PARADISE LOST AND FOUND IN TRANSLATION

World-making through Mimesis of Translation

Inaugural-Dissertation
zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophie
der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität
München

vorgelegt von

Yola Teresa Schmitz
aus
Herrenberg
2022

Table of Contents

1. Mimesis – Translation – Epos – World-making

In Milton's heroic poem *Paradise Lost* Satan travels from hell to the gates of heaven and to the earthly paradise. Transgressing the vast abyss that separates the different realms Satan manages to sneak into Eden: on his journey, he changes form and language many times. Satan converses with demons, angels and men, and seemingly without any difficulties Satan adapts to whatever language he encounters. Satan changes into various animals – a cormorant, a toad and a serpent – and is compared to the Leviathan, a prowling wolf and other (mythical) creatures. Satan and his metamorphoses can be read as a symbol of mimesis and translation because of this adaptability. He is a chimaera integrating various personalities and origins with the ability to deceive and seduce, to relate and explain. Whatever Satan's ambitions in *PL* the ability to change, to converse with all kinds of beings makes him dangerous and effective. In *PL* Satan uses exactly this power of language when he seduces Eve and she tastes the forbidden fruit:

> Queen of this Universe, doe not believe
> Those rigid threats of Death; ye shall not Die:
> How should ye? by the Fruit? it gives you Life
> To Knowledge, By the Threatner? look on mee,
> Mee who have touch'd and tasted, yet both live,
> And life more perfet have attaind then Fate
> Meant mee, by ventring higher then my Lot. (*PL* 9.684-90)

Satan addresses Eve as 'queen of the universe' and minimizes death. By asking how death could ever threaten Eve, the empyreal being, in a highly rhetorical manner, Satan trivializes death. Before the fall, Eve has no understanding of death and cannot fathom its consequences. Satan persuades Eve eventually that no harm can come to her if she eats from the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Satan claims tasting the fruit has not harmed him either. Instead, Satan argues, the knowledge it provided him with gave him the opportunity to overcome his fate.

The attributes mentioned above – dangerous and effective –pertain to translation as well. Translation is a necessary task, a productive poetic tool and a vehicle for the preservation and distribution of knowledge. Yet translators and their work have always been met with suspicion. No translator would be necessary if everyone had access to every language. By default, a translator always comes into play when a problem of communication arises putting the

translator in the position of a go-between and mediator. The power of language and words becomes even more clear in these moments when control over one's own words must be handed over to somebody else. The discrepancy caused by this situation, the unevenly distributed information and the resulting lack of control, is reason enough to dismiss translation as a deceiving practice. Nonetheless, it remains indispensable. This suspicion and ambiguity has not led to an abolishment of translation, on the contrary, but it has inhibited or at least slowed academic research into its processes for a long time.

Mimesis, on the other hand, is concerned with questions of representation and especially with the imitation of nature in art. Imitation is distinguished from copying by way of its procedure. Mimesis follows the principles and methods of production in the sense of Kant's "Nachfolge" (*Critique of Judgment*, §32). Mimesis takes on a double perspective: It is concerned with the relation of the arts towards each other and the relation of a world that lies ahead of any artistic implementation. In contrast to the common understanding of the term mimesis the attention will not be placed on the relationship between the arts but between different languages, the mimetic relations in the processes of linguistic adaptation and transformation will come into focus. Taking on the double perspective of mimesis as well as translation necessitates a new understanding of mimetic practices and processes that are not included in the conventional understanding of the term. This new insight is one of the aims of this project.

Translators must put themselves in the position of the author. Not unlike an actor the translator assumes the role of the author and translation becomes a performative art that has a double function (see Dieter Zimmer 1997): integrating the source as well as adapting to the target context. The translator must make the source text their own and then transform it into a self-sufficient work of literature in the target language context. To understand the complex bonds between these two concepts and processes, the terms mimesis and translation signify you must acknowledge that both concepts share an interest in the understanding of the original, the replica and their relation. Translation must be understood as a process of imitation through which not only the work of the original author is replicated but also that the underlying reality represented in the original work is productively recreated. Consequently, translation should not be read as merely derivative:

mimesis can be regarded as a production principle of conceptions of reality, i.e. world-making.

Mimesis and translation often share a similar fate. They follow similar production principles and are both secondary to a source. They imitate or recreate a so-called 'original'. Although mimesis is often regarded with suspicion and considered deceitful, a pale imitation and a mere reproduction without intrinsic artistic value or merit, mimesis is one of the most common and most productive forms of artistic expression. From Plato's *Politeia* to more recent research, such as Stephen Halliwell's study *The Aesthetics of Mimesis* (2002), mimesis has been the cause of discussion and heated debate. Precisely because of these debates mimetic practices have proven to be a catalysts of art production. Mimesis is responsible for many art movements, be it in accordance with its principles or in contrast to them.[1] However, suspicion towards the practice and the assumption of the corruptible potential of mimesis has remained. Surprisingly, the significance of translation as a mimetic art has been largely neglected in theories of the mimetic. This project seeks to change this by contributing a perspective on translation as a mimetic art in epic poetry. Translation studies and interest in translation has risen hugely and it comes as no surprise that a lot of work is being published on the topic. The relation between epic and translation, however, especially in concern to these two works has not yet been done satisfactorily. I seek to fill in this gap.

Literary translations seek to convert a text from one language into another, they are by definition a mimetic recreation of the source. There are no amimetic translations. Usually literary translations imitate content but also features such as style and form are part of the linguistic transfer. This transfer moves not only from one language to another but often from one culture to another, from past to present, from one linguistic level to another or from one medium to another. If the source and the target product can be identified, the transfer, albeit suspicious or without so-called artistic value, might be clear and comprehensible.[2] Still many

---

[1] See for example the "Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood" in England in the second half of the 19th century. Their artistic programme was based on a rejection of contemporary trends set by the Royal Academy. Instead, they turned to older styles as is also expressed in the name of the group. By doing so, they created their very own recognizable form of art.

[2] The so-called 'black box' in which translation happens is of course the mind of the translator / interpreter. What goes on in there is notoriously difficult to see or describe. But with the source and the outcome at hand connections can be drawn and relations made visible.

forms of translation, even in the narrowest interlingual sense of translation, come to us in disguise or we are unable to place them.[3] This makes the identification much more difficult and alters the function of translation from a tool for information conveyance to a poetic device. Translation is not only a craft but also a mode of artistic performance. Translation is a form of intertextual reference, translations of passages, verses or even idioms, wordplays, plays on etymological meaning, creative introduction or application of loanwords, etc., interlingual translation becomes part of poetic production. As such, the sources can be more difficult to trace and are often disguised or intentionally not mentioned. On the other hand, there are occasions in which a text has been presented as a translation and features characteristics of translation although being an original production.

     'Mimesis of translation' can take on two different meanings. Read as a *genitivus subjectivus*, making translation the agent, it signifies a translation as an imitation of something, e.g. the source language or specific aspects of the source or the target language. Interpreted as a *genitivus objectivus*, the phrase makes translation the patient and denotes something, e.g. a text that imitates a translation. The intricate relationship between both these meanings is key to showing the significance of translation as a mimetic art. In fact, this relationship makes a valuable analysis of translation possible. In the following chapters I will demonstrate how this relationship is mutually dependent and how it can be employed as a productive method.

     To investigate the significance and application of 'mimesis of translation' I turn to two texts: John Milton's *Paradise Lost* (1667) and James Macpherson's *Poems of Ossian* (1773). *PL* and *Ossian* are both epic poems that emerge in similar circumstances, in situations of political uncertainty and unrest. Both *PL* and *Ossian* claim to be (national) epics. Neither is a translation but both feature characteristics of translation. They are prototypical examples of the genitive phrase 'mimesis of translation'. The questions then are: Which characteristics of translation do these texts feature? Why do they employ characteristics of translation and to what do the texts react? Why did the authors choose epic poetry and why do they emerge in that specific period?

---

[3] Consider for example Ezra Pound's early works and Willis Barnstone's discussion of them in *The Poetics of Translation* (1995: 98).

Milton implied translation when he used epic conventions and formulas in translation. Phrases such as "In the Beginning" are not only reminiscent of the opening lines of Genesis but a reference to the conventionalized English translation of these words also. Milton simulated a prelapsarian language, a language before the fall, and introduced his narrator as well as some of the characters as mediator for the reader: as a translator figure. Milton, the narrator, interprets the word of God for his audience. Macpherson, on the other hand, simulated a translation when he presented the *Poems of Ossian* as the newly discovered works of a 3rd century Scottish bard. The poems were portrayed as fragmentary and primitive. Their supposedly naïve and sublime beauty was well received in the rest of Europe. These diverging strategies and processes can be used to demonstrate the poetic productive relationship between translation and mimesis.

The thesis of this paper is that translation is a form of creation: through recreation, with specific extraordinary significance for epic poetry, translation is an intrinsic feature of its production principles. The analysis of mimesis and translation does not only provide a critical assessment of these terms but can also lead to a reappraisal of the relationship between translation and epos. Translation and mimesis are not merely derivative but productive in their own right; they are an engine for world-making. They create either new knowledge about an artefact or in turn produce a new artefact. Nelson Goodman describes world-making as rearranging, adding, deleting, and weighting; ergo as a process of recreation (1978) not ex nihilo but working with approximation and dissociation. According to Nelson Goodman the method of weighting works as follows:

> While we may say that in the cases discussed some relevant kinds of one world are missing from another, we might perhaps better say that the two worlds contain just the same classes sorted differently into relevant and irrelevant kinds. (1978: 10)

Weighting uses the same categories found in the source but assigns a different degree of importance to them. Through weighting the emphasis on either form or content may change and vary. A mimetic approach or a faithful translation of one aspect over the other might cause great disparity on the one side but simultaneously offer careful proximity to its predecessor on the other. The

mimetic procedure of translation allows for the incorporation of a foreign principle into the target culture and, at the same time, emancipates a given work from the constraints of its first context. There is a continuum ranging from literal translation to free adaptation and both epic poems used as case studies for this investigation can be situated on this spectrum.

This does not mean that there is no difference at all between the composition of a genuinely new literary work and a translated work. However, the difference is sometimes less in the 'originality' of the subject matter than in the various modes of presentation. The employment of translation as a poetic device and the gesture of its application have consequences for the understanding of authorship, the performance of authorship and the relation to tradition and genre. In this thesis, I will describe the characteristic features of interlingual translation as a form of mimesis a) in a context that has not been specifically identified as translation situations before, and b) in actual interlingual translations. I want show how far reaching the influences and consequences of the use of translation as a form of poetic text (re-)production and as a poetic device are. Both approaches were applied in literature, especially in epic poetry. The goal here is to show how a disregard for these supposedly derivative processes has neglected the development of an important perspective on how epic poetry works: how it works with translation as a poetic device and how it can absolutely instigate and contribute to world-making. This study, by describing translation as a poetic device and a mode of mimetic production, seeks to close this gap and to offer a perspective on these procedures.

Epic poetry as a literary form is rooted in antiquity. Famous precursors to the poems I will discuss in this text include *The Gilgamesh Epos*, *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey* by Homer, *The Aeneid* by Virgil, *Gerusalemme Liberata* by Torquato Tasso, and *La Commedia* by Dante Alighieri. Not only were these heroic poems translated into English but they also carried the epic genre itself was carried over to 17th and 18th century England. In England, the new genre these translations introduced produced successors such as Spenser's *The Fairy Queene* and the epics under investigation in this thesis. In addition to the genre's geographical dissemination epic narratives often quite literally deal with travel and transfer. The epic hero usually enters on an epic journey to either foreign countries or other

realms, e.g. the underworld (katabasis). These narratives are a form of carrying across (etym. translation). The carrying of the past into a (uncertain) present with the goal of legitimising new ventures often with themes such as nation-building or founding. Due to its recurring and formulaic features, as well as its origin in another language and culture, epic poetry lends itself particularly well to translation. The normative structure of the conventions allowed for formulaic translations which were then adopted and repeated by other authors. This adoption and repetition came to constitute a new normative rule within the new language/context.

Among the most prominent epic conventions are: a narrator, the separation into books, the use of elevated style, focus on one central figure and one main theme, epic journeys of heroes and role models, beginning in medias res, invocations, frequent use of epic similes, epithets, and passages of ekphrasis. The narrator figure and the epic's origins in oral tradition make the genre a mediated one: it was common for oral epics to be recited in front of an audience by a bard. Even in later written epics a bard or narrator figure is imagined through other conventions for example the invocation where the narrator directly addresses gods or muses for inspiration. Thus, epic poetry already has an interpreter figure at its centre. These conventions also found their way into the epic poems of England in the 17th and 18th century in translation from Greek, Latin, etc. These translation techniques as well as the narrator figure of the bard function as strategies of legitimation and displacement of authority and, consequently, epic poetry is also concerned with world-making. Epic poetry concentrates world history with a teleological aim claiming to find realisation in the present (prefiguration). The goal is the interpretation of dispersed history and tradition. An imperialist and nationalist agenda often gives reason to the use of this genre, especially during a time of emerging national identity and national languages.

For epic poetry, as for translation, creation is always recreation. Translation is a readdressing because in its process the audience changes and a reframing of the narrative occurs to fit the new context. Likewise, the formulaic structure of heroic poetry is reshaped to fit the new circumstance but in close adherence to its traditions. Epic poetry evokes connections to the past and establishes a tradition through repetition and reframing. This tradition is then understood as culminating in the contemporary time and place of its emergence,

justifying the agenda of the epic. It works as a form of historicist wish fulfilment by arguing that the whole tradition concludes in the events of their respective centuries. Epic poetry, thus, works in two directions: it connects the present to the past by association to a tradition establishing a causal relation (metaleptically) moving backwards, and the restoration of Edenic clarity as an attempt to redeem the fall by moving from past to present (accommodation). Furthermore, its world-making claim is manifest in the distance created through the amount of information and the demand of universal validity which is highlighted through the perspective assumed by legitimation via reference to historic or mythological authorities. Both epics I analyse perform this legitimation process via acts of translation.

Milton's epos *Paradise Lost* (1667) retells the Judeo-Christian myth of origin, Genesis, and offers a prediction of the future until the Last Judgment. A hermeneutical reading of and individual approach to scripture was considered the task of the believer: it is impossible to fully comprehend the word of God before the Last Judgement. Milton's aim was "not to make verbal curiosities the end (that were a toilsome vanity) but to be an interpreter and relater of the best and sagacious things" ("Reason of Church Government", Book II)**.** Translation as a hermeneutical tool to further understanding is, thus, not uncommon for Milton. In *PL*, Milton performs multiple acts of translation on many different levels and from biblical as well as classical sources. Milton showcases and interprets various communication situations, above all he translates for his fallen audience. Obviously, there is a paradox within the text production. As Milton himself, when writing *Paradise Lost,* was of course postlapsarian and could avail himself only to fallen language. He performed a back translation creating a language to simulate the experience of being in a state of prelapsarian bliss. The motif of translation and creation through translation is a central theme of *PL* which is reflected in the content. A language crisis seems to be at the heart of *Paradise Lost*. When the rebellious angels fall, they also fall from the language of God. This loss of their shared language caused the need to interpret, i.e. to translate.

While Milton claimed authorship for the retelling of a well-known narrative, Macpherson chose a different approach. Macpherson claimed to have found a long-lost epic poem from the Scottish Highlands composed by the bard Ossian at around 300 BC. This body of texts consist of various poems among

which two long poems, *Fingal* and *Temora*, are stylistically epic. Macpherson published the poems of *Ossian* as translations adding another degree of mimesis to his poems by framing them with another narrative. He did not present himself as the author of these works. Instead, Macpherson presented himself as the compiler and the translator of long lost ancient poetry of Scottish Gaelic origin. Macpherson introduced Ossian, the blind bard, as the homodiegetic narrator and thereby placed himself seemingly in the background. By postulating a written source, recreating an oral narrative and making himself the mediator between languages and times, Macpherson's mimetic strategies function on a meta level — the poems of Ossian are an imitation of a translation without a written pre-text.

The strategies Macpherson employs also require mimetic procedures in different stages: first Macpherson styled himself as a translator and expert. He made the publications seem like a typical translation of a classic: the poems themselves by reference seemed familiar and through linguistic tricks strange at the same time. Although Macpherson deliberately presented the poems of Ossian as translations of ancient texts and employed strategies to deceive his audience, 'mimesis of translation' in this context aims not at exposing the poems of Ossian once again as forgeries but will be the tool with which I want to identify what makes these texts sound and look translated.

Creation and recreation are central themes in both epics under discussion here – on a structural level through characteristics of translation and the choice of genre, and on a content level through the choice of their respective topics. Milton recreates the story of Genesis and the fall of man. Macpherson on the other hand recreates a mythical past for the oppressed Scottish people. Both epics develop during a period in which epic poetry had already lost its pragmatic and world-making significance: both authors nonetheless chose this genre especially with its world-making ability in mind. These two epic poems, during their respective times of emergence, are exemplary for the employment of these strategies and techniques. These techniques are employed with the goal of engaging in a debate about creation and origin.

The unique role of Milton's epos has roots in the complex and sophisticated mode of telling, especially in the varying uses of mimesis and translation. His aim is nothing less than "to justify the ways of God to men" (*PL* 1.26). Therefore, the analysis of *PL* is more rewarding and more informative. *PL*

is the main attraction of this study. Macpherson's *Ossian* functions as a counterpart and to offer a look at the other end of the spectrum. While Milton adapted a well-known text, Macpherson's sources and characters were rather obscure. His attempt to publish a work of his own, *The Highlander* (1758), was met with little to no success. The Ossianic 'translations' on the other hand gained immediate fame and notoriety, not least thanks to the heated and long-lasting debate about their authenticity.

The German translations selected for the comparative part are cross sections. While *PL* has been translated multiple times in the last centuries since its publication, *Ossian,* itself a fragmentary body of texts, has a different history. *Ossian* has often come into German in form of translated quotes or otherwise fragmentary forms. These German translations will not offer a comprehensive translation history of the two epics. However, they will serve to illustrate their predisposition for being translated and their continuing afterlife in another language.

The nature of this project involves a time span of over four centuries. Beginning with the publication of *Paradise Lost* in the 17th century and continuing to Macpherson's publication of *Ossian* in the 18th century, the translations of both primary texts will lead us through the following centuries, up to the 1960s translation of *PL* by Hans Heinrich Meier. This project won't be able to do full justice to the literary periods in which the translations emerged. The goal is to situate the texts in their context, to consider the implications that the literary period and political circumstances had on the emergence of these translations.

Translation is the point of convergence between literary studies and linguistics as well as between two languages and their respective cultures. It is applied linguistics and literary studies at the same time. This study seeks to avail itself to the methodology of both academic fields as they come together in translation studies. Both disciplines offer tools to approach translation and additionally both fields make use of translation as a tool to analyse and interpret texts. In linguistics, translation has often been considered such a self-evident approach that critical analysis of the method itself has been neglected. Literary studies often either ignore the fact that they are dealing with a translation or downplay the

effect. The implications of a literary tradition rooted in processes of translation is ignored because of this. This thesis attempts to consolidate the practice of translation as a generator of cultural artworks to explore the theoretic and aesthetic consequences derived and developed by translators and critics. In translation, theory and praxis are more closely interlinked than in many other artistic creation processes. The occupation of a translator requires them to interpret, reflect and position their rendition. Prefaces to translations have often offered valuable insight into the considerations of the translator and brought about translation theories of their own. Through the interface of translation studies, combining literary studies and linguistics, this project seeks to contribute to the theoretic and aesthetic category of mimesis with a fresh set of eyes. This new perspective on mimesis in epic poetry will offer a productive extension to the creative force of translation.

Translation as a practice and a theorem has repeatedly eluded simple assessment. A text translated by different translators will never come out exactly same and still, the texts translated might be of equivalent value and precision. Translation defies a simple answer as well as a simple narrative. Consequently, the goal of this study is not to find definitive answers to the question *What happens in translation?* But rather to observe and document how and when translation gains momentum in epic poetry steps out of its shadowy existence. Translation itself is a productive method. The investigation of translation and its methods in the production of a literary tradition is productive.

The following investigation is divided into three parts: In the first chapter I look at one epic poem that uses translation in search of divine and poetic inspiration, in the second chapter I look at an epos that claims to be a translation but endeavours to rescue a poetic past, and in the third chapter I will follow up on the productive methods set going by the epic poem *PL* and how this affected its interlingual translations into German. The goal is showcasing the inherent translational characteristics of epic poetry and to illuminate translation from three different directions. The investigation of translatedness in *PL* and *Ossian*, as well as the strategies of the translations into German, follows typical tropes of heroic poetry (epic conventions).

In the first part, I move from the outside in. Looking first at genre, form and the overall language situation in *PL*, I then turn to the narrator as a translator

figure: the communication within the epic, the character's dialogues, their varying communication according to whom they are communicating with and the changing parameters before and after the fall. I use the same approach for the first part on *Ossian*: beginning with its form and the debate about the authenticity of Macpherson's body of texts, followed by an analysis of the methods he applied and how they affected the distribution and success of the poems. For the last chapter, I offer a cross section of selected passages of *PL* in German translation.

2. Translation in *Paradise Lost*

PL is not a translation. Milton is the sole author of the epic and he never pretended to be anything else.[4] It is, however, the retelling of the fall based on the Book of Genesis. And so, there is source material on which Milton built his interpretation. His epic is secondary to the biblical texts and stands in reference to them. Without this source material, there would be no *Paradise Lost*. This still does not make *PL* a translation, but it allows for an observation of its structure regarding translation methods. In addition, there are multiple instances in which Milton uses translation as a productive and creative process within the epic. These structural methods and creative processes of translation within *PL* shall be the focus of the following examination.

The choice of epic as its genre alone locates the whole project in the context of translation. The tradition of epic poetry is deeply rooted in acts of translation including interlingual translation processes, adaptation of formulaic conventions, and cultural translation. Epic poems often seek to explain the mythical origin of heroes and peoples such as Odysseus and Aeneas and their descendants. These stories are also frequently stories of travels, of displacement, and have in Odysseus' case become eponymous of arduous and dangerous journeys: journeys like that of Aeneas in which he fled his home of Troy to found a new city on the hills of Rome. These epic heroes are "translated" from their homes to foreign places and bring with them their traditions but also the need to make them anew in their new settings. Obviously, questions of language and understanding are part of such travels and here the literal meaning of translation comes into play for the first time. New words and a new language must be created to tell those stories to those descendants that came after their epic heroes. Epic poetry finds those new words to carry their stories across into a new era that builds its foundation on heroic deeds done in other lands, in long past times, and not seldom in long lost tongues. The experience of alienness and the encounter of unfamiliarity are inherent parts of epic plot composition. They bring along, if not

---

[4] He has once been accused of having forged *PL*. The Scottish forger William Lauder tried to discredit Milton as a plagiarist in "An Essay on Milton's Use and Imitation of the Moderns, in his *Paradise Lost*" (1750) with very similar accusations that could have been made correctly against Macpherson.

the need to negotiate new means of communication, at least the awareness of foreignness and the possibility of translation.

Similarly, most readers of Milton's era had come to know the classic epics in translation as well. During the Renaissance, many classical writings were translated into English, sometimes directly, sometimes via other languages. Translations were thought to enrich the own culture and to bring closer the revered classical period of Homer and other authors. In 1616 George Chapman published *The Whole Works of Homer*, which had great influence on literary production in England both in terms of content and style. His translation became so influential that John Keats even dedicated a poem to Chapman's translation titled "On First Looking into Chapman's Homer". Curiously Homer becomes an attribute of Chapman's through the possessive, which shows the incorporating concept of translation during that period and the confidence of such absorptions.

Milton makes use of features of translatedness not only regarding the structure but also on an internal level. His comprehensive knowledge of literature and languages, including Greek, Latin, Italian, French and Hebrew, enabled him to see language in a diachronic and comparative manner. To a scholar like Milton, translation must surely have been one of the most customary tools of his trade. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that Milton employed processes of translation in *PL*. He even played with languages and different meanings in its composition: using literal translation, paraphrase, and word formation based on translation, such as the appropriation of etymological significations of loan words, Milton references translation as a practice and literature in translation as well as the use of translation as a metaphor.

Furthermore, the communication situation in *PL* is constantly precarious. Language and speech are strongly connected to the characters populating *PL*, including its narrator. Interpretation situations are frequent and with a change of role or status comes a change of language. There is an imbalance between fallen and unfallen characters. It keeps changing and creates new need for interpretation.

Finally, the theme of Milton's Christian epic is one of exile. The fall causes the necessity for and circumstance of migration, mediation and translation. With the loss of home comes the loss of language for Satan and his demons as well as for Adam and Eve, and consequently, for the reader and for the author himself. Yet, *PL* is also about the creative power of the word. God's creation is

based on a speech act and the pragmatic force of language that has continued to play an important role in Christian tradition.

Milton attempts to recreate the unfallen state of mankind by means of words and language. Translation serves him as a tool for reconciliation. In this religious context the act of re-assembling language, in the sense of putting it back together, attempts to offer a form of penance. Milton attempts a reinstatement of divine order and seeks to fulfil the longing for the lost state of bliss.

These instances, in which Milton draws on translation in the composition of *PL*, will be the focus of the following examination. Starting with the genre, the form, and Milton's language, I will then turn to the narrator and the characters. I will place emphasis on methodological translation structures on the one hand and concrete translation situations within the epic on the other. Looking at the structural elements which feature translation as a poetical principle, I hope to show that a language crises is a key concern of *PL:* that Milton approached this crisis of language through translational approximations to recreate a state of prelapsarian linguistic clarity.

2.1 Genre in Translation

In the 17th century, Milton could draw on a long tradition of epic poetry. Its origins date back to circa 2000 BC with the Babylonian epic of *Gilgamesh* and continued to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey,* to Dante's *Commedia*, Tasso's *Gerusalemme Liberata*, to the English predecessors *Beowulf* and Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. And Milton was very familiar with this tradition. Thanks to his wide knowledge of languages Milton would have read at least passages of theses epics in their original language of composition but he would also have knowledge of translated editions into English. This gave him a unique insight into the various translation decisions and interpretations of translators of epic poetry.

During the Renaissance, an epic tradition based on translations of the classics and the imitation of Homeric style had already developed and the rapid increase of translations into English during that time enriched and changed the cultural landscape to a great extent. From the earliest cases to examples in modernity, the genre itself is often concerned with transfers and processes of adaptation and appropriation. These transfers and appropriations are often

metaphorically described as acts of translation. "[W]e can see that a main characteristic of the original epics is the ability to generate successors. They translate their predecessors in the sense of carrying them forward into new territories. […] almost without exception both major and minor practitioners of epic have themselves operated with an unusual sense of their ancestors, an acknowledged pietas" (Merchant 2010: 246). It became a central part of epic production to integrate and often critically receive their predecessors. Creating and adopting conventional tropes and characteristic features of epic poetry frequently entails some form of translation. Since the genre was no contemporary phenomenon but imitated, especially because of the "pietas" inherent to it through its origin in the past and in a different cultural background, translation is a simple fact of this literary import. Additionally, through the parallel development of a translation tradition of epic poetry another set of conventions was generated that in turn influenced the appearance of epic poetry. Consequently, another level of imitation or dissociation was available in the production of epic poetry making a positioning within the translation conventions of epics not only possible but unavoidable.

Translated epics are interlinked to an *imitatio veterum*, an appreciation and imitation of predecessors in a valued cultural practice. Translation is also deeply connected to (political) rule and conquest as they often treat this in their plot but also themselves are carried "into new territory". Epic poetry in general, and national epics in particular, are often concerned with themes of conquest. But even love epics always have the underlying motif of conquest, in their case, conquest of the beloved. The themes of battles and heroic triumph over others have worked as a self-fashioning process, as a self-constituting process for a people or a nation. In this sense, epic poetry functions as a vehicle for societies to associate and dissociate themselves from previous belief systems or systems of governance. By way of the narrative, lineages reaching far back into history can be traced and reconstructed, establishing or even inventing coherences, to constitute and to legitimize contemporary actions. The concept of *translatio imperii,* as it was used in the Middle Ages, served to establish a linear connection from antiquity via the Roman Empire to Western Europe. During the 17th century, religious sects, like the Fifth Monarchy Men, argued their eschatological view as a teleological *translatio imperii*. They saw a sign of the end of days in the

Interregnum and the year 1666, which was associated with the sign of the devil and the Book of Revelation. Their name derived from their expectation of a fifth monarchy following the Babylonians, Persians, Macedonian Empire, Rome, and culminating in the British Empire. After the fifth monarchy, they believed the world would come to an end.

Epic poetry and translation have the ability to re-order established ideas to reaffirm or topple purported rule. Epic poetry traditionally originates in a society at the shift from a mythological worldview to a specific historical awareness. This was not the case when Milton wrote *Paradise Lost*. But, after the Civil War and the Restoration of Charles II, social order in England had just barely been regained, and at a high cost. Milton chose the epic form deliberately for its world-making ability. Even though England already had a literary tradition reaching beyond epic poetry, Milton dismissed the idea of realizing the theme of man's fall as a tragedy. At the time, epic poetry had completely different implications as any dramatic work might have had. When theatres reopened after eighteen years of Puritan rule, the theatre of the Restoration remained largely unpolitical or tried to reaffirm the social order in the monarchy. It was influenced strongly by the royal court and the king, who had experienced theatre and opera during his exile in France.

Heroic poems on the other hand, work to validate and to legitimize a specific order by drawing on past authorities, thereby creating a space through which subversive attitudes could be conveyed.[5] Authoritative figures are drawn on by authors to give gravity to their own literary work. These figures of authority are rooted in the past and in different languages. Therefore, this genre involves translational processes by necessity. These translational processes were further strengthened by the formulaic recurrence of epic conventions. The pattern-like structure and the early adaptation and integration of these conventions as characteristic attributes of epic poetry manifest in their transfer into other languages and thereby establish this tradition. Their fixed structures also contributed to translation conventions. For their formulaic effect to show,

---

[5] Spenser's *Fairy Queene* is an example of epic poetry that was used not to subvert monarchical rule but to confirm the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Spenser also draws on classical motifs and past authorities employing allegories to reinforce the universal aspiration of her reign. Epic poetry is not per se a tool for subversion but during the Restoration the genre lent itself to that purpose more readily than others.

translations must – like original compositions – adapt their design. Like building blocks, epic conventions serve as the foundation to the heroic poem. A foundation on which the author, as well as the translator, can then realize their vision. The comparison of architecture to epic poetry is, thus, multi-layered. Especially in *PL,* the motif of construction and of the poem as an edifice are not only implemented though the structure, form and adherence to conventions: the poem also broaches the issue by way of using metaphors and imagery from this context. These formulaic traditions are intrinsically mimetic in their adaptation of conventions. By creating new conventions, by way of another mimetic practice of translation, these traditions have furthered the translatability of heroic poetry and become productive in their own right.

Milton recognized the significance of translation as an essential feature of epic poetry and employed it not only as a strategy to further validate the universal claim of his poem but as a productive poetic technique. *PL* is composed in the early modern English of the Renaissance but other languages, especially Latin, resonate throughout the epic poem. Milton's multilingualism informed his use of language and allowed for a plethora of playful double meanings and references. Milton's etymological knowledge of terms and their different modes of application furthered the complexity of the text. He also played with different degrees of translation and intentionally made questions of language and interpretation a central theme of *PL*. Milton's use of epic conventions is both a nod to his predecessors and a critical, sometimes ironic, subversion of conventions in general. A linear reading of *PL* is almost impossible because of the multitude of significations Milton achieved through his use of languages. Although the story of Genesis was common knowledge, Milton's take on the creation and fall apparently needed more explanation. The epic owes just as much to mythology, classical writing and contemporary science as it does to the first books of the Bible, making *PL* incredibly challenging for the reader.

The text of the Bible, in general and in translation, is not unproblematic either. It also features characteristics of epic poetry. Abraham, Moses and Noah can be described as the epic heroes of their narratives, including epic journeys and enemies. In contrast to the Koran, in Talmudic and Christian hermeneutical traditions, the Bible has always been more open to interpretation. Translations of the Koran are not only prohibited but in the strictest sense not even possible. The

actual word of Allah is recorded by the prophet Mohammed, who functions as a form of conduit for his message. Arabic is the only language in which this message was received. Moses, on the other hand, is identified as the author of the Pentateuch.[6] In his "Thirteen Principles of Faith", the philosopher Maimonides (ca. 1135-1204) stated that "I believe with perfect faith that the entire Torah presently in our possession is the one given to Moses" (in Levenson 1993: 63). Rabbi David Juda Eisenstein (1854-1956) specified that the books were written by Moses "under the inspiration of God" (in Robinson 2008: 97). Jesus also credited Moses with the authorship of the Torah (see John 5: 46). The crucial difference between these three religious texts is their approach to the interpretation of scripture. While Islam does not allow any kind of interpretative choice, Judaism and Christian tradition require a certain critical examination of the text, as it is impossible for mankind on earth to fully comprehend God's mystery: "For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known" (Corinthians 13:12). The need of interpretation and translation is part of the Christian salvation promise.

Nonetheless, the venture of translations of the Bible has not been without risk or need of legitimation. The translation of the Bible into Greek was accompanied by the myth created around the origin of the Septuagint. The name was derived from the idea that 72 translators worked separately for 72 days and all produced the exact same version. Jerome, the translator of the Vulgate, was canonised for his work and on 30. September translators celebrate their trade and their patron saint. Both instances of Bible translations show how divine inspiration was necessary for these acts of translation and that myths of divine origin had to be established as forms of legitimation. Yet, the interpretation and therefore the translation of the Bible, is principally recognised as a valid operation.[7] According to Milton, everybody is tasked with their own interpretation of the Bible, this is how he justified his 're-writing' of Genesis.

---

[6] Debate about the authorship of the Pentateuch is long-standing and exhaustive. In this context I am only interested in theological assumptions and not in historically accurate attribution of authorship.
[7] Nonetheless, sometimes translators had to endure gruesome consequences for their interpretations of religious and political texts. This can be seen in the case of French translator Estienne Dolet, who was burned at the stake for his too literal translation of the Bible in 1546.

2.2 Epic Rhyme and Metre

Moving from external to internal features of translation in *PL*, first of all the structure and composition have to be addressed. *PL* was first published in 1667 and divided into ten books. Milton revised it later, issuing a twelve-book edition in 1674. The structure now resembled its predecessors even more closely, as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are both divided into 24 books and the *Aeneid* and Statius' *Thebais* into twelve books. Not only during the Renaissance did numerology, the belief in the relation between numbers and events, enjoy popularity.[8] St. Augustine of Hippo surmised that "Numbers are the Universal language offered by the deity to humans as confirmation of the truth". Even though numerology was denounced by the church during the First Council of Nicaea (325 AD) it continued to play a role in astrology and magic. John Dee, mathematician, occult philosopher and an advisor to Queen Elizabeth I, believed that the key to all knowledge and the basis of all things was in numbers.[9] The correlation between numbers and supposedly divine or mystical incidences is also an important feature in Hermeticism and the Talmudic tradition. In Hebrew, for example, all letters of the alphabet also have a numeric value offering great possibilities for hermeneutic interpretation. All these theories have in common a belief in an underlying, greater order that is based on God's language. Christianity even considers it to predate the schisms and represent a united theology. Milton's use of numerology reflects his knowledge of these traditions and their employment in *PL* can be seen in its superstructure. The number of books, as well as the number of invocations and their symmetric arrangement, attests to Milton's mimetic approximation to his epic predecessor's.

In the second edition of *PL* Milton also added a statement on versification and the synoptic "Arguments" preceding the books. The summaries were added after early readers admitted they had difficulties with the poem. Even though such synoptic summaries were conventional tools of epic poetry, they are also a form of greatly condensed intralingual translation. Rooted in the oral tradition, they were intended to help guide the audience. In addition to further strengthening the

---

[8] For further information on numerology during the Renaissance see: Walter I. Trattner. 1964. "God and Expansion in Elizabethan England: John Dee, 1527–1583".

[9] See also Robert Poole. 2005. "John Dee and the English Calendar: Science, Religion and Empire".

connection to epic tradition regarding layout and form, Milton added the arguments for the benefit of his readers, giving the reader easier access to his interpretation. This also goes to show that *PL* lived up to the demand of elevated language and a noble topic. The fact that heroic poetry is characterised by its sophistication regarding style and topic contributed to the challenge translators and successive writers of epic poetry faced. The two main questions they had to decide on regarding structure were metre and rhyme.

In the 16th and 17th century translators and writers experimented with different forms of versification in translations of classical epics and in writing original heroic poems. Edmund Spenser even invented his own stanza for *The Fairy Queene*: eight lines in iambic pentameter followed by a single 'alexandrine line' in iambic hexameter. The rhyme scheme of these lines is 'ababbcbcc'.

Let us take a look at a few examples: Richard Stanihurst tried to emulate the hexameter of Virgil's *Aeneid* with an almost parodistic effect:

> First then among oothers, with no small coompanie garded
> Laocoon storming from Princley castel is hastning,
> And a far of beloing: what fond phantastical harebraine
> Madnes hath enchaunted your wits, you townsmen vnhappie?
> (1582: Book II, 23)

Stanihurst claimed to adhere to imitation of his Greek and Latin predecessors by all means possible. His versification recreates the same metre used in the Homeric epics and by Virgil, the dactylic hexameter without rhyme, also called epic hexameter. In Greek and Latin poetry dactylic hexameter without rhyme was considered heroic style. His translation is, thus, subtitled: "Translated into English Heroicall Verse".

In 1557, Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, was the first to use blank verse for his translation of the *Aeneid*. The first few lines from Laocoon's speech are:

> Lo, foremost of a rout that followed him,
> Kindled Laocon hastened from the tower,
> Crying far off: O wretched citizens,
> What so great kind of frenzy fretteth you?
> (1557: Book II, 114; spelling modernized)

He changed the metre but avoided rhyming as well. Iambic pentameter became the most common verse form of poetry with Shakespeare writing his plays and sonnets in this metre. This style was soon adopted for epic poetry and translation. The most significant distinction then was whether the verse was rhymed (e.g. in

heroic couplets) or unrhymed (blank verse). Dryden's *Aeneid* is composed in heroic couplets and Chapman, too, had already used this form in his translations of Homer in 1611.

> Laocoon, follow'd by a num'rous Crowed,
> Ran from the Fort; and cry'd, from far, aloud;
> O wretched Country-men! What Fury reigns?
> What more than Madness has possess'd your Brains?
> (1697: 2.52-55)

Why then did Milton choose blank verse? A form more common in verse drama. Milton argued in his statement on *The Verse*, prefacing the argument before Book I, that he adapted the same style as his predecessors, too: "THE Measure is English Heroic Verse without Rime, as that of Homer in Greek, and Virgil in Latin" (*PL* The Verse). And he does so in terms of rhyming, which is the most significant point Milton made in this statement. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are both composed in dactylic hexameter. Virgil and other Latin poets later adapted the metre from their Greek antecedents into their language. This verse form was already a cultural translation into Latin and as such it also underwent some modulation. The Greek hexameter was still indebted to the oral bardic tradition. At least the early poems were sung accompanied by an instrument.[10] When the verse form was adapted to Latin not only the linguistic sign system changed from Greek to Latin but the metre was also incorporated into a written tradition. Even though the effect of this change is visible, the transfer was still possible without metrical alterations. Both languages use a quantitative metre, both allow for the characteristic front weight of dactyls. Their synthetic syntax, allowing for free word order, avoids the poems droning along. English on the other hand uses a qualitative metre, stressing the syllables. As a result of the English accentuation the dactylic hexameter develops a rhythm that seemed inadequate for epic poetry and except for a few exceptions never enjoyed great success.

Milton dismissed rhyming and positioned himself closer to his classical predecessors, even commenting that "some famous modern Poets, [get] carried away by Custom, but much to their own vexation, hindrance, and constraint to express many things otherwise" (*PL* The Verse). This might well have been meant

---

[10] The *Iliad* is still composed as an oral epic, the *Odyssey* already shows signs of written composition (cf. Andrew Dalby. 1995. "The *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* and their Audiences").

as an allusion to Dryden, the future poet laureate and his heroic couplets. It is easy to see that for Milton's project of epic scope the rhyming structure is unfavourable. The couplets form too narrow a pattern, leaving less flexibility than blank verse to draw out syntactic and semantic moments of surprise and recognition. The non-rhyming but rhythmic metre with little restraint gave him the opportunity to construct meaning and to add to it over the course of several lines. For Milton, the "musical delight" of poetry lies "in apt Numbers, fit quantity of Syllables, and the sense variously drawn out from one Verse into another, not in the jingling sound of like endings" (*PL* The Verse). Milton claimed to have gone back to the 'original' style but omitted the change of metre. Maybe iambic pentameter was just too obvious or Milton considered it the only logical equivalent to dactylic hexameter. Or, when Milton claimed to use the same verse "as that of" Homer and Virgil, he had already acknowledged the transfer from one literary culture to another: he had pointed to the effect and not to literality by also calling this versification "English heroic verse".

Even though Milton knew many languages and had access to a lot of texts in their original language, he was also accustomed to reading translations and producing them. During the Renaissance, translation and imitation were common tools for educational purposes. In *The Schoolmaster* (1570), Roger Ascham praised the didactic effect of translation for scholars (cf. 18-22). Not only translation but double translation form the student's vocabulary and ability to produce as good poetry as was done in Greek:

> [P]oetry was never perfect in Latin until by true imitation of the Grecians, it was at length brought to perfection; and also thereby to exhort the goodly wits of England, which is apt by nature and willing by desire, give themselves to poetry, that they, rightly understanding the barbarous bringing in of rhymes, would labour, as Virgil and Horace did in Latin, to make perfect also this point of learning, in our English tongue. (187)

Ascham's focus is on perfection via imitation. Stanihurst's translation of the *Aeneid* is, thus, according to Ascham, a more desirable translation and more in line with his demand. He also rejected rhyming because for him it seemed to have brought Latin writing to the perfect state, now worth imitating in English.

2.3 Fallen and Unfallen Language

Heroic poetry is also characterised by its elevated style of form and language. Milton's learning and multilingualism provided him with the ability to create a linguistic and poetic language that suited his grand purpose - to "justify the ways of God to men" (1.26). Milton uses processes of translation as a productive technique for word formation and language-making. In addition to the genre's translation tradition and Milton's adaptation of epic conventions, translation is an essential part of the communication situation within *PL*. The plot is a rewriting and an interpretation of the story of Genesis, originally composed in Hebrew. The language of God is unique. He can communicate with Adam and Eve, but they in turn depend on God's willingness to be understood. The language of the angels and of mankind changes after their fall. The interior language differences between the different characters as well as their different states create multiple translation situations: the changing circumstances of the characters demand constant renegotiation of communication methods.

Apart from the intradiegetic translation and interpretation processes within *Paradise Lost*, the epic poem is in itself a translation fiction. Not only because Milton reinterprets the story of Genesis, but also because of the internal plot logic. For Milton, language changed after the fall. This makes his enterprise to create the illusion of a language before the fall an impossible task.

Yet Milton attempts to create the illusion of linguistic clarity for the reader. Language before the fall, of both the angels and of mankind, is supposedly without irony, without misunderstandings, and without ulterior motive. After the rebellious angels fall they also learn how to use language in a deceitful way. Stanley Fish argued therefore that prelapsarian language is always logical and postlapsarian language merely rhetorical:

> Rhetoric is the verbal equivalent of the fleshly lures that seek to enthral us and divert our thoughts from Heaven, the reflection of our own cupidinous desires, while logic comes from God and speaks to that part of us which retains his image. Through rhetoric man continues in the error of the Fall, through logic he can at least attempt a return to the clarity Adam lost. (Fish 1997: 61)

Fish differentiates between rhetoric and logic, claiming they are the opposing forces of language within *PL*. Rhetoric is the manipulative and dishonest process of modelling language to one's own purpose, no matter the consequences. Satan is the most rhetorically skilled figure in this regard, repeatedly proving his linguistic

cunning. The speech of God and the Son on the other hand are characterised by calm and measured diction. Even though their communications are not always accessible to humankind, mystery and hidden meaning are part of their message, the aim of any communication between the godhead and mankind is not meant to deliberately deceive.

A clear distinction between the two forms of speech can be seen when comparing how Satan volunteers to travel to earth and corrupt mankind. Satan has Beelzebub suggest that, instead of open war, which they consider too dangerous after their defeat, only one of the devils should try to find God's new creation. After his lengthy proposal, Satan can appear as their saviour when he offers to take the risk upon himself alone. The whole scene is a setup:

> […] Beelzebub
> Pleaded his devilish counsel, first devised
> By Satan, and in part proposed: for whence,
> But from the author of all ill could spring
> So deep a malice […]. (*PL* 2.378-82)

Only Satan, Milton suggests, can devise a plan so vicious and be so conceited as to belief himself to be the only one capable. Satan has Beelzebub deliberately make the task sound dangerous to make him look even more heroic when he volunteers with feigned humbleness:

> O Progeny of Heav'n, Empyreal Thrones,
> With reason hath deep silence and demurr
> Seis'd us, though undismaid: long is the way
> And hard, that out of Hell leads up to light;
> Our prison strong, this huge convex of Fire,
> Outrageous to devour, immures us round
> Ninefold, and gates of burning Adamant
> Barr'd over us prohibit all egress.
> These past, if any pass, the void profound
> Of unessential Night receives him next
> Wide gaping, and with utter loss of being
> Threatens him, plung'd in that abortive gulf. (*PL* 2.430-41)

Satan repeats the risks of leaving hell, the obstacles he will face when having to cross gates, fire and the void, making his undertaking sound dangerous and difficult. The description of hell is closely related to literary depictions of hell elsewhere. The "ninefold" structure is based on the nine circles of the river Styx and the "gates of burning Adamant" refer to the columns surrounding Tartarus in the *Aeneid* (6.570). Dante's *Inferno* is likewise divided into nine circles through which the protagonist is guided by Virgil.

Satan employs both biblical diction and typically epic rhetoric when addressing his peers. His speech oscillates between biblical and classical motifs giving the impression of high oratory skill and expertise. But the use of his wording remains largely shallow due to his emphasis on effect rather than coherence or purity of style. He then continues to accept he must go because his rhetorical argument compels him to: he cannot reign without taking responsibility for the other devils and taking the risk alone.

> If thence he scape into whatever world,
> Or unknown Region, what remains him less
> Then unknown dangers and as hard escape.
> But I should ill become this Throne, O Peers,
> And this Imperial Sov'ranty, adorn'd
> With splendor, arm'd with power, if aught propos'd
> And judg'd of public moment, in the shape
> Of difficulty or danger could deterr
> Mee from attempting. Wherefore do I assume
> These Royalties, and not refuse to Reign,
> Refusing to accept as great a share
> Of hazard as of honour, due alike
> To him who Reigns, and so much to him due
> Of hazard more, as he above the rest
> High honourd sits?
> […] this enterprize
> None shall partake with me. (*PL* 2.442-65)

Even though the plan seems almost impossible to accomplish, Satan agrees to undertake the voyage without support. Therefore furthering the heroic image, he generates for himself. His speech echoes the addresses of generals and kings to their followers common in other epics. Satan's exaggerations, such as in verses 446-7, point to his goal of ruling in hell as God's sole antagonist. Satan's oratory creates radiance by offering a multitude of references. By interlinking assumed nobility and humility, Satan uses language to style himself in the fashion of past heroes and simultaneously alludes to expectations and aristocratic behaviour of tyrannical rulers of Milton's own time. There is a significant gap between the selfless sacrifice Satan is ready to give and his ulterior motives. This gap being also an allegory for Milton's political disillusionment after the failed Commonwealth.

When the Son comes forward to give his life to save mankind, the wording is equally elevated and far more indebted to religious diction:

> Behold mee then, mee for him, life for life
> I offer, on mee let thine anger fall;

Account mee man; I for his sake will leave
Thy bosom, and this glorie next to thee
Freely put off, and for him lastly dye
Well pleas'd, on me let Death wreck all his rage;
Under his gloomie power I shall not long
Lie vanquisht; thou hast givn me to possess
Life in my self for ever, by thee I live,
Though now to Death I yield, and am his due
All that of me can die, yet that debt paid,
Thou wilt not leave me in the loathsom grave
His prey, nor suffer my unspotted Soule
For ever with corruption there to dwell;
But I shall rise Victorious […]. (*PL* 3.236-50)

The repetition in the first few verses of this passage constructs a balance between the Son's sacrifice and the allusion to his resurrection in the last line. His whole demeanour is unquestionably obedient to God and, therefore, without any ambiguity or hidden agenda. The wording is based on unity, continuity and purity. The Son is certain God won't let him suffer and he believes in the fulfilment of his father's prophecy: "Life in my self forever, by thee I live" (*PL* 3.244). The Son's sacrifice is given out of love and trust. These differences in the levels of diction and application of language express the disparity between fallen and unfallen language. The Son speaks without sleight, his references are not meant to mislead or embellish. He can be taken by his word. Nonetheless, the Son's language is not without oratory skill or poetic value. Satan might be able to play all kinds of rhetoric tricks on his audience but his bluff will be called in the end. Whereas the Son can be confident in his trust in God and the narrative. The linguistic imbalance between Satan and the Son is a result of the fall which altered the relation between literal and figurative meaning. Only through a fall from God could language lose its denotational clarity and unequivocal signification. And only through resurrection can a return to this clarity be gained.

