of a clash and interaction of different cultures and regimes of political thought. The purpose of this article is to reveal how new political concepts penetrated Russia and how they were adapted in the Russian translations from 1700 to the 1760s. In particular, translation and adaptation of the concepts of *state* and *society*—interconnected and yet hard for early modern Russians to distinguish—provide evidence of how the translators constructed Russian equivalents of the key concepts of European political thought, such as *res publica, status, stato, état, societas, société, society*, and so on. I suggest that misunderstanding of the new lexica made the translators switch from transliteration to loan translation (calques). Only later, while searching for equivalent political concepts, did they begin to use customary Russian words, endowing them with new political meanings. Hence the crucial shifts in translation practices were the transition from recontextualization, which often led to a loss of the text's inherent original meaning, to decontextualization, which indicated the appropriation of the strange or new through its "domestication" or adaptation to existing social reality.[2]

The framework of the article reflects the stages of development that translation practices went through in 18th-century Russia. The study starts with the Petrine era (the 1700s) when, compared to the Old Russian tradition, the volume of secular literature in translation, both printed and handwritten, increased sharply. The share of manuscript books was especially high among translations of political treatises at this time. The article ends in the 1760s, when the volume of printed political literature began to exceed handwritten translations. In the same period, the political vocabulary developed: new concepts borrowed in the Petrine era passed through a series of experiments

[2] For more detail on these practices, see Peter Burke, "Cultures of Translation in Early Modern Europe," in *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*, 8–10.

by trial and error, then were adapted and accepted within the language field of educated Russians, primarily the political elite, by the 1760s. The new lexica were not only recognized but also widely used in the Elizabethan and Catherinian reigns according to the meanings ascribed to these terms by the translators who pioneered their adaptation. A notable result of this process was the concept of "state" as used by Catherine II in her *Instruction to the Legislative Commission* (1767): its meaning did not coincide with that embedded in it by Peter I but reflected the political ideas that Russian translators had been trying to transmit since the 1720s.

Methods of conceptual history and translation studies are widely used in this field of study, including works by Michel Espagne, Michael Werner, Margrit Pernau, Melvin Richter, and Roger Chartier.[3] The concept of cultural transfer, introduced by Espagne, is central to this study. Being transposed from one cultural context to another, a translated text often acquires a new meaning and acts in a new capacity, reflecting problems specific to the cultural situation in which it has been placed.[4] Espagne avoids the traditional notion of "influence" to stress the interaction of both sides in the transfer process. The transfer itself is determined not by the export but by the needs of the recipient culture.

In my opinion, such needs should be linked not to "nations" or "cultures"—terms too broad to be useful—but to social groups and even specific actors within cultures. In early modern societies, different groups—secular, clerical, academic—addressed themselves to translations and borrowed new concepts that corresponded to their needs. An immediate need that emerges within a recipient culture causes those engaged in cultural transfer to adapt the experience of an alien culture. In this regard, the recipient culture is the prime mover of cultural transfer. Therefore, transfer of ideas, concepts, and images

[3] Michel Espagne and Michael Werner, eds., *Transferts: Les rélations interculturelles dans l'espace franco-allemand (XVIIIe et XIXe siècles)* (Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les civilisations, 1988); Burke and Hsia, *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe;* Thomas Adam, *Intercultural Transfers and the Making of the Modern World, 1800–2000: Sources and Contexts* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Espagne, "Sur les limites du comparatisme en histoire culturelle," *Genèses*, no. 17 (1994): 112–21; Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann, "Beyond Comparison: Histoire Croisée and the Challenge of Reflexivity," in *History and Theory* 45, 1 (2006): 30–50; Mary Snell-Hornby, *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2006); Michael Cronin, *Translation and Identity* (London: Routledge, 2006); Mona Baker, ed., *Critical Readings in Translation Studies* (London: Routledge, 2010); Margrit Pernau, "Whither Conceptual History? From National to Entangled History," *Contributions to the History of Concepts* 7, 1 (2012): 1–11.

[4] Mishel´ Espan´ [Michel Espagne], "O poniatii kul´turnogo transfera," in *Evropeiskii kontekst russkogo formalizma: K probleme esteticheskikh peresechenii. Frantsiia, Germaniia, Italiia, Rossiia*, ed. Ekaterina Dmitrieva, Espan´, et al. (Moscow: Institut mirovoi literatury Rossiiskoi akademii nauk [IMLI RAN], 2009).

is highly selective, based on the preferences and interests of the educated representatives of social groups. For this reason, it is impossible for an object to be selected for translation by chance; even the notion of "chance" tells us about the boundaries of and conditions governing selection.

The theory of cultural translation approaches translation as a sort of negotiation, assuming complicated interactions, an exchange of ideas, and the alteration of meanings within the target culture. The translator acts here as an active creative agent of cultural translation. To borrow Margrit Pernau's felicitous phrase, translators "did not 'find' equivalents between languages, but created them."[5] In addition, translation is deeply rooted in social interaction and power structures. Translation indicates cultural dominants and stereotypes that exist inside society itself. In this context, "losses in translation" are not less important than the results of translation itself, for these "losses" reveal essential cultural differences, marking specifies and differences.

We can analyze changing concepts in the European and Russian contexts, in particular, by applying the methods of *Begriffsgeschichte* and the Cambridge school of the history of concepts.[6] The notion of "context" developed by Quentin Skinner and John Pocock attempts to reconstruct the meaning of a speech act. Social and political language represents a context, an active background, within which the "author" works.[7] For instance, in the 18th century translated European writings represented the context, so to understand original Russian political and literary texts, one should place them in this context. Written statements by those active in Russian politics become comprehensible only when compared with the ideas and texts they used and to which they appealed.

Among translation strategies, *cultural translation* refers to intentions (why, for what purpose, and in what direction a translation was undertaken),

[5] Pernau, "Whither Conceptual History?," 7.

[6] Kirill Levinson, Iurii Zaretskii, and Ingrid Shirle [Schierle], eds., *Slovar´ osnovnykh istoricheskikh poniatii: Izbrannye stat´i*, trans. Levinson (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2014), 1:24–44; Kh. E. Bedecker [Hans Erich Bödeker], ed., *Istoriia poniatii, istoriia diskursa istoriia metafor* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2010).

[7] John G. A. Pocock, "Concepts and Discourses: A Difference in Culture? Comment on a Paper by Melvin Richter," in *The Meaning of Historical Terms and Concepts: New Studies on Begriffsgeschichte*, ed. Hartmut Lehmann and Melvin Richter (Washington, DC: German Historical Institute, 1996), 47–58; Quentin Skinner, "'Social Meaning' and the Explanation of Social Action," in *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and His Critics*, ed. James Tully (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988), 79–96; Martyn P. Thompson, "Reception Theory and the Interpretation of Historical Meaning," *History and Theory* 32, 3 (1993): 248–72; Richter, "Pocock, Skinner, and Begriffsgeschichte," in *The History of Political and Social Concepts: A Critical Introduction*, ed. Richter (New York: Oxford, 1995), 124–42.

whereas *translation tactics* cover practices of implementation: the style of translation, the theories translators pursue, the translator's habitus. Peter Burke asserts that to understand "regimes of translation" in early modern Europe, six large questions must be answered: "Who translates? With what intentions? What? For whom? In what style? With what consequences?"[8] The same questions have a powerful claim to consideration when studying the culture of translation in 18th-century Russia.

Strategies of Translation—Customers and Translators

In the early 18th century, translations were usually initiated by the customer—above all, by the monarch or those in his circle. A translation could also be initiated by a translator, who then explained his choice in a preface. If so, the main goal of such translations was usually the education and self-education of statesmen, the improvement of morals, or readers' self-improvement, as in the case of political (*politichnye*) instructions. For example, in the preface to John Locke's *Second Treatise on Civil Government*, translated as *O grazhdanskom pravlenii*, the translator Andrei Fedorovich Khrushchov stated: "Everyone should know how to live in civil assembly in peace, quiet, and tranquillity, according to the natural laws that constitute all moral teaching.… An industrious and diligent reader will discover that in this book, as he deigns or as he is able."[9]

The translators of manuals (*priklady*), guides, and instructions make similar claims. In the preface to his translation of *Monita et exempla politica* (Political Advice and Examples) by Justus Lipsius, for example, Simon Kokhanovskii argued for the necessity of historical works: history "reveals the causes of troubles and serious changes in states and offers advice to those in national administration," therefore "all those who manage state affairs should preserve it." "Those selected to manage state affairs" read history "not for consolation or delight, not out of boredom or to fill time, but to receive counsel and instruction and assistance in governing the nation; and many of them, in civilian as in military matters, benefit greatly."[10] The translator of Cardinal Richelieu's *Testament* echoed Kokhanovskii, wishing the readers "to follow the cardinal's advice to the extent possible and in line with the conditions of the state."[11]

---

[8] Burke, *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*, 11.

[9] Otdel rukopisei Rossiiskoi natsional´noi biblioteki (OR RNB) f. 550, F.II.41, ll. 1, 3.

[10] "Nauchno-issledovatel´skii otdel rukopisei Rossiiskoi gosudarstvennoi biblioteki (NIOR RGB) f. 354, d. 233, ll. 3, 5, 10; [Justus Lipsius], *Iusti Lipsi Monita et exempla politica* (Antwerp: Moretus, 1606).

[11] NIOR RGB f. 256, d. 432, l. 11.

