UNIVERZITET U SARAJEVU

FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET

ODSJEK ZA ANGLISTIKU

FINAL THESIS

SHAKESPEARE IN TRANSLATION: THE ANALYSIS OF LEXICAL, SYNTACTIC AND SEMANTIC ELEMENTS IN THE CROATIAN AND SERBIAN TRANSLATIONS OF THE PASTORAL COMEDY *AS YOU LIKE IT*

SHAKESPEARE U PRIJEVODU: ANALIZA LEKSIČKIH, SINTAKTIČKIH I SEMANTIČKIH ELEMENATA HRVATSKOG I SRPSKOG PRIJEVODA PASTORALNE KOMEDIJE *AS YOU LIKE IT*

Mentor: prof.dr. Amira Sadiković **Student: Tomislav Piplica**

Sarajevo, 2019

Abstract

The main objective of this paper is to examine the degree of success of the Croatian and Serbian translations in terms of lexical and syntactic elements with focus on the semantic implications of stylistic speech markers. This will be done through a detailed analysis between the two translations of Shakespeare's *As You Like It* in Croatian and Serbian. The historical, regional and social divergence between the English language and the Croatian and Serbian languages represents a difficult obstacle in producing a precise translation while still retaining all the elements of humour such as: word play and humorous allusions to bawdiness, classical literature and even Shakespeare's own contemporaries. The paper concludes that the Serbian version by Borivoje Nedić and Velimir Živojinović represents a more complete translation than that of Slavko Ježić.

Keywords: source language, target language, preciseness, lexis, syntax, style, semantics, Croatian equivalent, Serbian equivalent, humour, context, Shakespeare

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

Acquiring knowledge is the primary goal of every individual. Whatever the sphere of interest one finds themselves in, further knowledge represents the next logical step. For centuries people have passed knowledge onto their successors and obtained what civilisations have strived for – a consistent medium in which knowledge could be passed, shared, and in today's time and age – sold – as a valuable means to an end.

Science has been a catalyst for humanity since the dawn of discovery, and curiosity an intrinsic impetus for improvement since the first cognisant human. Although translation is not as definitive as mathematics, it is a skill, an artform and has a scientific penchant. The aim of this paper is therefore to employ that affinity towards science, analysis and pragmatics to explain why Shakespeare's language is timeless but has been made a servant of time, especially by regional, temporal and cultural differences.

With the belief that we have moved on from a phono-centric global society to a logo-centric one, the other goal is to raise awareness, albeit in a self-effacing manner, to the need to readdress what is considered 'staple' or 'essential'. That is in no way meant to undermine our former knowledge authorities' credibility, but rather expand on what we already know and adjust accordingly. The parameters for this adjustment are of course: time, region and culture. The medium is, clearly, language and the motif the aforementioned acquisition of knowledge.

Literature has always been a learning tool for people. It cultivated their imagination, skills at interpretation, opinion and individuality. The power that written word has over visual and audio elements is reflected in the way one tackles the problems life puts in front of them, the expression and conversion of intrinsic motivation and by the longevity of the motivation. As infants we are stimulated by auditive and visual elements and once we develop cognitive abilities and learn to read and write we become writers of history, we become fully functional units in a system that communicates through written word.

As a written discipline and skill, translation is one of the most important tools for being a functional unit in a world made out of babelian fragments.

1.1 Revision of time-st(r)uck Shakespearean works

Time propelled Shakespeare's works to become set in stone and very few attempts at re-translation have been made since the last published Serbian version in 1978, which was only edited, but not translated anew (the first translation into Serbian was created in 1938 and was edited and revised in the 1949 version which was again revised in 1978). Nearly half a century away from the latest publication of a translation dating to the post World War 2 era as the closest Shakespeare reference of to our time and region, and we are yet to witness another translation of this internationally acclaimed literary must, taught in elementary schools, gymnasiums and universities. The geographical remnants of the Social Federalist Republic of Yugoslavia, especially Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia, have always been a culturally distinct cluster of countries and peoples. This gives revision an even deeper importance - to expand cultural horizons through modern approaches to old materials.

We all had assignments in school, related to Shakespeare and many other prominent authors, which were translations. Once I read Shakespeare in English, it became clear how we had missed a vast amount of Shakespearean substance by reading restricted and redacted translations or third-from-the-truth translations, with one curriculum being considered more adequate for a socio-political regime than another. It is this that incited me to choose this thesis as it will be a personal beginning to exploring Shakespeare's translations even further and hopefully for others to be inspired to pursue questioning things that we have been served for years as the final and only product.

The two translations used for this paper will be by B. Nedić and V. Živojinović and by S. Ježić, to Serbian and Croatian respectively. The Serbian translation was published in 1949 by Prosveta – Beograd and, the Croatian translation in 1951 by Matica Hrvatska, Zagreb. The search for the appropriate versions was cumbersome as the only Croatian translation available for sale or lending was the one used for this paper. The Serbian translation was not the only one available, but it was the second oldest translation. The older Serbian translation was published in 1938 and I chose the newer version because I believed it was important to see how the literary and, in particular, literary translation sphere operated after the Second World War and how it differed from the 1951 Croatian version but also how both of them compare to the original text, published and printed first in 1906. The original text in English is from *The Oxford Standard Authors edition of Shakespeare's Works.*

1.2 The scope of the paper and the why and whats

Due to time and space limitations this paper will analyse examples chosen by their translational value, i.e. examples which reduce, simplify, censor or misinterpret lexical, syntactical and stylistic elements from the original English text, or are just choices which at first glance do not seem obvious.

The paper will not, in any form whatsoever, try to provide a comprehensive analysis of every element, but only those that hold the most subjective interest. While it will provide possible alternative solutions to some examples, its intent will not be to lessen the value of the Croatian and Serbian translations, but to supply them with equivalents which might have been out of the allowed scope of translational freedom of the era when they were written.

The analysis will include comments on the precision of the selected examples from the two translations, explanations on why they were deemed as precise or non-precise and possible alternative solutions.

The two main questions throughout the analysis will be: is it precise (does it represent the correct social, cultural, and historical context of the original i.e. does it say what is meant) and why it is or isn't precise.

1.3 Structural guideline

After explaining the method of analysis, the paper will establish a theoretical framework on the importance of literary translation and translation in general, its failings and successes when dealing with humour and certain 'untranslatable' elements of language. The books I will use for building said framework are *Translation/History/Culture A Sourcebook* edited by André Lefevere, Gideon Toury's *Descriptive Translation Studies - and Beyond*, and *Is That A Fish in Your Ear – Translation and the Meaning of Everything* by David Bellos. Since the second book is in the form of essays by different authors and with different topics, it will not be used in their entirety but only the chapters relevant to the paper. Following that, a short historical overview of the Elizabethan era will be laid out to provide some social, historical and cultural context. This will be required for familiarising the reader with the main analytical parameter which is context. The book used for that purpose will be *Daily Life in Elizabethan England* by Jeffrey L. Singman. The book's importance as a showcase of the societal customs in Shakespeare's time is paramount as it will provide insight into what makes the core of *As You Like It* in a more understandable format.

The paper will then begin with the analysis which will be explained step-by-step in the Methodology section. Then, the findings will be discussed in the last segment of the thesis, the conclusion.

2. Methodology

The analysis will be conducted in the following order: An item (word, phrase or whole verse) will be selected from the original English text. The criteria for selection will be what I believe could have been misinterpreted, reduced, simplified or censored in the Croatian or Serbian versions. The same item will be compared to the two translations and then both translational counterparts will be subjected to the analysis.

The first step of the analysis will consist of making sure that the context is properly understood by consulting *The Arden Shakespeare – As You Like It* edited by Juliet Dusinberre. This book will be a reference for proper contextualisation and will prevent misinterpretation of the original text.

The second step will be comparing the contexts of the two translations to the original text, followed by further dissection and analysis. If the context is proven to be correct then the analysis will continue with lexis, then syntagma, syntax and finally style. If all the elements work in unison at properly conveying the message of the original, that is in their respective languages, in that case the analysis will prove the translation precise. If one or more elements are not congruent with the meaning of the original text then an explanation of why and how will ensue; i.e. if a lexical equivalent is mistranslated, emphasis occluded by the wrong word order, or style undermined by inadequate lexical or syntactic choices.

If need be, lexical elements will be analysed with the help of Željko Bujas' 1999 English to Croatian dictionary. Due to a lack of a physical English to Serbian dictionary, online resources will be used. If there is uncertainty or ambiguity pertaining a word, or a word is not listed due to the older nature of the two translation languages internet sources will be consulted. Individual grammars of the Croatian and Serbian languages will also be consulted if odd structures impact the context and the message of the original. The Croatian grammar that the paper will consult will be the second edition of *Hrvatska Gramatika* by Eugenija Barić, Mijo Lončarić, Dragica Malić, Slavko Pavešić, Mirko Peti, Vesna Zečević, Marija Znika, published in 1997, and the Serbian grammar will be referenced with *Gramatika Srpskog Jezika* by Ivan Klajn.

3. Defining dimensions and thresholds

Measuring and defining the dimensions of an object is imperative when constructing one. Without those numbers the amount of resources would be unknown, the timeframe within which the construction should be finished infinite if we assume that there is a drive to continually move forward. If we consider translations to be objects of text, which are morphed into similar objects with roughly the same amount of material, and with the same given space but in different surroundings, we can see why creating boundaries and defining numbers is important. Translating literature brings unfathomed responsibilities as it is the way one culture is embedded, extended or promoted in the culture of the target language. How far in terms of success at integrating itself into the socio-cultural norms of a language a translation can go is something the translator defines by the extent of his/her/their understanding of the context of the original text. Since Shakespeare belongs to the genre of drama, and as such is meant to be performed on the stage, is the approach the translator takes to the textual content itself more important than his ability of making written more becoming of a stage performance?

