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Abstract

This article shows how and why censorship was practiced in translated and edited texts of two British 19th-century translators, Sarah Austin and her daughter Lucie Duff Gordon. They were recognised translators from the German and French languages, Duff Gordon eventually receiving more credit for her writing than translation. As mother and daughter, they were obviously influenced by each other and both probably could have contributed more to the history of translation if it were not for one’s fear of publicity and the other’s health. They were not only mediators between the cultures (German, Egyptian and English), languages, texts and minds of the time. They also made substantial contributions to British society and the intellectual circles of the age, not only through their translations, but also with the aid of their cross-cultural ideas in the fields of writing and thought production where women were considered inferior for many centuries and in the domains where only men had a substantial social voice. This paper shows that both women had power and freedom with the decision-making process to introduce censorship into their translations as well as their writing.
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Resumen

Este artículo proporciona una visión general del trabajo y la vida de dos traductoras inglesas del siglo diecinueve, a saber, Sarah Austin y su hija Lucie Duff Gordon. Ambas fueron reconocidas traductoras de alemán y francés, aunque Duff Gordon obtuvo mayor reconocimiento por sus escritos que por sus traducciones. Como madre e hija, ejercieron influencia mutua en sus trabajos y ambas probablemente podrían haber contribuido más a la historia si no fuera el temor a la publicidad de una y la mala salud de la otra. No eran sólo mediadoras entre las culturas (alemana, egipcia e inglesa), las lenguas, los textos y la mentalidad de la época. Eran más que eso, ya que su voz destacaba socialmente entre los círculos intelectuales británicos de la época a través de la traducción, y destacaba también por sus ideas interculturales en el campo de la escritura y el pensamiento, campos en los que las mujeres habían sido consideradas inferiores durante muchos siglos y donde sólo los hombres habían sido escuchados. El artículo muestra que ambas mujeres tenían poder y libertad en la toma de decisiones a la hora de censurar tanto sus traducciones como sus textos escritos.
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1. INTRODUCTION

An account of the history of translation will usually also reflect the history of translation practice. What is more important than who translated what, when and why however is the importance or influence of a translation or translator on the history of translation and/or history overall. Pym argues about the humanisation of translation history, where four central issues are seen as key: the reason, i.e. why translation was produced; the object, i.e. who the translator was; interculturality or the cultural belonging of translators; and priority of the present, i.e. the reasons for researching the history of translation (30-45).

The role of women in translation practice has been acknowledged and documented by a number of researchers (Agorni; Chamberlain; Delisle and Woodsworth; Dow; Flotow; Kawashima; Robinson; Schaeffner). If women were deprived of the opportunity to conduct research and practice science and philosophy for a long period of time in history, they were often practicing and actively engaged in translation. Translation in fact was one of the few fields in which women could show their expertise. Over the span of history, women translators in the West have been investigated to a substantial extent although some researchers still consider this field neglected (Agorni 181; Bacardi and Godayol 144; Martin 1; Tyulenev 77), especially in relation to women translators of less popular languages than English or French. Therefore, the interest in women’s translating agency has been for the past 25 years or so increasing not only in Europe but also in other countries around the world (Malena 1).

Translation from the perspective of censorship has not been given adequate attention (Merkle *et al.* 9). In 19th-century Europe, censorship in translation was not a new concept. In many European countries, it was long practiced both institutionally and individually. Translators were engaged in censorship for different reasons. Some of them manipulated their translated texts in order to be published (Pajares 289). Merkle *et al.* (11) argue that censorship cannot be completely separated from translation. Thus, the purpose of this paper is to uncover the translation and related practices in respect of censorship by two famous British women translators of the 19th century, Sarah Austin (1793-1867) and her daughter Lucie Duff Gordon (1821-1869). The main issues discussed in the paper are the following: what were the other practices that British women translators exhibited alongside translation; what were their approaches and attitudes towards translated and edited texts; and how was their translation practice affected by the fact that they spent a substantial period of their life outside Britain. The paper concentrates on Sarah Austin and Lucie Duff Gordon, both of whom translated and were forced to spend time outside their mother country, England. The extent to which these two women modified the texts they translated will also be touched upon, and the scope of contribution made by women to particularly male-dominated domains will be noted: legal and sociological by Sarah Austin and political and historical by Lucie Duff Gordon. Their exceptional contributions prove that they were “far from being victims [and] helped to uphold the patriarchal social order” (Bisha *et al.* in Tyulenev 78), like a great many other women in other countries through a number of writing-related activities.
2. SARAH (TAYLOR) AUSTIN: TRANSLATOR AND EDITOR

