

Analysis of literary translations.

Milton: *Paradise Lost*

etadadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

provided by Dipos

Rosa M^a Flotats i Crispi
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Undertaking the task of commenting some translations of *Paradise Lost* may seem hard, absurd, boring, and maybe a waste of time to some receptors who feel in a somewhat contrary way towards this great poet, John Milton. Even though he is much known in the academic world, he is not necessarily a popular figure. It can be due to his bold and direct beliefs which he never hesitated to defend and make known by publication. His thought derived through voracious reading and deep thinking was far advanced for his age and includes ideas which are closer to the 20th-century than to his own age, the 17th-century. Advanced for his age, but a man of his age, he seems to have been eternally misplaced and often misunderstood. This is even more remarkable nowadays when we realise that his works, especially his poetry, can be read under different lights. He dealt with a great variety of topics belonging to human knowledge and understanding. Not only theology, but history and politics, amongst others, were concerns of his for which he wrote long, deeply, and condensely. It is well-known that he took freedom, or “liberty”, as he would say, as standard and axis of his thought. Milton joined with the popular claim for freedom against an all powerful totalitarian Monarchy, and defended the establishment of a Republic in a period of Civil War and Revolution caused by religious and political disagreements.¹

In this age of profound change and disturbances, Milton participated in the events of the nation with his “pen”. Not a real soldier himself, he decided to make use of the ability he was most confident with. His prose works exhibit great learning and skill in combining rhetoric with deep thought, characteristics of the Renaissance and especially of Humanist writers following Cicero’s belief in combining *sapientia*, wisdom that contains knowledge of human and divine things, with *eloquentia*, or the capacity of expressing thought in a beautiful and persuasive manner.² However, he also followed the trend of

using poetry, or art, as a means to communicate ideas, feelings or new discoveries with a didactic objective since it was widely believed that in this way learning was more pleasurable and, therefore, more effective.

The pleasure of the ear, that is, the musicality of poetry, and the pleasure of the visual imagination stimulated by metaphor, allegory, and other poetical tropes was used to convey the deepest thought and learning. Milton was no exception to this fashion. His main concern was Man, his welfare and everything related to him. As the Humanists, he gave emphasis on human values and on the dignity of Man highlighting freedom as an inherent right and endowing the human person with an internal capacity to use his freedom rightly, that is, to be able to make the “right choice”. *Paradise Lost* (PL), with its very structured form, offers an illustration of Milton’s humanism characterized by its closeness to rationalism. Composed by 10,565 lines distributed in twelve books, this great Christian epic of the Protestant tradition presents itself as a tapestry dealing with free will, the highest good virtues and vices, active and contemplative life, will, intellect, dignity of man, and theological issues such as the (im)mortality of the soul. Milton’s concern to acquire not only knowledge but also happiness is exposed in PL, which manifests the significance of order-harmony, knowledge-science, and liberty constantly intertwining and conditioning each other. A balanced combination of these issues constitutes a basic requirement to reach this longed-for happiness and welfare of the human being.

Should this poem be read or not is a decision that belongs to the reader. However, reasons to read it are multiple and not necessarily conditioned to a good education of the classics and of the history of the British nation, even though this is what Milton would most certainly have preferred. Nevertheless, PL does not require a Christian reader to enjoy the poem as, in agreement with Michael Fixler, the significance of the poem is in the poem itself. He says that PL “seeks its own transcendence by showing the poet in his creation to be like God”,³ and the reader to be the hero as it usually happens in any imaginative work.⁴ Other reasons are to be found connected with Milton’s intention to establish certain objections on standard dogma, religious and political mainly, and to motivate the reader. Such instigation plus the poem’s poetical beauty with the interest for the aforementioned questions still worrying the modern person such as the existence of God, the validity of dogma, the reason why God allows for so much misery in the world, which in a way seems to be questioning God himself, together with scientific proposals like the Copernican theory on the Earth rotation around the Sun⁵ and considerations about the origin of the universe make of PL a very dense and interesting poem. Milton, with his concern for every aspect of the common person and with his incredible artistic gift, makes of us and our life a work of art in itself. He seems to be suggesting that living is another art based on our capacity to choose, on our inherent freedom.