Toury says that 'literary translation' showcases systematic ambiguity and provides two different variants of its main role:

> a. The translation of texts which are regarded as literary in the *source culture.* In an extreme formulation, which has become rather obsolete, this sense refers to *any translation* of such texts; in a modified version – one where the focus is on the retention (or, better, reconstruction) of the source text's internal web of relationships (e.g., Even-Zohar 1971; Snell-Hornby 1987: 93) – it takes such a text as a unique instance of performance, rather than its mere realization in language; b. The translation of a text – in principle, *any* text, of any type whatsoever – in such a way that the product is acceptable as a literary text in the *recipient culture.*[1]

As You Like It, as a pastoral comedy, is stamped with both intrepid, glaring humour and the subtle type, which requires a play to be performed inside the reader's mind to be properly understood. Since the two translations this paper will analyse represent the literary translations without the

[1] G. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies – and Beyond*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2012, p. 199.

adaptation for stage performance they will be regarded as literary translations, rather than play adaptations for the target languages.

How well can humour traverse time and space, and different cultural norms? When does a humorous remark materialise itself fully if it is translated to a different language?

3.1 Translation in culture, society and norm

A generic formula for translating does not exist. Comprehending translation as a binary concept is impossible. The amount to which translations vary is unimaginable. There is no single genre-specific formula just like there is no generic translational one. A translation might be a scientific text, a literary text, an administrative text and within each of those three categories a multitude of other sub-categories exist. The way an accomplished, established translator succeeds at translating a European Act does not represent the way a well-versed translator of poetry or prose will translate a sonnet or a novel. Their accomplishment and authority within the genre they work in is also not mutually interchangeable. Therefore, a translation cannot be graded and judged only on the basis of the name of the translator. The same way it cannot be praised, or ahead of time guaranteed to be successful just based on the authority of a translator,

> a translation will never be *either* adequate or acceptable. Rather, it will represent a blend of *both*. This is to say, no translation can reveal a zero amount of either adequacy or acceptability, no more than it can be 100% acceptable or 100% adequate.[2]

From this, we can extrapolate that translating a play only as a literary text brings some issues with it. Bassnett mentions in her essay how

> A great deal of the language about translation concerns loss. We are told that things get lost in translation, that a translation is second best, a pale copy of the original. This discourse of loss dominates much discussion of the translation of poetry and prose, but curiously in theatre the idea of loss is usually reversed. What we have instead is the notion of the play text that is somehow incomplete in itself until realised in performance. The play is therefore something that fails to achieve wholeness until it is made physical.[3]

It is partially true that drama is not read and acted in the same way, but the roof context should not be moving outside the margins the author set. Translating Shakespeare is an immense responsibility. Not only because of the context, but for reasons that surpass the immediacy of literature. Shakespeare wrote for the people, and his plays were performed to give reality a fleshier

[2] Ibid., p. 70.
[3] S. Bassnett & A. Lefevere, *Constructing Cultures: Essays On Literary Translation Topics in Translation*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, 1998, p. 91.

taste. Adapting a literary work which was created for a stage, and the unavoidable human contact, to text only elevates the degree of pressure put upon the translator. Since Shakespeare's plays weren't part of the Balkans' theatre performances in a regular fashion, according to the few, limited and vague historical sources I could find on the internet regarding the repertoires of the Croatian, Bosnian and Serbian National Theatres in the capitals I believe that there was no great deal of attention focused towards Shakespeare's translations as plays, but rather as mere textual evidence that 'Shakespeare was here'.

The translators themselves are a pen in the hand of their patrons. That has always been the way translation worked, and since the middle ages when patronage was not exclusive, but a standard – just like modern day sponsorship – that concept is equally applicable to the era when these two translations of *As You Like It* were created. Publishing companies with a name to uphold, and their close ties to the government, which was strict in terms of what information was granted dissemination and which not, steered the wheel of the translators' car much like autopilot in electric cars nowadays. Lefevere unravels a problem of the modern society too here, with which parallels can be made to the following:

> Not all features of the original are, it would seem, acceptable to the receiving culture, or rather to those who decide what is, or should be acceptable to that culture: the patrons who commission a translation, publish it, or see to it that it is distributed. The patron is the link between the translator's text and the audience the translator wants to reach. If translators do not stay within the perimeters of the acceptable as defined by the patron (an absolute monarch, for instance, but also a publisher's editor), the chances are that their translation will either not reach the audience they want it to reach or that it will, at best, reach that audience in a circuitous manner. [4]

As we who live in one of the Former Yugoslav Republic daughter countries know, the Socialist Federal government, until its dissolution in 1992. was headed by the Communist party of Yugoslavia. This meant that the party, as in all communist regimes was the sieve for public information.

[4] A. Lefevere, *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook*, Routledge, London and New York, 1992, p. 6-7.

The fact that every aspect of life was in essence politicised means that translation, as a means to communicate and influence a culture by introducing alien customs, expressions and concepts meant the translation was

> …an act of violence against itself. Translations can be potentially threatening precisely because they confront the receiving culture with another, different way of looking at life and society, a way that can be seen as potentially subversive, and must therefore be kept out.[5]

These observations are crucial to having a clear view of all the cogs that take part in turning the hands of translation or else the bearing of the analysis would be void of the human quality which cannot be detached from translation.

[5] Ibid., p. 14.

3.2 External culprits in literary translation and the place where humour and word play sleep

Languages are stacked loops if we think of language as a three-dimensional cylinder. Translation is a process of converting all the dots that make one loop into the loop of the target language. The more loops a language consists of, the longer the cylinder and the less space there is to add more length to it. What if the target language loop is formed of fewer dots than the source language? How does volume influence translation, and how do you fill the gaps?

In her book *Uvod u teorije prevođenja*, Pavlović mentions these problems in the form of cultural redundancies or 'gaps' which become evident only at the moment of exchange or comparation of the two cultures. She further describes a case that Veselica Majhut mentions as an example from a translation dating back to the Socialist era of Yugoslavia. The peculiarity of this case was that in the 1978. translation of Agatha Christie's *Three Act Tragedy* the syntagma 'till Christmas' (do Božića) was translated as a neutral time marker (neutral in the sense that it did not refer to any religious festivity) 'do kraja prosinca' (till the end of December).[6]

Elements such as this, going through change which is not necessarily prompted by stylistic boundaries, prove the point of patronage/sponsorship. Financing and political leniency define a translation just as much as a translator's ability to understand what and how needs to be conveyed to a target language. Pavlović does go on to provide more examples of how cultural gaps can be filled by influence from film or film-related products, but those same place-holders are not derived from the target language culture, i.e. are not organic.[7]

While solutions exist, they are many and this paper is limited to simply giving some food for thought before reaching the analytical phase. Through many an acquaintance and friend from abroad I have never stopped marvelling at the number of linguistic varieties, not delineated by country borders or cultural heritage, but in the form of a bouquet of all the nuances of deliberate choice collected through childhood and forming into a unique personality with a distinct, personal language. This has to be accounted for in defence of every translator who is believed to be inferior or superior to another – it simply cannot be done. It is a personal stroke of a brush, unconsciously added into the works of every individual translator. This is not quite equivalent to style. Bellos says:

[6] N. Pavlović, *Uvod u teorije prevođenja*, Zagreb, Leykam international, 2015, p. 71.
[7] Ibid., p. 72.

> If 'style' is such an individual attribute that it cannot even be controlled by the writer (thus allowing sleuths to catch forgers out), then every translator has a 'style' of that kind in his target language, and the style of all his translations must be more like itself than it can ever be like the style of the authors translated.[8]

Indeed, translation in this case will never be automated, done according to a stylistic recipe since style is coarse compared to subtle features of individual translational choices. Style itself, however, has limitations that sprout from the language itself. If a speaker is bound by the perimeter of the target language, no nuance or stylistic approach will wholesomely occupy the place of equivalency. Bellos gives two examples for two results regarding the matter of humour and the lines that draw around its linguistic liberty:

> Stalin and Roosevelt had an argument about whose bodyguards were more loyal and ordered them to jump out of the window on the fifteenth floor. Roosevelt's bodyguard flatly refused to jump, saying, 'I'm thinking about the future of my family.' Stalin's bodyguard, however, jumped out of the window and fell to his death. Roosevelt was taken aback. 'Tell me, why did your man do that?' he asked. Stalin lit his pipe and replied: 'He was thinking about the future of his family, too.'[9]

Through this example he proves that only the ambiguity of the notion of thinking about one's family in the target language is necessary to successfully translate this joke. The joke, as he says, is not originally Soviet, but was taken from Peter the Great and was then used by many that came after. The other example, as he himself states is rather vulgar, albeit useful in visualising the lines drawn around the linguistic liberty in translating humour

> A Brooklyn baker became deeply irritated by a little old lady who kept standing in line to ask for a dozen bagels on a Tuesday morning despite his having put a big sign in his window to say that bagels were not available on Tuesday mornings. When she got to the head of the line for the fifth time in a row, the baker decided not to shout and scream but

[8] D. Bellos, *Is That a Fish In Your Ear – Translation and the Meaning of Everything*, Faber and Faber inc., New York, 2011, p. 82.
[9] Ibid., p. 79.

