

The Whirlwind of Passion

New Critical Perspectives
on William Shakespeare

The Whirlwind of Passion

New Critical Perspectives
on William Shakespeare

Edited by

Petar Penda

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



The Whirlwind of Passion:
New Critical Perspectives on William Shakespeare

Edited by Petar Penda

This book first published 2016

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2016 by Petar Penda and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-9046-4

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-9046-5

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Petar Penda	
Translation as Empowerment of Cultural Mediation: Revaluing Relevance, Equivalence and Discourse Shift	10
Željka Babić	
Unfrequented Woods: Taking <i>The Two Gentlemen of Verona</i> Seriously	28
Nicholas Birns	
<i>Hamlet</i> Torn between Catholicism and Protestantism.....	48
Nick Ceramella	
The Virginia Company's Role in <i>The Tempest</i>	71
Barry R. Clarke	
Manifest and Latent Bodies in Selected Shakespeare Texts and their Slovene Translations	94
Michelle Gadpaille and Simon Zupan	
More than Word Can Wield the Matter: Rhetorical Deceptions and Linguistic Inflation in Shakespeare's Tragedies	113
Vladislava Gordić Petković	
"Despair, therefore, and die:" The Poetics of Memory in <i>Richard III</i>	133
Anthony Guy Patricia	
"'Tis the times' plague when madmen lead the blind": Madness and Blindness in Shakespeare's <i>King Lear</i> and Bond's <i>Lear</i>	159
Milena Kaličanin	
"Fixing" Shakespeare: What Happens When We Get Bored with the Bard	180
Cason Murphy	

Diminutives in Shakespeare: A Contrastive Stylistic Study	196
Tomaž Onič, Urša Marinšek and Simon Zupan	
Shipwreck in Shakespeare's Plays.....	217
Armela Panajoti	
'Trans-gendering' in William Shakespeare's Lady Macbeth	230
Ana Penjak	
The Game of Power in <i>The Merchant of Venice</i> Reflected in the Use of Pronouns.....	251
Andrijana Stokić Penda	
Shakespeare's Sonnets: Truly Elizabethan?	280
Zack Rearick	
What a Dream Was Here: An Ontological Approach to Love and Magic in Shakespeare's <i>A Midsummer Night's Dream</i>	300
Brittany Rebarchik	
If It Live in Your Memory: On Memory, Memorization and Shakespeare.....	324
Cecilia Rubino	
Contributors.....	345

INTRODUCTION

PETAR PENDA

400 years after his death, critics continue to cast aspersions on Shakespeare's work. From almost the moment he started writing, his contemporaries, Frances Meres, Robert Greene and Ben Jonson wrote about his works and this practice of critically appraising Shakespeare's works continued up to this very moment incessantly and profusely. There has been no single period since the end of the sixteenth century that his plays, sonnets and longer poems have not been discussed, idealised, commended or criticised. This fascination with Shakespeare's oeuvre is not so difficult to explain taking into account the Bard's versatile and rich literary production, with "a very large collection of plays by the standard of his contemporaries."¹ Namely, Shakespeare penned forty-four plays, some of them as a co-author, 154 sonnets and four longer poems. Furthermore, his knowledge of his own time and the past, as well as his awareness of the then audience's theatrical preferences and wishes, certainly helped his popularity during his lifetime. It could be said that he even anticipated what would make future theatre-goers and readers tick – the quality of an out-of-time author, or, better to say, an author of all times. Such an achievement is admirable in itself and it goes without saying that the richness of his oeuvre must be one of the "cause[s] of great diversity of interpretation."²

This collection of critical redefinitions of Shakespeare's works proves his popularity nowadays and the volume aims at giving new critical perspectives of his plays and non-dramatic works and thus marks 400 years since his death. The authors presented here observe Shakespeare delineating his plays as both theatrical and literary pieces; they compare his writings to those of his contemporaries and try to precisely position him either as Jacobean or Elizabethan; his works are studies in translation

¹ Hugh Craig, "Authorship" in Arthur F. Kinney (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 23.

² Stanley Wells and Lena Cowen Orlin, *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 4.

in different languages, which gives another dimension and deeper analyses of his literary merits and linguistic means utilised; the authors of this volume also inspect present-day perception and cognition of his works, which emphasises the importance of his works for the contemporary readership; linguistic inspection of Shakespeare's language sheds new light on the meaning of his works, while close readings of some of his plays reveal new interpretative possibilities and nuances of meaning.

Although versatile and covering a wide range of Shakespeare scholarship, chapters presented in this volume are unique in the sense that in all of them we find "the whirlwind of passion,"³ as Shakespeare puts it in *Hamlet*. Namely, the authors are intense and enthusiastic while explicating their arguments and one cannot but notice "the whirlwind of passion," which, as Hamlet suggests to players, "acquire[d] and beget a temperance that may give it smoothness."⁴

Following this vein, Željka Babić, from the University of Banja Luka, deals with translations of Shakespeare's works into Serbian and sees translation as an empowerment of cultural mediation. By pursuing a psycholinguistic path in dealing with translation as a psycho-semiotic phenomenon, this chapter offers a significant reading of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* and *Twelfth Night*. The main focus is on different roles that underline the reader's reactions, which are results of purely linguistic choices made by translators in their endeavor to represent the characters more thoroughly. Although this chapter is primarily focused on revaluing the issues of relevance, equivalence and discourse shift, attention is paid to the possible reconstruction of additional (un)wanted meaning(s), which the target language readers have definitely been offered in the surface and deep levels of the translated texts. The aim of this chapter is also to highlight the mental processes present in the translation process and to show that the process of translation must be understood as an interdisciplinary effort, where linguistic, literary and cultural issues have to be dealt with simultaneously.

Nicholas Birns, from New School University, notes that *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* is often seen as a slight and frivolous comedy, congenial to winsome stage production but one of the least analysed of Shakespeare's plays. However, he argues that *Two Gentlemen*, in fact, mounts a sophisticated social critique, and that the play, while indeed delightfully funny, should be taken seriously. For instance, the Duke's pretensions to authority are revealed as buffoonish, and at the end he must

³ William Shakespeare, *Hamlet* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003), 105.

⁴ Ibid.

yield much of his power to the meritocratic Valentine, who has made himself a force in the state by sheer conviction and honour. That Valentine has teamed up with the Robin Hood-like outlaws in the forest shows that rebellion and dissent can have a role in reforming, if not revolutionising the state, presaging the role of similar areas of “unfrequented woods” as in the Forest of Arden in *As You Like It*. Birns also argues that the incipient mature style in *Two Gentlemen* is not Shakespeare’s first play and that there is internal evidence which puts it after *The Comedy of Errors* and at about the same time as *Titus Andronicus* (a fact evoked by the RSC’s controversial 1981 double production of the plays). The Robin Hood theme of the outlaws in the forest not only shows Shakespeare’s biographical immersion in Midlands folklore but also reveals him using his astonishing gifts of language plotting, and stagecraft in the interests of a broad and compassionate programme of social justice.