Peter I manifested the utilitarianism characteristic of him in acquiring literature for his private library. According to Sergei Luppov, the library contained "more than twice as many books on natural sciences as those about the humanities." The same can be said of the writings selected for translation: Peter was obviously interested in textbooks and manuals about the applied sciences (*khudozhestva*).[12] The tsar acquired political books for the same utilitarian reasons: to educate his successor or teach laws to the new collegiate officials. In about 1707, Peter charged Feofan Prokopovich with translating a treatise by D. Saavedra Fajardo, *The Idea of a Christian Political Prince*, which had been recommended by Heinrich von Hüyssen, the tutor of Grand Duke Aleksei. Later, as Gavriil Buzhinskii reported, Peter learned from "prudent persons, those skilled in this art, that they use a book by the famous lawyer Samuel Pufendorf in many academies as the primer for teaching youth." The emperor then "wanted to see this book in the Russian dialect."[13]

There were not many political manuscripts in Peter I's private library, although it did include some treatises by German cameralists: Wilhelm von Schröder's *Fürstliche Schatz- und Rentkammer* (The Princely Treasury and Revenue Office) and Heinrich von Bode's *Fürstliche Macht-Kunst* (The Art of Princely Power)—the latter he even wanted to have printed—and a pamphlet by the Göttingen professor Gottlieb Samuel Treuer, *Untersuchung nach dem Recht der Natur* (An Inquiry according to the Laws of Nature)—an outline of the historical and legal arguments in favor of excluding the "firstborn son" from the succession to the throne.[14] The utilitarian purpose of all these works is self-evident.

---

[12] S. P. Luppov, *Kniga v Rossii pervoi chetverti XVIII veka* (Leningrad: Nauka, 1973), 170–71. What Peter understood by *khudozhestva* (i.e., crafts and sciences), he conveyed in an imperial decree of 23 January 1724: "Translators are in great demand, especially for books about crafts [*khudozhestvennye*].… These crafts [*khudozhestva*] include Mathematics up to spherical triangles, Mechanics, Surgery, Architecture, Politics, Anatomy, Botany, Military Sciences, Hydraulics, etc." (*Polnoe sobranie zakonov Rossiiskoi imperii* [St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Vtorogo otdeleniia Sobstvennoi Ego Imperatorskogo Velichestva kantseliarii, 1831], 14:no. 4438).

[13] "Predislovie," in [Samuel Pufendorf,] *O dolzhnosti cheloveka i grazhdanina po zakonu estestvennomu, knigi dve sochinennye Samuilom Pufendorfom: Nyne zhe na rossiiskii dialekt s latinskogo perevedeny poveleniem … gosudaryni Ekateriny Alekseevny* (St. Petersburg: Sankt-Peterburgskaia tipografiia, 1726).

[14] Otdel rukopisei Biblioteki Akademii nauk (OR BAN) 17.15.3 (Vil´gel´ma Shredera Kniazheskoe sokrovishche); OR BAN 16.7.4 (P.I.B.87), [Heinrich von Bode,] *Kniazheskikh sil khitrost´ ili neischerpaemyi kladez´, chrez kotoroi gosudar´ silnym sebia uchinit´ i poddannykh svoikh obogatiti mozhet*; OR BAN 17.15.9, *Ist´iazanie po natural´noi pravde, skol´ daleko obladatel´skaia vlast´ rasprostiraetsia pervorodnogo svoego prinza ot naslediia derzhavstvovaniia vykliuchat´*. There exists an alternative translation of Schröder's book made for Prince Dmitrii Mikhailovich Golitsyn: OR RNB f. 550, Q.II.19 (Vil´gel´ma barona von Shredera kazna i prikhodnaia komnata).

The interests of private customers (Peter's associates) were more diverse. Some of them were translators themselves: for example, Count Petr Andreevich Tolstoi. Others only ordered translations, as did Prince Dmitrii Mikhailovich Golitsyn. In his library, books in Romance languages prevailed.[15] According to the confiscation inventory of 1737–38, books in French were most numerous in his library—994; 447 books were in Latin, 346 in Church Slavonic, 334 in Russian (civil books), and 14 in Polish.[16]

Golitsyn, whom Jakob Stählin called the "Russian Machiavelli," collected the best library in Russia, as Vasilii Nikitich Tatishchev asserted.[17] He was the most active commissioner of translations of political and historical works. The tsar knew that and often asked Golitsyn to provide him with "new books—historical, political, and others."[18] Peter was not the only one to make use of Golitsyn's library: we can tell from the way in which copies of some writings spread that they originated in Golitsyn's library. Golitsyn himself borrowed books from Fedor Matveevich Apraksin and Petr Andreevich Tolstoi and ordered copies of them. When he was interrogated in January 1737, he confessed to borrowing copies of books by Machiavelli and Boccallini.[19] The Swedish ambassador Herman Cedercreutz informed his government that Golitsyn "ordered different Latin, German, and French books for translation and studied them diligently."[20] An anonymous translator dedicated his *Ischislenie narochitykh akademii i uchilishch v Evrope* (A List of Distinguished Academies and Institutes in Europe) to Golitsyn during his service as governor in Kyiv (1707–18) and addressed him in the preface:

> You diligently try to know everything, to understand everything—everything that the innumerable sages and authors, ancient and modern,

[15] Dmitrii Golitsyn was educated in Italy. He spoke French with foreign ambassadors, for instance, with Westfallen. Once he demanded the mastery of "Latin letters" of one Semenov, whom he hired as his secretary. At the investigation of 1737, Semenov testified that he had not mastered written Latin but, being self-educated, could write and read "some Latin letters—and that was why Golitsyn kept him, Semenov, on" (Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv drevnikh aktov [RGADA] f. 6, d. 189, l. 415).

[16] RGADA f. 340, op. 1, d. 13981, "On Making an Inventory and Sale of Prince Golitsyn's Belongings, 1737–41"; B. A. Gradova et al., "K istorii arkhangel´skoi biblioteki D. M. Golitsyna," *Arkheograficheskii ezhegodnik za 1978 g.* (Moscow: Nauka, 1979): 239.

[17] [Jakob Stählin,] *Zapiski Iakova Shtelina: Ob iziashchnykh iskusstvakh v Rossii*, 2 vols. (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1990), 1:368; V. N. Tatishchev, *Istoriia Rossiiskaia*, 7 vols. (Leningrad: Izdatel´stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1968), 7:387.

[18] P. P. Pekarskii, *Nauka i literatura v Rossii pri Petre Velikom*, 2 vols. (St. Petersburg: Obshchestvennaia pol´za, 1862), 1:259.

[19] RGADA f. 6, d. 189, l. 388.

[20] See, e.g., Isabel de Madariaga, "Portrait of an Eighteenth-Century Russian Statesman: Prince Dmitry Mikhaylovich Golitsyn," *Slavonic and East European Review* 62, 1 (1984): 42.

> who lived all over the world—wrote. It is evidenced not by one but by the many books that were translated with your support into the language of your Fatherland. And all this was created solely by virtue of your aspiration for wisdom. Although you are so skilled in Historical, Economic, Philosophical, and other doctrines, you still try to learn something every day.[21]

Golitsyn's library, with its translations of treatises from different political schools, is an excellent source to study the formation of the new political language in early 18th-century Russia.[22] After Golitsyn was sentenced to death, his books were distributed among various collections. Probably, some of them reached the library of Artemii Petrovich Volynskii, at least the volumes by Machiavelli and Boccallini. At Volynskii's trial in 1740, he was charged in particular with reading translations of Justus Lipsius and Machiavelli.[23]

In the reign of Elizabeth Petrovna, statesmen and noblemen educated in Europe again employed translators or translated political treatises themselves. The empress initiated the publication of a translation of François de Fénelon's political novel *Les aventures de Télémaque* (The Adventures of Telemachus) and probably *Argenis* by John Barclay.[24] She also urged the Academy of Sciences, in a decree issued on 27 January 1748, "to seek to translate and print civil books on various topics in Russian, in which utility and fun would be combined with moral instruction appropriate to the secular life."[25] During her reign, the courtier and diplomat Mikhail Illarionovich Vorontsov (1714–67), in particular, supported the work of translators. His extensive book

[21] OR RNB Q.XVIII.5, ll. 3 ob.–4. *Ischislenie narochitykh akademii i uchilishch v Evrope* is probably a translation from the next edition: [M. Windsor,] *Academiarum quæ aliquando fuere et hodie sunt in Europa, catalogus & enumeratio breuis* (London : n.p., 1590).

[22] Golitsyn's collection contained works by Niccolò Machiavelli, Francesco Guicciardini, Paolo Paruta, Traiano Boccalini, Fadrique Furió Ceriol, Arnold Clapmarius, Johann Friedrich Lange, Andrzej Maksymilian Fredro, Christian Georg Bessel, Wilhelm von Schröder, Hugo Grotius, Nicolas de Vernulz, Johann Paul Felwinger, Samuel von Pufendorf, and John Locke, among others.

[23] Pekarskii, *Nauka i literatura*, 1:220; Ol´ga Novikova ascertained that the phrase "i khot´ia veseloe litso kazhet, no i gnev v serdtse tait" is a quotation from Justus Lipsius's *Monita et exempla politica:* "et benignior ille vultus, nescio quomodo, saevum saepe animum et vindicem celat" ("Lipsii v Rossii pervoi poloviny XVIII veka," *Filosofskii vek: Al´manakh*, 10 [St. Petersburg: Sankt-Peterburgskii tsentr istorii idei, 1999], 157). In Kokhanovskii's translation, this citation implied a negative attitude toward female rule: "especially when they demonstrate merry faces, they keep even greater anger in their hearts."

[24] [François de Salignac de La Mothe-Fénelon,] *Pokhozhdenie Telemaka, syna Ulissova* (St. Petersburg: Pri Akademii nauk, 1747); [John Barclay,] *Argenida: Povest´ geroicheskaia* (St. Petersburg: Pri Akademii nauk, 1751).