> to get the message through this way instead. 'Lady, tell me, do you know how to spell *cat*—as in *catechism*?' 'Sure, I do. That's C-A-T.' 'Good,' the baker replies. 'Now tell me, how do you spell *dog*—as in *dogmatic*?' 'Why, that's D-O-G.' 'Excellent! So how do you spell *fuck,* as in *bagels*?' 'But there ain't no *fuck* in *bagels*!' the little old lady exclaims. 'That's precisely what I've been trying to tell you all morning!'[10]

Clearly, the locality of the area where the joke originated is highly focused, but one would become Sisyphus trying to translate this into their target language. Phonological word plays and localisms drive this joke. Outside of this narrow scope of realisation, the joke is impossible to be literally translated except a similar joke with the same message is available in the target language. Shakespearean drama is full of such jokes, and most dialogs contain vulgarities which are materialised through word play inside a language which is not congruent with Serbian or Croatian. This could prove to be a problem in translation of *As You Like It* to the aforementioned languages.

[10] Ibid.

4. Elizabethan England quotidian life

This entire section will be a very brief overview of the most important elements of the Elizabethan Era. All information will be from the book mentioned in the Structural Guideline but in a highly compressed summary.

Society

By the Elizabethan Age most armoured knights were obsolete and professional soldiers were preferred. This signified that the privileges of gentle birth persisted. Gentlemen still dominated society and were the effective owners of most land. Sir Thomas Smith defined gentlemen as 'Who can live idly and without manual labour and will bear the port, charge and countenance of a gentleman…' Government service was considered an acceptable occupation if one did not own land. Men who were part of the Army or Navy were considered gentlemen just like all those who had an education or worked in a profession. Nobility was the top layer of gentlemen and on the lowest position of gentlemen were esquires who had knights in their family. An estimated 16.000 of nobility and esquires combined were present by the end of Elizabeth's reign. Clergy were a class on their own whose land could be sold freely unlike land owned by landholders.

Rural hierarchy was most prominent in the Elizabethan world-view. Townsfolk owed allegiance only to the Monarch and had the privilege of self-government. They were mostly tradesmen and craftsmen based in working groups called guilds. At the base of both rural and urban hierarchies were servants and laborers. The 'poor laws' sought to help the poor and drive away vagrants. Although this was a widespread issue, the fact that it was on a per-parish basis did not help much in solving the issue.

The status of every Elizabethan was governed based on gender. Widows were the only women recognised as independent individuals.

Elizabethan England was a family-oriented society. A typical lord's household numbered some 40 people. The Elizabethan society consisted of households rather than individuals. Individuals were expected to follow family tradition and stay in the family business. They could, however make

social advances. Shakespeare himself is a great example of a son born to a glover in Stratford upon-Avon who returned a gentleman after his successful theatrical career.[11]

Law and Government

The prime legal authority was the Monarch sitting in Parliament. The Parliament was divided into two houses: The House of Lords and the House of Commons. The parish was the basic units of governmental organisation in towns and in the country. Treason, murder and felony were capital offenses and carried a mandatory death sentence. Those accused of these three crimes could be pardoned by the crown. [12]

Religion

Every Elizabethan was expected to receive basic religious instruction. Every child over the age of 6 had to attend religious instruction every other Sunday and mass every Sunday and on Holy Days. They had to memorise The Ten Commandments, the Articles of Belief and the Lord's Prayer. Another obligatory task was to memorise catechism - a series of questions and answers regarding Christian Belief. Religion was not a personal matter but a contentious social issue.

The Elizabethan Church was Protestant in its teaching but still retained conservative features inherited from Catholicism. Since religion was one of the most important aspects of Elizabethan life people prayed every morning and evening and said grace before every meal.[13]

The Economy

Work was much more personal than nowadays. Business tended to be conducted in and around the house. For most people work meant rural work. People supported their households by producing surplus. There were common rights over wastelands: forests were useful for feeding pigs and gathering firewood. The mode of life in the woods was mostly individualistic and more efficient. Woodland areas were not actually wooded but fenced with tall wooden hedges.

[11] J.L. Singman, *Daily Life in Elizabethan England*, Greenwood, London, 1995, p. 9-19
[12] Ibid., p. 20-22
[13] Ibid., p. 22-27

Sheep raising was becoming increasingly more widespread as it was much less labour intensive than raising crops. Smaller households could not survive because did not have the land necessary to produce surplus and that meant the decline of individualistic life.

Wool was the number one export and source of riches in England. In towns, trade and crafts had the same role since there was very little actual industry.

Young people usually worked as servants who had the opportunity to move upward on the social ladder. Unskilled labourers and agricultural workers were stuck in in the same social status forever.

Women's primary job was to stay at home and tend to livestock but also included a plethora of other work related to the household like cooking, cleaning, gardening, tending to the children etc. They also worked in the family crafts if those crafts included working inside the household for example weaving, or spinning wool.

The sixteenth century was a period of unprecedented inflation. That is partially due to the Elizabethan money consisting of silver and gold coins which meant fluctuation in the purity and value of precious metals. Even the smallest half-penny of the era was worth more than most coins today. Used goods also played a much larger role than today.[14]

Etiquette

In learning the language, the child would learn proper modes of address too. 'Thou' was used to refer to social inferiors and very close friends. Superiors were addressed by their title and surname and inferiors by their Christian name. 'Sirrah' was used to address inferiors and was deemed insulting. 'Cousin', 'coz', 'friend' was used between very close friends.[15]

Education

After the age of 6 boys started doing things which moved further towards what men did and girls remained in the women sphere. For boys, this meant going to school. The number of educated children started increasing although still privileged to upper classes only. There was a range of

[14] Ibid., p. 27-36
[15] Ibid., p. 40-41

independent and semi-independent educational institutions. 'Petty schools' content was strongly religious. Spelling was a matter of custom for Elizabethans as no dictionaries existed at the time.

After petty school, if the family was rich and the boy showed promise to earn a scholarship, he might go to a 'grammar school'. The grammar taught was Latin language and literature. The school might also teach a bit of French and some Greek.

Families sometimes hired private tutors. The tutors could provide an entire education to girls too and on other occasions teach what public schools did not. This was important as the child was expected to learn French, Spanish and even Italian under private tutorship. Book learning was not deemed suitable for girls.

After grammar school a boy might pursue further education – University, which was exclusively the preserve of clergy. The usual age of matriculation was 15-17. All students were boys.

A noteworthy feature of Elizabethan thought was that science and magic were not very distinct from each other.

The most important turning point of the lives of both girls and boys was marriage. It meant being a householder and that in turn meant independence. We tend to think of Elizabethan marriage at a very young age which has much to do with the 14-year-old Juliet of Shakespeare's play. Mean age of marriage was in fact 27 for men and 14 for women. Upper classes did tend to marry at a slightly younger age.

Betrothal was considered serious and had to be done before witnesses. Marriage was considered a legally binding contract. For young women and men of the age of under 21 parental permission was required. The Elizabethans were very frank regarding sexuality – their society allowed for comparatively little physical or social privacy. 'Bawdy courts' punished adultery and fornication. Sixty was the official number of old age.[16]

Leisure

The Elizabethan age witnessed the first emergence of a genuine entertainment industry, especially in the theatre of London. The early theatres resembled the innyards which they evolved from. Less

[16] Ibid., p. 41-51

privileged people stood on the ground and the upper classes including gentlemen sat on the galleries. Plays had to be licensed and authorities were always weary of overcrowding. Travelling actors' rights were often abused by the anti-vagrancy laws because they did not belong to any household in particular. The theatrical companies then placed themselves under the patronage of the great noblemen of England which allowed them to avoid punishment.

Playwrights were usually University graduates. Christopher Marlowe was one of the most prominent of the era before William Shakespeare. The London companies often brought theatrical performances to the provinces.

The other forms of entertainment were literature, which meant that Elizabethan presses churned out all types of texts: technical, political, religious, scientific etc.[17]

[17] Ibid., p. 149-152

5. Analysis

Extraction of examples will follow the progression of the drama. Due to a large number of potential examples, and a limited amount of space, up to

five examples will be taken from each act.

The first two examples for analysis are located at the beginning itself – Act I, Scene 1. Orlando (Oliver's brother and son of Sir Rowland De Bois) and Adam (Oliver's servant) enter.

English:

My brother Jaques he keeps at school, and
report speaks goldenly of his profit: for my part,
he keeps me rustically at home, or, to speak more
properly, stays me here at home unkept;

Croatian:

Moga brata Jacquesa šalje u škole,

I izvještaji govore divno o njegovu napretku.

Mene pak odgaja poput seljaka kod kuće ili

Bolje reći, drži me ovdje u kući bez svakog odgoja.

Serbian:

Moga brata Džekviza poslao je na univerzitet, I

Izveštaji govore da napreduje odlično.