Milton tried to create the illusion of a prelapsarian language by using Latinate and archaic words. Already in his own time, Milton's use of these terms was recognised. In his dictionary, Samuel Johnson used a quote from Addison as the definition of the term 'Latinism': "Milton had made use of frequent transpositions, Latinisms, antiquated words and phrases, that he might the better deviate from the vulgar and ordinary expressions" (1818: 'Latinism'). The definition given shows the purpose of these terms is to raise the level of the diction and the aim is to emphasis the association with past meanings.

Furthermore, Addison describes these loan words as "transpositions", moved from one cultural and linguistic context to another. These words were not translated but carried over into Milton's English. In the process, they altered and gained significations: in their form in English, in their new context, they could convey their tradition and long gathered variations of meanings. Nonetheless, a translational process is at the core of these transfers.

According to Christopher Ricks, Milton employed Latinisms to take the reader "back to a time when there were no infected words because there were no infected actions" (1963: 110).[11] Milton applied a technique of foreignization, rendering the language of *Paradise Lost* unfamiliar for his audience and, by using certain triggers, asked his audience to make specific connections. John Leonard identifies Latinisms as an attempt to reproduce Adamic language in *PL* (see Leonard 1999: 135). In Book VII, Raphael tells Adam about the creation and describes the waters separating from the land as: "With serpent error wandering" (*PL* 7.302). This phrase gains much more signification when the etymological meaning and tradition is considered. It foreshadows the events of the fall in Book IX but primarily reflects the behaviour of the meandering waters by using the archaic significations of 'serpent' (crawling and winding) and of 'error' (straying and wandering). For this wordplay to take effect, the reader must have some knowledge of Latin. John Hale, borrowing a term from Ann Moss, calls it "compound" bilingualism. "[T]he two languages are learnt in the same context and are more or less interdependent" (1997: 13). The effect of one language 'shining' through in original composition, like on a palimpsest, is similar to translations that focus on the source language.

The same 'compounding' can be found in Milton's syntax. His sentence structure often borrows from Latin word order, making interior sentence relation very complicated but giving him also the opportunity to overlap meaning. F. R Leavis comments on Milton's use of Latinate syntactic structures and criticises their complexity: "So complete, and so mechanical, is Milton's departure from the English order, structure and accentuation that he often produces passages that have to be read through several times before one can see how they go" (1959: 53). English fixed word order is analytic due to the loss of inflections. Latin on the

---

[11] Milton also coined many new terms, e.g. "terrific" and "enjoyable". Approximately 600 words were introduced into the English language by Milton.

other hand, as a synthetic language, is freer from a conventionalised word order. Blending these two types of syntactic structuring must necessarily lead to an increased complexity of the fabric of the poem. Noticeably, this effect can only be observed from Latin to English. Employing a fixed word order in Latin would not have the effect of foreignization or make it seem more like English. The reader would not necessarily notice that the word order is based on English syntax.

When Adam describes his awakening and the vision sent to him by God, the Latinate syntax furthers the mystic quality of the moment of awakening:

> […] with soft oppression seis'd
> My droused sense, untroubl'd, though I thought
> I then was passing to my former state
> Insensible, and forthwith to dissolve: (*PL* 8.288-91)

Milton's multilingualism and mimetic approach towards his predecessors make translation and questions of interlingual communication a prominent concern of *PL*. Through the different levels of linguistic complexity, rhetoricity, passages of highly condensed language and meaning, and passages of flowing, rhythmic diction alternate. Satan's highly rhetorical language has often been praised as the more inventive and has been met with great admiration, especially during the Romantic era. William Blake commented on the creative force of Milton's demonic language in his *Marriage of Heaven and Hell* (ca. 1790–93): "The reason Milton wrote in fetters when he wrote of Angels & God, and at liberty when of Devils & Hell, is because he was a true Poet and of the Devil's party without knowing it". However, at no point does Milton's grand style fail to employ language at a creative and elevated level.

If indeed the fall changed language, consequently Milton himself must speak in the postlapsarian language: Milton used a language that was created after the fall of Adam and Eve, and the same holds true for his audience. All readers of the epic are themselves fallen and do not have uninterpreted access to the prelapsarian language. In order to rewrite the story of Genesis and create a setting before the fall of mankind, Milton had to simulate a prelapsarian language. Milton's narrator, thus, functions as an interpreter for the word of God and for the benefit of the reader. His translation fiction is based on the disparity between unfallen language and fallen language, the state in which the author and the reader find themselves in while reading a fiction of linguistic bliss. Simultaneously,

according to Milton's own logic, only the fall made his own creative artwork possible.

In the following paragraphs, I will look at translation situations within *PL*, starting by looking at the narrator as a translator figure. I will investigate instances in which the narrator steps into the foreground and the occasions in which he interprets the narrative for the reader. Among these 'moments of translation' are the invocations, epic similes and metaphors. Subsequently, I will examine translation situations between the characters of the epic.

2.4 The Miltonic Narrator

The differentiation between author and narrator at the outset of *PL* seems more complicated in epic poetry than in other genres. As there has been a long tradition to conflate author and epic voice a lot of criticism does not make an explicit distinction. Of Homer, the historical person, not much information is available. It has generally been accepted to neglect a clear-cut distinction in the epic voice of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The same has been true for Milton studies.[12] Only recently, compared to the century-long scholarship of epic poetry, have author and speaker been more precisely separated from one another. But still, even in more recent commentary, this distinction is often argued to be a marginal one. According to Stephen Fallon, the narrator's description does not suggest a strong distinction between the poetic voice and Milton himself (see 2014: 3).

Compared to his predecessors, Milton inserted himself much more into the epic narrative. While Aristotle applauded Homer for saying very little in *propria person* (cf. *Poetics* 1460a 5-12), Milton departs from the imitation of his predecessors in this respect. Milton uses not only personal pronouns on multiple occasions but also draws a connection between the author's morals and the quality of the narration. Consequently, Milton's own morals might still reflect in *PL* and according to his view, virtue cannot follow from immorality. An immoral author cannot produce virtuous poetry. In *Apology for Smectymnuus*, Milton wrote:

> [H]e who would not be frustrate of his hope to write well hereafter in laudable things, ought him selfe to bee a true Poet, that is, a compostition, and patterne of the best and honourablest things; not presuming to sing high praises of heroic men or famous Cities, unlesse he have in himselfe the experience and the practice of all that which is praise-worthy. (*YP* 1:890)

---

[12] See for example Robert McMohan. 1998. *The Two Poets of* Paradise Lost.

Milton's argument, that only virtuous men can produce virtuous poetry, goes to show his awareness of the role of the poet in epic poetry. Fallon, therefore, identifies Milton not only as author and narrator but even as a character, and in some instances the hero of the epic poem (cf. 2014: 10). Nonetheless, it would be misleading to assume that Milton's views are reflected in every single position presented in *PL*. In order to have greater interpretative freedom and not to fall into the trap of wanting to consolidate all the varying positions, McMohan argues for a stricter separation of the speaker and the historic Milton.[13] He suggests that the poetic voice of the narrator "Milton" sings the poem in the literary present. The poetic voice is therefore open to doubt and revision of previous statements, whereas Milton the author, has constructed the epic knowing where it will lead him. The speaker on the other hand is constructing the epic "now" (McMohan 1998: 10).

In the following passage when referring to Milton, I will speak of the narrator and not the historic person unless otherwise indicated. Milton the narrator of *PL* is an amalgamation of Milton, the poet and Milton, the interpreter. The epic voice takes the role of the translator for the benefit of his audience and thus, stands between the message and the recipients as a mediator of the word of God – an interpreter of his revelation. Especially considering *PL*'s status as a Christian epic, this gesture puts Milton in the position of a go-between for religious beliefs. The narrative attitude of the narrator can thus be placed closer to Milton's own understanding of the interpretation and reading of scripture. Milton, who was opposed to clerical bureaucracy, considered everyone to be tasked with their own interpretation of scripture. His epic can therefore be read as his poetic examination of his religious beliefs. More importantly, the positing of the all-knowing narrator in *PL* and the conflation of author and narrator within the epic allow Milton, the author, to invent and seemingly successfully apply a prelapsarian language. No other genre would have accommodated his task better.

---

[13] See Anne Ferry. 1963. *Milton's Epic Voice: The Narrator in "Paradise Lost"*.

2.4.1 Invocations

Some of the most prominent instances in which the narrator steps into the foreground and addresses his audience directly are the epic invocations. Invocations are a common convention in epic poetry and can be found in the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* and the *Aeneid*. They originated in the oral tradition of recited epics and have been adopted to the written epic tradition. The epic voice (or bard or rhapsode in the case of oral epics) asks for divine inspiration from a god or a muse. The *Iliad*'s invocation begins with "Sing, O goddess"[14] and the *Odyssey* with "Tell me, oh muse".[15] The invocation of muses generally works as a tool for displacement of authority. The source of inspiration for the poetic work is ascribed to someone other than the poet, redirecting authority to a divine or other-worldly power. The form, not only the content of the epic, is often also presumed to be influenced by this authority: for example, when the bard asks the muse to help deliver the divine message properly. By replacing the authority and the origin of the narrative, the poet makes themselves out to be only the messenger and at best the embellisher of another's story.

This is a gesture of humility. By creating this distance through displacing the source an effect of translatedness enters the fabric of the poem. The epic voice becomes the interpreter of a message and therefore could be affected by the same difficulties and calamities as any other interpreter or translator. The account is seemingly mediated and thus possibly less reliable because the reader could always suspect a misinterpretation might have entered the narrative at some point. The reader's perception is deliberately influenced by this gesture and their attention is directed towards one thing while seemingly hiding something else. While the conventionalised invocation form appears to leave little room for artistic invention, it often offers just that, the self-positioning of the author in relation to the project. In fact, the formulaic structure and adaptation of the invocation offers a platform for a poetological recourse of artistic creation.

In the case of an oral epic, the bard was not always the author of his song and his version usually a rendition on a well-known theme of a hero, an ancestor

---

[14] Translation by Samuel Butler. 1898. *Homer. The Iliad of Homer. Rendered into English prose for the use of those who cannot read the original*.
[15] Translation by A.T. Murray. 1919. *Homer. The Odyssey with an English Translation by A.T. Murray, PH.D. in two volumes*.

or ruler. Bards and rhapsodes were always also mediators of another's story. Therefore, the invocation used to be directed at someone other than the rhapsode himself. That changed when heroic poetry was carried over into the written tradition and prompted the self-assertion of authors. In the *Aeneid*, from the Latin written period of a later age, Virgil's bard claimed his position more boldly. When he started the *Aeneid* with "Arms, and the man I sing",[16] his "ego" asserted the source of the poet's inspiration from within, even though only in this one instance. Milton's muse is of a different kind altogether. His Christian epic took on a very well-known theme, the creation of mankind and tackled an extremely powerful authority, God and the Son of God. According to epic convention, Milton opens *PL* by stating his theme followed by the first invocation:

> OF Mans First Disobedience, and the Fruit
> Of that Forbidden Tree, whose mortal tast
> Brought Death into the World, and all our woe,
> With loss of Eden, till one greater Man
> Restore us, and regain the blissful Seat,
> Sing Heav'nly Muse that on the secret top
> Of Oreb, or of Sinai, didst inspire
> That Shepherd, who first taught the chosen Seed,
> In the Beginning how the Heav'ns and Earth
> Rose out of Chaos: Or if Sion Hill
> Delight thee more, and Siloa's Brook that flow'd
> Fast by the Oracle of God; I thence
> Invoke thy aid to my adventrous Song,
> That with no middle flight intends to soar
> Above th' Aonian Mount, while it pursues
> Things unattempted yet in Prose or Rhime.
> And chiefly Thou O Spirit, that dost prefer
> Before all Temples th' upright heart and pure,
> Instruct me, for Thou know'st; Thou from the first
> Wast present, and with mighty wings outspread
> Dove-like satst brooding on the vast Abyss
> And mad'st it pregnant: What in me is dark
> Illumin, what is low raise and support;
> That to the highth of this great Argument
> I may assert Eternal Providence,
> And justifie the wayes of God to men. (*PL* 1.1-26)

Milton uses personal pronouns throughout the invocation and involves himself much more into the narrative than Aristotle had prescribed for heroic poetry. The inversion of the invocation and the address allowed Milton to give the whole theme in the first line without disrupting the following verses and thereby adhere

---

[16] Translation by John Dryden. 1697. *Virgil's Aeneid*.

to epic conventions. The close connection to Latin syntax is exemplified in this first sentence.[17] The sense of the word "Fruit" alters from the fruit of man's disobedience to the fruit of the tree in the next line but without losing either meaning. Building up tension throughout the first six lines, the first final verb asks the muse to sing.

Apart from the formula of invocations being carried into English epic poetry via translations, there is an interesting translation history and tradition in the first line. 'Fruit' already presents a matter of some debate. Since the 16th century and the influencing works by painters Albrecht Dürer and Lucas Cranach, the Elder, the forbidden fruit has customarily been depicted as an apple. The Hebrew Bible is not that specific. It names the fruit of the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil as 'peri', which would have been used to signify any number of fruit such as figs or pomegranates.[18] Jerome decided to use the word 'malus', which as a noun has come to signify the apple,[19] but concurrently as an adjective 'malus' means 'bad' or 'evil'. This double meaning was created through an act of translation. In the process, it led to the specification of the term's meaning. The forbidden fruit became the apple, the apple was morphologically linked to the negative connotation for the following centuries. Milton knew about the original text and Jerome's translation, so the narrator only refers to the ill-fated produce as 'fruit'. Satan, when seducing Eve, suddenly calls the fruits "those fair Apples" (*PL* 9.585). He continues to do so after the fall, when he recounts to his fellow demons what caused mankind's fall:

> Him by fraud I have seduc'd
> From his Creator, and the more to increase
> Your wonder, with an Apple […]. (*PL* 10.485-7)

Satan trivializes the transgression, first when telling Eve about it and later when bragging to the other fallen angels about what commonplace product brought mankind's fall. In putting these 'mistranslated' words into Satan's mouth, Milton emphasises the devil's misunderstanding of God's nature and creation. The devil is exposed as a fraud in his speech and his actions. Regarding the theological

---

[17] Consider the difficulty to bring the first full verb at position 39 in any English sentence, regardless of metre and rhyme.
[18] Michelangelo portrays the tree as a fig tree in the ceiling of the Sistine Chapel.
[19] The apple tree still carries the biological name 'malus' and the Italian word for apple, 'mela', derives from that same term. The Italian word for 'evil' is 'male'.

implication, it is not relevant what fruit it is because mankind fell by disobeying God. The morphological correlation between 'malum', the inflected term for a fruit, and 'malum', the adjective meaning 'evil', was exploited by the Latin translator and contributed to the successive concept of the fruit being an apple.

Another form of translation can be encountered when looking at other epic poems. Milton drew on different authors and works not only biblical but also of Greek and Roman origin. The third line, e.g., closely resembles a verse in Book IV of Virgil's *Aeneid*. The consequences of Aeneas and Dido's nuptials are described as: "Ille dies primus leti primusque malorum causa fuit."[20] Fairclough translated this line: "That day was the first day of death, that the first cause of woe" (1935: 4.407). The terms 'letum' and 'malum' have repeatedly been translated as "death" and "woe". Dryden, too, translated: "From this ill-omen'd hour in time arose / Debate and death, and all succeeding woes."[21] Even though the cause in *PL* is different from the *Aeneid* – the relationship of Adam and Eve is not forbidden, as was the love of Dido and Aeneas – the occasion is the beginning of the end. Aeneas leaves Dido to pursue his and his son's fate in Italy, Adam and Eve leave Eden to fulfil mankind's destiny on earth. Both departures follow the loss of a country and the loss of the presence of the loved one – in the case of *PL*, God.

The theme of travel and exile runs through many epics, inherently including questions of foreignness and belonging. With travel and exile also translation becomes a necessary feature. At the same time, the first few lines of the invocation also echo Romans 5:19: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." In line four "one greater Man", Jesus, the Messiah and 'second Adam', will restore paradise, which was lost for mankind by the sins of Adam and Eve. The variation on biblical terms continues throughout the invocation.

In line six the muse is finally asked to sing. Milton adhered to many structural conventions of his predecessors, such as the use of non-rhyming metre and conventional tropes. However, the text differed not only in theme from its

---

[20] "That day was the first day of death, that the first cause of woe" (1935: 407), a more literal translation by H. Rushton Fairclough still uses the same two words.
[21] Milton repeats this phrase in slight variation at the beginning of Book IX, line 11: "That brought into this World a world of woe."

classical antecedents but also the source of inspiration did not come from the same muse as before. In *PL*, the poet invokes a "heav'nly muse" often associated with the Holy Spirit as translator. According to Davies and Hunter:

> Milton's 'heavenly born' Muse presents a medium between earth and heaven (as divine messenger, God's agent, advocate and revealer of language and vision, the traditional functions of the Holy Spirit). (1988: 106)

In consequence, the same muse would be invoked as the one that gave the ten commandments to Moses on Mount Horeb. Milton's muse does not dwell near Mount Parnassus or on Mount Helicon, as the classical muses do, but near the Mountain on which Moses received the laws of Christianity. But Milton reconsidered this too, by adding that the spirit prefers "Before all Temples" the pure heart: suggesting that no earthly or pagan location can be the seat of true divine inspiration.

The negotiation of creation itself and the creation of the Christian written tradition begins in line nine, starting with the words: "In the Beginning". In the KJV Genesis 1:1 and John 1:1 open with this phrase. Originally, they did not begin with the exact same phrase because both texts were composed at different times and in different languages. The source text for Genesis, *Bereshit* the first book of the Torah, takes its name from its first words: אִבְּרֵאשִׁית בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֵת הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֵת הָאָרֶץ:. The Gospel of John was originally composed in Greek: Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος. When the Gospel of John was composed, the Septuagint translation of the Tanakh had already created a Greek version. The author of the Gospel established the connection between these two passages by emulating the beginning of Genesis and using the same phrase as the Septuagint version. Subsequently, later translations transferred this reference.[22] In the Vulgate both passages begin with: "In principio". The conjunction of the two sections was therefore already well established by the time the KJV was published in 1611. The syntactic placement of these lines in *PL* underlines the effect of these seminal words: referencing at once the bringing about of the universe and the essence of Christ as the word of God. In Genesis, the line continues as follows: "God created the heaven and the earth", whereas in

---

[22] Luther's translation makes a significant distinction between "Am Anfang" in Genesis and "Im Anfang" in John, focusing on the firstness of God. This is further highlighted by the inversion of the last phrase in John 1:1: "[…]und Gott war das Wort" in Luther as opposed to "und das Wort war Gott".

John: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Linking these two passages through one reference, Milton emphasizes the significance of language and the significance of translation. This effect only comes through the translatedness of these biblical texts.

Milton begins before the beginning. His muse was there before the angels fell and before mankind was even created. The creative spirit is aligned with the Holy Ghost when it is described as sitting "dove-like". Milton's translation of what the spirit does, "brooding", is more literal than the commonly known: "moved upon the face of the waters" (KJV Genesis 1:2). The connotation of typically female experience "mad'st it pregnant" with the Holy Spirit does not necessarily contradict the association of the muse with the male godhead or the trinity. The Holy Ghost is frequently identified as the female part of the Holy Trinity.[23] In the Hebrew *Bereshit* 1:1 the article is a plural that was translated by the singular "God". In the first invocation Milton's muse is addressed with "thou" allowing him to play on the multiple facets of the godhead, the trinity or simultaneously on the individual parts of it and, thus, "nicely reflecting the ambiguity of the plural Hebrew word" (Davies and Hunter 1988: 99).

The narrator asked the spirit not only to help deliver the message but to assist him in finding the required language for the universal claim of his subject: "I thence / invoke thy aide" (*PL* 1.12-13). The gesture suggests a humbleness through the request for moral support but the claim of originality in line 16 is a literal translation from Ariosto's *Orlando Furioso*: "cosa non detta in prosa mai, né in rima" (Canto I, 2:2). This is probably no accident and seems more likely to be an ironical comment on the formulaic structure of the epic. The genre of the epic or poetic works in their respective vernaculars are no novelty. Ariosto was preceded by Dante and his *Commedia*. Milton could refer to Shakespeare as the producer of a huge amount of poetry in English and neologisms, therefore the creative force of literature in English. However, although its peak impact was over, both Milton and Ariosto made the epic genre productive in their vernacular. What is the purpose of using this phrase then in such a literal translation? The claim that nothing like this had ever been attempted is clearly not true. Christian epics were created before and the genre itself is laden with tradition. Milton's play

---

[23] See for example positions of theologians such as: Clark H. Pinnock, Thomas N. Finger, Jürgen Moltmann, Yves M. J. Congar, John J. O'Donnell, Donald L. Gelpi, and R.P. Nettlehorst

on originality in form of a literal translation is not only an ironical nod to his predecessors but also a comment on literary production itself. Literature does not come about in an empty space but is fed by antecedents, just like God's creation is not out of nothing but out of himself.

Milton kept inverting instances of genuine originality and imitation to elevate his message and to distance it from the messenger. His humility is subverted by his syntax. The first invocation focuses on the two demands "Instruct" and "Illumine" through their positioning at the beginning of their respective lines. Both ultimately express the desire for more knowledge but in two different ways: instruction as acquired knowledge and illumination as granted knowledge. A bit subtler than Virgil's use of it, but not less significant, is the pronoun "I" at the beginning of verse 25. It is in the following two lines that the rising tension and the build-up of the first lines of Book I conclude.

Subsequently, the poem starts in medias res. As announced in the "Argument" to Book I, the poem literally dives into "the midst of things" beginning with the fall of Satan. The events leading to the fall are related later to Adam by Raphael in Book VII and VIII.

The four invocations in *PL* are at the beginnings of Book I, III, VII and IX. They follow a symmetric pattern within the twelve-book structure.[24] Hunter and Davies (1988) argue that the first invocation is addressed to the Holy Trinity: the Father, as the source of inspiration for Moses, the Son through association of the places he performed significant actions and the Holy Spirit featuring as the dove. In the first invocation of *PL* the trinity is described through their means of communication with mankind.

The second invocation addresses the "holy Light" and the first sentence ends in a rhetorical question, also a typical element in epic invocations. Milton seems to be debating whether he is addressing God in an adequate way: "May I express the unblam'd?" (*PL* 3.3). Milton does not say address, but express, simultaneously blending the gesture of speaking to the godhead and finding an appropriate manner of naming. Three lines further into the passage Milton offers

---

[24] Davies and Hunter (1988) argue that only the proems of Book I, II and VII are proper invocations addressing an inspirational source. In the first ten-book edition the symmetry of the invocations would have been different. The corresponding passages, according to Davies and Hunter, are in Book IV and VIII of the 1667 edition.

an alternative address: "Or hear'st though rather pure Ethereal stream?" (*PL* 3.6). This incertitude can again be interpreted as a devout and humble gesture. But it also displays the multifaceted godhead and the many aspects by which God can be identified and addressed. Yet, this fact also points to mankind's inability to find the proper words or terms for God, the implication being that God defies human definition. As a phenomenon of translation, the inability to come up with a singular linear equivalent regarding God, reminds the reader of the translator's dilemma: the narrator struggles to find the right words.

In this passage, Milton is referring to the association of the Son as light and as water; light, being the first thing God created (Genesis 1:3), and water, since all creation is flowing from him. The "relationship between Father and Son as source and issue" (Davies and Hunter 1988: 100) is a chronological one, even though the son is "the ofspring of Heav'n first-born" he is also "of th' Eternal Coeternal Beam" (*PL* 3.1-2). Milton's questioning and his use of "or" here in this passage point to an actual inability to comprehend, not a figure of speech. Milton offers a symmetry of first and secondness regarding the relation of Father and Son. The Father is the source and the Son the translation.

In the first two invocations, the muse remains without a name, she is only referred to as the "heav'nly muse" establishing the association with the Holy Spirit. Only in Book VII does Milton identify the muse as Urania, noting however "the meaning, not the name I call" (*PL* 7, 5). This indication invites the reader to see beyond the common connotations of Urania and points to a metaphorical and allegorical use of the figure. Among the classical muses, Urania is the patron of astronomy. As Milton's epic revolves around the creation of the universe and the maker of the same, Urania is favoured over the muse of epic writing, Calliope. During the Renaissance, Urania was also identified as the Holy Spirit and as the divine source of Christian inspiration (Brumble 2013: 229): Dante invokes her, too, in *Purgatorio* 19.37-42. The Holy Spirit is also responsible for the communication and comfort of mankind. (cf. John 15: 26-27).

The accommodation of pagan mythology within this Christian epic goes to show that, although emphasis was placed on the contemporary, Milton's approach was of consolidating the past and the present. The epic form of *PL* supports this same enterprise. But the aim, according to McMohan (cf. 1998: 9), was to show the superiority of scripture to the classics. This interplay of translational acts

between classical authors and religious scripture has a two-fold effect. Milton established a claim of universal validity for his epic through the Christian theme on the one hand and on the other he positioned his epic in the tradition of his predecessors and most notably likened himself by comparison to the ancient epic bards.

There is a traditional connection between blindness and sight of transcendental knowledge. Many blind prophets populate the classical literary canon. Demodokos, the *Odyssey's* bard at the court of the Phaeacians, is blind. His sight was taken by the muses to elevate his other senses to the task of singing. Coincidentally or not, Homer himself was blind, too. Milton considered his blindness as a form of punishment but also welcomed it for it made him more like Homer and other blind prophets:

> Those other two equal'd with me in Fate,
> So were I equal'd with them in renown,
> Blind Thamyris and blind Mæonides,
> And Tiresias and Phineus Prophets old. (*PL* 3.33-36)

Milton's blindness connected him to the blind prophets and seers who claimed it to be "a mark of divine favour" (Fallon 2014: 7). The idea that to heighten the senses one would sacrifice a sense is a cultural practice with a long tradition and is common in many religious narratives. By excluding one or more senses, others are thought to be opened to a transcendental experience. Milton creates a connection to past prophets, classical as well as Christian, by invoking this mythology.

2.4.2 Epic Similes and Metaphors

Another form of influence on the reader through the mediation of the narrator and the adherence to a translation situation is Milton's use of the epic simile. The epic or Homeric simile is in itself a mimetic practice appropriating Homeric style. Through association with his name, Homer is posited at the beginning of epic high style and as standard of the practice. The simile works through processes of similarity and comparison. By accentuating a relation that offers a new perspective on tenor and vehicle two seemingly unrelated things are connected. Milton adapted this formulaic convention, appropriated it for his Christian epic and his goal of a theodicy. On the one hand, this use is a gesture of cohesion to

the epic genre. On the other hand, in the context of a reinterpretation or translation fiction, such as Milton's rewriting of Genesis, these epic similes can be read as a form of authorial or translator's commentary. The similes are not plot relevant but serve to make the narration more vivid. However, they distract the reader from the main event: in the *Iliad*, a lengthy simile delaying the moment in which the fight between Achilles and Hector functions this way. In these instances, the narrator addresses the reader directly and therefore creates an immediate communication situation with his audience. The narrator assumes the position of an interpreter offering ways to compare for the reader's understanding. These references allocate the matter of comparison within their new context, sometimes by attributing directly, other times by subverting the relation. These comparisons, misattributions and subversions encourage the reader to recognize the sheer impossibility to find an adequate relation. The first long simile in *PL* compares Satan to Leviathan and other monsters.

> […] in bulk as huge
> As whom the Fables name of monstrous size,
> Titanian, or Earth-born, that warr'd on Jove,
> Briareos or Typhon, whom the Den
> By ancient Tarsus held, or that Sea-beast
> Leviathan, which God of all his works
> Created hugest that swim th' Ocean stream:
> Him haply slumbring on the Norway foam
> The Pilot of some small night-founder'd Skiff,
> Deeming some Island, oft, as Sea-men tell,
> With fixed Anchor in his skaly rind
> Moors by his side under the Lee, while Night
> Invests the Sea, and wished Morn delayes:
> So stretcht out huge in length the Arch-fiend lay
> Chain'd on the burning Lake […] (*PL* 1.196-210)

Shortly after he has fallen and landed on the burning lake Satan is compared to different monsters to demonstrate his size. The titans, that rebelled against Zeus, Briareos and Typhon are both children of the goddess Gaia. They are monsters with additional extremities, they are described as having multiple heads and arms. Typhon, who had heads of beasts and dragons, could also speak to gods and animals:

> Strength was with his hands in all that he did and the feet of the strong god were untiring. From his shoulders grew a hundred heads of a snake, a fearful dragon, with dark, flickering tongues, and from under the brows of his eyes in his marvellous heads flashed fire, and fire burned from his heads as he glared. And there were voices in all his dreadful heads which uttered every kind of sound

> unspeakable; for at one time they made sounds such that the gods understood, but at another, the noise of a bull bellowing aloud in proud ungovernable fury; and at another, the sound of a lion, relentless of heart; and at another, sounds like whelps, wonderful to hear; (Hesiod, *Theogony* Evelyn-White, trans. 823-35)

Typhon's ability to speak to whatever creature he desired is considered something more like a threat than a blessing. Having uninterpreted access to all language and communication makes an enemy even more dangerous. Like Satan, Typhon can imitate human, heavenly and beastly language and like him he is defeated by Zeus and sent down into a pit of fire. These references to mythological creatures are a comment on the characters being connected to them in body and in behaviour.

The myth of Leviathan is originally rooted in Mesopotamian and Babylonian legend. The sea monster is also referenced in the Bible, most notably in Job 41:15-34:

> His scales are his pride, shut up together as with a close seal.
> […]
> Upon earth there is not his like, who is made without fear.
> He beholdeth all high things: he is a king over all the children of pride. (KJV)

The Leviathan, like Satan, speaks in different tongues and pride is its strength and offense. On the Day of Judgement, God will destroy Leviathan:

> In that day the Lord with his sore and great and strong sword shall punish leviathan the piercing serpent, even leviathan that crooked serpent; and he shall slay the dragon that is in the sea. (KJV)

The connotations invoked by the simile that compares Satan to Leviathan are manifold. Firstly, Satan is foreshadowed as the serpent who seduces Eve. Secondly, the origin of Leviathan in Babel links the mythical creature to the episode of the tower of Babel in Genesis 11.1-9 and the ensuing confusion of languages. But, Babel is also considered a symbol of Satan himself. This threefold link connects Satan, the serpent or dragon, with linguistic confusion and simultaneously it points to the power of God. God has the power to ban Satan, to destroy the dragon and to inhibit human hubris.

Associations made by the reader, depending on their knowledge of Greek mythology, influence the perception through the audience. The simile works, thus, as an explanation and re-positioning device. While some editions of translations offer annotations and commentary as explanations of translation decisions. The similes also serve as restructuring and interpreting device. They are, however, not

accentuated by being placed in the periphery of the text, such as footnotes or endnotes. They are part of the core structure of *PL*. Yet, when looking at *PL* as a translation fiction, they stand out through their length and the insertion of the epic voice.

Through Milton's repeated use of 'or' in the first few lines the narrator seems to be looking to find the correct expression to make his point. It suggests doubt, the inability to precisely pin down the characters and events being described by the simile. A definitive result is elusive not only to the reader but to the narrator himself. The similes and intertextual references serve as paratexts, as "thresholds of interpretation", as the book with the same title by Genette (1997) describes them. They stand inside and outside of the narrative, blurring the lines between the fictional narrative and the commentary. They lead the reader through the process of the narrator's struggle. The struggle to find words, to describe the events that led to the creation and the fall. The consequence is an admission of the failure of human language to serve as a vehicle of descriptions of heavenly or hellish occurrences. Peter C. Herman terms Milton's approach a "poetics of incertitude" (2003: 182). He contests the notion held by Fish and other critics that "the affirmation of variety is immediately countered by the imposition of unity and the insistence on an underlying sameness" (Fish 1997: xxi). Herman argues that the similes and metaphors in *PL* continuously lead to moments of *aporia* (cf. Herman 1998). Milton's wish to consolidate the message of God, as much as his disappointment after the failure of the revolution, is undermined by the inability to find the 'right words'. According to Umberto Eco translation is just that, "the art of failure". There can never be success in translation when translation is supposed to focus on one meaning. It can offer deeper insight by unfolding various interpretative possibilities. This strategy is key to understanding Milton's narrator as an interpreter figure.

The theological perspective of the translator's failure suggests the impossibility of linguistic reconciliation before the last judgment and the return to heaven. Milton's approach, in this context, seems to play out translational failing over and over. Yet, the insistence and the repeated attempt to find the 'right words' goes to show Milton's understanding of the task of the believer as much as that of the author as one of trial and approximation.

Similes are not only an expression of incertitude. Milton also uses them deliberately to show off his poetic skill and simultaneously demonstrate the linguistic ineptitude of human language in regard to divinity. This holds particularly true for the negative similes. In descriptions of Eden they evoke exotic beauty but admit to the inability to describe Paradise with words (cf. Leonard 1999: 135).

> Not that faire field
> Of Enna, where Proserpin gathering flours
> Her self a fairer Floure by gloomie Dis
> Was gatherd, which cost Ceres all that pain
> To seek her through the world; nor that sweet Grove
> Of Daphne by Orontes, and th' inspir'd
> Castalian Spring, might with this Paradise
> Of Eden strive; (*PL* 4.268-75)

Neither of the two famous gardens invoked in this passage can apparently begin to describe the beauties of Eden. Both comparisons begin with "nor". Yet, both foreshadow the events of *PL* and the loss of Eden. Proserpine was taken to the underworld by Hades (Dis) and Daphne turned into a laurel tree to avoid the advances from Apollo. In both instances, female characters lose the freedom to live in their respective gardens. Proserpine will even seal her fate by also eating a forbidden fruit.

Many similes are combined with ekphrastic descriptions. Ekphrasis is a special form of description. It is the verbal description of another not-textual work of art, it is a "representation of a representation" (Heffernan 2004: 3). It used to be a rhetorical exercise with the aim to produce "a speech which leads one around bringing the subject matter vividly before the eyes" (Aphthomius: *Progymnasmata* in Webb 1999: 11). The description should not be merely a report but illustrate and involve the reader. Then, the concept was not limited to the description of artworks. However, based on the limitation introduced later, DuBois posited that "ekphrasis has no place in *Paradise Lost*" (1982: 93). Koelb, on the other hand, argued that by narrowing the concept of ekphrasis to one specific case of description, integral texts have been excluded from analysis. Ekphrasis was a practice originally concerned with literary description in a much broader sense (Koelb 2006: 4). The point of reference for ekphrasis does not necessarily have to be a work of art or any other object. The narrator of *PL* does not explicitly describe specific artworks. Objects of classical epic ekphrasis, too,

were not necessarily 'real' existing objects. The difference to more general concepts of description lies in the anticipated effect on the reader. Its aim is to describe 'as if it were before the poet's eyes' and to create the illusion for the reader of describing an actual scenery. It is a translational process in three stages: from immaterial (imaginary place) to material (verbal rendition) back to immaterial (imagination of the reader).

In *PL,* ekphrasis is most effectively employed in the description of Pandemonium. Mimetic and translational processes continue to be at play on many levels. Not only does Milton translate (move into his composition) and emulate (accommodate pagan beliefs to show Christianity's superiority) multiple old sources, which he brings together in a different order and emphasis. He also translates within his own system of reference. The question of creation, construction and building regarding Pandemonium is posed over and over again by the epic itself. Pandemonium is an imitation of heaven, a translation from bliss to hell. The seat of Lucifer is the horrific mistranslation of the kingdom of God. Only by contrast to it, does the whole spectrum of how wrong the rebel angels were and what they lost, become clear. After the angels have fallen and seemingly recuperated from their loss of heaven, they begin building their own royal palace. The reader takes part in the construction of Pandemonium and gets to be a witness of its development.

> There stood a Hill not far whose griesly top
> Belch'd fire and rowling smoak; the rest entire
> Shon with a glossie scurff, undoubted sign
> That in his womb was hid metallic Ore,
> The work of Sulphur. Thither wing'd with speed
> A numerous Brigad hasten'd. As when Bands
> Of Pioners with Spade and Pickax arm'd
> Forerun the Royal Camp, to trench a Field,
> Or cast a Rampart. (*PL* 1.670-78)

First the layout of their immediate surrounding is described. The situation in which they find themselves in is hell, a ferocious, inhospitable landscape. There are fire breathing mountains and boiling soil. The fallen angels are associated with soldiers building armaments for combat, although they carry the same tools used for mining, which is in fact what they are about to do.

Beginning the line and phrase with "There" not only indicates that the readers find themselves in the location now being described closer, but also points

the reader's gaze towards a direction, asking them to look closer. The deictic quality has a similar function as the teichoscopy, where an actor on stage pretends to relate an action before his eyes to which the audience has no access. Through the perspective and the emotions of that actor, the audience can make their own impression of what cannot be seen. In *PL*, the authorial narrator assumes the role of the actor. Continuing in midline, a new sentence with "Thither" emphasizes the deictic motion by interrupting the flow and using the stress to point again into a specific direction. Milton's syntax usually exhibits longer constructions with similes and examples. This sentence is slightly over one clause. The contraction also works in favour of the impression of haste and contributes to this phrase seeming like an instruction, even though it's in the past tense. No time should be lost when it comes to building their hellish palace.

The aim of ekphrasis, making something visible before the reader's eye, is here further realised through the graphic adjectives in the first four lines. There are phonetic impulses given by onomatopoetic constructions, like the voiced velar approximant in "rowling smoak". Milton applied not only visual description but made the sounds of his syntactic constructions work towards a broader experience for the reader. The translational aspect here is a mixture of different sense perceptions into verbal form. Not only visual and acoustic ones but also smell and touch are evoked through the belching hill and the sulphuric soil, the amalgamation of visual and tactile sensation in "glossie scurff". It is in fact an experience addressing more than just the intellectual perception of his readers. Milton has made the text an actual sensual encounter with the reality of hell.

Milton draws on conventional imagery from hell and purgatory but at the same time on more specific, more palpable images. Milton names the architect responsible for building the new demonic capital. Mammon a word originating in the Bible and a synonym for wrongly acquired riches and human greed, is used as a personification for the demon architect.

> Mammon led them on,
> Mammon, the least erected Spirit that fell
> From heav'n, for ev'n in heav'n his looks and thoughts
> Were always downward bent, admiring more
> The riches of Heav'ns pavement, trod'n Gold,
> Then aught divine or holy else enjoy'd
> In vision beatific: by him first
> Men also, and by his suggestion taught,
> Ransack'd the Center, and with impious hands

> Rifl'd the bowels of thir mother Earth
> For Treasures better hid. (*PL* 1.678-88)

Visual impressions are in the foreground in this passage. Mammon himself is described as the most crouched of all fallen angels. He has only ever been interested in the golden structures of heaven, always looking down and too concentrated on material beauty to properly worship God. Now in hell, he leads the other angels, taking from their surroundings whatever they need for their construction.

It is Mammon who teaches mankind how to make use of the earth's resources. A teacher on the one hand and on the other hand also a seducer, a preacher of false likeness. For he has led mankind on a path of improper mimesis. It is a blasphemous act, even a violent act against nature. An act which should, according to the narrator's comment, better not have occurred. The language used here alludes to a form of rape of mother earth, an 'unnatural' intrusion into her inner workings. There is also a clear reference to the myth of Prometheus, who brings fire to men, teaches them how to use it, and is then punished by Zeus. Prometheus is punished for challenging, for reducing the differences between gods and mankind. This kind of improper mimesis is done deliberately and a disregard of their orders.

When Mammon leads the other fallen angels, they build their new residence as if he were leading them into battle. The vile landscape seems like an enemy itself, one the fallen angels must conquer in order to construct their kingdom in hell. The war in heaven had just ended with their defeat. Now they raid the earth, whose "veins of fire / Sluc'd from the Lake" (702) and open "a spacious wound" (689) in search for "ribs of Gold" (690) for the construction of their palace.

> Anon out of the earth a Fabrick huge
> Rose like an Exhalation, with the sound
> Of Dulcet Symphonies and voices sweet,
> Built like a Temple, where Pilasters round
> Were set, and Doric pillars overlaid
> With Golden Architrave; nor did there want
> Cornice or Freeze, with bossy Sculptures grav'n,
> The Roof was fretted Gold. Not Babilon,
> Nor great Alcairo such magnificence
> Equal'd in all thir glories, to inshrine
> Belus or Serapis thir Gods, or seat
> Thir Kings, when Ægypt with Assyria strove

In wealth and luxurie. Th' ascending pile
Stood fixt her stately highth, and strait the dores
Op'ning thir brazen foulds discover wide
Within, her ample spaces, o're the smooth
And level pavement: from the arched roof
Pendant by suttle Magic many a row
Of Starry Lamps and blazing Cressets fed
With Naphtha and Asphaltus yeilded light
As from a sky. (*PL* 1.710-30)

Milton's description of the finished structure works both with ekphrasis and emulatio. The building rises from this terrifying landscape as if by itself. Yet, the term "fabrick" in contrast to the untamed material the fallen angels find, appears to have a pattern, seems organised and structured, "a product of skilled workmanship" (OED: fabric). The other interesting definition of the term fabric, in this context, is the formation of animals or their body parts. So 'fabric' can denote two seemingly opposing processes: a cultural activity in need of expertise and the organic development of limbs. Both meanings and the apparent contradiction are more strongly carved out in the subsequent description of the palace.

Pandemonium rises from the earth and is breathing like an animal in labour. However, the structure's coming into existence is accompanied by sweet music. Not only visual imagery is evoked here but also sounds contribute to the scene. The fallen angels roar as if still in battle while sweet tunes play from pipes and organs accompanying their work. Full of contrast between brutal forces of nature and man-made violence directed towards a tender mother earth this passage continues to evoke images from Greek antiquity. The seat of Lucifer is "Built like a Temple" and has all the adornments recognizable as features of classical devotional and political architecture, pillars, pilaster, architraves and sculptures. The comparison between Pandemonium, Babel, and Cairo works in both directions, Milton is trying to establish this here. Pandemonium is built before the reader's eye by referencing well-known classical structures. However, according to the timeline the buildings referenced by the architecture of Pandemonium will only be built in the future. Milton could count on the reader understanding the references, such as human hubris in the story of Babel and the earthly riches of pharaohs and kings. The name of the architect further underlines the vanity and immoral human ambition, the ambition to compete with gods.

Milton probably had both the temple in Jerusalem and St Peter's in Rome in mind, when he imagined the construction of Pandemonium. For Milton, the Vatican stood for misguided religious pomp and the unjust papal authority. But, as David Quint points out, the references to sacred buildings and sites goes to show Milton's "distrust of *any and all* [sic] established churches" (2014: 25). The religious establishment though, is also deeply connected to political rule and authority. Both the temple in Jerusalem and the Vatican, are in addition to their religious importance, manifestations of political strength. This hellish ekphrasis is a negative epic simile, evoking all these historic and legendary places but ultimately failing to match up.

Yet, with a twist Milton positions his hell before the time of all these worldly buildings, thus arguing that all human vanity is simply an imitation of this first blasphemous enterprise. "[A]ccording to Milton's fiction, all vain and ephemeral human monuments are only a pretentious imitation of Pandaemonium" (Blakemore 1986: 142). Milton has based his account of Pandemonium on other (mythical) cities and in doing so is inverting the chronology. Hell is repeatedly compared to man-made structures, such as the Pyramids (*PL* 1.694), Babylon (*PL* 1.717) and Cairo (*PL* 1.718).

Ekphrasis is a conventional device in the tradition of heroic poetry. In the *Iliad*, a famous and lengthy passage of ekphrasis describes the shield of Achill. Virgil in turn appropriated this motif and dedicated a passage in the *Aeneid* to the description of Aeneas' shield. Milton employing ekphrasis is not only a mimetic appropriation of a literary device. Ekphrasis is a mimetic principle in its own right and follows the productive principles of its source. It thus shares noticeable productive processes with translation. In both instances the product is secondary, it is based on a source and imitates the underlying structure. Like translation, ekphrasis selects and reorders one work of art from one medium and reassembles it in another.

Due to the origin of ekphrasis, as a rhetoric exercise, it follows conventionalised rules. Customarily, ekphrastic passages would begin at the bottom left and continue through to the top right. Using this description device as a method to approach the indescribable, might be indebted to the formulaic fashion of the device. If there is no real chance of finding satisfying terms for the

language of the divine, turning to systematic methods of description might offer a partial remedy to the lack of semantic clarity after the fall.

Milton's concern with questions of translation and language crises, can further be seen in the many references to Babel. Babel, as the source of linguistic dispersal, is foreshadowed. It is not by chance that Milton compares the fallen angels to the destroyed tower of Babel: "those [the rebellious angels] proud Towrs to swift destruction doom'd" (*PL* 5.907); "In shape and gesture proudly eminent / Stood like a tow'r" (*PL* 1.590).

Like the epic similes, passages of ekphrasis are not imperative to the narrative. They present a digression from the plot, but often metaphorically reposition the narrative within a greater context or offer a basis for comparison without the trigger words 'as' or 'like'. Similes and metaphors both offer additional information but can also be read as evidence for the inability to actually 'name'. Eden can only be described by negative similes, Pandemonium only through the comparison of vain human building projects and the recourse to a highly standardised literary device. But Heaven is missing from all those descriptions. It cannot be grasped or translated. As we will see in the next paragraph, Adam has no such problem in his unfallen state. But the loss of Eden or in Satan's case of heaven affects the speech of the fallen characters.

2.5 God's Interpreters

In this section, I will look at the dialogue within the text. I want to investigate how language is employed by the characters of *PL*. There are different stages of linguistic proficiency in the epic: angelic, satanic and human. All characters function as interpreters of God's world, according to Milton. The narrator is the most prominent interpreter of God. But the other characters also translate and interpret God's message. Above all, the angels function as translators, fulfilling their most fundamental task. Satan has great oratory skill but his speech is deceitful. Adam and Eve are created with the faculty of speech, but their language changes after the fall.

2.5.1 Divine Messengers

In Genesis, the word constitutes the moment of world-making through God. By God's word, creation was set in motion: "And God said, 'Let there be light'; and there was light" (Genesis 1:3, KJV). However, in the gospel of John the word is also identified with Jesus Christ: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" (John 1:1). In John, Christ is understood as the logos, as the second part of the trinity and of the same substance as God. "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth" (John 1:14). In *Paradise Lost* Milton adopts this notion when he writes:

> And thou my Word, begotten Son, by thee
> This I perform, speak thou, and be it done […]
> So spake the almighty, and to what he spake
> His Word, the filial Godhead, gave effect. (*PL* 7.163-175)

The word of God is creative and productive: "by thee / This I perform". Locution is God's world-making principle. The significance of the locutionary act as a creative force is also a prominent factor of epic poetry. The genre emerged in situations in which authority and cultural awareness shift. The epic likewise attempts to create order out of chaos by way of addressing these shifts of authority and awareness. Milton's verses paraphrase John in the KJV. Yet, he departs from Genesis when making the Son the executor of his creation.

Jesus Christ is God's message made corporeal. The term "begotten" has often caused confusion. It has been used to argue that the Son could not be part of the trinity, as if he was begotten, he must have a beginning. One who begins could not be eternal like God.[25] This supposed contradiction was also addressed by Milton. The term "begotten" is a translation from Greek monogenēs (μονογενὴς). Its two definitions are "pertaining to being the only one of its kind within a specific relationship" and "pertaining to being the only one of its kind or class, unique in kind".[26] It is this meaning that Milton distils out of the etymological source of the term. Through the turn of line 174 and the position of "His Word" (*PL* 7.175), two readings are possible. God speaks 'his word' and 'to his word'.

---

[25] See for example the concept of the trinity for Jehova's Witnesses.
[26] *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (BAGD, 3rd Edition)

Milton can express the seemingly contradictory notion of the Son's existence with this syntactic arrangement.

In *PL*, the word is Christ as part of the trinity and the force of creation. Creation is in part a process of recreation. Man is made in God's image and Eve is made from Adam's rib. But, recreation and imitation are not only engines for divine world-making: Satan tries to recreate the heavenly throne in Pandemonium for himself. Before God created the world, there was already something in existence, his infinite being. According to Milton's Monism, creation was brought about *ex Deo*.