[25] As referenced in P. N. Miliukov, *Ocherki po istorii russkoi kul´tury*, 3 vols. (Moscow: Progress-Kultura, 1995 [1930]), 3:230.

collection speaks to his striving for self-education. He regularly acquired the latest editions of European fiction and political literature and ordered translations of certain works. It seems likely that he ordered translations of Emperor Frederick the Great's *Anti-Machiavelli* and Jean Rousset de Missy's *État politique de l'Europe* (The Political State of Europe), because both manuscripts are in the Vorontsovs' archive.[26]

Empress Catherine II not only undertook translations (of Jean-François Marmontel's *Bélisaire*, for example, with her courtiers) but initiated an entire translation program bringing important classic texts into Russian.[27] Thanks to the Society for the Translation of Foreign Books, established by the empress in 1768, 154 books were translated over the course of 20 years. In all, 765 translated books were published in 1756–75, most of them French (402).[28]

The facts cited above reveal a politics of translation that definitely existed in 18th-century Russia—a "translation campaign," in Peter Burke's words.[29] It had a variety of causes, beginning with the desire to catch up with the West culturally and technically and ending with an awareness that it was necessary to introduce readers to ideas and concepts previously unknown in Russian life, culture, and politics. These goals determined the customers' requirements.

The customers' interests determined the repertoire of translated literature, whereas the specific language of translated political texts was determined by the social and educational status of the translator. Petr Pekarskii distinguished three types of translators in the Petrine era: (1) employees of the Ambassadorial Chancellery (Posol´skii prikaz); (2) members of the clergy; and (3) noblemen educated abroad.[30] This division is strongly reflected in the linguistic

[26] Naucho-issledovatel´skii arkhiv Sankt-Peterburgskogo instituta istorii Rossiiskoi akademii nauk (NIA SPbII RAN) f. 36, op. 1, dd. 179, 807.

[27] V. P. Semennikov, *Sobranie staraiushcheesia o perevode inostrannykh knig, uchrezhdennoe Ekaterinoi II, 1768–1783 gg.: Istoriko-literaturnoe issledovanie* (St. Petersburg: Akademiia nauk, 1913).

[28] Gary Marker, *Publishing, Printing, and the Origins of Intellectual Life in Russia, 1700–1800* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985), 50–53, 88, 91.

[29] Peter Burke argues: "In the case of eighteenth-century Russia it is even more appropriate to speak of a translation campaign.… Translations in Peter the Great's time were mainly military, scientific, and technical, reflecting the tsar's interests and policies.… This campaign increased in scale after Peter's death, but technical books were replaced by works of literature, reflecting a 'self-conscious attempt' by Catherine to create a lay vernacular culture in Russia via foreign models, whether classical (Horace, Virgil) or French (Boileau, Fénelon). Eighteenth-century Russia offers a vivid early modern example of the importance of translation in cases where a given literature is 'young,' weak, and peripheral" ("Cultures of Translation in Early Modern Europe," 18).

[30] Pekarskii, *Nauka i literatura*, 1:4–5.

characteristics of the texts: chancellery language (*prikaznyi iazyk*), Church Slavonic, or the new secular spoken language.

Vasilii Kruglov argues for distinguishing translations that originated in Kyiv. These translations were completed in Kyiv on behalf of Peter I or Prince Golitsyn.[31] Really, "Malorossian learning" was highly influential, and the translations were close to those undertaken by the Petrine clergy—Feofan Prokopovich, Feofilakt Lopatinskii, and Gavriil Buzhinskii, who came from the Kyiv Academy—in linguistic terms. These texts did not differ greatly from texts produced by their students and were sometimes created with their help. However, the later Kyiv translations by Feofan Prokopovich and especially by Simon Kokhanovskii are notable for a greater purity of language than can be found in the early translations. In addition, there was a group of foreign translators in Russian service who have been almost forgotten and their work underestimated, including Johann Werner Pause (1670–1735), who translated textbooks and handbooks for Pastor Ernst Gottlieb Glück's school and for his own private students; later, he became a translator in the Academy of Sciences.[32]

The language used to translate political treatises was mostly determined by the "school" of the translator. From 1700 through the 1710s, the language of chancellery officials prevailed. Their style employed words from the formal language (*kantseliarizmy*) and barbarisms directly borrowed from European treatises (*suksetsion*, *skribenty*, *avantazhi*, *aliiantsy*, etc.). Students and graduates of theological academies, whether the Kyiv-Mohyla or the Slavic-Greek-Latin Academy (Prokopovich, Buzhinskii, Kokhanovskii, etc.), translated texts into "Slavonic"; in fact, Church Slavonic prevailed in these texts. In the Kyiv translations, Polonisms were especially frequent. Finally, the influence of colloquial speech and of the new education was noticeable in the translations fulfilled privately by nobles who returned from abroad or had been educated by foreign tutors at home (Andrei Khrushchov, Ivan Shcherbatov, Antiokh Kantemir). From the 1720s on, the last trend prevailed, influencing the normalization of the Russian language in the later period. For example, in translating *État politique de l'Europe*, Vasilii Trediakovskii (1703–69), secretary of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences, was guided by the same rules as Khrushchov: he avoided Slavonicisms and strove to convey

[31] V. M. Kruglov, "Rannie rukopisnye perevody s frantsuzskogo iazyka na russkii i formirovanie russkogo literaturnogo iazyka novogo tipa" (Doctor of Philological Sciences diss., St. Petersburg, 2004), 28–29.

[32] On Pause, see V. N. Peretts, *Istoriko-literaturnye issledovaniia i materialy*, vol. 3 (St. Petersburg: Vaisberg i Gershunin, 1902); and Galina Nikolaevna Moiseeva, "Pause Iogann Verner (Paus)," in *Slovar´ russkikh pisatelei XVIII veka*, ed. Kochetkova et al. (St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1999), 2:413–15.

meaning, not replicate the word order.[33] The translators of the 1740s–70s sought mostly to strip ill-conceived borrowings from the Russian and to adapt the terminology to the culture. This program forced them to search for Russian equivalents, which as a result often acquired new meanings. All these attitudes become visible in studying the transposition of the concept of "state" into a Russian context.

The "Impersonalized State" or the "Holder of Power"

Historians have often associated a new understanding of the "state" in Russia in the 18th century with the activities of Peter the Great and his contemporaries. The historians suggest two different answers to the question of whether the Russian people of the Petrine era separated the "state" from the personality of the "sovereign" or not. One group believes that Peter and his contemporaries imagined the state as an abstract institution, whereas others are convinced that people at the time tied the state to the personality of the ruler, as well as his patrimonial and inheritance rights to the territory and its population. Those in the first group insist, following Vasilii Kliuchevskii, that before Peter the idea of the state in commoners' political consciousness was tied to the person of the monarch in the same way as the householder was legally merged with his household. Peter divided these concepts, in particular by legalizing separate oaths to the sovereign and to the state. In his decrees, he emphasized state interest as the supreme and absolute norm of state order and even subordinated the sovereign to the state as the supreme bearer of law and the guardian of the common good.[34]

In Marc Raeff's view, Peter demanded the loyalty of his subjects to the abstract and impersonal state in accordance with his own conception of it.[35] Peter I's legislation reveals, according to Oleg Kharkhordin, that "if subjects refused to carry out the tsar's orders, they no longer simply opposed the will of the sovereign but also betrayed their own fathers, ancestors, and the entire community." The state was thus turned into a common cause, not the personal business of the sovereign.[36]

---

[33] Jean Rousset de Missy, *État politique de l'Europe*, 1: *Introduction à l'état politique de l'Europe* (La Haye: Adrien Moetjens, 1738); NIA SPbII RAN f. 36, op. 1, d. 179 (Vasilii Trediakovskii, *Vvedenie v politicheskoe sostoianie Evropy*, vol. 1).

[34] Vasilii Osipovich Kliuchevskii, *Sobranie sochinenii* (Moscow: Mysl′, 1989), 4:193.

[35] Marc Raeff, *The Well-Ordered Police State: Social and Institutional Change through Law in the Germanies and Russia, 1600–1800* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 207.

[36] Oleg Kharkhordin, "Chto takoe gosudarstvo? Russkii termin v evropeiskom kontekste," in *Poniatie gosudarstva v chetyrekh iazykakh*, ed. Kharkhordin (St. Petersburg: Evropeiiskii universitet, 2002), 193.

Nancy S. Kollmann adheres to similar ideas about early modern Russian legal consciousness: "Peter claimed a power unlimited by traditions of Christian piety. Laws of his time projected an impersonal vision of the state, embodied in the concept of 'state interest.' … In distinguishing crimes against 'state interest' from 'particular crimes' from which only private individuals suffered, Petrine law further asserted the state as impersonal."[37] Hence in the opinion of many historians, an impersonal state is evident in both legislation and Peter I's activities.

However, this view has been criticized since the early 20th century. Aleksandr Sergeevich Lappo-Danilevskii tried to understand the meanings behind the words of Peter's decrees. He pointed out that the notion of "common good" was tightly tied to the concept of "state good" or "state interest." In fact, the laws did not distinguish "his majesty's good" from "state good," equalizing them with "his interest."[38] Georgii Gurvich examined *Pravda voli monarshei* (The Justice of the Monarch's Will) and emphasized that according to Feofan Prokopovich, the monarch was "the only subject of supreme power; [he had] his own, independent right to it. The concept of the state as a legal entity is completely lacking in *Pravda voli monarshei*; the monarch is not state authority but the owner of the power that was alienated in his favor by the former owner—the people."[39]

Claudio Sergio Ingerflom recently summarized the critical arguments against Peter's "impersonal state." He gave a negative answer to the question of whether Peter I's Poltava speech or other loyalty oaths contained the idea of the "modern state" as an authority of abstract power, depersonalized and free from religious conditions or ties with patrimonial theory. According to Ingerflom, Petrine discourse was remarkable both in its religious and patrimonial features and in its representation of power as inherently personal. The most important question asked by Ingerflom has a powerful claim to consideration for every historian of 18th-century Russia: is it admissible to treat the word *gosudarstvo* in historical sources as a contemporary category of historical analysis that supposedly contains the contemporary concept of the state?[40]

---

[37] Nancy S. Kollmann, *Crime and Punishment in Early Modern Russia* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 404.