Nick Ceramella, from the University of Trent, writes about Christian aspects of *Hamlet*. He claims that religion has traditionally divided Shakespearean critics between those who believe that the Bard’s plays were influenced by the Bible, and those who, starting from the beginning of the twentieth century, were rather doubtful about his religiousness. Many academics underlined the huge influence the Christian faith had not only on Shakespeare, but also on Elizabethan and Jacobean England. Ceramella maintains that the impact Christianity had on Shakespeare can be detected in several of his plays, and that this is certainly the case with *Hamlet*, a tragedy which is particularly significant from this point of view. The author also claims that through Hamlet’s typical contradictions and doubts, religion proves to be a source of spiritual strength, though it may also have a negative and contradictive role in his decision making.

Barry R. Clarke, an independent scholar, examines the Virginia Company’s role in *The Tempest*. The dating evidence for *The Tempest*, the author explicates, is improved by showing that Caliban’s speech on edible things relies on knowledge of the Bermudan cahow, a bird whose behaviour was unknown in England before September 1610. The evidence Clarke provides suggests that Virginia Company documents were sources for the play and that parts of the play date to late 1610. Strong reasons are given as to why Shakespeare would have been prohibited from gaining access to Strachey’s restricted company report ‘True Reportory’. Shakespeare was not a member of the Virginia Company and several Virginia Company publications show a suspicion of actors, which would have made it difficult for him to inspect it. In fact, a sermon delivered by William Crawshaw in February 1610 warned the entire Virginia Council to be wary of players. Furthermore, all letters and reports sent back from

the colony were kept under tight security. So it is unlikely that Shakespeare would have had access to documents upon which the play relies without Virginia Company cooperation. It is suggested that *The Tempest* was used as a political instrument to uphold England's power in the New World, and though Strachey's 'True Reportory' could not have been released for inspection, the Virginia Company must have cooperated in providing information for the writing of the play.

Michelle Gadpaille & Simon Zupan, from the University of Maribor, deal with the manifest and latent bodies in selected Shakespeare's texts and the corresponding Slovenian translations. Apart from being allegorical and the fleshy agent of passion, a third body appears in the text—a latent body, having a sub-textual existence and the power to evoke the woman's body absent from the actual Elizabethan stage. While sometimes expressed in imagery and metaphor, this hidden body often lurks in metonymy and cognitive metaphor. Gadpaille and Zupan hypothesise that Slovenian translations of Shakespeare's plays accurately capture the manifest bodies of both types, subject only to the usual caveats of rhythm, rhyme and register. In contrast, the latent body largely eludes translation, or survives with omissions and compensations that result in body deformation and perhaps even in an unintentionally monstrous body.

Vladislava Gordić Petković, from the University of Novi Sad, tackles rhetorical deceptions and linguistic inflation in Shakespeare's tragedies. According to the author, Shakespeare felt that words provide dramatic economy, since they can simulate, inspire and even substitute action: verbal manifestation spurs lingering processes of thought and action. Still, no matter how obstinately words struggle to express the meanings and mechanisms of the world, they produce a set of mutable signs, which make Shakespeare's world restless and unstable. Shakespeare's art demonstrates how rhetorical deceptions destroy the set of societal values; the same way words can destroy the world they unduly represent. Wordplay, puns and linguistic ambiguity endow his tragic heroes with an actual power to change their world, but at the same time annul their impact upon the events. The characters' speech acts irreversibly change their lives and their worlds, enabling them to display both a cunning self-consciousness and a curious self-deception. A victim to dangerous word effects, King Lear irrationally undermines his power and banishes his favoured daughter, whereas Hamlet's suffering springs from unsatisfying verbal equivalents of love, grief and duty. Although Lear's verbal measuring of love has ruined his kingdom, respect must be shown for his impossible mission to harmonise the two realms. As opposed to language itself, Shakespeare's tragic idiom possesses the prestige and the power that surpasses the

shortcomings of verbal communication. The paper intends to show that Shakespeare's ceaseless wordplay with the world shows that nothing actually exists before being conceived in the tricky dimension of language.

Anthony Guy Patricia, from Concord University, deals with the poetics of memory in *Richard III*. In his chapter he argues that Shakespeare transforms memory into drama of the highest order in *Richard III*, with the general result of this critical inquiry being a poetics of memory. From an all-embracing perspective, Shakespeare uses More, Halle, and Holinshed to remember significant portions of English history in his dramatisation of the bloody concluding episodes of the Wars of the Roses in *Richard III*. Richard's downfall, of course, results in the Tudors taking the throne of England and maintaining it until the death of Queen Elizabeth I and the coronation of King James I in 1603. By so doing, Shakespeare also remembers his dramatic legacy, particularly that which he inherited from his contemporaries such as Thomas Kyd and Christopher Marlowe, as well as that from earlier tragic playwrights like Seneca. From a more local perspective, Shakespeare endows many characters that appear in *Richard III* with individual and collective memories that, in turn, generate compelling drama.

Milena Kalićanin, from the University of Niš, focuses on the comparative analysis of the recurrent motifs of madness and blindness in Shakespeare's *King Lear* and Bond's *Lear*. She shows in what way Shakespeare uses the motifs of madness (in Lear's character) and blindness (in Gloucester's character) in order to depict their existential survival and moral recovery. Although Shakespeare's concern with injustice in the patriarchal society eventually results in the absolute failure of the institutions of justice, a strong need to create reasons for hope is exposed in *King Lear* through the description of the three loyal servants, the idea that the loving children continue to love their fathers even after they are rejected and the fact that the self-proclaimed villain Edmund repents and has the unexpected need to do some good before he dies. It is precisely these "optimistic" traits in Shakespeare's *King Lear* that Bond finds unrealistic. According to Bond, Shakespeare's play is not cruel enough, so his version of Shakespeare's story intensifies this aspect. Bond depicts his *Lear* as a modern-day political figure who progressively recognises the moral dilapidation and injustice of current body politics and becomes a revolutionary voice of conscience in his effort to deny dominant ideology. However, in Bond's version of the story, it is Cordelia who eventually internalises the destructive patriarchal need for domination by becoming madly blind in her desire for power, whereby she resorts to mere aggression and violence.