> […] bid the Deep
> Within appointed bounds be Heav'n and Earth,
> Boundless the Deep, because I am who fill
> Infinitude, nor vacuous the space. (*PL* 7.166-9)

God is the essence out of which everything was created: "I am who fill / Infinitude." Therefore, the principle of creation is based on reassembling. God is infinite and he created the universe out of his own substance. This theological perspective corresponds with the productive method of epic writing and of translation. Mimetic approximation and reordering are not only methods of text-making but, according to Milton, they are God's ways of world-making. "The King of Glorie in his powerful Word / And Spirit coming to create new Worlds." (*PL* 7.208-9). God is the source and the translation in Christ. This view gives license to the author to recreate the story of creation in terms of imitation, translation and appropriation. But simultaneously, the danger of hubris is always looming over the project of this Christian epic. Milton appropriates creative methods he recognises in God's creation and consequently, runs the risk of comparing himself to God.

There are multiple occasions in which Milton refers to God as the "author" of creation. "[T]hee Author of all being, / Fountain of Light, thy self invisible" (*PL* 3.374-5). These verses in Book III summarise Milton's understanding of God in *PL*. God is the invisible source of which mankind in their fallen state can only see the effects but not the cause. Satan too, is addressed as author by his incestuous family Sin and Death: "Thou art my Father, thou my Author" (*PL* 2.864). Satan inverts the creative force of God to produce his fatal offspring. Sin has no choice but to see her creator in Satan, missing that her creation was a direct

result of Satan's revolt. This line is also a translation and a paraphrase of the beginning of the *Inferno*. Dante addresses Virgil with: "You are my master and my author" (1.85) and later repeats the notion "you are my guide, my governor, my master" (2.140). And Eve speaks to Adam as "my author and disposer" (*PL* 4.635). The metaphor of the author as creator plays out on all three levels of internal communication: divine, satanic and human. God is the eternal author of all being, Satan in turn the creator of all evil ("But from the Author of all ill could Spring / So deep a malice" *PL* 2.381-2; "Misery, uncreated till the crime" *PL* 6.268) and as Eve was made from Adam's flesh he is her creator.

A central position in terms of divine communication falls to the angels. Due to the infinitude and elusiveness of God to mankind, before and after the fall, God's words need to be interpreted for them by the angels. From the earliest Christian tradition angels were considered to be the messengers of God. The word 'angel' derives from Latin *angelus* and originally meant nothing more than messenger. It was translated in the Septuagint from Hebrew 'mal'ach' (מַלְאָךְ), which also simply denoted courier. No divine connotation was part of the original signification: the term represented the transfer of information or goods from one point to another. The lexical limitation of the term's signification occurred through the processes of translation into Germanic languages. 'Angel' in English and 'Götterbote' in German express this distinction through borrowing and compounding. The etymological roots of the translations into German and English emphasise the spatial and material quality given to the angel's tasked as heavenly messengers.

Though they are first and foremost the messengers and interpreters of the word of God, they are also heavenly warriors. In Book V, Adam requests of Raphael to tell him about Satan's rebellion. But before beginning, Raphael expresses his concern:

> High matter thou injoinst me, O prime of men,
> Sad task and hard, for how shall I relate
> To human sense th' invisible exploits
> Of warring Spirits; how without remorse
> The ruin of so many glorious once
> And perfet while they stood; how last unfould
> The secrets of another World, perhaps
> Not lawful to reveal? […] (*PL* 5.563-70)

The angel struggles with the idea of relating to Adam what seems to him to be impossible to explain to a human, ending in a rhetorical question. Raphael experiences a typical interpreter's dilemma: how to express it in your, i.e. Adam's words? The interrogative pronoun 'how' is repeated three times. Raphael rephrases the problem, posing the same question multiple times with escalating gravity. Not only will human language be insufficient, but another world is at stake. Another world could be lost in translation. Furthermore, Raphael does not even seem sure if it is his right to reveal the inner workings of heaven. The consequences of his interpretation might possibly exceed a mere language crisis. For the sake of Adam, he decides to attempt a translation with the following translator's comment:

> […] yet for thy good
> This is dispenc't, and what surmounts the reach
> Of human sense, I shall delineate so,
> By lik'ning spiritual to corporal forms,
> As may express them best, though what if Earth
> Be but the shaddow of Heav'n, and things therein
> Each to other like, more then on earth is thought? (*PL* 5.570-76)

Raphael explains that he will use similarity to find the proper expression, one that won't surpass Adam's human understanding. His translator's concern and commentary are also a variation on Plato's allegory of the cave (*Republic* 541a). Earth is a shadow image of heaven and only by similarity is Adam able to fathom divinity.

Raphael continues to relay to Adam an account of the war in heaven and the creation of hell, but keeps coming up with interjections. The interjections function to show how difficult this task is:

> Unspeakable; for who, though with the tongue
> Of Angels, can relate, or to what things
> Liken on Earth conspicuous, that may lift
> Human imagination to such highth
> Of Godlike Power […] (*PL* 6.297-301)

The narrative mode of reported action is also a common feature in classical epics. There are reports such as the lengthy report by Odysseus, while at the court of Alkinoos, in Books IX–XII of the *Odyssey* or Aeneas' account of the fall of Troy to Dido in Books II and III of the *Aeneid*. Milton adapted the convention of the reported action and added a translation situation, which creates even more distance to the empyreal quarrels.

The situation becomes even more complicated after the fall of Adam and Eve. In Books XI and XII, Michael is sent to share a vision of the future with Adam before leading Adam and Eve out of Eden. Even though they have repented, Adam and Eve can no longer stay in paradise. They must go into exile, east of Eden and from then on, the gates of Eden will be guarded by angels. Consequently, the colloquial and familiar situation they shared with Raphael before the fall is no longer possible. At first, it seems narration is failing and a visual aid in the form of a vision becomes necessary. The connection to God has been damaged and therefore the communication between God and humans must change along with it. However, in Book XII Michael returns to telling the story of what follows after the flood. Michael argues that Adam's senses won't be able to comprehend these divine things:

> […] objects divine
> Must needs impaire and wearie human sense:
> Henceforth what is to com I will relate,
> Thou therefore give due audience, and attend. (*PL* 12.9-12)

Additionally, Michael reminds Adam to pay attention. Adam is even less capable of understanding divine reasoning after the fall than before and maybe Michael is also a less accommodating interpreter than Raphael. Raphael's rhetoric imitates classical epics while Michael performs the speech act of scripture. The first episode Michael relates is that of the tower of Babel. In Genesis 11:1-9 (KJV) the passage reads as follows:

> And the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech.
> And it came to pass, as they journeyed from the east, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar; and they dwelt there.
> And they said one to another, Go to, let us make brick, and burn them thoroughly. And they had brick for stone, and slime had they for morter.
> And they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth.
> And the Lord came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of men builded.
> And the Lord said, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do.
> Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech.
> So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city.
> Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the Lord did there confound the language of all the earth: and from thence did the Lord scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth.

After the flood, mankind speaks one language and is therefore capable of such an elaborate undertaking. It is again a story of hubris and the wish to become equal to God. But on the other hand, it is also a story of nation-building. The excerpt also depicts the transition from nomadic life to settlement and manufacture. Along with this change, comes specialisation and the advance of cultural practices. Nimrod, the King of Babel, charges his people to manufacture brick, to organise and build a tower. They can do so, because of their shared language. They hope to protect and affirm their community by making "a name" for themselves. This linguistic unity seems to enable mankind to accomplish anything they can imagine. Apparently, this is such a powerful privilege that it is more of a threat to God than the tower itself. In the last verse, the etymology of the city's name is revealed in a meta-linguistic comment on the story of Babel: "Yahweh took the proper noun *Babel* (gate of God) and made it a common noun (tumult of tongues)" (Barnstone 1995: 135). The name Babel imitates the unintelligible blabber of unknown human languages.

In the Book of Genesis, this passage adds to the story of exile a story of diaspora. While Adam and Eve left together, the people of Babel are dispersed over the world. At the same time the last stage of postlapsarian linguistic confusion is reached, a state that will only be resolved by the miracle of Pentecost in the New Testament. In comparison, here the episode is related by Michael:

> A mightie Hunter thence he shall be styl'd
> Before the Lord, as in despite of Heav'n,
> Or from Heav'n claming second Sovrantie;
> And from Rebellion shall derive his name,
> Though of Rebellion others he accuse.
> Hee with a crew, whom like Ambition joyns
> With him or under him to tyrannize,
> Marching from Eden towards the West, shall finde
> The Plain, wherein a black bituminous gurge
> Boiles out from under ground, the mouth of Hell;
> Of Brick, and of that stuff they cast to build
> A Citie and Towre, whose top may reach to Heav'n;
> And get themselves a name, least far disperst
> In foraign Lands thir memorie be lost,
> Regardless whether good or evil fame.
> But God who oft descends to visit men
> Unseen, and through thir habitations walks
> To mark thir doings, them beholding soon,
> Comes down to see thir Citie, ere the Tower
> Obstruct Heav'n Towrs, and in derision sets

> Upon thir Tongues a various Spirit to rase
> Quite out thir Native Language, and instead
> To sow a jangling noise of words unknown:
> Forthwith a hideous gabble rises loud
> Among the Builders; each to other calls
> Not understood, till hoarse, and all in rage,
> As mockt they storm; great laughter was in Heav'n
> And looking down, to see the hubbub strange
> And hear the din; thus was the building left
> Ridiculous, and the work Confusion nam'd. (*PL* 12.33-62)

Michael retells the story very literally. The hunter is a reference to Nimrod, who is described as a mighty hunter in Genesis 10. The location of the city and building material are mentioned, as well as the Babylonian people's wish to make "a name". What Michael adds is information about where the plain is situated, not only to the east, but above hell. This creates a connection between the rebellious enterprise of the humans and of Satan. The perspective is also inverted in *PL*, where the focus is on where they came from, the West, and not where they settled as is the case in Genesis. Nimrod or Babel are never mentioned by name, thereby pointing to their failure and their disappearance into oblivion. Only at the end of the passage, the name of the city is given in its new meaning or rather translation: "the work Confusion nam'd". Yet, the passage is still connected to nation-building: nation-building but of the negative kind, monarchy and tyranny similar to hell. By referring to their common language as their "Native Language", Milton further contributes to the concept of nation- and myth-making, which is in any case a major aspect of the passage.

Finally, Michael derisively describes the sound of the newly created languages as "hideous". The builders get hoarse and enraged while in heaven a sort of *Schadenfreude* causes the angels "great laughter". The phrase used here, "jangling noise", is suspiciously reminiscent of the "jingling sound of like endings" Milton uses to criticise rhyme in his preliminary comment on the verse.

As readers, the narrative situation we encounter here is the foreshadowing of events relayed by the angel Michael to Adam. This retelling occurred before the confusion of languages and is written by a postlapsarian, post-diluvian author, paraphrasing an English translation of a Hebrew text: the text includes a pun on the etymology of the Akkadian word 'Babel' and its onomatopoeic quality. The fallen narrator speaks through an angelic messenger in a metaleptic translation, rearranging and reframing the unfortunate instances that provide the conditions

for his own art. Only through the fall from heavenly language, the subsequent differentiation between the signifier and the signified, could ambiguity and figurative language became a possibility. Even though in parts Milton, the author, as well as the narrator, claims to make himself a vessel for the interpretation of God's word. Milton created one of the most impressive epic poems in the English language, fully exploiting the consequences of the linguistic fall and confusion of languages after Babel. In another context, the use or misuse of this circumstance leads us to look closer at Satan's speech acts.

2.5.2 Satanic Speech Acts

In Book V, when the revolt in heaven is related to Adam, Satan's dilemma and his vice is summarised in one paragraph.

> The Palace of great Lucifer, (so call
> That Structure in the Dialect of men
> *Interpreted*) which not long after, he
> *Affecting* all equality with God,
> In *imitation* of that Mount whereon
> Messiah was declar'd in sight of Heav'n,
> The Mountain of the Congregation call'd;
> For thither he assembl'd all his Train,
> *Pretending* so commanded to consult
> About the great reception of thir King,
> Thither to come, and with calumnious Art
> Of *counterfeted truth* thus held thir ears. (*PL* 5.760-71, emphasis mine)

Satan, the master deceiver, resides in a palace that imitates the seat of Christ. Satan, a false saviour on a make-believe throne who claims to be equal to God, feigns obedience with "counterfeted truth" to praise Christ. In this paragraph, the whole danger inherent in mimesis comes to a head. All the fears Plato had about wanting to be something one is not and the hopes of exonerating this concept by Aristotle seem to converge here.

The results of bad or wrong mimesis are Satan's main offenses. He does not want to come second to Jesus, he wants 'to be like' God. Satan is jealous when God orders the angels to adore his Son as his equal. Satan's rebellion is brought about by the wish to be something he is not and the inability to come to terms with his role in the heavenly society. This inability of his taints all other traits of his character, such as his splendour before the fall, so far that it is impossible to be called by the same name. Satan, once called Lucifer the brightest

and most beautiful angel, God's favourite, chooses bad mimesis over being governed by a god who has treated him unjustly.

Satan lacks the pragmatic capacity of God's language, pragmatism that can create. God's word started the creation of the universe and it is his word that has pragmatic power over the inhabitants of his cosmos. Satan can use and abuse language according to his needs. When he first speaks after his fall into hell, Satan gives this highly rhetorical speech:

> Is this the Region, this the Soil, the Clime,
> Said then the lost Arch-Angel, this the seat
> That we must change for Heav'n, this mournful gloom
> For that celestial light? Be it so, since he
> Who now is Sovran can dispose and bid
> What shall be right: fardest from him is best
> Whom reason hath equald, force hath made supream
> Above his equals. Farewel happy Fields
> Where Joy for ever dwells: Hail horrours, hail
> Infernal world, and thou profoundest Hell
> Receive thy new Possessor: One who brings
> A mind not to be chang'd by Place or Time.
> The mind is its own place, and in it self
> Can make a Heav'n of Hell, a Hell of Heav'n.
> What matter where, if I be still the same,
> And what I should be, all but less then he
> Whom Thunder hath made greater? Here at least
> We shall be free; th' Almighty hath not built
> Here for his envy, will not drive us hence:
> Here we may reign secure, and in my choyce
> To reign is worth ambition though in Hell:
> Better to reign in Hell, then serve in Heav'n. (*PL* 1.242-63)

Full of rhetorical questions and interrogative pronouns, this passage introduces Satan as a skilled orator. Satan abandons his initial despair following the fall and quickly turns his fate around, declaring that hell is only a state of mind. Even though this concept might seem understandable to modern readers, during the Renaissance the concept of hell was not considered to be a metaphysical state: for a Renaissance believer, hell was a reality. Is Satan being ironic here or is he trying to console himself? A little further in the extract, he claims nobody will envy him this place, but who would? Maybe Satan's fate was already sealed when he planned to revolt against God and now the outside has just change to reflect the inside: "What matter where, if I be still the same" (*PL* 1.256). This lets him conclude: "Better to reign in Hell, than serve in Heaven" (*PL* 1.263) turning a phrase from the *Odyssey* upside down. There, Odysseus claims: "I would rather

be a paid servant in a poor man's house and be above ground than king of kings among the dead" (1.489-91).

Satan can adapt his language to any occasion and any addressee. He can use "Ambiguous words and jealousies, to sound / Or taint integrity" (*PL* 5.702-3). Satan can converse with Sin and Death in their foul language, whom he "answered smooth" (*PL* 2.816). Yet, he is still able to deceive Uriel, one of the archangels, who is guarding the gates of Eden. Satan disguises himself as an angel but also his speech changes. He flatters Uriel with his standing and his appearance, but also by claiming to need his help to understand God's plan:

> *Uriel,* for thou of those seav'n Spirits that stand
> In sight of God's high Throne, gloriously bright,
> The first art wont his great authentic will
> Interpreter through highest Heav'n to bring,
> Where all his Sons thy Embassie attend;
> […]
> Unspeakable desire to see, and know
> All these his wondrous works, but chiefly Man, […] (*PL* 3.654-63)

Uriel is addressed as "Interpreter" and a few lines further Satan admits an "Unspeakable desire to see" mankind. Satan plays on Uriel's vanity and reveals one of his key flaws, his own desire. It is also the first instance in which Satan uses the name of God. Satan is an actor, an imposter, who knows about the impact of words and unscrupulously uses language for his advantage.

Satan's plan to corrupt mankind and his travel to Eden lead him through several metamorphoses, an angel, a cormorant, a toad, and finally a serpent. Each time he changes shape, he changes speech. When he seduces Eve, the first thing she notices is the particularity of hearing a snake speak:

> Though at the voice much marveling; at length
> Not unamaz'd she thus in answer spake.
> What may this mean? Language of Man pronounc't
> By Tongue of Brute, and human sense exprest?
> […]
> Thee, Serpent, suttlest beast of all the field
> I knew, but not with human voice endu'd;
> Redouble then this miracle, and say,
> How cam'st thou speakable of mute, and how
> To me so friendly grown above the rest
> Of brutal kind, that daily are in sight? (*PL* 9.551-65)

As the simile comparing Satan to Typhon and Leviathan already foreshadowed, Satan's dangerousness lies in his enormous skill as an imitator and above all, his

mastery of language and oratory. He can even give a satisfying answer to Eve's questions: "How cam'st thou speakable of mute […]?" (*PL* 9.563). Satan argues that he conceived speech after he ate from the forbidden tree. Satan praises the fruit's quality and plays down the dangers of disobeying God. According to Satan, he is proof of the exaggeration of God's warning against eating from the forbidden tree. Why would God want to keep all the knowledge to himself? Satan's role declines with the progression of the epic. In the beginning, he seems to show all the characteristics of the epic hero. However, after Satan's seduction of Eve, Milton turns his emphasis on the human couple and their familiarisation with their fallen condition.

2.5.3 Human Understanding

Adam and Eve experience two different linguistic stages, prelapsarian and postlapsarian language. Satan's speech also changes after his fall. The reader experiences his unfallen speech only through Raphael and while Satan is already planning to rebel against God. Adam and Eve on the other hand are represented both before and after their fall. Initially, language is given to them by God on their creation. Adam describes his awakening and the discovery of speech:

> to speak I tri'd, and forthwith spake,
> My Tongue obey'd and readily could name
> What e're I saw. (*PL* 8.271-3)

Speech comes ready to him and it is easy for him to find the corresponding term to the concept he his confronted with, there is no mediation needed. There is no discrepancy between signifier and signified. The same holds true when Adam names the animals. He has no hesitation or difficulty thanks to the knowledge of their form God has given him:

> I nam'd them, as they pass'd, and understood
> Thir Nature, with such knowledg God endu'd
> My sudden apprehension. (*PL* 8.352-4)

The prelapsarian couple also has no difficulties in addressing each other either, their angelic guests, or even God through their prayers. The words in prose or rhyme come 'naturally' to them and without planning or thinking they can produce poetry:

> Thir Orisons, each Morning duly paid
> In various style, for neither various style

> Nor holy rapture wanted they to praise
> Thir Maker, in fit strains pronounc't or sung
> Unmeditated, such prompt eloquence
> Flowd from thir lips, in Prose or numerous Verse,
> More tuneable then needed Lute or Harp
> To add more sweetness, and they thus began. (*PL* 5.145-52)

Adam and Eve's spontaneous prayer shows Milton's idea of the importance of immediate and personal worship without the necessity of an established church or clergy as mediator. There is no language barrier hindering the couple in their prayer. They can speak freely without second thoughts or planning. "Rapture", the biblical concept of being caught up to heaven, is also called "translation". Adam and Eve in this state needed no translation to communicate with God.

Yet, the communication does not go both ways. God understands Adam and Eve "unmediated" and can make himself be understood by them but it is his choice do so. Being understood by God, thus, depends on God's will. There are instances in which Adam and Eve cannot comprehend God's language uninterpreted. "Unspeakable, who sitt'st above these heavens / To us invisible or dimly seen" (*PL* 5.156-7). This is how Adam and Eve address God in their morning prayer before their fall. Even the prelapsarian language of Adam and Eve is not the same or even sufficient to communicate with God directly, their wording is reminiscent of Corinthians 13:12. They require support from beings closer to God. "Speak ye who best can tell, ye sons of light, / Angels, for ye behold him" (*PL* 5.160-1). They ask the angels to join in their praise as they have more knowledge of God. In Book VIII, Adam is reassured that man is not only made after God's image but also his capability to speak and understand language:

> Nor are thy lips ungraceful, Sire of men,
> Nor tongue ineloquent; for God on thee
> Abundantly his gifts hath also pour'd
> Inward and outward both, his image faire:
> Speaking or mute all comliness and grace
> Attends thee, and each word, each motion formes. (*PL* 8.218-23)

After the fall, the changes become immediately noticeable. When Eve returns after her seduction by Satan and tells Adam about the tree and the fruit, Adam remains speechless. His usual, natural eloquence seems to have left him. Adam's first and immediate response to Eve's trespass is the inability to employ

language:[27] "Speechless he stood and pale, till thus at length / First to himself he inward silence broke" (*PL* 9.894-5).

2.6 Things Unspeakable

PL is an epic poem deeply concerned with language. From the narrator to the reader via the characters of the epic everyone involved is drawn into a conflicted relationship with communication. Translation evolves as a necessary evil after the fall but also offers a remedy. Consolidation through translation is an attempt to recreate and to return to a lost prelapsarian linguistic clarity. This enterprise must fail. Linguistic clarity can only be achieved after death and resurrection when the relationship of humanity and God is restored through God's presence. Milton can only approximate and simulate prelapsarian language. The epic genre and the prominent narrator figure serve as vehicles to convey a translation fiction that approximates Edenic bliss. Epic poetry offers, thanks to its formulaic structure and its tradition in translation, a unique potential for producing Milton's argument. The programmatic concerns of nation-building, exile and world-making present Milton with a structure that has proven to be influential beyond the literary realm. Milton's religious but also political convictions could be expressed in the guise of a poetical work that played out its programme. The reader is drawn into the narrative and the characters before realizing their own predicament: the inevitably fallen state and the own insufficiency of language and perspective.

In *PL* language is mediated by the narrator, the angels and Adam and Eve. Satan manipulates language and as the epics polyglot can converse with all the other characters. His use of language is the deceitful trap of translation. Satan bends language to his will and abuses the other characters' naivety or lack of linguistic knowledge.

The failure of language and the paradoxical quality of Milton's undertaking is highlighted by the things that cannot be named or spoken about. They are paradoxically so because Milton writes about these things and by naming the unnameable belies the inability to come to terms with failing language. Satan is unnamed in heaven after his rebellion (*PL* 6.263). His change after the fall is so grave that his former name cannot describe or hold the concept

---

[27] See also Liam D. Haydon. 2014. *Ambiguous words: Postlapsarian language in Paradise Lost.*

of his satanic character anymore. The war in heaven is almost impossible to relate in human terms, it is a "Fight unspeakable" (*PL* 6.296-7) followed by "Eternal silence" (*PL* 6.385). The devil himself, a chameleon with many names, must give up his original name in heaven, Lucifer, the light bringer, and is known from his rebellion on as Satan, the enemy (*PL* 1.81-2).

3. Translation Fiction *Ossian*

The Poems of Ossian are not a translation in the usual sense either. Milton employs imitatio, emulatio and translatio as forms of mimetic practice to reference his predecessors or to subvert their meaning. As we have seen in the previous chapter, even in so-called original poetry, like Milton's *Paradise Lost*, mimetic strategies underscore, support and bring about new perspectives. They do so even if only by changing the context and the referential environment in which they are presented. Or, they offer a basis from which to negotiate the changing circumstances as Milton does in challenging classical mythology and showing how scripture overcame and bested these conventions.

Macpherson's 'translations' took it one step further. His Ossian is a collection and elaboration on old legends and traditional myths. The poems, as they come to us now, do not have a source as one would typically expect from a translation. Macpherson claimed to have found and translated these fragmentary but "sublime" heroic poems. His approach is mimetic on several levels and the intertwined effect has had great impact on Scottish identity. The poems were also widely read and discussed on the continent. In tracing back these mimetic strategies, I want to identify what makes these texts sound and look translated and how this contributed to the success of these so-called translations. Among the strategies which will be further investigated in this chapter are Macpherson's translation theory, how he established himself as an expert, created a form of translatese and embedded the poems in paratexts.

Macpherson added an elaborate corpus of references such as dissertations by himself and other scholars. Furthermore, he offered parallel passages from other texts, most frequently referencing Milton's *Paradise Lost* and other classics, the *Odyssey*, the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid*, both in their original Greek or Latin as well as in translation by John Dryden or Alexander Pope. In doing so he attempted to place the poems in the context of a scholarly translation. He also developed and advertised a translation theory that established a context for the poems and explained his approach to the supposedly ancient texts: laying the foundations of what came to form a way of language-making, resulting in this peculiar and now recognizable Ossianic prose. Macpherson created an 'artificial' language that tried

to establish that these poems were not originally composed in English. This language and its results will be further investigated in this essay in regards to his treatment of colour terms and epithets in *Fingal*.

Macpherson's creative and productive use of language, as if in a translation, is legitimised by his predecessors. Their establishment of the ability of epic poetry to generate worlds is what enabled Macpherson to utilise a fictional language and by doing so generate a sense of authenticity. However, his treatment of the material has in turn contributed to world-making. In order to do so, Macpherson drew on different, sometimes even conflicting, concepts. Concepts like primitivism (creating a savage pre-Christian setting, calling extensively on the ancient pagan belief and the veneration of the elders, partly basing his translation theory on difficulties arising from the supposed roughness of the originals) and nationalism, which he furthered by creating a myth of origin. Through the recounting of an epic battle for dominance over Scotland, Macpherson gave the Scottish people a point of reference for national pride, an idea of what it meant to be Scottish and how Scottish people came to be.

All these factors of world-making owe their existence to an era that had seen a huge rise in translations of classic texts which gave European scholars a new set of mythologies and poetic forms to borrow from and to be inspired by. This led to an increased interest in the study of ancient societies and built upon the idea of ancient civilisations as ideal environments for the production of original artwork. This type of historicism informs the whole project and was welcomed by the Romantic audience. Macpherson's inventive use of language also made an impact outside of academia. The timing of these translations could not have been better and thanks to Macpherson's successful self-fashioning and acute sense of the needs and desires of his audience, he was able to influence the poems reception: this influence was even felt beyond the realm of literature and language.

Macpherson was one of the first Scottish authors to gain international fame for his writing, although in the guise of a translation. His Ossianic poetry was not only itself influenced by the Scottish Enlightenment but in turn also furthered the importance of this movement. Macpherson contributed to the movement's success by producing a character onto which all these desires, enlightened and romantic, could be projected. This world-making is based on a

transfer, on a relocation in time as well as in space. The context of the 3rd century alters the place in which the poems are set and this temporal relocation gave Macpherson the opportunity to confront the British occupation with a Scottish experience and tradition without risking confrontation.

The Ossianic Poetry was published in quick succession. Beginning with *Fragments of ancient poetry, collected in the Highlands of Scotland, and translated from the Gaelic or Erse language* in 1760 (published twice the same year with only small alterations), followed by the fragmentary longer epic poem *Fingal* in 1761/62, which Macpherson had announced in the *Fragments*. In 1763, the longer epic fragment *Temora* was published and in 1765, Macpherson published the collected edition under the title *The Works of Ossian*. In 1773, Macpherson published a 'carefully corrected, and greatly improved' edition of his Ossianic poetry, *The Poems of Ossian*, in which he reduced references to predecessors and annotations. Here, notably there is a shift from his claim of the poems' authenticity to one of his own originality. After the great success his poetry had, Macpherson probably felt undervalued. His work had been published without giving him credit for his artistic endeavour. The questions I will focus on are: 'How did Macpherson do it?' by looking at external and internal features of the poems; and 'Why was he so successful?'

3.1 Faking a Translation

Without his work a lot of Scottish legend might have been lost but Macpherson was also a con man. He scouted out his possible readership, tested their interest, and then gave them what they wanted. He had support from other experts and knew how to make a forgery at least sufficiently credible to keep the debate going. Although his fraud was so quickly suspected, the ensuing debate did not damage the poems' reception but on the contrary cemented their notoriety.

Macpherson used the mystifying and suspicious aura of translation to lift a story of origin from the fog of pre-Christian Scotland while simultaneously availing himself of the enlightening methods of translation. Translation has a paradox quality in this regard. It can be used as a hermeneutical tool to extract knowledge, and on the other hand, it can disguise its sources and cover its origins in a mythical veil. Macpherson's strategy was based on both these features. He

argued that only through his translation these texts were made available, especially as there would have been no audience for the Gaelic originals. But, at the same time, he used this same argument to cover up his fraudulent endeavour. He utilised the idea of translation to create a mythical past out of a few oral fragments, pieces of Irish mythology and legends, he had heard during his childhood and from the clan culture.

The features of epic poetry concerning the genre's translatedness and its formulaic structure laid out in the previous chapter are also relevant to the following discussion of translatedness of Ossianic poetry. Epic poetry is to a great part based on processes of translation, this is one of its main production method. Epics have always been written in approximation to and differentiation from predecessors. Furthermore, the epic conventions laid out before have contributed to the formulaic style of many epic poets. The invocations have developed further but always in contrast to what came before. When Virgil's narrator first used the personal pronoun to address the muse, he made clear the changing self-awareness of epic poets and their role in relating the events of the poem. Authorial self-positioning became a major factor in the aesthetic debate on imitation versus originality. And, during antiquity these ideas began to shift. The self-assured emergence of the narrator in *PL* was in response to epic writers that came before. However, Milton's epic voice also sought to firmly position the epic within a new tradition, a tradition of Christian epics. Macpherson, on the other hand, deliberately tried to vanish behind the bardic figure of Ossian:

> As the translator claims no merit from his version, he hopes for the indulgence of the public where he fails. He wishes that the imperfect semblance he draws may not prejudice the world against an original, which contains what is beautiful in simplicity, and grand in the sublime. (Macpherson 1765a: 52)

With comments like this Macpherson cultivated a gesture of humility that would allow readers to look behind the 'translations' and see the beauty of the 'original'. Despite all Macpherson's work, the debate about authenticity began immediately after the publication and was most prominently disputed by the English writer and critic Samuel Johnson. Johnson was not going to be fooled by Macpherson's tactics and called him "a mountebank, a liar, and a fraud, and" Johnson was convinced "that the poems were forgeries" (in Magnusson 2006: 340). Others, however, appeared to have looked behind the translation and seen somethings so

peculiar that prominent experts and critics like the German philosopher Hegel came to their defence:

> Obschon berühmte englische Kritiker wie z.B. Johnson und Shaw blind genug gewesen sind, sie für ein eigenes Machwerk Macphersons auszugeben, so ist es doch ganz unmöglich, daß irgendein heutiger Dichter dergleichen alte Volkszustände und Begebenheiten aus sich selber schöpfen könnte. (Hegel 1823–1829/1835: 403)

Wilhelm Grimm even went so far as to say that without Ossian the essence of epic poetry could not be comprehended at all: "Wer könnte den Ossian übergehen und das Wesen des Epos erforschen wollen?" (1818: 221). Following Grimm's claim, it would be amiss not to discuss Ossian when looking at epic poetry, even more so in a context of epic translations.

3.1.1 Epic Conventions

From the collected works of Ossian, the poem *Fingal* deserves special attention when regarding mimesis and translation. The poem is called "An Ancient Epic Poem" in the publications. Whether this designation is justified is a valid question. But in Fingal Macpherson tried the most to mimetically approximate his poems to heroic poetry. The other long poem *Temora* has similarly been fashioned to look like an epos, but there Macpherson did not add contrastive passages from other epic poetry. Epic poetry shares a long and diverse tradition, spanning over ages and continents. Conventions are therefore multiple and various. Keeping in mind that Macpherson collected but also constructed his Ossianic poetry, he intentionally used epic conventions to position Ossian within the canon of western literature.

This strategy becomes most obvious in the poem *Fingal*. It is separated into six books, each accompanied by an introductory summary called argument. The arguments were first introduced for the 1763 edition of *Temora* and then added to Fingal for the 1765 edition as well. Numerology has often played a significant role in epic poetry. Homer's classical Greek epics comprise 24 books each, Vergil's *Aeneid* as well as Milton's *Paradise Lost* were twelve books.[28] Both numbers can be divided by three, typically considered a 'magic' number. The

---

[28] The epic poem *Pharsalia* by the Roman poet Lucan is composed of ten books only. But it remains unfinished as Lucan committed suicide in the wake of the Pisonian conspiracy.

number three has pre-Christian significance as well as having been appropriated for Christian mission to make conversion to Christianity easier. Pagan rituals and myths were reinterpreted as Christian precursors and relocated within the Christian tradition. One of the oldest Celtic symbols, the triskele, for example, was appropriated as the symbol for the Holy Trinity and can be seen in church windows and on other Christian ornaments. But Macpherson does not seem concerned with consistency when it comes to the symbolism he could draw on. *Temora* has eight books and in the many editions which were published under the supervision of Macpherson the setup would often change. In some editions, the sections are not referred to as books but as cantos, switching between frames seemingly without problem.

The narrator of the Ossianic poetry is its namesake Ossian, the son of Fingal and father of Oscar. Fingal is the eponymous hero of the longer heroic poem *Fingal*. Ossian is a homodiegetic narrator, he is part of the events and relates his own as well as his relatives' experiences. He is blind like so many other epic narrators. Ossian is situated in the same realm as the supposedly blind bard Homer whose works reverberate strongly in the Ossianic poetry. There is also Teireisias, the blind prophet, who appears in many classical works, among them the *Odyssee,* Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes* and Dante's *Commedia*. Milton is the most important of the blind poets for Ossian as it was Milton on whom Macpherson models his Ossian. Blindness also played an important role for Milton, who had to dictate *PL* to one of his daughters after he had lost his sight. But it was also the reason that kept him from being imprisoned, or worse, after the restoration of Charles II in 1660, seven years before the publication of *PL*. It is made clear in the second invocation in Book III of *PL that* Milton sees himself in the tradition of other blind poets. Although blindness is keeping him from writing himself, he elevates his condition to the level of blind prophets:

> So were I equalled with them in renown,
> Blind Thamyris, and blind Maeonides,
> And Tiresias and Phineus prophets old. (*PL* 3.34-36)

Macpherson follows the same logic and tradition when he describes Ossian as old and blind and dependent on his daughter in law Malvina, who cares for him. As is the case of Milton, a female relative takes on the task of delivering the epic and in doing so becomes a form of conduit for the prophecies of the blind prophet.

Ossian is also, like Milton's epic voice, not merely in the background but relates past events and foreshadows future events as well as offering commentary and interjections with apostrophes and lamentations. He adheres to a gesture of oral representation. The frequent use of epithets and repetitions employed to make remembering easier for the rhapsode also feature in Ossian. While Macpherson seems to blend into the background, his narrator steps into the limelight and requires the attention of a protagonist. How prominently Macpherson is present in the texts is most obvious in the paratexts which will be the focus of the next section.

Another defining characteristic of epic poetry is that most epics come to us in form of a long narrative in verse. Macpherson's Ossianic poetry has, as will be discussed in more detail later, developed its own lyrical prose and does not adhere to classical versification. It is also fragmentary, as Macpherson explained, because it had been lost and only recently and partially been rediscovered. The poems do, however, portray a serious subject in elevated style. The central figures Fingal, Oscar and even Ossian, who is not involved in warfare, are heroic figures, whose actions influence and determine the fate of their people and followers. The period described in the Ossianic poems is of a time of great change and nation-building. Typically, epic poetry evolves in periods of upheaval and when a society begins to establish a historiography. Some of the fragments and myths Macpherson collected might well derive from such a period in the Gaelic past. But Macpherson, through recourse, designed them to represent this past to his liking and the assumed taste of his readers and fellow Scots.

Typically, the setting of epic poetry is vast in scope with world-making ambitions. The fate of the nation as a motif in the Ossianic poems is a construction of transporting a matter of the 18th century back into a time before the British occupation of Scotland. However, the term and the concept is obviously contemporary to Macpherson and not to a 3rd century Scottish bard supposedly living in a pre-clan culture. Nonetheless, the whole programme of Macpherson's writing is deeply inspired by the notion of nation-building as was almost everyone everywhere else in Europe during that time. His goal of creating a national epic, as other countries had done for themselves, was rooted in the spirit of his own times. While Milton's epic is concerned with just rule and government, *PL* is foremost a Christian epic, focusing on the relation of mankind

and god.[29] During the Scottish Enlightenment, such a project would probably not have succeeded and not have had such an impact abroad and at home.

Supernatural forces do, however, play an important role in the poems. Ghosts, spirits and ancestors people the events in the poems of Ossian. The postulation of a pre-Christian society and Gaelic paganism allowed Macpherson to use the uncanny presence of the supernatural without risking confrontation with the enlightened ideas of his peers and time. Macpherson describes the Scottish society of the 3rd century as mainly without any religion and before the establishment of the clans. According to him, the order of the druids, the spiritual leaders of the Scottish people, were made extinct by the Romans, leaving no trace of their rites and ceremonies:

> It is a singular case, it must be allowed, that there are no traces of religion in the poems ascribed to Ossian, as the poetical compositions of other nations are so closely connected to their mythology. (Macpherson 1765a: 45)

The effect of this idea was a huge response generated from the Romantic movement and the Gaelic revival. This primitivistic religious setting, connecting nature, ancestry and the supernatural, combined Romantic ideals that created a screen to project sentiments onto. After the Enlightenment religion did not simply disappear but became relegated to a more personal sphere. Religion retreated from the public sphere and could therefore be blended with esoteric and primitivistic practices including popular myths and superstitions. Religion, as opposed to magic, purports to take place mostly in public. Services are regularly held to organise and homogenise society and the public aspect is a major factor of the success of religion. Magical practices, on the other hand, usually remain secret and private. Ossian catered to the wish of metaphysical connection and for a sense of belonging. And Macpherson did even more so for the Scottish people who were losing their right to practice their traditions in the wake of the Jacobite Risings: a series of rebellions with the aim to return Stuart kings to the throne of England and Scotland.

Stuart Scotland was predominately Catholic and therefore accustomed to a more ritualistic practice of religion in the first place. Often supernatural beings are

---

[29] It would be wrong to think that Milton did not also try to create an epic poem to unite England, especially since he was considering writing an epic about King Arthur. But his approach ultimately caused him to write a Christian epic with a more metaphysical goal and not one that merely reacted to political change.

addressed in invocations. Muses, gods or ancestors are asked for support and inspiration. Macpherson explains this in the *Dissertation concerning the Antiquity,* where poets take inspiration from as follows:

> A generous spirit is warmed with noble actions, and becomes ambitious of perpetuating them. This is the true source of that divine inspiration, to which the poets of all ages pretended. (Macpherson 1765a: 49)

In his *Critical Dissertation*, Hugh Blair, one of the most enthusiastic defenders of the poems' authenticity, describes Ossian's poetic skill in even more Romantic terms:

> Ossian himself seems to be endowed by nature with an exquisite sensibility of heart; prone to that tender heart which is so often an attendant on great genius; (Blair 1765: 352)

Blair's focus on genius, sensibility and nature points to his own taste rather than to the authenticity of the poems. Other aspects of epic conventions are clouded because of the purported fragmentary state of the poems. Macpherson does not give the theme of the text in the opening line, like Milton did in *PL.* Instead, Macpherson offers a summary of the events in the heroic poem in his introductory dissertation, from where the arguments were later derived (Gaskill 1996: 419, n.2). The text does, however, begin in medias res with a description of Cuchullin, the mythical king of Ireland:

> Cuchullin[i] sat by Tura's wall; by the tree of the rustling leave. ——His spear leaned against the mossy rock. His shield lay by him on the grass. As he thought of mighty Carbar[ii], a hero whom he slew in war; the scout[iii] of the ocean came, Moran[iv] the son of Fithil. (Macpherson 1765b: 55)

The reader is immediately confronted with the characters of the epic and only a little information, apart from their relation to each other, is revealed in terms of progressive action of the plot. The first paragraph of *Fingal* sets the scene and the mood of the poems. Yet, this passage alone has four annotations by Macpherson (I have indicated them by superscript Roman numerals), which frame and contextualise the poem according to Macpherson's project. These annotations and the accompanying advertisements, dissertations and prefaces frame the text. The purpose and effect of these literary devices will be the subject of the next section.

3.1.2 Paratexts

Macpherson was in a unique position. Born in the Scottish Highlands, Macpherson had been brought up in a Gaelic-speaking clan community, one of his relatives was even a well-known bard. He went on to get an education in Classics at the University of Aberdeen. It was there that other scholars and critics, such as Thomas Blackwell, Hugh Blair and John Home became interested in Scotland and the Scottish folklore. Scotland seemed an attractive anthropological enterprise close to home (Stafford 2005: 418). This inspired Macpherson, first to write a historicist Highland novel himself, but this brought him little success and later to write the Ossian poems. He realised the need for a more 'authentic' text in the community of scholars and critics, something comparable to the epics of other nations, and so he set upon collecting and inventing the Ossianic translations. In this endeavour, he would be more successful. "Macpherson's Ossian poetry communicated the glories of ancient Scotland by speaking the teleological language of Enlightened civility" (Pittock 2012: 89). But creating this longed-for epic narrative of a Scottish genesis involved a much more elaborate approach for Macpherson, it meant creating distance between himself and the narrative he was asked to tell.

For Macpherson's plan to work, he had to do two things: he had to establish someone else as the source or 'original' narrator of the poems, and himself as the translator and mediator of his message. The first part was filled by Ossian, a loan from Irish mythology and legend. Macpherson adapted this figure for the role of his legendary bard and Ossian became the epic voice of the Scottish text of origin. For the second part, Macpherson had to cultivate himself as an expert on Gaelic Scottish Literature. Thanks to his education, he had the knowledge of how such an epic find would look. And he realised that the important question was: what would these fragments look like when edited for his academic environment? Macpherson went in search for the lost epic on two excursions, but eventually seems to have appropriated and creatively adapted most of his Ossian. He appeared as their collector and translator claiming that he had indeed found fragments of long lost epic poetry. But there would be no interest in the originals and no one would publish them, so he offered them in translation.

Macpherson shared any forger's dilemma: If the plan works out nobody will ever know it is their work and in consequence no one would know it was their genius who created the work. In the introduction to *Nationalepen zwischen Fakten und Fiktionen* (2011), Detering extrapolates how (feigned) translators can effectively gain great impact through this distancing tool:

> Andererseits kann er auf diesem Umweg in der Wirkungsgeschichte der Texte doch wieder einen überaus starken Autorstatus gewinnen, der ihn etwa zum Wiedererwecker der Nation stilisiert. (2011: 11)

It is a gesture of humility of sorts, stepping back behind a prominent epic figure such as Ossian, but it also gave Macpherson great liberty and sovereignty over his text, especially since his project soon turned out to become a world-making story of origin for the Scottish identity. To lend the poems more authenticity and to give himself even more authority and control over his project, Macpherson surrounded the poems with paratexts. Paratexts like footnotes referencing passages from other epics, advertisements, prefaces, dissertations on their origin and authenticity by Macpherson himself and others proclaimed the authenticity of the poems and the weight of their translation. According to Genette:

> [Paratexts] constitute a zone between text and off-text, a zone not only of transition but also of transaction: a privileged place of pragmatics and a strategy, of an influence on the public, an influence that […] is at the service of a better reception for the text and a more pertinent reading of it. (1997: 2)

Paratexts blur the vision. They offer another level of abstraction and another transit area between the already confusing layers of this translation fiction. Macpherson pretended to translate an ancient Nordic epic that he claimed to have found and added comments on his translation in the footnotes. He sometimes discussed a single translation decision or offered the reader information on the motivations behind his interpretative choices. Regarding a passage in *Fingal* Book V, Macpherson comments:

> The reader will find this passage altered from what it was in the fragments of ancient poetry.—It is delivered down very differently by tradition, and the translator has chosen that reading which favours least bombast. (Macpherson 1765b: 433, n.42)

Macpherson's intrusion on the text level can be seen at the very end of *Fingal* in Book V, in the following lengthy comment:

It is allowed by the best critics that an epic poem ought to end happily. This rule, in its most material circumstances, is observed in the three most deservedly celebrated poets, Homer, Vergil and Milton; yet, I know not how it happens, the conclusion of their poems throw a melancholy damp on the mind. One leaves his reader at a funeral; another at the untimely death of a hero; and the third in the solitary scenes of an unpeopled world. [*gr.q.*] *Homer*. Such honours Ilion to her heroes paid, / And peaceful slept the mighty Hector's shade. *Pope*. [*l.q.*] *Virgil*. He raised his arm aloft, and at the word / Deep in his bosom drove the shining sword. / The streaming blood distain'd his arms around, / And the disdainful soul came rushing thro' the wound. *Dryden*. They, hand in hand, with wandering steps and slow, / Through Eden took their solitary way. *Milton*. (Macpherson 1765b: 435)

Macpherson declares openly that it is more to his and the audience's taste that an epic should end happily. The happy end his *Fingal* has is not surprising, Macpherson argues, because of the tradition Homer and Virgil cultivated and Milton replicated. By turning the timeline around, Macpherson made the other authors work for him in two ways, as a legitimation on the one hand and a canvas onto which he could project his Gaelic epic on the other. As a mythological story of origin was what many Scottish scholars and intellectuals had longed for since the de facto dissolution of Gaelic clan culture, his readers were already easy targets.

In other comments, Macpherson elaborates in detail on the relations of the heroes, when they battled whom, where and how and when they died a heroic death. This strategy contributed to the overall confusing, yet meticulously structured, layout of the 'translations'. It gave the impression that there was much to be told and much to be learned about the relations and that in Macpherson a knowledgeable expert had been found. He bet on the assumption that, as Genette says, paratexts are "at the service of a better reception for the text" and that his performance would be credible.

But he did not only count on himself as witness to prove the poems' natural and primitivistic value. He wanted to legitimise his own adapted and creatively appropriated fragments through related passages from other heroic poems by famous epic poets. The consequence of this elaborate corpus of references was that the editions using footnotes, annotations and comments were full of Macpherson, Homer, Virgil and Milton, and very little Ossian. A typical page in *Fingal* would have the poetical text surrounded by Macpherson's introductory comments. These comments would explain the relevance of the

following quotations to the passage from Ossian. The quotations are given then in their original language and additionally in their translations by either Pope or Dryden, also indicated as such every single time. To the description of the shield of a warrior: "His spear is like that blasted fir. His shield like the rising moon[i]" (Macpherson 1765b: 55), Macpherson adds this footnote describing the shield of Satan in a simile in Milton's *PL*:

> [i] — — His ponderous shield
> Behind him cast; the broad circumference
> Hung on his shoulders like the Moon. *PL* 1.284-6 (Macpherson 1765b: 420, n.12)[30]

To add to the credibility of his Ossianic poetry, Macpherson created an entire corpus of references and commentary, embedding these poems deep into the canon of European literature. All these annotations and commentaries serve to suggest a serious scholarly interest in and debate around his material. On the one hand, Macpherson makes a show of how academic and selfless his approach is, he goes on and on about making this treasure available for the public. On the other hand, he guided his readers through the text and directs their attention to the details he wants them to notice.

> The four annotations from the very beginning of *Fingal* Book I are:
>
> [i]Cuchuliin, or rather Cuth-Ullin, *the voice of Ullin*, a poetical name given the son of Semo by the bards, from his commanding the forces of the Province of Ulster against Ferbolg or Belgae, who were in possession of Connaught. Cuchullin when very young married Bragela the daughter of Sorglan, and passing over into Ireland, lived for some time with Connal, grandson by a daughter to Congal the petty king of Ulster. […] He was so remarkable for his strength, that to describe a strong man it has passed into a proverb, "He has the strength of Cuchullin" […].
>
> [ii]Cairbar or Cairbre signifies a strong man.
>
> [iii] We may conclude from Cuchullin's applying so early for foreign aid, that the Irish were not then so numerous as they have since been; which is a great presumption against the high antiquities of that people. We have testimony of Tacitus that one legion only was thought sufficient, in the time of Agricola, to reduce the whole island under the Roman yoke; which would not probably have been the case had the island been inhabited for any number of centuries before.[31]
>
> [iv]Moran signifies many; and Fithil, or rather Fili, an inferior bard.

---

[30] This reference appears only in the 1762 edition of *Fingal* (see Gaskill 1996: 420, n.12).
[31] The reference in the 1762 edition runs on for twice that long.

Macpherson not only directed the reader's eye, he hid his sources in plain sight and a large part of his sources were not only epic poetry but also religious writings. Macpherson availed himself of the aura of ceremonial language. He moved his poems visually into the sphere of the sacral. Macpherson simulated methods of biblical exegesis and some editions of Ossian are almost set up to look like a Talmudic page. The layout of the poems became part of the postulation of a universal underlying mythical and sublime brilliance of the translations.

In the announcements and advertisements that accompanied his publications, Macpherson found yet another way of influencing his readership. The first thing Macpherson states in the preface to *Fragments of Ancient Poetry* is a claim of authenticity: "The public may depend on the following fragments as genuine remains of ancient Scottish poetry" (Macpherson 1760: 5). This is followed by an attempt to date the poems. Macpherson cannot give an exact date but tries to deduce it from the fact that clan-ship is not mentioned which it would have if it had already existed. Macpherson argues that the lack of clan-ship and the absence of nearly any reference to religion and no mention of Christianity at all dates the text. According to Macpherson, this is also "supported by the spirit and strain of the poems themselves" (ibid.).