[38] Aleksandr Sergeevich Lappo-Danilevskii, "Istoriia politicheskikh idei v Rossii v XVIII veke v sviazi s razvitiem ee kul′tury i khodom ee politiki" (unpublished manuscript from Peterburgskii filial Arkhiva Rossiiskoi akademii nauk [PF ARAN] f. 113, d. 77, ll. 110, 113, 114.

[39] Georgii D. Gurvich, *Pravda voli monarshei i ee zapadnoevropeiskie istochniki* (Iur′ev: Tipografiia K. Matissena, 1915), 15.

[40] Claudio Sergio Ingerflom, "'Loyalty to the State' under Peter the Great? Return to the Sources and the Historicity of Concepts," in *Loyalties, Solidarities and Identities in Russian*

Starting with this question, I extend it to reveal what Russians in the 18th century understood when speaking about "state" or "society," asking whether the concept of "state" in Russia in the first half of the 18th century had anything in common with the "modern" comprehension of the state.[41] What was these 18th-century Russians' semantic field, and to what extent was "state" separate from the person of the monarch? To answer these questions, I examine translations of political writings—a source not often used by historians. First, I address the problem of the context in which new political concepts in Europe originated. Second, I explore how they spread throughout Russia.

In early modern Europe, a new comprehension of state and society emerged, tightly tied to the theoretical conceptualization of the function of public power in a dynamically changing society. Manfred Riedel accentuates two dominant paradigms in the development of these two concepts. The first developed in European thought from Aristotle up to the middle of the 18th century. Thinkers who adhered to this paradigm considered state and society as indissolubly united and perceived them as synonymous. "Society" was perceived as an assembly of free people, subordinated to a specific political power. From the French Revolution to the present, the second paradigm of society as a free space of capable persons and people of property, not subordinate to any dominant force, separate from the state, and removed from politics has prevailed. Riedel demonstrates decisively that the notions of *civitas* and *respublica* were used as synonyms of *societas*, *societas civilis*, *populus*, and *communitas* in the 17th and 18th centuries.[42]

The notion of *Stato/État/Staat* emerged in political writings of the 16th and 17th centuries, however, alongside the notion of sovereignty; people spoke about *ragione di Stato* or *raison d'état*. Political theoreticians faced the problem of describing impersonalized political power that differed from both rulers and subjects. Quentin Skinner distinguishes two different directions in

Society, History and Culture, ed. Philipp Ross Bullock, Andy Byford, and Ingerflom (London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies, 2013), 18–19.

[41] On the notion of the "modern state," see Joe H. Shennan, *The Origins of the Modern European State, 1450–1725* (London: Hutchinson, 1974), 64–65; Kenneth Dyson, *The State Tradition in Western Europe: A Study of an Idea and Institution* (New York: ECPR, 1980); Willem Pieter Blockmans and Jean-Philippe Genêt, eds., *Visions sur le développement des états europeens: Théories et historiographies de l'état modern* (Rome: École française de Rome, 1993); and Wolfgang Reinhard, *Geschichte des modernen Staates: Von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2007).

[42] Manfred Ridel´ [Manfred Riedel], "Obshchestvo, grazhdanskoe," in *Slovar´ osnovnykh istoricheskikh poniatii*, 94–95, 122. In 1797, Immanuel Kant emphasized, "Civitas sive societas civilis" as a copybook maxim.

the developing of the concept of "state": republican and secular absolutist.[43] Owing to Machiavelli, in the republican tradition *stato* developed as an apparatus of administration: a part of the republic, although not separate from the rulers. In the same republican vein, John Locke insisted that rulers were still magistrates (public representatives) of the republic (*civis*, commonwealth). He separated rulers from the system of administration, but he did not distinguish the system itself from the concept of society as a political entity.

According to Skinner, the crucial role in the emergence of the new concept of "state" and its separation from "society" belonged to the secular absolutist theoreticians of the 16th and 17th centuries. Jean Bodin introduced the notion of "sovereignty" and perceived the concepts of *république* or *estat* as synonymous ways of describing indissoluble and nontransferable supreme power as the foundation needed to realize the essence of the state. Thomas Hobbes completed this division of "public" and "state": power was no longer a personal characteristic of the ruler but a duty of the sovereign, whereas "state" appeared as an "artificial body," which could not be equated with either the people or the ruler.

By the early 18th century, although European political thought did not distinguish "state" from "society," and the very idea of a modern state did not exist, the doctrines that introduced separate elements of the state came into being: in particular, a clear distinction between personal and public authority, the idea of sovereignty as supreme power in society, or the idea of "state interest" (as a matter of "political society" as a whole). Nevertheless, the supreme political power and the state power were not yet equalized, and this was a controversial theory that gained ground only by the mid-18th century. Thus in the Petrine era, an entire set of European political ideas reached Russia. Perceptions of this set lacked unity or integrity. Indeed, the diversity of the Baroque amazed contemporaries with extreme viewpoints.

Terminological Experiments, 1700–20

I have identified two dominant ways through which European political concepts were adopted by Russian 18th-century culture. First, a concept could be introduced after people read the original written work. Even if the work was not translated completely, the Russian language incorporated the semantic content of its concepts. A reader used the new terminology, "translating" it into Russian in his own writing. For example, *les lois fondamentales* were included in some original writings as *nepremennye ustavy*

[43] Kventin Skinner [Quentin Skinner], "The State," in *Poniatie gosudarstva v chetyrekh iazykakh*, 44–58.

or *osnovnye ulozheniia*, drawing on all the meanings of these domestic terms. In this case, the treatise or treatises that the Russian author read before he started to use the new terminology in his own writings are important. The second way was through spontaneous translation of original political writing that introduced a system of associated political concepts into Russian.

I employ these two models in analyzing cases of adaptation of specific concepts within manifold practices of translation. To trace how translation practices changed in conjunction with the language used in translations, I examine several political treatises translated from 1700 through the 1760s. I focus my attention on how a translator constructed equivalents of political concepts.

The period discussed can be conventionally divided into three smaller ones based on the development of translation practices: from 1700 through the 1710s; from 1720 through the 1730s; and from 1740 through the 1760s. Examples of translations are borrowed from each of these three periods to demonstrate distinctive features of the translators' usage or dynamics in the adoption of new concepts.

Translators' usage in the Petrine period is characterized by the Slavonicisms that prevailed in political treatises, for the translators originated mostly among present or future members of the clergy, including students of the Kyiv-Mohyla or Slavic, Greek, and Latin Academy in Moscow. In particular, the translation of the famous treatise by Hugo Grotius, *De iure belli ac pacis*—completed for Prince Golitsyn by one Oronovskii, a student at the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, between 1712 and 1718—conveys the linguistic peculiarities of this era.[44] The translator persistently followed the original text, conveying the structure of the Latin sentences word by word. Surprisingly, this method did not prevent understanding of the text, for example, "правление весма ради тех иже управляются, а не тех иже управляют, поставляется" (*regimen omne eorum qui reguntur, non qui regunt, causa esse paratum*). But for the most part, Oronovskii's translation is heavy and barely comprehensible. Its language is overloaded with Polonisms to the point where it could be regarded as Polish if it were not written in Cyrillic and its grammar dominated by Church Slavonic. For instance, to translate the Latin *publica* Oronovskii used not the familiar word *narod* but the Polish word *pospolstwo.*[45] Probably,

[44] As the translation was made from the Amsterdam edition of 1712, as indicated on the first page of the manuscript, and Golitsyn stayed in Kyiv till 1718, the Russian text emerged in this period of time.

[45] OR RNB f. 550, f.II.36/1 ([Hugo Grotius,] *O zakonakh brani i mira tri knigi, v onykh knigakh povestvuetsia zakon estestvennoi i narodnoi*): "V tsarstvakh zhe, idezhe pospol´stvo est´ vol´noe, ne byvaet takovaia pospol´stva vol´nost, daby tsar´ ot imperatorstva svoego udalen

he did this because he was trying to convey the legal content of the term *publica* as an assembly of citizens but could not find an analogue either in Russian or in "Slavonic," so he applied the Polish word for both people and society. In his translation, the famous definition of state by Grotius looks as follows:

> *Potestas civilis* est, qui civitati praeest. Est autem *civitas* coetus perfectus liberorum hominum, juris fruendi & communis utilitatis causa sociatus.
>
> *Область гражданская* есть юже град предстоит. *Град* убо есть собрание совершенное людей волных, и ради употребления устава и общаго пожитку дружество.[46]

Remarkably, despite this literal approach, he could not convey the exact meaning and used words that were close in meaning but obscured the essence of Grotius's thoughts. In the same vein, *potestas civilis* in the meaning of "state (civil) authority" appears as *oblast´ grazhdanskaia*, *communis utilitatis* (common good)—as *obshchii pozhitok* (*pozhitok* also meant "good," but only in the material sense). The abstract concepts—*civitas* (state) and *sociatus* (society)—the translator conveyed as *grad* (city) and *druzhestvo* (friendship). These exact equivalents were widespread in translations from Latin from 1700 through the 1720s.

Only a few translators tried to avoid the first vocabulary meaning of *civitas* and searched for Russian equivalents. In this respect, the translation by Johann Pause from German in the early 18th century is of particular interest—*Statskaia komnata, vo nei zhe vsiakie staty i rechi pospolitye v nyneshnoe vremia tsvetushchie sokrashchenno opisany*.[47] Although Pause was strongly influenced by "Slavonic," he was closer to the secular translators of Peter I's era—in particular, when it came to using barbarisms. Pause's text reveals the practice of borrowing words during written adaptation. The function of the text is obvious from the title—it was intended for *Vedomosti* readers, those who wanted to examine political information coming from abroad. But the problem of how to convey the concept of *state* came to the fore immediately. Because Pause did not find any direct analogues of the German *Staat* in Russian, he followed the path of amplification. That is, he gave several meanings of the term simultaneously:

byl" (Book 1, chapter 1, §13.1), or "izhe soizvoleniem pospol´stva nachalo svoe imiashe" (Book 1, chapter 1, §15.1).