Cason Murphy, from Baylor University, deals with adaptations of Shakespeare at the Austin-based theatre collective Rude Mechs and their Fixing Shakespeare series. After an inaugural performance of Fixing King John in November of 2013, the Rude Mechs advanced development on their next installation—Fixing Timon of Athens. Murphy labels their “postmodern” (or even “post-postmodern”) approach as one of transformation and gives an in-depth examination of what he calls “Shakesperimentation.” First, he locates and presents the legacy of historical attempts to “fix” Shakespeare in order to better contrast them against the project-in-progress of the Rude Mechs. Second, he is interested in The Rude Mechs’ decision to use the term “fixing” as the key verb for the project. It suggests both a means of repairing and fastening something in place, but it also calls to mind the idea of underhandedly influencing the outcome of an event. In either case, it acts as a distancing force, encouraging for a disruption in “traditional” performance modes in order to forge an innovative Shakespearean aesthetic. But most significantly, the author uncovers the sole quality that Shakespeare possesses.

Tomaž Onič, Urša Marinšek, and Simon Zupan, from the University of Maribor, comparatively scrutinise diminutives in Shakespeare and in its corresponding Slovenian translations. They maintain that the role of diminutives in drama is stylistic more frequently than not. This is particularly the case in the Elizabethan drama, because of its verse format and poetic language. In this context, the diminutives can carry positive or negative meanings expressing endearment, mockery, irony, vulgarity, etc. Furthermore, another significant role of the diminutives is found in translations and is investigated: translators sometimes use diminutives to preserve iambic pentameter, since synthetically formed diminutives are usually one or two syllables longer than the original word.

Armela Panajoti, from the University of Vlora, gives interesting observations about the theme of shipwreck in Shakespeare’s plays. She notices that in the past, transport to remote places was mainly carried out by sea vessels and for foreseen and unforeseen reasons, human and natural, sea voyages, quite often, ended in shipwreck. Given their complexity, stories of shipwreck, more precisely, of castaways marooned on unknown land, have inspired writers from the earliest beginnings of literature to this day. On a largely historical level, the discovery of new land was, among other things, due to shipwreck, whereas on a more personal level, shipwreck brought human character and relations under close examination. As Panajoti observes, in Shakespeare’s plays shipwreck is much more than a plot device. It generally brings about a condition of change or loss that shuffles and reshuffles human relational

patterns in ways that reshape human consciousness and identity with the storm constituting a metaphor laden with meaning. Although such images are frequent in Shakespeare's plays, in this paper Panajoti discusses shipwreck in, *The Comedy of Errors*, *Twelfth Night*, *Pericles* and *The Tempest*. In these plays, storms and shipwreck are not occasional occurrences but take place from the onset and eventually mark the course of events in the play by dividing people not only from their family but also from their own identity. The reading of these plays examines the paradigmatic shifts in the metaphoricity of shipwreck situations from patterns of mistaken identity and male disguise in the earliest *The Comedy of Errors* and *Twelfth Night* to the more elaborate exile and island motifs in *Pericles* and *The Tempest*.

Ana Penjak, from the University of Split, writes about 'trans-gendering' in William Shakespeare's *Lady Macbeth*. She starts with the assumption that if we take the fact that identity is not a fixed concept, based on gender markers, then we may agree that each time we face the new context we create, through our body, a new identity. Also, if we consider our body not only as a biological entity, but much more as our representation or our self-expression, then we perceive the idea of the body as our means of communicating various issues (gender, cultural, anthropological, political, religious, etc.). Penjak focuses on *Lady Macbeth*, and her process of 'trans-gendering' and through it reconstructs her identity. By putting on her symbolic mask, *Lady Macbeth* goes through the process of 'trans-gendering', which at the same time creates her new identity.

Andrijana Stokić Penda, from the University of Banja Luka, investigates employment of pronominal forms of address in *The Merchant of Venice*. She maintains that depending on their mode of use and context, these forms can empower or disempower either addressees or addressers and denote closeness, distance, familiarity, hesitation, social and hierarchical position, to name but a few. In *The Merchant of Venice*, pronominal forms, especially *you* and *thou*, serve to promote and uphold the Elizabethan idea of order, racial intolerance towards Jews, and obedience to the sovereign. By investigating different relations, it can be seen that pronouns also reflect patriarchal values and societal hierarchy in general. Thus, *you* is normally used to show respect, distance or formality, while *thou* is used to show disrespect, closeness or informality. However, the language of Shakespeare's time is transitional, with many remnants of Middle English in Early Modern English, and Shakespeare uses it more freely. One of the remnants from the previous period is *thou*, which becomes interchangeable with *you*. This interchangeability allows

Shakespeare to challenge fixed values of order, patriarchy and racial intolerance by manipulating Early Modern English rules. He often exploits the connotations of *you* and *thou* for dramatic effect, especially by a deliberate shift from *you* to *thou*, or vice versa. This chapter emphasises the importance of switches and their reversibility, which allows subtle games of power demonstrated in their use.

Zack Rearick, from Georgia State University, inspects Shakespeare sonnets as Elizabethan and Jacobean. As Rearick claims, the Shakespeare sonnet sequence is usually held to be a late entry in the Elizabethan sonnet trend that began with Sir Philip Sidney's 1591 publication of *Astrophil and Stella*. Most sonnet literature holds that the sonnet fell out of vogue around the time of James I's coronation in 1603, making Shakespeare's sequence passé when it appeared in 1609. However, there is more to the story. Sonnet sequences were still published in the Jacobean period and to a relatively high degree compared to succeeding eras; it was not until the turn of the 19th century that the sonnet would regain this level of popularity. Shakespeare's sonnets, which were composed from the early 1590s up until their publication date, straddle the Elizabethan and Jacobean sonnet epochs. If we accept that the Jacobean sonnet sequence differs from the Elizabethan sonnet sequence in significant ways, then suddenly there appears a new and necessary way to approach these sonnets. That they are Elizabethan (thematically, stylistically, and even ideologically) has been almost universally assumed. If they are not, if they are both Jacobean and Elizabethan, then the entire sequence must be re-examined.

Brittany Rebarchik, from Brigham Young University, deals with an ontological approach to love and magic in Shakespeare's *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. She claims that though sometimes invoked, Heideggerian philosophy is not often seriously developed in Shakespeare criticism. More particularly, Heidegger's idea of world disclosure has yet to be used for an extended thematic examination of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. In contrast to the majority of Shakespeare critics who treat Shakespeare's use of magic as an epistemological issue, Rebarchik argues that the main action of these plays develops through an inherent incongruity between the magical and non-magical ontological states of the characters and the love that results. Heidegger's theory becomes significant in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* because we meet two holistically structured, yet distinct worlds. The first world is that of the Athenians who, having yet to confront something outside of their pre-conceived and pre-determined ideas and objects, exist in a fully disclosed world. The second world is that of the fairies, who through their day-to-day encounter with magic and

potions have a separate but still fully disclosed world. When the two worlds unify, a new and conjoined world must be disclosed to both entities. In the play and subsequent film adaptations, magic creates the need for this disclosure, love is the end result and the enchanted wood is the physical point of their convergence. Rebarchik shows in her study of film productions of *A Midsummer Night's Dream* that these theoretical developments are intrinsic to the text and story, hence presenting themselves in any production or reading.

