

udc 821.111.09-193.3 Shakespeare W.
821.111'255.4=163.41
doi 10.18485/bells.2015.7.2

Jelisaveta Milojević
University of Belgrade
Faculty of Philology
English Department

OVER AND BEYOND: THE FUSION OF TRUTH AND POETRY IN SHAKESPEARE'S SONNET 20 AND ITS SERBIAN TRANSLATIONS

Dedicated to Professor Draginja Pervaz

Abstract

This paper considers Shakespeare's Sonnet 20 through analysis of the original and extant Serbian translations, which are compared in terms of the quality of their translation solutions alongside the author's own translation, presented here in print for the first time. The criteria applied in the evaluation of the translations demand for there to be a correlation between the literal and the poetic content evoked through sound and rhythm as a bridge across which the truth translates into supratruth. Sonnet 20 is written in feminine rhyme, and is the only poem of this kind in the sequence of 154 sonnets. Key terms from the field of translation criticism are emphasized, the limits of poetic license are examined, and expert knowledge is enjoined as a crucial foundation for talent. It is imperative that the translation critic vindicate the undefended authority of the poet, who has the right to his own thought and expression.

Key words: sonnets, rereading, translation, translation criticism, poetic license, truth, supratruth

1. Introduction

Not 50 years since the publication of William Shakespeare's *Sonnets* in Serbian, a new translation of his Sonnet 20 is presented here to readers. It is observed that there has been a need for a new translation that would invalidate the serious errors made up to now and approximate the original as closely as possible.

First, we shall answer the question: *Why translate that which is already translated?* Or, in other words: *What purpose does translation criticism serve?*

“Weak translations should perhaps not be given greater attention than weak original works if it were not for the question of false representations of the original. A weak writer speaks in his own name only; a weak translator lends his voice to great poets also. This is why the translation critic is the only vindicator of the undefended author of the original.” (Konstantinović 1981: 123)

“In reading a weak translation the reader most often lives with the false belief that the poet, whose greatness he does not perceive, has created an ephemeral work of significance only to his contemporaries and compatriots (Konstantinović 1981: 122, 123).” As a reader of Shakespeare's sonnets, I would have also subscribed to such a conviction had I not been consumed by a twofold suspicion: that Shakespeare had written ephemera and that the existing translations exhibited an expertise that I was incapable of perceiving. My suspicions were allayed the moment I took up the original – the poems revealed themselves in their full splendor and the translations were but shadows of a shadow. Thence my decision to stand in defense of the poet as far as my academic and poetic strengths would allow. Thence, too, the decision to print the original alongside the translation. And thence my decision to take a critical look at the entire body of sonnets translated into Serbian thus far and to put forward my translation solutions, which speak more eloquently than any criticism (Milojević 2012).

In the text that follows, Sonnet 20 will be reread from the translator's perspective and, by way of introduction, the formal and thematic elements of Shakespeare's sonnets will be discussed: subject matter, figures of speech, rhythm and meter, and structure, while answers will be given to general questions such as: Why the sonnets, again? Why translate that which has already been translated? Can someone who does not know the

source language translate poetry with the assistance of a prose translation by someone who does know it? Where are the limits to poetic license in adaptation? Are the expert and the translator to be the same person? Can a translation be criticized by someone who has no command of the source language? What purpose does translation criticism serve? As I think that translation criticism is a worthwhile endeavor, and by way of an apology, for illustrative purposes, I present to readers side-by-side analysis and criticism of a few translation-adaptations of Sonnet 20.

2. The sonnets' themes

Shakespeare's sonnet sequence contains 154 poems, first printed in quarto in 1609. In the sonnets, the poet addresses various themes, which are crowned by that of love. Beneath the aegis of love, the themes discussed include the brevity of human life, the transience of beauty, and the prickings of the flesh. Figures of speech, imagery, and tone accompany the various themes (compare, for example, Sonnet 116 and Sonnet 151, which respectively speak of ideal and carnal love). We shall, by way of illustration, cite the concrete themes of individual sonnets or their lines: the perpetuation of beauty and the benefits of procreation (Sonnets 1-16), praise of the beloved in terms of physical as well as spiritual beauty (Sonnets 20 and 53), separation from the beloved (Sonnets 27-32), love guiding out of darkness into light (Sonnet 29, Sonnet 66), unrequited love (Sonnets 33-42), amorous longing and anxieties (Sonnets 43-55), the pleasure of the hope and fancy of love (Sonnets 52-53), proof of love (Sonnet 54), romantic doubts (Sonnets 56-75), jealousy (Sonnets 75-96), the triumph of love (Sonnets 100-126).