[46] OR RNB f. 550, f.II.36/1, l. 13 (Book 1, chapter 1, §14.1).

[47] OR BAN 26.3.58. This text is a compilation of different German manuals of this kind. I have not definitely identified the original.

> *Вопрос А*. Что знаменует словце стат?
> В Германском, Францускоm, Англском и проч. языцах словце *Стат* знаменует с[о]тояние, качество, чин, сан, достоинство, г[осу]д[а]рство, землю или королевство, и сие последное знамение во обще знатно яко же рещи: Галландскои Стат, Францускои или Турецкои Стат.

Interestingly, when listing synonyms for the word *stat*, the translator mentioned *gosudarstvo* but did not use it, implying a certain difference between these concepts. In this regard the existing word *gosudarstvo* was not the equivalent of *stat*, but only a half-synonym. Accordingly, the translator defines the statesman as *statskii muzh*.[48]

Only one political synonym borrowed from Polish—*rech´ pospolitaia*—corresponded to the two Russian words *strana* and *gosudarstvo* that pointed to the spatial characteristics of the sovereign's domain, as *pospol´stvo* did for Oronovskii. Pause and Oronovskii found themselves in similar circumstances: not being able to convey full semantic equivalence in Russian, they used a Polish word to translate a concept from Latin or German.

An anonymous translator of *De stato principis* by I. F. Lange followed a similar path. One finds the following definition of state in his translation:

> *Status* a stando dicitur, ut sit in bona Reipublicae administratione res per se stabilis. Hoc sensu convenit omnes stare unanimos in quodam Reipublicae orbe.
>
> *Стан* от стояния именуется, дабы бых в добром правлении Речи Посполитой при себе постоянний, сим сенсом пристоит дабы все стояли единомысленно в согласии Речи Посполитои.[49]

Conveying *Status* through the Polish *stan* as *sostoianie*, the translator not without wit played on the Russian verb "to stay" (*stoiat´*), its verbal forms and a related word in the definition of *stan* (*stoit, stoiali, stoianie, postoiannyi*). The translator of F. A. Oldenburger's *De ratione status* (1637–78) also used the Polish word *stan* to designate the concept of state; explaining the notion of *politik*, he applied the Latin loan translation from the word "state" (*Status*)—*statista* (*politik ili statista*), and vice versa.[50]

In 1717–18, translating the most important treatise by Samuel Pufendorf, *De jure nature et gentium*, the monk Simon Kokhanovskii, one of the most refined translators of the Petrine era, followed the already

[48] Ibid., ll. 2–2 ob.
[49] OR RNB f. 550, F.II.46, l. 2 ("O state vladetel´skom").
[50] Ibid., F.II.52, l. 30 ("O vine stana"); Philipp Andreas Oldenburger, *Politica curiosa, sive Discursus iuridico-politicus de statistis Christianis* ([Hannover], 1686), 74.

established tradition and conveyed *Civitas* as *grad* in most cases. He also used such synonyms as *grazhdanstvo*, *rech´ pospolitaia* (when translating *Respublica* too), *gosudarstvo*, and *tsarstvo*. He translated the concept *Societatis civilis* as *druzhestvo grazhdanskoe*, as was usual for translations into "Russian-Slavonic."[51] However, Kokhanovskii went further in the second version of his translation of *Monita et exempla politica* by Justus Lipsius, where he consciously rejected the Polish notion of *rech´ pospolitaia* in favor of the Russian *gosudarstvo*, in this way conveying equally *Respublica* and *Societatis*.[52]

In this respect, the published translation of Pufendorf's *De officio hominis et civis juxta legem naturalem* (translated by Iosif Krechetovskii and Buzhinskii) followed the lexical equivalents created by Kokhanovskii. But whereas Krechetovskii obviously preferred *grad* to convey *civitatum*, Buzhinskii, who corrected or rewrote Krechetovskii's translation, advocated for *grazhdanstvo*. His translation of *civitatum* in the second book revealed other equivalents of the concept of "society" as related words (*druzhestvo, sodruzhestvo*):

> non contenti parvis illis primisque *societatibus*, magnas *societates*, quae *civitatum* nomine veniunt, constituerint.

> Не доволствуяся малыми оными и началными *дружествами* великия *содружества*, которыя мы *Гражданством* именуем, установили.[53]

By the end of the 1710s, the "Slavonic" language gradually lost its position. Clerks were less likely to use Slavonicisms and preferred new European lexica.

[51] Otdel rukopisei Gosudarstvennogo istoricheskogo muzeia (OR GIM), Syn. 115; Syn. 255 (*O zakonakh estestva i narodov*). These files contain the corrected drafts of Kokhanovskii's translation. The fair draft prepared for Golitsyn is kept in OR RNB f.II.26/1 (part 1) and 26/2 (part 2).

[52] The first draft of the translation emerged in 1712; the second draft was completed in 1721. On the copy of the first draft, there is an immediate indication that the translation was ordered by Golitsyn: "Kniga Iusta Lipsiia sobrannaia iz drevnikh knig, istorii, primerov politicheskikh, predlozhenii. Drukovannaia na latinskom iazyke. S latinskago zhe na slavenskii perevedennaia v Kieve, leta ot Rozhdestva Khristova 1712 g., ot mirozdaniia 7220 godu. Tshchaniem kiuvskago gubernatora, i namestnika smolenskago, kniazia Dimitriia Mikhailovicha Golitsyna" (OR BAN 1.5.42, l. 1). In the first draft from the Synod collection, one can trace the unique work of the translator: Kokhanovskii, when editing it, altered the terminology substantially. For instance, he translated the title of the second chapter *De religione. Eius utilitas, sue necessitas: velim totâ Societate, vel seorsim in Rege, et Subditis*, which finally became the first one, as "О ~~побожности~~ *благочестии* ~~о пользе и потребе ея~~, яко полезно и нужно есть ~~в целой Речи Посполитой~~ *обще всему государству*, и такожде особне царю и подданным." Further, he continued to write "gosudarstvo" instead of "respublika" and "rech´ pospolitaia" (OR GIM Syn. 115, l. 1; [Lipsius,] *Monita et exempla politica*, 4).

[53] [Samuel Pufendorf,] *O dolzhnosti cheloveka i grazhdanina po zakonu estestvennomu*, 388; *S. Pufendorfii De officio hominis et civis juxta legem naturalem* (London: G. Thulbourn and J. Woodyes, 1758), 417.

For example, here is the description of the contract theory of the origin of the state and its legal consequences in the translation of *Untersuchung nach dem Recht der Natur* by Gottlieb Samuel Treuer:

> Те правости, которыми обладатель в своем Государстве (Land) и народе во всех делах, тако де и в сукцессионе, диспонеровать имеет, оные единако из внутреннейшей формы стата (Form des Staats) признаватися и разсуждатися могут. Самодержавной какой Государь (Souverainer Herr) не ради того власть имеет своими подданными по своему изволению поступать, хотя и *величеством* (die Majestät) владеет, ибо народы всегда при манере правителства болшие или меншие волности себе предъудерживали, когда они державствование (Regiment) своему вышнему соизволили, особливые правости и привилегии себе предудерживали и утверждать давали, и для оных с ним порядочные примирении (Verträge) наставили.[54]

The translator used Slavonicisms rarely but overloaded the text with barbarisms that struck the eye of contemporary readers so obviously that they demanded that the word *suktsession* be replaced with *nasledie*. However, the translator was not as helpless in the face of foreign ideas as one might imagine at first glance. He could easily provide Russian equivalents for complex legal terms and translate *sovereign* as *samoderzhavnyi*, whereas *Maestat*, which Prokopovich had used without any changes in *Pravda voli monarshei*, this translator conveyed as *Velichestvo*. The anonymous translator, like most of his contemporaries, could not find any equivalent to the concept of *state* (Staat) and used the loanword *stat*. He used the Russian word *gosudarstvo* solely to designate the territory the sovereign possessed (Land).

The above examples reveal that for a Russian translator and reader of the early 18th century, the familiar *gosudarstvo* was indissolubly tied to the monarch's person, power, and lands. Russian translators seldom found Russian equivalents to convey the institutional and abstract concept of *Status, Staat, État*. Instead, they used loan words or replaced the word with Polonisms. The most common Polonism to designate *gosudarstvennoe i grazhdanskoe sostoianie* was *rech´ pospolitaia*. All this indicates the "untranslatability" of this concept. An attempt to find Russian equivalents pushed translators toward the Church Slavonic vocabulary. There *grad* and *druzhestvo* acted not only literally but also figuratively or metaphorically, in an abstract sense (*grad Bozhii*, *druzhestvo sovershennoe*, etc.). Slavonic was also the source of quite awkward and literal constructs to convey *Res publica*, such as *veshchi obshchie* or *veshchi gradskie*.

[54] OR BAN 17.15.9 (P.I.B.88), l. 14 ob. ("Istiazanie po natural´noi pravde"); [Gottlieb Samuel Treuer,] *Untersuchung Nach dem Recht der Natur Wie weit ein Fürst Macht habe, Seinen Erstgebohrnen Printzen von der Nachfolge in der Regierung auszuschließen* (s.l., 1718), 9.

The most successful translators' achievement of the early 18th century was probably *grazhdanstvo*, which united *grad* and *druzhestvo*. In the shade cast by the ecclesiastical *grad* and the bureaucratic *stat*, *grazhdanstvo* became a key word to convey the concepts of state and society.