Here Macpherson denies commenting on the quality of the poems. However, in the next sentence he promises his readers that his future find will be "no less valuable" (Macpherson 1760: 5) than the fragments and that it "deserves to be styled an heroic poem" (Macpherson 1760: 6). The text then follows a more detailed description of the epic poem and Macpherson promotes his project to win sponsors. Simply terming his translations epic poetry, a by so closely linked to myths of origin (e.g. the mythical foundation of Rome through Aeneas in Virgil's *Aeneid*) serves two purposes: Ossian is placed within the tradition of the typical genre of stories of genesis and at the same time the readers' expectations are focused and work in favour of the project. In the advertisement to the second edition of *Fragments of Ancient Poetry* (1760), Macpherson continued to work on his image as scholar, fully integrating himself into his role as the expert and noted:

> In this edition some passages will be found altered from the former. The alterations are drawn from more compleat copies the translator had obtained of the originals, since the former publication. (1760: 3)

By adding this kind of information, Macpherson created the impression of himself as a diligent researcher and translator. A translator concerned with taking great care and willing to revise his translations based on new developments and discoveries made in his field. In the same advertisement, Macpherson continues by giving this announcement:

> It may be proper to inform the public, that measures are now taken for making a more full collection of the remaining works of the ancient Scottish Bards; in particular for recovering and translating the heroic poem mentioned in the preface. (Macpherson 1760: 3)

This advertisement shows that Macpherson tried to test his audience's interest and either really hoped to find that lost epic or was already fully prepared to write it himself. He checks out the market for such an epic and tests the tastes of his contemporaries to see whether such an enterprise might be worth it. In a later advertisement, one issued announcing the publication of the first edition of *Fingal* (before 1761/62), Macpherson seems to react to the question of why he has not published the originals. He claims that he would transcribe them as soon as time would allow and that he had published proposals to publish by subscription but nobody had come forward, therefore "he takes it for the judgment of the public that neither is necessary" (Macpherson before 1761/62: 33). It is not clear whether Macpherson even offered such a subscription to the originals but by claiming nobody cared he shifted the cause of this shortcoming away from himself and kept up his reputation as an attentive researcher.

The debate about the authenticity of the Ossianic poems continued to influence Macpherson's statements in the preface to *Fingal* (1761/62). He commented on the fate of authors and how their merits can be appreciated without their vices only after they are dead. Macpherson argues that flaws in the poetry of dead authors might be more easily forgiven than those of living writers. This following statement so daringly challenges the public to recognise his strategy, which he openly proclaims:

> This consideration might induce a man, diffident of his abilities, to ascribe his own composition to a person, whose remote antiquity and whose situation, when alive, might well answer for faults which would be inexcusable in a writer of this age. (Macpherson 1761/62: 35)

Then Macpherson turns it around announcing that no one in their right mind would denounce being the author of such beautiful poetry: "It would be a very

uncommon instance of self-denial in me to disown them, were they really of my composition" (Macpherson 1761/62: 35). Macpherson then reveals his discovery of the lost epic poem and further styles himself as the mere compiler and translator by saying: "It is only my business to lay it before the reader, as I have found it" (ibid.).

Macpherson reacted to his audience and observed their taste as well as the developments on the book market. These observations can be seen in his changing attitude towards references to classic texts from *Fingal* to *Temora* where there are no more parallel passages provided. However, he did not stop to comment as himself on the texts. In one of his annotations to *Temora*, Macpherson describes the state of the poems when he found them. He argues that any resemblance to Homer could not have come from Ossian's knowledge of Greek poetry but from their shared inspiration from nature: "the similarity must proceed from nature, the original from which both drew their ideas" (Macpherson 1765d: 479, n. 2). Macpherson suggests that mimetic inspiration from nature is a general rule of artistic production. It is not determined by cultural factors but rather instinctive and therefore supports the universalistic claim the project tries to uphold. He continues explaining how this poem might not be as eloquent as Homer's but that it follows Aristotle's rules of unity of place, time and action. This is a neat way of linking Ossianic poetry to Greek epic poetry and by admitting their inadequacies Macpherson can claim their authenticity with even more fervour. These comments contribute to the work's appearance as a well-researched and investigated publication in the tradition of contemporary editions of classic texts. In doing so, Macpherson achieved at positioning Ossian's poems before some of their sources. With this twist, he cleverly suggested that analogies between Ossian and Milton are based on Milton's knowledge of Ossianic poetry and not the other way around.

The Scottish author and critic Hugh Blair might have been Macpherson's partner in crime or maybe his wish for the recovery of a Scottish epic poem was what clouded his expertise. They met in Edinburgh and Blair promoted Macpherson's project of finding the lost epic poem. The *Critical Dissertation on the Poems of Ossian* Blair wrote to support their claim of authenticity was later included in every edition and provided another paratext for the corpus. Blair's contributions will be part of the next section. In the next section I am looking at

the translation theory Macpherson claimed to have adhered to but in fact constructed, to give more credence to his work and to further disguise his sources and his fraudulent approach.

3.1.3 Counterfeit Theory

Another trick Macpherson employed to substantiate his poems was describing his method of translation in relation to the texts he claimed to have translated. This strategy has effects on both the external and internal make-up of the poems. His theories can be found in the paratexts, they are spread out over his dissertations and prefaces. But the effects of his assumed approach to translation can also be seen in the poems themselves. In the next section, I will be looking at the consequences of this on the level of language-making. But first, Macpherson's (and Blair's) argumentation and justification must be situated. In the preface to *Fragments of Ancient Poetry*, Macpherson stated that his translations are "extremely literal" and that "even the arrangement of the words in the original has been imitated" (Macpherson 1760: 6). In pretending to translate in an "extremely literal" translation style, Macpherson positioned himself within one of the oldest debates in translation theory: the question of whether a translation should be foreignised or domesticated, literal or paraphrased.

Translations first served a didactic purpose. Theories derived from classical sources, above all Cicero, Horace and Jerome generally denounced literal translation in favour of paraphrase, which was indebted to a tradition of commentary and interpretation (Steiner 1975: 7). During the 17th century, translations were still mainly a vehicle for distribution of information or as exercises for linguists and theologians. Their theories were deeply rooted in the study of epic and religious writing but with very different consequences for the translations. While epic writing is based on internal translation processes and is itself a medium in translation, epic poems lend themselves to great artistic and linguistic freedom. Religious texts, on the other hand, were a totally different matter. Where the word of God is concerned, a translator enjoys very little liberty. Since the 17th Century, translation theory has been stuck between these two antagonisms.

During the late 18th century, due to the rise of national states, translations became an important factor for building national languages and because of this

modern linguistics began to develop. In the controversy over imitation and original genius, translation became a battle ground. The Enlightenment and the rise of natural sciences allowed for a more descriptive approach to translation. This was the situation Macpherson found before himself when he began working on his Ossian. The debate about language, nation and translation, was already in full swing. But, since his project was a historicist recourse, trying to excavate a 'primitive' source text in translation, he had to draw on older concepts of language production, at least at a surface level.

Early translation theories Macpherson would base his own upon are conveyed via epic poetry and the translation of religious texts (Steiner 1975: 11). Jerome, the translator of the Vulgate, famously coined the phrase: "non verbum e verbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu", which has often been understood as a general rule for translation. But Jerome made an important exception for the translation of the Bible: "absque scripturis sanctis, ubi et verborum ordo mysterium est" (LVII. §5). In religious texts, the word order is part of the divine message and should not be altered. Jerome reacted to the criticism of having falsified his original and answered in a letter, presenting his own theory of translation. Jerome drew on several examples from classical and ecclesiastical writers (see LVII. §5, 6, 7).

When Chapman began translating Homer in the late 1590s, he still had few sources to draw on. However, his translation had a great influence, not only in form of providing access to Homer's writing, but also in setting the scene for other translators. In an age that already had seen some of Shakespeare's great works but was still building and standardising its poetic language and canon, these new methods of translation were vital. Another great translation project to be published was the King James Bible. Even though these translations do not have as prominent a place in the development of a literary language as in other countries, these circumstances yet were catalysts.[32]

John Dryden, Milton's contemporary, was the first to postulate a translation theory outside of religious writings. As Samuel Johnson observed he gave "just rules and examples of translation" (in Steiner 1975: 27). Dryden, and later the Scottish writer and historian Alexander Fraser Tytler, demanded the

---

[32] England has Shakespeare, Spain Cervantes, Italy Dante, only German literary language is primarily rooted in a translation: Luther's Bible.

translator should be a poet too and know both languages. He demanded that a translator should be true to the original and make the translation as if the author had written in English. The rules they formulated are much too general to give a concrete guideline, yet they form the basis for the next two centuries (Steiner 1975: 32-33). Dryden's translation theory was based on a concept of mimesis and on the relation of the sister arts, poetry and painting. In his preface to the *Sylvae* he writes: "Translation is a kind of drawing after life" (in Steiner 1975: 36). As mimesis was still considered to be the general form of artistic production, this more specific metaphor was valid in the 17th century. As Steiner points out, this mimetic process is mostly based on idealistic imitation and an emphasis on "the sense" rather than naturalistic faithfulness to every detail (1975: 40-42).

In translation, as in mimetic practices, the aesthetic demands shifted towards a preference of identification of the translator with the author as a source of genius. Consequently, the task of the translator became less a service to the original's author's work than to their shared creative experience in producing genuine works of art. Macpherson used this shift to his advantage and made the unpopular move to step back and deny himself the fame. Macpherson used the controversy surrounding translation, the developing interest in languages and their origin to seem more authentic. Macpherson used ideas of translation traditions to successfully create a forgery but also to fill the gap the oral tradition of the Highlands had left by not producing written testament of their past glory.

By announcing his application of this literal method of translation, Macpherson places his poems in a religious context and as consciously opposing the contemporary fashion of idealistic mimesis. With this argumentation, Macpherson achieves several goals at the same time, one of which is giving his translations an authoritative meaning regarding their significance in Scottish history. Simultaneously, Macpherson can assign to the Ossianic poetry a sacred message, further raising the importance and standing of his creation. Additionally, this allows Macpherson a more creative way of employing language, while coincidentally underlining the postulated value of the texts themselves. The result of this approach, from the poem Carthon published in the *Works of Ossian* in 1765, look as follows:

> He beholds the hills with joy, he bids a thousand voices rise.——Ye have fled
> over your fields, ye sons of the distant land! The king of the world sits in his hall,

and hears of his people's flight. He lifts his red eye of pride, and he takes his
father's sword. Ye have fled over your fields, sons of the distant land!
(Macpherson in Gaskill 1996: 127)

Here the closeness to the diction of the King James Bible is particularly obvious,
in part due to the content of the passage. Yet, the syntax and the invocations
strongly resemble passages in the KJV: "But of the fruit of the tree which is in the
midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it,
lest ye die" (Genesis 3:3). Again, this mimetic approximation seems to flip the
chronology and gain from both sides of the debate. The resemblance to the KJV
generates a familiarity on the one hand and yet suggests an anteriority to it. This
religious context is, however, a pre-Christian one. Macpherson, thus, also
mediates between a supposedly primitive culture, one of the past, and the
sensitivities of his own age. With his bard Ossian, Macpherson managed to please
the growing aesthetic demand for an original genius and by imitating a primitive
source language. Without many descriptive passages, he was able to paint a
surprisingly vivid picture of the 'times' of the bard.

Macpherson also translated between different levels of orality. His faked
translations may have been based on oral traditions and ballads that he collected
in the Highlands but he still claimed that his pre-text was a written one. Through
his bardic figure Ossian, Macpherson kept the intended communication situation
alive. In his *Critical Dissertation,* Hugh Blair supports Macpherson's claim of
literality and truth to the original as follows:

> Though unacquainted with the original language, there is no one but must judge
> the translation to deserve the highest praise, on account of its beauty and
> elegance. Of its faithfulness and accuracy, I have been assured by persons skilled
> in the Gaelic tongue, who from their youth were acquainted with many of these
> poems of Ossian. To transfuse such spirited and fervid ideas from one language
> into another; to translate literally, and yet with such a glow of poetry; to keep
> alive so much passion, and support so much dignity throughout; is one of the
> most difficult works of genius, and proves the translator to have been animated
> with no small portion of Ossian's spirit. (Blair 1765: 399)

As the first thing he does is to admit that he does not know the original language
of the Ossian Poems, Blair's defence of their authenticity is odd. Having been
informed by others who claim to understand the original language of the text,
Blair feels capable of passing judgment of their "faithfulness and accuracy". His
praise is particularly focused on Macpherson's achievement at conveying the

original beauty of the poems. The terms Blair uses to do so are filed by the sentiments of his era: genius and spirit. Macpherson, according to Blair, seems to have managed to both translate literally and, by performing idealistic mimesis, recreate the 'original' author's intention. Blair's suggestion that "the translator to have been animated with no small portion of Ossian's spirit" points to a mystical meeting of souls and a form of communion across the centuries. It is almost as if Blair feels that Ossian held Macpherson's hand through the composition and the translation of the text.

Macpherson, revealing his doubts about the success of these poems in English, states that "he never had the smallest hopes of seeing them in an English dress" (Macpherson 1765a: 50). He imagines translation as a form of change of garment, the core or the content is preserved, but the suit changed. In the edition of 1773, Macpherson's attitude towards his role changed. The edition was published under the subtitle "carefully corrected and greatly improved". The changes he made to this addition show the shift from praising Ossian to making the poems more self-reliant. This becomes obvious in his comments on the poems. Where it had said, "Ossian opens the poem" in 1762, in the 1773 version it says "The poem opens" (Gaskill 1996: 452, n. §3). And again, in the former edition it reads "He [Ossian] relates", which then becomes "It [the poem] relates" (ibid.).

In his prose translation of the *Iliad*, composed at the same time, Macpherson publishes his new edition of the *Poems of Ossian* and describes the translation method of his predecessors alongside mimetic practises, contesting their imitative approach. Again, he uses the metaphor of dress: "The purple patch appeared, on the tattered garment; and, instead of adorning it, rendered more conspicuous its meanness" (Macpherson 1773: vi). Through this metaphor, his changing attitude towards his own position as an author and a translator becomes obvious. Where the role of the translator had previously served a very specific purpose, now it seems to have become a burden, a curse of imitation: "Unlimited in their admiration of Homer and the dramatic writers of Greece, even Virgil himself sunk into an imitator; and their drama […] vanished into that oblivion, which ought ever to be the fate of imitative composition" (1773: iv). Macpherson had first claimed to imitate classical translation theories and positioned himself in a tradition of writers who had great impact on the literary canon, as well as

translators of religious texts. However, later in his career, Macpherson was not that happy with having to share the limelight with his creation anymore. Macpherson tried to control his Ossian through the paratexts but it seems to have gotten out of hand and in the end his creation became a monster haunting Macpherson throughout his life.

3.2 Fraudulent Language

The features addressed so far mainly concerned the layout and the external structure of the poems of Ossian although they would have an effect on the execution of the 'translation'. The epic genre with its conventionalised tropes was chosen for the world-making aspiration it had. An aspiration that was present not only in the eye of its audience but also in connection with translation and in translation for the productive synthesis the genre could enable. Translators would prove, over and over again, how much world could be made through the translation of such a conventionalised genre. Macpherson used this fact to his advantage. He could freely invent along the given paths of epic poetry and justify all deviation with the primitive nature of the poems and their remote origin. The paratexts supported this strategy by giving credence to the scholarly debate that surrounded translation. This established Macpherson's role as the mediator of the paratextual references and further mystified the poems while pretending to present them to the audience in their most 'raw' condition. To this end, Macpherson also created and expanded on his translation theory, again in close analogy to his predecessors, while elaborating on the advantages and disadvantages of this or that theory. All these steps were taken ultimately to set the scene for the poems themselves. But Macpherson's poems also had to convey the intended archaic atmosphere themselves. Their internal 'translation' characteristics will be the focus of the next section.

3.2.1 *translatese*

To make the poems look like an actual translation from fragmentary finds of a long-lost epic, Macpherson had to postulate two things: that sources of heroic Scottish poetry existed and that this source existed in writing, even if it had developed from an oral bardic tradition. Macpherson claimed that such a written pre-text existed and that it served him as the source for his translations. Such a

source is traditionally a prerequisite of any translation. And, because there was no such thing, Macpherson used his knowledge of the Gaelic language to construct a substratum to shine through in his translations. Since he had declared he translated literally and that he retained stylistic features of the poems in the translation, these characteristics would show in the translated version as well. What Macpherson did, was what most translators usually try to avoid: to create an idiosyncratic language that became characteristic for this particular translation. The language of such translation is often derogatively called *translatese*, which the OED defines as: "The style of language supposed to be characteristic of (bad) translations; or unidiomatic language in a translation". Wiktionary offers: "awkwardness or ungrammaticality of translation, such as due to overly literal translation of idioms or syntax", which I included because Macpherson really wanted to achieve that exact reaction. The strategy worked out and if enough influential critics were willing to believe his hoax it would help promote his project.

Although Macpherson owed much to his predecessors, he did not imitate their versification. Homer and Virgil wrote in hexameter, Milton in blank verse and Dryden used heroic couplets for his translations of the *Iliad*. Macpherson deliberately decided against this and explained in detail why he did so. In the preface to the *Fragments*, he stated:

> They are not set to music, or sung. The versification in the original is simple; and to such as understand the language, very smooth and beautiful. Rhyme is seldom used; but the cadence and the length of the line varied, so as to suit the sense. (Macpherson 1760: 6)

The poems were not sung but, according to Macpherson, recited.[33] He claimed to imitate the primitive but beautiful versification of the Celtic bards, which turns out to be a very modern verse form, a kind of proto-free verse (Kirby-Smith 1996: 66), which would become more fashionable much later. Free verse became popular during the second half of the 19th century through the writing of authors such as Walt Whitman, Christina Rossetti and Ezra Pound. This metric prose can, however, also be found in Psalm translations and the King James Bible. It therefore, once again, draws the connection between religious texts and translation

---

[33] In a footnote in *Fingal* Book V Macpherson justifies the versification by claiming the epic was probably accompanied by harp. He either contradicts himself here or claims Fingal to be different from the other poems (see Macpherson 1765b: 431-32, n.2).

traditions closer together. Macpherson describes the Celtic language, from which he supposedly translated, as based on and still strongly indebted to oral traditions of poetry and historiography. In verse, he argued, it was easier to remember them by heart.

> Each verse was so connected with those which preceded or followed it, that if one line had been remembered in a stanza, it was impossible to forget the rest. (Macpherson 1765a: 49).

He claims that Celtic poetry stands in the same tradition as Greek and Spartan poetry (ibid.). The Celtic language, as described by Macpherson, is so particular that it is "perhaps to be met with in no other language. […]The numerous flections of consonants, and variation in declension, make the language very copious" (ibid.). Macpherson's ardent supporter Hugh Blair praised his choice in his *Critical Dissertation*:

> The measured prose which he has employed, possesses considerable advantages above any sort of versification he could have chosen. While it pleases and fills the ear with a variety of harmonious cadences, being, at the same time, freer from constraint in the choice and arrangement of words, it allows the spirit of the original to be exhibited, with more justness, force, and simplicity. (Blair 1765: 399)

Macpherson used paratactic prose with rarely more than ten words per phrase. This staccato style with its repetitive structure seems to lure the reader and has an almost hypnotising effect, which is intended to remind the reader of the musical accompaniment there allegedly was. This following is a passage from *Temora* Book III. The epic fragment tells the story of the usurpation of the Irish throne and the endeavors to take it back.

> They tell, by halves, their mighty deeds: and turn their eyes on Erin. But far before the rest the son of Morni stood: silent he stood, for who had not heard of the battles of Gaul? They rose within his soul. His hand, in secret, seized the sword. The sword which he brought from Strumon, when the strength of Morni failed. (Macpherson 1765d: 245)

Macpherson's poems and prose are confusing and difficult to understand. But that is the point: "Wer davon nichts versteht, hat alles genau verstanden" (Döring 2008: 180). While the epic fragments *Fingal* and *Temora* follow a plot line, the *Ancient Fragments* seem even less consistent. Because the poems frequently relate the deaths of heroes and how they came about, many passages are

lamentations and elegies. Even though this gesture of grief was welcomed during the period the poems were published, they do not offer a lot in terms of plot.

There are frequent invocations and apostrophes, which contribute to a sense of the style being based on an oral tradition. This impression is also confirmed by the use of variable length-dashes as rhythmic punctuation. Furthermore, Macpherson regularly used epithets and repetitions as well as rhetorical questions. These serve a metrical purpose and support the idea that knowing the poems by heart would be part of the poetic practice. This is a reminder of the poem's origins in bardic recital. Adding to the supposed oral communicative structure of the poetry, there are certain poems in the *Fragments,* as well as in *Fingal* and *Temora* (e.g. after Book III), which Macpherson presents as dramatic dialogues. Macpherson describes the passage in *Temora* after Book III as "Dialogue in lyrical measure" (Macpherson 1765d: 251) between Fingal and Roscrána. Again, the focus is on a dramatic situation as well as on the performativity of the poems. Macpherson justifies certain idiosyncrasies of the poems with the fact that they are derived from oral tradition, which he does not carry over into his written version. However, he changes the rendering to a contemporary, familiar style of oral recitation.

In the case of the poem "Comála: A Dramatic Poem" the title refers to the dramatic nature before the dialogue begins and the characters are listed like a theatrical cast. Macpherson comments on this structure and argues that "[T]his poem is valuable on account of the light it throws on the antiquity of Ossian's composition. […]The variety of the measure shows that the poem was originally set to music" (Macpherson 1765b: 436, n.1).

<div align="center">Dersagrena</div>

The chase is over. —No noise on Ardven but the torrent's roar!——Daughter of Morni, come from Crona's banks. Lay down the bow and take the harp. Let the night come and with song, and our joy be great on Ardven. (Macpherson in Gaskill 1996: 105)

It is true that some Homeric epic poetry was sung and that also the bardic tradition of the Highlands used musical instruments to accompany poetry recital. But Macpherson had just declared that these poems were not sung or set to music. Macpherson tried to establish his own timeline and stadial development of the poems, one in which he could contradict himself and make use of this contradiction to justify itself. The layout of the poems with the cast of characters

on top and the structure of name above and text below contradicts Macpherson's claim of authenticity drastically. But it goes to show how far Macpherson could go in his construction of a Celtic literary tradition.

Another literary device that makes the poems seem 'awkward or ungrammatical' is Macpherson's syntax. He often disregards traditional standards of grammar and places adjectives or verbs at the beginning of a sentence. Sometimes there are no verbs at all. Macpherson also uses incoherent punctuation, which seems to support the idea that he found the poems in a fragmentary state while also maintaining that he structured the poems rhythm. Compared to Milton's language-making through back-translation, word-formation and etymological use of language, Macpherson's approach is much fringier. He covered the texts with a blanket of fluffy commonplaces that give most of the poems a very similar diction. Milton used his language-making to concentrate and densify his poem, Macpherson spread it out even beyond the text.

The frequent repetitions and the relatively limited vocabulary could give the impression of Macpherson styling himself as a worse translator than he actually was. These kinds of repetitions can often be found in translations where the translator had difficulties using as many diverse expressions used for similar terms as can be found in the source language. If the target language seems to lack a variety of idioms in a certain circumstance, the translator often must draw on such methods. In this case, it must have been part of Macpherson's method of stepping in the background and claiming the translation to be very literal.

Except for the heroes' given names and the names of places and ritualistic sights, the poems contain very few loan words. The names, like Malvina and Fiona, were invented by Macpherson and have since become quite popular. They sounded foreign and familiar at the same time. They have the appearance of Latinised versions of Gaelic names and embrace the double heritage Ossian claims as his own. Again, Macpherson is ready to explain etymology and origin, variations on spelling and other information as we have already seen in one of the annotations to *Fingal* Book I. The names and their explanations serve to entrench the poems in a genealogy of a heroic past.

Macpherson's use of the out-dated pronouns ye, thy and thee (Lass 2000: 153) contributes to make the poems sound archaic and creates the aura of a serious subject matter.

> Why art thou sad, they said; thou first of the maids of Lutha! Was he lovely as the beam of the morning, and stately in thy sight?
> Pleasant is thy song in Ossian's ear, daughter of streamy Lutha! Thou hast heard the music of departed bards in the dream of thy rest, when sleep fell on thine eyes, at the murmur of Moruth. When thou didst return from the chase in the day of the sun, thou hast heard the music of bards, and thy song is lovely!
> (Macpherson in Gaskill 1996: 187)

The application of these pronouns and the inflected verb forms is sometimes reminiscent of Shakespearean language but above all, the poems echo the diction of the King James Bible. Macpherson draws on the familiar sounds, sounds his audience will have identified as old-fashioned language. His claim that he could not convey the inflections might have made Macpherson choose the closest he could find that would foreignise the poems. However, the recognition of the familiar style by the reader prevented a detachment from the poetry, it was never too strange or too random.

The revisions of the 1773 edition of *Fingal* may shed some light on this particular method of Macpherson's. He altered not only many instances of perspective, as we have already considered above, but also expanded his vocabulary to a certain degree (e.g. "golden" 1762 becomes "sun-streaked", Macpherson 1765b: 422, n.69). Furthermore, he deleted many references to Homer, Virgil, Milton and the Bible. After defending the authenticity of the poems of Ossian for over a decade, Macpherson's decision to end this kind of understatement and emphasise his own involvement in the creation of the Ossianic poetry, might seem a natural development in the career of a rather unsuccessful writer. In regards to his original poetry and his 'actual' translations, Macpherson's original writing was not really lucrative. Only Ossian's poems were a triumph but their success was closely connected to Macpherson's invention of the bard as their originator and the debate he created around their authenticity.

The language of Macpherson's poems could well be described as 'awkward or ungrammatical' but above all, their 'idioms and syntax' make the impression of 'overly literal translation'. Through Macpherson's creative use of language and his systematic mimicking of translation, a form of *translatese* was developed: a language that does not affect the reader through structural complexity but through its expression and, therefore, lends itself willingly to translation. Macpherson made the poems' awkwardness work in his and their

favour. His *translatese* has maintained the poems' claim of authenticity and made it possible for them, he wrote, to sound just as 'translated'. In fact, this is also how they would sound in any alternate language versions that were to circle the continent in the process of their publication.

In the next two sections, I will be looking at the semantic level of the poems. The translation of colour terms in epic poetry already comes with a debate of its own. The epithets are an epic convention with multiple functions, among them creating references and attributes.

3.2.2 Colours and Epithets

The framing and makeup Macpherson gave his poems, is about establishing a credible background for them. By inventing a language in translation that supported the authenticity and the merit of these publications, Macpherson placed his work within a literary tradition, albeit a false one. Macpherson engaged in productive language-making when he developed a rhythm and syntax which would come to be regarded as typically Ossianic. In this section, I will look at two morphological and semantic structures that contribute to the poems archaic tone and result in the poems being associated with the epic tradition: colour terms and epithets.

During the 19th century, colour naming became of great interest to linguists, psychologists and anthropologists. And the whole century seemed to be enthralled by nation-building which turned their eyes towards origins. Externally focussing on national mythology while internally obsessed with concept like legacy and inheritance. The former concern played out on an international and political stage, while the latter was explored closer to home and always with the intention of supporting the former. From a scientific point of view, genealogy and lineage gained more relevance and ideas around them led many to consider applying the same methodology or theory onto other areas. Such was also the case when William Gladstone notoriously suggested that the ancient Greeks were colour blind and that sight had developed throughout the following centuries. Gladstone, who was British prime minister four-times, published *Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age* (1858) one year before the publication of Charles Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* (1859). Gladstone had analysed Homeric epic and concluded that the denominations Homer used were odd. The phrases

Gladstone referred to were most famously Homer's "red sea" and "green honey". In his chapter "Colour in Homer" he states:

> The uses of this group of words thus appear to exhibit a degree of indefiniteness, hardly reconcilable with the supposition that Homer possessed accurate ideas of colour. (1858: 456)

Gladstone considered Homer's use of colours as a matter of poetic license. He did not believe that Homer's sophisticated use of colour contradicted his idea that the Greeks were colour blind or that eyesight had 'developed over generations' (1858: 484-85). He also considered Homer's alleged blindness as a possible reason and dismissed the idea that Homer had known colour or came from a culture with a rich and sophisticated literary colour pallet. After all, even if Homer was blind, this didn't not stop him from describing other things, such as the shield of Achilles, in great detail. Consequently, why should we consider Homer's blindness to have influence over his recollection of colours (ibid.). Gladstone's hypothesis was soon negated by the work of Grant Allen, a Canadian scientist and novelist, in *The Colour-Sense* (1879). Maybe, Allen and others suggested, the difference between what they saw was a difference in nomenclature, not in eye-sight, and that colour could be described qualitatively and quantitatively. Homer had just focused more on opacity than on hue. That would also explain why descriptions of dark and bright feature frequently. Such debates show the intensity of discussion around such apparently innocent topics. Topics like the name of a colour or how to describe it could gain a greater significance. Matters of nation- and identity-building were still influenced by the form and themes of epic poetry. The debate about these colour terms would also spill over into translation.

Macpherson, when writing his 'translations' in the second half of the 18th century, was unaware of such debates. He was, however, familiar with the works of Homer and especially with their translations. He imitated Homer as well as his translators. In the Ossianic poems, colour terms are used more frequently than in Homer's epics. There are even a few instances in which Ossian, too, seems to have allocated the wrong colour to an object, such as "red tree" in *Fingal* Book I, (Macpherson 1765b: 55). According to Gladstone, Homer used only "the most crude and elemental forms of colour, black and white" (1858: 458) and all other colours were hues on a scale. There are many passages in Ossian which lack any kind of colour term, although they seek to describe light conditions and

luminosity. In the following example, also from *Fingal*, Macpherson describes the quality of the light and the light source without naming specific colours.

> But gather all the shining tribes, that I may view the sons of war! Let then pass along the heath, bright as the sunshine before a storm; when the west wind collects the clouds, and Morven echoes over all her oaks! (Macpherson 1765b: 57)

Macpherson uses shade regularly. "Dark" is probably the most frequently used colour allocation. In the passage above, not only "shining" and "bright" are contributing to the atmosphere but also the phrase "sunshine before a storm" with the airy indefinite article which adds to the vibrancy of this speech. In addition, the listener's gaze is indirectly addressed and directed, positioned as bird's-eye view, driven by the west wind, the echo, over the clouds and over the oaks. This atmospheric use of colours contributes to the solemn and reverential style of the poems, which has become a large part of their attraction. The dark and gloomy descriptions contrast this northern epic with the bright antiquity of Homer. The poems portray their times and characters as much more haunted and deeply influenced by loss and longing, presenting a kind of beautiful and sublime suffering.

However, the most obvious mimetic approximation Macpherson employs is not to Homer but to his translators. In his essay, Gladstone only gives the Greek terms and does not translate them into English. Although a translation mimesis occurs to the works of Chapman, Dryden and Pope, only the latter two are mentioned in Macpherson's comments. Macpherson imitates epic translations, rather than the epic poetry in its original language and structure.

Macpherson creates another level of recognition and another form of mimesis of translation. The English language does not have the same morphological methods as Greek. The approach to colour terms (and also to epithets) chosen by the translators of Homer has shaped the layout of the English language version of his work. This structure has become so iconic that Keats in his poem "On first looking into Chapman's Homer" describes Homer as follows: "Oft of one wide expanse had I been told / That deep-brow'd Homer ruled as his demesne;" (5-6). The fact that Keats wrote a poem especially about the English translation is a case in point regarding how significant this translation was.

The word formation method that English translators of epic poetry used is called compound adjectives. Adjectives are combined with another adjective or adjectivised and orthographically linked by a hyphen. This morphological strategy is very productive. With the approach of linking any two adjectives together, complex structures can be created with a pretty simple procedure. This created attributes that are very distinctive in the layout. Both Keats and Macpherson had noticed that this was the case, although Macpherson of course noticed it a little earlier. This has become a kind of trade mark of Homeric poetry in English. Again, it offered Macpherson the opportunity to hide his sources in plain sight. When he quoted Dryden and Pope's translations of the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid*, their translator's strategies pointed to Macpherson's forging strategies.

In Ossian, as in Homeric poetry, the colour terms are often used to characterise. They reflect on the emotions of the person or persons, animals and nature. In *Fingal* Book I, bright and dark, as well as red, quickly follow each other within one passage:

> From whence, the white-armed maid replied, from whence Duchômar, most gloomy of men? Dark are thy brows and terrible! Red are thy rolling eyes! (1765b: 57)

Duchômar is described as "gloomy", a term that can be interpreted as meaning both a shade of colour and a state of mind. His brows are both dark and terrible. The first might speak to the colour of his hair but the latter does not seem to refer to the state of the brow itself but alludes to his expression, his rage. Both adjectives are used to reveal Duchômar's emotional state. This is further indicated by his red rolling eyes. Allen writes in *The Colour-Sense,* that "Red is pre-eminently, and beyond all comparison, the poetical colour" (1879: 263). Although colours are used to describe objects in Ossian, they are also used to give information about the emotional state of the characters. The colours are symbolic of emotion in a way that stems from idioms that were popular in Macpherson's day. A few more examples should exemplify how this strategy operates on a textual level. "The dark-maned, high-headed, strong-hooffed, fleet, bounding son of the hill"; "The look of this blue-rolling eye is wide beneath dark arch of his brow"; "The high-maned, broad-breasted, proud, high-leaping strong steed of the hill" (Macpherson 1765b: 59), all three phrases can be found on the same page in

Gaskill's edition. This word formation strategy really sculpted the setting and form of the poems, as well as influencing their reception.

The compounded colour terms point directly to another feature, Macpherson's regular use of epithets. They too are a loan from Homeric poetry. Macpherson's heroes are often described as "blue-eyed chief", "white-bosomed", "white-armed". In Homer, typical epithets are "swift-footed Achilles", "ox-eyed Hera" or "bright-eyed Pallas". Some of the epithets operate on the same morphological structure as the compound adjectives but they can also appear as phrases in an attributive function. Recurring phrases in Homer are "Hector, tamer of horses", "Diomedes, master of the war cry" and "Artemis, the golden distaff". In the same manner, some of Macpherson's heroes are called "sons of war", "son of the sea" or "hunter of deer".

These attributes are genitive constructions but also possessives (Döring 2008: 180-181). The relations are not only remnants of oral tradition, which had gone out of style long before and during the 18th century, but rather seemed like a poetical mannerism. Milton does not use epithets as epic device, which shows that he did not make use of just any epic convention but chose other forms of representing his connection to his predecessors. In the Ossianic poems, heritage is also evoked by using this form of grammatical structure to describe the epic cast. There are two traditions that this method binds together: the Ossianic poems to the tradition of epic poetry and the Ossianic heroes to their place of origin.

In an oral production and reception situation, these epithets serve to help the rhapsode as well as the audience. They function as an aid to the bard in memorising the poems he recited by heart. And they help the audience to structure the narrative and to recognise immediately which character they are being told about. Usually these attributes refer to characteristics of the heroes, a character's home, their ancestry, skill or rank. They have an organising effect but also contribute to the colourful fabric of the poetry. The poems of Ossian are characterised by long passages of direct speech and very little description. While Milton often allows his narrator to describe settings and scenery, Macpherson's bard reveals such information mainly through his epic cast. Ossian, in contrast, is a much more active part in the plot than the epic voice in *PL*. Even though the narrator of *PL* could claim to relate a story concerning all mankind and placing man at the centre of the epic, the narrator's fate is not directly at stake but rather

affected in a metaphysical and spiritual context. Milton's epic voice repeatedly asks for inspiration to make him 'see' what the Bible describes. Ossian, even though blind as well, is apparently present in many events related in the poems and the oral narration situation is much more prominent than in *PL*. This makes a lot of sense considering the narrative Macpherson tried to sell his peers. Since Milton had only written *PL* in the preceding century, his epic was an art epic and not the primitive epic of a people on the cusp of establishing historical awareness. Therefore, it only affirms Ossian's authenticity.

The morphological intervention described in this section helped to further situate the poems in an epic context. In addition to the archaic vocabulary, ungrammatical syntax and the feigned loan translations of epithets and compound adjectives, Macpherson sought to place the poems not only in the epic past but also connected them to translation traditions. Macpherson put Ossian in the same league as Achilles and Aeneas and by doing so he also put himself on a level with accomplished translators, of which two, Dryden and Pope, were also esteemed authors of 'original' poetry.[34]

3.2.3 Similes and Imagery

By highlighting their translatedness, Macpherson's imagery also works to convey the authenticity of these poems. The use of similes in the poems of Ossian plays with different levels and stages of mimetic approximation. The simile operates based on similarity and comparison, it therefore plays with proximity, with familiarity and difference. The allocation of unfamiliar references and idioms, as well as word creations, gave the impression of the poems being on the one hand very old and on the other obviously translated.

Metaphors and similes, too, create a more colourful scenery and serve to characterise and situate the cast as well as the poems, consequently promoting Macpherson's fraudulent project. The simile form allowed Macpherson's narrator Ossian to indulge in some description and commentary, the speeches and lamentations are also full of figurative language. While I described the similes in *PL* as a form of translator's comment on behalf of the Miltonic narrator, in the

---

[34] Dryden and Pope both consider imitation a creative form of artistic production, see for example Pope's mock heroic poem "The Rape of the Lock" (1717) as mimetic parody of the high subject matter of epic poetry.

Ossianic poems figurative language is responsible for creative language-making. Milton's long similes connect the characters to other epic heroes or mythological creatures, they do so to elaborate on the personalities Milton figures in the text. Macpherson uses figurative language to create new relations, relations that were in their presentation unfamiliar to the reader. That does not mean that Macpherson did not draw on commonplaces, he tried to pull close everything that made the poems resemble and fit his claim, but he also created semantic connections between uncommon sign object relations. He introduced new constellations, ones that bound his poems closer to their supposed place of origin. Therefore, the imagery is often related to nature and the landscape of the Scottish Highlands.

Recurring references and comparisons in the poems are made to trees, streams, the ocean, the hills and clouds. Woods, bushes and leaves not only build the backdrop but also symbolise the characters' virtues. The oak stands out in particular. Warriors and heroes in Ossian stand like oaks, they fall like oaks and lovers embrace like the branches of an oak. In Fragment VIII from *Fragments of Ancient Poetry*, all these comparisons can be found on a single page:

> How hast thou fallen like an oak, with all thy branches round thee! […]
> The race of Fingal stood on thy banks, like a wood in a fertile soil.[…]
> He stood on the hill like an oak; his voice was like the streams of the hill.[…]
> as two oaks, with their branches mingled, fall crashing from the hill.
> (Macpherson 1760: 18)

The similes in Ossian are not as long and elaborate as the ones in *PL*. Milton constructed multi-layered references and these sometimes turned out to signify the exact opposite of what one would expect at the beginning of the phrase or stanza. Macpherson's comparisons are repetitive and remain in narrow semantic fields. However, the image is often kept going for more than one phrase developing a rhythm and imprinting the relation on the reader. Like the epithets, Macpherson argued, this was caused by the oral recitation and the advantages of repetition in relation to memory. The first example from Fragment VIII compares a character to an oak and continues metaphorically by calling their arms branches, suggesting their connection to be on an almost biological level. There is no physical difference between the tree and the hero. In the second example Fingal's whole clan is described to be like a wood, which conjures up associations of thick, impenetrable forests, at once being nurturing and prospering. The heroes and the landscape are intertwined and this suggest an association of strength and loyalty.

The other two examples blend the tree imagery with other geographic features. Now Macpherson's inconsistency tests the reader and it is the atmospheric tone that brings the attention back to the poems.

Trees also play a significant role in *PL*. Not only the fateful Tree of Knowledge but also Satan's punishment for corrupting mankind is related to a tree. When Satan is finally cast out of Eden and returns to his demons, he finds them turned into snakes and a tree in hell whose fruit turns into ash in their mouths (*PL* 10.565-7). Satan's punishment is a reference to his own offence and to the Greek demigod Tantalus, who was punished for serving his half-brother as a dish to his stepmother. Tantalus was punished by never again consuming any food or drink that would not turn to ash in his mouth. In *Fingal* Book V, there is another reference to the tree: "Like a tree they grew on the hills; and they have fallen like the oak * of the desart" (Macpherson 1765b: 95), which is accompanied by this footnote:

> [gr.q.] HOM. *Iliad* 16. ——as the mountain oak / Nods to the ax, till with a groaning sound / it sinks, and spreads its honours on the ground. POPE (1765b: 433, n.51)

Through the references to other epics, the *Iliad* in the original Greek and the translation by Pope in this case, Macpherson created relations to Greek mythology, like Milton, without having to knit them into the primary textual level of the poems. The oak in particular has a long-standing history in mythology and tradition. It is linked to Zeus in Greek mythology. Women would listen to the sound of the leaves and devise the gods' prophecies. In Germanic and Celtic tradition, the oak was also considered sacred, so much so that cutting down an oak was punishable by death. The word 'druid' is also etymologically related to the Old Celtic word for oak, possibly meaning 'they know the oak'. For Macpherson however, the oak might have had another meaning. The oak was also the clan badge of the Stuarts. After the Battle of Worcester, Charles II hid in an oak tree known as the Royal Oak and hid from the Roundheads (Pittock 1998: 44-45). The oak, with its multiple meanings, also symbolises both multiple genders. The oak represents male strength but has also female attributes, such as its capacity to nourish and an idea of longevity. A wood of oaks would provide hunting ground, fire wood and shelter. This great relevance of the oak for Celtic and Germanic mythology is clearly given a lot of attention in the poems of Ossian. The

references to this particular tree function on several levels, equally evoking Greek and Nordic mythology. Macpherson could claim the existence of a universal set of epic features and meanings shared by all primitive but sublime cultures such as the Greeks, the Romans and the Scottish. Another nature related image can be found in the following example, also from Fragment VIII:

> I am strong as a storm in the ocean; as a whirlwind on the hill.[…]
> fair, as the spirits of the hill when at silent noon they glide along the heath; fair,
> as the rainbow of heaven;[…] O Minvane, thou fairer than the snow of the north.
> (Macpherson 1760: 18)

These examples share a different point of reference, the weather. They are used again in reference to male and female figures and have gender flexible attributes. The strength of a storm and whirlwind are juxtaposed with the warmth of the hottest time of day and the colours of a rainbow. Both images involve some sort of movement and are effective because of their combination of acceleration and deceleration. Here in this example, there is a divide between male movement and female stasis. Although Minvane is likened to the beauty of the spirits when they glide over the hill, it is not her that moves and gliding itself is not a particularly active movement. In fact, it is the silent noon and the rainbow caused by the storm that seem to bring movement to a halt, even if just for a short moment. In this next passage, age and the existence on earth is compared to the movement of the moon:

> Age is dark and unlovely; it is like the glimmering light of the moon *, when it
> shines through broken clouds, and the mist is on the hills; the blast of north is on
> the plain, the traveller shrinks in the midst of his journey. (Macpherson in Gaskill
> 1996: 134)

> * [l.q.] VIRG. *Aeneid*, 6.270 ff. Thus wander travellers in woods by night,
> By the moon's doubtful and malignant light:
> When Jove in dusky clouds involves the skies,
> And the faint crescent shoots by fits before their eyes. DRYD. (447, n.49)

This time Macpherson adds a reference to Dryden's translation of the *Aeneid*. In Macpherson's poem, old age is compared to autumn and the changing season. This depiction of age is in direct contrast to the other similes and is one of the longer similes in the Ossianic poems. In the passage from the *Aeneid* no such connection can be found. In Ossian, age is described by seasonal change but also in terms of dark and bright. Macpherson often combined the similes from nature

with colours, also functioning as symbols for the circumstances or the characters of the poems. Blair also comments on Ossian's use of similes in his *Dissertation*. He states that as the poet "copies from nature […] we ought to be, to some measure, acquainted with the natural history of the country" (Blair 1765: 383). Yet compared to other poets, Ossian used the same concepts in different comparisons for different purposes. Blair describes:

> [V]ery often the similes are widely different. The object, whence they are taken, is indeed in substance the same; it is presented to the fancy in another attitude; and clothes with new circumstances, to make it suit the different illustration for which it is employed. In this lies Ossian's great art; in so happily varying the form of the new natural appearance with which he was acquainted, as to make them correspond to a great many different objects. (Blair 1765: 385)

Blair continues to present several such circumstances, e.g. the moon, the mist and the clouds. The use of untypical metaphors, such as "shadow of mist" (Macpherson 1765b: 65), also gives the impression of the text being an 'overly literal translation'. In a target language-oriented translation, metaphors would not be translated word by word but equivalents would have to be found, phrases that are common in the target language even if they differ from the original. By 'inventing' these new relations and using these comparisons, Macpherson is dangerously close to losing his reader's interest. Blair states that the only thing that could be said against the poetry of Ossian is its repetitiveness and that the reader must make an effort to understand Macpherson's interpretation of the text (Blair 1765: 384; 356-7).

Macpherson's project was not only an attempt undertaken for personal benefit but can also be considered an attempt to defend Scottish culture, which he had experienced and saw was being erased by the occupation. Macpherson does not give the impression of a revolutionary. However, the recourse into the mythical Scottish past and the distancing trick of performing as translator gave Macpherson the opportunity to criticise current political events without the risk of suffering any consequences. He could draw an image of this region, whilst claiming that the descriptions in the text referred to a time long past. This helped to advertise and mystify a place which had been portrayed as a savage and uncivilised country, one inhabited by a barbaric people. Therefore, Macpherson interconnected heroic qualities with the characteristics of the nature that had brought them about.

The similes and metaphors used by Macpherson created a reference point between the nature and the characters. Macpherson's use of metaphor suggests that the characters are connected to their surroundings by more than just inhabiting the land. They are part of it and behave like it. They are untouched by Roman or Christian influences and are, according to Macpherson, not yet affected by the disease of civilisation. As an example, he suggests that suicide was completely unknown to the people of the Highlands. He argues that their deaths had to be honourable and by the hands of an honourable person. Only later do suicides occur (Macpherson 1765b: 451, n.1) and because of this Macpherson establishes that it is also possible to date later day influences on the poems. Landscape, weather and animals build the mythical background and through figurative language, Macpherson connects it to the people.

Macpherson's balancing act between postulating a projected past, imitating his epic predecessor, constantly contrasting the poems with other epics via footnotes, creating a language imitating archaic and translated poetry, and using the productive linguistic liberties all that were established by this balancing act, is what made his fraud plausible. This complicated construct, for several reasons, had enormous impact on its audience and quickly generated a great interest in the Scottish past and its people. Macpherson's creative language-making had contributed to world-making. Suddenly, a much broader audience became aware of Scottish culture and history as well as the plight of the Scottish people. The first step the poems took was to establish a value of Scottish mythology and culture at home. The second step was to establish Scotland as having rich heritage outside of the British Isles.

3.3 Forging on

The timing of these translations does not seem to be a surprise, Macpherson gave the readers what they wanted but was himself borne by the spirit of nationalism and romantic sentiment. Thanks to Macpherson's successful self-fashioning and acute sense of the needs and desires of his audience, he could influence the poems reception even beyond the realm of literature and language. The poems became a national and a global phenomenon. He made the poems to engage in language-making but, as Nelson Goodman described it in *Ways of Worldmaking* (1978),

they also contributed to world-making. Constructivism rehabilitated projects such as Macpherson's and in the second half of the 20th century publications such as Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities* (1983) and Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger's *The Invention of Tradition* (1983) highlighted the importance of constructing national identity. Their findings concluded that creation is always a form of recreation and re-imagination, especially when it came to nation-building.

The poems of Ossian occupy an important place in the 18th century efforts to (re-)create national epics. They became immediately successful in a national and global context. The ongoing debate about their authenticity demanded a differentiation not only between the Scottish and the English but also between Irish and Scottish identity and self-assertion. This kept them in the eye of the public and for a long time reignited public interest in debates around identity. The poems were also quickly translated and circulated all over the continent, even reaching the American colonies. They were also featured in other media, infiltrating art forms such as music and painting (Schaff 2011: 93-94).

The epic genre offers two directions of self-assertion. On the one hand, it explains to the community what shapes their identity by emphasising similarities "Das Epos stellt nicht allein dar, *dass* wir sind, sondern auch, wer wir *uns* sind. Im Nationalepos soll ein Volk sein eigenes Bild erkennen können (Taterka 2011: 31). And, on the other hand, the epic shows to everyone else that they are indeed a community and different to the others. "Das Epos stellt dar, dass wir eine Nation sind" (ibid. 26). The epic has a mirroring effect for the Scottish people and a window effect for the English and the rest of the world. This gave Macpherson the opportunity to contrast the primitive gentles of the pre-Christian Scottish Highlands with the modern British brutality expressed through occupation and patronage.