Of the two women to be discussed in this study, Sarah Austin’s life and work have been most extensively studied. There are a few contemporary research papers (Goodman; Johnston), encyclopaedic articles (Lewes; Shattock) and books (Stark) examining Sarah Austin’s life and work in detail. A more extensive review of Sarah Austin’s life is given by Lotte and Joseph Hamburger in their book *Troubled lives: John and Sarah Austin*. However, in some of these works, Sarah Austin’s name is credited along with her husband’s, a man regarded by some to have been a gifted personality (Clive 312) and by others a mere shadow, mostly due to his melancholic nature and weak mental health in comparison with his wife’s talents (Lewes 58). Relatively few studies have been primarily concerned with Sarah Austin as an authority on translation taking into consideration her “most prolific, manipulative and subversive” nature of translation (Stark 15). Her translation of Hermann Fürst von Pückler-Muskau’s *Tour in England, Ireland, and France by a German Prince* has been given exceptional attention by Johnston (101-113), where the historian outlines in detail the circumstances behind the publishing of the volume, revealing much about the translator’s personal life and character. Two other books, Victor Cousin’s *Report on the State of Public Instruction in Prussia* translated from German (1834) and *On National Education*, a collection of official documents commented and translated from French (1835) by Sarah Austin have also been given scrutiny by Goodman (425-435).

Arguably among the best known German to English translators, Sarah Austin was born in 1793 in Norwich, England, to the yarn maker and hymn writer John Taylor and his wife Susanna. Sarah was both beautiful and smart, inheriting her talents from her mother (Lewes 57). She was also strong-minded and hardworking (Harman). Her talents and beauty were clearly transmitted to her daughter, Lucie Austin Duff Gordon, famous for her *Letters from Egypt*, and her granddaughter Janet Ross, a prominent historian and biographer. Benjamin calls them “a bloodline of remarkable achievement” (Benjamin 25). Sarah Austin travelled and lived outside her native England for a substantial period of time, spending more than 20 years abroad. Between 1827 and 1848, she lived in Germany, Malta, and France.

Sarah translated, edited, commented and wrote in the domains and on the issues very much in touch with the political and social system in England at the time. It is not at all extraordinary that Sarah has been praised by both notables of the day and contemporary researchers as an exceptional first-class translator from German (Goodman 429; Johnston 101; Lewes 57). She went to live in Germany, admired the German way of life and the country’s governmental and educational systems. She became friends with many German intellectuals of the period, wrote and translated about German social values and wanted to introduce German cultural standards to the English elite (Goodman 427, 430; Johnston 101-111; Waterfield 42, 49, 61). It may be maintained that Sarah Austin’s time spent living in Germany enormously influenced her translations, mostly in terms of the nature of the texts she chose to introduce to English society.
Sarah was tireless in her devotion to her husband and his work, especially after his death, when she undertook to revise and publish his writings, notably *Lectures on Jurisprudence*, published in 1879 (Waterfield 149). She improved his poorly written essays to such an extent that they assured him a long lasting recognition (Lewes 58). Her husband was not the only family member whose texts Sarah volunteered to edit and revise. Her only daughter, Lucie Duff Gordon, was an author of two collections entitled *Letters from Egypt*, the first of which was also revised by her mother (1865). The letters were not only of a personal nature, they were also a portrayal of life in Egypt. This demonstrates that Sarah Austin was well versed in many topics and domains and was a talented editor. Besides that, by editing her daughter’s letters, Sarah was able to secure her honour and good name, which at the time might have been undermined by trivial but thoughtless openness. Her granddaughter, Janet Ross, writes in her memoirs about her mother Lucie that Sarah “was obliged to omit much that might have given offence and made my mother’s life uncomfortable —to say the least— in Egypt. Before the end of the year the book went through three editions” (Duff Gordon, “Lady Duff Gordon’s Letters from Egypt: Revised Edition” 17). Lucie’s translation of *Stories of the Gods and Heroes of Greece* was published under her mother Sarah’s name (1845), which she also revised and edited. It can be, thus, argued that Sarah Austin was very much devoted to her family and, by revising the writings of her husband and her daughter, helped the family to build —and retain— a good reputation. Bearing in mind that Sarah belonged to (or rather established) an intellectual gathering of some of the great minds of the period, including eminent politicians, jurists and writers (Lewes 57), and that wherever she went to live she made friends with many intellectuals, it is only natural that she wanted nothing to cast a shadow on her family’s good name.