We shall see how freedom is dealt with, how it applies to three fields, namely “three species of liberty: religious, civil, and domestic” as Milton himself explains in his biographical pages in the *Second Defence*:

...to turn my thoughts to other subjects; to the promotion of real and substantial liberty; which is rather to be sought from within than from without; and whose existence depends, not so much on the terror of the sword, as on sobriety of conduct and integrity of life. When, therefore, I perceived that there were three species of liberty which are essential to the happiness of social life - religious, domestic, and civil.⁶

These lines, obscure as they may seem, underline the idea that freedom must be regulated by reason, which is made specific with the terms “sobriety” (or regulation) and “integrity” (proper conduct). We shall also see how all these intertwining ideas have been transferred and understood in three translations of PL.

The idea that there are some intentions underlying a text has already been hinted in this paper. Intentions and the final objective of the author for producing the work under concern need to be interpreted and isolated by the reader in order to understand the work itself. Whatever the nature of these intentions may be, aesthetic or conceptual, or both aesthetic and conceptual, the interpreter needs to perceive and grasp them in order to reach the meaning of the work. The need of the author to communicate something appears as a first stimulus for the production of a work which usually results of objectives and means generally agreeing with the creative nature of the artists who very often draw from their own experience. According to Harry Frankfurt in his article “On the Usefulness of Final Ends”,⁷ making sense of one’s own experience of life will help the receptor, or interpreter, when trying to approach a concrete work. An understanding that may be derived from this idea of making sense of life is that there is an element of subjectivity on the part of both, sender and receptor. Not only the sender or author of a text may feel the need to communicate something which is after all an activity with a final purpose; but the receptor also has some subjective tendencies and limitations that are meant to condition the understanding of the text, that is, the receptor will tend to grasp some cultural aspects better than others, like, for instance, someone with a musical ear may notice the musicality of the poem before realising the content. Therefore, we have the unavoidable questions of what is to interpret a text and how to do it. The intentions of the author often exhibit themselves under metaphor, irony, indirect speech and other tropes and processes. The experience of the reader, which is basically his capacity to understand reality, will undoubtedly help him to approach the author, no matter how distant in space and time they may be.

The question of what “interpreting a text” means is an important issue when dealing with the future task of translating a given work. That is, the

translator is an interpreter first, and only afterwards does he become an author, which means he has had to produce a close reading in order to reach the full significance and particularities of meaning of the text. A microlevel analysis of some extracts of PL with their respective translations is proposed to see how the Miltonic thought has been understood and transferred by three translators: Josep M. Boix i Selva, Esteban Pujals, and Abilio Echevarría.

In order to facilitate the task, we shall concentrate on the topic discussed above and which is basic for Milton, “freedom”. The difficulties of translating PL may seem to increase due to the conceptuality of the poem. A religious epic with a narrative that is repeated in different ways exhibits, as a main issue of the plot, the Fall, first of the angels and then of Man. A second issue deals with its consequences and with the reaction of the characters involved. Seen under this global significance, it may seem as if it could be an easy translation, for being an epic it must contain a narrative, and the target version could understandably concentrate on the plot as a main issue. However, this is not the case as it can be seen in the versions of the three translator-poets. They have managed to keep the form as well as the content rather close to the original, with the exception of Echevarría, who opted for a different prosody typical of Spanish epic poetry.

We are relying on the translators authority as interpreters of PL due to the close and full reading they have performed, their empathy with the original author, together with all the work and study they have needed to undertake in order to solve constant difficulties and to avoid sacrificing too many things. In order to facilitate the comprehension of the analysis and to study relations between the different target language texts, they will be numbered according to the suggested method of comparing texts and describing translations in José Lambert and Hendrick van Gorp’s article, “On Describing Translations”.⁸ Thus, T1 stands for Source Text; T2 for the Catalan version by Boix i Selva; T3 for the 1986 Spanish version by Pujals; and, T4 for the 1993 Spanish version by Echevarría. They will also be indexed in order to distinguish the different passages under discussion. Thus:

T1a = first original extract `a`. `T` stands for text, `one` for the source language (SL), and `a` is the actual index of one concrete extract.

T2a = the Catalan version of T1a. `Two` stands for Boix i Selva’s translation and `a` is the actual index of the same extract.