3.3.1 At Home

Epic writing and nation-building often go hand in hand. They support each other because their theories and practices are based on similar experiences and beliefs. Both seek to lay a foundation and establish a tradition. The earliest epic poems describe myths of origin in a period that was just about to establish historical awareness and (re-)collection. During the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, Christian epics and art epics took their place. However, in the period of nation-

building the epic claimed world-making abilities again. The nations of the 18th and 19th centuries wished to create something equivalent to those seminal texts of the European canon. In the hopes of mimetically transferring the importance of antique heroic poems, they looked to have an epic of their own. This would turn out to be more difficult than expected and only few 'original' or modern epic poems have become so successful as to contribute to world-making. Although their main task was to simply exist: "Sie sind vor allem dazu da, da zu sein" (Detering 2011: 13). Freely inventing something, however, was usually not going to cover it. It must at least pretend to be rooted in the past as only then can it be rediscovered.

> It has always been a central tenet of nationalist faith that no nation can be "new", only "renewed". Typically, all self-respecting nations undergo a three-phase career: an initial cultural flowering or "Golden Age"; a suppression of identity and promise at foreign hands; and an "Awakening" to ultimate fulfillment as a modern nation-state. (Pearson 1999: 69)

Following Pearson's phases, Macpherson and Blair positioned the poems in the Scottish "Golden Age". They saw themselves to be in a phase of suppression and were hoping to achieve this form of "Awakening" through their metaleptic recreation. By way of his *translatese*, Macpherson creates the image of a proud people full of honour but also establishes a form of primitivism. The simple syntax may be due to Macpherson's translation strategy or difficulties he supposedly faced when translating the poems. However, the simple syntax also serves to convey the image of a primitive, pre-Christian people of warriors, whose poetry might have been more elaborate but could not be rendered as such. Macpherson addresses this blank space openly and yet it only adds to the effect of giving the poems their sense of being painfully recovered. Additionally, the missing pretext points also to the missing voice of a lost Scottish culture and a nation: a nation that had suffered a lot at the hands of their British suppressors and one that Macpherson had to experience first-hand. Although the *translatese* was due to Macpherson's translation approach and the 'original' poems were supposed to be written in verse, it is exactly this style that makes them sound arcane and rough. Even though this is generally the case for this pseudo-translation, this is an instance where Macpherson openly admitted it. It is a confusing turn of logic, but it is the proclaimed choice of the translator which contributes largely to the

fragmentary and broken pictures the poems convey. This in turn again supports the claim of authenticity that Macpherson is making.

In the "Critical Dissertation on the Poems of Ossian" Blair goes into describing the conception of man, according to the contemporary ideas of the Scottish Enlightenment. In accordance with the stadial model Adam Smith described in his *Lectures on Jurisprudence* in 1762, Blair also saw the development of mankind in four stages: nomadic hunter-gatherers, shepherding pastoralists, settled agriculturalists, national and international commerce and exchange (Blair 1765: 353; Pittock 2012: 87).

> In contrast to Enlightenment notions of stadial and social progress, Romanticism reinscribed the importance of the primitive and isolated person, the figure of genius touched by what Wordsworth called 'the self-sufficing power of solitude'. (Pittock 2012: 88)

Blair's efforts sought to do just that, he wanted to combine enlightened notions with romantic ideas of the individual. He strongly believed in 'human nature' and in human feelings and passions. He sees humans as hindered by "those refinements of society", which "disguise the manners of mankind" (Blair 1765: 345). At this point, the dramatic change from a veneration of the past and a belief in the continuous decline of civilisation from antiquity to a stronger belief in human progress becomes a conflict Blair must address. Blair's choice of metaphors describing the stages of mankind alongside ontogenetic phases in phrases such as "In the infancy of societies […]" (ibid.) finds its culmination is the statement that: "The process of the world in this respect resembles the progress of age in man" (346). As the imagination is more vivid in childhood, societies were more imaginative in their primitive stages. Blair also argues that, although he says this might be surprising, poetry is among the first forms of artistic production. The language used by primitive people is, thanks to their imagination, more figurative and relies more on metaphors. The preference for poetry can also be caused by the orality of these people and the accompaniment of the poetry by song. Furthermore, Blair suggests that if one were to search for the roots, one would be likely to find that "a certain degree of resemblance among all the most ancient poetical productions" (Blair 1765: 347) could be found. Blair continues to deduce that there is a common source or root for all of humanity's artistic productions and endeavours, which could be traced back in analogies as

the "current of human genius and manners […] descends originally from one spring" (ibid.). Arguing his point thus, Blair concludes that poetry is not originally oriental as it had been suggested, the earliest examples available being from eastern societies, but equally occidental. Of course, "[o]f this the works of Ossian seem to furnish a remarkable proof" (ibid.).

The metaphors he chooses himself to describe his view of these so-called primitive times and people are themselves revelatory. Apart from the analogy between onto- and phylogenesis, Blair describes the artistic productions of earlier societies as "the most natural pictures of ancient manners" and explains "they describe everything in the strongest colours" (Blair 1765: 345). These parallels to painting are still suggestive of the notion of *ut picture poesis,* so Blair describes their art as a form of imitation of nature and then explains their imagination and figurative speech based on the need to describe nature. The painting metaphor he uses is his own and has no connection to actual painting by Gaelic artists. Even though Blair suggests that poetry was among the first art forms, he needs to explain it via painting and uses metaphors from this context to describe the peculiar writing of this ancient society. The representation of the Highlanders, according to their state of development, functions as a narrative to raise the significance of their poetic production. In his "Dissertation" Macpherson describes this as follow

> The nobler passions of the mind never shoot forth more free and unrestrained than in these times we call barbarous. That irregular manner of life, and those manly pursuits from which barbarity takes its name, are highly favourable to a strength of mind unknown in polished times. (Macpherson 1765c: 205)

This belief in the virtue of a savage people and their art is based on the model of progress suggested by Smith and repeated by Blair, however, it also reaffirms the progress of the enlightened society of modern Scotland. The roots of the society lie in an exceptionally creative and imaginative people and justify the contemporary view of a very sophisticated Scottish identity.

Adding to the descriptions of the people and times as barbaric and primitive, is also the image of their religious beliefs. In the "Dissertation Concerning the Antiquity of the Poems of Ossian" (1765a), Macpherson elaborates on the composition of the poems and the circumstances under which they came to be. He points out that it is remarkable that there is no evidence of

any religion in the poems. Yet, Macpherson does not argue that there was no cultural practice during the times of Ossian but suggests that it would have reduced the honour of the heroes, his friends, if he had related the gods' influence rather than just praised them. He continues to explain that: "To this day, those that write in the Gaelic language seldom mention religion in their profane poetry; and when they professedly write of religion, they never interlard with their composition, the actions of their heroes" (Macpherson 1765a: 46). In Ossian's leaving out all kind of religious practices, Blair saw another proof of the poems authenticity. He argues that Ossian, just like Homer, adapted the folk stories of their society and since there were no tales of any deities in Scotland at that time, Ossian could not have sung about them (Blair 1765: 365). The connection between the inhabitants of the Highlands and the landscape and wildlife, as well as their belief system, is highlighted in such annotations as the following given to a passage speaking of deer avoiding a certain area:

> It was the opinion of the times, that deer saw the ghosts of the dead. To this day, when beasts suddenly start without any apparent cause, the vulgar think that they see the spirits of the deceased. (Macpherson in Gaskill 1996: 445, n.3)

The people Macpherson describes are deeply connected to the natural world and, therefore, their characters are linked to their spiritual past as well. This primitivism is, however, rather a mirror of the Romantic Age of Macpherson than a reliable representation of the time the poems are supposed to have been created in. Macpherson catered to his contemporary aesthetic demand of genius with his bardic figure Ossian. He sets the scene of a barbaric place and time, then allows Ossian to emerge:

> Every one knows what cloud of ignorance and barbarism overspread the north of Europe three hundred years ago. The minds of men, addicted to superstition, contracted a narrowness that destroyed genius. Accordingly we find the compositions of those times trivial and puerile to the last degree. But let it be allowed, that, amidst all the untoward circumstances of the age, a genius might arise, it is not easy to determine what could induce him to give the honour of his composition to an age so remote. (Macpherson 1765a: 48)

The only remnant of any cultic tradition is found in the bards. They are supposed to be "an inferior order of the Druids" (48) who survived the Roman oppression unharmed. This also, from a religious perspective, elevates the significance of the bards. Not only do they recount the stories of the heroes of the Highlands, in this context they are also assigned the role of spiritual leaders.

This postulation of a primitive but sublime people through language-making and world-making was the foundation that led to the poems' gaining significance for the Scottish struggle of independence. In the poems of Ossian, Macpherson did not only create a language that plays with translation and the style of translation but made these poems the foundation of a Scottish tradition. And, by doing so, created a story of genesis with all the typical features such as epic battles and heroic journeys, that supported the rise of emancipated Scottish artistic production; not least authors such as Robert Burns, Walter Scott and Byron. Burns, Byron and Scott were inspired by Ossian to develop a Scottish national literature.

In form of an 'imagined community' (see Anderson 1983), Macpherson creates the foundation of a nation across the centuries. Thus, his translations do not only establish a new language but they also constitute a new reality, they partake in productive world-making. A nation is not only built by similarities and shared cultural experiences but also on distinction towards others. In order to represent a nation it is necessary to set it apart from others and make these distinctions clear. In Ossian, the Gaelic and Celtic regions of Scotland and Ireland are represented as unity on the basis of shared beliefs. As has been described above, there was no religion as such but a knowledge of various gods existed. Loda, the Scandinavian god Odin, is mentioned several times in the text, the Ossianic heroes feel superior to this god and the Scandinavian invaders. Though they are still considered to have honour, it is not in the same sense as the Celts. In *Fingal*, the life of Swaran, the Scandinavian chief is spared because his sister Agandecca once saved Fingal's life. This also goes to show the Celt's graciousness, which Blair so often cites as one of the key elements in Ossianic poetry. Here one can see the influence David Hume's philosophy had on Macpherson. Not only did his scepticism towards specifically monotheistic religions strengthen the moral high ground of druidic spirituality but also Hume's approach of consolidating naturalistic and romantic ways of describing mankind or the world seem to have informed Macpherson's writing.

In Macpherson's "Dissertation concerning the Antiquity" (1765a), he describes the coming about of a nation in terms of mimetic adaptation. The bards, the former pupils of the druids who were spared by the Roman invaders, could ascribe an ideal character to their leader through their poetry. This would inspire

the people to imitate his character and in turn the leader would endeavour "to excel his people in merit, as he was above them in station" (Macpherson 1765a: 48). In his "Dissertation", Macpherson again hides his political commentary in plain sight (Macpherson 1765c: 205). He argues that the Romans themselves and later scholars have looked to Greece and Rome as examples of civilisation for too long as and as a result of this have neglected other cultures. This could be read as criticising the behaviour of the British towards Celtic and Gaelic culture. Macpherson agrees that there are only few instances in which the original traditions of ancient times have been preserved. One such case is the Scottish Highlands as these regions were considered to be unattractive to invading enemies (1765c: 205). With this metaphor, Macpherson is affirming the untouched and undiluted creativity of the Scottish people. This source of identity and the creation of a common cultural heritage not only based on language but above all on the shared experience of an oral tradition and an epic struggle to conquer nature as well as political enemies supported the contemporary notion of Scottish nationalism. In light of the Jacobite Rising of 1745 and the consequent British oppression, national literature became a matter of self-assertion which would not only bring about a confident Scottish identity but would also influence other struggles for independence.

Furthermore, Macpherson's use of the term 'nations', when he writes about other epic poems "the poetical compositions of other nations are so closely connected with their mythology" (Macpherson 1765a: 45), is remarkable in this context. The narratives he refers to are more like the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid*. Of course, both are closely connected to myths of origin and the foundation of cities. The former dealt with a war and the siege of a city that lasted for ten years and ultimately resulted in the fall of the city of Troy. The whole plot is deeply linked to the city's fate. The latter, on the other hand, is a direct result of the Trojan war and sets the background to the foundation of Rome, which begins as a city state and then developed into an empire. However, the concept of nation states as Macpherson and his contemporaries experienced it is much different then cities such as Athens, Sparta and Mycenae, which were first and foremost organised in city-states. Yet, for Macpherson, in his agenda to construct a past for the Scottish people in a century of national states, the term has another strategical meaning. Again, Macpherson blends contemporary needs with ancient traditions in a

metaleptic recourse. Thus, seemingly rooting a modern concept in the past and drawing a myth of origin from the ages. In doing so, he could create a strong Scottish history without frightening the British rulers. Macpherson placed his criticism so far in a fictitious past that it could not be misinterpreted as threatening.

Authenticity and epos depend on each other, so how come Macpherson's forgeries became so successful? This is also, to a great extent, thanks to the recurring debates the authenticity claim sparked in Irish and Scottish national movements. Accusations of plagiarism furthered the differentiation of Scottish and Irish national identities, this discourse resulted in cultural movements such as the Scottish Twilight and the Irish Renaissance. These struggles led to the demand of topographical proof, which was sought after in different ways. English, Irish and Scottish experts tried to argue their respective point in favour or against the texts and contributed to the corpus of critical work on the poems of Ossian even further. Now all these texts form a secondary canon of paratexts.

3.3.2 Abroad

The poems of Ossian were quickly translated into French, German and Italian. In German, the reception of the poems sparked a debate about aesthetics. Not only did the poems find translators easily but they were also discussed and received by other authors, especially Johann Gottfried Herder and Johann Wolfgang Goethe. In "Über Ossian und die Lieder alter Völker" (1773) Herder developed his theory on "Naturpoesie" based on Ossian. Herder does not place Ossian within the canon of epic poetry but instead, connects Ossian to folk tales and songs. In Ossian, according to Herder, we can recognise the oral narration situation that is present in other folk tales. Herder suggests that these poems are folk art and as such are not meant for publication in books: "Bücher waren das Grab des Epos" (Herder 1795a: 425-26, Anm. †). Herder's correspondence about the poems inspired Goethe, who writes about Ossian in *Die Leiden des jungen Werther* (1774). Werther and Lotte feel their own sorrow reflected in the fate of the Ossianic heroes ("Sie fühlten ihr eigenes Leid in dem Schicksale der Edlen", Goethe 1774: 158). Goethe is completely taken by the Ossianic poems and his Werther will go on to quote Ossian to Lotte. Goethe translated two poems form Ossian, "The Songs of Selma" and "Berrathon".

The "Songs of Selma" were, possibly because of their appearance in Goethe's Werther, among the most popular poems from the works of Ossian in German. Selma, the castle of Fingal in the Ossian poems, was supposedly a meeting place for the bards. According to annotations that accompanied the poems, it was a common practice for the bards to come to Selma once a year and recite their songs (Macpherson 1765: 463, n.1). The "Songs of Selma", published under that title in *Fingal* (1761/62) and again in the *Works of Ossian* (1765), comprised of three poems: Colma, Rsyno and Alpin. The poems were published before in *Fragments of Ancient Poetry* (1760) and titled Fragments X, XII and XI. Set before those poems is an invocation to the evening star, which was added in 1761/62. This passage has few annotations compared to other poems, however, there is one right at the beginning of the text explaining the occasion and presentation of the poems. In the 1773 edition, Macpherson changed the annotation preceding the invocation from an aside to an argument. Macpherson uses the convention and the appellative form of the invocation to begin:

> Star of descending night! fair is thy light in the west! thou liftest thy unshorn head from thy cloud: thy steps are stately on thy hill. What dost thou behold in the plain? The stormy winds are laid. The murmur of the torrent comes from afar. Roaring waves climb the distant rock. The flies of evening are on their feeble wings; the hum of their course is on the field. What dost thou behold, fair light? But thou dost smile and depart. The waves come with joy around thee: they bathe thy lovely hair. Farewell, thou silent beam!—Let the light of Ossian's soul arise.
>
> And it does arise in its strength! I behold my departed friends. Their gathering is on Lora, as in the days that are past.——Fingal comes like a watry column of mist; his heroes are around: And see the bards of song, grey-haired Ullin! stately Ryno! Alpin, with the tuneful voice! the soft complaint of Minona!——How are ye changed, my friends, since the days of Selma's feast? when we contended, like gales of spring, as they fly along the hill, and bend by turns the feebly-whistling grass.
>
> Minona then came forth in her beauty; with down-cast look and tearful eye. Her hair flew slowly on the blast, that rushed unfrequent from the hill.——The souls of the heroes were sad when she raised the tuneful voice. Often had they seen the grave of Salgar, the dark dwelling of white-bosomed Colma. Colma left alone on the hill, with all her voice of music! Salgar promised to come: but the night descended around.—Hear the voice of Colma, when she sat alone on the hill! (Macpherson 1765b: 166)

The first paragraph contains the invocation proper. In the second paragraph, the circumstance of the presentation, the bards and audience are introduced. The singer of the first poem, Minona, is described in more detail in the third paragraph. The syntax is paratactic and the sentences are short. The diction is

characterised by the exclamations and rhetorical questions, typical elements of epic invocations. The typography is used to highlight the rhythm and the dashes of varying length suggest different pauses. The layout and typography are attempting to mimetically represent the structure of the bard's song. Although the bards would have sung from memory, Macpherson represented sound patterns in a typographical manner. In keeping with Macpherson's nature based poetry and lack of specific gods, the address is not to a deity or a muse but to a celestial body. This is reminiscent of Milton, who in the third invocation in Book VII of *PL* addresses Urania, the muse of astronomy. But, Milton insisted that he is only referring to her meaning and not to her name, implying that the Greek conception of the muse is in fact a misunderstanding of Christian theology. Macpherson used personification and constructed his apostrophe to nature conversely to Milton. Milton invokes a concept to reject it in the next line. Macpherson's muse must be lifted out of nature and made corporeal to then be re-associated with nature. The association is established via the way of communication, Macpherson's muse communicates through murmurs and hums. Macpherson's choice of words also points the reader towards the second invocation in *PL*. The narrator addresses his muse as "Hail holy light" and presumably this is a reference to the Son as the second part of the Holy Trinity. After a while it seems, Macpherson could leave out some of the comments he had made in the first editions of *Fingal*. The "fair light" in Macpherson's invocation tries to avail itself of the same mystic and spiritual authority that the addressees in *PL* are endowed with.

In Macpherson's invocation, the steady rhythm of the syntax fits the imagery. Although not an elegy, in this specific occasion the tone is still one of lamentation and is suitable for an invocation preceding three poems on grief. The pronouns used throughout seem grammatically incorrect, especially when they come in such clusters as here: "thou liftest thy unshorn head from thy cloud: thy steps are stately on thy hill." Such clusters give the impression that English and Scottish Gaelic have different forms of applying pronouns and are therefore not compatible. At the time, this grammatical incompatibility was interpreted as an example of the incompatibility of the English and Scottish Gaelic language. One could argue that creating a sense of incompatibility was an intention of Macpherson's programme. If we consider Macpherson to be attempting to create discord here with an improper use of pronouns, one could consider this small

intervention in the text as having a big effect. It suggests the English and Scottish cultures are incompatible on a fundamental level. Macpherson presents a 'failure' of translation, intended to show the sophistication of Scottish and the incapability of English as an attempt to undermine English while re-establishing the text as a translated one. The comment to "The Songs of Selma" in the first edition explains the reception and tradition of the poems as follows:

> This poem fixes the antiquity of a custom, which is well known to have prevailed afterwards, in the north of Scotland, and in Ireland. The bards, at an annual feast, provided by the king or chief, repeated their poems, and such of them as were thought by him, worthy of being preserved, were carefully taught to their children, in order to have them transmitted to posterity.——It was one of those occasions that afforded the subject of the present poem to Ossian .—It is called in the original, The Songs of Selma, which title it was thought proper to adopt in the translation.
> The poem is entirely lyrical and has a great variety of versification. The address to the evening star, with which it opens, has, in the original, all the harmony that numbers could give it; flowing down with all the tranquillity and softness, which the scene described naturally inspires. […]
> (Macpherson in Gaskill 1996: 463, n.1)

The invocation is narrated by Ossian. However, it seems more like nature is asking the evening star for support in her telling of events. The stormy winds, the murmur of the torrents, the roaring waves and the flies, relay more than the epic voice does and seem to carry the poem. The following poems are narrated by the bards previously introduced. In the 1773 edition, Macpherson changes the layout and instead of the long first comment, he prefixes this argument:

> Address to the evening star. An apostrophe to Fingal and his times. Minona sings before the king the song of the unfortunate Colma; and the bards exhibit other specimens of their poetical talents; according to an annual custom established by the monarchs of the ancient Caledonians.

The number of publication of Macpherson's Ossian and the continuous growth of print media enabled the fast distribution and translation of the text. Michael Denis, translator and librarian, was the first to translate Ossian into German. His translation was very influential and would contribute greatly to the distribution of Ossian in German speaking parts of Europe. Denis translated in 1768/69 and so could not have worked from the edited version of 1773, the edition that included the argument by Macpherson. Denis' translated an abbreviated and edited version of Macpherson's annotation to "The Songs of Selma" and prefixed it in form of a

summary. His apostrophe at the beginning of "Die Lieder von Selma" reads as
follows:

> Stern der kommenden Nacht! Schön ist in Westen dein
> Funkeln. Von dem Gewölk' hebst du dein Stralenhaupt.
> Prächtig schwebet dein Zug über den Hügeln fort. —
> Doch du blickest zur Flur herab?
>
> Nicht mehr stürmet der Wind. Fernher erbraust der Strom.
> Wogen brüllen empor an den entlegenen
> Felsen. Mücken der Nacht üben den zärtlichen
> Flügel, schwirren im Feld' umher.
>
> Holder Schimmer! Warum blickst du zur Flur herab? —
> Doch du lächelst, und scheidst! Wellen umscherzen dich,
> Tränken lieblich dein Haar.—Schweigender Stral, fahr hin!
> Und entflamme dich du, mein Geist! (Denis 1768: 67)

Denis gave the invocation the structure of verse and separated the first paragraph
into three stanzas, each of four lines. By adapting their layout as he considered
customary for epic poetry, he recognised the difference between the three
paragraphs and highlighted their respective tasks. The other two paragraphs are
set in a less poetic manner and differentiate Ossian's commentary from the poetic
level. Denis does not introduce rhyme but through his choice of metre and layout,
the first paragraph of the apostrophe resembles the translations of Homeric poetry
more than the poems of Ossian. Denis's decision to translate the poems of Ossian
into hexameter, was criticised by Herder in his "Über Ossian und die Lieder alter
Völker":

> Hätte der Herr D. die eigentliche Manier Ossians nur etwas auch mit dem innern
> Ohre überlegt – Ossian so kurz, stark, männlich, abgebrochen in Bildern und
> Empfindungen – Klopstocks Manier, so ausmalend, so vortreflich, […]– welch
> ein Unterschied? und was ist nun ein Ossian in Klopstocks Hexameter? in
> Klopstocks Manier? Fast kenne ich keine zwo verschiednere […] (Herder 1773:
> 5)

Herder does not approve of Denis' style of translating Ossian because he firmly
believes the poems to be authentic: "so etwas kann Macpherson unmöglich
gedichtet haben! so was läßt sich in unserm Jahrhunderte nicht dichten!" (1773: 5-
6). Denis also translated the annotations by Macpherson. Only the first comment
Denis had used, as an introductory summary, is consequently left out. However,
in the abbreviated form he used, there is no mention of the versification
Macpherson had given. Denis seemed to have taken that information and

approximated his translation to the supposed original in Gaelic language and not to Macpherson's prose rendition of it. In consequence, Denis' translation is foreignizing and domesticating at the same time. He is not translating literally but is translating according to a programme he believed to have been described in Macpherson's comment. Denis does, however, adopt one layout speciality, the rhythmic dashes.

In some instances, it seems like Denis anticipated decisions and alterations Macpherson would make to his 1773 edition, in which he moved himself more into the foreground. In the last line, where in Macpherson's 'translation' Ossian speaks of himself in the third person, Denis takes the floor and uses the first-person speaker perspective: "Und entflamme dich du, mein Geist". Here an unexpected effect comes to the surface, the clusters of pronouns in the last line corresponds with the clusters we have seen before in Macpherson's text.

"Die Gesänge von Selma" in Goethe's version adopts the prose style suggested by Macpherson.

> Stern der dämmernden Nacht, schön funkelst du in Westen, hebst dein strahlend Haupt aus deiner Wolke, wandelst stattlich deinen Hügel hin. Wornach blickst du auf die Heide? Die stürmenden Winde haben sich gelegt; von ferne kommt des Gießbachs Murmeln; rauschende Wellen spielen am Felsen ferne; das Gesumme der Abendfliegen schwärmet übers Feld. Wornach siehst du, schönes Licht? Aber du lächelst und gehst, freudig umgeben dich die Wellen und baden dein liebliches Haar. Lebe wohl, ruhiger Strahl. Erscheine, du herrliches Licht von Ossians Seele! (Goethe 1774: 149-150)

Goethe's translation is a Sturm und Drang interpretation. It is in similar diction as his Werther, in which the translation features, and Goethe's Sturm und Drang ballad "Prometheus". Goethe imitates the flowing lyrical prose with the same harmony and softness Macpherson applied here and additionally postulated the original to have. Goethe's choice of words with fricative 'w' as alliterative recurrence in the passage carries the soundscape invoked by the noises of nature.

In the "Leiden des jungen Werther", Goethe wrote:

> Ossian hat in meinem Herzen Homer verdrängt. Welch eine Welt in die der Herrliche mich führt! Zu wandern über die Heide, umsaust vom Sturmwinde, der in dampfenden Nebeln die Geister der Väter im dämmernden Lichte des Mondes hinführt. Zu hören vom Gebirge, im Gebrülle des Waldstroms, halb verwehtes Ächzen der Geister aus ihren Höhlen und die Wehklagen des zu Tode sich jammernden Mädchens um die vier mossbedeckten, grasbewachsenen Steine des Edelgefallenen, ihre Geliebten. (Goethe 1774: 113-114)

For the Sturm und Drang spirit, Werther's Ossian has taken the place of Homer. Werther's description of Ossian to Lotte is imbued with the same vocabulary and imagery as Macpherson's poems. Goethe's translation does not transfer Macpherson's comments. Especially in the context of Werther, this would not have fit his programme. Bodmer's translation of *PL* from the mid-18th century resembles Macpherson's prose but Goethe's Ossian resembles Bodmer's translation of Milton to a greater degree.

Adolf Böttger, a Romantic poet, translated *Fingal*, *Temora* and most of the other minor poems of Ossian. One can assume that his translation was based on the 1773 edition of Ossian as he translates the argument which was present in this edition but not before. He did not translate the comments and annotations.

The invocation of "Lieder von Selma" in his rendition looks as follows:

Stern der sinkenden Nacht,
Schön glänzt im Westen dein Licht!
Du hebst aus Wolken dein lockiges Haupt,
Schreitet stattlich den Hügel entlang!
Warum blickst nach der Haide du hin?
Gelegt hat sich der stürmische Wind,
Fernher dringt des Waldstroms Gemurmel.
Rauschende Wogen branden am Felsen,
Fliegen des Abends schwärmen auf schwachen,
Luftigen Schwingen durch das Gefild!
Wonach blickst du, du schönes Licht?
Doch du lächelst und schwindest hinweg.
Die Wogen umgaukeln mit Freuden dich
Und baden das liebliche Haar dir.
Leb' wohl, du schweigender Strahl,
Erwecke das Licht in Ossians Geist! (Böttger 1847: 179)

Böttger returns to translating Ossian in verse. His version of the invocation seventy years after Goethe's and by the mid-19th century portrayed Ossian in the typical layout of longer verse poetry, he did not separate lines into stanzas as Denis had in his apostrophe. Böttger also translated *PL*, and he did not make a difference between the approaches to the texts. He translates both epics in blank verse.

3.4 Text, Texture, Territory

The fragmentary state of the poems left open spaces into which, under the pretence of filling these spaces, the romantic and the enlightened audiences could

project their needs or fantasies. Goethe summarises this need for meaningful world-making and how this need leads to the creation of origin stories:

> Jede Nationaldichtung muß schal seyn oder schal werden, die nicht auf dem Menschlichsten ruht, auf den Ereignissen der Völker und ihrer Hirten, wenn beide für Einen Mann stehn. Könige sind darzustellen in Krieg und Gefahr, wo sie eben dadurch als die Ersten erscheinen, weil sie das Schicksal des Allerletzten bestimmen und theilen, und dadurch viel interessanter werden als die Götter selbst, die, wenn sie Schicksale bestimmt haben, sich der Theilnahme derselben entziehen. In diesem Sinne muß jede Nation, wenn sie für irgend etwas gelten will, eine Epopöe besitzen […]. (Goethe 1829: 103f.)

Not only does a nation need an epic, according to Goethe, but the epic they need should tell stories grounded in the most human conditions. People needed allegories, stories of kings and wars, stories where the virtuous natures of the characters were proven for the first time. When they manifest in epic poetry, they become the foundation of legend, myth and nation-building. The hybridity of 'translation' contributed to Ossian functioning as a screen onto which wishes of national identity could be projected. The 'translatedness' of these texts made them available to being translated again. Like Homer, Ossian was an author so far removed from the present that his texts leant themselves easily to interpretation and artistic adaptation. Because of this ease of use and translatability, modern print media just accelerated the distribution of Ossian on the continent. Macpherson's poems also stimulated an international interest in Scotland.

> Auffallend häufig beziehen sich nationalepische Texte nicht nur wie die Sage auf bestimmte Orte, sondern werden auch – durch volkstümliche, gelehrte oder kommerzielle Zuschreibungen – physisch in die Landschaft eingetragen, die auf diese Weise ihrerseits im Sinne des Epos semantisiert wird. (Detering 2011: 13)

Thanks to his descriptions of the mythical landscape of Scotland, the tourism industry boomed. Places such as Fingal's Cave on Staffa Island or Ossian's Hall and Cave in Dunkeld supplied the sights for tourists who could follow in the path of the Ossianic heroes. Georgian follies became locations of significance both in the realm of Ossian and for the audience: Macpherson's entire project, his creating Ossian and the poems, strives to meet a need, like the folly it is a false romantic structure which represents a romanticised notion of the past. Macpherson claimed to drape old Scottish poems in an English garment. The landscape Ossian invoked, mystified and inspired in turn and became a memorial to texts of origin that Ossian claimed were made of scraps of history.

Macpherson formalised myth-making when creating the corpus surrounding the poems. He contributed to language-making through his prose, feigning translatedness for his own means. And, finally, when they became successful and began circling way beyond the British Isles, the poems turned out to take part in world-making. Yet, Macpherson's Ossian is a translational process and on many levels, even though the poems have been branded as forgeries from early on they inspired authentic emotions in their readers. Even though the poems were fraudulent, they gave the Scottish people a point of reference to their past and as that was Macpherson's intent, the poems can be considered a success. Macpherson transferred his collected material and the stories of his childhood in the Scottish Highlands into the English language. He also translated the oral tradition of Scotland into the written tradition of the superstratum. By placing the poems of Ossian in a mythical pre-Christian period, Macpherson moved the epic genesis of the Scottish nation into a time predating the British rule and the subsequent loss of Scottish national identity. By setting the whole project in the framework of a scholarly translation, Macpherson could hide these last two aspects from his audience.

The strategy of making the translations look as if they were a scholarly edition was successful at first and this success contributed to prolonging the debate about their authenticity. Blair's "Critical Dissertation" and his claim of their originality, along with his reputation in the scientific community, had an especially great influence on the longevity of this debate. Macpherson's translation theory and the justification of his approach lent further credibility to his project. Above all, the detailed explanation of the difficulties he encountered, such as the collection of fragmented manuscripts, a metric language he could not convey in English and the taste of his contemporaries, added to the impression of the authenticity of his claim of being the translator and discoverer of the texts. The claim of translating the poems literally also served more than one purpose: he positioned the poems as para-religious texts, giving them a sacral aura and confirming that they were important at the time they were supposedly composed in. Macpherson legitimised their 'strangeness' and gave himself creative space to invent this new and now typical Ossianic prose style.

Macpherson's language-making strategies succeed in making the texts look as if they were translations from an ancient source. The paratactic and

sometimes ungrammatical syntax, as well as the adaptation of stylistic devises such as the epithets, the epic simile and apostrophes, and the use of uncommon metaphors and idioms, all contributed to the idea that this was a translated text. This continuous playing with language is, like all the other strategies Macpherson employs, blurring the borders by overwhelming the audience with the sheer amount of levels of reference. Macpherson's Ossian does not itself get lost in translation, on the contrary, it comes about through translation, and it is the reader not the text that might get lost within Macpherson's web of allusions.

4. *Paradise Lost* in German

In this chapter, I turn to interlingual translations of *PL* into German. In contrast to the analysis so far, the focus now is on interlingual translation in the more conventional sense. The providence of the source text is clear. The translations do not intend to mislead the reader regarding their original author. What has been analysed as a poetic device before, is now the concrete method of text production in another language. The question of what happens in translation, still remains the central aspect of investigation. Yet, as David Bellos argued in his illuminating and entertaining contribution to translation studies *Is that a Fish in your Ear?* (2011), finding good answers requires good questions. And, 'What happens in translation' is rather unrewarding. We cannot answer this question because we do not know what exactly we are asking. Translation has, as we have already seen, more than one simple rule and can serve more than one purpose. Depending on circumstances, translations can look totally different to their source and still be 'correct'. But this makes it very difficult to come to some kind of 'easy-to-use' or 'easy-to-understand' explanation of what is occurring in translation. According to Bellos, and also conforming with my approach in the following and preceding chapters, the better question to ask is how does translation work and in what context. This approach requires a comparative strategy to integrate the target language and culture, in this case German.

Translation studies were established as a field of research in the second half of the 20th century. While everything concerned with translation until then was primarily concentrated on prescriptive approaches, now translations were investigated according to descriptive methods. The long-standing tradition of criticism has its beginnings as early as in Horace's *Ars Poetica* (ca. 10 BC) when he argues for a freer translation and rejects word-for-word translations. In the introduction to *The Translation Study Reader* edited by Lawrence Venuti, the history of translation studies has always oscillated between two concepts: equivalence and function.

> Equivalence has been understood as "accuracy," "adequacy," "correctness,"
> "correspondence," "fidelity," or "identity"; it is a variable notion of how the
> translation is connected to the foreign text. Function has been understood as the
> potentiality of the translated text to release diverse effects, beginning with the

> communication of information and the production of a response comparable to
> the one produced by the foreign text in its own culture. (Venuti 2000: 4)

The four German translations of *Paradise Lost* I will be looking at are a cross section through four centuries beginning as early as the 17th century and cutting through the 20th. The selection of these translations is based on specific translation and world-making strategies, it is not representative of the overall translation tradition of *PL*. On the contrary, the translators have been chosen because of their unique positions: How did they negotiate equivalence and function? To which functions were the translators committed? How did the literary and cultural context influence their work?

Theodor Haak's 1667 translation was strongly informed and influenced by his religious conviction, as well as his interest in science. In this regard, he placed a similar emphasis on the extra-literary effects and aspects of his work as Milton did. Both men were deeply religious and considered their efforts to be standing in greater relation to their faiths, which has consequences for the result of the translation. Both men consciously express their desire to contribute to world-making.

Johan Jakob Bodmer's main concern in his first out of several editions of *PL* from 1732 was his aesthetic preference for the Middle Ages and Milton's sensualism. Bodmer had a long-standing dispute with Gottschedt, who favoured antiquity and his French predecessors. What this dispute reveals is that Bodmer's translation is not only a contribution to the German literary canon, but above all a statement. Bodmer's translation is a statement on his aesthetic demands on literary production and the negotiation of mimetic relations between past and present.

Adolf Böttger's translation (1843) answers to the preceding period of Enlightenment with a Romantic and more personal programme. It is also the most popular and readily available version today.[35]

Hans Heinrich Meier's 1969 translation is the most recent translation into verse. However, there won't be the same emphasis on all these texts and although

---

[35] If a specific translator is not part of the search, German Amazon primarily offers the translation of *PL* by Böttger. The MarixVerlag published a new edition based on the 1890 edition by the Kunstverlag von Neufeld & Henius, Berlin, in 2008. This edition is readily available and comparatively low-priced. It also features the illustrations by Gustave Doré.

some instances will be investigated in all the translations, some other aspects are particular to individual texts.

The examples in the following chapter will, on the one hand, follow the structure established in the preceding chapter, and on the other hand, focus on specific instances of translation, interpretation, communication and world-making. By focusing on recurring passages in various translations and analyzing them together one can see the changes in style and approach to their translation over the centuries. It will also give us the opportunity to follow a line of thought translators have developed, considering their own trade and their thoughts on mimesis and originality.

The analysis of translation offers various perspectives and lenses from which source and target texts can be investigated. Translation comparison can take the perspective of the source and look at the target text, but it is equally possible to look back at the source from the point of view of the translation. This difference seems trivial but when working with translations it soon becomes clear that the amount of material involved requires limitations. In the first part of this thesis, in the absence of a single evident source, I have taken the point of view from the target to the source. I have traced Milton's predecessors and sources for *PL*, such as Genesis and Homer through the epic. How did Milton render the account of creation and mankind's fall? In the second part, the perspective is directed from source to target. How was Milton expressed in German?

The questions I will be following in this chapter are: Why translate *PL* in the first place? And with what strategy or programme did the translators approach *PL*? The decision to translate an epic poem from England and the realisation of this work are subjected to ideological and aesthetic demands of the given centuries. The translator's in the following analysis were more or less prominent figures in the literary scene in Germany. Their tastes and backgrounds inform the resulting renditions of *PL*. These will be traced and exemplified via selected passages following tropes of translation and authorial creation as well as typical translation decisions, such as versification and diction. In turn, the influence their translations had on the German literary landscape will be investigated as well.

4.1 New in Translation

4.1.1 The 17th Century: Theodor Haak

Theodor Haak was born near Worms in 1605 to a family of scholars and Calvinists. There is not a lot of information about his upbringing. We do know that he was enrolled at the University of Heidelberg until 1618 when his education was cut short by the onset of the Thirty Years' War. The war was ignited and fuelled by religious conflict between Protestant and Catholic fractions. This conflict followed the Reformation and the Counter-reformation. The war between the Habsburgs and France developed into a battle over the hegemony of Europe and caused a substantial economic, cultural and political decline in Germany. Even though the war involved the whole continent, the Holy Roman Empire in central Europe, comprising among others and in varying unions the kingdoms of Germany, Bohemia and Italy was impacted the most. Schools and universities were closed, trade broke down, the country side became a battle ground and agriculture came to a halt. In the wake of war the plague took hold of many cities, further diminishing social and cultural activity, leaving Central Europe in a devastated condition.

During the literary period of the Baroque, the political and creative situation was dire. Germany was separated into several governments and was still a long way from becoming a united nation. It was at a disadvantage concerning the emergence of a standardised language and especially that of a poetical language. Although the German language had gained some importance during the reign of Charlemagne, an avid reader and proponent of education, who founded libraries and commissioned translations and furthered literary production in the vernacular, it did not flourish. French was predominant in the west and in the south of the Carolingian empire. However, German was spoken throughout central and eastern parts of Europe. Thanks to the efforts and reforms of Charlemagne a lot of Classical texts were preserved and rediscovered. This lead to the period being named the Carolingian Renaissance.

After the decline of Carolingian rule, the lack of a centralised government or a cultural centre, as Florence was to Italy or London to England, prevented German literature from gaining attention outside of German speaking areas. The distance between clerical and lay communities was not overcome but rather

reinforced with the adaptation of French and Italian motifs and conventions. These French conventions and motifs were only accessible to those with education, like the clergy and members of the royal courts. Compared to Italian and English literary efforts, Germany was still well behind establishing poetical standards. While England had already brought about writers and poets such as Shakespeare and Milton, who were known beyond the limits of their native countries and who had contributed a lot to the establishment of a poetic language, Germany was yet to establish a comparable literary tradition. The same holds true for German as a scientific language. The divide between scientific academic discourse and popular vernacular remained wide. Leibniz (1646-1716) still published his mathematical and philosophical treaties in French and Latin due to lack of sufficient terminology in his native German. Leibniz was not able to express these concepts in German as German had not yet realised the language necessary to express scientific developments and discoveries.

German might not have continued to play any role in the linguistic map of Europe if the Reformation, that was about to unsettle the whole of Europe, had not been prompted by the actions of a German from Eisleben: Martin Luther. Through an act of translation German emerges as a language of theological and political discourse. Luther's translation of the Bible and especially his programme had immense impact on the significance and development of German.

> [m]an mus nicht die buchstaben inn der lateinischen sprachen fragen, wie man sol Deutsch reden, wie diese esel thun, sondern, man mus die mutter jhm hause, die kinder auff der gassen, den gemeinen man auff dem marckt drumb fragen, und den selbigen auff das maul sehen, wie sie reden, und darnach dolmetzschen, so verstehen sie es den und mercken, das man Deutsch mit jn redet. (1530: 17)

It was Luther's great contribution to the further development and advancement of *Frühneuhochdeutsch* (roughly from 1350 to 1650) 'to look at their mouths' to find the language to compose his Bible translation. In his "Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen" (1530) Luther describes how to speak proper German and suggests that looking to Latin and imitating antiquity is not advisable. Instead, favouring direct and unmediated access to scripture, the speech of common people is declared the desired form of expression for a religious programme. Additionally, during the Renaissance, humanist ideas and values were carried into the Holy Roman Empire leading to the establishment of such Universities like the one in Heidelberg attended by Haak.

Literary and artistic production in Germany during the Baroque era was informed by source material from the aesthetics of the Renaissance and the experiences of the Thirty Years' War and its consequences. Therefore, art produced in the German Baroque era was chiefly concerned with antithetical motifs. The war and the ensuing devastation of the plague inspired defeatist contemplations on sickness and death but also on valuing the present. The *vanitas* theme became characteristic for the period and emblematic for a phase of opposing forces. *Carpe diem* and *memento mori* expressed these contradictions, focusing on the one hand on the present and on the other on the finitude of life. Gryphius' poem "Es ist alles eitel" chillingly captured the *vanitas* motif. The influence of Luther's Bible translation can also be seen in Gryphius' use of 'eitel'. Luther translated Ecclesiastes 1, 2: "Vanitas vanitatum, dixit Ecclesiastes; vanitas vanitatum, et omnia vanitas" as "Es ist alles ganz eitel, sprach der Prediger, es ist alles ganz eitel." In English, the Latin root can still be found in the word 'vane'. The German rendition by Luther uses a Germanic term which Gryphius adopted for his poem. Compared to other national literatures, German literary tradition emerges from a relationship with translation. This shows how dispersed the region was at that time. A consolidating act of translating the common basis of religious belief and piety made it possible for a more unified language to come into use. Luther's Bible achieved what the division of the Germany feudal system had inhibited for so long, the spreading of German as a language of culture outside of its own borders.

While the Renaissance had brought with it a flourishing of culture and the arts, the consequences of the Reformation had led to a catastrophe for the whole of Europe. The Thirty Years' War was not only caused by political rivalry. The violent outburst of religious conflict between Protestants and Catholics was started by the Reformation. Consequently, artistic expression was curbed and what was made sought to make sense of the experience of loss and hopelessness. In 1627, Martin Opitz published his poetics of rules (Regelpoetik) the *Buch von der Deutschen Poeterey*. His book emerged in the middle of ongoing battles in Europe and is the first such work to be published in German. Translation theory was part of his poetic theory and Opitz considered translation as a form of mimesis:

> Eine guete art der vbung aber ift / das wir vns zueweilen auß den Griechifchen vnd Lateinifchen Poeten etwas zue vberfetzen vornemen: dadurch denn die eigenfchafft vnd glantz der wörter / die menge der figuren / vnd das vermögen auch dergleichen zue erfinden zue wege gebracht wird. (Opitz 1624: 79)

He praised translation for its ability to enrich the target language and as a practice tool. The rules formulated by Opitz are oriented towards French fashions as form of a *Nachahmungspoetik* and are based on Scaliger's Latin poetics (see Tappen 2002). Opitz postulated a strict adherence to versification and the natural word accent. He objected to half rhymes, abbreviations and loan words and favoured Alexandrines instead of the *Knittelvers*.

But by then Haak had already left the country and was not particularly committed to Opitz' rules. Haak's most influential source of German literature was Luther's Bible translation. As a literary and historical document and as a religious text, Luther's Bible translation was of immense importance to Haak, particularly as he was a Calvinist. Haak's status as an exile also separated him from literary discourse after his departure from Germany. As we will see, Haak employed multiple conventions Opitz criticised. But by the time he began his translation of *PL*, Haak was much more indebted to English poetics than to the literary developments of his native country. Haak emigrated first to the Netherlands, where he began translating the Staatenbibel,[36] and then to England, where he became a Fellow of the Royal Society. He considered himself a collector of the works of other great men and early in his education he began translating, establishing himself as a skilled wordsmith and linguist.[37]

On the backdrop of these political and linguistic circumstances, Haak was confronted with difficulties on both sides of his literary enterprise. Even though Germanic folk epics, such as the *Nibelungenlied*, were created during the Middle Ages, the epic tradition was only just about to be rediscovered as a genre. During the 17th century the revival of heroic poetry, through translation or creation of literary epics, had not yet begun. Homer's epics were translated by Johann Heinrich Voß in the 18th century and spread widely for an educated audience. The political and social climate that developed a century after the death of Haak

---

[36] The Staatenbible is a commissioned translation of the Bible into Dutch ordered by the Protestant Dutch Republic in 1637.

[37] His early translation of Daniel Dyke the Elder's *Mystery of Selfe-Deceiving* became an unexpected success and was reprinted multiple times during his life time.

facilitated cultural and aesthetic debates that in turn led to increased literary production. Voß's influential translations are still in use today and in terms of enriching the German poetic language they are similarly significant to Luther's translation of the Bible.

When Haak was working on his translation of *PL,* German literary language had not yet achieved the same level of differentiation and sophistication as English. Haak's departure from his home country separated him from any of German literary language's ongoing contemporary developments. Furthermore, Milton's own word formation strategies and neologisms called for a creative and inventive approach. Haak's translation of Milton's *Paradise Lost* is fragmentary and based on the first ten-book edition of 1667. As Haak's version was composed before Milton's second edition of *PL,* the introductory summaries are not part of his translation.

Haak is not only the first German translator of Milton's epic but he was also one of its first readers. Due to his participation and activity in the Royal Society and his movement in the community of religious exiles from Germany, Haak had access to *PL* earlier than most readers. Additionally, the epic poem and its themes were of enormous interest and import to the scholar and Calvinist from Germany. Haak only translated a little more than the first three books and never published his translation. Ernst Gottlieb von Berge completed the German translation of *PL* and published it in 1682. However, it is Haak's early attempt that holds special interest for scholars interested in the analysis of translation and intercultural communication between England and Germany during the 17th century.

4.1.2 *Das verlustigte Paradeiss* (1667)

Haak's translation strategy of *Das Verlustigte Paradeis*[38] is mimetic especially regarding visual aspects of the source text. He hoped to achieve an accurate visual resemblance by applying two measures: adapting the orthography as needed and translating blank verse – a novelty in German poetry. As in English, blank verse

---

[38] Haak translated the title *Paradise Lost* into *Das Verlustigte Paradeis*. The complemented version by von Berge was published later with the same title. This established Haak's phrasing of Milton's poem for quite a while in the German speaking context. The *Grimm'sche Wörterbuch* also offers von Berge's title as one early instance of the appearance of the term 'verlustigt' in the sense of 'lost' or 'defeated' creating or at least coining this idiom in German.

was introduced through translation. By using the same versification as Milton, Haak occasionally had to bend the syntax to fit the source. But he achieved a very close visual resemblance and proximity to the source text and its layout.

The whole translation has only a few lines more than the source, the length of the verses is imitated as well. This has taken an impressive amount of effort. German words and phrases tend to be longer and translations from English about a third longer than the source. Haak tried to compensate by abbreviation and contraction: "ohn' all' Empfindlichkeit: u. wer weiss noch, / wañ's wünschen währt" […] (2.16-7). The vowels at the end of 'ohne' and 'alle' are clipped to make the line run no longer than Milton's. Haak frequently made use of syncope and apocope, especially in less important words, to retain the pentameter. Double consonants are orthographically shortened and represented by a dash over a single grapheme. 'Und' is abbreviated to 'u.' throughout when necessary for the rhythm and the metre. The example also shows Haak's inclination for alliterations. This gave Haak the opportunity to add phonetic and visual features whenever he felt the source lacking or his repertoire failing.

His advantage was that the orthography of German was not yet standardised, this allowed for Haak's rather inconsequential style and a varying of the orthography of one word to fit the versification. The invention of the printing press by Johannes Gutenberg in the middle of the 15th century had led to a certain amount of standardisation. However, due to the multitude of German principalities and states, a coherent orthography was not established until much later and this lack of standardisation provided Haak with a lot of freedom. This freedom can be seen here, where Haak spelled *Feuer* (fire) in two different ways in the same line: "Fewr-fest", "feür-flüssig" (1.229).