Another example that supports the idea of Sarah Austin’s desire for a flawless reputation is her removal of eccentric material in the translation of Hermann Fürst von Pückler-Muskau’s *Tour in England, Ireland, and France by a German Prince*. The ‘eccentric’ material basically consisted of erotic accounts and anecdotes, which she herself defined as “never meant to be published” in a letter she wrote to the publisher John Murray (Johnston 104). Sarah took the liberty of censorship in this translation and was even reproached, to put it mildly, by the author himself for such arbitrariness (Johnston 109-110).

Besides, Sarah was a successful editor not only of her husband’s legal texts and daughter’s letters, but also of other kinds of text, including *Memoirs of the Reverend Sydney Smith by his daughter, Lady Holland, with a Selection from his Letters* (2 volumes, a total of 930 pages, 1855). In the preface to the edition of the second volume, published in 1855, she writes:

I have generally omitted not only the usual formulae at the conclusion of letters, but many continually recurring expressions of kindness and affection, friendly greetings, domestic news sought and communicated. They show his kindly recollections of great and small, but their repetition would occupy much space, and might become wearisome to the reader. (xiii)
In the context of her craving to maintain her daughter’s name and to establish fame for her husband, this particular passage might imply that Sarah had her own strict views towards what was meant to be publicised and what was not. And in her assessment most probably, the memoirs of a reverend could do more harm than appropriately build a reputation for the great talents he had. This sustains the idea that she might have cared a lot about position and honour and she did what she could to protect them from the potentially unfair judgements of society.

Nonetheless, credit to Sarah Austin should undoubtedly be given for her outstanding translations from German and French during the 1840s. Her granddaughter, Janet Ross, writes in her memoirs of her own mother Lucie, Sarah’s daughter, “[l]eft much alone, as her mother was always hard at work translating, writing for various periodicals and nursing her husband” (Duff Gordon, “Lady Duff Gordon’s Letters from Egypt: Revised Edition” 5). This paints Sarah Austin in a good light not only as a hardworking translator; she was on the whole a woman of diligence and heartiness in whatever she took to.

Although regarded by many as the most prominent German to English translator of the period, Sarah could equally well translate from French. All of her translations, both from German and French, were in the political, historical and sociological domain. Sarah Austin’s translation and editing practice was of commercial nature (Johnston 101), and most probably the evidence for such a claim is obvious. However, the fact that all her translations were in one way or another related to her political and social views and values cannot be overlooked.

Being praised and appreciated by notable people of the time, Sarah Austin did everything she could to “distance herself from the outrage which was bound to be caused” by any gossip in relation to her translated authors (Stark 150). She tried to maintain her reputation unquestioned using a variety of methods. For example, she did everything to ensure her name remained unmentioned on the title page of the English edition of Pückler’s letters. She even went so far as to remove considerable amounts of text without acknowledging the fact to her unaware readers, something Pückler found particularly infuriating (Stark 150). She might have done this for different reasons: in fear of exposing her own personality, thus making her name vulnerable for reprehension and criticism or fear of presenting awkward ideas and language to a very conservative society or fear of not being published at all (bearing in mind her financial shortages and her constant persuasion of publishers to undertake her translations for publication).

Her habit of removing potentially compromising text and dissociating herself from the ideas expressed in the texts she translated in fact contradicted the translation theories advocated at the beginning of the 19th century. Being one of the best translators of the period who was so much fascinated by the German tradition, Sarah Austin could not be unaware of the ideas towards translation maintained in the period of German Romanticism by Friedrich Schleiermacher, Wilhelm von Humboldt, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Johann Gottfried von Herder and others. Goethe, for example, indicated that the goal of the translator was to “make the original and the translated text as identical as possible so that one is not meant to replace the other, but to act in its place, a mode in which the original can still be seen ‘shining
through” (Stark 50). The philosopher Johann Gottfried von Herder, whose ideas influenced many famous 18th and 19th century scholars, in his work *Fragments on Recent German Literature and Volkslieder* claimed that the primary goal of a translator was to faithfully reproduce the meaning (Forster). Sarah was very well acquainted with these ideas, not least because she lived in Germany for a substantial period of time. She admired Goethe and appreciated his reviews (Johnston 105). Besides, Sarah believed that only the Germans understood “the morality of translating” (Stark 72). Therefore, Sarah Austin’s practiced removal of uncomfortable original ideas during the process of translation seems to be incongruous with the principles and postulates professed by the prominent translation theorists and philosophers of the time. She expressed many times in her letters and prefaces to translations that as a translator she had a privilege to have no opinion (Raumer in Stark 38), but exactly the opposite of what she did—an accurate rendering of all the original ideas of the authors she translated—would have been ‘no opinion’. Through her censorship, removal and changes made to the translated text, Sarah Austin expressed quite firmly her own attitudes and approaches to a number of social phenomena. On the other hand, she believed that these changes and manipulations were justifiable because translators were free to choose instead of demonstrating “rigid fidelity” to the text (Stark 49). In terms of practiced censorship and the abridgment of text, Sarah Austin’s translations would have better conformed to the 17th century translation postulates when the idea of *les belles infidèles* was advocated.

