

Н. В. Дьомова,

Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка, м. Львів

ROMEO AND JULIET'S FIRST DIALOGUE FROM THE PROSODY STANDPOINT: THE PECULIARITIES OF RENDERING IT IN THE UKRAINIAN TRANSLATIONS

У цій статті Н. Дьомова розглядає просодію відомого Шекспірового сонету-діалогу (з драми «*The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet*»), його відмінності від петрарківського сонету, а також аналізує просодійні особливості, спричинені його символічно-змістовим навантаженням та функціонуванням в межах трагедії.

Ключові слова: просодія, шекспірівський (англійський) сонет, петрарківський (італійський) сонет, сонет-діалог, рима, тавтологічна рима, ритм.

В этой статье Н. Дёмова рассматривает просодию известного Шекспировского сонета-диалога (из драмы «*The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet*»), его отличия от петрарковского сонета, а также анализирует просодические особенности, вызванные его символически-смысловой нагрузкой и функционированием в рамках трагедии.

Ключевые слова: просодия, шекспировский (английский) сонет, петрарковский (итальянский) сонет, сонет-диалог, рифма, тавтологическая рифма, ритм.

This article examines the prosody Shakespeare's dialogue sonnet (from the drama «*The Tragedy of Romeo and Juliet*»), its differences from the sonnet by Petrarka. Besides, there is an analysis of the prosody peculiarities entailed by its symbolic and semantic load and functioning within the tragedy.

Keywords: prosody, Shakespearean (English) sonnet petrarkivsky (Italian) sonnet, sonnet, dialogue, rhyme, tautological rhyme and rhythm.

The First Folio of Shakespeare (1623) clearly lists «*Romeo and Juliet*» under tragedies [10]. And though the tragedy is now mostly referred to as «*Romeo and Juliet*», its full title emphasises the tragic sense of the play: «*The Tragedie of Romeo and Juliet*». The drama belongs to the so-called «early Shakespearean tragedies». Shakespeare's second tragedy, it was written in 1594/95 [1; 5], the same temporal period when many of his comedies came into being; therefore, it is not strange that it is full of comedy episodes and may seem bright and optimistic if compared to Shakespeare's tragedies that appeared later. In fact, the unique combination of tragic and comic elements as well as a distinct sense of a 'different tragedy' peculiar to «*Romeo and Juliet*» is a part of William Shakespeare's style.

As Nataliya Torkut notes, defining genre and stylistic dominant of Shakespeare's tragedies is very problematic since different tragedies differ significantly not only from the tragedies of other authors, but from each other as well [3, p. 10]. We also cannot but agree with Emma Smith, the author of «*The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare*», who argued that: «all plays combine elements we might want to consider as 'tragic' or 'comic', and it is the effect and the style of these combinations that is important, rather than some external definition of Shakespearean genre» [14, p. 94]. Discussing the key aspects of comedy and tragedy in Shakespeare's dramas, Emma Smith identifies the following 9 elements as typical of tragedies by William Shakespeare and opposite to what can be found in his comedies: 1) Titles focus on an individual – or less often, two individuals; 2) Movement is towards isolation and social breakdown; 3) Ends in death; 4) Little sense of a future beyond the end of the play; 5) Tendency to soliloquy; 6) Male characters prominent and active; 7) Transfer to a different location intensifies old problems; 8) Puns tend towards nihilism and impossibility of communication; 9) Sense of inevitability and inescapability about the sequence of events [ibid., p. 94]. All of the nine elements can be found in «*Romeo and Juliet*», even though three aspects (No. 4, 5 and 6) are only half-true for the play as better and peaceful future beyond the end of the drama is suggested for the bereaved Montague and Capulet families if not for the lovers themselves; the tendency to dialogues more typical for comedies is just as strong as the tendency to soliloquy in this play; and Juliet is just as prominent and active as the male character of Romeo.