T3a = the first Spanish version of T1a. `Three` stands for Pujals’s translation and `a` is the actual index of the same extract.

T4a = the second Spanish version of T1a. `Four` stands for Echevarría’s translation and `a` is the actual index of the same extract.

The first step in the following analysis is to present an extract of T1 properly indexed, then the analysis of its key words submitted in bold type

followed by a commentary on them and the general meaning of this extract. The second step will consist on the presentation of its Catalan translation: how the key words have been transferred and understood. The third step will follow the same process with Pujals' extract T3 with the same index. The fourth step, following the same process, will present the corresponding T4 accordingly indexed. Finally, a general discussion of the three translations will be offered. Therefore, the process followed is composed of five steps:

1. Presentation of T1 properly indexed and a comment on its key words, submitted in bold type, and on its general meaning.
2. Presentation of T2 accordingly indexed submitting the key words in bold type, and a general comment on the semantic transference of the translation.
3. Presentation of T3 accordingly indexed submitting the key words in bold type. It follows the same process as with T2.
4. Presentation of T4 accordingly indexed submitting the key words in bold type. It follows the same process as T2 and T3.
5. This is the final step and it includes a general view of the three translations to contrast the different interpretations, and to highlight the transference of concrete ideas and thoughts.

The passage that shall be discussed first belongs to Book III (103-18) and manifests the concept of freedom in relation to reason. It is a part of a conversation between the Father and the Son; it brings forward the difference between “decree” and “command”. God’s high decree is freedom, and His command refers to the Law. Lines (103-18) focus on free will and the capacity of Man to choose right. A justification on the reason why Man should be free is given in terms of excluding necessity. There is also a clear rejection of Predestination:

T1a

Not free, what proof could they have given sincere
 Of true allegiance, constant faith or love,
 105 Where only what they need must do, appeared,
 Not what they would? What praise could they receive?
 What pleasure I from such obedience paid,
 When Will and reason (reason also is choice)
 Useless and vain, of freedom both despoiled,
 110 Made passive both, had serve necessity,
 Not me. They therefore as to right belonged,
 So were created, nor can justly accuse
 Their maker, or their making, or their fate,
 As if predestination overruled

- 115 Their will, disposed by absolute decree
 Or high foreknowledge; they themselves decreed
 Their own revolt, not I: if I foreknew,
 Foreknowledge had no influence on their fault,
 (III. 103-18)

The key words “allegiance” and “obedience” both refer to the law to be followed, to the submission and acceptance of God’s command. It is clear that such submission must be “true” and in order to be true it needs to be “free”, thus the rejection of “necessity”. Line 108: “will and reason (reason also is choice)” indicates the capacity of Man to make the right choice. God has already explained that He created Man in His image and capable. The distinction between decree and command is made evident in this passage. Milton conscientiously differentiates “decree” and “high foreknowledge”. The qualifier “absolute” that accompanies “decree” seems to change its meaning into a more pejorative one conveying a dictatorial sense; however, this could be understood differently as here “absolute” may be thought to mean “perfect, pure and unlimited”.⁹ It also presents a certain liberal understanding of the doctrine of Predestination. “Necessity” is excluded from the doctrine of free will.¹⁰ In relation with Predestination, lines (114-18) indicate that God knows but He does not predetermine. He can foresee the decision they (angels, men) will make and He offers the means to change their wrong decisions, but he never imposes them.

The first translation we shall discuss is Boix i Selva’s:

T2a

No essent pas lliures ¿quina prova franca
 d’amor i fe constant i obediència
 n’hauria mai pogut tenir, si ho fóra
 d’actes que haurien fet forçats a fer-los,
 i no de res volgut? ¿Quina lloança
 llavors podrien rebre, i jo, quin gaudi,
 si amb Voler i amb Raó (que també és Tria)
 exempts de llibertat, tots dos inútils,
 vans i passius, haurien retut culte
 a la Necessitat, no a mi? Vaig fer-los
 tal com de dret s’esqueia, i no els és lícit
 d’acusar el Creador o bé llur natura
 o bé el Destí, com sí, amb decret despòtic,
 Predestinació tingués sotmesa
 llur voluntat, o amb l’alta presciència;
 ells mateixos dictaren llur revolta;
 no vaig pas ésser jo: si la preveia,

no influí pas la meva presciència
en la revolta llur,

(Cant Tercer p. 94-5)