Even though Sarah Austin took the responsibility of abridging, changing and removing text when she translated or edited, it was not always that she practiced such censorship. In her daughter Lucie Duff Gordon’s translation of Berthold Niehbur’s *Stories of the Gods and Heroes of Greece* (published in 1843), which she undertook to edit, Sarah Austin writes:

> The translation is, as nearly as may be, literal. The translator has tried to keep to the style of those who know how to narrate for children and childlike men; where each sentence is a simple uninvolved statement, and the sentences are bound together by the most direct and inartificial links.

Having carefully ascertained the accuracy of the translation, my task was at an end. I found nothing to alter, and was rather tempted to envy the youthful freshness and courageous naïveté of the style. (v)

As the editor of her own daughter’s translation, Sarah here reveals that the text was not changed, which implies that condensation, abridgment and omission of text might have been within the general practice of 19th century translating and editing. Otherwise, why would an editor need to state that no modifications had been introduced? On the other hand, this also sides with the idea that only particular subjects and topics were subjected to such substantial alterations. Since the text Sarah Austin was editing had been written for children and had been translated by one of nearly the same age, which she marks in the preface, there were no reasons to introduce serious revisions and substitutions as it could in no way expose the author, translator and editor to criticism.
Having said all the above, it might be conceived that Sarah Austin had very scrupulous views that did not allow her to display anything discreditable about those whose works she undertook to edit or translate in her aspiration for esteem and reputation. Along the same lines, she might have done so in order to disguise any pitfalls of those great men whose texts she revised as well as to safeguard her own name.

3. LUCIE DUFF GORDON: TRANSLATOR AND WRITER

The well-known translator and writer Lucie Duff Gordon has received as much attention as her mother, Sarah Austin. Her life and work have been rather considerably examined, mostly because she was an extraordinary woman who was too open-minded and modern for the times she lived in (Foster 16). She is often claimed to have been the most genuinely open (Foster 16) woman who led a very “radical lifestyle” while in Egypt (Logan 452). Waterfield writes that “[s]he had instead a quality—an attitude to life—which makes her a member of the twentieth rather than of the nineteenth century” (2). The first to record her life was her own daughter, Janet Ross, who gave a detailed account of Lucie’s life along with her grandmother Sarah Austin’s and great grandmother Susanna Taylor’s, in her book Three Generations of English Women published in 1888 and its follow-up The Fourth Generation: Reminiscences by Janet Ross published in 1912. In 1937, the journalist and publisher Gordon Waterfield published a book, Lucie Duff Gordon in England, South Africa and Egypt, which was a very substantial biography. In modern times, interest in this outstanding and noteworthy figure has not decreased, resulting in a biography by Katherine Frank in 2007, a 1992 research study devoted solely to Lucie Duff Gordon by Helen Wheatley and a few papers where she was given slightly less attention (Foster; Logan; Tucker).

Lucie Duff Gordon was born in England, but spent much of her childhood in Germany where she learned to speak German alongside her native English. Unfortunately, due to illness, later in life she had to leave the continent and went to live in Egypt, where she spent seven years between 1862 and 1869. Lucie was brought up by her mother, Sarah Austin, in the same educational spirit that she herself had been raised by Lucie’s grandmother, Susanna Taylor (Waterfield 9). However, unlike her mother Sarah, Lucie was bored by the things girls were taught at the time: sewing, knitting and music. She was also uninterested in the talks and discussions of the prominent figures of the time, who gladly visited her mother’s intellectual salon (Waterfield 35). Instead, she loved animals and was extremely fond of reading. Left much to herself by the mother who was constantly struggling to earn an income for the family, Lucy grew to be intelligent, self-confident and independent, which her mother would always wish to secure as she felt Lucie was “not like the children of the upper classes” (Waterfield 9).