Mene, pak, čuva prostački kod kuće, ili, tačnije

Govoreći, drži me kod kuće nečuvanog

The first example is the translation of the phrase ‘keeps at school’. In English, the verb clearly insinuates an action that is still ongoing, meaning his brother Jaques is still studying. The Croatian translation ‘šalje’ is in the present tense and translates properly into the TL, whereas the Serbian translation uses the past tense ‘poslao’ which would equal to ‘sent’ in English, and implies that he was sent to school at one point in time and it is unknown whether he is still at school. The noun ‘school’ is translated in Croatian and ‘škole’ which is the plural form of the direct equivalent for the translation (sg. ‘škola’). The Serbian translation uses the noun ‘univerzitet’ whose direct equivalent would be ‘university’. However, the historical background provided in the previous section of the paper clearly shows that the age at which boys matriculated into Universities was 15-17, and conventional schools did not exist, meaning the Serbian translation is more accurate. However, neither translation is complete. Another factor in play is the fact that in Croatian and Serbian, school can be used for a more general notion, i.e. any type of educational institution is a school, and often, in colloquial speech, less educated people will say ‘uči škole’ for someone who is a student in higher instances of education. This makes the Croatian translation semantically closer to the character of Orlando, and displays his lack of education. Another historical element that prevents the Croatian phrase from being precise is the fact that ‘school’ in the Elizabethan Era could have meant any type of school which would keep Jaques’ age unknown but would not include university, which is not the case here. In the later stages of the drama we will find out that Jaques is too old to be attending any educational institution but the University or higher than. The phrase would be precisely translated if we combined the two translations, keeping the verb as from the Croatian version and the noun from the Serbian – ‘šalje na univerzitet’, or an alternative ‘tjera da uči škole’. Since the verb seems to be the carrying element of emotion, in this case frustration and anger, the Croatian translation is the more precise one. The fact that it is unknown whether he still is attending University is an important element of the message but the main point is the frustration Orlando feels. It also semantically complements the fact that Orlando being aware of his lack of education, doesn’t even know that it is a University, but rather says school.

The second example from the same excerpt is ‘stays me here at home unkept’. Both translations precisely represent ‘stays’ as ‘drži’ since it designates an action which is contrary to Orlando’s

will, meaning it is enforced or imposed upon him. The Croatian translation of 'at home' – 'u kući' is less precise than the Serbian 'kod kuće' as 'u kući' is semantically closer to the English 'in the house' which is further emphaticised as a spatial prepositional phrase with 'here'. 'Here' is another instance of the character's frustration connected directly with him being trapped inside, thus it does not have to be necessarily filled with meaning. The Serbian translation is more closely connected to the verb 'stays' and creates a more compact unit representing an imposed restriction. Finally, the adjective 'unkept' is actually used as both 'not looked after' and 'unkempt' being afterwards compared to horses[18]. The meaning of unkempt is removed in both the Croatian and Serbian version therefore not showing the ambiguity of the message. This could be due to the similar phonological nature of the words in English, but no appropriate equivalent in Croatian or Serbian. The Croatian translation goes for a descriptive approach with 'bez svakog odgoja' which would translate to English as 'without any breeding'. The Serbian version deems 'nečuvanog' as a 1-for-1 equivalent but still completely misses the ambiguity, only conveying the meaning of 'unkept'.

Another example is from the same speech by Orlando:

English:

Besides this nothing that he so
plentifully gives me, the something that nature gave
me his countenance seems to take from me: he lets
me feed with his hinds, bars me the place of a
brother, and, as much as in him lies, mines my
gentility with my education.

[18] W. Shakespeare, *As You Like It – Arden Shakespeare*, ed. Juliete Dusinberre, London, Arden Shakespeare, 2006, p. 149.

Croatian:

Osim ovog ništa, što mi ga tako obilno daje,

Čini se, da mi njegovo pokroviteljstvo oduzima

Ono nešto, što mi je priroda dala I pušta me da se

Hranim s njegovim slugama, sprečava me da

Zauzmem mjesto brata I koliko je do njega,

Mojim odgojem potkapa prirođenu mi plemenštinu.

Serbian:

Pored ovog ničeg, koje mi on tako obilno daje,

Njegova vlast izgleda da mi oduzima I ono

Što mi je sama priroda darovala: tera me

Da jedem sa slugama, lišava me bratskog mesta,

I, ne dajući mi nikakvo obrazovanje, potkopava

Koliko može moju plemenitost.

While we can look for translational equivalents on a lexical basis, consulting the Bujas dictionary for the entry ‘countenance’ shows ‘lice, izraz lica; moralna podrška, odobravati, pružati moralnu podršku, sankcionirati, štititi, trpjeti; pogodovati’. These were at least somewhat relevant to the translation. The solution by the Croatian translator was to remove the emotional part of the word by using ‘pokroviteljstvo’ and translate the lack of relationship between his brother and him while omitting the fact that he also looks down on him (ill look). However, in Bujas ‘pokroviteljstvo’ is listed as a translation for the term ‘patronage’. With that said, the translation itself strays away

from the main meaning of ill look and lack of favour[19] while still marginally touching the correct semantical content. The Serbian translation uses ‘vlast’ which has ‘power, authority, hand, sway’ listed as equivalents.[20] Neither translation matches lexically but more importantly neither preserves the ambiguity again. Shakespeare wants do depict Orlando’s bitterness in the sense that his brother is his nemesis, not his sibling, who shows his resentment through the way he treats him. The Serbian translation ‘vlast’ is more precise due to the element of superiority it contains in the meaning which very subtly indicates the possibility of ill looks, but is not definitive on that matter.

The following example from a dialogue between Oliver and Orlando right after the former walks in:

English:

OLIVER

Now, sir! what make you here?

ORLANDO

Nothing: I am not taught to make any thing.

OLIVER

What mar you then, sir?

ORLANDO

Marry, sir, I am helping you to mar that which God
made, a poor unworthy brother of yours, with idleness.

[19] Ibid., p. 150.
[20] Glosbe, "countenance", *Glosbe – the multilingual Online Dictionary*, accessed 10 June, 2019 https://glosbe.com/sr/en/vlast

Croatian:

OLIVER

O, gospodine, što to radite ovdje?

ORLANDO

Ništa. Nisu me naučili da bilo što radim.

OLIVER

Pa što onda kvarite?

ORLANDO

Ej, gospodine, pomažem vam da pokvarite ono, što je bog učinio,

jadnog vašeg nevrijednog brata, tako da dangubim.

Serbian:

OLIVER

Hey, gospodine, a šta ti praviš ovde?

ORLANDO

Ništa. Nisam naučen da išta pravim.

OLIVER

A šta kvariš onda?

ORLANDO

Pa tako, tvoj jadni, nedostojni brat pomaže tebi da kvariš

Božja dela lenošću.

The most immediate difference between the two translations is the way the brothers address each other. In the Croatian translation they address each other as sirs with the addition of ‘vi’ which is a sign of respect for a superior or elder, a person one just met or is not close with but still requires formal addressing. In the Serbian version there is no such element. The Croatian version clearly plays according to the historical sources. Equals addressed each other with ‘Sir’ and ‘thou’ was an alternative to ‘you’ which was used to address inferiors or very close friends. In this dialogue between Orlando and Oliver we see the Croatian version retaining the format from English with Orlando showing proper etiquette as a younger brother and the less accomplished and reputable brother. In the Serbian translation we see that format breaking and the two brothers seemingly lose the face of credible characters. The use of ‘gospodine’ (‘sir’) along with ‘ti’ (‘you’) seems to be the more precise translation since it can, as shown in the Serbian version, be translated with 1-on-1 lexical equivalents. However, the lack of formality and proper addressing, as in the original inhibits the dramatic tension. The two brothers start of speaking to each other in a sarcastic tone – addressing each other with proper etiquette. The inability for Croatian and Serbian to differentiate the use of ‘you’ in formal and non-formal forms is clearly shown. The marker that differentiates one use from the other in Croatian and Serbian is person and numbe;, ‘Vi’ with a capital V is formal and although it is the second person plural of ‘ja’ (‘I’) it does not mean addressing a group in second person but someone who is a superior or elder to the speaker. The same rule applies to Croatian, but the Croatian translation is more precise in translating the dramatic tension and escalation of conflict between the brothers. To prove this we need more of the dialogue:

English:

OLIVER

Know you where you are, sir?

ORLANDO

O, sir, very well; here in your orchard.

OLIVER

Know you before whom, sir?

ORLANDO

Ay, better than him I am before knows me. I know
you are my eldest brother; and, in the gentle
condition of blood, you should so know me. The
courtesy of nations allows you my better, in that
you are the first-born; but the same tradition
takes not away my blood, were there twenty brothers
betwixt us: I have as much of my father in me as
you; albeit, I confess, your coming before me is
nearer to his reverence.

OLIVER

What, boy!

ORLANDO

Come, come, elder brother, you are too young in this.

OLIVER

Wilt thou lay hands on me, villain?

Croatian:

OLIVER

Znate li vi, gospodine, gdje se nalazite?

ORLANDO

O da, gospodine, vrlo dobro. U vašem sam vrtu.

OLIVER

A znate li, gospodine, pred kim ste?

ORLANDO

O da, bolje, nego što mene znade onaj, pred kojim sa.

Znam, da ste moj najstariji brat, a po nježnoj vezi krvi

I vi bi ste morali mene poznati. Uglađenost naroda daje vam

Prednost preda mnom, jer ste prvorođenac; ali isti običaji

Ne oduzimaju vam moju krv, pa da je i dvadesetero braće

Između nas. Ja imam isto toliko od moga oca u sebi

Koliko i vi; uza sve to, priznajem, buduća ste prije mene došli

Na svijet, čini vas to bližim poštivanju, koje se u njemu duguje

OLIVER

Šta to znači, momče?

ORLANDO

Hajde, hajde, stariji brate, za to ste ipak premladi.

OLIVER

Zar misliš staviti ruku na mene, nitkove?

Serbian:

OLIVER

Znaš li gde si?

ORLANDO

O, da, vrlo dobro: tu u tvome vrtu

OLIVER

A znaš li pred kim, gospodine?

ORLANDO

Da, bolje, nego onaj pred kim sam što mene zna.

Ti si moj najstariji brat, i zato što si plemenite krvi,

I ti mene treba da tako poznaješ. Narodni običaj

Smatra te boljim zato što si prvorođen, ali isti običaj

Ne oduzima ni meni plemenitost, pa neka i dvadesetero braće

Ima između nas. Ja u sebi imam isto toliko od moga oca

Koliko i ti; ma da priznajem da ti, zato što si rođen pre mene,

Imaš više prava iz njegove časti.

