

Whose Immortality Is It Anyway? The Hungarian Translations of Shakespeare's Sonnet 18

Péter Egri

Text and translation mutually function as one another's context both in terms of style and cultural history. None of Shakespeare's sonnets is easy to translate, but Sonnet 18 would seem to be especially difficult to render. The turns of its intellectual-emotional structure, the dramatic changes of its poetic message, the verse music of its rhyme scheme, the referential ambiguities of the sonnet, the relationship between sense and sound, metre and rhythm, the intricacies of imagery and the daringly innovative treatment of tradition present and represent complexities that test the translator, try the adventurer, and challenge the challenger.

1. The Challenge

Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?
Thou art more lovely and more temperate:
Rough winds do shake the darling buds of May,
And summer's lease hath all too short a date:
Sometime too hot the eye of heaven shines,
And often is his gold complexion dimm'd;
And every fair from fair sometime declines,
By chance, or nature's changing course untrimm'd;
But thy eternal summer shall not fade,
Nor lose possession of that fair thou ow'st,
Nor shall death brag thou wander'st in his shade,
When in eternal lines to time thou grow'st;
So long as men can breathe, or eyes can see,
So long lives this, and this gives life to thee.
(Shakespeare 1108)

Shakespeare's Sonnet 18 seems to start in Petrarch's wake. The first eight lines praise the matchless friend by a gallant comparison "to a summer's day," by the courteous and courting claim of "Thou art more

lovely and more temperate," and by the visual *crescendo* of increasingly sensuous images representing "nature's changing course."

The Petrarchan praise is enhanced by the proverbial comparison underlying line 1: "as good as one shall see in a summer's day," meaning 'as good as the best there is' (Booth 161). So Shakespeare pays a paradoxical compliment to his friend: if he is "more lovely and more temperate" than a summer's day, then he is better than the best.

Line 9 begins with the usual Petrarchan contrast here specifically emphasized by "But." The turn is emphatic: while the section before "But" throws into relief the capricious changes a summer's day is subject to, the lines after "But" point out proudly the unchanging quality of the friend's beauty, whose "eternal summer shall not fade."

Rhythm is also full of reverence. In the first two lines metric iambs are gropingly tentative. In pronouncing "Shall I," "thee to," "Thou art," "more love-" and "more tem-," "we hardly know which of two syllables in a foot receives greater stress (Wright 81). In line 9, however, rhythmic pulsation gains metric assurance proclaiming, "But thy eternal summer shall not fade," and proving Hallett Smith right in claiming that Shakespeare's sonnets "must be heard" (x). Does the sonnet pay tribute to Petrarch's immortality? It hardly does.

The last two lines (introduced by the previous one) bring a characteristic change with an unexpected, abrupt and dramatic turn in the intellectual-emotional structure of the sonnet: the friend is eternal only by virtue of the eternalizing magic of the sonnet. Until the very end, the poet pretends to be down on his knees, looking up to his friend in humble adoration. At the conclusion of the sonnet, the poet, as it were, dusts off his knees, towers over his friend, un.masks himself, patronizes his patron, and transforms the semblance of humility into the praise of pride. It is indeed the sonnet which renders the friend eternal and immortal, it is then Shakespeare who is eternal and immortal.

Who would now be interested in the doubtful identity of the addressed person if the address had not been made by Shakespeare? Who was Mr. W. H. that Thomas Thorpe dedicated the pirated edition of the *Sonnets* to in 1609? Was he Henry Wriothesley, third Earl of Southampton, despite the reverse order of his initials? Was he William Herbert, third Earl of Pembroke, in spite of the incompatibility of his high social standing and the low, matter-of-fact tone of *Mr.*? Was he William Hart, Shakespeare's brother-in-law? Or another William Hart, Shakespeare's nephew? Or William Hughes allegedly suggested by a pun in Sonnet 20? Was he William Hathaway, Shakespeare's other brother-in-law? Or William Hathaway, his father-in-law? Later research has unfortunately proved that both were, in fact, called Richard. Was Mr. W. H. William Harvey (or Hervey), the third husband of Southampton's mother, the begetter as procurer, rather than inspirer, of Shakespeare's *Sonnets*? Perhaps William Hatcliffe, Lord of Misrule at Gray's Inn? Or William Hammond, the dedicatee of Middleton's *Game at Chess*? Or William Haughton, a dramatist of no importance? Or William Holgate, an

innkeeper's son? Or another William Herbert, Pembroke's cousin? Maybe William Harrison, topographer, clergyman and biologist? Or Henry Willobie, author of *Willobie His Avis* where the protagonist is called H. W. and another character is named W. S.? Or William Hall, another procurer as begetter, a stationer's assistant and later a printer? Or a fictitious person invented to mystify, misguide and mislead? Could Mr. W. H. by any chance be William Shakespeare himself as William *Himself*? Whose immortality is it anyway? The farcically long series of identifications is worthy of the spirit of Shakespearean comedy. Theories surface and submerge in rapid succession (Rollins II 295-313; Kéry 305-306, 310; Halliday 462-463; Rowse 1965, 61; Wilson LXXXVIII-CVIII, 115; Booth 547-548; Smith 15; Giroux 18, 20, 24; Wells 165; Tótfalusi 160-161). What matters for the translator if he, too, aspires to immortality is to find the right tone which corresponds to the inspirer as a fair youth, a young man, an exquisite friend the poet was attracted to with the personal affection and ardour characteristic of Elizabethan friendship.

Another crucial factor the translator must consider in choosing the right words for the couplet is the age-old tradition of the immortalizing power of poetry witnessed in Pindar, Bacchylides, Simonides, Theocritus, Sappho, Theognis of Megara, Horace, Ennius, Ovid, Tibullus, Propertius, Tasso, Ronsard, Du Bellay, Desportes, Spenser, Daniel or Drayton: a tradition Shakespeare both continued and renewed with Renaissance emphasis and personal ingenuity (Leishman 49-50). The metrically clear iambs of the closing couplet, the spondee in the fourth foot of the last line ("gives life"), the *ritartando* of pace and the strong stress on "this" and "thee" lend special prominence to the process in which "the poetry of praise becomes a praise of poetry itself" (Fineman 93-95). The resonant pauses after "this" and "thee" are filled with intimations of immortality and reverberations of eternity. Shakespeare's sonnet ultimately proves to be the paean of Renaissance individualism.