3. Figures of speech

When reading the sonnets, an impression imposes itself that Shakespeare did not, strategically, in a *l'art pour l'art* or exhibitionist sense, actively seek to employ particular stylistic figures or rhetorical techniques. When Shakespeare wrote the sonnets he did not, it seems, consciously or self-servingly place an emphasis on the use of stylistic figures and in older edited editions of the sonnets little attention was devoted to style.

Today, however, at a time when texts are meticulously scrutinized, much attention is given to the deconstruction of the sonnets and the use of figures of speech and stylistic figures, such as: alliteration, assonance, antithesis, enjambment, metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, oxymoron, personification, internal rhyme, wordplay, allusion, sexual allusion, double entendre, multiple associations... Readers may find examples and interpretations of the employment of those figures in the commentary to representative volumes of the *Sonnets* in editions issued by the esteemed publishing houses of Cambridge University Press (*Sonnets*, CUP: 1996) and Penguin (John Kerrigan, ed. *William Shakespeare: The Sonnets and A Lover's Complaint*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1986). The sonnets, as the union of functional, stylistic ornamentation and powerful emotional cohesion and transposition, have culminated in works like the exceptionally beautiful Sonnets 5, 29, 33, 71, and 116. A few more words about style: any stylistic analysis, whether an end unto itself or carried out with the intent to understand the text and translation, ought to be preceded by competent research into the meaning of the words, which in Shakespeare's day did not have the same meaning as they do today. This step is *sine qua non* but we are nonetheless witnesses of the categorical failure of certain translations to convey accurate meaning or to correctly identify relations between words appearing in collocations and associations. It is important for the translator to have a healthy dose of caution – that will lead him to check even the meaning of words he thinks he knows and so in this way prevent any errors. For example: *wasted time* (Sonnet 106) meant “time spent” but today *wasted* means *spent to no purpose*; words that today have a specific meaning, like *hideous* (cf. Sonnet 12) or *gaudy* (cf. Sonnet 1), would often have multiple meanings. Fortunately, today we have at our disposal *glossaries* of Shakespeare's words, the *OED* can also be accessed *online* together with various etymological dictionaries – translators need only, as the profession demands, deflate their ego and approach the dictionary, occasionally dictionaries, to avoid any oversights. Counter to the cursoriness and ignorance of translators stands the objective difficulty tied to the original: sometimes the inscrutability of the original is a matter of fact: we refer readers to the gloss accompanying Sonnet 20, lines 1-2; Sonnet 27, lines 13-14 (*Sonnets*, CUP, 1996). So, it is possible for there to be different readings of the meaning, which is, of course, reflected in translation. We shall add the following thought: “A poetic work is often inadequately transparent and as such – enigmatic, the translation should also remain (Konstantinović 1981: 126)”.

4. Rhythm and meter

Shakespeare's sonnets are written in iambic pentameter, which means that every line has ten syllables divided into five metrical feet, which, themselves, consist of two syllables of which the first is unstressed (or short) and the second, stressed (or long). Sonnet 20 is the only sonnet in the entire opus of 154 sonnets to be written in feminine rhyme (finishing in unstressed syllables). This fact may reveal a connection with the theme that the sonnet deals with and point to the inextricable, intrinsic, connection between the form and content of the poem. We shall mention in this context the authoritative opinion of Alen Howard (cited in: Barton 1984c), according to which the importance of rhythm and sound in Shakespeare is paramount: sound translates into a sphere above and beyond basic meaning into a sphere of metameaning; in the words of John Barton, there are three fundamental pillars of support in playing Shakespeare: "Truth of reality. Truth of poetry, which is a little bit of super-reality. And truth of character. It is the fusion of poetry, truth, and character that is required in Shakespeare" (ibid.).

In Serbian poetry, in accordance with the descending rhythm of literary language, descending meters are dominant: the trochee and dactyl. For Serbian translations of Shakespeare, Hugo Klajn suggested the dactyl-trochee meter while Bogdan Popović proposed the dodecasyllabic (*dvanaesterac*) instead of the decasyllabic (*deseterac*) because, "the iambic decasyllabic suits neither the splendor or color of the diction nor the depth of Shakespeare's thought" (cited in: Klajn 1964: 237). Because this paper addressing Sonnet 20 considers it from the perspective of translation, I will also add that I think that the rhythmic essence of every language is distinctive and that it is characteristically expressed in a particular way – so that the essence of the Serbian language is trochaic and this fact must be respected in translation; for the translation to resonate with the rhythmic essence of the native tongue it must pulse only in that rhythm. Hence the senselessness of all the insistence on the literal transference of rhythm and meter from the source language into the target language: the translated poem must bear the vibrations of the linguistic essence of the language into which it is being translated.