OLIVER

Šta reče, momče?

ORLANDO

De, de, veliki brate, još si i ti mlad da takvim glasom govoriš.

OLIVER

Hoćeš li da digneš ruku na mene, nevaljalče.

Due to limited space, we can focus on the underlined parts only. The precision of translating the dramatic tension and escalation of conflict from sarcasm to quarrel manifests itself, in the Croatian version only, through the change from proper addressing etiquette to insulting where we see Oliver ceasing to use 'sir' in addressing his brother and using second person singular. This dynamic is not present in the Serbian version because the Serbian translators opted to use sir, but not the other marker for addressing superiors in Serbian – 'vi'. Therefore, the Croatian translation is precise in translating the progression of dramatic tension in the TL, whereas the Serbian version manages to appear inconsistent in character and dynamic reproduction more than anything else. Both versions avoided the use of exclamation marks. The exclamation mark is important in translating the exact moment when the dramatic tension reaches the peak. A better translation of 'What, boy!' would be 'Ti slinavče!'. Although the *wh*-word is present, that does not mean the type of sentence is a question. Oliver is merely expressing his disbelief of what his brother just told him, and retorts with 'boy' followed by an exclamation mark which makes it even clearer that the two translations are misinterpreting the meaning of the entire phrase. Although 'What' could be interpreted as an ellipsis for 'What did you just say?' it is clear that Shakespeare's intent is to provide a way for Oliver to insult his brother by saying he is a boy, meaning immature. The question mark in the two translations decreases the level of tension. This is key since it is also a landmark of what really triggers Oliver's response (the longer speech by Orlando following the question 'Know you before whom, sir?').

Act I, Scene 2; a reply from Celia to Rosalind, and a comment/question on the entrance of Touchstone:

English:

CELIA

Peradventure this is not Fortune's work neither, but
Nature's; who perceiveth our natural wits too dull
to reason of such goddesses and hath sent this
natural for our whetstone; for always the dulness of
the fool is the whetstone of the wits. How now,
wit! whither wander you?

Croatian:

CELIJA

Možda to i nije djelo Fortune, nego Prirode.

Kad je vidjela da je naš prirodni duh pretup

da mudruje o takvim božicama, poslala nam je

ovog zvekana kao brus; jer tupost glupana služi

uvijek kao brus duhovitom čovjeku. –

A kamo to putuješ, mudronjo?

Serbian:

SILIJA

Možda to i nije baš delo Sreće

Nego delo Prirode, koja, videvši da nam je um

I suviše tup da govorimo o takvim boginjama,

Posla nam ovu ludu da nam bude točilo;

Jer uvek je glupost budale točilo za mudre.

Kako ti, mudrače? Kuda lunjaš?

What I found interesting in this example is the omittance of all alliteration. 'How now, wit! Whither wander you?' The sonority of the words even when not uttered keeps the entire verse in an aliterative rhythm. The repetition of 'wh' and 't' gives it an airy tone and none of that can be found in the translations.

The Croatian translation removes the semi-colon and replaces it with a full-stop. This also influences the rhythm and emphasis on 'Nature'. The semi-colon allows the sentence after to be focused on the noun, i.e. Nature, prolonging the natural flow of the thought. The Serbian translation is precise and retains the flow through nominality, whereas the Croatian translation breaks the thought through the midpoint. Another peculiarity is the clumsiness with which the world play regarding Touchstone is introduced in this verse, but also similarly throughout the comedy. The definition for 'touchstone' in Bujas is 'kamen za kušanje zlata; kamen kušnje, mjerilo'[21]. While the definition is correct and matches the English definition - a black siliceous stone related to flint and formerly used to test the purity of gold and silver by the streak left on the stone when rubbed by the metal[22]- the Croatian version translated 'Touchstone' as 'Brus' meaning 'whetstone'. Although Shakespeare's plays all do have marvellous and intricate word plays, the part analysed here up to the point of directly addressing Touchstone does not have any connection to the jester himself.

[21] Ž. Bujas, 'touchstone', *Veliki Englesko-Hrvatski Rječnik,* Zagreb, Nakladni Zavod Globus, 1999, p. 922.
[22] Merriam-Webster, 'touchstone', *Merriam-Webster,* accessed 10 June, 2019, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/touchstone

The Serbian version loses the ability to create word play with whetstone and Touchstone but does not introduce needless confusion, which does not have the same effect intentional confusion created by Shakespeare does.

Act II, Scene 1; A dialogue between Amiens and Duke Senior on Jaques' sensitivity and pathetic nature:

English:

DUKE SENIOR

Come, shall we go and kill us venison?
And yet it irks me the poor dappled fools,
Being native burghers of this desert city,
Should in their own confines with forked heads
Have their round haunches gored.

Croatian:

Vojvoda

Hajd, hoćemo li divljač strijeljati?

Pa i tog mi je žao šarnog društva,

Što rođeni su građani tog grada,

Da tu, na svom tlu, probodenih glava

I krvava da stegna budu

Serbian:

STARI VOJVODA

Hajd, hoćemo l' u lov na divljač poći?

A opet, žalim te šarene lude, -

Pustoga grada ovoga nasledne

Žitelje, - što im na vlastitom njinom

Imanju bedra strelama porimo.

The verb ‘irk’ as defined by Merriam-Webster is to make weary, irritated, or bored[23]. Both translations deviate from the original intention - to express Duke Senior’s irritability, his frustration of having to do something that he wished not to do. This is not the case in either translation, and both versions opt for a verb with a far less conflicting meaning. The Croatian translation translates ‘irks me’ as ‘mi je žao’ which would translate into English as ‘makes me feel sorry’ which reduces the semantic density of the expression and diminishes the character’s moral strength. By using ‘žalim’ the Serbian translators have improved on the ‘mi je žao’ but still slightly lowered the involvement of the character in the activity of killing the deer. ‘Muči me’ would be a more appropriate translation as it would transfer the inner conflict of Duke Senior fully without representing him as a melancholic character who is out of his own sphere of influence. This is crucial because Jaques is the bearer of those features.

English:

DUKE SENIOR

But what said Jaques?

Did he not moralize this spectacle?

Croatian:

Vojvoda

A Jacques? Zar o moralu nije zborit stao?

Serbian**:**

STARI VOJVODA

I šta reče Džekviz?

Zar moralis'o nije na taj prizor?

The Croatian translation nominalised the verb ‘moralize’ into ‘o moralu’ which would translate ‘about morality’. Despite being semantically similar to ‘moralis'o’ which is the direct lexical equivalent of ‘moralize’ it is not precise when combined into the phrase. The implication is not dialogue-heavy enough to stop the emphasis from passing from a place of equality shared by the

[23] Merriam-Webster, ‘irk’, *Merriam-Webster*, Accessed 10 June, 2019, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/irk#h2

sight he had seen and his tendency to moralize to a dominant position of presupposition. If we interpret the Croatian translation, we clearly see the emphasis leaning towards his tendency to moralize, putting the sight, which drives the dialogue into second place.

English:

First Lord

O, yes, into a thousand similes.
First, for his weeping into the needless
stream;
'Poor deer,' quoth he, 'thou makest a
testament
As worldlings do, giving thy sum of more
To that which had too much:' then, being
there alone,
Left and abandon'd of his velvet friends,
"Tis right:' quoth he; 'thus misery doth part
The flux of company:' anon a careless herd,
Full of the pasture, jumps along by him
And never stays to greet him; 'Ay' quoth
Jaques,
'Sweep on, you fat and greasy citizens;
'Tis just the fashion: wherefore do you look
Upon that poor and broken bankrupt there?'
Thus most invectively he pierceth through
The body of the country, city, court,
Yea, and of this our life, swearing that we
Are mere usurpers, tyrants and what's worse,
To fright the animals and to kill them up
In their assign'd and native dwelling-place.

Croatian:

Prvi plemić

O da, spomenu tisuć poredaba,
Najprije suze, što u rijeku teku:
‘Moj jelene, ti’ reče, ‘oporuku
Ko svjetovnjaci praviš, dajuć više
Tom, koji odveć ima’. A jer sam bje
Od baršunastih napušten drugova:
‘U redu’, reče, ‘bijeda svako društvo
Prorjeđuje’. I baš je nato krdo,
Što je napaslo se, kraj njeg prohrlilo,
Ne pozdravivš ga. ‘Aj, aj’, reče Jacques,
‘Odjurite brzo, siti građani,
To vaš je način. Čemu pogled bacit
Na slomljenoga bijednika tog ovdje?’
I s prigovora napao je mnogo
Svu jezgru zemlje, grad, pa i sam dvor.
I ovaj život naš; i kleo se
Da otmičari, tirani smo, sve zlo,
Strah divljači, i ubojice njine
Na rođenom im mjestu boravka.

Serbian:

PRVI LORD

O, da, u bezbroj metafora. Prvo, zbog suza
tako izlišnih za potok:
‘Jelene jadni, praviš zaveštanje
K'o veselici što sve daju onom
Ko odveć ima.’ Zatim što je sam,
Od kadifastih ostavljen drugova:
‘Da, reče, tako nesreća razdvaja
Druga od druga’. A kad čopor srna,
Trbuha punih, protrča kraj njega
I ne zastavši da ga pozdravi:
‘Hajd, hajd, buržuji gojni, reče on,
I red je tako! Što da gledate
Na ovog tu bednog stradalnika?’,
Tako vam on ustrojstvo zemlje, grada,
Dvora i ovog našeg življenja
Izobličava; i kune se da smo
Mi nasilnici, razbojnici da smo,
I gore još no to, jer tamanimo
I plašimo životinje u njinom
Vlastitom domu.