The movement of emotions is supported by the motion of rhymes. In the rhyme scheme of *abab, cdcd, efef, gg* the structural caesura after line 12 separates individual rhymes and contrasts alternating rhymes with the closing couplet whose dramatic function is also attested by its frequent use at the ends of scenes in Shakespeare's plays. The units in the rhyme scheme correspond to the sections in the intellectual-emotional structure. Verse music accompanies intellectual and emotional progression in Renaissance harmony. Ideas and passions become audible with Renaissance plasticity.

They also become visible in the sonnet's imagery. The intention of comparison announced and intoned in the very first line proves the formative principle of structuring images. The idea of comparing the friend to a summer's day causes surprise by its simplicity. Petrarch would certainly have used a more exquisite target of comparison, a much more "incomparable" element of nature. In the first line of his sonnet, Shakespeare astonishes the reader or listener by presenting nature natu-

ral. This is congruent with the tone of his Sonnet 130 whose imagery is overtly and polemically anti-Petrarchan (Bermann 86-87), parodying the Petrarchan platitudes of Thomas Watson's seventh "Passion" in the sequence *Hecatompithia* (Wilson CX). (For us, of course, it would be futile and unjust to set up any kind of hierarchy between Petrarch and Shakespeare.)

The second line of Shakespeare's Sonnet 18 provides the second surprise: the friend is claimed to be "more lovely and more temperate" than a summer's day can be. In this resourceful complement the measure of comparison is inverted in a witty compliment. "Lovely" and "temperate" are Janus-faced adjectives: they may refer both to the friend's qualities and to nature's properties.

The images and tropes to follow fulfil the promise of comparison with full visual plasticity. The next six lines focus the changing phenomena of nature, but imply a personal presence and interest by personification ("Rough winds do shake," "summer's lease," "the eye of heaven," "his gold complexion,") by combining personification with metonymy ("the darling buds of May,") by a metaphor referring to a human transaction ("summer's lease,") and by evoking a complex symbolic image of sweeping and imaginative generalization which may equally relate to Fate, nature and people ("And every fair from fair sometime declines, / By chance, or nature's changing course untrimm'd.")

The translator certainly has a hard time in rendering this pseudo-octet of Shakespeare's sham-Petrarchan section. Besides adhering to the general sense of the sentence, he or she must also remain faithful to Shakespeare's tropes. He cannot omit Shakespeare's metaphors, since the Shakespearean sonnet tends to transmit its message by "dramatic metaphor" (Bermann 59-92). Nor can the translator disregard the appearance of metonymy, because the Petrarchan sonnet shows an inclination to "lyric metonymy" (Bermann 10-50), and therefore the use of metonymy in a mock-Petrarchan section is functional. Nor can the translator disregard the metaphor-related personification of "the eye of heaven" which has a number of other parallel and converse occurrences in other works by Shakespeare (Pooler 21). Besides, sun, king and gold are frequently associated in Shakespeare's sonnets (Knight 63). The syntactical relationship of "By chance, or nature's changing course untrimm'd" presents further difficulties for the translator. He may interpret the grammatical connection like this: "Every fair from fair sometime declines" 'stripped of its ornaments by accident or in the course of changing seasons' (Wilson 116, Booth 161), but he may also think that the relationship is best expressed the way A. L. Rowse does in his prose translation of the sonnet: 'everything that is fair loses its beauty, by chance or in the course of nature coarsened' (Rowse 1973, 39). Shakespeare's syntax is expressively ambiguous.

The four lines after the turn ("But") continue the comparison; however, they make personal presence overt ("thy eternal summer," "thou wander'st," "thou grow'st,") focus the friend's perennial fairness, and with-

out omitting personification (“brag,” “wander’st”) they tend to reverse the direction of analogy by pointing out contrastive properties of capricious nature in the friend’s unchanging nature through hypnotic and magnetic metaphors (“*thy eternal summer shall not fade,*” “When in eternal lines *to time thou grow’st.*”) While “eternal lines” primarily refer to the verse lines of this sonnet, they may also pluck the semantic overtones of being ‘bound eternally’ as “a graft is usually bound in place by chords until it has coalesced with the stock” (Booth 162). They may also symbolically allude to the ‘lines of life,’ “the threads spun by the Fates in classical mythology” (Booth 162). In any case, eternal lines defeat Devouring Time.

While the personified “gold complexion” and “the eye of heaven” invest the sun with human qualities, the vastly dimensioned metaphoric image of growing to time attributes natural traits to the peerless friend who grows to time with such natural ease as “the darling buds of May” will open, unfold, unfurl, blossom forth and grow. Both personification and metaphor work magic in the poem: in terms of presentation and representation they achieve perfect visual plasticity of the human and the natural, attaining total sensuous unity of man and thing. (The magic is paradoxical: it is performed in a poem which thematically separates the qualities of the friend from the properties of nature.)

Since the miracle takes place in this sonnet, it is only appropriate that in its closing couplet the opening perspective of eternity should project and reinforce the inseparable unity of thing and person, object and subject, the poet’s verse and his friend’s worth. The former is not only the immortalizer but also the creator and sustainer of the latter. The challenge is formidable.

2. Taking up the Gauntlet (Kojari, Szász, Zoltán, Ferenczi, Fábry, Pákozdy, Vöröss, Keszthelyi, Justus, Víg and Csillag)

As early as 1872, Lajos Kojari published a Hungarian version of Shakespeare’s Sonnet 18 in the periodical *Családi Kör*:

A nyári naphoz hasonlitsalak?

Nem, nincs oly kedves az, milyen te vagy;
Tavaszi rózsái hamar hullanak,

S muló a nyár is, kis nyomot ha hagy!

Most arany napja forró hévvel ég,

De verőfénye már meg elborult. . .

S hányszor cseréli báját, kellemét

Ha a természet neki zordonult!

Nincs ily veszélytől néked félni mért,

Mi sem fenyegeti szépséged nyarát,

Örök dalokban nyersz te majd habért, (sic)

És nem kell félned a fagyos halált!
 A mig lehellnek, mig fog látni szem:
 Él s éltet téged is ez énekem!
 (Kojari 272)

The general line of argument in the translation approaches the progress of ideas in Shakespeare's sonnet: Kojari has rendered the turns of thought in lines 9 and 13, even if he has reversed the Shakespearean order in lines 11-12. Kojari has also translated Shakespeare's rhyme scheme correctly.