Cecilia Rubino, from New School University, tackles the questions of memory and memorisation in Shakespeare arguing that we continue to remember Shakespeare because his work delves into a deep well of questions that speak to our own pressing, very current concerns; and we remember Shakespeare, Rubino adds, because we also are collectively struggling with a profound crisis of memory. For a documentary film called 'Remembering Shakespeare,' Cecilia Rubino interviewed a broad range of people, particularly the elderly, about memory, memorisation in the digital age and how Shakespeare's words live in us now. A repeated theme in the interviews is that people recall lines and phrases from Shakespeare that are linked to their own personal stories and apprehensions.

I believe the chapters collected in this volume, approaching Shakespeare from diverse and fresh critical, cultural, and linguistic perspectives, will significantly contribute to current Shakespeare studies.

Works cited

- Craig, Hugh. "Authorship" in Arthur F. Kinney (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Wells, Stanley and Lena Cowen Orlin. *Shakespeare: An Oxford Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Shakespeare, William. *Hamlet*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2003.

TRANSLATION AS EMPOWERMENT OF CULTURAL MEDIATION: REVALUING RELEVANCE, EQUIVALENCE AND DISCOURSE SHIFT

ŽELJKA BABIĆ

Another linguistic interpretation of Shakespeare?

The attraction of returning to Shakespeare's oeuvre, be it in English or in a translation, seems never to cease. This ever so needed reinterpretation or attempt of interpretation begins with every new article or monograph published. There seem to exist two different paths when approaching this subject - one takes us to a cul-de-sac with a clear statement that everything has already been said and written and what one attempts will present only the re-writing of already existing statements, even if the author is not aware of their existence; the other opens some space for a personal reading, however redundant or overwhelmingly cumbersome on the pile of other readings it may seem when looking from an outer angle. I personally see the previously mentioned paths as yet another attempt of presenting issues by using the infamous black-and-white technique. The necessity of labelling things as linguistic, literary or cultural has ceased, more or less, the very moment the terms multidisciplinary and interdisciplinarity appeared in the research community, thus enabling us to re-examine and re-evaluate not only our individual posits but also those well-established ones.

The 400th anniversary of Shakespeare's death united scholars yet again in their efforts to examine the established views and to add some new flavour to already existing posits. This is especially true when translations of Shakespeare's works are in question. Toury's¹ insistence on the reconstruction of norms, which he defines as sociocultural constraints

¹ Gideon Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies - and beyond* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1995).

specific to each culture, society and time, makes one stop and reconsider a translation not only as a product but also as a process. The process this paper deals with focuses on an attempt to give a cross-sectional understanding of issues that may have been put aside in previous researches. Namely, this paper offers a personal view of using a translation as empowerment of cultural mediation parallel with highlighting the mental processes seen in the text as the representation of the translator as the Other.

Therefore, this new reconsideration must not be understood as yet another juxtaposition or a quid-pro-quo relation. Pym² emphasises that the very origin of the noun *translation* in English should be traced to the Latin verb *transferre*, thus adding to it the meaning of *to transfer across*, namely marking the product of the translation process. In such a way, Pym again draws attention to the cultural level, which cannot be considered separately from the text itself. Still, Pym does not offer any final solution as to how to deal with translation of cultural issues of the past, but just gives guidelines which do not set the path for successful transfer. Thus, every new reading of a translation offers a possibility of engagement in evaluation of the translator's ability to transfer layers of different messages, which are at hand to readers of the source text.

Translation, interpretation or a brand new text - the possibility of attaching labels to target language texts

The problem of translating Shakespeare is not just evident when one deals with translations into foreign languages, and, therefore, cultures, but also when one speaks about attitudes towards the understanding of his works in countries where English is spoken as the first language. Crystal emphasises voices that call for the translation of Shakespeare into Modern English and claims that those proponents nurture “the translation myth”³, of the necessity of adaptation of the original text in order to make it more appealing and available to contemporary readers. He strongly argues that the small percentage of grammatical and lexical issues, viz. some five to ten per cent, are proof enough that Shakespeare's language is still acceptable and understandable to a general audience.

² Anthony Pym, *Exploring Translation Theories* (New York and London: Routledge, 2014).

³ David Crystal, *'Think on my words': Exploring Shakespeare's Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 10.

Therefore, a whole array of questions and problems present themselves when dealing with the translation of Shakespeare into some other language. A highly distinctive one is definitely culture and the preservation of its image. Lefevere claims that “[T]ranslations not only project an image of the work that is translated, and, through it, of the world that work belongs to; they also protect their own world against images that are too radically different, either by adapting them or by screening them out.”⁴

Pym offers an in-depth discussion of history, issues and applicability of the concept of cultural translation in translation studies. Meticulously presenting its meaning in researches of various authors, from Homi Bhabha⁵ to Wolf⁶ and Even-Zohar⁷, he concludes that “[T]he social and cultural spaces that once set up equivalence theory are no longer there. Cultural translation might thus offer ways of thinking about the many situations in which translation now operates in the world.”⁸ Even though Pym is primarily focused on researching the present-day status of cultural translation within the theoretical scope of translation studies, the idea of establishment of, at least, a possibility of discussion on whether it is feasible to study translation if one knows only one language offers itself instantly for consideration and conceivable acceptance. Such a postulate again leads us onto posing the first and, at the same time, the ultimate question of translation studies: how should one approach the target language text: as a translation, an interpretation or a new creation? The answer seems simple: it depends primarily on the very essence of each individual text in focus.

⁴ André Lefevere, *Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context* (New York: Modern Language Association, 1992), 125.

⁵ Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York and London: Routledge, 1994).

⁶ Michaela Wolf, “The location of the ‘translation field’. Negotiating borderlines between Pierre Bourdieu and Homi Bhabha,” in *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, eds. Michaela Wolf and Alexandra Fukari (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2007), 109-122.

⁷ Itamar Even-Zohar, *Ideational Labor and the Production of Social Energy: Intellectuals, Idea Makers and Culture Entrepreneurs*. Tel Aviv, Unit of Culture Research, 2010. Available at: http://www.tau.ac.il/~itamarez%20works/books/ez-Intellectual_Labor.pdf. Accessed: 7th October, 2015.