Yet, Haak had to make concessions for this choice. His diction was strongly influenced by his agenda to make *Das Verlustigte Paradeis* 'look' like its source. These two parameters, the linguistic circumstances in Germany during the 17th century and Haak's adherence to a visually mimetic approach to Milton's versification and layout, can be illustrated in the invocation. The invocation is also a good starting point for the analysis of translations because for the translator the first phrase is as important as for the author. It can be a statement of the translator's programme as well as a conscious positioning in contrast to the author

of the source text. Haak opted for utmost adherence to Milton's syntax and semantics, making his version sometimes look almost like a linear translation.

> Of Man's first disobedience, and the fruit
> *Des Ersten Menschen Abfall u. die Frucht*
> Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
> *Ihm hochverbottnen Baums, dass ihr Versuch*
> Brought death into the world, and all our woe,
> *Den Todt u. all Unheyl hat auf die Welt*
> With loss of Eden, till one greater man
> *Gebracht, u. und auss Eden biss Gott-Mensch*
> Restore us, and regain the blissful seat,
> *Uns voll erlös' und alles wiederbring,*
> Sing heavenly muse, […].
> *Singend, Ô Sin, […].* (Haak 1.1-6)

The first two lines of Milton's *PL* and Haak's translation are almost identical in length. Considering the syntactical differences between English and German, Haak achieved a stunning visual similarity between the individual words. Milton's Latinate syntax was more difficult to imitate, the Anglo-Germanic passages seems more intuitive (Smith 2016: 385, 391). But, even though the German syntax sometimes worked in Haak's favour, he did not highlight the position of the final verb as Milton does. While the analytical syntax of English leaves little room to accommodate playful word order, the synthetic German does. And as, when in a sub clause, the main verb usually comes at the end of the phrase, it should have been easy to postpone the verb as Milton does in the first phrase.

Haak follows Milton's pentameter throughout the first lines and almost offers a word for word translation. To do so, Haak translates 'mortal taste' in the second verse as 'Versuch'. 'Versuch' in the context of food is not as familiar as 'taste' is for the reader of the English poem. 'Versuch' carries two meanings: 'Versuch' (attempt, experiment) and 'Versuchung' (temptation).[39] This allowed Haak to do without a translation for 'mortal'. In Milton's *PL*, 'mortal' combines the significance of taste being deadly (the original sin causing all humans to die) and the fact that the transgression is done by the very first two mortals. Haak tries to convey both of Milton's implications, the cause and the consequence, through the etymological and semantic proximity of 'Versuch' and 'Versuchung'. Yet, in the first few words of the invocation Haak maybe does not mistranslats but omits

---

[39] The terms 'attempt' and 'temptation' stand in a similar relation. They both trace back to a common root as does the German pair.

the more obvious relation of "Man's first disobedience". In Haak's version, "Des ersten Menschen Abfall" is the disobedience of the first human. Relation changes from describing the deed to describing the agent. Syntactically it would have been just as possible to translate 'Des menschen erster Abfall'.

As Haak tried to achieve not only semantic proximity but particularly focused on visual similarity, when he deviated from the syntactic pattern of his source he compensated for by re-establishing visual likeness. In this case, Haak substituted 'woe' with the alliterative 'Welt' at the end of line 3. He represented "one greater man" with "Gott-Mensch", an unfamiliar compound, avoiding a translation as 'ein größ'rer Mensch' which would have altered the emphasis in German. By using the indefinite pronoun in German, the singularity of that person would not be raised but made him one of many. Therefore, "Gott-Mensch" serves the purpose of exposing the singular position and meaning of Christ as well as maintaining a visual correlation between the source and the result. This visual mimesis of the text, regarding semantic, syntactical and visual aspects, is really condensed in the continuation of the first invocation.

> And chiefly thou O Spirit, that dost prefer
> *O weiser Reiner Geist, der des Gemühts*
> Before all temples th' upright heart and pure,
> *Aufrichtigkeit für aller Tempeln dienst*
> Instruct me, for thou know'st; thou from the first
> *Anschawest, Leyt du mich, du weissest alles*
> Wast present, and with mighty wings outspread
> *Von erst-an bey, da deiner Fittich Macht*
> Dove-like sat'st brooding on the vast abyss
> *Taub-gleich, das Erste Lähr-Wüst überschwebt,*
> And mad'st it pregnant: what in me is dark
> *und durch u. durch befrucht; Was mir unhäll*
> Illumine, what is low raise and support;
> *Erleücht; erhöh was ring, u. stärck was schwach,*
> That to the heighth of this great argument
> *Dass ich, geziemend der so hohen Sach*
> I may assert Eternal Providence,
> *Die ewige Führsehung recht erweis*
> And justify the ways of God to men.
> *u. Gottes Weg am Menschen klar rechtfertig.* (1.17-26)

Haak had to face some difficulties regarding the vocabulary and repertoire of not only poetic but also technical German. According to the OED, 'abyss' was since the time of Middle English the technical term for the world before God created

heaven and earth.[40] In his version of Genesis 1,1-2 Luther translates: "Am anfang schuff Gott Himel vnd Erden. Vnd die Erde war wüst vnd leer / vnd es war finster auff der Tieffe / Vnd der Geist Gottes schwebet auff dem Wasser". Luther renders the Hebrew 'Tohu wa bohu' literally with 'wüst und leer'. Haak transforms this *terminus technicus* coined by Luther into a compound word. He employed it for 'vast abyss', which was in turn the *terminus technicus* established in English and based on the Old Norse concept of the limitless void 'Ginnungagap'.[41] This neologism at first seems unwieldy but at closer inspection Haak's reasoning stands theologically and linguistically on solid footing. Haak adapted Milton's word formation strategy by coining new terms. These new terms were created based on their etymological meaning and exploited the ability to create compound words in German.

As Haak does with 'Lähr-Wüst' in line 21, he gives a literal translation of 'dove-like'. This translation of 'dove like' achieves a likeness through positioning the term at the beginning of the verse and through the structural similarity of 'taub-gleich'. In other occasions Haak is not that creative. The lack of vocabulary becomes obvious in his compound word-making when terms are being repeated for various situations: "Abgrund" is used for "bottomless perdition" (1.47), "hollow Abyss" (2.518), "dark Abyss" (2.1027).

As Haak only translated the first three books, only two invocations come to us in his version. In the first book, Haak translates the "heavenly muse" (1.6) with "Sin". 'Sinn' has a Germanic-Frisian root and only later came to blend with the Latin 'sensu'. The term included, according to Grimm's dictionary, a sense of direction and is related to the verb 'senden' (1.1-3).[42] Haak, thus, interprets Milton's source of inspiration of explicitly heavenly origin in combination with the classical concept of the muse as a directional 'Sendung'. 'Sendung' is interpreted to be based on a Germanic term on the one hand, and on the other hand Haak still implements it as personification albeit in a much more abstract manner. The term undergoes a change from a classical allegory for inspiration to a more conceptual concept, yet still addressing 'Sin'.

---

[40] "abyss, n.". OED Online. June 2018. Oxford University Press.
[41] 'Ginnungagap' appears in the Völuspá 3 of the *Poetic Edda*, an Old Norse folk epic from Iceland.
[42] *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob und Wilhelm Grimm.*

Haak proceeds similarly with the concept of 'mind', a notoriously hard to translate term, as it could have many adequate counterparts in German depending on the context. 'Mind' in German could be rendered as 'Hirn' (brain), 'Kopf' (head), 'Verstand' (wit, sanity), 'Geist' (spirit), 'Gemüt' (temper, disposition), 'Meinung' (opinion) and so forth.[43] Satan's famous realization that "The mind is its own place, and in itself / Can make a heaven of hell, a hell of heaven" (*PL* 1.254-5) is rendered in German as "Der Muht ist selbst sein ort, u. in sich selbst, / kan Hiṁel Höll, u. Holl zum Hiṁel machen" (1.254-5). Haak's choice to represent 'mind' by 'Muth' is in part due to the visual similarity between the two words. 'Muth' has the same Germanic root as 'mood' and as such relates to an emotional state. Western Germanic used the term to denote the location of feelings, thoughts, desire and ambition. In contemporary German, the semantic meaning of 'Mut' has narrowed to denote almost exclusively 'bravery'. 'Gemüth' has come to be used instead as the seat of emotions. The relation of the terms is still obvious. During the 17th century, both significations were still more present however, even then a strong tendency to differentiate was forming.[44] Haak appropriated an already archaic term for the translation of 'mind'. Reasons for Haak to exclude more obvious terms, such as 'Geist' for example, could lie in his own understanding of how human, or in this case satanic, emotions and conditions are brought about and processed. Using 'Muth' includes an intuitive and emotional level 'mind' carries as well but it is not as strongly emphasised as in the German translation. On the other hand, Haak's reasons could just as likely have been caused by the fact that he had translated 'spirit' with 'Geist' earlier on.

Haak was part of the circle of Milton as were many other Germans, such as the poet Georg Rodolf Weckherlin (from whom Milton took over the office of secretary to Lord Conway). And from whom Haak derived a lot of his poetic register. His *Gaistliche und Weltliche Gedichte* became a source of inspiration for vocabulary and poetic devices such as *Worthäufung* and synonymous doubling. But Weckherlin, too, stood outside of the German literary establishment. This is particularly unfortunate because after that line follows Satan's famous expression that "The mind is its own place, and in it self / Can make a Heav'n of Hell, a Hell of Heav'n" 1.254-5) and in translation the repetition of the term "mind" is not as

---

[43] See the search on www.linguee.de/deutsch-englisch for 'mind'.
[44] *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob und Wilhelm Grimm.*

strong as in the source. Considering that this is together with the assessment that it is "Better to reign in Hell, then serve in Heav'n" (1.263) only a few lines later, Satan's most sophisticated statements regarding free will and choice.

This example shows how this translation behaves at its limitations, where it can become creative. Haak was first and foremost a translator not a poet, not only content but also form and language were important to him. Haak translated *PL* with the same approach as he translated the Dutch Bible (Barnett 1962: 171), with scrutiny and care to the form as another level of (theological) meaning, as Jerome had prescribed it: in religious texts the word order holds its own mystery. Haak took Milton's epic poem not only as a work of literature but as a piece of theology. But he proceeded according to his faith and took great care not to misrepresent his understanding of Calvinism. The location of human emotion as well as that of reason and thought, is highly influenced by the culture that produces the terminology that refers to such concepts. Linguistically, German and English are relatively closely related. Yet, regarding the ideas and concepts of originality, mimesis and inspiration linguistic evidence shows that German and English were not at the same level during the 17th century. Even though religious motifs and beliefs influenced and informed both languages, due to its geopolitical position and scientific developments, English had an advantage over German.

Milton's descriptions of the universe are surprisingly accurate and influenced not only by Middle Eastern thought but also informed through first-hand knowledge. Milton had met with Galileo during his travels through Italy and continued correspondence that he later incorporated into *PL*. One such example is Milton's treatment of the possibilities of world creation through God. Before God created the earth and humanity who lived on it there were the heavens and angels. But Milton considered the possibility that God could create other or more worlds, worlds beyond earth and heaven.

> […] Into this wilde Abyss,
> The Womb of nature and perhaps her Grave,
> Of neither Sea, nor Shore, nor Air, nor Fire,
> But all these in thir pregnant causes mixt
> Confus'dly, and which thus must ever fight,
> Unless th' Almighty Maker them ordain
> His dark materials to create more Worlds,
> Into this wild Abyss the warie fiend
> Stood on the brink of Hell and look'd a while,
> Pondering his Voyage: for no narrow frith
> He had to cross. (*PL* 2.910-20)

In this paragraph, Milton seized on his understanding of the cosmos and his knowledge of the elements and science. In his interpretation of God's power and method, Milton saw science and nature as brought about by God but nonetheless had a great interest as well as an expertise in scientific research. His description of Satan at the edge of hell is full of terms from the field of natural science. 'Abyss' appears again as the *terminus technicus* for the universe before creation. The abyss is portrayed as female and nature as her womb, the origin of creation. At the same time the concept goes full-circle and the abyss is also portrayed as nature's grave. The elements are not (yet) differentiated because the abyss is still pregnant with them until God orders them to bring about another world.

Haak, although anxious to follow Milton's programme, occasionally compensated for a lack of scientific language to which he found no German equivalent with peculiar word coining. But in this passage, religious motifs might have been equally at play when he translated:

> […] biss Gott selbst
> der einig Schöpfer etwas Newes schafft,
> wo, wañ und wie es Ihm allein gefällt. (Haak 2.915-17)

While Milton considered the possibility of multiple worlds and used the plural form (916), Haak altered the choice of words to highlight the singularity of God. But, more importantly, by doing so Haak also indicated that earth is the only world God created. Here theological perspectives seem to contribute to Haak's deviating from his source. In this case, Haak took the time over two verses to stress the point he wanted to make about earth's special and unique position even though he usually made an effort to create verses with the same length as the source text. Haak's God might create something new but he deliberately avoided using the term 'Welt'. It did not seem enough to describe God as "einig" (916) in an additional line Haak added that God would create only where, when and how he pleases.

In other instances, Haak again concerned with ideological rationalisation consistently changed the plural "worlds" into the singular "Welt". Haak rendered "Space may produce new Worlds" in 1.650 as "ein newe Welt". While Milton advocated for the idea of multiple worlds, Haak insisted on earth being the only one. The question of the existance of multiple worlds and their creation was one

of philosophy's great concerns during the Enlightenment. Approaching religion and faith by way of logic and reason led to highly scientific debates about God's creative force and mankind's position within the creation myth. Leibniz' postulate that God created "the best of all possible worlds", assumes that anything else would contradict God's omnipotence.

Similar contrasts, logical and ideological, can be found in other places and scenes in *PL*, such as hell and Eden. Milton constructed hell as a precursor to the classical conceptualisation of the underworld. Therefore, Milton reinterpreted classical myths as misunderstandings of divine and above all Christian celestial struggles. *PL* treats the beliefs of antiquity as misguided and as if they were only an imitation of the actual hell, Pandemonium. Haak does not reproduce Milton's coinage but translates Pandemonium creating a neologism analogously to Milton's own procedure, albeit in the other direction. Milton reached back into antiquity creating a new word by back translation and according to Greek morphology patterns; "παν", meaning "all" or "every" and "δαιμόνιον" meaning "little spirit", "little angel" or, as Christians interpreted it, "little daemon" and later "demon". It thus roughly translates to "All Demons", but can also be interpreted as Παν-δαιμον-ειον, "all-demon-place". Haak translated Milton's neologism into "Höll-Helden Saal" (1.755).

In Haak's translation of the passage on Moloch in Book I, the anteriority of hell before Gehenna is curiously reversed. Haak translated "The pleasant valley of Hinnon, Tophet thence, / And black Gehenna, the type of hell" (1.404-5) as follows: "unfern des Heyns im Schönen Himons Thal / seyt Tophet u. 'Gehenna' heissend, Höllen Vorbild" (1.403-4). Where Milton discussed the various translations via references to the Anglo-Saxon concept of hell in regard to his own conceptions and his timeline, Haak subverted these efforts showcasing the multitude of human error in regard to divine or demonic origin. Haak makes Gehenna the "Vorbild", the prototype or model of hell. Whereas in Milton these places served as 'Abbild', in Haak they became the prefiguration of hell. Haak's departure from Milton's reasoning might point to the complex logic Milton employs when reordering and restructuring classical topoi and biblical motifs. Milton often openly stresses the misinterpretation of Greek mythological reasoning as in Book I: "Erring; for he with this rebellious rout, / Fell long before" (*PL* l.747-8), but he also often disguises his interpretation more deeply

within the structure of the epic. This can be seen in the word formation processes Milton employs to create terms for the language before the fall and the celestial battle. However, Haak's apparent discomfort at following Milton's reasoning might not only point to his shortcomings but to the still prevailing differences even between the reformed fractions.

The difficulties involved in translating *Paradise Lost* cannot be underestimated. The linguistic and poetical situation Haak was confronted with, also did not make the matter easier. In the following example, the circumstances are even more demanding because the translation of Milton's epic similes is by itself already an act of double translation and of double mimesis. The trope is based on comparison, on similarity and on the subtle navigation between two or more semantic fields. This requires a translation process through which new perspectives are offered about the source. The Miltonic simile, running over several lines and usually offering more than one reading, would be a challenge for any translator, even if the translator's approach does not set out to imitate the style and layout of its source. Milton's similes are carefully constructed in a manner that offers a multi-layered compendium of references interlinking several myths and narratives through a common moral. His grand style further elevates the effect of being confronted with truly epic subjects. Through the act of interlingual translation another level of abstraction is added, this can be seen in Haak's translation of the Leviathan simile in Book I:

> Diss aussgeredt, hub er sein Haupt empor
> u. schlug das glim̄ernd, fünckelnd Angesicht
> umber mit underm Theil noch flat da auf
> der Flam-Fluht aussgestrecket, weit u. breit,
> viel meilen lang; so gross u. ungeheüwer
> dass Dichter Unthier nichts dagegen, Titan
> die Erd-erborne Him̄elstürmer; noch
> der grausame Briareus, noch der Typhon,
> in seiner grossen Höhl dort bey alt Tharsus;
> noch selbst der Leviathan welchen Gott
> So gross im Meer u. mächtig hat erschaffen;
> Von dem man sagt, dass auf Norweger See,
> Ein Steüer-Man mit Nacht-behemtem Schiff,
> Alss Insel bey, auf seiner Schuppen rand
> Den Ancker warf; u. Ihm zur Seyt anlag,
> Wind-Wetter-frey, biss selbe Nacht fürüber,
> u. Tag-rath ihn hiess eylend dannen seglen; (Haak 1.192-208)

The simile in translation still compares Satan to ancient monsters and their size. Haak transforms the more abstract idea of "fables", used by Milton to a concrete "Dichter". The agent becomes an actual person. In the context of this simile and the always underlying concerns about authorship, Haak might be raising the question of whether poets can even begin to name the size and circumstance of these beings. Additionally, Haak embraces the foreshadowing already prevailing in this passage by calling the titans "Himmelstürmer" where Milton refers to them as warring "on Jove" (l.198). Both wordings point to the sacrilege of rebellion against God, the rebellion that is the reason for Satan's current state in the fiery gulf. Haak's phrasing is more literal than Milton's and by using this German compound, the whole verse becomes more domesticated. This programme of domestication continues throughout the passage. When Haak struggles to find equivalent idioms, he resorts to domesticating or using baroque motifs. The antithetical composition of concepts like the "burning lake" find equivalent representation in Haak's translation as "Flam-fluht", creating another compound and at the same time satisfying Haak's fondness for alliteration.

Haak transferred a gradual and repeated process or state into a single action (Barnett 1962: 182-3). While Milton describes the sailors' activity as habitual, Haak describes it as a singular event. The same is true for God's decree, which in Haak's translation is bound to a single moment in time by using "nun". Milton is often vague on the exact timing of an event whereas Haak intensifies Milton by introducing the idea of consecutive events. When Satan meets the monster in Book II, Haak's use of "flugs" (2.675) creates a hurriedness that the source does not suggest: "Satan was now at hand, and from his seat / The Monster moving onward came as fast" (2.674-5). While Milton avoids using a proactive verb and his Satan is curiously passive in this verse, Haak accelerates the scene and reinterprets Satan's behaviour.

Broken sentences and the use of conjunctions and impersonal verbs ("sah man") interrupt the flow of Milton's longer and more complicated syntax. However, Haak also evaded preserving Milton's grey areas by structuring the translation in black and white, good and bad ("subtle Fiend", 2.815, becomes "der arge Feind"), leaving out all ambiguity about Satan's character. Haak exaggerated positives and comparatives to superlatives ("schnödst' Abgötterey", 1.443, for "idols foul") and thus continues to hold on to the baroque motif of antithesis. He

141

often accentuated situations as opposites and highlighted contrasts whereas Milton described a synergetic state as in the following example from Book II:

> From Beds of raging Fire to starve in Ice
> Thir soft Ethereal warmth, and there to pine
> Immovable, infixt, and frozen round,
> Periods of time, thence hurried back to fire. (*PL* 2.600-3)

> […] ja sie vermehrt
> die Qual nur denen die hier brahten, dort
> erstarren müssen, hier verschmachten, dort
> erfrieren; hier in eytler gluth, dort gantz
> in Eyss verklemt, für die bestim̃te Harr. (Haak 2.599-603)

By using deictic pronouns in this passage, Haak creates opposites where Milton creates relations. Milton tries to express the circularity of time for heavenly and demonic beings. It almost seems as if Haak walks into a trap set by Milton, pointing out how right he was when suggesting these concepts are beyond the reach of mere mortals. Haak's characterisation of Satan changes the whole atmosphere of *PL*. While Milton's source gives Satan and the fallen angels rhetorical skills and an elevated language, Haak's Satan speaks ordinarily and often in colloquialisms (1.84-99). Satan laments his state and is robbed of the dignity he has, at least in the earlier books of *PL*, because of this.

Haak does not join Milton in the prelapsarian construction and metaleptic order he established when relaying things that happened before the fall. The fallen angels in Milton still hold some of their heavenly dignity and, although Satan is characterised as jealous and grandiose, he is also described in regal and proud language. While Satan in Milton has "transcendent glory" (2.427), Haak exaggerates the description and translates it to "mit übermachtem Stoltz". The translation continues in the typically baroque form of *Übersteigerung,* representing "with thoughts inflam'd of highest design" (2.630) as "ruhmdürstig, trotz-vermessentlich" (Barnett 1962: 185). This style of describing Milton's characters causes them to lose almost all depth and removes any suspense about their internal development throughout the epic. The stark difference between Satan's varying states before the fall in heaven, throughout his metamorphoses, and the according shift in attributes and symbols, changing him from a "bringer of light" (Lucifer) to being surrounded by "darkness visible" (1.63) contrasts with Haak's usual strategy. While he argued in black and white in other respects, here

he leaves out the significant markers that would point towards the light/dark dichotomy.

Haak turned statements into questions when his diction was not able to follow Milton's. Satan's reply to Beelzebub is therefore less reassuring than reproving:

> […] schrey, was
> Gefall'ner Cherub? Du klein-müthig sein,
> in Leyden oder Thun? pfuy! Weisstu nicht
> dass unsers Werck nie sein wird gutes thun? (1.156-9)

The result are three questions and an interjection in place of Milton's verse which is separated only by a colon and commas. The interjection "pfuy" domesticates Satan's speech again. The flow of the line is interrupted and in Haak's translation it has a staccato tone. The tone is caused by the rapid succession of question marks each time also causing a break in the verse. This is further highlighted by the interjection which is meant to reinforce Satan's refusal to accept defeat. It might have seemed necessary to Haak because of the potentially weakening argument through the form of interrogation. In general, Satan comes across like a vengeful spirit, which he is in Milton's *PL*, too. In Haak's version, Satan sounds rather dull and less like a sophisticated general.

When the lexical repertoire was not sufficient, Haak often compensated by using resounding alliterations and hyphenated compounds: "Weit-öd-Wilde Wüsteney" (1.180) translates "dreary Plain, forlorn and wilde" (1.180). Here, Haak also turned the question Satan poses into a request. These alterations in syntax are only partially due to Haak's attempt to imitate Milton's verse, they also function to shift the text towards Haak's own interpretation. The same inversion happened in another passage. When Satan argues that his state has not changed after the fall in Milton, he expresses that in form of a rhetorical question:

> What matter where, if I be still the same,
> And what I should be, all but less then he
> Whom Thunder hath made greater? (1.256-8)

Haak changed this into a statement:

> Es gilt mir alles gleich, so lang ich pleib
> Was ich sein soll u. bin; kaum weniger
> Alss der den Donner führt. (1.256-8)

Milton's Satan might not in fact try to convey doubt about his utterance. Although, this too would have been lost in Haak's translation, above all Satan's rhetorical skilfulness is undermined by Haak's change of syntax. Occasionally, Haak even created comical moments like when Satan "schnarchte" (1.270) while lying on the burning lake. But, as Barnett concludes, Haak was confronted with a difficult situation and for his ability and programme offered an impressive result:

> Nonetheless, though Haak was not a poet and thus not able to produce a really worthy translation of *Paradise Lost*, he certainly achieved some degree of success because of his determined acceptance of the conditions which he had imposed upon his work. (Barnett 1962: 186)

Haak's word formation strategies are sometimes similar in structure to Milton's approach to coinage. Both drew on etymological meanings, such as in "abyss" and "Wüst-Lähr". At the same time, they also used translation conventions and back translations to introduce new terms. Haak, however, often resorted to tautology instead of ambiguity, synonyms instead of denotation (Assmann 1974: 310). He also used pairing and juxtaposition to make up for his lack of vocabulary. Indeed, as much as Haak struggled to fit German syntax into iambic pentameter, he also often had to fill in where German language could not match Milton's language ("schalten-walten", "singend-klingend", "Pein und Qual", Ruhm und Ehr", Trug und List", 181).

> Although Haak tried occasionally to create new compounds and to write with greater freedom in imitation of his model, in the main he was dependent upon the language and the literary usage of the seventeenth century. (Barnett 1962: 181)

When Haak used compounds, he often combined two nouns where Milton used an adjective. This way, Haak could avoid the adjective endings which take up a lot of space. However, because of a lack of vocabulary, the translation sometimes becomes monotonous in rhythm.

Haak occupied himself mostly with scientific, mathematical and theological books, although it seems likely that he read works by the poet Andreas Gryphius. As a member of the Royal Society, Haak was a specialist in magnetism and often emphasised scientific aspects over Milton's mythical references. Haak was not an original poet or scientist but occupied with the communication of scientific information. He was a secretary, translator, natural philosopher and correspondent. Haak was also a Calvinist and a Republican. Religious belief and

natural science were at odds in some instances of his translation. And, in German, Milton's revolutionary insinuations became more prominent (Smith 2016: 385-6, 395). Haak, in the spirit of German Protestantism, rejected authoritarian rule even more vividly.

German literary production had reached a low point. Wishing to prove that German was able of higher literature by imitating foreign models, especially from France and Italy, during the 17th century *Sprachgesellschaften* encouraged translations. Haak stood outside of the strict confines of the German literary milieu (Barnett 1962: 170). His aim was to make poetry he deemed highly valuable accessible to the German reader. Haak had no patriotic motive and did not seek to enrich the German literary language, the national literature or to apply Opitz's rules as other translators vigorously did. In a time that favoured poetic paraphrase as the most common form of translation, often producing longer versions, literal translations were rather rare (Barnett 1962: 170-1). But Haak subscribed to this programme and in the second invocation he achieves striking accuracy (Barnett 1962: 174). He was able to translate almost literally, retaining not only sense but word order and rhythm as well. Haak adopted from Milton unrhymed iambic pentameter and the predominant use of enjambments. In the 18th century, Gottsched criticised this way of translating, referring to the completed version by von Bergen:

> Von Bergen aber hat sich aus sclavischer Nachahmung Miltons gar eingebildet, dieses beständige Eingreifen in die folgenden Verse wäre eine besondere Schönheit der miltonischen Poesie: da sie doch him Englischen eben so wohl unangenehm ist. (1748, p. 633)[45]

Haak maintained great accuracy of form and content despite the differences between German and English. But through the abbreviations and frequent use of participles, common and familiar in English but sometimes enigmatic in German, Haak's translation lost the meaning it was trying to preserve. At times the meaning can only be retraced when going back to Milton: "gestallt die Under droben Obre thun" (3.736) to "As to superior Spirits is wont in Heaven" (3.737). According to Barnett, "[s]o much has to be compressed into few words that its meaning fails to emerge" (1962: 178). The main reason Haak's version has

---

[45] For a detailed comparison between Haak's first three books and Berge's revisions see Barnett 1962: 168-186.

emerged with roughly the same length as Milton's is because of his omissions (178-9). Sometimes Haak omitted to keep the five-foot line and in general he had to compress the lengthier German.[46] Haak's tendency to paraphrase, albeit less pronounced than in his contemporaries, also hindered the exact correspondence of lines between Milton's text and Haak's translation.

Haak seems to be stuck between different desires: the desire to attain a high level of visual mimetic proximity to Milton, the desire to be true to his Calvinist sentiments and the desire to challenge the linguistic disparity between German and English in the 17th century. The insinuation that Haak's translation was, first and foremost, meant as a tool to convey the contents is unjustified. Even though Haak's translation might seem lacking poetically, it would be wrong to suggest he had no intention of creating a work of art. His emphasis on versification and the layout of the translation represent his programmatic but also his aesthetic demands. Haak's lexical repertoire, never mind the domesticating expressions and idioms, challenged Milton's source text in the sense that the density is obtained albeit deferred. Milton's complexity got lost mostly due to Haak's lack of linguistic range. But one only has to look at the following translations of *PL* to realize how difficult it was to produce a version accurate in content, form and length (Barnett 1962: 179).

4.2 Aesthetic Battleground

4.2.1 The 18th Century: Johann Jakob Bodmer

A century later the situation in Germany had changed drastically. The political and social circumstances allowed for an educated middle class to develop and to actively participate in the intensified emerging cultural production. The 18th century, although Germany was still not a single united nation, offered a relative amount of political stability and continuity, giving artists and poets the opportunity to reflect upon and to begin to establish an artistic tradition. In the preceding century, artistic production was still firmly rooted in classical ideas of beauty and imitation. Aesthetic ideals were derived from antiquity and imparted to the artists with the notion that imitation was the best way to achieve these aesthetic values. Students of the arts trained by studying and meticulously

---

[46] For a detailed analysis of the lines and their correspondence see Barnett 1962: 179.

imitating classical works of art. The concept of artistic production through imitation by no means came to a complete halt during the following centuries. Yet, the points of reference changed. The Enlightenment foregrounded reason as its rule of law and therefore, questioned religious beliefs, outdated ideas and ideologies. The concepts of original production and of genius were strongly debated and confronted with traditional concepts of the production of art, following role models from classical antiquity.

In addition to this philosophical and aesthetic debate, the linguistic situation in Germany was challenged by the pioneering role of French. During the 18th century French became the language of art and science. In the 18th century, French was replacing Latin as the lingua franca of scholars and authors. Whereas a century ago writers who wanted recognition beyond the borders of their home countries needed to publish in Latin, soon they would write and translate their works into French. As wars subsided and international relations demanded means to distribute concepts all over the continent, interlingual exchange gained importance in Europe. After the peace of Westphalia and the end of a decade long conflict at the core of Europe, skill in diplomacy and negotiations became more important. As French continued its triumphant march through Europe, many works came to German via a French translation. Many English texts were first translated into French and then based on the French translation, translated into other languages.[47] However, for a long time standards and requirements for translations had been mainly reserved for religious debates. These religious debates were concerned with the rendering of the word of God in other tongues. But in the more stable political climate, the lines between fiction, religious meditation and report became more blurred.

Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* is a great example of this new style of translation. In his preface, its first German translator Ludwig Friedrich Vischer, a tutor and educator, stated that he would refrain from commenting on the truthfulness of the account and relate "bloß die Verteutschung" (in Zeller 1982: 57) of the content. Vischer promised to be true to the source text, without interpreting or re-contextualising it regarding its authenticity.[48] Vischer took the

---

[47] This holds true for many other languages as well, not only English (Zeller 1982: 10).
[48] Even though Robinson Crusoe became an immediate success and to this day is well-known as a children's book, Vischer's name has largely been forgotten (Zeller 1982: 54).

success of *Robinson Crusoe* (first published in Germany in 1720) as a sign that German taste in literature was not altogether lost (58). Thereby, Vischer made a strong argument for the pioneering statues of English literature. Even though English was still far from becoming the lingua franca on the continent, in the decades to come after Vischer English literature was on the rise and gaining more momentum. The early 18th century in Germany witnessed an enormous rise in translations of literary works. Along with the writers and translators came the critics and debates on how translations were or should be done. Moral and religious sensitivities often ruled these debates and translators felt the obligation to justify their work or to find patrons who themselves were beyond reproach. Georg Wolf, translator of Jonathan Swift's "A Tale of a Tub" ("Mährgen Von Der Tonne", published 1729), explained in his preface that accusations against Swift and his satirical approach to religion are misconceptions because Swift's actual goal was to satirize "was wider die Religion ist, und was sie verunehret" (in Zeller 1982: 63). He continued to describe his approach to translation and the difficulties he had retaining the satirical elements and the irony of the original text. Contrary to the French translator, Wolf claimed he stayed close to the English source text without generalisation or omission (63).

Even though religious sentiments still played an important role, translation theories became more interested in literary works and poetics in general. Opitz had already placed emphasis on translation as a means of poetic production a century earlier but now the establishment of a German literary language became more pressing in the eyes of the critics. The debate about translation positions as well as aesthetic questions on the value of mimesis and imitation famously developed between Johann Christoph Gottsched on the one side and Johann Jakob Breitinger and Johann Jakob Bodmer on the other. As Opitz's *Regelpoetik* was an attempt to raise the German literary language to an internationally competitive level, so was Gottsched's. His *Versuch einer Critischen Dichtkunst*, originally written for his students at the University in Leipzig, is still firmly rooted in a mimetic tradition as the full title of his poetic theory attests to: *Versuch einer critischen Dichtkunst für die Deutschen; darinnen erstlich die allgemeinen Regeln der Poesie, hernach alle besonderen Gattungen der Gedichte abgehandelt und mit Exempeln erläutert werden, überall aber gezeigt wird, daß das innere Wesen der*

Poesie in einer Nachahmung der Natur bestehe. Gottsched's approach was normative and didactic. He wrote about mimesis:

> Aristoteles hat es schon ausgeführt, wie natürlich es dem Menschen sey, alles was er siehet und höret, nachzuahmen. [...] Alles was wir lernen und fassen, das fassen und lernen wir durch die Nachahmung. [...] Daraus leitet nun der tiefsinnige Weltweise den Ursprung der Poesie her. (Gottsched 1730: 100-101)

Following a quote from Opitz, Gottsched added: "Daraus leitet nun der tiefsinnige Weltweise den Ursprung der Poesie her" (ibid.). Gottsched referred to Aristotle and contended that not only is everything learned through imitation, imitation is also the source of poetry. Opitz functioned as predecessor and role model to whose ideas Gottsched was indebted. Gottsched was ready to follow in his path.

In his poetics, the focus shifted from a rule-based poetics (*Anweisungspoetik*) to a more abstract aesthetic concept of literary production. Different genres are still analysed according to their specific features but Gottsched wanted to show that there is a general concept underlying all forms of literary works: the imitation of nature. For Gottsched, it followed that this mimetic approach requires translation as a mode of literary production and representation. He argued for a free translation, one that allows the poetic creativity of the translator and the target language to surface.

> Ich rühme mich nicht, dass ich es [das Werk] von Zeile zu Zeile, vielweniger von Wort zu Wort gegeben hätte [...]. Ein Übersetzer müsse kein Paraphrast oder Ausleger werden […]. Ein prosaischer Übersetzer muss es hierinn genauer nehmen: einem poetischen aber muss man, in Ansehung des Zwanges, dem er unterworfen ist, schon eine kleine Abweichung zu gute halten; wenn er nur diesen Mangel durch eine angenehme und leichtfliessende Schreibart ersetzt. (Gottsched 1730: 6)

Gottsched differentiated between poetic and prosaic translation. While the latter must be more faithful to the source and has a greater responsibility to the accuracy of content, the former has a responsibility to the target language and its diction. Deviations from literal translation can be forgiven in a poetic translation if the style and diction remains pleasing to the reader. The translator of poetic works is constrained: 'unterliegt dem Zwang'. Gottsched's wording here is reminiscent of Jerome's comment on his Bible translation, in which the method is described as not "verbum e verbo" but "sensum de sensu". Consciously or not, Gottsched reaffirmed his position regarding the sources worth, imitating by drawing on this famous statement on translation.

A decade later, in his essay "Von der Kunst der Uebersetzung" from his *Kritische Dichtkunst* (1740), Johann Jakob Breitinger at prima facie closely followed Gottsched's reasoning concerning mimesis and translation.

> Von einem Uebersetzer wird erfordert, daß er ebendieselben Begriffe und Gedancken, die er in einem trefflichen Muster vor sich findet, in eben solcher Ordnung, Verbindung, Zusammenhange, und mit gleich so starckem Nachdrucke, mit anderen gleichgültigen bey einem Volck angenommenen, gebräuchlichen und bekannten Zeichen ausdrücke, so daß die Vorstellung der Gedancken unter beyderley Zeichen einen gleichen Eindruck auf das Gemüthe des Lesers mache. Die Uebersetzung ist ein Conterfey, das desto mehr Lob verdienet, je ähnlicher es ist. (Breitinger 1740: 139-40)

At first sight his emphasis, like Gottsched's, seems to be on achieving an equivalent effect in the target language. Both translators conceive language as a sign system that can be encoded and decoded in any given language and therefore have a universalistic perspective on language and translation. Gottsched's universalistic approach favoured a domesticating process when transferring poetical texts. Not only the single linguistic signs are being recreated in another language but also idioms and figurative speech are adapted to the target language and culture. There is a focus on the target context and the target audience as opposed to faithfulness to the source.

However, 'equivalency' and 'Ähnlichkeit' are ambiguous terms and can be subject to numerous interpretations themselves. Equivalent or similar to what? The syntax? The semantic level? The morphology? Or the versification? Attempts to consolidate all aspects of a text in translation require compromise and negotiation. As the transferral of a text from one language to another necessarily causes distance between the source and the translation, equivalency and similarity must be understood as relative concepts. Yet, Breitinger departed from Gottsched when he argued for a more literal translation theory, simultaneously beginning to favour foreignization over domestication. Breitinger suggested that a translation should strive to be the source's "conterfey", be made in its 'image'. Breitinger also used the term 'original' for the source material and therefore established a hierarchy not only in terms of chronology but also in value. Literary form became more important for the translation. Not only should the content be replicated with equivalent effect but the form of the original should also reflect in the translation. This demand made translation a very sophisticated undertaking and one that

required not only skilful use of the target language, the finding of equivalency, but additionally asked for imitation of the form.

> Man hat daher jederzeit vor ein bequemes Mittel eine Sprache anzubauen angesehen, daß man von Uebersetzungen der besten Schriften fremder Nationen den Anfang mache, weil dadurch neben schönen Gedanken, viele eigene Wörter, die sonst in Abgang kommen würden, erhalten, auch etwann neue eingeführet werden; vornehmlich aber, weil auf diese Weise eine Menge verblühmter Ausdrückungen in dieselbe hinübergetragen und in Gang gebracht werden. (Breitinger 1740: 350-51)

Here, Breitinger argued strongly for a more foreignizing translation. A translation that allows for expressions and terms to be carried over into the target language to enrich it and keep idioms alive that might otherwise fall out of use. By calling for this expansion of translation, Breitinger further highlighted the productive and inventive capacity of translation.

Bodmer, whose translation of *PL* will be the object of the following translation analysis, was from Switzerland like Breitinger, and like Breitinger also a republican and a democrat. Both had theological backgrounds and might have had a particular interest in an author like Milton. While Gottsched favoured antiquity and French writing, Breitinger and Bodmer turned their focus on the Middle Ages and English literature. Gottsched's concern of working toward a German literary language able to stand its ground when confronted with other European literatures was naturally more focused on creating parameters for that literary language. Gottsched created these parameters according to methods that had given French its prevailing statues. The equivalency Gottsched pointed out as favourable in a translation is based on equivalency in terms of linguistic sophistication and the establishment of a tradition rooted in the admiration for the classical periods of Greece and Rome.

> Was bey den Römern die Griechen waren, das sind für uns itzo die Franzosen. Diese haben uns in allen großen Gattungen der Poesie die schönsten Muster gegeben, und und sehr viel Discurse, Censuren, Critiken und andere Anleitungen mehr geschrieben, daraus wir uns manchen Regel nehmen können […]. Aber die alten griechen und Rümer sin duns deswegen nicht verbothen, den ohne sie hätte uns Opitz nimmermehr eine so gute Bahne zu brechen vermocht. (Gottsched 1730: 42)

A domesticating process coexists with a wish of renewal which seeks to create an equally sophisticated opus. Rules and traditions were what Gottsched was looking for in the mimesis of the classical period. This strictness and emphasis on

prescriptive guidelines caused Gottsched to be labeled as the "Geschmacksdictator". Breitinger and Bodmer were less concerned with the establishment of normative rules for translation and less worried about unregulated foreign influences. They were also concerned with equivalency but were much more focused on the source text. Breitinger's respect for the 'original' is also expressed in his emphasis of the source material. Both translators shared an understanding of which effect should be transferred equivalently and which response should be triggered within the reader.[49] The friction caused by their debate with Gottsched, the so-called 'Literaturkrieg', about the method of mimetic approaches to artistic production, poetic production and about which sources and predecessors were worth imitating, became very influential for following literary movements, especially during the Romantic period.

Bodmer's main aim was accuracy of content. But not even this proved to be easy considering the complexity of Milton's epos and its ambiguous figurative language. His goal was also clarity, "which involved the specific statement of all that Milton left to the imagination" (Barnett 1962: 180). As a result, his translation is much longer than the source.

4.2.2 *Verlust des Paradieses* (1732/42)

Bodmer's translation of *PL* follows a completely different programme than Haak's. It was first published in 1732 (although the manuscript was ready almost a decade earlier) but was harshly criticized for its Swiss diction and language. Bodmer edited his translation of *PL* and added a justification of Milton and his own translation: *Critische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren in der Poesie und dessen Verbindung mit dem Wahrscheinlichen* (1740). Subsequently, in 1742, Bodmer published the so-called 'German version' with the title: *Johann Miltons Episches Gedichte von dem verlohrnen Paradiese.* In the following paragraphs, I will mainly work from the 1742 version but occasionally contrast to the earlier version of 1732.

Bodmer did not adhere to Milton's versification and offered a prose rendition of the epic. Bodmer's translation of *PL* rather resembles Goethe's

---

[49] Friedrich Schlegel. 1986. "Sich 'von dem Gemüthe des Lesers Meister' machen. Zur Wirkungsästhetik der Poetik Bodmers und Breitingers".

translation of Ossian. While Milton had liberated his verse from the constraints of rhyme, Bodmer liberated his translation from the constraints of metre as well. Consequently, and contrary to Haak, Bodmer did not try to establish an overall visual resemblance of the translation to the source text's layout. His prose does not, as demanded by Gottsched, imitate the flow or diction of Milton's blank verse. A comparison of the first invocation immediately shows that the layout and the general appearance of the translation hold no obvious resemblance to the source.[50] In the 1732 version, Bodmer begins his epic as follows:

> Singe von dem ersten Ungehorsam des Menschen, und der Frucht des verbotenen Baumes, deren vergifftetes Essen den Tod und das Elend in die Welt gebracht, so daß wir aus Eden ertrieben worden, biß daß ein grösserer Mensch und entsetzet, und den luftreichen Sitz wieder gewonnen hat; himmlische Dichterin, […]. (Bodmer 1732: Book I, 2)

A rather obvious intervention, that points to a repositioning of the narrator, is Bodmer's change of word order in the very first line of *PL*. While Milton inverted the syntax in favour of giving the subject in the first few lines, Bodmer places the address to the muse at the beginning. In this version, the source of the inspiration is identified as "himmlische Dichterin" and is closer to Milton's version as it appears after the first several lines. Bodmer's personification filters the idea of inspiration through a female muse and the idea of poetry as a craft. By introducing the concept of the poetess, Bodmer paid tribute to the occupation with and practice of poetry. The version of 1742 is even less dependable on the source:

> Singe, himmlische Muse, von dem ersten Ungehorsam des Menschen, und der verbothenen Frucht, die mit dem Verlust Edens das Elend und den Tod in die Welt gebracht hat […]. (Bodmer 1742: Book I, 2)

Bodmer, not restricted by the length of the verse, could still sum up the whole argument in the first sentence but chose to feature the invocation of the muse at the very beginning. During the 18th century, the concepts of divine inspiration and literary production were even further separated than before. Milton already struggled with questions of authorial creation and the source of inspiration, negotiating his creativity and his devotion to his belief which he dealt with in numerous instances throughout *PL*. Bodmer, however, had even greater

---

[50] While it is possible to contrast Milton and Haak by giving line by line the source and then the translation, as has been done in the previous paragraph of the chapter, in Bodmer's case this is not an option anymore.

difficulties with navigating divine and original inspiration. The Enlightenment and the Reformation on the continent had furthered the rift between reason and religious devotion even for theologians like Bodmer. Placing the address to the muse right at the beginning of the passage somehow absolved him from positioning himself in more of a relation to the source of inspiration. It also stands in a mimetic relation to not only Milton but classical epic poetry such as Homer and Virgil. In Bodmer's translation, right from the beginning of the epic, the muse is identified as the creative impulse for the poem and the narration of the fall is subsequently integrated into that framework. From a translation perspective, it is not at all unavoidable or even necessary to change the opening of the heroic poem. Therefore, the decision to do so must be rooted in another aesthetic or personal sentiment, possibly concerning the validity of the sources of inspiration. Bodmer's translation still begins in medias res but the syntactical alteration subverts the powerful opening Milton achieved with his word order. The narrator in Bodmer's version is less mystically hidden behind linguistic ambiguity as it is in Milton or even Haak. He steps in the foreground as a translator, not only of interlingual exchange but also as an interpreter of religious and literary devices. In contrast to this prose translation, Milton's close interleaving of religious belief and language is strongly highlighted.

> Bevorab du o Geist! der das aufrichtige und reine Hertz den prächtigen Tempeln vorziehet, unterrichte mich von diesen Sachen, den du weißest sie; Du warest von Anbeginn anwesend, und sassest mit ausgebreiteten mächtigen Flügeln gleicher einer brütenden Taube auf dem ungemeßenen Abgrund, und machtest ihn trächtig: was dunckel in mir ist, erleuchte, und was nedrig, richte auf und stütze es empor, auf daß ich mit einem hohen Schwung der Rede, wie meine große Materie erfordert, die ewige Vorsehung vertheydigen, und den Menschen die Wege Gottes rechtfertigen möge. (Bodmer 1732: Book I, 2)

How can something contain the same information and yet be so different from its source? Bodmer translated literally with emphasis on the content and the details of the narrative. Literary theory for the first half of the 18th century, predominantly influenced by Gottsched, was looking for the rational and educational value of literature, and therefore, favoured fidelity and accuracy. The decision to translate *PL* into prose was made to achieve this level of fidelity and has several consequences in addition to the visual appearance. Since Bodmer is no longer constricted by rhyme and metre, the content is inevitably foregrounded. He embraces the freedom given to him as translator through the change of form. It is

curious, however, that he, who along with Breitinger placed such great importance on form, would choose to deviate so far from what he found in Milton. Yet, this goes to show how 'equivalency of effect' is interpreted in different ways and leads to very diverse and unique renditions. Similarly to the concept of mimesis, the idea of fidelity in translation can place emphasis on different aspects of the artwork in relation to the source material. While Bodmer gave priority to the narrative, he disregarded Milton's versification and visual arrangement. The interpretation and aesthetic preferences of the translator found their way into the translation. Therefore, the method of mimetic weighting in translation makes the task a productive and creative act. Translation becomes a mode of world-making.

In addition to the practice of weighting, Bodmer's approach seems to seek a form of unfolding Milton's dense verse and erodes all nuances in the epic, exposing the meaning in an attempt to explain every perceived vagueness. Considering Milton's novel lineation and the connection between free will and blank verse in a genre otherwise constraint by rhyme, Bodmer's approach could be understood as an attempt to elaborate on the idea of liberating the text from the restrictions of the genre. From the translation of "dove-like" and "abyss" we can see how language had been modernised in the course of the last century. Bodmer did not restrict himself by trying to create visual and structural similarity as Haak had done by creating the neologism "taub-gleich". Instead of Haak's elaborately derived and constructed "Lähr-Wüst", which goes back to Luther's translation of the Hebrew 'tohu wa bohu', Bodmer uses "Abgrund", a profane term that is not primarily associated with a religious context.

Bodmer's translation approach also altered the position of the narrator within the epic. In Milton's *PL*, as I have tried to show in a previous chapter, the narrator can be considered a translator in their own right. As an intermediary between the word of God and the fallen reader, the narrator must negotiate between fallen and unfallen language. Milton's verse and his use of etymological word meaning gave him the opportunity to play on meaning and the semantic ambiguity created through the fall. While linguistic clarity was lost after the fall, Milton's language tried to give the illusion of a prelapsarian language and simultaneously led the reader to realise their own inevitable fallenness.

By choosing a prose translation, Bodmer could not make use of significant word positions the way Milton did. Beginning line 23 with "Illumine" stresses the

personal wish of the narrator and at the same time highlights the poetic programme of the whole enterprise. Bodmer had to make up for that and did so by rearranging the syntax to bring "Erleuchte" to the beginning of the new phrase. He proceeded the same way with the following phrase. Again, a form of weighting is present in his translation. It gave Bodmer's translation a comparable mode of accentuating the plea to the muse and the programme of his task. However, his ductus and the use of punctuation in the last sentence give the impression of a restructuring and shifting within the composition of the epic. This has consequences for the overall impression and position of the narrator. In accordance with Bodmer's enlightened and reformed theological background he considered the narrator much more as an interpreter and educator of his German audience than a creator. Therefore, his approach to Milton in prose was about looking to explain and expound on the theological perspectives he found in Milton.