Some of his phrasing is definitely fortunate ("Örök dalokban,") and by beginning the first line with the unstressed definite article, he deftly counterbalances the "trochaic" tendency in Hungarian, where all words have the accent on the first syllable and so, without the article, "nyári" would start the iambic line and poem with a clear trochee.

Yet his translation is a far cry from the original. Spelling Shakespeare's name with *Sch-* in the title "Schakespeare sonettjeiből" may suggest a German source (unless *Sch-* is a simple misprint like "habér" for babér in line 11). The comma after "Nem," in line 2 breaks the flow of rhythm with an unnecessary and unpleasant pause. Shakespeare's key word ("temperate") has been omitted. Line 3 discards "Rough winds" and replaces the particularity of "May" by a vague reference to spring. In line 4 Kojari leaves out the expressively sharp and seemingly "unpoetic" legal term of "lease" and, to make rhyme, he adds a "Biedermeierish" make-rhyme ("kis nyomot ha hagy!") Line 5 substitutes a stylistic commonplace ("arany napja") for Shakespeare's vivid personification ("the eye of heaven,") and line 6 also replaces a personification ("gold complexion") by a platitude ("verőfénye.") The surprised wondering implied in "már meg" and the three dots at the end of the line are out of place and context. In line 7 Shakespeare uses a universalizing new subject ("every fair,") but Kojari lags behind by keeping the earlier subject and by adopting outworn Romantic clichés ("báját, kellemét.") Being synonyms, they are doubly superfluous. Line 8 leaves Shakespeare's alternative untranslated and fills in yet another Romantic stereotype increasing the impression of contextual incongruity ("neki zordonult!") Line 9 loses a natural metaphor ("thy eternal summer") and uses unnatural word order ("félni mért,") no doubt, to extort a rhyme. In line 10 metaphor lost becomes metaphor regained ("szépséged nyarát,") but unfortunately also weakened. Line 11 drops Shakespeare's personification ("brag") and introduces a further banality ("nyersz te majd habért/babért,") while line 12 exemplifies the change of Shakespeare's classical context by substituting "És nem kell félned a fagyos halált!" for "Nor shall death brag thou wander'st in his shade." Line 13 sounds awkward with its general subject ("A mig lehellnek,") but line 14 closes the sonnet with a terse phrase ("él s éltet,") good rhyme and smooth rhythm.

If Lajos Kojari was an amateur, Károly Szász was a professional, well versed in Shakespearean sources, critics and critiques. While Kojari just tried his hand at translating a few sonnets by Shakespeare, Szász, a prolific translator of his plays and poems, joined forces with Vilmos Győry to render all of Shakespeare's sonnets. A master of routine rather than inspiration (Kardos 59,) Szász came forth with a translation that was deeply anchored in the average "poetic" vocabulary preceding or coinciding with the time of its publication (1878), and lost its significance with the passing of time. Yet a few of his solutions deserve notice:

A nyári naphoz hasonlitsalak?
 Kedvesb vagy annál s enyhébb fényű te.
 Zord széltül gyöngé bimbók hullanak,
 És ah, rövid a nyárnak élete.
 Forró sugárral néha gyujt a nap,
 De arany arcza néha elborul.
 Elveszti báját, mi legbájosabb,
 S a változó idővel díszé mul.
 Csak életed nem veszti el nyarát:
 Mi bájte birsch, azt el nem tépi vész.
 Kevély halál árnyát nem nyujtja rád,
 Örök dalomban ki örökre élsz!
 Mig lesz egy élő s lesz szeme s szive:
 Ez élni fog, s fogsz benne élni te!
 (Szász 176)

While the first line is identical with Kojari's, the last line puts the personal pronoun to the very end and thus places an authentic Shakespearean emphasis on it.

On the other hand, Szász is out of context with Shakespeare. Whereas his sentimental vocabulary ("Zord," "báj") places him out of semantic context, and his overemotional "ah" in line 4 puts him out of rhetorical context (É. Kiss 29), his practice of finishing lines 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 with a full stop and lines 12 and 14 with a mark of exclamation sets him out of tonal context. He radically changes Shakespeare's verse music. Shakespeare prescribes only one full stop (at the very end of the sonnet), and so invites the speaker of his poem to lower his voice once (leaving it to him whether he wishes to use a falling intonation at the end of line 8). Szász, however, suggests with his punctuation that the speaker's voice should descend at the end of every other line. The usual way of describing the rhyme scheme only indicates the order of rhymes. In the set of *abab*, *cdcd*, *efef*, *gg* the different letters only show where a different rhyme occurs. A true translator should also consider the pitch of the rhymes, the relative intervals of contiguous rhymes, which—depending on the individual speaker's actual performance—may be like this:

pitch										
a1	a1						e1	e1	f2	
	b1	b1						f1	f1	
		b2	c1	c1						
	a2			c2				e2		
			d1	d1						g1 g1
				d2						g2
time										

Making allowances for the deviations of intonation patterns in English and Hungarian, the actual rises and falls of the voice pronouncing the rhymes may come in the translation at different moments, but the total effect of tonal undulations should be rendered, and the general direction of the ascending or descending voice should be observed as far as possible. This is the very thing that Szász's translation fails to do.

Vilmos Zoltán's translation was published in 1908.

Mondjam talán, hogy nyárnak vagy te napja?
Hisz szebb vagy annál, s nem oly szertelen,
Május rózsáját metsző szél fagyasztja,
A nyár meg röpke, s elszáll hirtelen.

Az ég szeme majd gyilkos lángot áraszt,
Majd meg korongját rejtik fellegek,
Mi szép volt, látom rútra válni már azt,
A báj idő gyors szárnyán ellebeg.

Csupán a te nyarad virul örökre,
És bájából szépséged mit se' veszt el,
Bár sirnak hantja domborul fölötte;

Mert te örök sorokban élsz s növekszel:
Mig ember él, mig szem olvasni képes,
A dalom élni fog, s te benne, édes!
(Zoltán 101)

Zoltán initiated a number of happy solutions. His "Mondjam talán...?" breaks a new path after "hasonlitsalak...?"; his "nem oly szertelen" is the right equivalent of "more temperate;" and his "Az ég szeme" renders Shakespeare's personification for the first time in Hungarian.

Yet if his text improves those of his predecessors, his context falls short of the original. His "báj" and "ellebeg" are dated sentimental clichés; his "sirnak hantja domborul" adopts and adapts Petőfi's "Hol sirjaink domborulnak" ("Nemzeti dal") rather than translates Shakespeare's "Nor

shall death brag thou wander'st in his shade;" his "mig szem olvasni képes" presupposes a reader rather than a listener of Shakespeare's sonnet; and his final "édes!" artificially sweetens the sonnet and suggests a feminine addressee.