The key words “allegiance” and “obedience” are condensed in one single term “obediència” which accounts for both. The omission of one of these terms does not posit any problem for the understanding of T2a. The sense is conveyed just the same as it is a bit redundant in the original. “Will” and “reason” have been transferred as “Voler” and “Raó” (108), “will” becomes “voluntat” in (115). “Voler” and “voluntat” are synonyms,¹¹ the choice of these two terms may have been thought for aesthetic or prosodic purposes. “Raó” in Catalan has the same connotations “reason” has in English. Notwithstanding the omission in line 108, “que també és Tria”, this posits no problem as its antecedent is immediately preceding it. The idea that “reason also is choice” has been faithfully transferred. Rejection of “necessity” gets some emphasis with “retut culte”, a liberal translation of “serve”; it has a stronger sense than “servir”, the literal translation. Such a choice shows that Boix i Selva was concerned with expressing Milton’s belief in freedom and against necessity. “Absolute decree” becomes “decret despòtic” concentrating on and reinforcing Milton’s opinion about Predestination. The use of the qualifier “despòtic” gives the phrase political connotations. The use of “presciència” for “foreknowledge” appears as a literal translation. According to the OED, a synonym of “foreknowledge” is “prescience”, just like in Catalan. It is not surprising to find transferences of words which seem to be exact equivalences, because they are usually derived from Latin. The influence of Latin language is strong in the three languages.

Pujals’ version is the next extract to comment:

T3a

De no ser libres ¿qué sincera prueba
Pudieran haber dado de adhesión
Verdadera, fe constante y amor,
Al hacer solamente lo debido
Dado el momento y no lo deseado?
¿Qué elogio pudieran recibir? y yo
¿Qué gozo obtener de esa obediencia,
Cuando la voluntad y la razón
(Razón es también elección) inútiles
Y vanas, ambas de libertad exentas,
Ambas pasivas, a la necesidad
110 Servido hubieran, y no a mí? Por tanto
Como de derecho fueron así
Creados y no pueden con justicia

Acusar al Creador, a su substancia
 Propia a su destino, como si
 La predestinación su voluntad
 Dominara, y de ella dispusiera
 Por decreto absoluto o previsión
Suprema; ellos mismos decretaron
 Su propia rebelión, no yo. Si la preví,
 Mi presciencia no influyó en su delito,
 (Llibre III, p. 153)

This version is very faithful to the original. The first key word, “allegiance”, has been transferred as “adhesión” which signifies agreement and submission.¹² The next one, “obedience”, is literally translated by Pujals. The question about the true obedience and its subjection to freedom has also been transferred literally. “Will” and “reason” become “voluntad” y “razón”; following “inútiles/Y vanas” for “Useless and vain”, and “ambas de libertad exentas” for “of freedom both despoiled”. Such literal translation indicates the similarity of both languages when dealing with certain topics. Theology, religion and the classics are themes that use terminology which in most cases derives from Latin and Greek. Hence, the extraordinary frequent coincidences between the three languages.

Echevarría’s version is the next to be analysed:

T4a

No libres ¿qué sincera prueba presentarían
 de una obediencia auténtica, de amor y fe constante,
 haciendo lo que sólo debían por la fuerza,
 no lo que hacer querían? ¿Qué elogio iba a valerles
sumisión semejante a ellos, a mí que gozo,
 cuando inútiles, vanas, de libertad ayunas,
voluntad y razón (también libre albedrío
es la razón) a fuerza mayor servido hubieran,
 no a mí, pasivas ambas?