5. The structure of the sonnets

The structure of Shakespeare's sonnets is such that they comprise fourteen lines. The first twelve lines are divided into three quatrains that develop a particular theme for it to be underscored in a couplet at the end, in lines 13 and 14. The rhyme scheme is ababcdcdefefgg. This type of sonnet structure is usually referred to as the English sonnet or Shakespearean sonnet, in contrast with, for example, the Italian Petrarchan sonnet, whose form is divided into two main parts: the rhyme scheme for the octave is abbaabba and that for the sestet is cdcdcd (or cdecde). On the basis of the formal features we have listed of the Petrarchan and Shakespearean (Elizabethan, English) sonnets thus far, it is already possible to see that the difference between these two kinds of sonnets is not only formal but also intrinsic to the extent to which form and content are unified: the Petrarchan sonnet has a binary structure – an octave plus a sestet – which, in terms of content, means that in the first part, up to the turning point, an argument or emotion is developed to culmination, and in the second part of the structure this intellectual or emotional situation is resolved; Shakespeare's sonnet comprises three quatrains and a couplet, which are the arena of an alternate rationality and another way of producing argumentation and rhetorical constructions. We recall that Shakespeare was also a dramatic writer and that some sonnets are poetic counterparts to his theatrical works, also consisting of a tripartite structure with a thesis. The poets who wrote both Petrarchan and Shakespearean sonnets were aware of the *essential* difference between the respective forms and they evidenced, in creative terms, the distinction discussed above; Keats, the anthological English poet, spoke with particular eloquence about this difference.

6. Why the sonnets, again? Why translate that which has already been translated?

The answer is: for at least three reasons. Poetic translations are the most demanding, and as such it is always possible for translations to be done differently and better, considering that translation is but an *approximation of the ideal* and not an actual realization of the ideal. On the other hand, new translations are necessary because language itself is *dynamic* in its

temporal and social development so at certain times, communication between the language of the translation and that of the reader becomes strained or impossible (e.g. Shaw 1970). There is another reason, perhaps the most important of all: *it is the duty of every professional and translator to, necessarily, stand in defense of the poet – the author of the original – and to correct predecessors' errors, insofar as they are such that they completely alter what the source is saying* (cf. e.g. the original and the translations of Sonnet 20 by Raičković and Angjelinović). We can only imagine, as a result of terrible translations that miss the point of the original, how much is borne by the literary criticism and the history of literature that does not deal directly with original works but relies on this type of translation, never suspecting that the translation is inaccurate; the same is true of theatre, where an inadequate translation leads directors, then actors, and subsequently the public to a perpetually deficient and poor interpretation. “A criminal act is always something that took place and had an effect and consequences at one time in the past, and which are relatively short-term. A bad translation has an influence and consequences in the future, which are lasting (Živojinović 1981: 273).” It was for these reasons that the idea was conceived to translate Shakespeare’s sonnets once again (Milojević 2012). “A bad translation can only be confuted by a good one. Opinions cannot be changed, only creative output (ibid: 267).”

7. Can someone who does not know the source language translate poetry with the assistance of a prose translation by someone who does know it?

There have been, and are, those of the opinion that knowledge of the source language is desirable but not necessarily *sine qua non*. One of the poets who believed it possible to translate from a language he did not speak was Ezra Pound. Appearing in an anthology of translations entitled *Ripostes*, published in 1912, was Pound’s translation of the 8th century poem *The Seafarer*, written in Old English: the translation was not literal but represented his own interpretation of the poem, destined for readers who did not know Old English – and is an adaptation, a poem unto itself, and not a translation. This adaptation and, accordingly, this practice – translation from an unfamiliar language, has been fervently championed but also attacked. Even today there is a practice but also a professional