Besides getting the sonnet's stylistic context wrong, Zoltán also misinterprets its innovative context and anti-Petrarchan bias. The division of the sonnet into four separate stanzas of two quatrains and two tercets corresponds to the Petrarchan practice and rhyme scheme, but contradicts the Shakespearean model and rhyme arrangement. The liberal use of feminine endings also evokes Petrarchan associations. For him who finds the gauntlet too heavy, taking it up may lead to letting it fall, or even to running the gauntlet.

Zoltán Ferenczi, the philologist-translator (Kardos 62), in some respects follows in the wake of Vilmos Zoltán:

Mondjam, hogy mása vagy egy nyári napnak?
 Szelídebb s bájosabb vagy, mint amaz:
 Zord széltől május szép bimbói fagynak,
 S a nyár nagyon rövid idő-szakasz;
 Olykor túlnagy a hője ég szemének,
 S arany-arczán gyakran van borulat:
 S szépségből majd kifogynak mind a szépek,
 Dísz veszve természet vagy sors miatt;
 De sohse lesz örök nyaradnak vége,
 Se nem veszted szépséged birtokát;
 Halál sem ujong, hogy jutsz éjjelébe,
 Örök dalban ha nőssz időkön át;
 Mig ember él s mig csak szem fénye lát,
 Ez addig él és néked éltet ad.
 (Ferenczi 258)

His translation (1916) also mollifies and mellifies Shakespeare's lines by appending them with Petrarchan feminine endings (in lines 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11 and 13). His vocabulary cannot give up exhausted Romantic stereotypes either ("bájosabb," "Zord," "borulat," "éltet ad,") and even his spelling is archaic ("arczán.")

On the other hand, several of his innovations tend to be over-precise and much too technical ("amaz," "idő-szakasz," "túlnagy a hője," "Se nem," "Ez.") His philologically explanatory text does not live up to the requirements of a Renaissance poetic context. Sometimes Ferenczi is not content with the auditory cross effect of Shakespeare's alternating rhymes, and adds awkward-sounding, far-distanced and internally placed cross-eyed slant rhymes (fagynak," "kifogynak.") On other occasions (in line 9) he means to be ameliorative but proves pejorative.

Yet some of his phrases show ingenuity. Like Zoltán, he starts the sonnet with the intimate "Mondjam...?," he hits upon the words "mása

vagy,” finds the phrase “szépséged birtokát,” and approaches the concept of immortality in “Örök dalban ha nőssz időkön át.”

Károly Fábry’s rendering (1921) sounds like a paraphrasis in prose of Shakespeare’s original:

A nyári naphoz hasonlítsalak?
 Te szeretetreméltóbb vagy s mérsékelt:
 Május rügyén a böszült szelek ráznak
 S rövid szolgálát után a Nyár széled:
 Néha túl forrón az ég szeme izzik
 És gyakran arany orcája ködös lett;
 És minden szép idő egyszer elmúlik
 Véletlen, mert változó a természet;
 De a Te örök nyarad sosem múlik
 S nem vagy adósa soha semmi szépnek;
 S a Halál ne kérkedjen, hogy hol nyúlik
 Örök utad, árnyékai ott élnek:
 Amíg ember lélekkzik, szemek néznek,
 Addig e sorok veled együtt élnek.
 (Fábry 77)

With the exception of the smoothly iambic first line, which is a literal borrowing from Kojari and Szász, the metric pattern of the other lines is so lame, the syntax of line 3 so poor, the word order of lines 5 and 6 is so artificial, the wording of lines 2, 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13 and 14 is so unprecise and prosaic that one wonders why rhymes occur at all in a text like this. Its context is not attuned to the lyric register of Shakespeare’s sonnet.

Ferenc Pákozdy’s poetic fantasy (1943), on the contrary, strikes the listener or reader as a free musical variation on a Shakespearean theme:

Tavaszi naphoz hasonlítsalak?
 Te állandóbb vagy s enyhébb, kedvesebb:
 vihart vet május és rügyet arat
 és úgy elillan, mint a fõrgeteg;
 egének szeme olykor túltüzes,
 aranyos arca gyakran elborul
 s ha fagy találja érni vagy reves
 köd, minden ékessége porbahull:
 de a te örök tavaszod sosem
 fakul meg, sosem hal meg; a halál
 se henceg, ő is ámul veszteden:
 idővé, örök dallá nőssz te már, —
 ameddig ember él, e dal is él
 s minden hangjában életed zenél.
 (Pákozdy 18)

The translator prefers spring to summer, so he chooses to compare the friend to a spring's day (lines 1 and 9). In interpreting line 3, he has in mind the Hungarian proverb "Ki szelet vet, vihart arat," and gives it a witty twist, but then in line 4 he faces the problem of what to do with his much-too-prominent tempest, and devotes a full line to charming it away, along with May. As man sows, so he shall reap. The "reves köd" of lines 7-8 is a mere invention screening Shakespearean sense with dialectal nonsense, an inappropriate enjambement and an inaccurate term. Line 11 makes even death wonder, and line 14 closes the sonnet with soft and gentle music. It is apparently a refuge in time of war, as the whole sonnet cycle proved to be for the retired translator (Pákozdy IX, XIII).

István Vöröss published a comparable free fantasy in the same year (1943):

Azt mondjam rólad, bibor nyári nap vagy?

De lényed nála lengébb s lágymeleg;

május bimbóit ősz tarolja s vad fagy

s nyár éltét kimérik a kósza, bús szelek.

A Nap néha rőten ég, mint a máglya,

de máskor arcán árnyak fürtje lóg;

ráncossá vénhed szépség cifra bája

s a perc eltépi mind, mi dísze volt.

Élted nyarára nem hullhatnak árnyak,

szépséged várát nem veszik be vészek,

kevély halálnak ökle nem találhat,

de dalomban élsz, mint forró lüktetések.

Míg ember lesz s a szív kacagva cseng, üt,

élni fog versem s te is vele együtt.