Así creado el hombre
 como cumple a derecho, no puede con justicia
 acusar al que le hizo, ni a su obra, ni al destino;
 como si, decidida por decreto absoluto
 o por suma presciencia, la predestinación
 su voluntad hiciera nula. Él ha decretado
 su propia rebeldía, no yo; si la he previsto,
 mi presciencia no tuvo influencia en su culpa,

(Libro III, p. 75-6)

A different synonym for “allegiance” and “obedience” is found in this translation, “sumisión”, although it gives the same connotations. “Obediencia”, commented above, posits no special problems. The overall transference of the semantic content is faithful to the original. Other key words like “will”, “reason”, “absolute decree”, and “foreknowledge” have been transferred literally. As mentioned above, the possibility is not surprising due to semantic coincidences between the two languages when referring to certain fields of knowledge. The translator shows preference for “presciencia” and repeats it instead of using another option as Pujals does. It is worth noticing the explanatory transference of “fuerza mayor” for “necessity”. Here, Echevarría specifies all the connotations that “necessity” had for Milton. It implied something done by force with no possibility of choice, hence “fuerza mayor”. The aforementioned ambiguity gets some light in this translation, he (Echevarría) applies “decreto absoluto” to Predestination. This is the same understanding of the other two translators, although the original could be understood differently. By “absolute” Milton may have meant to signify in this concrete example “independent, unconditional”,¹³ thus the receptor would think of God’s high decree which is free will.

There is general coincidence with the literal translation of the words “love”, “fault”, and “faith”. The choice Pujals and Echevarría make to transfer the concept of “obedience”, “adhesión” (T3a), “sumisión” (T4a), “obediencia” (both) indicates interest in expanding its sense to that of “loyalty and respect”, apart from “submission”.

Other key words like “reason”, “necessity”, and “fate” are translated literally in the three target language texts. With the word “choice” we find more variation. In T2a, the statement “reason also is choice” has been translated into the relative clause “que también es Tria” avoiding the repetition of “Raó”, which is its antecedent. Pujals in T3a repeats the word “razón” just like the original “Razón es también elección”, he keeps a full [S V O] clause; finally, Echevarría in T4a offers a very interesting case by reversing the order of the phrases: [S V O] “reason also is choice” becomes [O (PC) V S] “También libre albedrío es la razón”. Instead of “elección”, which is a more literal translation, he has decided for a very much of a Miltonic expression that signifies what is really meant by “choice”, “libre albedrío”.¹⁴

In spite of some slight differences, the meaning of the word “freedom” has been fully and faithfully transferred, the use Milton makes of it stands clear in the three versions. The interrelation of concepts is also made evident thus reinforcing the belief that Milton subjected true “liberty” to reason and knowledge, or truth.

T2a stresses the importance of key-words by capitalizing them. What is a question, or an emphasized thought is duly signalled with the use of punctuation marks stating the translator’s understanding and interpretation.

The avoidance of repetition, as in the case with the word “reason”, is meant for poetical purposes and internal rhythm. The capitalization of key-words permits the verse to be adapted to poetical requirements.

Pujals is also very careful with the punctuation and marks that he uses to leave his understanding clearly expressed. He does not seem to be bothered by the use of certain repetition since it is found in the original as well. His sentences and clauses are easy to discern which, in a way, facilitates the reading.

Echevarría makes use of linguistic techniques to produce a sonorous impact, and also to emphasize the content of the concrete phrase under transformation. An example is found with the expression “de libertad ayunas” which undergoes a change of line in the poem. Such fronting may quite easily be considered an indication of the interpreter’s understanding and evaluation. He is stressing further the importance Milton gave to this idea by giving it preference.

With the next example we shall see how happiness is conditioned to choosing right. Raphael, the angel sent down to talk to Adam, gives him all the necessary information by explaining in full detail the life of the angels and the Fall of Satan in order to offer Adam a clear picture of what happens when making the right and the wrong choice. This following extract is from Book V (235-39) and it belongs to the moment when God sends Raphael to warn Adam.

T1b

Happiness in his power left free to will
 Left to his own free will, his will though free,
 Yet mutable; whence warn him to beware
 He swerve not too secure: tell him withal
 His danger,

(V, 235-39)

The key words in this extract indicate the Miltonic concept that happiness depends on choice. According to E.M.W. Tillyard the presentation of contrasts is necessary to reinforce the idea of free will,¹⁵ and, for Milton, Satan was intended to be a terrible warning. In this extract the warning is in the surface and the contrast is in the underlying content: heaven and hell. What heaven signifies is directly opposed by what hell does. If happiness is to be found in the proximity of God, Satan can only offer misery. Therefore, to choose right is to choose God’s ways. Repetition indicates and highlights Man’s free will which knows how to choose right, and it is used to emphasize two premises: one, man is left to his own free will; and two, this free will is “mutable”, which means he may choose right or wrong. If he chooses wrong, the consequences imply a lot of suffering, thus, “Beware” is meant to awake

the awareness of constant danger. The verse “He swerve not too secure” hints to the constant decision-making of everyday life.