Lucie’s translations are well known. As a child, she learned German and began her career as a translator quite early. Like her mother before her, she specialised in translations from German and French. One of the reasons Lucie undertook
translation was, as in the case of her mother, earning money. For this same reason, she published a few translations from German and French together with her husband Alexander. Besides, like her mother, she was always interested in the possibility of translating the books she was reading (Waterfield 99). However, while her mother always thought of the German language as superior and would have liked to introduce Germanisms into English for the purpose of reforming the language (Stark 50), Lucie would doubt whether certain pieces written in English could have been properly rendered into German: “nor would it be easy to translate—a lively, brilliant and rather insolent style is very hard to put into German above all” (Waterfield 99).

Lucie did some editing as well: H.C.L. von Sybel’s *The History and Literature of the Crusades* (published in 1861) was translated by Lucie’s daughter Janet Ross, and Lucie contributed to Janet’s first translation by editing the volume. However, although Lucie could and occasionally did editing, her translation and writing practice is much more widely known about and acknowledged.

Mostly she translated historical and political texts, although there were a few literary prose renderings. One of the first of her translations to be published was the German historian Berthold Niebuhr’s *Stories of the Gods and Heroes of Greece*, which appeared in 1843 under the name of her mother, Sarah Austin, and, the next year, a translation of Wilhelm Meinhold’s *Mary Schweidler: The Amber Witch*, followed by *The French in Algiers* in 1845 (Ross 7). Lucie Duff Gordon’s translations were often referred to as masterpieces and she herself, like her mother, was known by her contemporaries to be a translator of genius (as noted by editor Morley in the preface to *The Amber Witch* translated by Lucie Duff Gordon and published in 1844) and a remarkable woman of the time (noted by J.W. Mackail in the introduction to the 1928 edition of *The Amber Witch*).

Although too open-minded, tolerant and progressive for the time she lived in, like her mother again, Lucie did not completely refuse the possibility of text omission and censorship. The translation of Baron von Moltke’s *The Russians in Bulgaria and Rumelia in 1828 and 1829* from the original German and published in 1854 is attributed to Lucie Duff Gordon (and considered to be her last translation), although there is no reference to the name of the translator in the book itself. The preface is written and simply signed The Translator.

My first intention was to make an abridgment of the book —leaving out all purely military details— but as I proceeded in the work I was so much interested by the vivacity and clearness with which even technical matters are described, that I thought even those among my readers who are as ignorant of the art of war, as I am myself, would have cause to regret their omission. I have therefore only condensed some of the political speculations relating to bygone events, and left out a few unimportant passages. <...>

Thus the correctness of the version of Baron von Moltke’s book now offered to the English public has been secured; but the Translator must crave indulgence towards any inelegance of style caused by the endeavour to make the book as clear and as short as possible. (iv)
Although the translator explains the reasons for abridging and condensing the text, i.e. for leaving out parts of the text, mostly those related to military matters, the feelings of regret by the translator herself or those arising from the readership for omissions were pre-contemplated, as the passage suggests, and the idea of the removal of parts of text might have been speculated as inappropriate. However, the translator indicates that “a few unimportant passages” were left out, which might imply that she had either the permission to abridge or decided herself on what to render and leave out. If such removal of parts of the text could be attributed to the latter reason, then how did the translator decide which passages were to be left out, especially taking into consideration the fact that she admitted her ignorance in the subject? Was it personal choice? Or was it the realisation that a translator was not a mere mediator, but an individual of decision and voice? The translator also confessed to having omitted some political speculations concerning past events, which might suggest she was well acquainted with the history and the current political situation in the country and might have feared to introduce some debatable issues, possibly attracting more attention. This might also support the idea that the decision not to translate political speculation could have been made for the sake of maintaining her, or her family’s, name unexposed to criticism or condemnation, just like the decision to conceal the name of the translator. The justification of possible inelegance of style by the fact that the book had been intended to be very short again might imply that there were more than a few omissions.