(Vöröss 92)

Line 1 adds purple to Shakespeare's summer and shifts the duration of the day towards the colour of the sun. Line 2 weaves on the fantasy by the not quite pleasant contrast of claiming the friend to be more airy and lukewarm. Line 3 outdoes Shakespeare by conjuring up autumn, and the next verse (even worse) does the same by adding an inappropriate sixth foot to the limping line. Line 5 brings in the unwonted and unwanted image of a bonfire in a non-Shakespearean simile, while line 6 hooks un-Shakespearean curls and clusters of shadows over the face of the sun. Line 11 surprises the reader by the idea that death has a fist, and line 13 astonishes him by the contention that man's heart laughs, rings and hits. Vöröss's images are painfully out of pictorial context.

The same year (1943) saw Tibor Keszthelyi's complete sonnet cycle in Hungarian. Sonnet 18 in his translation is much more successful than Pákozdy's or Vöröss's, yet it takes more *poetica licentia* than Shakespeare's sonnet invites or permits:

Egy nyári naphoz hasonlitsalak?
 Te bájosabb és annál szelidebb:
 Vad szél a május friss rügyébe kap
 S a nyári pompa máris elsiet:
 Az ég szeméből izzó fény ragyog
 S arany haját homály takarja már;
 És minden szín elhervad és halott,
 A változó körforgás sodra vár;
 Ám: kedvesem, te újuló nyarak
 Hervadhatatlan szépségét veted,
 A kérkedő halál fut, elszalad
 S e versek őrzik fényességedet:
 Életre hívnak s lélekzel Te itt,
 Mig ember szeme fénnel megtelik.
 (Keszthelyi 28)

The first line takes over the solution offered by Kojari, Szász and Fábry, but happily replaces the definite article by the indefinite one. The second line daringly and originally turns a sentence into an addressing apposition. The third line provides a fortunate and fresh interpretation, but the fourth one substitutes “pomp” for “lease.” The fifth line conjures up “the eye of heaven” with an apt personification, but the sixth one changes “complexion” into hair and thus softens the image. The seventh line simplifies Shakespeare’s expressively ambiguous generalization, while the eighth one fails to render the sharp dichotomy of chance and necessity. The ninth and tenth lines are “nicer” and more intimate than the original. The eleventh line is repetitious, whereas the twelfth one provides unexpected brightness. The thirteenth makes the *friend*, rather than “men” breathe, and the fourteenth, by filling man’s eye with light, presents the poet and especially the translator genuinely moved, rather than moving the reader. In his preface Keszthelyi sets the aim of rendering the “flowery style” of 16th-century English poetry (6). His success is his weakness, and his “failure” his forte.

Habent sua fata libelli. The bilingual book (1956) containing all of Shakespeare’s sonnets in the translation of Pál Justus is a unique venture. Equipped with a single copy of the Oxford edition of the *Sonnets* and a pocket dictionary, Justus rendered Shakespeare’s sonnets in Rákosi’s prison. The enterprise is indeed heroic in defence of beauty and personal autonomy. Its result is fairly musical, an aim Justus set in his preface (17):

Szép nyári naphoz hasonlitsalak?
 Sokkal bájosabb vagy és szelidebb:
 Rügyek hullnak vad szél keze alatt
 Májusban, s a nyár fénye rövidebb:
 Az ég szeme olykor tulontul izzik,
 Aranyos arcát fedi máskor felleg;

És még a szépség sem hibátlan mindig,
 És véletlentől homályos a jelleg.
 De a te nyarad el sose viruljon,
 A szépség, mely most ékít, sose vesszen,
 Halál-árnyékban se homályosuljon,
 Örök versem időtlenné nővesszen:
 Míg ember él, s ragyog tekintete,
 Él ez a versem és élsz benne te.
 (Justus 57)

The first quatrain is tender and graceful. The enjambement in line 4 is missing in the original, yet it strikes an original note by placing a special, prolonged and almost song-like emphasis on May. The effect is increased by the significant and sustained pause following "Májusban." The strong outlines of Shakespeare's "lease" are luminously dissolved by the impression of light.

The second quatrain is playfully light, omitting Shakespeare's contrast of contingency and necessity, and sounding a rhyme ("felleg" — "jelleg") which is musically inventive but semantically inappropriate.

The third quatrain with its four-fold subjunctive and stylistic parallelism assumes the attitude, quality and even the tone of an incantation (É. Kiss 171), and the closing couplet is apt, comes pat — save for the extra-polish of eyes radiating happiness. Considering, however, Justus's unhappy condition, the solution is at least understandable.

Béla Víg's interpretation of the total set of sonnets (1976) is also a kind of reinterpretation. This is his version of Sonnet 18:

Egy nyári naphoz hasonlítalak?
 Te gyönyörűbb és mértéktartóbb vagy.
 Május rügyei szélben bomlanak
 S a nyár, alighogy jön, magunkra hagy.
 Az ég szemében égető a kéj,
 De arany arca gyakran elborul.
 A szép a szépnek búcsút mondva kér,
 Hogy gondoljunk rá, s meghal jámborul.
 De a te nyarad nem senyedhet el
 S a szépség tőled soha el nem válhat.
 Csontos kézből sem hull rád gyászlepel,
 Mert az Öröklét szerves része bájad.
 Addig, míg ember lélegzik és szem lát,
 Élni fog ez, mert ebben emlékszem rád.
 (Víg 9)

The first quatrain is beautiful. Its opening line is a literal and literary take-over from Keszthelyi. The following line is original. Its rhythm is

smooth, its "mértéktartóbb" exact; but its "gyönyörűbb" reads like an overstatement. Its middle line is charming, although it omits "rough" and so beautifies the beautiful. Its closing line is again tender, but leaving out "lease," it also softens Shakespeare's statement.

The second quatrain raises some doubts. In its first line "kélj" is more of a complement than a compliment. Its second line repeats Szász, emending his "néha" by the more precise "gyakran." The rest of the quatrain is an independent poetic achievement, but it "declines" from Shakespeare. ("Every fair from fair sometime declines. . .")

The rest of the translation treats Shakespeare's text with increasing liberty. Its "nem senyvedhet el" is below Shakespeare's "shall not fade," while its "Csontos kézből" is over and beyond him. Whereas "szerves része" is too prosaic, "bájad" is too "poetic." The use of feminine endings in lines 9, 11, 13 and 14 is unjustified, and the last line, though elegant, is less poignant than Shakespeare's. In the translation it is the friend's memory in the poet's mind that makes the sonnet live, whereas in the original it is the sonnet that gives eternal life to the friend. The full stops at the ends of lines disregard Shakespeare's musical context, force the voice to descend, disrupt and dismember Shakespeare's poetic continuity and dramatic increase. (Earlier a similar problem appeared in Szász's rendering.) All the same, Béla Víg's version has added an independent voice to the polyphonic chorus of Hungarian translations.