view according to which *intuition* is the ultimate criterion (Konstantinović, president of the Association of Literary Translators of Serbia 2014). I think, however, that insofar as intuition is introduced as a sufficient and pre-eminent condition for translation then what follows is that *anything goes* because that is precisely what the translator ‘feels’. Then, we observe, every discussion of the quality of a translation becomes superfluous – anything goes. We would like to say, in this venue, something about artistic license. *Licentia Poetica*, also known as ‘poetic license’, or simply ‘license’, in terms of how it is seen from the point of view of translation, is most often a euphemism that signifies the distortion of facts; simplification, stylization, or metaphorical concentration of images; omission or addition of linguistic material; distortion of grammar rules and verbal reshaping of the original text with the intention to reinvigorate and improve the original through vested power. Those who make use of poetic license, whether consciously or not, consider it to be the absolute discretionary right of the poet-translator, to be necessarily tolerated and condoned by the public. Speaking of the poetic approach to translation Milovan Danojlić says: “According to that understanding, the original is not considered a safeguarded model that must at all costs be protected and carried over, but is taken as a challenge, stimulus, model from which to write comparable poems... It was important to give as personal a touch as possible to the new version, breathe new life into it, and endow it with an autonomous aesthetic influence. The undertaking was as attractive and worthy of attention as the personality carrying it out was interesting (1981: 247-8)”. Examples of the extent to which poetic license leads to improvisations, adaptations, and a lack of comprehension of the original may be found in the examples of translation-adaptations in the comparative analysis of Shakespeare’s Sonnet 20 that I present to the reader below.

8. Are the expert and the translator to be the same person?

It has been suggested that only authors and poets should translate poetry and that, insofar as there is a choice, preference should be given to poets. We cite a typical example of the reasoning: “The translation of poetic work, performing a service to the original, belongs to the literature of the language into which the work is translated (Borivoje Nedić, epilogue to *Suština o Šekspiru* [*The Essential Shakespeare*], by J. Dover Wilson, trans.

and commentary by Borivoje Nedić 1959: 146))”; Nedić further writes that he personally, for those reasons, favors the translations by: D. Angjelinović, J. Torbarina, S. Stefanović, V. Živojinović, B. Nedić, S. Pandurović, Ž. Simić. Many of our country’s esteemed poets, revered for the oeuvres they penned, have been inspired by Shakespeare’s sonnets and made attempts at translation-adaptation into Serbian: Laza Kostić and Miloš Crnjanski, for example. When the time came for the entire opus of sonnets to be published in Serbian, the task was assigned to a poet by vocation – Stevan Raičković. Does this mean *a priori* that a poet, through the mere fact of being a poet, will best translate another poet? We shall make an inspired attempt to answer that question in the text that follows – our answer is: there is no guarantee, rather, often, the opposite is true. Bogdan Popović wrote of Laza Kostić’s translation that it is one of the worst translations in our country’s literary history and Jovan Skerlić writes that, “In his translation, Kostić took from Shakespeare all of his strengths and gave to him all his own flaws: his translations are not Shakespeare but a travesty of Shakespeare” (cited in: Klajn 1964: 232). The translations by Svetislav Stefanović also drew severe criticism, at the forefront of which was that of Velimir Živojinović, who wrote that the translations were unclear, diluted, and devoid of a trace of the poetic spirit. Translation criticism has also recorded a first-rate example of where one poet has translated another. Klajn deems that Shakespeare was best translated by Oton Župančič, for which he finds an explanation not only in the talent of the poet but also in the particularities of the Slovenian language (ibid: 234).

Some poets in our milieu had literal translations prepared which they then converted into rhyme (Stevan Raičković poetically reworked Shakespeare’s sonnets by drawing from a prose translation by Živojia Simić). These writers of ours, esteemed, and rightfully so, above all for the opuses they have authored, believed and through the very act of translation wished to confirm that it is possible to translate from an unfamiliar language. “The poet naturally inclines towards adaptation: he thinks, he believes, that much is permitted him (Danajlić 1981: 248)”. The question that logically presents itself is: Where are the limits to poetic license and when does the poet-translator begin to distort and jeopardize the original? The answer to this question may be found further on in this paper where the original, translations, and adaptations of various authors are compared. My critique, which resulted from a comparative analysis of all the originals and all of Raičković’s translation-adaptations (we

intentionally write *translation-adaptation* because its fruit is *neither fish nor foul* – neither do they fulfill the rigorous demands of translation nor are they individual poetic creations with a strong individual stamp), is that a poet cannot translate nor write an adaptation without a thorough knowledge of the language from which he is translating and I further think that both such knowledge and the poetic gift must be united within the same person.

9. Rereading Sonnet 20

My basic thought is there can be no good translation without a proper understanding of the text being translated: the talent of the translator must be supported by knowledge. Cited below are the originals – different, due to different editorial rereadings (cf. the 1609 Quarto, CUP, Penguin, and Arden editions) and three translations of Sonnet 20 followed by comparative analysis. From that analysis, it becomes clear that the starting point of translation is difficult: it implies, at every moment, an active relationship with the original text, which in different editions may be different; deliberation at each step of the way; a profound knowledge of the language and the literary opus of the author, upon which will lean, as on a good foundation, the talent for translation and versification.