In the preface to her translation of Anselm Ritter Von Feuerbach’s *Narratives of Remarkable Criminal Trials* published 1846, Lucie Duff Gordon also admits to having abridged the text. She writes:

> I have selected those trials which appear to me to possess the greatest general interest, and, in obedience to the suggestions contained in a most interesting article in the last-named journal, I have abridged them to little more than half their original length. I hope that I have nevertheless succeeded in preserving the main outline of every trial, filled up with just so much of detail as will serve to give a tolerably faithful picture of crimes common to all nations, treated in a manner very widely differing from our own. (x)

It is not surprising that Duff Gordon does not apologize for her abridgment and even indicates the length to which the trial descriptions were condensed. This might have been a regular practice. On the other hand, the idea of a possible inadvertent disregard for detail might be sensed in her craving to preserve a main outline that still retains an adequately precise picture of events.

Waterfield (1937) argues that Lucie most probably would have only found a little fame for translation and more as “a talented and attractive hostess”, if it were not for her illness, which forced her to move and live in Egypt (3). The historian stresses Lucie’s strength as an outstanding writer with exceptional qualities (*ibid.*). In Egypt, although still involved in translation and editing, she could not resist the temptation to reveal her perfect literary talent. Unlike her mother, who always feared and thought she was not capable of writing herself, Lucie wrote two collec-
tions of letters: *Letters from Egypt*, 1863-1865, edited by her mother and published in 1865 in England and the United States,¹ and *Last Letters from Egypt*, edited by her daughter, Janet Ross, and published posthumously. For modern researchers, the *Letters* collections offer a lot more than the usual travel writing of British women at the time: “The letters of Lady Duff Gordon, who lived in Upper Egypt in the 1860s, provide the kind of source material that can be used to explore Egyptian attitudes as well as her own British ones” (Wheatley 82). Wheatley finds Lucie Duff Gordon’s writings capable of revealing “subtle and complex interactions between cultures” (82), Egyptian and British, most probably because Lucie was extremely open, vivid and straightforward in disclosing the peculiarities of Egyptian life. It seems that she did enjoy her observations of life in Egypt and the Egyptian people and was satisfyingly overt in her writings where she often asked for tolerance towards Egyptian life and culture (Wheatley 98). The receptiveness and broad mindedness revealed in her letters most probably would not have been welcomed by her mother Sarah Austin who edited her text to omit the most dangerous and open observations. On the other hand, Lucie most probably did not mind her mother editing her letters since, although she felt content with her translations, she was not exactly satisfied with her writing style (Frank 299-300).

A number of historians and researchers have judged Lucie Duff Gordon to have been a distinguished travel writer. Her translations, although excellent, appreciated and republished, might have been for the most part overlooked and consequently underestimated. Upon closer scrutiny, they might demonstrate the internal conflict that a lively, independent and well-educated woman of poor health went through living in the middle of two very different societies. On the one hand, Lucie Duff Gordon was obliged by society, her education and above all by her mother to adhere to rigid attitudes and values. On the other, she spent a substantial period of her adult life in Egypt, a society of brutal but elemental power and beauty, where her own innate liberty was almost certainly uplifted and unsuppressed.

### 4. FINAL IMPLICATIONS

Sarah Austin and Lucie Duff Gordon are recognised British women translators of the 19th century. On the subject of their views on translation, as revealed in the prefaces and introductions to the translated and/or edited texts they worked on, both women practiced similar methods in their translations. Although Lucie Duff Gordon was a generation younger than Sarah Austin and most probably is naturally expected to have been more liberal, it might be said that, like her own mother, she regularly practiced abridgment, omissions and similar modifications —i.e. censorship— of the texts she translated. Through such practices, the women made their voices heard; by abridging and removing parts of original texts, which

---

¹ Private edition (Frank 322).
possibly discuss some of the dangerous and controversial issues of the time, they unveiled their fears, values and attitudes.

Both translators spent years abroad. Sarah Austin admired the German way of life and its political system and wanted to introduce German values into English society. For this reason, she translated and edited a number of political and sociological texts; almost all of her translations demonstrated certain political and social judgments and points of view. Lucie Duff Gordon was more interested in history than politics, which is revealed through her acknowledgement in the prefaces of translated volumes that she omitted political speculations, thus demonstrating her indifference or ignorance of politics. Duff Gordon’s residence in Egypt seems to have inspired her to more than just translate. She also contributed to travel literature with her own writing about the Egyptian way of life. Thus, it may be stated that living abroad essentially influenced the translation and related practices of both women.
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