T2b

de la ventura
 que posseïx, que fou deixada lliure,
 deixada lliure al seu ben lliure arbitri,
 però mutable tanmateix. Avisa'l
 que eviti molt i molt d'esgarriar-se
 per massa confiat: sobretot, digues-li
 quin perill té,

(Cant Cinquè, p. 173)

Boix i Selva has translated “happiness” as “ventura”, word that has a poetical impact for the listener. He faithfully keeps the repetition of the original in “deixada lliure, / deixada lliure al seu ben lliure arbitri”. The idea “left free to will” has been kept with the same emphasis as with the original; danger is introduced with “però mutable tanmateix”. The next key word “beware” seems to have posited some problems as it is conveyed using the whole verse in which the meaning of the verb “to swerve” is included: “que eviti molt i molt d'esgarriar-se”. “Beware” has been omitted and “molt i molt d'esgarriar-se” used instead. The intention of the translator seems to be directed towards this warning. As seen, the general concept has been duly transferred.

T3b

Y que la dicha se halla en su poder
 Y a merced de su libre voluntad;
 Su voluntad que aunque libre es mudable;
 Y aconséjale que no se extravíe
 Por sentirse demasiado seguro.
 Dile además que se encuentra en peligro,

(Libro V, p. 232)

“Happiness” becomes “dicha” in T3b. The idea that it is entirely in the power of Man is clearly stated in this version. Repetition, so remarkable in the original (three times free will) loses part of its strength by being restricted. “Mutable” becomes “mudable”, a literal translation that indicates variability, a possibility of change. The translator may be willing to express the sinful nature of Adam. The meaning of “beware” is conveyed within the whole verse: “Y aconséjale que no se extravíe”. The content has been duly transferred.

T4b

le recuerden, la dicha propia, la cual depende
 de su arbitrio, su propio arbitrio libre, suyo

pero libre y, con todo, mudable: se lo adviertes,
 no yerre por creerse seguro en demasía.
 Advértele asimismo del peligro que corre,
 (Libro V, p. 140)

“Dicha” is the word used for “happiness” like in T3b. Repetition of “free will” has been respected. It seems the intention of the translator to use it to convey meaning as in the original. This characteristic repetition recalls Biblical narrative and serves a purpose of emphasis, maybe to call the attention of the reader.¹⁶ The phrase “Yet mutable” becomes “y, con todo, mutable”, so the idea is exactly the same. Echevarría condenses the sense of “beware” in one phrase, “se lo adviertes”, thus avoiding the repetition in “warn” and “beware”. The underlying contrast of happiness and misery is brought to the surface by means of a warning, which has been respected in T4b.

The impact of the repetitive narrative is remarkable. Milton uses it constantly for several reasons: to highlight the belief that is being dealt with, to encourage a process of adjustment by not letting the reader forget the important issues, and to recall the Biblical rhetoric in order to think of it. It has been observed how this resource is considered important by the translators as the three of them keep some kind of repetition in their versions. It is also important for the sonorous impact it produces. There is a slight variation with the translation of the key-words in this little extract. T2b and T4b use the same expression “lliure arbitri”, “libre arbitrio” for “free will”; however, T3b has translated it as “libre voluntad”. Apparently they all mean the same, but the two words “arbitrio” y “voluntad” have a distinctive connotation, the first is more restricted and therefore it is used at a more personal level as it refers to the actual capacity of making a choice; the second has a wider range of concepts and it can be applied to a group of people or a community, apart from having the sense of the first as well. When considering the context and use of “voluntad” in this instance, it seems as if the translator had used it for alliteration purposes as the two sounds /b/ and /v/ are homonymous in Spanish, and he could reproduce one form of repetition that would recall the original. The difference in meaning is not really relevant here. As far as the word “warn” is concerned, T2b and T4b exhibit a more literal translation, “avisa” and “advierete”; whereas T3b shows a different choice, “aconséjale” (advise him).