9.1. The original text of Sonnet 20

William Shakespeare
Sonnet 20
The 1609 Quarto Version

A Womans face with natures owne hande painted,
Haste thou, the Master Mistris of my passion,
A womans gentle hart but not acquainted
With shifting change as is false womens fashion,
An eye more bright then theirs, lesse false in rowling:
Gilding the obiect where-vpon it gazeth,
A man in hew all Hews in his controwling,

Which steales mens eyes and womens soules amaseth,
And for a woman wert thou first created,
Till nature as she wrought thee fell a dotinge,
And by addition me of thee defeated,
By adding one thing to my purpose nothing.
But since she prickt thee out for womens pleasure,
Mine be thy loue and thy louses vse their treasure.

Sonnet 20
Shakespeare's Sonnets
Arden Shakespeare: Third Series, 1997

A woman's face with nature's own hand painted
Hast thou, the master mistress of my passion;
A woman's gentle heart, but not acquainted
With shifting change, as is false women's fashion;
An eye more bright than theirs less false in rolling,
Gilding the object whereupon it gazeth;
A man in hue, all hues in his controlling,
Which steals men's eyes and women's souls amazeth;
And for a woman wert thou first created,
Till nature as she wrought thee fell a-doting,
And by addition me of thee defeated,
By adding one thing to my purpose nothing:
But since she pricked thee out for women's pleasure,
Mine be thy love and thy love's use their treasure.

William Shakespeare
Sonnet 20
New Penguin Shakespeare, 1986
New Cambridge Shakespeare, 1996

A woman's face with Nature's own hand painted
Hast thou, the master-mistress of my passion;
A woman's gentle heart, but not acquainted
With shifting change, as is false women's fashion;
An eye more bright than theirs, less false in rolling,
Gilding the object whereupon it gazeth;

A man in hue, all hues in his controlling,
Which steals men's eyes and women's souls amazeth.
And for a womna wert thou first created,
Till Nature as she wrought thee fell a-doting,
And by addition me of thee defeated,
By adding one thing to my purpose nothing.
But since she pricked thee out for women's pleasure,
Mine be thy love, and thy love's use their treasure.

9.2. Comparative analysis of the original text and translations, and translators' relation to the original

The differences among the original texts, in key places, are the following: lines 1-2: in the 1609 edition the word *woman* begins with a capital letter, unlike the CUP, Penguin, and Arden editions; in line 2, we see: *the Master Mistres* (Quarto, 1609), *master-mistress* (CUP and Penguin) and *master mistress* (Arden). Obviously, the editors and proofreaders read into the poem and their rereading of Shakespeare's original corresponded with their wishes and how they themselves understood and interpreted it. It is clear that changes to punctuation are not marginal or irrelevant – on the contrary, the difference among the cited works is crucial, in terms of the essential conceptual difference between that which philologists call binomial noun phrases and, conversely, compounds. *Master*, the way that it appears in *the Master Mistres* in the 1609 version means 'male' but also 'skilled at controlling his followers'. As a compound, the word *master-mistres* means 'having both masculine and feminine sexual attributes' – thus, keeping in mind the sequential word order, is interpreted as, 'you who are the object of my homosexual desire' (cf. Stanivuković 2014). Such an interpretation is present in the translation solutions of Angjelinović and Raičković (see line 2: *gospodaru-gospo mojih strasti* [Angjelinović] and *gospodaru-gospo moje žudi* [Raičković]). The word *passion* (line 2), similarly commonplace, did not mean 'sexual desire or infatuation': seen from the context of the entire body of sonnets and also from that of Shakespeare's entire opus – because a single translation unit of a poem is not of a word but a poem as a whole (cf. "Solutions for translations of poems cannot be sought on the level of lines, and even less so on the level of phrases, rather the unit of translation of a poem – is but the poem [Konstantinović 1981: 126]") – the word *passion* is employed to mean 'suffering', as in, for example,