The Search for Equivalents in the 1720s and 1730s

The period of the 1720s and 1730s were a turning point for the formation of a new political lexicon. The secular translators of the new generation, not tied to "ecclesiastical learning" but educated within the secular European tradition, worked actively. The most striking example of how the language of translated literature altered was John Locke's *Second Treatise of Government*, translated by Andrei Khrushchov (1691–1740). Later Khrushchov's translation of Fénelon's *Les aventures de Télémaque* (1724, published in 1747) earned recognition from Russian readers.[55] Lappo-Danilevskii pointed out that this translation of Locke's treatise, probably commissioned by Golitsyn, was outstanding relative to other translations of the time.[56] For unknown reasons, however, Lappo-Danilevskii ascribed the translation to Prokopovich, although it is obvious that Feofan's "Slavonic" language of translation in no way coincides with the refined Russian text of the *Second Treatise*. Kruglov ascertained Khrushchov's authorship as a translator as well as the French source of the original. His hand is recognizable in the draft of *Pravlenie grazhdanskoe*, the final copy of which belonged to Prince Golitsyn.[57]

Khrushchov translated the *Second Treatise* about 1723,[58] based on the French text from Golitsyn's library.[59] The Russian translator of Locke had to cope with several political and legal notions that were not clear to Russian readers.

[55] This political novel by Fénelon was translated in about 1724, at around the same time as Locke's *Second Treatise*. Thus the Russian text reflects the translator's attitude in the early 1720s. It was published only in 1747 at the personal order of Empress Elizabeth Petrovna, after it had been distributed in handwritten copies for 20 years. On the translation of *Télémaque*, see Kruglov, "Rannie rukopisnye perevody," 148–72.

[56] PF ARAN f. 113, d. 78, l. 225.

[57] V. M. Kruglov, "Russkii rukopisnyi perevod 1720-kh gg. vtorogo traktata 'O pravlenii' Dzhona Lokka," in *Izvestiia Akademii nauk: Seriia literatury i iazyka*, no. 4 (2003): 50–55. The draft is kept in RGADA (f. 181, op. 2, d. 194), and the final copy in OR RNB (f. 550, F.II.41).

[58] The final copy of *O pravlenii* that belonged to D. M. Golitsyn can be dated according to the watermarks (Z. V. Uchastkina, *A History of Russian Hand Paper-Mills and Their Watermarks*, edited and adapted for publication in English by J. S. G. Simmons [Hilversum, Holland: Paper Publications Society, 1962], no. 6, 1723). V. M. Kruglov dates it from 1727 to 1729 ("Rannie rukopisnye perevody," 118–19).

[59] [John Locke,] *Du gouvernement civil, où l'on traitté de l'Origine, des Fondemens, de la Nature, du Pouvoir, & des Fins des Sociétez Politiques* [trans. David Mazel] (Amsterdam: Abraham Wolfgang, 1691); RGADA f. 340, op. 1, d. 13981, l. 144 (The inventory of Prince Golitsyn's belongings, 1737–41, "#928. Du Gouvernement Civil, à Amsterdam, 1691").

The important point here is that, compared to the translation of *Télémaque*—mostly oriented toward "Slavonic language" and the political vocabulary developed by Buzhinskii and Kokhanovskii—in his new text Khrushchov sought to speak with the reader a comprehensible language, diligently avoiding both Slavonicisms and borrowings. In this regard, the translation of the *Second Treatise* is characterized by real linguistic purity and clarity.

To describe the essence of "state," Locke used the concept of *commonwealth*—an analogue of *res publica*, *État* and *Société politique* in French, or *grazhdanskoe sostoianie* in Russian—opposing it to the "natural state." A society, by concluding an agreement to unite, determined the form of government. Hence, regarding different forms of government, Locke wrote about different forms of commonwealth (*des Formes des Sociétez*). Khrushchov, using *grazhdanstvo* to convey the synonymous concepts of *Estat* and *Société*, managed to explain clearly enough what Locke was talking about:

> Par une *Communauté* ou un *Estat*, il ne faut donc point entendre, ni une Démocratie, ni aucune autre forme précise de gouvernement, mais bien en général une *Société indépendante*, que les Latins ont très-bien désignée, par le mot *Civitas*, & qu'aucun mot de nostre langue ne sçauroit mieux exprimer que celuy d'*Estat*.
>
> Чрез *Общество* или *Собрание* не надобно разуметь ни Демократию, ни иное правление, но *Гражданство неподчиненное*, которое латыни изрядно своим словом называют цивитас *Civitas*, а на нашем языке лутче невозможно назвать, как *Гражданство*.[60]

Obviously, Khrushchov consciously choose *grazhdanstvo* to designate "state" as an institution established by society and united with it through a community of interests. In his translation of the *Second Treatise* he used the word *grazhdanstvo* 196 times to convey the concepts of *estat, société, sociétez politiques, gouvernement de l'estat*. At the same time, he used the word *gosudarstvo* only 34 times, mostly to designate the territory of *estat(s)* or to translate the notions *pays* or *royaume*. *Obshchestvo*, too, yielded to *grazhdanstvo* in frequency (65 times). The only rival of *grazhdanstvo* was *sobranie* (163 times), used to designate a political community—*Société, Société civile, Communauté*.[61]

Grazhdanstvo became an intelligent concept used to construct Russian equivalents for such concepts as "political society" or "state" in Khrushchov's

[60] [Locke,] *Du gouvernement civil*, 169; OR RNB f. 550, F.II.41, l. 119.

[61] Kruglov, "Rannie rukopisnye perevody," esp. 337 (Lexical Index to the Translation of *Du gouvernement civil*).

translation. Nevertheless, despite the long existence of *grazhdanstvo* and its synonyms (*grazhdanskoe uchrezhdenie* and *grazhdanskoe pravlenie*) in translations or original writings, it was never assimilated like *stat* or *stan* to convey the modern concept of the state. If *respublika* took deep root in Russian, *stat* and *grazhdanstvo* made room for *gosudarstvo*.

This trend was already evident in translations by Khrushchov's contemporaries. A revealing example is the anonymous translation of Georg von Bessel's *Neuvermehrter politischer Glücks-Schmid* at the turn of the 1720s–30s.[62] In this text, the translator gradually overcame earlier tendencies to transliterate and Polonize concepts. The translator sought a terminological unity, though less successfully than Khrushchov. For instance, using transliteration, he provided at once a Russian equivalent that then prevailed in the text.

> als hat ein Bedienter große Ursache mit dem recht gottseligen Könige von Engeland Carolo I. täglich zu beten: O, Lord! never suffer me for any *reason of State*, to go against my Reason of conscience!
>
> сего ради служитель дворовой великую притчину имеет, со истинно блаженным королем аглинским Каролом 1м, повседневно так молится: "О, Господи не допусти мя никогда ради какой *Статскои рации* {или *притчины государственной*} против правости совести моей поступати."[63]

Later in the text, the translator used *gosudarstvo* and *gosudarstvennye pritchiny* for *Staat* and *Staats-Rationen*, *gosudarstvennye dela* for *Staats-Sachen*, and *tovarishchestvo* for *Société*. *Respublica* was still conveyed through the Polonism *rech´ pospolitaia*, but the translator used *obshchestvo* to convey both *communi* and *publico*.[64]

The translations by Vasilii Kirillovich Trediakovskii (1703–68) provide evidence of a significant change. A student of the Slavic-Greek-

[62] NIOR RGB f. 178, op. 1, d. 2849 (*Khristiana Georgiia fon Besselia Politicheskii schastiia kovach*). One of the earliest copies can be dated based on the watermarks (S. A. Klepikov, *Filigrani i shtempeli na bumage inostrannogo proizvodstva XVII–XX veka* (Moscow: Vsesoiuznaia knizhnaia palata, 1959), no. 158, 1728–34.

[63] Christian Georg von Bessel, *Neuvermehrter politischer Glücks-Schmid* (Frankfurt: Liebezeit, 1697), 11–12; NIOR RGB f. 178, op. 1, d. 2849, ll. 7 ob.–8.

[64] For instance, in Exhortation no. 19, the words by P. Paruta "nelle ragioni di stato" were translated as "in Staats-Rationen" in German and "v gosudarstvennykh pritchinakh" in Russian (Bessel, *Neuvermehrter politischer Glücks-Schmid*, 254; NIOR RGB f. 178, op. 1, d. 2849, l. 61); "Und lieber dem Publico schaden als den Hohn haben"—"i lutche obshchestvu vrediti nezheli styd imeti" (*Neuvermehrter politischer Glücks-Schmid*, 243; NIOR RGB f. 178, op. 1, d. 2849, l. 58 ob.).

Latin Academy, he denied the conventions of Church Slavonic ("Slavonic stupidity") and declared the priority of Russian colloquial speech as the literary norm even during his study in France, being guided largely by young nobles.[65] Trediakovskii applied this principle not only to belles-lettres but also to political writings.[66] Like Khrushchov, Trediakovskii tried to talk to the reader about political concepts with the "simplest Russian words," in line with the principles of domestication. He was thoroughly concerned with terminological conformity, translating *État* as *gosudarstvo* and *Royaume* as *derzhava*, implying the political state of society in the first case and territory and population, subordinated to the monarch, in the second.[67]

Even so, in his translations *société* could be either *obshchestvo* or *grazhdanskoe sozhitie*, depending on context.[68] The following fragment is remarkable in its revelation that *gosudarstvennye* and *grazhdanskie* (public) affairs were synonyms in *ancien régime* societies:

> Ce ne peut estre que par: une téméraire présomption que des sujets trouvent à redire à *l'administration de l'Estat*, s'imaginant que *les affaires publiques* iroient mieux si elles estoient conduites selon leurs idées.
>
> Сие происходит от продерзостнаго высокомыслия, когда подданные осуждают *Государственное Правительство*, думая, что *общия гражданския дела* лучшим бы образом отправлялись, ежели б оныя производились по их мыслям.[69]

It is revealing that Trediakovskii translated *affaires publiques* as *obshchiia grazhdanskiia dela*. He used two Russian equivalents to specify the idea of *publiques*, the first derived directly from *obshchestvo* and the second related to *grazhdanstvo*, both denoting society and state simultaneously.