The idea of God worrying for what is going to happen to Adam and the strengthening the concept of free will receives in the original have been duly transferred in the three TLTs. This extract does not seem to have represented any special problem apart from that of the repetition.

As a matter of conclusion, it should be pointed out that the importance of freedom in the Miltonic thought gets properly transferred in the three TLTs. The importance the three target language authors have given to the structure

of the poem, its form together with its content, is manifested in the result they have produced: a combination of a literal and a free version. Also, the outstanding literalness often rendered arises the suspicion that PL itself encourages such literalness not allowing for much variation. Considering that Milton uses repetition to convey rhythm, but also to help remembering important concepts underlying his thought, the translators must have felt that their “liberty” when translating is conditioned and constrained. Another factor that impels the use of literal transference is the almost exact equivalence of some terms and phrases between the original and both target languages, probably due to their Latin origin.

NOTES

1. See Douglas Bush, *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth-Century. 1600-1660* (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1945) Chapter I «The Background of the Age» p. 1-38 and Chapter XII “Milton” p. 359-98.
2. Schmitt & Skinner (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy* (C.U.P. 1988. Last pub. 1992) p. 61-5. Also Jerrold E. Seigel, *Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism* (Princeton University Press. Princeton, New Jersey 1963) Especially Part One: «Rhetoric and Philosophy: The Ciceronian Model», p. 3-30.
3. Michael Fixler, «Milton’s Magnanimous Reader» in *Modern Philology*. Vol. 82. No. 3. February 1985, p. 310-14.
4. Ibid. Also, for the idea of reader’s self-identification and the texts allegories see John P. Rumrich «Uninventing Milton» in *Modern Philology*. Vol. 87. No. 3. February 1990. p. 249-65.
5. Book VIII in PL deals with astronomy and there different theories current in the 17th-century are discussed and questioned.
6. John Milton, «The Second Defence» (ProPopulo Anglicano Defensio Secunda) in *John Milton. Selected Prose*. The Worlds Classics. Edited by M. W. Wallace (O.U.P. London 1925. This reprint 1963), p. 389-90.
7. Harry Frankfurt, «On the Usefulness of Final Ends» in *IYYUN*. The Jerusalem Philosophical Quarterly. Vol. 41 January 1991, p. 3-19.
8. Theo Hermans (ed.), «On Describing Translations» by José Lambert and Hendrick van Gorp in *The Manipulation of Literature*, p. 42-53.
9. Shorter OED, II.3 and IV.4.
10. See Alastair Fowlers note to lines (III. 113-23) in his edition of *Paradise Lost* (Longman Annotated Texts. Longman 1968, 1971). This is the edition of PL that has been used for this paper. See also note III. 110: “God disassociates himself from Necessity or Fate, which has become the devils idea of the supreme power.”, p. 149.
11. PF (*Dictionary Pompeu Fabra*). Voler, tenir l'intenció determinada // voluntat.

12. RAE (*Diccionario de la lengua española. Real Academia Española*) 2. convenir en un dictamen. Acción de adherirse.
13. OED III.a. arbitrary, despotie. IV. 11. Of persons and things. Free from all doubt or uncertainty; positive; perfectly certain; decided. IV. 12.a. Of statements. Free from conditions or reservations; unreserved; unqualified; unconditional.
14. RAE 1. potestad de obrar por reflexion y elección.
15. E.M.W. Tillyard *Milton* (Penguin 1968), p. 226-30.
16. See George William Smith «Iterative Rhetoric in *Paradise Lost*» in *Modern Philology*. Vol. 74. No. 1 August 1976, p. 1-19.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources:

- MILTON, John (1968): *Paradise Lost*. Ed. Alastair Fowler (Longman Annotated English Poets. Longman. London).
- (1953) *El Paradís Perdut*. Traducció i notes per Josep M. Boix i Selva. Alpha. Barcelona.
 - (1986) *El Paraíso perdido*. Edición y traducción de Esteban Pujals. Cátedra. Madrid:
 - (1993) *El Paraíso perdido*. Introducción de Claudio Rodríguez. Versión poética y notas de Abilio Echevarría. Planeta. Barcelona.