suffering in the Christian sense, also as in, ‘an attack of frenzy or a heartfelt speech’, thus, spiritual and soulful exaltation. Congruous with this reading is the translation solution in lines 1-2 in Milojević (*Ti, moja si strast, patnja, nadahnuće/ Vladaru, Vladarko, ljubavi moje!*) In translating this verse we went along with the punctuation as it appeared in the 1609 quarto edition, which brings a syntactical sequence of noun plus noun, written with capitalized first letters. In connection with line 7 (*A man in hew all Hews in his controwling*): the word *Hews* has a capitalized letter only in the 1609 edition. This has led interpreters to conjecture that this has to do with an allusion being made to a concrete person by that name but, despite great wishes and a great quest to discover the identity of Hews the person, they have not succeeded in solving the riddle. Even if it is an allusion, I think that the poem, just like any artistic creation, can exist independently, apart from its author – compare the opinion of Eliot and Keats: *A poet can speak of his personal experience but can equally be, through the nature of poetry, a depersonalized medium, a catalyst in a chemical reaction of emotions, the synthesis of which creates an artistic image. Good poetry is impersonal and exists independently from its poet* (Eliot: *Tradition and the Individual Talent*); *A poet, actually, has no identity* (Keats, *Letters I.*, no. 76). In connection with line 10, only in the CUP and Penguin editions does the word *Nature* appear with a capitalized first letter – in the 1609 and Arden’s editions, the word begins with a lower case letter. In our opinion, the capital letter would be related to the following meanings: the personification of nature – in English, as *she* (line 10: *Till Nature as she wrought thee fell a-doting*), which is comprehensible and justifiable in the context of the poem: the idea that Nature, which created the individual in question (*as she wrought thee*), fell hopelessly in love with its creation (*fell a-doting*); *fell a-doting*, it may be remarked, has another meaning as well: ‘made a mistake’; therefore, further interpretation of the following lines is as follows: Nature, with the idea to create you as a woman, became infatuated with you, its creation, so, seeing as she herself is female, deliberately made a mistake and gave to you a male appendage in order to derive full pleasure from intercourse with you – in this way, I (the poet) am left without you and the possibility of completely enjoying sexual relations (lines 9, 10, 11: *And for a woman wert thou first created; / Till Nature, as she wrought thee, fell a-doting, / And by addition of me of thee defeated*). Stevan Raičković’s translation solution (i.e., Živojin Simić’s, who primed him) is completely wrong (*Najpre si stvaran da si nalik ženi,/ Al’ priroda je s željom da te slije/ Zadremala i – otela te meni/ Davši ti nešto što za mene nije*). *Sa željom da te slije* means:

to make of you a homosexual; *zadremala* means: that the mistake was made unintentionally, subconsciously, through a lapse of attention. Danko Angjelinović's translation solution is also inadequate: *Al' predari te iz svojih ulišta, / I tim kroza te prevari i mene, / Trun da ti više, što je za me ništa*. The solution of the third quatrain, as I have conceived it, based on analysis of the original and numerous interpretations made in a critical edition entitled *Sonnets*, is as follows: *Naum Prirode bila je žena / Sve dok se Ona u tebe ne zaljubi. / Dodatak telu, tako, namerna je greška njena / Pa se moja muška namera izgubi*.

9.3. Translations of Sonnet 20

Vilijem Šekspir

Sonet 20

**Translated by Danko Angjelinović
(Beograd: Kultura, 1966)**

Gospodaru-gospo mojih strasti, Narav,
Nježno ti žensko naslikala lice
U ženskom srcu ne dade ti varav
Ni himben kucaj nevjerne ženice.
Ženski je pogled lažniji, a tebi
Jasnije mnogo zlatonosne zjene;
Dječaku nalik sve podvrgneš sebi,
Zanosiš ljude, zatravljuješ žene.
Protivno Narav bit di dade žene,
Al' predari te iz svojih ulišta,
I tim kroza te prevari i mene,
Trun da ti više, što je za me ništa.
Kada te stvori ženam' za žeđanje,
Daj meni ljubav, njima uživanje.

Vilijem Šekspir
Sonet 20

**Translated by Stevan Raičković based on a prose translation
by Živojina Simića (Beograd: Prosveta, 1966)**

O, gospodaru-gospo moje žudi,
Imaš lik slikan rukama prirode
I žensko, nežno srce, al' bez ćudi
Žena, koje se na varljivost svode;
I sjajno oko od ženskog vernije
Koje pozlati sve što takne žena;
Muškog si tela, al' pun čarolije,
Te ti se dive i čovek i žena.
Najpre si stvaran da si nalik ženi,
Al' priroda je s željom da te slije
Zadremala i – otela te meni
Davši ti nešto što za mene nije.
Za uživanje stvorila te ženi,
Daj njoj grljenje, ali ljubav meni.