The invocation itself is already laden with references to mimesis and translation. As I have tried to show in the previous chapter on *PL*, the invocation stands in a tradition of repetition and functions as a form of prologue: the invocation establishes a connection to predecessors of epic writing. This effect culminates in verse 16, where Milton quotes Ariosto's *Orlando Fusioso* in translation: "Things unattempted yet in prose or rhime." In the described context, the claim of originality becomes more paradoxical as it contradicts its production process. Milton created a quasi-legitimation allowing translators of his work to follow in his footsteps and claim originality for their own translations. Thus, the passage in translation also signifies a moment of dialogue between the author and the translator.[51] For Bodmer's prose version, the phrase becomes inclusive and enters into a multilevel communication through the wording, including prose as a way of relating the material. In his prose version, the passage reads as follows: "[U]nd von Dingen dichten will, von welchen noch niemand weder in gebundener noch in looser Rede zu schreiben unterstanden hat" (Bodmer 1732: Book I, 2). Bodmer, liberated from the constraints of "gebundener Rede", splits the two nouns and adds adjectives to differentiate between the two types of poetic form.

---

[51] The dialogue between author and translator or between Milton and translators of Ariosto continues when looking at the 1823 translation of *Orlando Furioso* by William Stewart Rose. He took the phrase from Milton without any alterations.

His narrator is not interested in visual similarity and thus is "ungebunden" regarding the choice of word order and morphology. This way, Bodmer also refrains from using nouns, such as "Prosa" and "Dichtung", which would have been at his disposal. The use of adjectives in this passage is both a nod to the originality granted to the translator by the source text and at the same time they link the translation even deeper to the tradition of mimesis in epic poetry. The translated phrase in this prose rendition playfully comments on the claim of singularity. Other than the source, it is not composed in verse but is still a rephrasing of Milton's (and Ariosto's) line. Although the direct quote is less recognisable than in Milton, Bodmer accentuates the supposed inimitability by claiming nobody had ever even 'dared' to write about these issues in any form before.

Gottsched was not impressed by Bodmer's efforts. He not only criticised his translation of *PL*, he also had no high regard for Milton himself. In a letter from 1732, he accused Milton of "regellose Einbildungskraft" (Gottsched 1730: 3), inspiration without any rules. Gottsched advocated for a mimesis of reality whereas Bodmer favoured a mimesis of possibility. This is already stated in the full title of Bodmer's *Critische Abhandlung* where he defended his translation against Gottsched and tried to consolidate the notions of 'das Wunderbare' (the sublime) and 'das Wahrscheinliche' (the possible).[52]

Milton's epic poem is based on a continuous play on possibilities. Gottsched disliked Milton's use of enjambments and criticised his apparent lack of syntactic cohesion. Gottsched neglected to understand or consciously dismissed Milton's syntax as a mimetic referral to Latinate word order and considered the use of blank verse as disorderly and inconsequential. But Bodmer's translation was commented on even less favourably. On Bodmer's translation of "pregnant" as "trächtig' in the first invocation Gottsched wrote:

> Von Weibspersonen sagt man bey uns schwanger; von Standespersonen gebraucht man die Redensart, sie ist gesegneten Leibes, vom Regno vegetabili heißt es fruchtbar; trächtig ist ein niedriges und sehr gemeines Wort, das bloß von Thieren gesagt wird. (Gottsched 1730: 175)

---

[52] The German term 'wahrscheinlich' literally means *what seems real* or *what could be a possible reality*. In its composition the term already posits the hypothetical possibility of something being or becoming reality. Therefore, the basis is one of approximation. Something is not only possible but the similarity is so close to reality that they might be interchangeable.

Gottsched criticized Bodmer's use of a verb commonly associated only with animals. What he neglected, however, was that on the figurative level "trächtig" refers to the dove. The semantic level is preserved using these two terms in connection. It is a matter of lexical levels. If terms reserved for animals are principally excluded from poetry, then there is an argument to be made against the use of 'trächtig'. For Gottsched, the "Geschmacksdictator", this might have been a good enough reason. Bodmer, however, was less indebted to prescriptive conventions of style and aesthetics focusing rather on expressions that have creative potential in terms of generating poetic 'worlds' and developing a semantic field. However, in the edited version of 1742, Bodmer changed the passage and substituted "trächtig" with "fruchtbar":

> Und du vornehmlich, o Geist, der mehr von einem aufrichtigen und reinen Herzen hält, als von allen Tempeln, unterrichte du mich, denn du weissest von diesen Dingen, du warest zuerst dabei gegenwärtig, und sassest einer brütenden Taube gleich mit ausgebreiteten Flügeln auf dem ungemessenen Abgrund; und machtest ihn fruchtbar. Erleuchte, was in mir dunckel ist; erhöhe und unterstütze, was niedrig ist, dass ich der Hoheit meines edeln Vorhabens gemäß die ewige Vorsehung vertheidigen, und die Wege Gottes unter den Menschen retten möge. (Bodmer 1742: Book I, 2)

In this second version, circumstances are even more emphasised, like when Bodmer translates "from the first wast present" (1.19-29) as "warest zuerst dabei gegenwärtig". Bodmer doubled the presence of the spirit (dabei + gegenwärtig) and pointed more strongly to the physical existence of the spirit at the time of the creation.

In another passage, we see again how Bodmer's precision and attention to the content altered Milton's structure but embraced his received meaning. Bodmer's characterisation of Moloch in Book II, Satan's second in command, shows some of the pitfalls of the prose translation.

> He ceas'd, and next him Moloc, Scepter'd King
> Stood up, the strongest and the fiercest Spirit
> That fought in Heav'n; now fiercer by despair: (*PL* 2.43-5)

> Er schwieg, und zunächst an seiner Seite stand Moloch auf, ein König mit dem Scepter in der Hand, der stärckeste und frecheste Geist, der in dem Himmel gefochten, den die Verzweiflung jezo noch frecher machte. (Bodmer 1742: Book II, 52)

Although Bodmer did not imitate the visual level as much as Haak did, he nonetheless created visual reference. He did this, for example, by choosing

adjectives beginning with the same letter as they do in Milton's *PL* to describe Moloch. The repetition of "fierce" as "frech" continues the argument about Moloch's character and draws a visual relation in addition to one of comparison. The attempt to unfold all the content can also be seen in this paragraph in the double translation of "next". Bodmer gave both meanings, the temporal and the local, when he translated "zunächst an seiner Seite". The English term 'next' works in both the temporal and the spatial dimension. A German translator, however, must decide which meaning to express or, as Bodmer did, to offer both options. In the first phrase, Bodmer adhered to Milton's word order and throughout tried to imitate his syntax. But the number of relative clauses necessary to accommodate all possible meanings produces a completely different result. Milton's dense language, full of double meanings and ambiguity suffered some losses due to Bodmer's prosaic approach and faithfulness to the message. Even though Bodmer distinguished his aesthetic and poetic programme from Gottsched's strict attention to rules and championed the significance of form in poetry through the decision to produce a prose translation, the content is usually valued over form.

Milton's epic similes are, like the invocations, multilevel platforms for the negotiation of mimesis and originality. The simile is itself a poetic device indebted to similarity and distance. The description of characters as someone or something else integrates different areas of association and guides the readers' perception of these characters towards sometimes seemingly remote perspectives. Milton's similes are famously digressive and long. They give the impression that the narrator is leading the reader far away from the point of departure and returning with illuminating insight back to the start. Milton usually organises multiple references, sometimes with contradictory messages, around the conjunction 'or'. Thus, Milton presents the reader with an abundance of information. The detour via multiple references and the addition of various associations offers further information about the characters. The complexity of Milton's similes also exemplifies the complexity of his topic and his characters. The reader gets to participate in the irritating and sometimes unsettling process of finding out the true colours of a character. While Gottsched turned to French predecessors, Bodmer looked to the English poet and essayist Joseph Addison. In

1711-12, in his magazine "The Spectator", Addison wrote about Milton's epic similes:

> The resemblance does not, perhaps, last above a line or two, but the poet runs on with the hint until he has raised out of it some glorious image or sentiment, proper to inflame the mind of the reader, and to give it that sublime kind of entertainment which is suitable to the nature of a heroic poem. (1711-12, No. 303, 438)

Epic similes, such as the first long simile describing Satan, offered Bodmer the possibility to explore the topos of the sea monster.

> Seine übrige Theile lagen auf den Wogen, der länge nach viel Huben Feldes weit ausgestrecket, von so ungeheurer Grösse als jene Riesencörper, welche in den Fabeln berühmt sind, die Titanen oder die Söhne der Erden, welche mit Jove kriegten, Briareus oder Typhon, welcher die Höle nicht weit von dem alten Tharsus einnahme, oder die Seebestie Leviathan, welche GOtt unter allen seinen Werken, so in dem Ocean schwimmen, am leibigsten geschaffen hat; Oft, wie die Seefahrenden erzelhen, wenn sie in der Norwegischen See schliefe, hat der Pilot einens kleinen von der Nacht verschlagenen Jachtschiffes, in der Einbildung es seie eine Insel, den Ancker auf ihre schuppichte Rinde ausgeworffen, und ist an ihere Seiten hinter dem Winde still gelegen, so lange die Nacht die See bedecket, und den gewünschten morgen verzögert hat; (Bodmer 1732: Book I, 9-10)

First, Satan's sheer size is described. Milton uses a non-typical and rather outdated unit of measurement, "rood" (*PL* 1.196), which Bodmer similarly interprets as "Huben".[53] Both terms bring an archaic tone to the passage and are attempts to try to connect the text to a time that predates the gods of antiquity. Consequently, Satan's size is compared to the titans, the race of giants Zeus overpowers and imprisons. Only the second reference compares Satan to the mythical sea creature Leviathan. The association this reference invokes, is not only to the monstrous size and appearance of the Leviathan but also to the Leviathan's snake-like nature. The snake being the animal into which Satan will later change gives this evocation some significance:

> In that day the Lord with his sore and great and strong sword shall punish Leviathan the serpent, even Leviathan that crooked serpent; and he shall slay the dragon that is in the sea. (KJV: Isaiah 27, 1)[54]

In this simile, Milton is not satisfied with merely mentioning the name as he is with other creatures like he is with Typhon and Briareos. Milton references the

---

[53] "Hufe" was a square measure in Medieval German, in the south it was pronounced "Hube".
[54] During the Middle Ages Leviathan was also linked directly to Satan. Thomas Aquinas and the Jesuit Peter Binsfeld see Leviathan as an allegory for envy, one of the seven deadly sins.

Leviathan because there is a point to be made in the association with that myth in particular. What follows then, is the relation of a myth describing the deceiving nature of Leviathan. The myth of the Leviatan is that mariners would mistakenly identify the monster as an island and the island as a place to escape the wild sea. The Leviathan is a mimetic creature, pretending to be inanimate so that the fishermen bring their ship to anchor on "his skaly rind" (*PL* 1.206). The pronoun Milton used clearly assigns the creature male genus. In the apocryphal Book of Enoch, Leviathan is described as the female counterpart to the male land-creature Behemoth (1 Enoch 58, 7). In Milton's *PL,* this double meaning or double gender of Leviathan remains on an imaginative level, it is for the reader to interpret. In Bodmer's translation, the pronoun belonging to the assumed island changes its gender according to the gender of German 'die Insel'. Thus, Bodmer's coherence regarding grammatical gender, maybe involuntarily, accentuates the gender perspective this mythological creature has to offer. Satan is associated with a monster that is able to disguise itself but does not disappear. Leviathan is also of unclear gender and clearly able to pretend to be something it is not. This mimetic ability is what makes the reference interesting and it produces an effect in the translation. It is a serpent, a dragon, a symbol for Satan, the female counterpart[55] to a male land-creature, an emblem for the variability of translation. In Bodmer's version, the aspect of its gender comes to the foreground through the grammatical gender of 'Insel'.

In Book V, where Adam is told about the war in heaven, Milton's Raphael prefaces his speech with a lament on the pitfalls of interpretation and translation. In voicing his problems with interpretation, Raphael subtly gets to sum up the dangers involved in being a messenger. This problem becomes even more pressing when it is related as a translation. Especially when in translating this passage the significance must be striking to the translator. In Bodmer's prose version it reads as follows:

> Du legst mir eine hohe Materie auf, o vorderster Mensch, eine schwere und traurige Verrichtung, denn wie soll ich menschlichen Sinnen die unsichtbaren Thaten streitender Geister vorstellen: wie, ohne Hertzeleid, den Untergang so vieler weiland herrlicher, und als lange sie standhaft geblieben, vollkommener Geister erzehlen; endlich wie soll ich Geheimnisse einer anderen Welt eröffnen, da vielleicht nicht erlaubt ist, sie zu offenbahren! Jedoch wird mir dieses, weil es

---

[55] In *PL* Milton describes both monsters as male. In Jewish tradition, the concept of male and female counterparts is stated in the Book of Enoch 60: 7-9.

dir zum Besten geschieht, vergönnet sein, und was das Maß der menschlichen Sinnen übersteiget will ich durch Vergleichungen der geistlichen Sachen mit irdischen so abbilden, als sie am besten ausdrücken mögen; Wie aber, wenn die Erde allein der Schatten des Himmels ist, und in beyden Dinge vorkommen, welche einander viel gleichförmiger sind, als man auf Erden dencket? (Bodmer 1732: Book V, 185-6)

Bodmer's Raphael expresses his concern in 18th century terms. The vocabulary Bodmer uses to represent Milton's language reflects the debate currently in process. Even though Bodmer translates closely to the source and often uses direct etymological equivalents to Milton's choice of words ("human sense" as "menschliche Sinne"), the literary and cultural changes Germany had undergone over the last century had bestowed some of these terms with additional significance. "Geister" and "geistliche Sachen" are used to represent "Spirits" and "spiritual form". They relate to the passage in translation more closely than to the contemporary debate on genius and creativity as well as the dependency on theological framing still in place. In this passage, we can also again observe how Bodmer aimed at distilling Milton's message, removing some of the more controversial elements. From Bodmer's translation of "high argument" in the first invocation as "hohe Materie" to his use of "Materie" in Raphael's speech, his policy of diminishing Milton's societal critique can be seen. The connection created by linking the first invocation in Book I to the translator's dilemma in Book V establishes a link between the matter and the cause on a more palpable level. What the whole poem is about, is the creation of matter and form but so is the composition and the translation. Bodmer continues this haptic approach to the situation and speaks about "abbilden" for Milton's "express" (l.574). In his translation, Raphael seeks to 'make an image, a representation' of the heavenly struggle that human senses could comprehend. His translator's effort lies in the wish to make palpable another interpreter's, i.e. Raphael's, approach to relating a matter, a physical action, a war between angels that no human has ever experienced or would be capable of comprehending. The difference between heaven and earth is an extreme example of incompatibility but one that can be transferred to interlingual translation processes, especially between remoter languages from different linguistic roots. Bodmer's decision to focus on the visual and palpable for the representation of the imagery used to describe Raphael's dilemma points to the connection of the sister arts, poetry and painting. In his

translation, this relation also existent in Milton, is highlighted. In the context of the 18ᵗʰ century, this *paragone* between the sister arts falls back on a lively discussion led by critics like Gotthold Ephraim Lessing in his essay *Laookon* (1753). Even though the debate was mainly concerned with the representation of art and the differences between visual and verbal representation, it also pointed towards the traditional understanding and place of both practices within the cultural landscape of Germany at the time. Milton made frequent use of ekphrastic descriptions when portraying heaven, hell and Eden. But through his many recourses to artistic discussions and traditions, he opened the door to considering the epic as a representation of a representation – therefore, for Bodmer's interpretation of the translation situation in Book V as an occurrence that allows for the perspective of a spectator and the visual imagery of Raphael's account.

In his translation of the third invocation, Bodmer's programme of explaining shows again:

> Steige von dem Himmel herunter Urania / wenn sie nicht unrecht bey diesem Nahmen genennt wird, deren Göttlichen Stimme ich folge, und über den Olympischen Berg hinauffliege, höher als die Pegasischen Flügel sich geschwungen haben. Ich ruffe die Bedeutung des Nahmens an, nicht den Nahmen, denn du bist nicht eine der neun Musen, wohnet auch nicht auf dem Giebel des alten Olympus, sondern von himmlischer Herkunft, und hieltest dich, ehe die Berge erschienen, und die Quellen flosse, in der Gesellschaft der ewigen Weisheit auf, der Weisheit deiner Schwester, und spieltest mit ihr auf den Kanten, vor dem Stuhle des Allmächtigen Vaters, der selbst durch deinen himmlischen Gesang belustigt wird. (Bodmer 1732: Book VII, 3)

Especially in contrast to Milton's elegant wording "The meaning not the name I call" Book VII, 5), Bodmer's solution seems awkward. To highlight the difference between addressing the muse or invoking the references the name carries, Bodmer repeated "Nahmen". But, what at first might look clumsy could also be read as pointing back to the naming of Adam. Reconnecting these passages draws further attention to the process of translation and to the recurring theme of communication within the epic. The rest of the passage is also characterised by the motif of explaining and smoothing the language that Bodmer had at his disposition. In the previous chapter on Milton, this passage was discussed in terms of the origin of the figure of the muse focusing on ideas around inspiration to the narrator and the muse's connection to the Holy Spirit. In the translations, the versions of this naming phrase, however, tell us a lot about the translator's handling of Milton's language as well as of their own.

In the preface to the 'German' edition, Bodmer described Milton's method of poetic production and related his own translation approach to it.

> Er hat sich unterschiedlicher Mittel bedient, seine Rede von der Prosa zu unterscheiden, indem er z. E. fremde Mundarten nachgeahmet, alte machtvolle Wörter an das Licht hervor gezogen, neue geprägt, die Wortfügung verändert, ungewöhnliche Metaphern erfunden, die Absätze der Rede in einander geschlungen u. Dieß alles aber mit gewisser masse, und am rechten Orte. (Bodmer 1732: Preface, 17)

Bodmer identified Milton's own text production tools as forms of loaning and borrowing. Milton had imitated foreign languages, reintroduced archaic terms, coined new ones, changed the word order, used unusual metaphors and unusual enjambments. This linguistic and poetic creativity was not only foreign to a German translator but had baffled contemporaries and native readers of his epic as well.

Bodmer recognised Milton's own translation strategies concerning the linguistic composition of *PL*. However, the whole project is based on an altered understanding of mimesis and consequently, is of completely different appearance to Haak's translation. Immanuel Kant published the *Kritik der Urteilskraft* in 1790. In the *Kritik der Urteilskraft,* Kant no longer followed the rules of mimesis as promoted since Aristotle and moved the origin of artistic production towards the individual. These developments lead to fierce disputes about the source of artistic inspiration between different religious and aesthetic fractions. Not only were mimetic relations put into question but the process of mimetic art production was itself interrogated. The Enlightenment also contributed to the slow replacement of Latin and French as the dominating languages in literature and philosophy. Bodmer's prose translation is a testimony to these changing tides. Even though Bodmer's prose version of *PL* is an indication of developments in the German literary debate it defers, even on a visual level, from the mimesis of Milton. The whole undertaking of rendering *PL* in prose seems at closer inspection to literally reshape and remake the epic: remaking it to make it fit the German language and culture. Through Bodmer's free approach to interpretation, the text gains a lot of liberty and opens up a field of poetic experimentation and negotiation. However, the prose version inevitably misses reproducing Milton's lyrical language and its density. As the translation is not structured according to verses, units of meaning are dissolved, sometimes over-explaining and sometimes

omitting references. Milton, unlike Bodmer, was vigilant about symmetry and symbolism. In general, transforming Milton's epic poem into prose is an exercise in change, the prose version will inevitably fail to be a mimetically 'faithful' rendition regarding form. The verse in *PL* is a feature of the overall message and cannot easily be replaced or compensated for. If one considers *PL* an epic debating the means of divine and human communication, the verse's importance as part of the overall message cannot be undermined, the verse is not easily replaced or compensated for. Bodmer's decision was not made from a lack of fundamental knowledge of Milton's work but his programme was effectively more 'faithful' to a different aspiration.

4.3 Romantic Milton

4.3.1 The 19th Century: Adolf Böttger

Adolf Böttger (1815-1870) was a German poet and translator from Leipzig. After the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars, a period of relative retreat into the personal sphere occured in reaction to the Enlightenment and the political reaction following the revolution. As an original poet, Böttger has not received great attention. He is, however, considered to be the originator of the so-called "Blumenlyrik" (Gottschall 1871: 118-9), flowers being a major motif in Romantic poetry. The period tried to consolidate the achievements of the Enlightenment with personal religion and individuality. The movement sought to be more liberated than classicism and turned to private experiences rather than public and political matters. Böttger's poem "Was dich erfreut, was dich bewegt" exemplifies this sentiment:

> Was dich erfreut, was dich bewegt,
> Verschließ es treu in deiner Brust,
> Der scheelen Blicke Neid erregt
> Des Frohsinns blumenheitre Lust.
>
> Das Herz, von Liebe still umhegt,
> Treibt Blüt' und Früchte fort und fort,
> Die keines Wetters Blitz zerschlägt,
> Die keine Sommerschwüle dorrt,
>
> Mit einer Seele, die dich liebt,
> Erhaben über Menschenstreit,
> Genieße, was die Erde gibt,
> In seliger Verborgenheit.

The speaker advises the listener to keep their happiness close to the heart and enjoy love in blissful seclusion. The concentration on the individual experience will also inform the translation of *PL*. Other than Milton, Böttger translated Pope, Byron, Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus* and Macpherson's *Ossian*. His interest in these texts is not at all surprising for a man of this period. *PL* was received with great enthusiasm during the late 18th and early 19th century. Romantic poets rediscovered Milton and reinterpreted the epic, William Blake's *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* and Mary Shelly's *Frankenstein* were influenced and inspired by the epic. Macpherson's *Ossian*, written in the second half of the 18th century, also fit right into the period with its Romantic programme and longing for the recovery of a long-lost past. Böttger, thus, a man of his time, was interested in both texts.

The 19th century brought also a paradigm shift in translation theory, provoked by the works of philosopher and biblical scholar Friedrich Schleiermacher. Schleiermacher reconsidered two of the axioms of translation: foreignization vs. domestication, and relativism vs. universalism. In a lecture entitled "On the Different Methods of Translating" (1813), he promoted word-for-word literalism in elevated language to produce an effect of foreignness in the translation. This approach was based on a changing understanding of languages and their relation to each other as well as an altered self-awareness of translators.

The second dichotomy became an even more imminent problem during the 19th century, a century which saw the development and promotion of national identity and languages peak. While universalism presupposes a common underlying system on which all languages are based and therefore considers translation a rather simple task of exchanging one sign from one language for another sign in another language, relativism postulates that translation is fundamentally impossible. The two concepts are based on different understandings of language and are indebted to the circumstances in which they emerged. In previous centuries, the practice of translation was, albeit regarded with suspicion or in religious contexts even as blasphemous, comparatively unproblematic in terms of application. Concepts of faithfulness and equivalency were not foregrounded, the transfer and communication of information was prioritised.

During the Romantic era, the significance of language and its connection to identity changed. The role of the author became more prominent and thus,

questions of faithfulness to the original text and issues of copyright arose. The emergence of national states and the parallel development and advance of national languages brought up the question: Is translation even possible? Would it be possible if approached with new vigour and rooted in a new ideology? The relativist approach claims that languages are singular concepts which cannot simply be transferred into another language. The signifier and the signified were arbitrary in regard to what they describe but not in terms of the intellectual development of the individual. The credo was 'language determines thought.' Thought and intellect, according to this, are so deeply connected to language that it is impossible to convey concepts formed in German in any other language faithfully. Advancements in philosophy and psychology were strongly influenced by wording and phrasing. Concepts were often either introduced into other languages as loanwords or translated into Latin (See for example how Freud's concept of the self in English uses the Latin terms for Ich, Es, Überich). The result was an understanding that translation, in the narrow sense, is simply impossible.

In the context of these developments of language and identity, translation trends often focused on foreignization as Schleiermacher proposed it. Since languages could not be transferred anyway, there was no reason to hide their foreignness. Sometimes this led to very literal translations, involving loanwords as well as syntactic approximation of the source language. Some of these features we have already seen in Haak's translation of *PL*. This is, however, an exception as Haak was not interested and not involved in contemporary German literary debates. His translation of *PL* is also in parts very literal and works with a lot of neologisms and loans. His approach was less influenced by philosophical and poetic reasons than the lack of linguistic repertoire. Where he found the German of his time not compatible with the English source, Haak also tended to domesticate language. In the 19th century Romantic sentiments and the developments regarding language philosophy shifted focus to relativistic and foreignizing translation strategies. The period confronted metaphysical questions in a new way. While during the Baroque period religion was still in the foreground and offered answers to these questions, the Enlightenment of the 18th century offered alternative answers and challenged religious authority. But the Romantic era was also greatly influenced by a sense of defeat and looming doom. Outside of the Baroque era, consistent confidence in religion was not an option.

Insecurity and doubt characterise this period but also a renewed curiosity in the inner workings of the human condition. As such, Milton's *PL* asks all the relevant questions.

4.3.2 *Das verlorene Paradies* (1853)

Böttger's 1853 translation of *PL* is the first translation after Haak's to attempt to imitate not only versification but also the length of the verses and the epos itself. That he did not fully succeed in his endeavour, shows already in the invocation. Of course, almost two centuries later, Böttger could draw on a much wider and much more established literary tradition than was available to Haak. Due to his work as a translator and poet, Böttger was involved in German literary production and distribution, whereas Haak never considered himself contributing to an aesthetic area but simply making *PL* accessible to German readers. At first Böttger's translation of the first invocation looks almost like an interlinear translation, the syntax is foreignised and adapted to the English source. But Böttger manages to retain a high level of poeticism through his diction without having to drastically change the word order.

> Des Menschen erste Schuld und jene Frucht
> Des streng verbotnen Baums, die durch Genuss
> Tod in die Welt gebracht und jeglich Weh;
> Die Eden raubte, bis ein größrer Mensch
> Des Heiles Sitz uns wiederum errang:
> Besing, o Himmelsmuse, die auf Horebs,
> Auf Sinais verborgnem Gipfel einst
> Den Hirten entflammte, der zuerst belehrt'
> Das auserwählte Volk, wie Erd und Himmel
> Im Anfang aus dem Chaos sich erhob;
> Von dorther, oder wenn des Sion Hügel,
> Siloahs Quell, der bei des Herrn Orakel
> Hinfloss, dich mehr erfreut, so ruf ich dich
> Von dort herab, mein kühnes Lied zu weihn,
> Das nicht gemeinen Flugs Äoniens Berg
> Überschweben will, solche Ding' besingend,
> An die sich Vers und Prosa nie gewagt.
> Vor allem du beseele mich, o Geist,
> Der offne Herzen mehr als Tempel liebt:
> Du bist allwissend, warst vom Anbeginn
> Und ruhtest brütend, einer Taube gleich,
> Mit mächtig ausgespreiztem Flügelpaar
> Überm ungeheuern Abgrund, ihn fruchtbar machend.
> Was in mir dunkel ist, erleuchte du,
> Was in mir niedrig, heb und stütze du;
> Dass ich gemäß dem hohen Gegenstand,
> Die Wege Gottes den Menschen preisend,

<div align="center">Die ewige Vorsehung verteidgen mag. (Böttger 1853: 1.1-28, 15-6)</div>

In the invocation, Böttger successfully recreates the repetitions of beginnings and firsts. As in Milton's text, in the first and eighth line, variations of "erst / zuerst" are employed, likewise in verse 9. Milton starts the line with the opening words of Genesis and the Gospel of John.[56] In verse 10, Böttger too, refers to the beginning of the Bible. However, Luther uses 'im' instead of 'am' only in his translation of John 1:1. In Luther's translation, Genesis begins with: "Am Anfang schuf Gott Himmel und Hölle". This slight deviation draws attention to the passage in John which deliberately connects the word of God to world-making and creation. Böttger offers a translational meta-level, intentionally or not, connecting the two passages that were previously differentiated by Luther's change of prepositions. Milton's text already enters into a dialogue with and about translation when he uses this phrase. Böttger's translation engages in this dialogue, not merely by repeating the phrase but by offering the variation of the preposition and, thus, recreating a lost connection and making it productive.

Böttger imitates Milton's elevated style. There are, however, instances in which references become blurred, for example, when Böttger uses participles to achieve the same length of verse as Milton. In line 16-17, Böttger switches the active – passive relation. For the claim of originality, translated from Ariosto by Milton, Böttger uses the participle "besingen" to express "pursue". The use of participles reduces the activity of the "adventurous song" and gives the passage a more static atmosphere. In contrast, "Vers und Prosa" are personifications that, like in Bodmer's rendition,[57] 'never dared' to address such topics before suggesting they have their own agenda instead of being devices of the author. Compensating one feature for another is a common practice for translators when there is no other possibility to maintain the existing condition of the source. Böttger's decision is understandable and the result is well executed. The direct quote from Ariosto is also still recognisable.

The Leviathan simile is, according to Böttger's programme, also characterised by Romantic ideals. Satan's fellow demons are called his "Leidgefährten", embracing the shared sorrow they felt falling from heaven.

---

[56] The Tyndale Bible as well as the KJV use the same phrase: "In the Beginning".
[57] 'Unterstehen' and 'wagen' are synonyms of 'sich erlauben' (to presume).

> So sprach der Satan zu dem Leidgefährten,
> Das Haupt der Flut enthoben, und die Augen
> Von Flammen funkelnd; niederwärts gebeugt,
> Schwamm, meh're Hufen weithin ausgestreckt,
> Sein Körper auf den Wogen lang und breit,
> An Größe jenen Riese gleich der Fabel,
> Wie die Titanen oder Erdgeborenen,
> Die Zeus bekriegt, wie Typhon und Briareus,
> Die einst die Schlucht beim alten Tarsus barg,
> Wie jenes Seegetier, der Leviathan,
> Den Gott als allergrößtes Wesen schuf,
> Das in des Ozeans Gewässern schwimmt,
> Den, wenn er in Norwegens Schaume schlummert,
> Der Schiffer einer nachtereilten Barke
> Oft für ein Eiland hält, wie man sagt,
> Wirft dann der Seemann in die Schuppenhaut
> Den Anker, liegt er vor dem Wind geschützt
> An des Riesen Seite, wenn, noch nachtumhüllt,
> Dem Meer nicht der ersehnte Morgen lacht. (Böttger 1853: Book I, 23-4)

The epic voice narrates a little less fluently than in the source, which is caused by the mainly end-stopped lines. The effect is a more tempered rhythm. Consequently, the passage floats and is softer in tone than the one produced by the dynamic rhythm in Milton's *PL*. In contrast to Haak's use of alliteration, Böttger does not alliterate to compensate for the lack of vocabulary or literary tradition. Unlike Haak's writing, Böttger's writing, the phonetic and visual accents, do not seem to be a method of distraction but appear deliberate and well-measured, corresponding to the Romantic style. Böttger's Typhon and Briareus rest in a 'Schlucht' and his Leviathan 'schlummert im Schaume'. Böttger represents the sailors as 'Schiffer' and as 'Seemänner', who rest at the monster's 'Schuppenhaut'. The soundscape that emerges through this fricative cluster captures the elevated diction Milton used himself while also being truly a product of the Romantic era. Even though Böttger could not retain the same sounds in the same places, fricatives used throughout the passage reference Milton's source text. Both idioms concerning night are translated by compound adjectives, the first in close analogy to Milton's "night-foundered" (*PL* 1.204) as "nachtereilt" and the other analogous to this one as "nachtumhüllt". Milton used "Night / Invests the Sea" (*PL* 1.207-8) and Böttger takes on the metaphor of garment and draping when he uses an adjective that means just that, 'being clothed by night'.

Satan's comment on his state right after the fall has often been considered a psychological statement on individuality although such concepts of personality were developed only in later centuries. Even though Freud would publish his fundamental works fifty years later, Böttger's translation falls into a period that valued individuality and the psyche more than Haak's or Milton's.

> Es ist der Geist sein eigener Raum, er kann
> In sich selbst einen Himmel aus der Hölle
> Und aus der Hölle einen Himmel schaffen.
> Was gilt das Wo, bin ich nur immer ich,
> Und was ich sein soll, doch nur geringer nicht
> Als Er, Der durch den Donner mächtger ward! (Böttger 1853: Book I, 27)

Böttger's translation adapts, quite literally, the metaphor of space and place that Milton used. He needs an additional line but can maintain the chiasmic structure which is now visually represented in sequence and not in the same verse. Milton's use of enjambment, which serves him to create weighty and surprising turns of verse, is imitated here but interrupted by the connector 'und' at the beginning of the next verse. Böttger translates 'place' as "Raum", which at first glance might not make a noteworthy difference but the connotation of "Raum" is much more three dimensional than the more general idea of place. A place can be indoors and outdoors, whereas "Raum" seems to suggest something manmade and enclosed as well as more concrete. It is also less influenced by external factors, influences like climate which would be important to an open space. The idea of the location of the consciousness being a room is suggestive not only regarding the individuality of the character but also the inability to access it from outside. This can have two effects: Satan's "Geist" is locked in its own room, so his thoughts are his own; or Satan revolves only around himself and is impervious to other influences. Additionally, in Böttger's translation Satan's mind 'creates' ("schaffen") the room, while all other translations follow Milton and 'make' ("machen").

The use of "Geist" for what Milton terms 'mind' creates a relation between the spirits and demons, often translated as "Geister" by Böttger for example in the first invocation (1.18). In other cases, he uses "Geister" to refer to the angels. This connection between the individual, the spiritual, the psyche and the intellect was in answer to the rationalism of the Enlightenment. Responding to the concerns of the Enlightenment was of great interest in the 19th century and it is not surprising that Böttger uses this platform to negotiate this relation. Aspects of

the unconscious become foregrounded when approaching Milton's epic through a 19th century lens. Even though such psychological contemplations were not Milton's focus, it is without doubt a text that demands attention of its readers and proves to be classic. Even two hundred years later, translators discover contemporary issues in the text that are worth elaborating on and exploring in the context of the period and the poem.

Raphael's translator's comment is another passage that gains different significance during the 19th century and in Böttger's translation reads as follows:

> Hochwichtiges verlangst du, Ahn der Menschen,
> Ein traurigschweres Werk, denn wie vermag ich
> Dem Menschensinn die unsichtbaren Taten
> Des Geisterkampfs zu schildern? Wie vermag ich
> Dir ohne Schmerz, den Untergang so mancher
> Vollkommenen, da sie standen, zu verkünden?
> Wie endlich soll ich einer andern Welt
> Geheimnis dir enthüllen, da vielleicht
> Ich unbefugt, dir's zu entdecken bin?
> Doch dir zum Guten ist es mir erlaubt,
> Und was zu hoch für menschlichen Verstand,
> Will ich in solcher Art und Weise schildern,
> Das ich den geistigen Formen irdische
> Vergleiche gebe, die am besten sie bezeichnen.
> Doch wie, wenn hier die Erde nur ein Schatten
> Des Himmels wär und alle Dinge beider
> Sich ähnlicher, als man auf Erden wähnt! (Böttger 1853: Book V, 203-4)

In the century that saw the development and institution of linguistics as an academic subject, questions of translation became more central. Raphael's interpreter's comment in translation can attest to that. In this translation, Raphael often uses compounds. 'Sad task and hard' becomes one word "traurigschwer", 'human sense' becomes "Menschensinn" and 'warring spirits' become "Geisterkampf". This allows Böttger to compress the translation and offers him the opportunity to blend meanings which were otherwise lost or spread out over several lines. Again, in contrast to Haak, Böttger does so in a much more conventionalised form. But Böttger interrupts the Miltonic verse by breaking up the syntax into more questions and giving Raphael, although he is the 'sociable spirit', an even more airy attitude. Raphael leaps from rhetorical question to the next, often ending at the break in the line while Milton's verse uses more enjambment. The difference between the two versions reflects in a varying reception of Raphael. In Milton, he seems lofty but his more complicated diction

and syntax suggest how little humans actually understand of angelic discourse. In Böttger's translation, the archangel becomes more like a confused teenager than an eternal heavenly being. Such differences are of course owed to changing attitudes towards religion and the assumed infallibility of divine decisions. Böttger's Raphael makes the impression of not being sure himself and hoping for godly intervention. Whereas,Milton's Raphael is debating with himself and seems to have an interior monologue: Even though he addresses Adam directly, he does not expect anyone to answer. In Böttger's version, Raphael seeks to offer earthly comparisons to spiritual forms to explain the war in heaven to Adam. His metaphor is more abstract than Bodmer's "abbilden". Böttger uses "bezeichnen", which belongs to the visual semantic field but in a more abstract form. The term still holds the root 'zeichnen' from the aesthetic context but with the prefix 'be-' comes to mean name rather naming than drawing, while still retaining the connection to the visual and the aesthetic.

Considerations about individuality also arise in the next passage. The whole semantic field of the unconscious, the spiritual world in connection to religious residuals and the questions of the mind, the soul and the location of these, is experiencing a shift during the 19th century. The third invocation in Book VII is the most metaphysical one of the three conventionally accepted invocations in *PL*. Urania, the astronomy muse, is called upon but immediately revoked. In Böttger's translation, the passage reads as follows:

> Vom Himmel steige jetzo zu mir nieder,
> Urania, wenn dies dein wahrer Name,
> Du, deren Götterstimme mich gelockt,
> Als über den Olympus ich geschwärmt,
> Weit über Räume, wo ein Pegasus
> Die Schwingen rührte. Deinen Namen nicht,
> Dein Wesen ruf ich an! Du wohnst nicht
> Auf dem Olymp, gehörst nicht zu den Musen
> Neunzahl; im Himmel bist du schon geboren,
> Eh Berge ragten und eh Quellen flossen,
> Gesellest dich der ewgen Weisheit zu,
> Die dir der Herr als Schwester auserwählt,
> Und sangst mit ihr vor dem allmächtigen Vater,
> Der an dem Himmelslied Gefallen fand. (Böttger 1853: Book VII, 262)

The address to Urania in Böttger's translation calls on her 'essence' not her name. The term "Wesen" can mean essence, but also being, entity or substance. It is, as is the case with the use of "Geist", in Böttger's version, less tangible and at the

same time carries metaphysical weight. In a philosophical context, the term can relate to two different meanings. Aristotle speaks about *to ti ên einai* ('the what it was to be'), a phrase that was translated into Latin as 'essentia'. According to Aristotle, "there is an essence of just those things whose logos is a definition" (in Barnes 1991: 1030a6) and "the essence of a thing is what it is said to be in respect of itself" (in Barnes 1991: 1029b14). That means that the essence is connected to its definition, the logos, and therefore, the word and speech act. Urania only has her essence conveyed through her name. How then can her essence be invoked but not her name? It seems to be a paradox Milton also encounters in this and other passages, passages in which unmentionable things become mentionable through the performance of epic writing. In Böttger's case, especially through the use of this particular term associated with Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, he enters into a discussion on the ontology of the muse without resolving it.

The last example is a passage from Book VIII in which Adam tells Raphael about his first memories. But first he flatters Raphael who then returns the compliment explaining how much of the divine presence is in Adam. Böttger realises the passage as follows:

> Adam, nicht Anmut mangelt deinen Lippen
> Und deiner Zunge nicht Beredsamkeit;
> Denn Gott erteilte deinem Inneren auch
> Wie deinem Äußeren reichlich seine Gaben,
> Sein Ebenbild; ob redend oder stumm,
> Umschweben Liebreiz dich und hohe Anmut
> Bei jedem Wort und jeglicher Bewegung. (Böttger 1853: Book VIII, 301)

Adam seems to have encountered a mimetic problem. How alike is he to God? And Raphael confirms that God did not only make him in His image but gave him similar qualities of language as well. While Milton uses double-negatives ("nor […] ungraceful, […] nor ineloquent", *PL* 8.218-9), Böttger turns the adjectives and negates the phrase: Adam does not lack grace or eloquence. This passage, again, discusses an ontological question. How exactly has God made Adam in his image? And Raphael explains that "[…] on thee, / Abundently his gifts hath also pour'd / Inward and outward both" (8.219-21). Böttger uses this moment, too, to negotiate this dichotomy and uses nouns instead of adjectives for the location on which God gave his gifts. The use of nouns makes the bestowing sound a little more like a transaction than an outpouring fountain of God's gifts, which is what

Milton's wording suggests. The compound "Ebenbild" (Bodmer uses as usual the longer version "Ebenbildniß") Böttger has at his disposal in German, however, re-establishes the close connection that might have been less fluently supported by the nominal style Böttger adopted.

Böttger's translation is the most readily available translation of *PL* in Germany. This is surely influenced by the fact that the edition was republished in 2008 and features the impressive engravings by Gustave Doré, as well as additional floral engravings on each page. Compared to more recent translations, it is easily available and more affordable.

During the long 19th century, epic poetry seemed impossible to write or engage with. The Industrial Revolution had left European societies with a fear of losing connection to nature and the untouched, the sublime and the unspoiled. Marx consequently asked:

> Ist Achilles möglich mit Pulver und Blei? Oder überhaupt die "Iliade" mit der Druckerpresse und gar Druckmaschine? Hört das Singen und Sagen und die Muse mit dem Preßbengel nicht notwendig auf, also verschwinden nicht notwendige Bedingungen der epischen Poesie? (Marx 1857/58: 45)

Marx was proven wrong by the enormous productivity the genre would outpour over the century. Nation building would make writers turn to epic poetry like in no other century. Trying to establish traditions and roots was a key concern for the modern nation states. Still in need of a legitimation through a basis in the past, they would begin challenging each other and appropriating where there was nothing to rediscover. Jacob Grimm, the collector of German *Volksmärchen,* attributed to the epic the power to reconstitute the last paradise and to blend it with the expectation of eternal subsistence.

> Wie vergangenheit und zukunft, das verlorne paradis und das erwartete, in der vorstellung des volks sich verschmelzen […] das ist des epos rechtes zeichen, dass es seinen gestalten ewige, unvergängliche dauer sichert. (1835a: 540)

Not only are the characters immortalised but the people whose 'Wesen' and history the poem narrates, are also immortalised and honoured. It is they who are represented in the past, the present and the future of the epic and the nation state. But it is true, that England, for example, never got around to create that one national epic other countries had. *Beowulf* was Norman, *King Arthur* was Celtic and *Paradise Lost* was revolutionary. Moreover, the national epic must be

175

singular. Just as there is only one flag, one anthem and one government, there can be only one national epic. This turned out to become an eminent struggle for authority in the context of world-making through the epic and epic recourse.

4.4 Last Sighting in Verse: Hans Heinrich Meier (1969)

The circumstances of the production and publication of translations and world literature in the 20th century is completely different from those a century ago. In the second half of the 20th century, the excitement for nation states and national languages had, in response to the bloodshed caused by fascism that resulted in two world wars, lost its appeal. Other factors became more prominent and alongside the social and political changes, the circumstances for writers and translators alike had changed. As publishers and copyright laws gained significance, questions of marketability, economy and audience stepped into the foreground. It became more important to place a translation with a renowned publisher and self-publication was regarded as lacking the authority of a text that came out of a publishing house with all that editors and a marketing strategy team could offer. Translations were published primarily thanks or due to other factors than in previous centuries. While Haak wanted to make *PL* available to German readers, he had little interest in profit and circulated the manuscript of his fragmentary translation before it was published. Bodmer's programme was driven by a dispute with Gottsched and his wish to prove German worthy and adaptable to epic literature. Böttger's Romantic programme was also strongly influenced by questions on metaphysics and the role of human individuality. Meier's translation falls into another era entirely, one that was focused on moving the text towards the reader.

Meier's translation is the only one that includes a German version of the introductory commentary on the verse and the book summaries that were added for the 1668 edition of *PL*. This causes the edition to have a very different layout than the previous translations discussed. The first invocation follows a summary that was also translated by Meier.

> Des Menschen erste Widersetzlichkeit
> Und jenes untersagten Baumes Frucht,
> Die dieser Welt durch sterblichen Genuß
> Den Tod gebracht und unser ganzen Leid
> Mit Edens Fall, bis, größer als der Mensch,

Uns wieder einzusetzen Einer komme
Und uns den Ort des Heils zurückgewinne,
Besinge nun, himmlische Muse, die
Du auf dem abgeschiedenen Gipfel einst
Des Horeb oder Sinai jenem Hirten
Begeistertest, der dem erwählten Volk
Von der Geburt des Himmels und der Erde,
Da sie sich aus dem Chaos hoben, sagte;
Wenn aber Zion und Siloahs Bach,
Der nah dem Gottorakel floß, dich mehr
Entzücken, leih von dort mir deinen Mund
Zu meinem Lied, das auf nicht lahmen Schwingen
Parnassens Höhen überfliegen soll,
Dieweil es Dinge sucht, die ungewagt
Geblieben noch in Rede oder Reim.
Und du vor allem, Geist, dem alle Tempel
Nicht wie das redlich Herz so lieb,
O lehr mich, denn du weißt; du warest da
Von Anbeginn, und einer Taube gleich,
Mit mächtig ausgespreizten Fittichen,
Saßest du brütend ob der leeren Tiefe,
Und sie ward schwanger. Mache hell in mir,
Was dunkel ist, erheb und kräftige,
Was in mir niedrig ist, daß ich vermöge,
Meinen erhabnen Gegenstand gemäß,
Die ewige Vorsehung hochzuhalten
Und heilig Gottes Wege vor den Menschen. (Meier 1969: 1.1-32)

Striking at first glance is the term Meier chooses for 'disobedience' in the first line. "Widersetzlichkeit" is an odd word. It is not commonly used and stands out when reading the first lines. Yet, Meier's translation follows Milton's syntax and draws out the sentence inly two verses longer than Milton's. Generally, Meier keeps close to Milton's syntax and whenever possible follows the word order and patterns of the original. Consequently, he uses enjambment and positions emotive words like "Begeisterte" at the beginning of the line. It is the only translation under investigation in this essay, that ends the invocation on the same word as Milton does and so manages to accentuate mankind's role and importance the same way Milton did. Meier does not try to use archaic language too overtly but sometimes does not seem to be able to avoid it or uses it when getting carried away by the subject matter. He often uses abbreviations that might come across as old-fashioned as well as out-dated tenses. In contrast to the elevated language which Meier usually adapts, there are occasional drops in tone, often with comical effect. This comic effect occurse, for example, when the Holy Spirit moves on "nicht lahmen Schwingen" (Meier 1969: 1.17).

4.5 Making of a new Tradition

Looking at these translations from four centuries has forced me to examine samples from each text. I have chosen passages that address questions of inspiration, interpretation and translation. In a work so deeply concerned with questions of communication and the meaning of speech acts such as *PL*, it was very rewarding that a good example of the themes I wanted to focus on could be found on any given page. The deeper I entered into the world of *PL* and its translations, the more I began to realise the urgency with which the constantly precarious communication situation is negotiated by the characters. And, this is the case in every single dialogue, no matter whether God speaks to the Son, to Adam or to Satan. Language needs to be contextualised, it needs to be explained and confirmed and reconfirmed. This also holds true for demonic and human conversations. Adam and Eve beginning life as fully grown people have the ability of speech without ever having gone through the process of acquiring it. They are blessed by this gift but also everything is new to them. Therefore, they are navigating unknown possibilities. The speaking serpent is in fact what surprises but finally persuades Eve to eat the apple and this example relates to another way of reading the text. How could Milton use his poetry if not represented through language? To make Satan speak in serpent form was theologically acceptable and in the epic created a powerful and seductive adversary for mankind to fail against. Satan's language, although being highly skilful and rhetorical, is corrupt from the beginning. Like his whole character, his language changes according to his state. Satan's final punishment, after his return from causing mankind's fall, is the loss and failure of demonic language. The reader is confronted with a narrator whose balancing act between hubris and humility is so well crafted that rereading the epic offers endless new perspectives.

In the translations, this effect continues. Through the lens of four different readers and interpreters, the importance and the relentless effort necessary for successful communications shows in every decision made consciously or not to reimagine and re-write *PL*. *PL* is a text that does not allow for any inattention, especially not when its own translational processes are transferred and challenged by another language.

To summaries the results of the investigation, I want to zoom in on a few specific instances. In the first invocation, Milton's term "disobedience" (*PL* 1.1)

is translated by Haak as "Abfall", by Bodmer as "Ungehormsam", by Böttger as "Schuld", and by Meier as "Widersetzlichkeit". In the Leviathan simile, in Haak Milton's "night-foundered skiff" (*PL* 1.204) becomes "Nacht-behemtem Schiff", for Bodmer it is "von der Nacht verschlagenen Jachtschiff", in Böttger's translation "nachtereilten Barke", and in Meier "bewegungsloses Boot". Satan's iconic phrase "The mind is its own place" (*PL* 1.254) is translated by Haak as "Der Muht ist selbst sein ort", by Bodmer as "Das Gemüthe wohnet in sich selbst", by Böttger as "Es ist der Geist sein eigener Raum", and by Meier as "Der Geist is selbst sein eigener Ort". Together with the other translators they created a tradition and established the canon of *PL* in German.