For some reason, the Croatian translator left out the word ‘needless’ which is important for the hyperbole of Jaques’ melancholy. The Serbian translation translates it precisely. Syntactically, the Croatian version is breaking the flow of the text by using odd structures, unnatural to the language. The natural sentence pattern in Croatian and Serbian is SVO. The Croatian translator used inversion to have an OVS pattern which creates unnecessary breaks while reading. The Serbian translators however used the pattern inversion in the same sentence ‘then, being there alone, Left and abandon'd of his velvet friends ‘, as a stylistic marker. What makes it a stylistic marker and not a break in the reading is the initial word with which the translators of the Serbian version start ‘Zatim’ translating into English as ‘And then’ which perfectly translates the English sentence initial ‘then’. The ‘A’ corresponds to the English ‘and’ which although coordinating the same structure does not have the same impact after a full stop.

The verb form ‘swearing’ in the lines ‘Thus most invectively he pierceth through the body of the country, city, court, Yea, and of this our life, swearing that we...’ is not correctly translated. Both Croatian and Serbian have a verb form that matches the progressive aspect in English, namely ‘glagolski prilog prošli’ which would make ‘klevši’ a better translational equivalent for ‘swearing’ in terms of meaning, syntax and dynamics.

English:

DUKE SENIOR

And did you leave him in this contemplation?

Second Lord

We did, my lord, weeping and commenting
Upon the sobbing deer.

Croatian:

Vojvoda

U takvim ste ga ostavili mislima?

Drugi plemić

Da, gospodaru, gdje mudruje u plaču
Nad jelenom, što stenje.

Serbian:

STARI VOJVODA

Ostade l' u tom razmišljanju?

DRUGI LORD

O, da, gospodaru;

Osta da plače, opaske čineći

Na račun jelena što grca.

The question Duke Senior asks is by structure closer to a declarative question, but semantically it is closer to a rhetorical question since the answer is presented through the collocutor's narration of events. The Croatian translator, again, reaches for a pattern inversion which does not yield the wanted results. The intonation is changed synchronous with the pattern change and the subject complement ‘u takvim’, being separated from the noun phrase creates syntactic dissonance. This use of pattern inversion differs from stylistic choice, as we have shown in the Serbian translation.

In the Second lord’s reply to Duke Senior the Serbian translators had a more redacted approach in conveying the melancholic nature of Jaques. The lexical choice ‘opaske’ is precise in terms of lexical equivalence but leaves a gap in terms of style. The nature of the long speech by the First lord, in which Jaques’ state is described in detail has a tone of mockery and as with most Shakespearean plays, change in dynamics is what creates the element of surprise. Lexical choices, therefore invariably represent the main building block in creating such a shift in mood. Although the aforementioned description of Jaques’ is expressively mockery, the images portrayed in it serve another purpose, that is to explain the state in which the exiled Duke Senior and his Lords are due to being displaced from their homes, and are now stranded in the Arden Forest. Without delving further into a literary analysis, lexical elements used in the original text – ‘sobbing’, ‘weeping’ ‘commenting’ all create a break from the intense imagery from the previous dialogue. We can see that in the shift of collocutors too (it is the Second lord who replies, not the first one). Pairing ‘commenting’ with ‘sobbing’ and ‘weeping’ creates a contrast which alleviates the force of the previous speeches which is not the case in the Serbian translation. The Croatian translation has better lexical choices in ‘mudruje’ and ‘stenje’. The way they are combined also differs. The Serbian translation keeps the form of the original in using three verbs ‘plače’ for ‘weeping’ ‘opaske čineći’ for ‘commenting’ and ‘grca’ for ‘sobbing’. While it is syntactically truer to the original, the auditive impression it produces is far too similar to the pathetic nature of Jaques. which does not create the desired break in the dialogue. The Croatian translator instead replaced the verb ‘weeping’ with a nominal phrase, namely a prepositional phrase ‘u plaču’ instead of ‘plače’ like the Serbian translators. The prepositional phrase in the Croatian version also complements the PP immediately following it, creating the desired effect, that is breaking the intensity of the previous speech by the First lord, while also translating the intent of both the Lords to show Duke Senior how they were annoyed by the melancholic nature of Jaques.

Act II, Scene 5

Amiens sings for Jaques. Upon stopping, Jaques asks for him to sing more:

English:

AMIENS

My voice is ragged: I know I cannot please you.

JAQUES

I do not desire you to please me; I do desire you to
sing. Come, more; another stanzo: call you 'em stanzos?

Croatian:

Amiens

Glas mi je hrapav. Znam da vam se ne mogu svidjeti.

Jacques

Ja ne želim da mi se svidite; želim samo da pjevate. Dajte, dajte, pjevajte još. Još jednui
strofu; zovete li to strofom?

Serbian:

AMIJEN

Glas mi je hrapav. Znam da vam se neću svideti.

DŽEKVIZ

Ja ne želim da mi se vi svidite; želim da
Pevate. Hajdete, još; još jednu stancu: je li ih tako zovete, ‘stance’?

The clear insinuation here is sexual, despite ‘pleasing’ was not used primarily in that context. It is a feature of Shakespeare’s writing to add comedy in a situation where the reader expects none. Both translations have reduced the sexual insinuation in its intensity but increased the obviousness of it. This is not a sentence one would utter, hear or write in either Croatian or Serbian, when used in this context. The more obvious choice here was ‘zadovoljiti’. It has the same sexual intensity that the original text has while still maintaining a natural tone in the two TL. This means neither

translations were precise in their attempt to convey the meaning. Historical and socio-political causes might have been the reason for this kind of translation.

In the same scene Jacques gives the lyrics to a song he wants Amiens to sing:

English:

JAQUES

Thus it goes:--
If it do come to pass
That any man turn ass,
Leaving his wealth and ease,
A stubborn will to please,
Ducdame, ducdame, ducdame:
Here shall he see
Gross fools as he,
An if he will come to me.

AMIENS

What's that 'ducdame'?

JAQUES

'Tis a Greek invocation, to call fools into a
circle. I'll go sleep, if I can; if I cannot, I'll
rail against all the first-born of Egypt.

Croatian:	Serbian:
Jacques	**DŽEKVIZ**
Glasi ovako:	Ovako ide:
Ako se desi to,	Desi l’ se čudo to
Oslom da bude tko,	Da neko, k’o glupi vo,
Ostavi bogatstvo,	Napusti raskoš I sjaj
I srećom smatra zlo:	Za neki pustošni kraj,
Ducdame, ducdame, ducdame –	Duc ad me, duc ad me, duc ad me!
Tu će nać oj,	Naći će tu
Luda lijep broj,	Gomilu svu
I neka se sjeti na me.	Luda, I mene uz nju.
Amiens	**AMIJEN**
Što će to reći: ducdame?	A šta je to ‘duc ad me’?
Jacques	**DŽEKVIZ**
To je grčka invokacija, kojom su se svi Luđaci sazivali u jedan krug. Sad idem da spavam, Ako mi to uspije. Ako ne, opsovat ću svu prvorođenčad u Misiru.	Tako Grci vabe budale da se skupe u krug. Odoh da spavam, ako mogu; ako li ne, skidaću s neba sve rodonačelnike misirske.

Ducdame meaning in the Arden Shakespeare is interpreted as **Ducdame** trisyllabic; a nonsense word to summon the Lords, as *Come hither*.[24]The notes section in the Serbian translation points out that the translators chose the above defined interpretation though, they do not specify why the translators decided to change the order of syllables in it. That being said, the rhythm of the Serbian variant of the ‘ducdame’ word does roll off the tongue more naturally and resembles Latin more than any other language which is perhaps where the more natural sound is derived from. The Croatian translator remained truthful to the original and changed nothing. The impact of the change is not radical, and in its existence enriches the authors’ stylistic choice. By changing the syllable

[24] Shakespeare, op. cit., p. 213.

order and adding spaces between what resembles words, the Serbian translation gives the word(s) authenticity – if it indeed is interpreted as nonsense, then as long as it makes no sense its purpose is served.

In Jacques reply to Amiens, an explanation ensues. Jaques shows his wit by implicating that the lords, who have gathered or have started gathering around him in a circle are fools and also to elicit a question from Amiens, about the meaning of the word which in fact allowed the witty retort. The Croatian translation reduces the depth of the joke by being overly descriptive. Jaques is a moralist, and a witty orator but the lexical choices and the length of the retort do not showcase it in this example. The Serbian translators however translated it precisely without losing Jaques' verbal features. The usage of the noun 'luđaci' is less precise than 'budale' in that it could insinuate that Jaques is speaking of a jester, or people who act like one which is not the case here. The Arden Shakespeare also adds an interesting interpretation by saying it is an allusion to the people who would come and watch the play and would do so by standing in circles around the stage.[25] This also makes the Croatian translation less etymologically accurate since the word 'fool' was used in the particular context.

The Serbian translation of 'first-born' as 'rodonačelnike' is inadequate for this context as the allusion here is at the Biblical story of the Ten Plagues of Egypt, namely the death of the firstborns. The Serbian word 'rodonačelnik' can bear the meaning of 'first-born' but is mostly used in contexts such as when referring to a person who is first of their name, or has started with a certain custom, or established something, i.e. is translated as 'founder'.[26]

[25] Ibid., p. 214.
[26] Kontekst.io, 'rodonačelnik', *Kontekst.io slični izrazi i sinonimi u hrvatskom, srpskom i slovenskom jeziku*, Accessed 17 June 2019, https://www.kontekst.io/srpski/rodonacelnik

Act III, Scene 5

After falling in love with Rosalind as Ganymede, Phebe remains only in the company of Silvius who is in love with her:

English:

SILVIUS

Sweet Phebe,--

PHEBE

Ha, what say'st thou, Silvius?