Vilijem Šekspir
Sonet 20

Translated by Jelisaveta Milojević

Ti, moja si strast, patnja, nadahnuće
Vladaru, Vladarko, ljubavi moje!
Ženskog si lica i duše mekoće
Al' ženski nestalno nije srce tvoje;
U očima ti iskrenost i sjaj vrca
I sve pozlate zraci tvog pogleda;
Privlačiš muške oči i ženska srca –
Muškaraca vladar a muškog izgleda.
Naum Prirode bila je žena
Sve dok se Ona u tebe ne zaljubi.
Dodatak telu, tako, namerna je greška njena
Pa se moja muška namera izgubi.
Da te koriste ženama je drago;
Meni daj ljubav – njima tela blago.

10. Conclusion

The paper presented here on rereading Shakespeare's controversial Sonnet 20 from the aspect of its translation addressed formal, thematic aspects of Shakespeare's sonnets: subject matter, structure, figures of speech, rhythm and meter, the connection between content and form, truth and supratruth, and answered some general questions, including: Why the sonnets, again? Why translate that which has already been translated? Can someone who does not know the source language translate poetry with the assistance of a prose translation by someone who does know it? Where are the limits to poetic license in adaptation? Are the expert and the translator to be the same person? Can a translation be criticized by someone who has no command of the source language? What purpose does translation criticism serve? The following answers are given: there are reasons to translate that which has already been translated because it is always possible for translations to be done differently and better; no one who does not know the source language can translate through the intervention of others – while this is 'possible', there is a strong possibility that the original will be compromised, to criminal extent; the poetic license of the translator-poet must not jeopardize the poet-author, who has an inviolable right to his own distinctive thought and expression; translation criticism cannot be performed by a person who does not have a command of the source language; the person with such knowledge and the translator, i.e., knowledge and talent, must be one and the same. Because I am of the opinion that translation criticism is meaningful, by way of apology, and for the purposes of illustration, I presented readers with side-by-side analysis and criticism of a few translation-adaptations of Sonnet 20 by Shakespeare.

References

- Barton, J. (1984a). *Playing Shakespeare 2 of 9: Using the Verse*. Filmed 1984. YouTube video, 49:08. Posted April 2015. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H3rMaHqH2TE>.
- (1984b). *Playing Shakespeare 4 of 9: Set Speeches & Soliloquies.* Filmed 1984. YouTube video, 51:23. Posted April 2015. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bWt54ABOdzg>.

- (1984c). Playing Shakespeare 9 of 9: Poetry & Hidden Poetry. Filmed 1984. YouTube video, 52:32. Posted April 2015. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qAHJnjYqTik>.
- Bećanović-Nikolić, Z. (2009). Shakespeare's Sonnets in Serbia. In: *William Shakespeare's Sonnets, For the First Time Globally Reprinted. A Quatercentenary Anthology 1609-2009*, edited by Manfred Pfister and Jürgen Gutsch, 587-596. Dozwil: SIGNATHUR, 2009.
- Blakemore Evans, G. (ed.) (1966). *William Shakespeare: The Sonnets*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bertolino, N. (1981). O kritici prevoda poetskih dela. In: Lj. Rajić (ed.), *Teorija i poetika prevođenja*, 159-176. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Booth, S. (ed.) (1977). *Shakespeare's Sonnets*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Crnjanski, M. (1983). Šekspirovi soneti. In: *Eseji*, 194-231. Beograd: Nolit.
- Danojlić, M. (1981). Pesnik kao prevodilac. In: *Teorija i poetika prevođenja*, edited by Ljubiša Rajić, 243-260. Beograd: Prosveta, 1981.
- Eliot, T. S. (1932). *Selected Essays*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Hecht, A. (1966). Introduction to *William Shakespeare: The Sonnets*, G. Blakemore Evans (ed.), 1-28. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ivir, V. (1978). *Teorija i tehnika prevođenja*. Sremski Karlovci: Karlovačka gimnazija.
- Keats, J. (1925). *Letters of John Keats to His Family and Friends*. S. Colvin (ed.). London: Macmillan and Co.
- Kerrigan, J. (ed.) (1986). *William Shakespeare: The Sonnets and A Lover's Complaint*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Introduction to *William Shakespeare: The Sonnets and A Lover's Complaint*, 7-63. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Klajn, H. (1964). *Šekspir i čoveštvo*. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Šekspir kod Jugoslovena. In: *Šekspir i čoveštvo* by Hugo Klajn, 228-242. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Konstantinović, M. (2014). Interview by Meliha Pravdić. *Sporovi u kulturi*. Radio Beograd, Drugi program, February.
- Konstantinović, R. (1981). O prevođenju poezije. In: *Teorija i poetika prevođenja*, Lj. Rajić (ed.), 119-139. Beograd: Prosveta, 1981.
- Kostić, V. (1994). The Sonnet in English Poetry. In: *Stvaralaštvo Viljema Šekspira I*, 83-107. Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga.
- Kovačević, R. (2001). *Sonet u evropskom pesništvu*, zbornik radova. Beograd: Zadužbina Ilije M. Kolarca.