⁸ Anthony Pym, *Exploring Translation Theories* (New York and London: Routledge, 2014), 156.

Pym⁹ also poses a highly critical view on Toury's proposed two laws of translation, the law of growing standardisation and the law of interference. He states that they contradict one another in that the proposed laws claim their application leads to products which are both the same as and different from their source texts, which results in proponents being half right and half wrong every time they use these laws in practice. Pym juxtaposes the universals of translation, explicitation, simplification, normalisation/ conservatism and levelling out proposed by Baker.¹⁰ His personal posit, derived from practice, proposes that "[T]ranslators tend to standardize language or to channel interference because these are two main ways of reducing or transferring communicative risk."¹¹ Pym here generalises the issue, for it is sometimes difficult to measure the appropriate level of balance to be used, especially when the source language text originates from an earlier period of time. Namely, the temporal distance unavoidably presents an overt risk during the transfer of communicative data, because of the translator's presumed inability of perceiving all the possible obstacles that will happen during the processing of the target language text.

Arrojo, on the other hand, emphasises the need for translation empowerment, thus focusing on the process, not the product. Her criticism over the usual practices in translation theory is directed towards descriptivists and empiricists who, according to her, "disregard not only the political implications of their argumentative moves, but, first and foremost, the often asymmetrical relations of power that constitute translation and the transmission of culture and knowledge between different languages and people."¹² She argues for the presence of a "consciously visible translator"¹³ who "take[s] responsibility for the texts

⁹ Anthony Pym, "On Toury's laws on how translators translate" in *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies. Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury*, eds. Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger and Daniel Simeoni. (Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2008), 314.

¹⁰ Mona Baker, "Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies: Implications and Applications," in *Text and Technology*, eds. Mona Baker et al. (Philadelphia and Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1993), 233-250.

¹¹ Pym, On Toury's laws on how translators translate, 325.

¹² Rosemary Arrojo, "Asymmetrical Relations of Power and the Ethics of Translation". *Text-Context 11* (1997a), 12.

¹³ Rosemary Arrojo, "The 'Death' of the Author and the Limits of the Translator's Visibility," in *Translation as Intercultural Communication*, eds. M. Snell Hornby, Z. Jettmarova and K. Kaindl. (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1997b), 31.

he or she produces, as it is impossible to hide behind the anonymity of the ideal “invisibility” which has allegedly been given up.”¹⁴

This short discussion is just the tip of the iceberg and its purpose obviously is not to define the problem of tagging the translation with any of the three proposed labels. The reason for this is simple: there is no unanimous voice present as to ascribe the general truth-value to only one term. We rather attach the label to every researched product of the translation process and value it accordingly. There may come a time when generalisations will be possible, but, at the moment, it is only possible to embrace either one or all three concepts and apply them in our studies.

Issues of relevance, equivalence and discourse shift

Cognitive science, with its focus on inference and the ability of humans to understand meaning which is not overt, inevitably offers many possibilities for implementation in translation studies. There are different ways in which we can evaluate translation, out of which this research discusses relevance, equivalence and discourse shift.

Relevance, according to Baker and Saldana presents “the tendency to achieve maximum benefit at minimum processing cost.”¹⁵ According to the theory of relevance, translation is a type of *interlingual interpretive use*¹⁶, which means that the translator’s job is to transfer utterances that are not hers/ his. These difficulties should be dealt with by employing different strategies and so-called communicative clues, which can be used whenever translators find themselves facing some linguistic disparity. The problem with such an approach is that it gives performance precedence over competence, thus approaching the problem narrowly and neglecting other dimensions that occur during the process of translation. The understanding of the relevance in this paper is targeted at establishing whether the personal interpretation is seen in the target text as the Other or in some different form.

Munday argues that equivalence is “a key concept in modern translation theory which defines translational connection between an entire ST and a TT¹⁷ or between an ST unit and a TT unit in terms of the degree

¹⁴ Arrojo, *Asymmetrical Relations of Power and the Ethics of Translation*, 18.

¹⁵ Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha (eds.), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (2nd ed.). (New York and London: Routledge, 2009), 208.

¹⁶ Ernst-August Gutt, *Translation and Relevance, Cognition and Context* (Manchester: St. Jerome, 2000), 136.

¹⁷ ST = source text; TT = target text.

of correspondence between the texts or the text units.”¹⁸ The very issue of equivalence has been one of the main topics of debate in translation studies and, primarily, it juxtaposes opinions on its necessity and usefulness. The research on equivalence in this paper primarily addresses the possibility or impossibility of implementation of such a concept into the corpus used.

Hatim and Munday define a shift as a process which “occurs if a ST element is rendered by a TL¹⁹ element that is different from the expected TL correspondent.”²⁰ Such a process can occur in discourse, text and genre, again building the semiotic triangle. While reading, we focus on certain information which is included in the text and which tries to persuade or inform us about something. During the process of translation, which is productive, the focus may not be stable and it may hover between evaluation of the emphasised information and observation of the given information. It is because of these structured formats that texts do serve various rhetorical purposes. What they must do is sustain the genre structure and serve an ideology. The research on discourse shift in this paper is aimed at establishing the role of discourse in moulding a particular perspective of reality.

Research corpus

The corpus for this paper consists of translations of two of Shakespeare’s plays, *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* and *Twelfth Night*, into Serbian by Velimir Živojinović. The reason for focusing on these very plays and this translator is two-fold. Firstly, these translations are included in the volume of the complete works of Shakespeare translations into Serbo-Croatian, which was used by the majority of scholars and laypersons dealing with Shakespeare in the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century. This inevitably led to the idea of using it as the corpus of yet another research project, this time based on psycholinguistic grounds. Secondly, the fact that the same person translated both plays was seen as a possible way of finding similarities and/or differences in approaching the translation process.

The idea of involving psycholinguistic posits in translation studies lies in essence on the determination of structural and semantic characteristics

¹⁸ Jeremy Munday, *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies (revised edition)* (New York and London: Routledge, 2009), 185.

¹⁹ TL = target language

²⁰ Basil Hatim, and Jeremy Munday. *Translation: An advanced resource book* (New York and London: Routledge, 2004), 349.

of the texts in both the source and the target language. The focus lay on trying to establish the ways in which both texts influence the readers in line with Paivio's²¹ dual code theory. Namely, Paivio talks about two opposing forces, which he calls two codes, verbal-logical and concrete-imagined. They keep on working in real-time processing, thus altering the state of consciousness of the recipient of information. In his recent studies on translation of poetry and prose, Zasyekin²² uses Paivio's postulate in order to promote a notion that a translation is a psycho-semiotic phenomenon. Even though his research has primarily been in establishment of the influence of translated texts, especially usage of "inaccurate choices" on attainment of adequate aesthetic responses, his research result definitely presents a starting point for others researching the influence of target texts on readers. Namely, he poses that the translation will be more successful if there exists more overlapping between the author's and translator's individual mental spaces.