SILVIUS

Sweet Phebe, pity me.

PHEBE

Why, I am sorry for thee, gentle Silvius.

SILVIUS

Wherever sorrow is, relief would be:
If you do sorrow at my grief in love,
By giving love your sorrow and my grief
Were both extermined.

PHEBE

Thou hast my love: is not that neighbourly?

SILVIUS

I would have you.

Croatian:	Serbian:
Silvije	**SILVIJE**
O Febo mila!	O slatka Febo!
Feba	**FEBA**
Silvije, što veliš?	Šta ćeš, Silvije?
Silvije	**SILVIJE**
Smiluj mi se, Febo!	O slatka Febo, sažali se na me!
Feba	**FEBA**
Pa ja te žalim, dobri Silvije.	Pa ja te žalim, dobri Silvije.
Silvije	**SILVIJE**
Gdje žaljenje je, I pomoć tu ima,	Gde sažaljenja ima, lek se nađe:
Bol ljubavnu li žališ mi, tad ljubi,	Žališ li zbilja bol ljubavi moje,
Pa tvoja žalba I sve moje boli	Žaljenju tvome, mom bolu, biće kraj,
Tad nestat će.	Budeš li volela me ti.
Feba	**FEBA**
Ta ti si mi drag mi I dobri smo susjedi.	Pa ja te I volim, kao sused suseda.
Silvije	**SILVIJE**
Ja tebe želim.	Hteo bih tebe.

This entire sequence between Phebe and Silvius is interesting in terms of translation. The very first line shows two different approaches: the Croatian translation has ‘mila’ – which is correct according to Bujas but is among the last entries in the definition, the top ones being ‘sladak, svjež, *fig* ugodan; milovidan, dražestan.’[27] The Serbian translation is more accurate in translating the lexical element ‘sweet’ with a 1-for-1 equivalent. Shakespeare plays with words again – Silvius knows she is sweet without having tasted her, so ‘slatka’ might fulfil the allusion to forbidden fruit. We mustn’t dismiss the Croatian translation though: ‘mila’ - ‘dear’ in English, might be a style marker of the Croatian translator. The reader can interpret the Croatian version as irony, since she is everything but ‘dear’ in her conduct with Silvius. Both translations give us food for thought and freedom of interpretational choice.

[27] Bujas, op. cit., p. 887.

The second interesting example is in the way the two translations tackle 'Ha?'. Both translations decided on skipping the interjection 'ha' despite it being a sign of her infatuation with Rosalind as Ganymede. The Arden Shakespeare edition of *As You Like It* describes the 'Ha?' as 'Not an arresting ha! but the vague and questioning interjection with which someone emerges from a daydream.'[28] The omittance of the word does not impact the dialogue in a major way but is an interesting choice in terms of historical usage. In modern day usage, interjections such as 'ha' are much more often used and, had Shakespeare been translated recently, the 'ha' might just have found its way into the translation. Perhaps dream-like infatuation at the time the translations were written was not as common, or as respectable.

The next example, again, showcases the odd choice of avoiding word play. The Croatian translator preferred 'smiluj' which in English would be 'have mercy' which disrupts the rhythm again. The Serbian translation decided on a simple, lexical equivalent which suits the word play from the preceding line and involves progressive and non-progressive verbs 'sažaliti' and 'žaliti'.

Allusions, as a core element of Shakespeare's writing are very condensed in relation to one another. Here, in the line 'Thou hast my love, is not that neighbourly?' the allusion is missed, or ignored, by both translations. It is 'a mischievous play on Christ's reformulation of the Ten Commandments: 'Thou shalt loue thy neighbour as thy self''.'[29] A better translation would be 'Pa i ljubim te kao bližnjega svoga.'

Act IV, Scene 1

Rosalind confesses the immense depths of her love for Orlando to Celia:

[28] Shakespeare, *op. cit.*, p. 282.
[29] Ibid.

English:

ROSALIND

No, that same wicked bastard of Venus that was begot of thought, conceived of spleen and born of madness, that blind rascally boy that abuses every one's eyes because his own are out, let him be judge how deep I am in love. I'll tell thee, Aliena, I cannot be out of the sight of Orlando: I'll go find a shadow and sigh till he come.

CELIA

And I'll sleep.

Croatian:

Rozalinda

Ne, isto zlobno kopile Venerino, što ga je misao stvorila, čežnja začela, a ludost rodila, isti slijepi lupeški dječak, koji vara svačije oči, Jer je vlastite izgubio, neka sudi kako je duboka Moja ljubav. – Velim ti, Alieno, ne mogu živjeti A da ne gledam Orlanda; potražit ću negdje hlada I uzdisati, dok on ne dođe.

Celija

A ja ću spavati.

Serbian:

ROZALINDA

Ne, ono isto nevaljalo derište Venerino, zametnuto
Mišlju, začeto ćudljivošću, a rođeno ludošću;
Taj slepi raskalašni deran koji opsenjuje
Svačije oči, jer svojih nema, - neka on presudi
Koliko sam utonula u ljubav. Velim ti, Alijena,
Ne mogu bez njega. Idem da nađem kakav hlad I Da uzdiem dok on ne dođe.

SILIJA

A ja ću da spavam.

In the original text we can see the allusion to the Apostles' Creed[30] but modified in a Shakespearean, anti-religious way. Memorising this prayer was part of the Catechism in the Elizabethan age, and we can see elements of rebelliousness in the modification, along with the Elizabethan belief in four elemental body fluids which ruled physical, and more importantly in this case, mental health. That would directly influence the way the person would express themselves. Since spleen was associated with melancholy, Shakespeare uses the syntagma 'conceived of spleen ', translated as 'čežnja 'and 'čudljivošću 'in the Croatian and Serbian versions respectively. However, 'čežnja' represents the more precise translation since it is a state sharing many similarities with melancholy. 'Ćudljivost' – the meaning belongs in the spectre of more aggressive behaviour and irrational actions[31] and is therefore less adequate.

The second example of another allusion is the noun 'hlad' used in both translations. Another allusion, specifically to the Elizabethan age word for actor (shadow: shady place - under a tree - where Celia plans to sleep; but the same word is used for an actor, thus recalling for the audience the roleplaying of the whole scene[32]) which neither translation represented faithfully. A better translation could be a more descriptive one, i.e. '...potražit ću negdje gdje svjetlost ne dopire i uzdisati, dok on ne dođe.' This would be short enough not to disrupt the flow of the dialogue, but descriptive enough to point the reader into the right direction – a place off-stage, without lights in the modern sense.

[30] Ibid., p. 299.
[31] Kontekst.io, 'ćudljivost', *Kontekst.io Slični izrazi I sinonimi u savremenom hrvatskom, slovenskom I srpskom*, accessed 17 June 2019,
https://www.kontekst.io/hrvatski/%C4%87udljivost
[32] Shakespeare, *op. cit., p.* 300.

Act V, Scene 1

Touchstone converses with William (Audrey's courter). Touchstone is set to marry Audrey and, explains to William:

English:

TOUCHSTONE

Then learn this of me: to have, is to have; for it
is a figure in rhetoric that drink, being poured out
of a cup into a glass, by filling the one doth empty
the other; for all your writers do consent that ipse
is he: now, you are not ipse, for I am he.

WILLIAM

Which he, sir?

TOUCHSTONE

He, sir, that must marry this woman. Therefore, you
clown, abandon,--which is in the vulgar leave,--the
society,--which in the boorish is company,--of this
female,--which in the common is woman; which
together is, abandon the society of this female, or,
clown, thou perishest; or, to thy better
understanding, diest; or, to wit I kill thee, make
thee away, translate thy life into death, thy
liberty into bondage: I will deal in poison with
thee, or in bastinado, or in steel; I will bandy
with thee in faction; I will o'errun thee with
policy; I will kill thee a hundred and fifty ways:
therefore tremble and depart.

Croatian:

Brus

Onda se uči ovo od mene: tko ima, ima. Jer To je retorička figura, da piće, kad se natoči iz vrča u čašu, time, što ispunjava jedno, ispražnjava drugo. Svi se pisci slažu u tom da je *ipse* on; a sad nisi ti *ipse*, nego sam ja on.

Vilim

Kakav on, gospodine?

Brus

Takav on, gospodine, koji mora da vjenča Ovu djevojku. Zato, zvekane, napusti (to se pučki veli: ostavi) saobraćaj (seljački se kaže: društvo)
Ovog ženskinja (obično rečeno: cure), što sve skupa
Znači: kani se ove djevojke; ili ćeš, zvekane, Poginuti, odnosno, da bolje razumiješ, umrijeti, To znači, ubit ću te, maknut ću te sa svijeta, prenijeti
Iz života u smrt, iz slobode u ropstvo. Poslužit ću te otrovom, ili toljagom, ili čelikom; udružit ću se protiv tebe; svladat ću te politički; uništit ću te na sto i pedeset načina. Zato dršći i nestani.

Serbian:

KREMEN

Onda nauči ovo od mene: imati, to je imati; Jer to ti je jedina figura u retorici, da piće, kad se sipa iz kupe u čašu, prazni jednu dok puni drugu; jer svi se pisci slažu u tome da je ipse on; međutim, ti nisi ipse, jer sam ja on.

VILIJEM

Koji on, gospodine?