In terms of the normalization of Russian written speech, the 1720s and 1730s marked a turning point: recontextualization gave way to

[65] [Paul Tallemant le Jeune,] *Ezda v ostrov liubvi* [trans. from French Vasilii Trediakovskii] (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Akademii nauk, 1730; repr. Moscow, 1834], 14.

[66] [Nicolas Remond des Cours,] *La véritable politique des personnes de qualité* (Paris: Jean Boudot, 1693); *Istinnaia politika znatnykh i blagorodnykh osob* [trans. from French Vasilii Trediakovskii] (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Akademii nauk, 1737).

[67] *Véritable politique des personnes de qualité*, 39; *Istinnaia politika znatnykh i blagorodnykh osob*, 34.

[68] For instance, "Bozhestvennoe pravo, poriadok sozhitiia [societé civile], i obshchaia vsekh narodov pol´za trebuiut, chtoby kazhdyi chelovek povinovalsia zakonam"; "to by nikakoe Obshchestvo [societé], i nikakoi by obraz Pravleniia ustoiat´ ne mog" (*Istinnaia politika znatnykh i blagorodnykh osob*, 30–31, 33).

[69] *Véritable politique des personnes de qualité*, 44; *Istinnaia politika znatnykh i blagorodnykh osob*, 38.

decontextualization or domestication of the conceptual apparatus. The translators were here guided by the demands of the noble elite, which wanted to read and talk about politics in intelligible and accessible language. Indeed, it was this demand from the new, educated tier of nobility that led to the return of old, familiar Russian words to convey the new European concepts. Beginning in the post-Petrine era, these trends consolidated and triumphed in subsequent decades.

The Return of *Gosudarstvo* in the 1740s–60s

Khrushchov, famous as the "Russian Socrates" among his contemporaries, was executed together with Artemii Volynskii in 1740.[70] The innovations he introduced were developed between 1740 and 1770, when secular norms of translation finally prevailed. This came about mostly in response to the "normalizing" publishing policy of the Academy of Sciences, which undertook to edit the first Russian magazine and new secular books alongside *Vedomosti*. The academy's translators, Trediakovskii and Sergei Savvich Volchkov, played an important part in this process. Trediakovskii translated *État politique de l'Europe* for Vice-Chancellor Mikhail Vorontsov in the 1740s.[71] In describing the peculiarities of *aglinskoe pravlenie*, Trediakovskii tried to designate this unusual phenomenon by using a concept intelligible to Russian readers:

> В Аглинском государстве (*État*) довольно равномерное смешение состояния монархическаго, аристократическаго, и демократическаго, так что трудно определить которой из сих трех родов господствует в ней наибольше. Кажется что король имеет главное участие в верховной власти, для того что отправление иностранных дел в его токмо одной силе, в разсуждении других державцов (*Souverains*), с которыми он договаривается … Аглинская система состоит в сем, что Король, которой ими правит, долженствует иметь связанныя руки на зло, а безмерную силу на добро. Но надобно чтоб сие добро было приятно всему народу (*Nation*). Особливо он хочет, чтоб сие добро не отбивалось от Системы установления учрежденнаго (*Système de la Constitution établie*). Сие

[70] Like Socrates, Khrushchov, when sentenced to death, led the conversation with his jailer, the former Imperial Guards officer N. F. Kokovinskii, in Mikhail Mikhailovich Shcherbatov's dialogue "Razgovor o bessmertii dushi," in Shcherbatov, *Sochineniia kniazia Shcherbatova*, 2: *Stat'i istoriko-politicheskie i filosofskie* (St. Petersburg: Tovarishchestvo "Pechatnia S. P. Iakovleva," 1898), 309–58.

[71] The book was translated by Trediakovskii in 1745, before he obtained a professorship, because he signed the cover page as the academy's secretary. In the same year he published his "Slovo o bogatom, razlichnom, iskusnom i neskhotstvennom vitiistve," dedicated to Mikhail Illarionovich Vorontsov.

> установление (*Constitution*) содержит все уставы, которые утверждают власть парламенту, и вольность народу.[72]

While searching for Russian equivalents, Trediakovskii created neologisms or gave old words new meanings. He could easily have used *suvereny* but chose to replace it with *derzhavtsy*. The abstract *zakon* (*loix*)—a word with a double meaning in Russian, more often associated with the concept of religion—he replaced with the specific and familiar *ukaz*. In thus sacrificing accuracy, he made the text intelligible to Russian readers by supplying familiar analogies.

Trediakovskii consciously chose *gosudarstvo* to designate a political institution, avoiding both a loanword (*stat*) and a neologism (*grazhdanstvo*).[73] He was well aware of the differences in political terminology, therefore he assigned to the old *gosudarstvo* new meanings that had previously been associated with *rech´ pospolitaia, stat, stan, grad*, or *grazhdanstvo*. Yet while normalizing the Russian language even as he adhered to linguistic purism, Trediakovskii sought to avoid superfluous foreign borrowings. Therefore he brought back *gosudarstvo* with a new semantic content. Taken as a whole, Trediakovskii's program corresponded to general trends in the Russian language and culture of Elizabeth's reign that became widespread in the second half of the century.

Remarkably, in the section on Swedish *pravlenie* Trediakovskii subtly nuanced the Russian equivalents of different meanings of *État.* He distinguished representation of estates—*les États* (*gosudarstvennye chleny*) and estates proper—*Ordres* (*chiny*), whereas the *tiers États*—urban dwellers—he conveyed by the word *grazhdanstvo*.[74]

The translation of the anonymous work *Pensées politiques sur les devoirs d'un Roi Citoyen*, probably completed for Mikhail Vorontsov in the late 1750s, reveals the process of distinguishing *gosudar´* and *gosudarstvo* as concepts:

> Государю не надлежит почитать государство свое имением, пришедшим к нему будто бы по наследству, ниже за чрезвычаиную милость Фортуны и счастливой случаи ево судбы, но содержать ево за божественное дело и самую наиважнейшую комиссию, которую всевышний благоволил ему поручить. Весьма бы государь погрешил есть ли б думал, что государство болше принадлежит ему нежели он сам государству, все

[72] NIA SPbII RAN f. 36, op. 1, d. 179, ll. 140–41 ob., 154 ob.–55; Missy, *État politique de l'Europe*, 1:138–39, 151.

[73] NIA SPbII RAN f. 36, op. 1, d. 179, ll. 140–41 ob.

[74] NIA SPbII RAN f. 36, op. 1, d. 179, l. 232; Missy, *État politique de l'Europe*, 1:227.

> ево старание и упражнение должно склониться к произведению ему пользы.[75]

In fact, here the translator dissolved the connection between *gosudar´* and *gosudarstvo*, which is obvious in Russian. He opposed the meanings of the words, despite the similarity of their sounds. Similar ideas were developed further in the handwritten translation of Henry Bolingbroke's pamphlet *The Concept of the Patriarch Sovereign* from the early 1760s, kept in Nikita Ivanovich Panin's library. The striking distinction between "king" and "state" is present in Bolingbroke's account of Louis XIV, who

> почитал свое *королевство* за наследство своих предков (regarder son *Royaume* comme le Patrimoine de ses ancêtres), которое инако признавать не должно; так что когда один весьма благоразумной человек вступил с ним в подробное разсуждение о бедности его народа, и часто употреблял слово *государство* (le mot d'*État*), то король, хотя ему и нравилась сила разговора, показывал негодование для частаго повторения сего слова и жаловался как на некоторую непристойность.[76]

The translator was obviously aware of the expansion of *gosudarstvo* and consciously used the word in a sense that was still unusual in the early 18th century.

Yet by the end of Elizabeth's reign, this new meaning of *gosudarstvo* became current. It is evident, in particular, in the translation of *Lettres russiennes* by Frédéric-Henri Strube de Piermont (1760).[77] Invoking Montesquieu's terminology, Stube used the concept of state (*État*) and civil society (*Société civile*) in what was by then the general sense. The anonymous translator did not deviate from the established lexemes *gosudarstvo* and *obshchestvo* to convey these concepts. In the example below, the concepts were used in a sense close to the meaning but substantially differentiated: the state is to be governed, whereas one should work for the benefit of society. Any "free person" can rule the state, not only a monarch:

---

[75] "Politicheskie mneniia o dolzhnosti takogo korolia kotoroi sleduet zakonam sushchago meshchanina," NIA SPbII RAN f. 36, op. 1, d. 798, ll. 20–20 ob.

[76] [Henry Bolingbroke,] *Lettres sur l'esprit de patriotisme, sur l'idée d'un roy patriote et sur l'état des partis qui divisoient l'Angleterre, lors de l'avènement de Georges I* (London: [n.p.], 1750), 84–85, 99; NIOR RGB f. 222, kart. 23, d. 5, ll. 36, 42 (*Poniatie o gosudare-patriote*); on this translation, see my recent article: Sergei Viktorovich Pol´skoi, "'Dolzhnost´ gosudaria patriota': rukopisnyi perevod i monarkhicheskii diskurs Prosveshcheniia v Rossii tret´ei chetverti XVIII veka," in *Vek Prosveshcheniia*, ed. Sergei Iakovlevich Karp, 4: *Chto takoe Prosveshchenie? Novye otvety na staryi vopros* (Moscow: Nauka, 2018), 155–75.

[77] [Frédéric-Henri Strube de Piermont,] *Lettres russiennes* (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Akademii nauk, 1760).