One thing must be emphasised: the research does not intend to label any part of the translation as good or bad; moreover, it does not intend to be judgemental on any grounds whatsoever. The purpose for choosing both the corpus and the research apparatus opens yet another discussion on the need to revisit translations by applying recent findings or methods in order to shed new light on already existing posits. Comparative study was needed in order to see whether it was possible to detect some presence of the translator, either overt or covert.

A Dream or an Illusion

Dealing with a play like *A Midsummer Night's Dream* usually means focusing on just one small part of the many layers every new reading offers. Therefore, for the purpose of this paper, I decided to focus on the plot of the sub-play within the play, that of Quince and his friends. Their language was chosen for the purpose of establishing whether the real life language of the time, the one used by the characters, offers the same amount of linguistic charge for the present-day reader of the target language as it does for the reader of the source language.

The translation of the title invites the researcher to imagine that the translation of the text is to follow the same pattern. Namely, *Snoviđenje u*

²¹ Allan Paivio, "Abstractness, imagery, and meaningfulness in paired-associated learning". *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 4 (1965), 32-38.

²² Serhiy Zasyekin, "Translation as a psycholinguistic phenomenon". *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 39 (3) (2010): 225-234.

noć Ivanjsku immediately offers the interpretation that what is to follow in the text must be understood as one personal understanding of the events, which are to be described. Instead of usage of the word *san*, which is the translation of the word *dream*, the translator opts for the word that means not only illusion, but also hallucination, apparition, vision, and phantom.²³ The reader immediately experiences a taste of something out of the ordinary. Nevertheless, in order to understand the phrase *u noć Ivanjsku* (at St. John's Eve), the average reader requires some explanation, for the celebration of midsummer in the Serbian culture is not only done on a different date (due to usage of the Julian calendar as the official church calendar), but it also does not bear the same cultural weight.

The characters Quince, Snug, Bottom, Flute, Snout and Starveling are translated as Dunja, Dušica, Vratilo, Frula, Njuška i Gladnica. The translator decided to preserve the original meanings of their names, even though, for example, Dunja is a female name in Serbian, so the common reader is usually surprised to find out that it is a male character. Due to the fact that the Serbian language possesses grammatical gender, the sex of the characters is easily discovered in the text, for it is almost impossible to hide this by usage of gender-neutral terms. The reasons for choosing translations for Snug (Honey) and Bottom (Bar) could lie in the difficulty of transfer of meanings of names from English into Serbian.

The first appearance, the introduction to readers (and viewers) of the previously mentioned characters, was done in a very specific manner. Namely, the translator felt the need of emphasising the fact that the surface awkwardness of the character's speech has nothing to do with his, the translator's skilfulness, but rather with the way the actual character speaks in the source text. The translator explains his reasons for using the word *prozovete džumle*²⁴ instead of *poimenično* in the original *to call them generally*.²⁵ I asked a few randomly chosen speakers of Serbian about the meaning of the word *džumle* and none of them had any idea what it meant. It seemed as if I were watching an old episode of *The Cosby Show* in which one of the main characters, a teenage boy, not wanting to read *Macbeth* opted for what at the time seemed an easier choice, listening to the recorded version of the play, and ended up in not understanding anything. The translator found it important to excuse himself from any

²³ Milan Drvodelić, *Hrvatsko ili srpsko engleski rječnik* (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 1989), 555.

²⁴ Viljem Šekspir, "Snovidenje u noć Ivanjsku," in *Celokupna dela Viljema Šekspira*, drugo izdanje, knjiga 2 (Beograd: Kultura, 1966), 139.

²⁵ William Shakespeare, "Midsummer-Night's Dream," in *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare* (London: Ramboro Books, 1993), 120.

misunderstanding that might happen for whichever reason. This begs the question: what was the reason for introducing such phrasing when no such thing was intended in the source text? One of the obvious reasons that comes to mind first, is that readers during the time of the translation were somehow aware of the existence of the word, but such a plausible explanation still could not suffice in explaining the fact that one would still need to be a speaker of a specific dialect in order to understand the intended meaning. The translator explains that his intention was to transfer the comic intent that was apparent in the source text, but somehow it is difficult to connect this explanation to the above-mentioned example.

The insistence on using specific vocabulary, which the translator deems colloquial, puts a specific psycholinguistic mark on the translation itself. When Bottom says: “Tispa, Tispa! - Ah, Pirame, jarane moj dragi! Tvoja Tispa mila, gospojica mila.”²⁶ (*Thisme, Thisme, - Ah, Pyramus, my lover dear; Thy Thisby dear! and lady dear!*²⁷), we see the same pattern used to stress colloquialism of speech, i.e. the usage of words of Turkish origin. So, instead of a word that depicts an emotionally close relationship between the characters, the word in Serbian shows a basically friendly detachment. Moreover, the term *jaran* in essence bears the meaning of a relationship between two male characters, which is very close and is even stronger than the one between siblings. Furthermore, the insistence on usage of one variant of a misspelled proper name in the target text even though the original text uses two different types of spelling and, then, usage of the colloquial word for an unmarried lady, this time of other dialectal origin, makes me feel that the translator had no choice in most cases. Namely, trying to keep the blank verse and most of the puns, it was inevitable for him to mix dialectal lexis, thus making the target text a little difficult to understand.

Further in the text, the presence of the translator’s self is perfectly visible in the translation of Bottom’s narrative in Act III, Scene I. The query “I would wish you, or I would request you, to, I would entreat you, not to fear, not to tremble: my life is yours”²⁸ bears a strong archaic trace in translation. Still, the feel is more of a nineteenth-century language than

²⁶ Viljem Šekspir, “Snoviđenje u noć Ivanjsku,” in *Celokupna dela Viljema Šekspira*, drugo izdanje, knjiga 2 (Beograd: Kultura, 1966), 140.

²⁷ William Shakespeare, “Midsummer-Night’s Dream,” in *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare* (London: Ramboro Books, 1993), 120.

²⁸ William Shakespeare, “Midsummer-Night’s Dream,” in *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare* (London: Ramboro Books, 1993), 124.

the one from Shakespeare's time. The phrase "ja bih vas lepo umolio"²⁹ (I would entreat you) bears an extremely strong regional marking in itself in so much that some speakers of Serbian may even consider it vaguely acceptable, even though it definitely belongs to the scope of the standard language usage. Moreover, one feels prone to depicting a picture of a good-humoured mild benign person, which is a truly characteristic stereotypical picture of persons who use the dialect in the target language text.