As late as 1994, Tibor Csillag, in his full series of Shakespeare's sonnets, has endeavoured to cast Shakespeare's ore into János Arany's slightly updated nineteenth-century mould. This is his variant of Sonnet 18:

Egy nyári naphoz hasonlítsalak?
 Te szelídebb búbájjal vagy tele:
 május kedvelt rügyére szél szakad,
 s hamar lejár, jaj, a nyár bérlete:
 az ég szeme most túl forrón tüzel,
 aranytűz-arca máskor elborul;
 s a szép a széptől sorra hajlik el,
 véstől s idő-keréktől fosztva hull;
 de ne hervadjon el örök nyarad,
 ne hagyja el szépséged birtokát,
 halál se hengegjen, hogy éjbe csalt,
 'sz örök sorokban nól sz időkön át;
 míg lélezkzik az ember s lát a szem,
 a versben híredet tovább viszem.
 (Csillag 15)

The first line is fine. It repeats Keszthelyi's *trouville* word for word. "Búbáj" in the second line strikes the reader as a somewhat dated overstatement. The equivalent of "temperate" is missing. "Kedvelt" in the third line is too official and officious, but "szél szakad" is an original

solution. "Jaj" in the text and context of the fourth line is an obsolete and superfluous complaint. The fifth, sixth and seventh lines follow the original closely and neatly, except for the unwarranted extra emphasis the word order lends to "sorra." In the eighth line "vésztől" is a left-over from the nineteenth century, and "idő-keréktől" is awkward. In the ninth, tenth and eleventh lines Csillag uses an independent variant of the subjunctives initiated by Justus, though without the incantatory quality of Justus's version. In the twelfth line "nőlsz" reads too archaic, while in the 'sz of its first word an absurd serpent is hissing from the nineteenth century. The couplet sounds beautiful and musical, even if it is less pointed than Shakespeare's "and this gives life to thee."

3. Meeting the Challenge (Szabó, Dávidházi and Mészöly)

Lőrinc Szabó's two translations of Shakespeare's complete cycle of sonnets (1921, 1948) accept the challenge of the original. The thoroughgoing, sensitive and sensible introduction to the 1921 edition already describes the sonnets as embodiments of intellectual objectivity. They are "not the soul of the soul, but the body in the soul. The imagination does not fly away from the body, the earthly, but it raises the body and the earth with itself." (Szabó 1921, XXXVI-XXXVII. My translation. P. E.) The essayist's characterization is also the translator's norm. The 1921 rendering of Sonnet 18 sets out in this direction, but does not yet reach its aim:

Hasonlitsalak nyári naphoz? — Arcod
szelídebb és szemed szendébb sugár;
a május gyöngye bimbóira harcoss
vihar csap és ah! oly rövid a nyár!

A menny szeme néha perzselve ég,
de arany arca gyakran fátylat ölt;
bájától végre búcsút vesz a Szép
s lehervad, muló élte ha betölt.

Te megmaradsz. Örök fényben ragyog
szépséged és nyarad; vak éjjelébe
irígy Enyészet nem dönti napod:
örök dalokban nősz föl az Időbe.

Mig ember ajka lehell s szeme lát,
él versem és néked is éltet ad.
(Szabó 1921, 22)

The intellectual objectivity Szabó claims and proclaims in his introduction is fully present in the extraordinary concision of "Te megmaradsz." (line 9), but much of the vocabulary is still saturated with nineteenth-century sentimentality ("szendébb sugár," "ah!," "fátylat ölt," "bájától," "betölt," "lehell.") The frequent use of enjambements suggests *Art Nouveau* restlessness rather than Renaissance plasticity.

Szabó's second translation is a classical achievement which has rightly found its place in the standard editions of Shakespeare's complete works in Hungarian:

Mondjam: társad, másod a nyári nap?
 Te nyugodtabb vagy s az nem oly üde,
 hisz a május méz-bimbaira vad
 szél csap, s túlrövid a nyár bérlete;
 az ég szeme néha gyujtva ragyog
 s arany arca máskor túlfátyolos;
 s mind válik a széptől a szép, ahogy
 rútitja rendre vagy vakon a rossz.
 De a te örök nyarad nem fakúl
 s nem veszíti szépséged birtokát;
 ne mondja Halál, hogy rád árnya hull:
 örök dalokban nőssz időkön át.
 Mig él ember szeme s lélegzete,
 mindaddig él versem, s élsz benne te.
 (Szabó 1948, 52)

Line 1 breaks with "hasonlitsalak. . . ?" in the early rendering, and breaks new ground by adopting and adapting Zoltán's and Ferenczi's "Mondjam. . . ?" with audacious originality. Zoltán dilutes the terseness of "Mondjam. . . ?" by adding the superfluously tentative "talán." Ferenczi hits upon the right word in "mása," but dissolves its concision by surrounding it with words which can, in fact, be discarded ("*hogy* mása *vagy*"). Szabó drops the rhythm-filling "hogy" and "vagy," gets rid of the incongruous overtone of 'hogy vagy?', and uses intellectually focussed weighty words ("Mondjam: társad. . . ?") whose syllabic composition corresponds to Shakespeare's "Shall I compare. . . ?" Szabó even reinforces the effect by adding another word of a similar syllabic structure ("másod,") and also renders the hovering rhythm of "Shall I. . . ?" by combining an accentual trochee with a measured iamb in "Mondjam: társad. . . ?" where the second syllable receives extra emphasis and length not only by the consonant cluster but also by the long-sounding nasal *m*, the pause indicated by the colon, and the rising intonation of the question.

Line 2 is right and fine: a definite gain on "szendébb sugár." Line 3 salvages Shakespeare's metonymy with a fortunate phrase ("május méz-bimbaira.") Giving up the enjambement in lines 1 and 2 and in a number of further cases brings Szabó's second translation much closer to

Shakespeare. The application of an enjambement in lines 3 and 4, however, fulfils an expressive function: it not only claims but also proves the fierce dynamism of rough winds. The blasts become audible. The wind “runs on” with the run-on line. A “nyár bérlete” in line 4 keeps the innovative force of “lease” and is much more to the point than the sigh of the 1921 version (“ah! oly rövid a nyár!”)