- Landry, H. (1963). *Interpretations in Shakespeare's sonnets*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Levin, Ph. (ed.) (2001). *The Penguin Book of the Sonnet: 500 Years of a Classic Tradition in English*. London: Penguin Books.
- Mabillard, A. (2000). Introduction to Shakespeare's Sonnets *Shakespeare Online.*, accessed February 14, 2012, <http://www.shakespeare-online.com/sonnets/sonnetintroduction.html>.
- Martin, Ph. J. T. (1972). *Shakespeare's Sonnets: Self, Love and Art*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Milojević, J. (2012). *Šekspir: Soneti*. Beograd: Filološki fakultet.
- Nejgebauer, A. (1971). *Tradicionalno i individualno u Šekspirovim Sonetima I-II*. Novi Sad,
- Pfister, M. and J. Gutsch (eds.) (2009). *William Shakespeare's Sonnets for the First Time Globally Reprinted. A Quatercentenary Anthology 1609-2009*. Dozwil: SIGNATHUR.
- Pound, E.. (1912). *Ripostes*. London: Swift & Co, 1912.
- Rajić, Lj. (ed.) (1981). *Teorija i poetika prevođenja*. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Rajić, Lj. (1981). O prevođenju s prevoda. In: *Teorija i poetika prevođenja*, Ljubiša Rajić (ed.), 201-218. Beograd: Prosveta.
- Sekulić, I. (1966). *Eseji i članci*. Novi Sad: Matica srpska.
- Stanivuković, G. (2014). Šekspirova estetika malih oblika: portreti u Sonetima. Lecture, Filološki fakultet, Belgrade, December 5.
- Shakespeare, W. (1966). *Poeme i soneti (Poems and Sonnets)*, adapted by Danko Angjelinović. Beograd: Kultura.
- Shakespeare, W. (1966). *Soneti (Sonnets)*, adapted by Stevan Raičković based on a prose translation by Ž. Simić. Beograd: Prosveta.
- The Shakespeare Glossary*. <http://www.shakespeare-online.com/glossary/>.
- Shakespeare, W. (1901). *Poems and Sonnets: Booklover's Edition*. The University Society and Israel Gollancz (ed.). New York: University Society Press. *Shakespeare Online*. August 20, 2009, accessed February 14, 2012, <http://www.shakespeare-online.com/sonnets/sonnetthemes.html>.
- Shaw, B.. (1970). *Pigmalion*. Trans: Borivoj Nedić, Beograd: Kultura.
- Wilson, Dž. D. (1959). *Sušтина o Šekspiru*. Trans: Borivoje Nedić. Beograd: Kultura.
- Vivian, P. (1990). *A Dictionary of Literary Terms*. London: G. Routledge & sons.
- Wilson, J. D. (ed.) (1969). Shakespeare, William. *The Works of Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wright, G. T. (1988). *Shakespeare's Metrical Art*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Živojinović, B. (1981). Beleške o prevodenju. In: *Teorija i poetika prevodenja*, Lj. Rajić (ed.). 261-278. Beograd: Prosveta.

Received: 25 May, 2015

Accepted for publication: 1 Jun, 2015

Јелисавета Милојевић

ИЗНАД И ПРЕКО: ИСТИНА И СУПРАИСТИНА У ШЕКСПИРОВОМ СОНЕТУ 20 И ЊЕГОВИМ ПРЕВОДИМА НА СРПСКИ

Сажетак

Рад се бави Шекспировим Сонетом 20: анализом оригинала и постојећих превода на српски, поређењем преводних решења и њиховим вредновањем, а даје се и ауторов превод овог сонета који се премијерно објављује на овом месту. Инсистира се на споју дословног и поетског значења сугерисаног звуковношћу и ритмом као мостом који истину преводи у супраистину. Сонет 20 је написан женском римом, једини у опусу од 154 сонета. Апострофирају се кључне теме из области критике превода, испитују се границе песничке слободе у препеву, а поручује се да је експертско знање нужно да би се на њега наслонио таленат. Критичар превода мора императивно стати у одбрану незаштићеног ауторитета песника, који има право на своју мисао и свој израз.

Кључне речи: сонети, рашчитавање, превођење, критика превода, песничка слобода, истина, супраистина