> Qu'est-ce qui l'empêcheroit de cultiver la terre, ou de conduire un troupeau, avec la même fidélité qu'un homme libre peut administrer l'*État*, & travailler au bien de la *société*?
>
> Что помешает холопу землю пахать или стадо господина своего с такою же верностию пасти, как свободному человеку *государство* управлять или о пользе всего *общества* старатся?[78]

Although criticized by Strube, Montesquieu's *De l'esprit des lois* (1748) became available to Russian readers in the 1750s, being freely sold in the academy bookshop. The first published translation by Vasilii Kramarenkov appeared only in 1775, although one can find the first examples of translation in manuscript collections of the 1760s.[79] In comparing one handwritten translation fulfilled by Aleksandr Pavlov in the mid-1760s with the published one, we can see that both translators, despite their disagreements on how to handle political terms, coincide in using *gosudarstvo* and *obshchestvo* to convey *État* and *société*.[80]

A unique monument of cultural translation is Catherine II's *Nakaz* (Instruction). The empress drafted it in French (excluding several fragments), then had it translated into Russian by her secretary, Grigorii Vasil´evich Kozitskii. His text became the source of translations into other European languages, including the official four-languages edition of 1770.[81] Kozitskii used the term *gosudarstvo* to convey *État*, excluding only article 91, where he used *obshchenarodie*. As analogues for the Russian *gosudarstvo* he used also *Empire* and *Patrie*.

The translator's interpretation of the state as an institution of power that administers society caused him to recognize politics and "political" (*politique*) as exceptional qualities of the state. For instance, Kozitskii translated *pouvoir politique* as *gosudarstvennaia vlast´*, *gouvernement politique* as *gosudarstvennoe pravlenie*, and *liberté politique* as *gosudarstvennaia vol´nost´*. In this respect, the *Instruction*, both original and translated, revealed the semantic proximity of European and Russian political vocabulary that had, if not achieved unity, at least established clear equivalents by the 1760s. Article 37 is notable in

[78] OR RNB f. 550, Q.II.101, l. 14 ob.

[79] [Charles Louis de Montesquieu,] *O razume zakonov* [trans. from French Vasilii Kramarenkov], vol. 1 (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Akademii nauk, 1775).

[80] For Pavlov's handwritten translation, see OR RNB f. 885, 42, *O priamom razume zakonov*.

[81] [Ekaterina II, imperatritsa,] *Nakaz imperatritsy Ekaterina II, dannyi Komissii o sochinenii proekta Novogo ulozheniia*, ed. Nikolai Dmitrievich Chechulin (St. Petersburg: Akademiia nauk, 1907); Nadezhda Iur´evna Plavinskaia, "Catherine II ébauche le Nakaz: Premières notes de lecture de *L'Esprit des lois*," *Revue Montesquieu*, no. 2 (1998): 67–88.

this regard because it gave the definition of the state within the theory that prevailed at this time in Europe, through a correlation with society:

> В *государстве*, то есть в собрании людей, *обществом* живущих, где есть законы.
>
> In *civitate*, id est coot hominum *Societatis* vinculis iunctorum, ubi quidem leges assent.
>
> In einem *Staate*, das ist, in einer Versammlung von Menschen, die in *Gesellschaft* leben, in Gesetze giebt.
>
> Dans un *État*, c'est à dire dans une *société* où ils a des Lois.[82]
>
> In a *State* or Assemblage of People that live together in a *Community*, where there are Laws.[83]

Important here is that, despite the old interpretation of "state" inherent in early modern political thought as not separate from "society," all the translations of article 37 used stable terms that have survived in the European languages to the present. Thus, regardless of changes in the semantic content of the concept of *state* that occurred during the revolutions of the late 18th and early 19th centuries, the word that designated it was not supplanted by a different one in most European languages, including Russian. Accordingly, in the Russian cultural context, the semantic equivalents of the European political concepts *state* and *society* were constructed in the mid-18th century. After a long search and many attempts, Russian translators finally decided in favor of the old *gosudarstvo*, preferring it to neologisms or transliteration.

Conclusion

In 18th-century Russia, the formation of the new, rational political language that included new concepts was tightly connected with the translation of political and juridical literature. The new concepts, forged in this smithy of the new political language, found their lives in the original writings of Russian speakers and publicists, statesmen and historians. This does not mean that political concepts were lacking in pre-Petrine Russia. Such concepts are inherent in every culture, but their complexity, diversity, and level of abstraction are always linked to the development of sociopolitical relationships

[82] *Nakaz Eia Imperatorskago Velichestva Ekateriny Vtoroi Samoderzhitsy Vserossiiskoi, dannyi Komissii o sochinenii Proekta novago Ulozheniia* (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Akademii nauk, 1770), 20 (Rus., Lat.)–21 (Ger., Fr.).

[83] *The grand instructions to the commissioners appointed to frame a new code of laws for the Russian Empire: composed / by Her Imperial Majesty Catherine II. Empress of all the Russias.… Translated from the original, in the Russian language, by Michael Tatischeff: a Russian Gentelman* (London: T. Jefferys, 1768), 76.

in the society. The process of political communication in Russia before the 18th century was not charged with a complex language. Only a collision with the Western world resulted in greater sharing of European terminology in the 16th and 17th centuries, as Muscovy's military and diplomatic relationships with its neighbors intensified. However, this intensification grew out of an attempt to describe and represent the Western order in the Russian way, to adapt mentally to cultural otherness but not to adopt it. Moscow's diplomats described European political life in its own terms but did not try to fit those terms to Russian reality, except for the specific case of the tsar's title with its political advantages.

The Petrine era brought a qualitative change when the number of European texts that poured into Russia together with new objects, technologies, and phenomena made it necessary to adapt unfamiliar terminology to the domestic experience. Peter I and his associates actively used words and concepts from the European languages not only in military, maritime, and engineering contexts but also in political and juridical discourses, from legislation to panegyric literature. The new terminology penetrated the everyday language being appropriated by oral discourse—as can be seen, for example, in interrogation reports, where the new political concepts were recorded. Representatives of different social groups were now talking about politics.[84]

The significance of Peter's reign for the formation of the modern Russian language reveals that national cultures and languages always emerge as a result of historical exchange. Two models of adaptation of European political concepts prevailed in Russia. First, a concept could penetrate when someone read an untranslated work and incorporated its conceptual apparatus into works written in Russian. Second, traditional translations of "canonical" political writing could introduce a set of related political concepts into the Russian language.

The key point, however, is that in both cases the meaning of a concept was constructed by the actor (reader or translator) and endowed with a certain sense based on that person's social experience and intellectual baggage. Thus translation became a power resource enabling "rule through words."

[84] This fact is abundantly evident in the spread of translations of political treatises whose owners were non-nobles. The anonymous translator of the Testament by Cardinal Richelieu (1725) wrote in the preface: "Оное описание политики и политика предлагаю здесь ради того, что оные слова в нашем языке чюжие, и в разговорах всякия люди оныя слова политика и политик много употребляют, но употребляют их не в прямом их натуральном разуме, политикою называют злодейство и бездельничество, а политиками называют злых людей и бездельников, противно натуре и резону" (RGADA f. 1274, d. 3166, l. vii). The incorrect adaptation of the concept's sense causes him to explain the true meaning of the European term to the Russian reader in detail.

Searching for, or rather constructing, equivalents of the new concepts was a creative process that resulted in the creation of a secular political language. Therefore, aristocrats and courtiers who knew foreign languages, like Prince Golitsyn or Vice-Chancellor Vorontsov, actively commissioned translations. They were primarily interested in creating Russian equivalents of concepts already familiar to them—for example, in French—but not found in Russian. For them, finding an equivalent was the same as finding a key that could open a door to new ideas and meanings for Russian culture. An equivalent, even if it did not capture the full sense of the original, made it possible to utilize a new concept conveniently in political discussions and to appeal to compatriots who did not read foreign languages. This desire to introduce a concept into the active political vocabulary meant that the word designating it should be translated and become a part of the language, abandoning its strangeness. As a result, loanwords did not contribute to the development of the concept, because it remained alien, whereas its "domestication" required the search for a Russian word that could be endowed with a new meaning.

In this process of constructing equivalents, the translator was a key figure. Translation practices in Russia in between 1700 and the 1760s passed through several stages depending on the level of translators' training and acquaintance with the European reality that lay behind the terms of political treatises. In the first decade, the translators were, above all, chancellery clerks and students or graduates from ecclesiastical academies. If the style of the former was strewn with bureaucratic words and barbarisms—direct borrowings from European treatises—the latter rendered the treatises into Church Slavonic, and new terms were often translated from Latin into Polish. Beginning in the 1720s, translators who returned from abroad or were educated by foreign tutors demonstrated the influence of colloquial speech and secular education. They started the normalization of the language that prevailed in the 1740s–60s, by which time most translations had already been purged of Slavonicisms caused by literal renditions.

The appropriation of the European conceptual apparatus in Russia was problematic because in fact there was little correspondence between the new concepts and the social, political, and juridical practices of Russian society. The idea of a free member of the *grazhdanskoe soobshchestvo* and an owner establishing *sotsietet* or *grazhdanstvo* as the result of a contract or participating in the implementation of the political power of a *stat* or *grad* hardly fit into the system of old ideas about the state as the sovereign's patrimony. In this sense, Peter I and most of his contemporaries did not separate the state from the monarch. At the same time, because of Peter's "window" on Europe, Russia

was inundated with political writings that gradually altered the notions of the Russian people, even though this new political vocabulary was difficult to grasp.

The adoption of concepts can be divided into two stages. At first, the translators and readers misunderstood the concepts' meaning, but by applying transliteration or borrowing words, they introduced new terms into the texts of translations or original Russian writings. Some concepts introduced in this way remain unchanged in Russian today (*politika*, *reglament*, *konstitutsiia*). Later translators sought Russian terms that corresponded in part to the semantic dominant of the European concept, then tried to tie them together more closely by introducing a new meaning for the Russian term (*gosudarstvo*, *obshchestvo*, *chin*) derived from European political literature. Thus Russian translations of European texts register a significant development of political consciousness and language over several generations that indicates a certain change that occurred in the perception and comprehension of social reality in Russia in the 18th century.

School of History
National Research University–Higher School of Economics
ul. Staraia Basmannaia, 21/4
105066 Moscow, Russian Federation
spolskoy@hse.ru