In the second quatrain “az ég szeme” (already appearing in Zoltán’s variant) renders Shakespeare’s personification with natural ease. So does “arany arca” (already hit upon by Szász.) “Tűlfátyolos” after “túlrövid” may be too much of a good thing, but “mind válik a széptől a szép” is felicitous in its ambiguous application to both thing and person; and “rútítja rendre vagy vakon a rossz” is a *tour de force* of poetic ingenuity equally suggesting fate (“rendre”) and chance (“vakon”). It is a far cry from the faded, dated and forceless attempt of the 1921 translation (“S lehervad, muló élte ha betölt.”)

The third quatrain opens with “De” corresponding to Shakespeare’s “But,” continues with a Shakespearean metaphor (“a te örök nyarad”), takes the courage of translating “Nor lose possession of that fair thou ow’st” with precision and concision, evokes Classical associations of Hades in “ne mondja Halál, hogy rád árnya hull,” and opens the line to eternity in “örök dalokban nőssz időközön át.” This is a fortunate and new combination of Kojari’s “Örök dalokban” and Ferenczi’s “nőssz időközön át”: the double plural of “dalokban” and “időközön,” and the repetition of the repeated *o* sounds of “örök” in “nőssz” and “időközön” work magic and provide a good example of how new bottle can season old wine. In his 1921 rendering Szabó still achieves symbolic effect by capitalizing “Idő” (and also “Szép” or “Enyészet,”) a much-too-obvious procedure which also runs counter to the translator’s effort to modernize spelling by starting most lines with small letters. In his 1948 translation Szabó capitalizes only “Halál,” and otherwise expresses symbolic overtones by other means (the more convincing and more refined double plural, the indication of temporal direction and increase in “át” and sound symbolism in line 12.)

The couplet in the final version is also consummate: it discards the sentimental phrase of “ajka lehell” and “éltet át” in the first variant and, improving on Szász’s solution, finishes the sonnet with a Shakespeare-inspired, single-syllable personal pronoun referring to the derivative eternity of the friend and announcing the genuine immortality of the poet. It also confirms the immortality of the translator. It is worth noting that in his introduction to his 1921 experiment Szabó views the development of the couplet at the end of the English sonnet as detrimental in that it has often finished the poem with a vague or rhetorical image (Szabó 1921, XXXIV). This holds true — of the couplet of his own translation. In the introduction to his 1948 achievement Szabó silently drops this accusation, and considers the couplet as the closing unit of a three-fold enhancement (Szabó 1948, 10). This is true of his new rendition. With his correction he has set even the cultural context of his translation right. It is little wonder that the masterful translator of Shakespeare’s series of

sonnets has proved to be the inspired poet of his own original cycle of sonnets (*A huszonhatodik év*). The couplet of Sonnet 18 in Szabó's second translation is as poetic *and* dramatic as are the closing couplets of Shakespearean scenes in plays rendered by Szabó.

Péter Dávidházi published his independent version in 1974:

Talán a nyáridőhöz mérjelek?
 Szebbek s nem oly túlzóak kincseid:
 május lágy rügyét martalóc szelek
 rázzák s a nyár birtoka túl rövid,
 az ég szeme sokszor már perzselő,
 vagy ború földi arany színeit,
 s míg rontja Véletlen s váltó Idő,
 szépségéből a földi szép veszít.
 Nem úgy nyarad, mely már örökre szól,
 meg nem fakúlhat szépséged soha,
 halál árnya sem érheti utól,
 épen megőrzi verseim sora,
 s míg ember lélegzik, míg lát a szem,
 él versem és nem múlhatsz el te sem.
 (Dávidházi 224)

The first quatrain immediately captures the reader's or listener's attention by its musical metre, felicitous phrasing ("nyáridőhöz") and innovative wording ("mérjelek?", "martalóc szelek").

The second quatrain maintains interest by its continued rhythmic pulsation, expressive alliteration ("Véletlen s váltó Idő") and inventive syntax (line 7).

The third quatrain steps up tension by a natural yet dramatic turn ("Nem úgy nyarad") and the fertile ambiguity of "verseim sora," where "sora" may refer both to 'line' and 'set'.

The couplet crowns the sonnet with a contrastive epigrammatic summary, fine rhyme and an authentic Shakespearean context of diction.

Dezső Mészöly's translation (1990) excels in a modern reinterpretation of tradition:

Egy nyári naphoz hasonlítsalak?
 Te kedvesebb vagy és megnyugtatóbb;
 hisz lágy bimbók közt durva szél arat,
 s szorongatók az őszi dátumok;
 az égi szem majd perzselően int,
 majd aranyára felhő fátyla hull;
 szilaj szeszély, vagy vastörvény szerint
 mindaz, mi szépség, rendre megfakul;

de hervadatlan a Te friss nyarad,
 szépséged kertje mindig zöldelő,
 Halál fölötted győztes nem marad,
 örök sorokban fényed egyre nő:
 míg ember szája szól, és lát szeme,
 él majd e versem, és élsz benne Te.
 (Mészöly 20)

The first line echoes Keszthelyi's, Víg's and — more distantly — Kojari's, Szász's, Fábry's and Justus's expositions, but its calling rhyme is answered resourcefully and dramatically by "arat," after a dramatic opposition between "lágú bimbók" and "durva szél." "Szilaj szeszély vagy vastörvény szerint" in line 7, with its poetic alliteration and dramatic contrast, is a bull's eye hit. It is also an actor's delight: with its natural proportions it is easy to render. The choice of "hervadatlan" in the ninth line reverberates Keszthelyi's "Hervadhatatlan" (line 10), but does so with a charming flavour, time-honoured taste and fresh air, revitalizing tradition.

The use of "örök sorokban" in the twelfth line parallels Zoltán's solution, but placing the phrase to the front of the line gives it special prominence, and following it by "fényed egyre nő" lends it increasing radiance.

The closing line and rhyme leaves "Te" emphatically to the very end, and in doing so follows the example set by Szász, Szabó and Justus. But making "ben/ne Te" an original cadence to "szeme," Mészöly's closure is strikingly effective and witty. Since the couplet's calling rhyme ("szeme") is a two-syllable *separate* word, for some readers and especially listeners of the translation, it may *separate* the last two syllables of the last line, which the last clear iamb *sets apart* anyway. Might this be an ingenious reproduction of Shakespeare's ambiguity in essentially praising the poem's, the poet's immortality by way of ostensibly bowing to the friend's eternity? Such a reading is already latent in Szabó's rendering, but might Mészöly have offered an interpretation of this kind by the preemptory call of his well-chosen, two-syllable, one-word calling rhyme? The analysis should not formulate what the translation might merely suggest. It would, of course, be an exaggeration to attribute the effect to the translator's conscious intention. It is at best no more than an accidental by-product of an instinctive insight made possible (if not necessary) by an inventive capturing of an auditory overtone. But poetry is such stuff as imaginative ambiguity is made on, and Mészöly's interpretation both of Shakespearean drama and poetry is good dramatic poetry. His closing line renders semantically Shakespeare's dramatic turn of "So long lives this, and this gives life to thee." Might his final rhyme not reinforce the impression audibly?