5. The Author as Translator – The Translator as Author

The project of examining translation as a poetic method and as a cultural practice over such a long period of time and on two extremely challenging texts, proved to be no easy task. As I stated at the outset of this essay, translation evades simply definition and is always at the margins and the friction points of literature. This project was an ambitious attempt to step onto a path that was sure to lead to these margins. In the case of Milton, the borders of the universe and with Macpherson's to the blurred lines of fact and fiction. Epic poetry and translation have proven to offer a rewarding reading with many different directions and results. Here, the investigative range is not exhausted by far.

For my project, I examined two texts – Milton's *Paradise Lost* and Macpherson's *Poems of Ossian* – from the perspective of translation although neither is a translation in the classical sense. The processes of translation in both, however, not only support their argument but are a requirement for their universalistic claim. *Paradise Lost* and the *Poems of Ossian* are fundamentally indebted to practices of mimetic cultural production. They adapt and employ classical models and reimagine them for their own agendas. Both claim the status of epic poetry with not only world-making abilities but the aspiration to generate meaning beyond their literary realm.

What I intended with the phrase *mimesis of translation* takes on a double perspective: In the case of *Paradise Lost*, Milton made translation the structure and texture of the poem. If language and communication is not explicitly addressed – which is one of the poem's main themes–, translation is employed on a linguistic and metaphorical level. Literal translations, references and meta-lingual puns, interpreter figures, similes and translation mistakes: all those are used to negotiate not only questions of origin, creation and the condition of human and divine relations, but those of authorship and imagination.

God made man in his own image but envy and jealousy, aspiring to be something one is not, causes all the trouble in paradise. When Satan first attempts to seduce Eve, he thus argues as follows:

> […] Oh fruit divine,
> Sweet of thy self, but much more sweet thus cropped,
> Forbidden here, it seems, as only fit
> For gods, yet able to make gods of men:

> And why not gods of men, since good, the more
> Communicated, more abundant grows,
> The author not impaired, but honoured more? (*PL* 5.67-73)

How can it be wrong to use language –and poetry– to communicate good? And is Satan not also making a point in favour of translation by arguing that through aspiring to become like a god "The author [is] not impaired but honoured more"? Satan, the master deceiver, speaks these words when he comes to Eve in a dream disguised as "One shaped and winged like those from heaven" (*PL* 5.55). The Satan from *Paradise Lost* becomes at once a symbol of translation and a cautionary tale of the dangers of mimesis. It is usually assumed that something gets lost in translation, but translation can also serve as a remedy. It is a necessary task, a productive poetic tool and a vehicle for the preservation and distribution of knowledge.

In the case of Ossian, the concept of *mimesis of translation* is of another kind: It is the imitation of a translation without a written pre-text. Macpherson published and advertised his Ossianic poetry as the translations of long-lost ancient epic fragments and poems. He reframed Scottish legends as myth of origin in form of a translation. This gave him the opportunity to create a narrative that presented the Scottish clans as proud and cultured people – equivalent to Homer, primitive and raw– during a time in which Scottish culture and language was seriously under threat.

Macpherson did two things to establish the authenticity of his so-called translations: He created a language imitating the Gaelic source in the English target language, and he built a corpus of paratexts embedding them in an epic tradition. Apart from the essays and prefaces, any given page of, especially *Fingal*, is surrounded by footnotes commentating on the translation or referencing 'similar' passages from Homer, Vergil, Dante and Milton –both, in the original and the translation. Macpherson also elaborated on his approach, claiming to have translated deliberately foreignizing and literal. In one of his own essays he writes: "[A]ll that can be said of the translation, is, that it is literal […]. The arrangement of the words in the original is imitated, and the inversions of the style observed" (Macpherson 1760: 6). Macpherson attempted to rehabilitate Scottish traditions and identity by 'translating' their oral myth of origin into written existence and finding or recovering the lost paradise of the Scottish people.

By taking into account the translations of *PL* into German, the extent of their influence can be traced over the centuries and in context of linguistic change. New literary imports also always influenced the original production of artworks as well as the translation tradition. Similarity and likeness cause trouble in paradise for Adam and Eve. Ossian could be saved from the past thanks to making the poems similar to a tradition that was valued and fundamentally indebted to the canon of classical literature. Milton and Macpherson sought to find and recover paradise from a linguistic fall. Their translators followed in their footsteps and carried their poetry over into new contexts.

In conclusion, I want to suggest that the suspicions held towards the mysterious practice of translation, were exactly what Milton and Macpherson used to their advantage, and by unfolding their *mimesis of translation* I attempted to 'justify their ways to us'.

6. Appendix[58]

Songs of Selma

Macpherson

> Star of descending night! fair is thy light in the west! thou liftest thy unshorn head from thy cloud: thy steps are stately on thy hill. What dost thou behold in the plain? The stormy winds are laid. The murmur of the torrent comes from afar. Roaring waves climb the distant rock. The flies o evening are on their feeble wings; the hum of their course is on the field. What dost thou behold, fair light? But thou dost smile and depart. The waves come with joy around thee: they bathe thy lovely hair. Farewell, thou silent beam! Let the light of Ossian's soul arise! (Macpherson 1765b: 166)

Denis

> Stern der kommenden Nacht! Schön ist in Westen dein
> Funkeln. Von dem Gewölk' hebst du dein Stralenhaupt.
> Prächtig schwebet dein Zug über den Hügeln fort. —
> Doch du blickest zur Flur herab?
> Nicht mehr stürmet der Wind. Fernher erbraust der Strom.
> Wogen brüllen empor an den entlegenen
> Felsen. Mücken der Nacht üben den zärtlichen
> Flügel, schwirren im Feld' umher.
> Holder Schimmer! Warum blickst du zur Flur herab? —
> Doch du lächelst, und scheidst! Wellen umscherzen dich,
> Tränken lieblich dein Haar.—Schweigender Stral, fahr hin!
> Und entflamme dich du, mein Geist! (Denis 1768: 67)

Goethe

> Stern der dämmernden Nacht, schön funkelst du in Westen, habst dein strahlend Haupt aus deiner Wolke, wandelst stattlich deinen Hügel hin. Wornach blickst du auf die Heide? Die stürmenden Winde haben sich gelegt; von ferne kommt des Gießbachs Murmeln; rauschende Wellen spielen am Felsen ferne; das Gesumme der Abendfliegen schwärmet übers Feld. Wornach siehst du, schönes Licht? Aber du lächelst und gehst, freudig umgeben dich die Wellen und baden dein liebliches Haar. Lebe wohl, ruhiger Strahl. Erscheine, du herrliches Licht von Ossians Seele! (Goethe 1774: 149-150)

Böttger

> Stern der sinkenden Nacht,
> Schön glänzt im Westen dein Licht!
> Du hebst aus Wolken dein lockiges Haupt,
> Schreitet stattlich den Hügel entlang!
> Warum blickt nach der Haide du hin?
> Gelegt hat sich der stürmische Wind,
> Fernher dringt des Waldstroms Gemurmel.

---

[58] In this appendix only the passages compared to more than three translations in chapter 4 have been listed. This concerns mainly Haak, who only translated the first four books and there other passages have additionally been chosen.

Rauschende Wogen branden am Felsen,
Fliegen des Abends schwärmen auf schwachen,
Luftigen Schwingen durch das Gefild!
Wonach blickst du, du schönes Licht?
Doch du lächelt und schwindet hinweg.
Die Wogen umgaukeln mit Freuden dich
Und baden das liebliche Haar dir.
Leb' wohl, du schweigender Strahl,
Erwecke das Licht in Ossians Geist! (Böttger 1847: 179)

First invocation (*PL* Book I)

Milton

OF Mans First Disobedience, and the Fruit
Of that Forbidden Tree, whose mortal tast
Brought Death into the World, and all our woe,
With loss of Eden, till one greater Man
Restore us, and regain the blissful Seat,
Sing Heav'nly Muse that on the secret top
Of Oreb, or of Sinai, didst inspire
That Shepherd, who first taught the chosen Seed,
In the Beginning how the Heav'ns and Earth
Rose out of Chaos: Or if Sion Hill
Delight thee more, and Siloa's Brook that flow'd
Fast by the Oracle of God; I thence
Invoke thy aid to my adventrous Song,
That with no middle flight intends to soar
Above th' Aonian Mount, while it pursues
Things unattempted yet in Prose or Rhime.
And chiefly Thou O Spirit, that dost prefer
Before all Temples th' upright heart and pure,
Instruct me, for Thou know'st; Thou from the first
Wast present, and with mighty wings outspread
Dove-like satst brooding on the vast Abyss
And mad'st it pregnant: What in me is dark
Illumin, what is low raise and support;
That to the highth of this great Argument
I may assert Eternal Providence,
And justifie the wayes of God to men. (*PL* 1.1-26)

Haak

Des Ersten Menschen Abfall u. die Frucht
Ihm hochverbottnen Baums, dass ihr Versuch
Den Todt u. all Unheyl hat auf die Welt
Gebracht, u. und auss Eden biss Gott-Mensch
Uns voll erlös' und alles wiederbring,
Singend, Ô Sin, der auf des Horebs Spitz
und Sinaï dem Schäfer, der zu erst
das ausserwehlte Volck recht unterwiesen,
Eingegeben hast, wie Himmel, Erd u. Meer,
Und all ihr Heer anfänglich geuhrständet,

Hast nachmahls Lust gehabt an Sions Berg
Und Silo's Bach, des Höchsten Ehrensitz
Fürüber räuschelnd; Dich ruf ich an,
zum Beystand eines so gewagten Wercks,
da auf gantz ungemeine Weis
Parnass ich über-steig u. ding fürbring
die keinem Dicher ie den Sin berührt:
O weiser Reiner Geist, der des Gemühts
Aufrichtigkeit für aller Tempeln dienst
Anschawest, Leyt du mich, du weissest alles
Von erst-an bey, da deiner Fittich Macht
Taub-gleich, das Erste Lähr-Wüst überschwebt,
und durch u. durch befrucht; Was mir unhäll
Erleücht; erhöh was ring, u. stärck was schwach,
Dass ich, geziemend der so hohen Sach
Die ewige Führsehung recht erweis
u. Gottes Weg am Menschen klar rechtfertig. (Haak 1667: 1.1-27)

Bodmer

Singe von dem ersten Ungehorsam des Menschen, und der Frucht des verbotenen
Baumes, deren vergifftetes Essen den Tod und das Elend in die Welt gebracht, so
daß wir aus Eden ertrieben worden, biß daß ein grösserer Mensch und entsetzet,
und den luftreichen Sitz wieder gewonnen hat; himmlische Dichterin, welche auf
Sinai und auf dem geheimen Gipfel des Berges Horeb den Schäfer unterwiesen,
der zuerst den erwehlten Samen gelehret hat, wie im Anfang die Himmel und die
ERde aus dem Chaos aufgesprossen: komme von da oder von dem angenehmern
Berge Sion, und dem Bache Siloa, der bahe bey dem Orackel GOttes flosse, auf
mein Ruffen herunter, und regiere meinen kühnen Gesang, der mit nicht
gemeinem Fluge höher, als der Ionische Berg reichet, hinaufwärts steigen, und
von den Dingen dichten will, von welchen noch neman weder in gembundener
noch looser Rede zu schreiben unterstanden hat.
Bevorab du o Geist! der das aufrichtige und reine Hertz den prächtigen Tempeln
vorziehet, unterrichte mich von diesen Sachen, den du weißest sie; Du warest von
Anbeginn anwesend, und sassest mit ausgebreiteten mächtigen Flügeln gleicher
einer brütenden Taube auf dem ungemeßenen Abgrund, und machtest ihn
trächtig: was dunckel in mir ist, erleuchte, und was nedrig, richte auf und stütze
es empor, auf daß ich mit einem hohen Schwung der Rede, wie meine große
Materie erfordert, die ewige Vorsehung vertheydigen, und den Menschen die
Wege GOttes rechtfertigen möge. (Bodmer 1732: Book I, p. 1-2)

Singe, himmlische Muse, von dem ersten Ungehorsam des Menschen, und der
verbothenen Frucht, die mit dem Verlust Edens das Elend und den Tod in die
Welt gebracht hat.
[…]
Und du vornehmlich, o Geist, der mehr von einem aufrichtigen und reinen
Herzen hält, als von allen Tempeln, unterrichte du mich, denn du weissest von
diesen Dingen, du warest zuerst dabei gegenwärtig, und sassest einer brütenden
Taube gleich mit ausgebreiteten Flügeln auf dem ungemessenen Abgrund; und
machtest ihn fruchtbar. Erleuchte, was in mir dunckel ist; erhöhe und unterstütze,
was niedrig ist, dass ich der Hoheit meines edeln Vorhabens gemäß die ewige
Vorsehung vertheidigen, und die Wege Gottes unter den Menschen retten möge.
(Bodmer 1742: Book I, p. 1-2)

Böttger

Des Menschen erste Schuld und jene Frucht
Des streng verbotnen Baums, die durch Genuss
Tod in die Welt gebracht und jeglich Weh;
Die Eden raubte, bis ein größrer Mensch
Des Heiles Sitz uns wiederum errang:
Besing, o Himmelsmuse, die auf Horebs,
Auf Sinais verborgnem Gipfel einst
Den Hirten entflammte, der zuerst belehrt'
Das auserwählte Volk, wie Erd und Himmel
Im Anfang aus dem Chaos sich erhob;
Von dorther, oder wenn des Sion Hügel,
Siloahs Quell, der bei des Herrn Orakel
Hinfloss, dich mehr erfreut, so ruf ich dich
Von dort herab, mein kühnes Lied zu weihn,
Das nicht gemeinen Flugs Äoniens Berg
Überschweben will, solche Ding' besingend,
An die sich Vers und Prosa nie gewagt.
Vor allem du beseele mich, o Geist,
Der offne Herzen mehr als Tempel liebt:
Du bist allwissend, warst vom Anbeginn
Und ruhtest brütend, einer Taube gleich,
Mit mächtig ausgespreiztem Flügelpaar
Überm ungeheuern Abgrund, ihn fruchtbar machend.
Was in mir dunkel ist, erleuchte du,
Was in mir niedrig, heb und stütze du;
Dass ich gemäß dem hohen Gegenstand,
Die Wege Gottes den Menschen preisend,
Die ewige Vorsehung verteidgen mag. (Böttger 1853: 1.1-28, p. 15-6)

Meier

Des Menschen erste Widersetzlichkeit
Und jenes untersagten Baumes Frucht,
Die dieser Welt durch sterblichen Genuß
Den Tid gebracht und unser ganzen Leid
Mit Edens Fall, bis, größer als der Mensch,
Uns wieder einzusetzen Einer komme
Und uns den Ort des Heils zurückgewinne,
Besinge nun, himmlische Muse, die
Du auf dem abgeschiedenen Gipfel einst
Des Horeb oder Sinai jenem Hirten
Begeistertest, der dem erwählten Volk
Von der Geburt des Himmels und der Erde,
Da sie sich aus dem Chaos hoben, sagte;
Wenn aber Zion und Siloahs Bach,
Der nah dem Gottorakel floß, dich mehr
Entzücken, leih von dort mir deinen Mund
Zu meinem Lied, das auf nicht lahmen Schwingen
Parnassens Höhen überfliegen soll,
Dieweil es Dinge sucht, die ungewagt
Geblieben noch in Rede oder Reim.
Und du vor allem, Geist, dem alle Tempel
Nicht wie das redlich Herz so lieb,

O lehr mich, denn du weißt; du warest da
Von Anbeginn, und einer Taube gleich,
Mit mächtig ausgespreizten Fittichen,
Saßest du brütend ob der leeren Tiefe,
Und sie ward schwanger. Mache hell in mir,
Was dunkel ist, erheb und kräftige,
Was in mir niedrig ist, daß ich vermöge,
Meinen erhabnen Gegenstand gemäß,
Die ewige Vorsehung hochzuhalten
Und heilig Gottes Wege vor den Menschen. (Meier 1969: 1.1-32)

Leviathan simile (*PL* Book I)

Milton

Thus Satan talking to his neerest Mate
With Head up-lift above the wave, and Eyes
That sparkling blaz'd, his other Parts besides
Prone on the Flood, extended long and large
Lay floating many a rood, in bulk as huge
As whom the Fables name of monstrous size,
Titanian, or Earth-born, that warr'd on Jove,
Briareos or Typhon, whom the Den
By ancient Tarsus held, or that Sea-beast
Leviathan, which God of all his works
Created hugest that swim th' Ocean stream:
Him haply slumbring on the Norway foam
The Pilot of some small night-founder'd Skiff,
Deeming some Island, oft, as Sea-men tell,
With fixed Anchor in his skaly rind
Moors by his side under the Lee, while Night
Invests the Sea, and wished Morn delayes. (*PL* 1.192-208)

Haak

Diss aussgeredt, hub er sein Haupt empor
u. schlug das glim̄ernd, fünckelnd Angesicht
umber mit underm Theil noch flat da auf
der Flam-Fluht aussgestrecket, weit u. breit,
viel meilen lang; so gross u. ungeheüwer
dass Dichter Unthier nichts dagegen, Titan
die Erd-erborne Him̄elstürmer; noch
der grausame Briareus, noch der Typhon,
in seiner grossen Höhl dort bey alt Tharsus;
noch selbst der Leviathan welchen Gott
So gross im Meer u. mächtig hat erschaffen;
Von dem man sagt, dass auf Norweger See,
Ein Steüer-Man mit Nacht-behemtem Schiff,
Alss Insel bey, auf seiner Schuppen rand
Den Ancker warf; u. Ihm zur Seyt anlag,
Wind-Wetter-frey, biss selbe Nacht früüber,
u. Tag-rath ihn hiess eylend dannen seglen; (Haak 1667: 1.192-208)

Bodmer

Seine übrige Theile lagen auf den Wogen, der länge nach viel Huben Feldes weit ausgestrecket, von so ungeheurer Grösse als jene Riesencörper, welche in den Fabeln berühmt sind, die Titanen oder die Söhne der Erden, welche mit Jove kriegten, Briareus oder Typhon, welcher die Höle nicht weit von dem alten Tharsus einnahme, oder die Seebestie Leviathan, welche GOtt unter allen seinen Werken, so in dem Ocean schwimmen, am leibigsten geschaffen hat; Oft, wie die Seefahrenden erzehlen, wenn sie in der Norwegischen See schliefe, hat der Pilot einens kleinen von der Nacht verschlagenen Jachtschiffes, in der Einbildung es seie eine Insel, den Ancker auf ihre schuppichte Rinde ausgeworffen, und ist an ihere Seiten hinter dem Winde still gelegen, so lange die Nacht die See bedecked, und den gewünschten morgen verzögert hat; (Bodmer 1732: Book I, p. 9-10)

Böttger

So sprach der Satan zu dem Leidgefährten,
Das Haupt der Flut enthoben, und die Augen
Von Flammen funkelnd; niederwärts gebeugt,
Schwamm, meh're Hufen weithin ausgestreckt,
Sein Körper auf den Wogen lang und breit,
An Größe jenen Riese gleich der Fabel,
Wie die Titanen oder Erdgeborenen,
Die Zeus bekriegt, wie Typhon und Briareus,
Die einst die Schlucht beim alten Tarsus barg,
Wie jenes Seegetier, der Leviathan,
Den Gott als allergrößtes Wesen schuf,
Das in des Ozeans Gewässern schwimmt,
Den, wenn er in Norwegens Schaume schlummert,
Der Schiffer einer nachtereilten Barke
Oft für ein Eiland hält, wie man sagt,
Wirft dann der Seemann in die Schuppenhaut
Den Anker, liegt er vor dem Wind geschützt
An des Riesen Seite, wenn, noch nachtumhüllt,
Dem Meer nicht der ersehnte Morgen lacht. (Böttger 1853: Book I, p. 23-4)

Meier

So sprach Satan zu seinem Nächsten hin,
Das Haupt erhoben aus der Flut, die Augen
Wie Blitze funkelnd, seine anderen Teile,
Weit hingestreckt an Länge wie an Breite,
Die lagen schwimmend, viele Morgen deckend,
In ungehrer Masse, wie die Fabel
Von Riesenwesen wie Titanen oder
Von Erdgeborenen zu sagen weiß,
Die Zeus bekriegten, oder Typhon, den
Die Höhle hielt, dem alten Tarsus nah,
Ägäon ähnlich oder jenem Scheusal
Der Meere, Leviathan, gleich, den Gott
Von allen, die den Ozean bschwimmen,
Am riesigsten erschuf, dem oft, zur Nacht
Wohl schlafend auf der Nordseegischt, der Schiffer,
Gebannt auf sein bewegungsloses Boot,
Ihn für ein Eiland haltend, wie man sagt,
Den Anker wirft in seine Schuppenhaut

> Und leewärts sich vertäut, da Dunkelheit
> Das Meer belegt bis zum ersehnten Morgen. (Meier 1969: 1.222-41)

The mind is its own place (PL Book I)

Milton

> The mind is its own place, and in it self
> Can make a Heav'n of Hell, a Hell of Heav'n.
> What matter where, if I be still the same,
> And what I should be, all but less then he
> Whom Thunder hath made greater? (*PL* 1.254-8)

Haak

> Der Muht ist selbst sein ort, u. in sich selbst,
> kan Himel Höll, u. Holl zum Himel machen
> Es gilt mir alles gleich, so lang ich pleib
> Was ich sein soll u. bin; kaum weniger
> Alss der den Donner führt. (Haak 1667: 1.254-5)

Bodmer

> Das Gemüthe wohnet in sich selbst, und kan in sich einen Himmel aus der Hölle,
> und eine Hölle aus dem Himmel machen. Was frage ich darnach, welcher Ort
> mich halte, wenn ich beständig der gleiche bin, und was ich seyn soll, alles, nur
> minder als jener, den der Donner grösser gemachet hat. (Bodmer 1732: Book I, p.
> 12)

Böttger

> Es ist der Geist sein eigener Raum, er kann
> In sich selbst einen Himmel aus der Hölle
> Und aus der Hölle einen Himmel schaffen.
> Was gilt das Wo, bin ich nur immer ich,
> Und was ich sein soll, doch nur geringer nicht
> Als Er, Der durch den Donner mächtger ward! (Böttger 1853: Book I, p. 27)

Meier

> Der Geist ist selbst sein eigener Ort und macht
> Aus Himmel Hölle sich, aus Hölle Himmel.
> Bin ich der gleiche noch, was denn gebricht's,
> Wo oder was ich sei, und kaum geringer
> Als jener, den der Donner größer machte? (Meier 1969: 1.296-300)

Raphael's translator problem (PL Book V)

Milton

> High matter thou injoinst me, O prime of men,
> Sad task and hard, for how shall I relate
> To human sense th' invisible exploits
> Of warring Spirits; how without remorse

The ruin of so many glorious once
And perfet while they stood; how last unfould
The secrets of another World, perhaps
Not lawful to reveal? yet for thy good
This is dispenc't, and what surmounts the reach
Of human sense, I shall delineate so,
By lik'ning spiritual to corporal forms,
As may express them best, though what if Earth
Be but the shaddow of Heav'n, and things therein
Each to other like, more then on earth is thought? (5.563-76)

Bodmer

Du legst mir eine hohe Materie auf, o vorderster Mensch, eine schwere und
traurige Verrichtung, denn wie soll ich menschlichen Sinnen die unsichtbaren
Thaten streitender Geister vorstellen: wie, ohne Hertzeleid, den Untergang so
vieler weiland herrlicher, und als lange sie standhaft geblieben, vollkommener
Geister erzehlen; endlich wie soll ich Geheimnisse einer anderen Welt eröffnen,
da vielleicht nicht erlaubt ist, sie zu offenbahren! Jedoch wird mir dieses, weil es
dir zum Besten geschieht, vergönnet sein, und was das Maß der menschlichen
Sinnen übersteiget will ich durch Vergleichungen der geistlichen Sachen mit
irdischen so abbilden, als sie am besten ausdrücken mögen; Wie aber, wenn die
Erde allein der Schatten des Himmels ist, und in beyden Dinge vorkommen,
welche einander viel gleichförmiger sind, als man auf Erden dencket? (Bodmer
1732: Book V, p. 185-6)

Böttger

Hochwichtiges verlangst du, Ahn der Menschen,
Ein traurigschweres Werk, denn wie vermag ich
Dem Menschensinn die unsichtbaren Taten
Des Geisterkampfs zu schildern? Wie vermag ich
Dir ohne Schmerz, den Untergang so mancher
Vollkommenen, da sie standen, zu verkünden?
Wie endlich soll ich einer andern Welt
Geheimnis dir enthüllen, da vielleicht
Ich unbefugt, dir's zu entdecken bin?
Doch dir zum Guten ist es mir erlaubt,
Und was zu hoch für menschlichen Verstand,
Will ich in solcher Art und Weise schildern,
Das ich den geistigen Formen irdische
Vergleiche gebe, die am besten sie bezeichnen.
Doch wie, wenn hier die Erde nur ein Schatten
Des Himmels wär und alle Dinge beider
Sich ähnlicher, als man auf Erden wähnt! (Böttger 1853: Book V, 203-4)

Meier

Du auferlegst mir aber hohe Dinge,
Menschenfürst, traurige Pflicht und schwer,
Denn wie soll ich für menschlichen Begriff
Die unsichtbaren Waffentaten schildern
Von Geistern in der Schlacht? Wie ohne Reue
Den Sturz so mancher, die so glorienreich

Einst und vollkommen waren, da sie standen?
Und wie zu guter Letzt enthülle ich
Die Geheimnisse einer andern Welt,
Die kundzutun vielleicht sich nicht geziemt?
Doch für dein Gutes ist es hier gewährt,
Und was des Menschen Fassung übersteigt,
Werde ich auch zu zeichnen wissen und
Das Geistige dem Sinnlichen vergleichen
Mit bestem Bild. Wie, wenn die Erde gar
Dem Himmel, dessen Schatten zwar sie ist,
Und allen Dingen drin entsprechend, wohl
Ähnlicher wäre als sie selber träumt? (Meier 1969: 5.719-36)

Third invocation (*PL* Book VII)

Milton

DEscend from Heav'n Urania, by that name
If rightly thou art call'd, whose Voice divine
Following, above th' Olympian Hill I soare,
Above the flight of Pegasean wing.
The meaning, not the Name I call: for thou
Nor of the Muses nine, nor on the top
Of old Olympus dwell'st, but Heav'nlie borne,
Before the Hills appeerd, or Fountain flow'd,
Thou with Eternal Wisdom didst converse,
Wisdom thy Sister, and with her didst play
In presence of th' Almightie Father, pleas'd
With thy Celestial Song. Up led by thee
Into the Heav'n of Heav'ns I have presum'd,
An Earthlie Guest, and drawn Empyreal Aire,
Thy tempring; with like safetie guided down
Return me to my Native Element. (*PL* 7.1-16)

Bodmer

Steige von dem Himmel herunter Urania / wenn sie nicht unrecht bey diesem
Nahmen genannt wird, deren Göttlichen Stimme ich folge, und über den
Olympischen Berg hinauffliege, höher als die Pegasischen Flügel sich
geschwungen haben. Ich ruffe die Bedeutung des Nahmens an, nicht den
Nahmen, denn du bist nicht eine der neun Musen, wohnet auch nicht auf dem
Giebel des alten Olympus, sondern von himmlischer Herkunft, und hieltest dich,
ehe die Berge erschienen, und die Quellen flosse, in der Gesellschaft der ewigen
Weisheit auf, der Weisheit deiner Schwester, und spieltest mit ihr auf den
Kanten, vor dem Stuhle des Allmächtigen Vaters, der selbst durch deinen
himmlischen Gesang belustigt wird. (Bodmer 1732: Book VII, p. 3)

Böttger

Vom Himmel steige jetzo zu mir nieder,
Urania, wenn dies dein wahrer Name,
Du, deren Götterstimme mich gelockt,
Als über den Olympus ich geschwärmt,
Weit über Räume, wo ein Pegasus

Die Schwingen rührte. Deinen Namen nicht,
Dein Wesen ruf ich an! Du wohnst nicht
Auf dem Olymp, gehörst nicht zu den Musen
Neunzahl; im Himmel bist du schon geboren,
Eh Berge ragten und eh Quellen flossen,
Gesellest dich der ewgen Weisheit zu,
Die dir der Herr als Schwester auserwählt,
Und sangst mit ihr vor dem allmächtigen Vater,
Der an dem Himmelslied Gefallen fand. (Böttger 1853: Book VII, p. 262)

Meier

Vom Himmel steig, Urania, wenn du so
Zurecht geheißen, die mich göttlich rief
Und über die olympischen Gipfel trägt,
Und höher als des Flügelrosses Flug.
Ich rufe dich nach dem, was du bedeutest,
Nicht was du gilst, ich weiß, du wohnest nicht
Unter den Musen noch auf dem Olymp,
Jedoch von himmlischer Geburt, gingst du,
Bervor die Berge waren und die Brunnen
Von Wasser quollen, mit der Weisheit um,
Der ewigen Weisheit, deiner Schwester, und
Spieltest mit ihr vor dem allmächtigen Vater,
Dem wohlgefiel dein himmlischer Gesang. (Meier 1969: 7.1-13)

Raphael explains Adam's similarity to God (*PL* Book VIII)

Milton

Nor are thy lips ungraceful, Sire of men,
Nor tongue ineloquent; for God on thee
Abundantly his gifts hath also pour'd
Inward and outward both, his image faire:
Speaking or mute all comliness and grace
Attends thee, and each word, each motion formes. (*PL* 8.218-23)

Bodmer

Auch deine Lippen sind nicht sonder Anmuth, Vater der Menschen, noch deine
Zunge unberedt; denn GOTT, dessen schönes Ebenbildniß du bist, hat auch über
dich beydes inn- und auswendig seine Gaben mit milder Hand ausgegossen; Du
redest oder schweigest, so begleitet dich der Wohlstand und die Artigkeit stets,
und zieret alle deine Worte und alle deine Gebärden. (Bodmer 1732: Book VIII,
43)

Böttger

Adam, nicht Anmut mangelt deinen Lippen
Und deiner Zunge nicht Beredsamkeit;
Denn Gott erteilte deinem Inneren auch
Wie deinem Äußeren reichlich seine Gaben,
Sein Ebenbild; ob redend oder stumm,
Umschweben Liebreiz dich und hohe Anmut

Bei jedem Wort und jeglicher Bewegung. (Böttger 1853: Book VIII, 301)

Meier

Auch deinen Lippen mangelt nicht die Gnade,
Vater der Menschen, noch der Zunge Zauber;
Denn auch auf dich hat seine Gaben Gott
Reichlich gehäuft, inner- wie äußerlich,
Sein holdes Ebenbild; es wartet deiner
Im Reden und im Schweigen aller Reiz
Und Lieblichkeit und bildet jedes Wort,
Jegliche Regung aus; (Meier 1969: 8.260-7)

7. Works Cited

Addison, Joseph. [1711-12]1837. "The Spectator", No. 303. *The Works of Joseph Addison: The Spectator, no. 1-314*, Vol. 1. New York: Harper and Brothers, 436-439.

Alighieri, Dante, 2019. *La Commedia / Die Göttliche Komödie. Italienisch/Deutsch. Neuübersetzung*. Ditzingen: Reclam.

Allen, Grant. 1879. *The Colour*-Sense. London: Trübner and Company.

Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Ariosto, Ludovico. [1516]1964. *Orlando Furioso*. Vols. 2. Eds. E. Sanguinetie M. Turchi and Milano Garzanti. Turin: Einaudi.

Aristotle, 1991. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*. Vols. 2. Ed. Jonathan Barnes. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ascham, Roger. [1570]1909. *The Schoolmaster*. London, New York: Cassell and Company.

Assmann, Aleida. 1974. "Vom Verlustigten Paradeiss zum Verlorenen Paradies". *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 211, 309-19.

Barnett, Pamela R. 1962. *Theodore Haak, F. R. S. (1605-1690): The First German Translator of* Paradise Lost. Den Haag: Mouton.

Barnstone, Willis. 1995. *The Poetics of Translation*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bellos, David. 2011. *Is that a Fish in your Ear? Translation and the Meaning of Everything*. London: Penguin.

Blair, Hugh. [1765]1996. "A Critical Dissertation on the Poems of Ossian". *The Poems of Ossian and Related Works*. Ed. Howard Gaskill. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 343–408.

Blake, William. [1790]1906. *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*. Boston: John W. Luce and Company.

Blakemore, Steven. 1986. "Pandemonium and Babel". *Milton Quarterly* 20.4: 142-145.

Bodmer, Johann Jacob (trans.). 1732. *Johann Miltons Verlust des Paradieses*. Zürich: Marcus Rordorf.

Bodmer, Johann Jacob (trans.). 1742. *Johann Miltons Episches Gedichte von dem verlohrnen Paradiese*. Zürich: Orell.

Bodmer, Johann Jacob. 1740. *Critische Abhandlung von dem Wunderbaren in der Poesie und dessen Verbindung mit dem Wahrscheinlichen. In einer Vertheidigung des Gedichtes Joh. Miltons von dem verlohrnen Paradiese.* Zürich: Orell.

Böttger, Adolf. [1853]2008. Das Verlorene Paradies. Wiesbaden: Matrix Verlag.

Böttger, Adolf. 1847. *Ossian.* Leipzig: Ver1ag Carl B. Lorck.

Breitinger, Johann Jacob. 1740. *Kritische Dichtkunst*, Vol. 2. Zürich: Orell.

Brumble, H. David. 2013. *Classical Myths and Legends in the Middle Ages and Renaissance: A Dictionary of Allegorical Meanings*. London: Routledge.

Butler, Samuel. 1898. *The Iliad of Homer. Rendered into English prose for the use of those who cannot read the original.* Longmans, Green and Co.: London, New York and Bombay.

Butler, Samuel. 1900. *The Odyssey. Rendered into English prose for the use of those who cannot read the original*. London: A. C. Fifield.

Dalby, Andrew. 1995. "The *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* and their Audiences". *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 45, No. 2: 269-279.

Davies, Stevie and Hunter, William B. 1988. "Milton's Urania: 'The Meaning, Not the Name I Call'. *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900.* 28.1: 95-111.

Denis, Michael. [1768]1791. *Ossian und Sineds (Michael Denis) Lieder*, Vol. 10. Wien: Ignaz Alberti.

Detering, Heinrich, Torsten Hoffmann, Silke Pasewalck, Eve Pormeister (Eds.). 2011. *Nationalepen zwischen Fakten und Fiktionen*. Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob und Wilhelm Grimm. 16 Vols. Leipzig 1854-1961. Leipzig 1971. (http://woerterbuchnetz.de). Retrieved 7 July 2015.

Döring, Tobias. 2008. "Am Anfang war die Übersetzung: Macphersons Ossian als Nationalfiktion". *Am Anfang war: Ursprungsfiguren und Anfangskonstruktionen der Moderne*, Eds. Inka Mülder-Bach und Eckhard Schumacher. München: Fink, 173-190.

Dryden, John (trans.). [1697]1909. *Virgil's Aeneid*. New York: P.F. Collier and Son.

DuBois, Page. 1982. *History, Rhetorical Description and the Epic: From Homer to Spenser*. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer.

Evelyn-White, Hugh G. 1914. *The Homeric Hymns and Homerica with an English Translation by Hugh G. Evelyn-White. Theogony.* Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann Ltd.

Fairclough, H. Rushton (trans.). [1935]1969. "Virgil. The Aeneid". *Virgil*, 2 Vols. Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Fallon, Stephen. 2014. "Milton as Narrator in Paradise Lost". *The Cambridge Companion to* Paradise Lost. Ed. Louis Schwartz. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ferry, Anne. 1963. *Milton's Epic Voice: The Narrator in "Paradise Lost"*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Fish, Stanley. 1997. *Surprised by Sin: The Reader in Paradise Lost*. 2nd ed., London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gaskill, Howard (Ed.). 1996. *The Poems of Ossian and Related Works*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Genette, Gerard. 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gladstone, William Ewart. 1858. *Studies on Homer and the Homeric Age*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. 1774. *Die Leiden des jungen Werthers*. Leipzig: Weygandschen Buchhandlung.

Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. 1829. "Dichtung und Wahrheit". *Goethes Werke. Vollständige Ausgabe letzter Hand*. Vol. 25. Stuttgart, Tübingen: Cotta.

Goodman, Nelson. 1978. *Ways of Worldmaking*. Indianapolis, Indiana: Hackett Publishing Company.

Gottschall, Rudolf von. 1871. "Adolf Böttger. Ein literarisches Portrait". *Unsere Zeit. Deutsche Revue der Gegenwart*. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 118-128.

Gottsched, Johann Christoph. [1730]1751. *Versuch einer critischen Dichtkunst. Vierte, sehr vermehrte Auflage*. Leipzig: Bernhard Christoph Breitkopf.

Gottsched, Johann Christoph. 1748. *Grundlegung einer deutschen Sprachkunst*. Leipzig: Bernhard Christoph Breitkopf.

Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (BAGD, 3rd Edition), Frederick W. Danker, Ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Grimm, Jacob. [1835]2007. *Deutsche Mythologie: Vollständige Ausgabe*. 2. Aufl., Wiesbaden: Marix Verlag.

Grimm, Wilhelm. [1818]1992. "[Rezension zu:] Ossians Gedichte. Rhythmisch übersetzt von J. G. Rhode. Zweyte verbesserte Ausgabe". Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm. *Forschungsausgabe*. Ed. Ludwig Erich Schmitt. Abt. 2: *Die Werke*

Wilhelm Grimms. Vol. 2: *Kleinere Schriften 2*. Ed. Otfried Ehrismann. Hildesheim et al.: Olms Weidmann.

Haak, Theodore (Trans.). [ca.1667]1962. "Das Verlustigte Paradeiss". *Theodore Haak, F.R.S. (1605-1690): The First German Translator of* Paradise Lost. Ed. Pamela R. Barnett. The Hague: Mouton, 189-260.

Hale, John. 1997. *Milton's Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halliwell, Stephen. 2002. *The Aesthetics of Mimesis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Haydon, Liam D. 2014. "Ambiguous words: Post-lapsarian language in *Paradise Lost*". Renaissance Studies, 30.2: 174-190.

Heffernan, James. 2004. *Museum of Words. The Poetics of Ekphrasis from Homer to Ashbery*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich (1823–1829/1835): "Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik. III". *Werke in 20 Bänden*, Vol. 15. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp Taschenbuch.

Herder, Johann Gottfried [1795]1883. "Homer, ein Günstling der Zeit". *Sämmtliche Werke*. Vol. 18. Ed. Bernhard Suphan. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 420-446.

Herder, Johann Gottfried. 1773. "Auszug aus einem Briefwechsel über Ossian und die Lieder alter Völker". Herder, Goethe, Frisi, Möser. 1968. *Von Deutscher Art und Kunst. Einige fliegende Blätter*. Ed. Dietrich Irmscher. Stuttgart: Philip Reclam, 7-62.

Herman, Peter C. 1998. "'Warring Chains of Signifiers': Metaphoric Ambivalence and the Politics of *Paradise Lost*", *Texas Studies in Literature and Language*. 40. 3: 268-92.

Herman, Peter C. 2003: "*Paradise Lost*, the Miltonic 'Or,' and the Poetics of Incertitude". *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900*. 43.1: 181-211.

Jerome: "Epistula LVII". *Ad Pammachium De Optimo Genere Interpretandi*. (http://www.bible-researcher.com). Retrieved 15 March 2016.

Johnson, Samuel. 1818. *A Dictionary of the English Language*. Vol. 3. London: Longman.

Kant, Immanuel. [1790]2017. *The Critique of Judgement: Immanuel Kant*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

King James Version (KJV). 1611. The King James Bible Online (https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/1611-Bible). Retrieved 24 May 2015.

Kirby-Smith, H. T. 1996. *The Origins of Free Verse*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Koelb, Janice Hewlett. 2006 *The Poetics of Description. Imagined Places in European Literature.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lass, Roger. 1999. "Phonology and Morphology". *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Volume III: 1476-1776*. Ed. Roger Lass. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 56–186.

Lauder, William. [1750]2018.*An Essay on Milton's Use and Imitation of the Moderns, in His Paradise Lost (Classic Reprint)*. London: Forgotten Books.

Leavis, F.R. 1959. *Revaluation. Tradition and Development in English Poetry.* London: Chatto & Windus.

Leonard, John. 1999: "Language and Knowledge in *Paradise Lost*". *The Cambridge Companion to Milton*. Ed. Dennis Danielson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 130-143.

Levenson, Jon Douglas. 1993. *The Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament, and Historical Criticism: Jews and Christians in Biblical Studies*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press

Luther, Martin. [1530]1965. *Sendbrief vom Dolmetschen*. Ed. Karl Bischoff. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

Luther, Martin. *Die Bibel. Nach der Übersetzung Martin Luthers*. Bibeltext in der revidierten Fassung von 1984, Stuttgart 1985.

Macpherson, James (Trans.). 1773. *Iliad*. London: T. Becket and P. A. De Hondt.

Macpherson, James. [1760]1996. "Fragments of Ancient Poetry", 2nd edition. *The Poems of Ossian and Related Works*. Ed. Howard Gaskill. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1-31.

Macpherson, James. [1761/62]1996. "Preface to *Fingal*". *The Poems of Ossian and Related Works*. Ed. Howard Gaskill. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 35-38.

Macpherson, James. [1765a]1996. "A Dissertation concerning the Antiquity of the Poems of Ossian" in The Works of Ossian, Vol. I. *The Poems of Ossian and Related Works*. Ed. Howard Gaskill. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 43-52.

Macpherson, James. [1765b]1996. "Fingal: An Ancient Epic Poem in Six Books" in The Works of Ossian, Vol. I. *The Poems of Ossian and Related Works*. Ed. Howard

Gaskill. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 53-104, (plus the endnotes by Macpherson in Gaskill 1996: 419-436)

Macpherson, James. [1765c]1996. "A Dissertation" in The Works of Ossian, Vol. II. *The Poems of Ossian and Related Works*. Ed. Howard Gaskill. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 205-224.

Macpherson, James. [1765d]1996. "Temora: An Ancient Epic Poem in Eight Books" in The Works of Ossian, Vol. II. *The Poems of Ossian and Related Works*. Ed. Howard Gaskill. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 225-292, (plus the endnotes by Macpherson in Gaskill 1996: 479-529)

Macpherson, James. [1773]1996. "Preface to *The Poems of Ossian*". *The Poems of Ossian and Related Works*. Ed. Howard Gaskill. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 409-412.

Macpherson, James. [before 1761/62]1996. "Advertisement preceding 1st edition of *Fingal*". *The Poems of Ossian and Related Works*. Ed. Howard Gaskill. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 33.

Magnusson, Magnus (2006): *Fakers, Forgers & Phoneys*, Edinburgh: Mainstream Publishing.

Marx, Karl. [1857/58]1983. Einleitung zu den "Grundrissen der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie". *Karl Marx – Friedrich Engels Werke*. Institut für Marxismus-Leninismus beim ZK der SED, Eds. Vol. 42. Berlin: Carl Dietz Verlag, 15-45.

McMohan, Robert. 1998. *The Two Poets of* Paradise Lost. Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press.

Meier, Hans Heinrich (Trans.). 1969. *Das Verlorene Paradies. Von John Milton.* Stuttgart: P. Reclam.

Merchant, Paul. 2010. "Epic in Translation". *Cambridge Companion to The Epic*. Ed. Catherine Bates. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 146-263.

Milton, John. [1654]2011. *An Apology for Smectymnuus with the Reason of Church-Government by John Milton ... (1654)*. Eebo Editions, Proquest.

Milton, John. 1642. *Reason of Church Government*. The Milton Reading Room, Ed. Thomas H. Luxon. (www.dartmouth.edu/~milton). Retrieved 13 March 2015.

Milton, John. 1674. *Paradise Lost*. The Milton Reading Room, Ed. Thomas H. Luxon. (www.dartmouth.edu/~milton). Retrieved 13 March 2015.

Murray, A.T. 1919. *The Odyssey with an English Translation by A.T. Murray, PH.D. in two volumes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, Ltd.

Opitz, Martin. 1624. *Buch von der Deutschen Poeterey*. Breslau: Deutsches Textarchiv. (www.deutschestextarchiv.de/opitz_buch_1624). Retrieved 14 October 2018.

Oxford English Dictionary. (www.oed.com). Retrieved 19 August 2018.

Pearson, Raymond. 1999. "History and Historians in the Service of Nationbuilding". *National History and Identity: Approaches to the Writing of National History in the North-East Baltic Region Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. Ed. Michael Branch. Studia Fennica. Ethnologica 6, Helsinki: 63–77.

Pittock, Murray. 1998. "James Macpherson and the Jacobite Code", *From Gaelic to Romantic: Ossianic Translations*. Eds. Fiona Stafford and Howard Gaskill. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 41-50.

Pittock. 2012. "Enlightenment, Romanticism and the Scottish Canon: Cosmopolites or Narrow Nationalists?" *Cambridge Companion to Scottish Literature*. Ed. Gerard Carruthers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 86-102.

Plato. *Plato in Twelve Volumes*, Vols. 5 & 6. Paul Shorey (Trans.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press and London: William Heinemann Ltd. 1969.

Poole, Robert. 6 September 2005. "John Dee and the English Calendar: Science, Religion and Empire". *Institute of Historical Research*. Archived from the original on 2007-09-30. Retrieved 26 October 2006.

Quint, David. 2014. *Inside Paradise Lost. Reading the Designs of Milton's Epic*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ricks, Christopher. 1963. *Milton's Grand Style*. Oxford: Claredon.

Robinson, George. 2008. *Essential Torah*. New York: Knopf Doubleday Group.

Rose, William Stewart (Trans). 1823. *The Orlando Furioso* translated into English verse from the Italian of Ludovico Ariosto with notes. London: John Murray Albemarle Street.

Schaff, Barbara. 2011. "Vom vielgelesenen zum ungelesenen Text: Ossians Vermächtnis in der schottischen Kultur". *Nationalepen zwischen Fakten und Fiktionen*. Eds. Heinrich Detering, Torsten Hoffmann, Silke Pasewalck, Eve Pormeister. Tartu: Tartu University Press, 93-114.

Schlegel, Friedrich. 1986. "Sich 'von dem Gemüthe des Lesers Meister' machen. Zur Wirkungsästhetik der Poetik Bodmers und Breitingers". *Europäische Hochschulschriften*. Frankfurt am Main u. a.: Lang.

Smith, Nigel. 2016. "Haak's Milton". *Milton in the Long Restoration*. Eds. Blair Hoxby and Ann Baynes Coiro. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 379-396.

Stafford, Fiona J. 1996. "Introduction: The Ossianic Poems of James Macpherson". *The Poems of Ossian and Related Works*. Ed. Howard Gaskill. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, v-xviii.

Stafford, Fiona J. 2005. "Ossian, Primitivism, Celticism". *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*. Vol. 3, 1660-1790. Eds. Stuart Gillespie and David Hopkins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 416-426.

Stanihurst, Richard (Trans.). [1583]2007. *Thee first foure bookes of Virgil his Aeneis translated intoo English heroical verse by Richard Stanyhurst*. Ann Arbor, Michigan and Oxford, UK: Text Creation Partnership.

Steiner, Thomas R. 1975. *English Translation Theory 1650-1800*. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Surrey, Henry Howard, Earl of. [1557]1908. *The poems of Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey*. London: George Bell.

Taterka, Thomas. 2011. "Die Nation erzählt sich selbst. Zum europäischen Nationalepos des 19. Jahrhunderts". *Nationalepen zwischen Fakten und Fiktionen*. Eds. Heinrich Detering, Torsten Hoffmann, Silke Pasewalck, Eve Pormeister. Tartu: Tartu University Press, 20-72.

Trappen, Stefan. 2002. "Dialektischer und klassicher Gattungsbegriff bei Opitz". *Martin Opitz (1597-1639): Nachahmungspoetik und Lebenswelt*. Eds. Thomas Borgstedt and Walter Schmitz. Berlin: DeGruyter, 88-98.

Trattner, Walter I. 1964. "God and Expansion in Elizabethan England: John Dee, 1527–1583". Journal of the History of Ideas. 25. 1: 17-34.

Venuti, Lawrence (Ed.). 2000. *The Translation Study Reader*. London: Routledge.

Vergil. 1900. *Bucolics, Aeneid, and Georgics of Vergil*. J. B. Greenough. Boston: Ginn and Co.

Webb, Ruth. 1999. "Ekphrasis Ancient and Modern: The Invention of a Genre". *Word & Image*. 15.1: 7-18.

Zeller, Bernhard (Ed.). 1982. *Weltliteratur. Die Lust am Übersetzen im Jahrhundert Goethes*. Marbacher Kataloge 37, Deutsche Schillergesellschaft Marbach. München: Kösel-Verlag.

Zimmer, Dieter E. 1997. *Deutsch und anders. Die Sprache im Modernisierungsfieber*.
Hamburg: Rowohlt.