Bottom's final speech in Act IV again irreversibly puts him in a position of a person labelled by the language he uses, especially in the target language. When he tells us "jer, ukratko i naširoko: naš komad je turen na tapet."³⁰, one feels prone to looking at the source language text, for the idiom is quite difficult for understanding, at least for people from my region. *Biti/staviti na tapet* should mean, to put in the limelight, to deal with something or someone presently, so when Bottom says that their "play is preferred,"³¹ one has to understand the translation as yet another misused phrase, which is the common way in which the translator portrays all the members of the group. What's more, in Scene II, we have yet another footnote written by the translator explaining to us why he used the term *delikatan* (delicate) to translate the pun in the following conversation:

Flute: No; he hath simple the best wit of any handicraft man in Athens.

Quince: Yea, and the *best person*, too: and he is a very paramour, for a sweet voice.

Flute: You must say, paragon: a paramour is, God bless us, a thing of nought.³²

The translator claims that it is common for a handsome, strong man in *our* rural areas to be called *delikatan*. Again, here we must emphasise that this *our* covers a very small area, for, as far as today's readers are concerned, this adjective would mean exactly the opposite. Still, in the footnote, the translator emphasises that the oppositeness in meaning is specific just to this rural area and is in total opposition with the actual meaning of the word. Again, one has to wonder why such a footnote was

²⁹ Viljem Šekspir, "Snoviđenje u noć Ivanjsku," in *Celokupna dela Viljema Šekspira*, drugo izdanje, knjiga 2 (Beograd: Kultura, 1966), 161.

³⁰ Viljem Šekspir, "Snoviđenje u noć Ivanjsku," in *Celokupna dela Viljema Šekspira*, drugo izdanje, knjiga 2 (Beograd: Kultura, 1966), 193.

³¹ William Shakespeare, "Midsummer-Night's Dream," in *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare* (London: Ramboro Books, 1993), 131.

³² William Shakespeare, "Midsummer-Night's Dream," in *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare* (London: Ramboro Books, 1993), 131.

needed if this misinterpretation of the word was so common in colloquial usage, even more because there were other colloquialisms used throughout the text which he did not feel obliged to interpret.

The most beautiful parts of the translator's personal appearance can be found in translations of poems within the text, in this case the actual play. Not only did he succeed in transferring all the data from the original text, but he also made them so vivacious and appealing, that, even for contemporary readers, they present the freshness and attraction of Shakespeare's thoughts. When Pyramus gives praise saying

Na sunčan-zraku, o, meseče, hvala,
Hvala ti, luno, što sjaš tako sjajno
S pomoću zlatnog tvog blistavog vala
Kusnuću verne Tispe lice bajno.³³

(Sweet moon I thank thee for thy sunny beams:
I thank thee, moon, for shining now so bright,
For, by thy gracious, golden, glittering streams,
I trust to taste of truest Thisby's sight.³⁴

we truly feel the presence of the target language culture. It seems as if one could be transferred into the past and immersed into the vast ocean of traditional folk songs and tales. These are the very parts of the translated text in which the translator is able to make the ever-so-needed connection between the source and target cultures. The beauty of translation is seen in this endeavour to make us both aware and involved in the very process of translation. Namely, one feels the urge for reaching out for the original text and seeing the solutions made by the author. The irresistible attraction of the previously mentioned translated lines opens space for reaching into the depths of our selves and making comparisons with previous experiences. There is this genuine thrill present when one starts reading the translation, the thrill, which leads to wanting to see the play on stage. The thrill of wanting to establish whether the expectations such a product incites will be met in another representation of the play, ultimately, in the one it was created for – on the stage.

³³ Viljem Šekspir, "Snovidenje u noć Ivanjsku," in *Celokupna dela Viljema Šekspira*, drugo izdanje, knjiga 2 (Beograd: Kultura, 1966), 203.

³⁴ William Shakespeare, "Midsummer-Night's Dream," in *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare* (London: Ramboro Books, 1993), 133.

What we or the translator will?

When one browses through the translation of *Twelfth Night*, one can see the translator's peculiar approach, at least when footnotes are in question. Namely, there are an evidently large number of footnotes present in the translation. From a psychological point of view, it made me wonder whether the reason for such an approach lay in the text or in the changed attitude towards the text. And then, if the second answer was the correct one, and why?

As it was the case with the previous play discussed, the research focuses on the lines spoken by the characters who gave a particular flavour to the text, in this case Sir Toby Belch and Sir Andrew Aguecheek.

There is again the need to start the analysis with the translation of the names, namely *vitez Tobi Štucalo* i *vitez Endrju Jezoliki*, for it undoubtedly shows the attitude of the translator throughout the translation. The appeal of the translation of *Sir* with *vitez* instead of, for example, the common *ser* opens a whole range of interpretations to modern readers. One can find the usage of the term even in cartoons, and, curiously enough, all the characters bearing the title are quite likeable. The decision of retaining first names in their original forms, even though there are Serbian equivalents available, but translating surnames, definitely is just a matter of personal choice and cannot be explained in any other way. The translator decides to attach the label of a person who is prone to hiccupping not belching to Sir Toby. The decision can be interpreted in a way that he wants us to like him (therefore the usage of a more euphemistic term), but still wants us to be aware of the character's personality. As far as the choice of a word for Sir Andrew's surname (a person with a shiver-like countenance), the Serbian equivalent is a bit eerie. Nevertheless, one can say that an agree really provokes shivering (*jeza*), and that the cheek can perfectly be transferred as *lik*, but, still, after comparison of the two choices which are made as far as the translation of the names is concerned, precedence is given to Sir Toby. The translator gives preference to the character of Toby, which can be seen by his choice of the Serbian adjective 'štucalo' (hiccup) instead of the original 'belch' (podrigivati), which is more derogative than 'hiccup'.

Shakespeare introduces Sir Andrew through the description of Sir Toby: "He's as tall a man as any's in Illyria."³⁵ When, in translation, Sir

³⁵ William Shakespeare, "Twelfth Night, or, What You Will," in *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare* (London: Ramboro Books, 1993), 57.

Toby says, “Đidija je on, kao ko mu drago u Iliriji.”³⁶, the reader is prone to looking at a footnote for an explanation (which is not present) or in the dictionary of archaisms. There seems to be this genuine preference of usage of colloquial and archaic lexis, which inevitably makes understanding of the phrases difficult, at least for modern readers.