Mészöly's incorporation, revitalization, reinterpretation and modernization of traditional translations is in tune with the prosodic context of Shakespeare's own achievement in integrating, rejecting, rejuvenat-

ing and recasting traditional ways of composing sonnets. Once again, context proves to be the crucial medium of artistic assessment that any translation embodies and expresses.

By touching the right chords, sounding the apt tones and eliciting the appropriate overtones, competent translations create an aura which not only evokes the parametric properties but also conjures up the poetic *paraselene* of the original text. This is the justification of translation as interpretation and evaluation. Text and translation can be one another's reinforcing and evaluating context if the translation as transposition can render not only the bright disk but also the luminous or nebulous ring of its solar, lunar, sublunary, subliminal and global target. This is where the translator's immortality lies.

Works Cited

Text

Shakespeare, William. *The Complete Works*. Ed. W. J. Craig. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford UP, 1962.

Translations (identified by the translator)

- Csillag: Csillag, Tibor. *Shakespeare szonettjei*. Budapest: Petit Print, 1994.
- Dávidházi: Dávidházi, Péter. William Shakespeare, "18. szonett." In: László Horváth, "Variációk az elmúlás témájára (Négy Shakespeare-szonett új fordítása elé)." *Filológiai Közlöny* XX, 1-2 (1974).
- Fábry: "Shakespeare szonettjeiből." Trans. Károly Fábry. *Új Idők* XXVII, 4 (Feb. 15, 1921).
- Ferenczi: "Shakespeare szonettjeiből I-XXVI." Trans. Zoltán Ferenczi. *Magyar Shakespeare-Tár* IX. Ed. Zoltán Ferenczi. Budapest: Kilián, 1916.
- Justus: *The Sonnets of Shakespeare — Shakespeare szonettjei*. Trans. Pál Justus. Introduction and notes by Tibor Lutter. Budapest: Corvina, 1956.
- Keszthelyi: *Shakespeare szonettjei*. Trans. Zoltán Keszthelyi. Budapest: Szöllősy, 1943.
- Kojari: "Schakespeare sonettjeiből" (*sic*). Trans. Lajos Kojari. *Családi Kör* XIII, 12 (March 24, 1872).
- Mészöly: Mészöly, Dezső. Shakespeare, "XVIII. szonett." In: *Shakespeare a szerelemről*. Ed. and intr. Sándor Maller. Budapest: Helikon, 1990.
- Pákozdy: *Shakespeare szonettjei*. Trans. Ferenc Pákozdy. Hódmezővásárhely: Takács, 1943.

- Szabó 1921: *Shakespeare Szonettjei*. Trans. and intr. Lőrinc Szabó. Budapest: Genius, 1921.
- Szabó 1948: *The Sonnets of William Shakespeare—William Shakespeare Szonettjei*. Trans. and intr. Lőrinc Szabó. Budapest: Franklin 1948.
- Szász: Shakspere (*sic*), *Szonettek*. Trans. Vilmos Győry and Károly Szász. *Shakspere vegyes költeményei. Shakspere minden munkái XIX*. Budapest: Kisfaludy-Társaság, 1878.
- Víg: *William Shakespeare szonettjei*. Trans. Béla Víg. (Murnau): the translator's edition, 1976.
- Vöröss: Vöröss, István. *Tű hegyén*. Pápa: Exodus, 1943.
- Zoltán: "Shakespeare szonettjeiből." Trans. Vilmos Zoltán. *A Hét* XIX 7/936 (Feb. 16, 1908).

Critical Comments

- Bermann, Sandra L. *The Sonnet Over Time: A Study in the Sonnets of Petrarch, Shakespeare, and Baudelaire*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1988.
- Booth, Stephen. *Shakespeare's Sonnets*. Edited with Analytic Commentary. New Haven: Yale UP, 1978.
- É. Kiss, Katalin. *Shakespeare szonettjei Magyarországon*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1975.
- Fineman, Joel. *The Subjectivity Effect in Western Literary Tradition: Essays Toward the Release of Shakespeare's Will*. Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 1991.
- Giroux, Robert. *The Book Known as Q: A Consideration of Shakespeare's Sonnets*. New York: Atheneum, 1982.
- Halliday, F. E. *A Shakespeare Companion*. Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin, 1964.
- Kardos, László. "A 73. szonett magyar útja." *Shakespeare-tanulmányok*. Ed. László Kéry, László Országh, Miklós Szenczi. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 1965. 56-79.
- Kéry, László. "Shakespeare költeményei." Shakespeare, *Versek*. Trans. Gábor Garai et al. Ed. László Kéry. Budapest: Európa, 1962. 299-312.
- Knight, Wilson. *The Mutual Flame: On Shakespeare's Sonnets and The Phoenix and the Turtle*. London: Methuen, 1955.
- Leishman, J. B. *Themes and Variations in Shakespeare's Sonnets*. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.
- Pooler, C. Knox, ed. *The Works of Shakespeare, Sonnets*. The Arden Shakespeare. London: Methuen, 1931.
- Rollins, Hyder Edward, ed. *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare: The Sonnets*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1944, II.
- Rowse, A. L. *Shakespeare's Southampton: Patron of Virginia*. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

- Rowse, A. L. *Shakespeare's Sonnets: The Problems Solved. A Modern Edition, with Prose Versions, Introduction and Notes.* London: Macmillan, 1973.
- Smith, Hallett. *The Tension of the Lyre: Poetry in Shakespeare's Sonnets.* San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1981.
- Tótfalusi, István. *Ki kicsoda Shakespeare világában.* Budapest: Móra, 1994.
- Wells, Stanley. *Shakespeare: An Illustrated Dictionary.* Rev. ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1985.
- Wilson, John Dover, ed. *The Works of William Shakespeare, The Sonnets.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1966.
- Wright, George, T. *Shakespeare's Metrical Art.* Berkeley, Los Angeles: U of California P, 1988.