KREMEN

Onaj, gospodine, koji će se oženiti ovom ženom. Zato ti, avguste, likvidiraj – što će prostački reći: rasturaj – svoju komunikaciju- što se seljački kaže: vezu – sa ovom damom – što se u običnom govoru kaže: ženskom; što jedno na drugo znači: likvidiraj komunikaciju sa ovom damom, ili si, avguste, svršio svoje, iliti, da bi me bolje razumeo mreš; što će pak reći, šaljem te bogu na istinu, preobraćam te iz života u smrt, iz slobode u ropstvo. Urediću te otrovom, ili batinom, ili čelikom; Razneću te zaverom, samleću te politikom, ubiću te na sto i pedeset načina. Zato, cepti i kidaj!

A grammatical joke such as the one in the first verse by Touchstone is difficult to translate. Arden Shakespeare's *As You Like It* explains the joke as follows:

> Touchstone claims that the Latin pronoun *ipse* means 'he', and that William cannot be *ipse,* i.e. the 'he' who will marry Audrey, because he himself *(ipse)* is that 'he'. In Lily's *Grammar* the section on pronominal construction declares: *'IPSE, ex pronominibus solum trium personarum significationem repraesentat: vt: Ipse vidi. Ipse videris. Ipse dixit'* (281) *('Ipse* is the only one of the pronouns which may stand for the signifying of three persons: as, I myself see. You yourself will see. He himself said.'). Touchstone is not the only 'he', because *ipse* can apply to all three grammatical (and actual) persons.[33]

Both translations had the same approach. The joke itself is translated well within the context but it remains open until William's retort, which is what makes it both complete and humorous. The Croatian translation does not close the joke properly. Again, consulting the Arden Shakespeare reveals that the reply William gives Touchstone combines fiction and real-world phaenomena. The question is legitimate as all actors in the Elizabethan Age were male, so the retort is important for the reader to realise the implication. The Serbian translators have succeeded at finalising the joke as intended and using ‘koji’ instead of ‘kakav’. ‘Kakav’ implies the collocutor does not understand the joke, meaning he does not understand the fictional joke. This immediately breaks off the immersion and ambiguity of the joke by completely making it devoid of real-life association. ‘Koji’ means ‘which’ – both simple and effective.

The second example would be the long reply by Touchstone. Several interesting elements are visible. Firstly, the way ‘clown’ and ‘the society’ are translated in both versions. The Croatian translator decided to go for a simple, lexical equivalent ‘zvekane’ which translates into ‘fool’. The Serbian translators were creative in their choice of translation. By opting for ‘avguste’ they created a historically viable element in the translation. The only source of explanation for why, mostly in the Serbian language, people say ‘glupi Avgust’ for someone who seeks for attention by acting foolishly is a news site. The explanation says that it involves an imperator named Octavian, who was named August by the Senate which would translate into ‘Supreme Stupid August’, and was used to address people who behave as described above. According to the source, the word was

[33] Shakespeare, *op. cit.*, p. 317.

first used by the English and French for a jester.[34] The usage of the words fits both the context and the style, but adds a note of uniqueness in the translation.

The second example includes the word ‘saobraćaj’ which would translate to English as ‘traffic’, although it can mean communication too. I find ‘saobraćaj’ to be a bold choice in a Shakespearean work, since it completely breaks the flow of reading. Adding to that, it was poorly chosen in relation to the entire comedy. The Croatian translation, as shown before, often features sentence pattern inversion, and generally a very artificial syntax. Perhaps it is to poeticise the comedy, or embellish it. Whichever the intention I found the word ‘saobraćaj’ completely inadequate and not belonging with the manner in which the remainder of the comedy was translated. The Serbian translators have chosen a less burdensome way by using ‘komunikaciju’ which is congruent semantically with ‘vezu’. By contrast, the Croatian ‘saobraćaj’ does not semantically complement ‘društvo’.

The word ‘female’ is translated as ‘ženskinja’ in the Croatian version, which is precise in terms of lexical equivalency, whereas the Serbian translation ‘dama’ means ‘lady’ thus making it imprecise on a lexical basis. The entire sequence including what Touchstone deems superior words (the first ones in order of appearance) works as a semantic unit which makes it successful, but not precise.

In the same reply, we also have two different approaches to the line ‘... which together is: ‘abandon the society of this female’...’ The Croatian translation gives the impression of sloppiness in that it does not even assemble the words which were meant to represent the ‘superior’ alternates to the common words into the same string, but uses a completely different set of words – ‘Znači: kani se ove djevojke’ vs. The Serbian translation which shows consistency in the choice of lexical items: ‘likvidiraj komunikaciju sa ovom damom;’ Albeit consistent, the Serbian translation’s ‘likvidiraj’ and ‘komunikaciju’ are words which do not necessarily represent the prime choices for literary translation of Shakespearean works. Better equivalents would be less technical words, belonging to colloquial speech, such as ‘prekini’ and ‘veze’. The Croatian translation is more organic with ‘kani se ove djevojke’, but unfortunately inconsistent with the first string of words it provides.

Going further in the reply we see in the Croatian translation the following line: ‘udružit ću se protiv tebe;’ which doesn't seem to have an equivalent in English at all. Perhaps the translator did not

[34] Ekapija, ‘*ZAŠTO SE KAŽE:* Glupi Avgust?’, accessed 17 June, 2019, https://www.ekapija.com/news/1259331/zasto-se-kaze-glupi-avgust.

properly interpret the line ‘I will bandy with thee in faction;’ According to the Arden Shakespeare explanation, bandy means ‘exchange blows and words’ and ‘in faction’ in a spirit of dissension.[35] The Serbian translation doesn't truthfully reproduce this translation either with the phrase: ‘Razneću te zaverom’. Semantically they do not represent the abovementioned phrase from the original and a better translation would be: ‘razmjenjivat ćemo udarce u razmirici.’

[35] Shakespeare, *op. cit.*, p. 318.

Conclusion

Translational analysis of literature the magnitude of Shakespeare is difficult. The translator has to make choices based on his own interpretation of the culture of his/her own time. In *As You Like It* I believe some passage require simplicity in translation, and have to target syntax. In other places, like long monologues or replies, a window opens for stylistically more elaborate expressiveness. Throughout the analysis, especially behind the scenes while creating a list of potential examples I have struggled to decide which example fit the category I aimed for. However, the intricacy of this comedy is in its inability to have solitary elements as main building blocks. Congruence, complementation, consistency - the three Cs – are what make this a delight for analysis. Both translations have done an admirable job in carefully moving the piece and restoring it in a slightly more contemporary manner but I believe that the delicacy with which they approached the play would be target of a groan or two from Shakespeare himself. The essence of the play is to provide a framework, and it is the time and place of the reader to fill it with the content that surrounds him. Perhaps writing for stage and reading is not as distinct as when I set out on this odyssey.

As theatrical performances gave way to modern cinematography, VOD and mass media, reading suffered too. Then it is indeed too much to expect for any modern a translator to tackle Shakespeare's plays. However, the approach needs to change – Shakespeare will remain a champion of literature and one of the most prominent literary prodigies alongside Plato, Homer, Dante Alighieri and many others – into being used as a formula, and we as humans living in another time and age, another plain of life, input our own numbers to achieve a great result.

In translating Shakespeare, by staying within the cultural and historical norms we set ourselves up for failure. It is hard, and not in the nature of man to identify or connect with what is distant. It is the conditio humana we all share. The Croatian and Serbian translations have achieved the goal of transporting an old message in a new envelope, but the message might as well be read a hundred times, yet we would still seek the meaning of it. Syntactically, both translations experimented with different constructions with adverbials in emphatic position, reversing the SVO pattern into OVS. Lexically the Serbian version was more accomplished, some of the choices were more engaging and left me as a reader with a content smile on my face. The Croatian version despite being only two years the younger had more odd choices than the Serbian and more often than not I found myself stopping to wonder if that was the right course of action. Stylistically, both added their own atmosphere to the play with the Serbian version being a little bit more engaging for my part.

To conclude this conclusion, the Serbian translation was the more complete one with not only more adequate, but also stylistically more usable lexical elements and syntax.

In the end, one can never quantify what is a subjective, intrinsic quality to oneself. The aim of the thesis was to try and show how Shakespeare's writing is not just permanent ink on paper, but a living form which can be stretched and moulded to fit what is close to us. The Serbian translation was a better showcase and for that I am grateful to both Mr. Velimir and Mr. Branimir in having made the case for this thesis 70 years ago.

Bibliography

S. Bassnett & A. Lefevere, *Constructing Cultures: Essays On Literary Translation Topics in Translation*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, 1998

D. Bellos, *Is That a Fish In Your Ear – Translation and the Meaning of Everything*, Faber and Faber inc., New York, 2011

Craig, W.J. ed. (1966). *Shakespeare Complete Works*. London: Oxford University Press

Glosbe, *Glosbe – the multilingual Online Dictionary*, https://glosbe.com/sr/en/

Kontekst.io, *Kontekst.io slični izrazi i sinonimi u hrvatskom srpskom i slovenskom jeziku*, https://www.kontekst.io/srpski

A. Lefevere, *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook*, Routledge, London and New York, 1992

N. Pavlović, *Uvod u teorije prevođenja*, Zagreb, Leykam international, 2015

W. Shakespeare, *As You Like It*, edited by Juliet Dusinberre, London, Arden Shakespeare, 2006

W. Shakespeare, *Kako vam se sviđa*, translated from English by Slavko Ježić, Zagreb, Matica Hrvatska, , 1951

W. Shakespeare, Kako vam drago, translated from English by B. Nedić i V. Živojinović, Beograd, Prosveta, 1949

G. Toury, *Descriptive Translation Studies – and Beyond*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2012