Sir Andrew, on the other hand, sometimes uses words, which can be deemed ambiguous nowadays. When he states “...; he does it with a better grace, but I do it more natural.”³⁷, the translation again offers a more insightful reading than the source text. Thus, “...: kod njega to ispada ljupkije, ali kod mene je to prirodnije”³⁸ uses the word *ljubak* as a translation for *grace*. The obvious problem for the reader is that the word used is more often used for describing female characters, thus attaching a whole new characteristic to the character of Sir Toby. There is definitely nothing which can be described as a feminine trait present in the character of Sir Toby, at least, there is nothing of that kind described here. Still, if the intention of the translator was to show us that Sir Andrew can be ironic, even witty, then this would certainly be a successful example.

Somehow, this claim seems not plausible. If we consider just a tiny part of the letter written by Sir Andrew, it is evident that the claim that his words could (or should) be read differently from what has been presented on the surface level is far-fetched. “I will waylay thee going home; where if it be thy chance to kill me, - [...] Thou killest me like a rogue and a villain,”³⁹ is read with the same amount of enjoyment and fun both in English and Serbian: “Pričekaću te u zasedi kad se budeš vraćao kući; pa ako te tu posluži sreća, da me smakneš... [...] Smaknućeš me kao hulja i nitkov.”⁴⁰ By the time readers will have reached this point in the play, they should have quite a distinctively depicted portrait of characters, so that it is highly unlikely that any of them would attach irony and sarcasm as qualities that mould Sir Andrew’s speech. Moreover, every time I read a new translation of this very play, I feel for the translator, for it is extremely

³⁶ Viljem Šekspir, “Bogojavljenka noć,” in *Celokupna dela Viljema Šekspira*. drugo izdanje, knjiga 3 (Beograd: Kultura, 1966), 114.

³⁷ William Shakespeare, “Twelfth Night, or, What You Will,” in *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare* (London: Ramboro Books, 1993), 62.

³⁸ Viljem Šekspir, “Bogojavljenka noć,” in *Celokupna dela Viljema Šekspira*. drugo izdanje, knjiga 3 (Beograd: Kultura, 1966), 136.

³⁹ William Shakespeare, “Twelfth Night, or, What You Will,” in *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare* (London: Ramboro Books, 1993), 69.

⁴⁰ Šekspir Viljem, “Bogojavljenka noć,” in *Celokupna dela Viljema Šekspira*. drugo izdanje, knjiga 3 (Beograd: Kultura, 1966), 167.

difficult to cut into the layers of finely woven linguistic pointers which rise to the surface with every new reading of the source text.

The next scene discloses the true valour of Sir Andrew, namely his ardent words in the absence of an adversary and a lack of actual action. Faced with the duel with Cesario and frightened by the prospect of a skilful duelist portrayed to him by Fabian, Sir Andrew keeps on changing his mind and attitude according to what is being said to him. Therefore, when Sir Toby persuades him that Cesario does not present any threat to him, he again feels strong enough to go ahead with the duel.

Sir Andrew: "Slid, I'll after him again, and beat him."

Sir Toby: "Do, cuff him soundly, but never draw thy sword."

Sir Andrew: "An I do not,"⁴¹

In translation, Sir Andrew swears (*sto mu njegovih*⁴²), but does not mention that he went after Cesario earlier, for the word *again* does not appear there. A colloquial *izbebucaj* is used as a guideline for the way he should deal with Cesario. Even though the term is quite rare, there is a good chance that the lexical item should be interpreted correctly. Again, the original bears a high level of irony, and yet the translation is quite ambivalent, for the translator again decided to omit the negation, thus disabling the reader to make a connection with the previous encounter of the two characters.

The last joint event in which we encounter these two characters is at the very end of the play. Drunk and hurt, Sir Toby yet again discloses his real feelings towards his companion, the ones presented to us at the very beginning of the play.

Sir Andrew: I'll help you, Sir Toby, because we'll be dressed together.

Sir Toby: Will you help? - An ass-head, and a coxcomb, and a knave? A thin-faced knave, a gull?⁴³

The proclaimed "hate for the drunk" addressed to the missing surgeon just keeps on being increased by disgust and contempt shown to Sir Andrew. This is the last dialogue between the two in the play and Shakespeare left it to our own devices to create the ending. The sequence

⁴¹ William Shakespeare, "Twelfth Night, or, What You Will," in *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare* (London: Ramboro Books, 1993), 70.

⁴² Viljem Šekspir, "Bogojavljenka noć," in *Celokupna dela Viljema Šekspara*. drugo izdanje, knjiga 3 (Beograd: Kultura, 1966), 174.

⁴³ William Shakespeare, "Twelfth Night, or, What You Will," in *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare* (London: Ramboro Books, 1993), 74.

of pejorative noun phrases should mean that this should be the moment in which Sir Andrew would have had the curtain drawn from his eyes as far as the true nature of his companion feelings was concerned. Still, knowing how he acted in previous cases, one can only hope for such an outcome to happen. Or be amused at yet another unsuccessful attempt to straighten the relationship of the two friends. The translation here is more precise. On Sir Andrew's "*Pomoći ću vam ja, viteže Tobi, jer ćemo zajedno da se previjemo.*", Sir Toby replies with "*Pomoći ćete vi? Vi, magareća tikvo i budalin praporče i šonjo! Uskolika šonjo i zvekane!*"⁴⁴. The translator decides to attack Sir Andrew's manhood by using a term which can be translated as 'a wimp'. The term is quite strong and, apart from carrying the meaning of a person who does not possess physical strength, it can also be interpreted as a male character susceptible to other people's influence or a person without an attitude of his/her own.

The presence of the translator in *Twelfth Night* is overt, yet not overpowering. Rosa discusses the translation of features within the text with special interest in the possibility of recreating otherness and concludes that "[T]ranslating formal features correlated with the information on the speaker, situation and prestige, further filtered by a poetics of fiction and used to indirectly offer contextual information about a character, however, does pose problems."⁴⁵ Employment of her posits on the translation discussed shows that the translator successfully overcomes the predicted problems by employing different strategies through a specifically created system whose application one can clearly follow in the translation from the first to the last page. I dare say, successfully, for the translation is experienced as an encircled product in which the system of the particular language use prevails in achieving the goals of the transfer, not randomly used strategies.

Concluding remarks

By trying to pursue a predominately linguistic, or to be more precise, a psycholinguistic course in dealing with translation, this paper reopens discussion on the need of novel researches focused on different roles that underline the reader's reactions and which are the results of purely linguistic choices made by translators in their attempt to portray the

⁴⁴ Viljem Šekspir, "Bogojavljenka noć," in *Celokupna dela Viljema Šekspira*. drugo izdanje, knjiga 3 (Beograd: Kultura, 1966), 190-191.

⁴⁵ Alexandra Assis Rosa, "Translating orality, recreating otherness". *Translation Studies* 8 (2) (2015), 213.