Other sources:

- BERAJANO, V. (1986): «Tres traducciones de un mismo texto poético latino». In: *Quaderns de traducció i interpretació*. No. 7 (p. 29-37) (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona).
- BENJAMIN, W. (1984): *Art i Literatura*. Traducció i introducció d'Antoni Pous. Manuel Carbonell (ed.) Eumo/Edipoes.
- BUSH, D. (1945): *English Literature in the Earlier Seventeenth-Century. 1600-1660*. Oxford. Clarendon Press.
- DANIELSON, D. (ed.) (1989): *The Cambridge Companion to Milton*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- FISH, S. (1967): *Surprised by Sin: The Reader in "Paradise Lost"*. University of California Press. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London. (This reprint 1971).
- FIXLER, M. (1985): «Milton Magnanimous Reader». In: *Modern philology*. Vol. 82. No. 3. February.
- (1977) «Platos Four Furors and the Real Structure of "Paradise Lost"». In: *PMLA*. Vol. 92. No. 5. p. 952-62.
- FRANKFURT, H. (1992): «On the Usefulness of Final Ends». In: *IYYUN*. Vol. 41. January, p. 3-19.

- GUILLÉN, C. (1985): *Entre lo uno y lo diverso. Introducción a la literatura comparada*. Crítica. Barcelona.
- HANFORD, J. H. (1950): *John Milton. Englishman*. Victor Gollancz. Camelot Press Ltd. London.
- HERMANS, T. (ed.) (1985): *The Manipulation of Literature*. Croom Helm.
- HILL, C. (1977:): *Milton and the English Revolution*. Faber & Faber. London (1985).
- KELLY, L. (1979): *The True Interpreter*. Basil Blackwell. Oxford.
- LEECH, G. (1969:): *A Linguistic Guide to English Poetry*. English Language Series, 4 Longman. London (This edition 1976).
- LOEWENSTEIN, D. (1993): *Milton. Paradise Lost*. Cambridge University Press.
- NEWMARK, P. (1981): *Approaches to translation*. Pergamon Institute of English. Pergamon Press. Oxford.
- RAFFEL, B. (1988): *The Art of Translating Poetry*. The Pennsylvania State University Press. University Park. London.
- RICKS, C. (1963): *Miltons Grand Style*. Oxford University Press. (1967).
- ROSE, M. G. (ed.) (1982-83): *Translation Perspectives. Selected Papers*. National Resource Center for Translation and Interpretation. Binghamton Site: SUNY-Binghamton. New York. (1984).
- RUMRICH, J. P. (1990): «Uninventing Milton». In: *Modern philology*. Vol. 87. No. 3. p. 249-65 February.
- SCHMITT, C. B. & SKINEER, Q. (eds.) (1988): *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*. Cambridge University Press. (Last reprint, 1992).
- SEIGEL, J. E. (1968): *Rhetoric and Philosophy in Renaissance Humanism*. The Union of Eloquence and Wisdom, Petrarch to Valla. Princeton University Press. Princeton, New Jersey.
- SMITH, G. W. (Jr.) (1976): «Iterative Rhetoric in “Paradise Lost”». In: *Modern philology*. Vol. 74. No. 1 August p. 1-19.
- STARNES & TALBERT (and others) (1955): *Classical Myth and Legend in Renaissance Dictionaries*. University of North Carolina Press. Reprint by Greenwood Press. Westport, Connecticut (1973).
- TILLYARD, E. M. W. (1968): *Milton. A Peregrine Book*. Penguin.
- VAN DE VEN, A. E. & ZWENEVELD, A. M. (eds.) (1983): *COLLOQUIUM 1983. Translation Studies*. Instituut voor Vertaalwetenschap. Amsterdam.
- WALLACE, M. W. (ed.) (1925): *John Milton. Selected Prose*. The Worlds Classics. No. 293. Oxford University Press. London (1963).
- WARREN, R. (1989): *The Art of Translation. Voices from the Field*. Northeastern University Press. Boston.
- WILSS, W. (1988): *La ciencia de la traducción. problemas y métodos*. Traducción de Gerda Ober Kirchner & Sandra Franco. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- WUILMART, F. (1989): «Lempathie dans la traduction litteraire». In: *IDIOMA*. No. 1 Bruxelles G.E.R.E.F.A., p. 33-43.