Alongside with tragic irony (dreams, premonitions, etc.), the drama is full of tragic accidents (death of Tibalt, undelivered letter), which play a very important role for the events unwrapping. But, unlike all the tragedies of that period, including Shakespeare's own earlier and later works of this genre, «*Romeo and Juliet*» does not correspond to the classic norms canonical at that time: a great explosion of passions with full of twists and overly intricate plot. On the contrary, this play includes comedy elements and blunt jokes of the servants. The peculiar elements of the comedy genre are also present: for instance, the symmetrical cast of characters, which may be typified as enamoured pair; strict parents; a friend who helps; an ironic friend; a confidant female servant; a rival, etc. The «love» theme is also typical of a comedy genre.

Majestic love which is more powerful than prolonged rivalry between the two powerful families is actually the main theme of the drama. Contrasting it with the fleeting passion that Romeo feels to Rosalinda early in the play, Shakespeare presents a 'true' feeling – everlasting, strong, able of forgiveness and sacrifice. Moreover, it is a reciprocated feeling, thus being the source of peace, joy and strength, instead of bleak weakness that Romeo felt when pining for Rosalinda. And the last important bit – it is destined, 'love at first sight'.

A master with astounding grasp of both, human emotions and words to render them perfectly, William Shakespeare managed to cover all these focus points in a brief, but multi-layered scene: Romeo and Juliet talk, flirt, fall in love and kiss within mere 14 lines of a sonnet-shaped dialogue. Admittedly, Shakespeare's usage of sonnets within his dramas is always loaded with additional significance¹. There are at least three distinct sonnets in «*The Tragedy of Romeo and*

¹ Unfortunately, in Ukraine (both Soviet and post-Soviet period) the topic of sonnets functioning within a drama has not been

Juliet): the prologue to the play, sonnet-dialogue of their first meeting, and a sonnet by chorus right after the first meeting².

Similarly to his immediate source (a long narrative poem «*The Tragical History of Romeus and Juliet*» (1562) translated by Arthur Brooke from Italian via French [ibid., p. 120]), Shakespeare starts this play with a sonnet prologue, but changes the rhyming scheme of the Brook's half-Petrarchan sonnet combined with three couplets (*abba abba cd cd cd*) into what is now known as a Shakespearean sonnet (*abab cdcd efef gg*). It is Petrarchan tradition that Shakespeare rethinks and transforms into something different, even the opposite at times: not just the formal features of the Petrarchan sonnet with its octave and a sestet, but in its very spirit. Shakespeare was not the one to introduce more natural for the English poetry sonnet form of three quatrains in alternate rhyme and a concluding couplet³, but he defied what then was considered as the main subject-matter for love poetry expressed in sonnets: brooding, unhappy and one-sided love to a perfect woman without a single chance for reciprocation. Gayle Whittier in her article «*The Sonnet's Body and the Body Sonnetized in Romeo and Juliet*» even refers to the general conventions of courtly love as «Petrarchan», focusing on its inward characteristics over the specific form: worshipful attitudes and «spiritualized» lady seen «only through the poet's selective presentation of her ... her body heraldized», and the woman herself removed «from the human realm, which is, after all, the Platonic lover's aim» [15, p. 33]. As David Schalkwyk put it, «Petrarchism as a purely poetic convention knows no other narrative: it feeds on the necessity of an eternal 'no'» [12, p. 76].

Shakespeare's «perfect woman» is never perfect, but she is always human instead, the best example probably being the famous sonnet 130 («*My Mistress' eyes are nothing like the sun...*»). Discussing the difference between Brook's and Shakespeare's prologue, Emma Smith notes, «Shakespeare has abandoned this moralistic framing» [14, p. 121], meaning his «*Romeo and Juliet*» is not a moralistic warning to youngsters thinking of defying their parents' plans for their marriage; it is a hymn to love which is strong despite any obstacles, and even more so owing to its passionate, earth-bound and human nature. This is also true for all the Shakespeare's creativity as the tendency of making people more human than perfect – including, letting women be passionate and able to fall in love, not only serve as a cold-blooded object spoken *at*, not *with* – is found in many of his sonnets and dramas, including «*Love's Labour's Lost*»⁴, «*Twelfth Night*», etc. If both the prologue and chorus sonnets in «*Romeo and Juliet*» serve mostly as a brief introduction and summary, though already breaking with the Petrarchan tradition by speaking of «a pair of star-crossed lovers» and «she as much in love»⁵, the dialogue-sonnet between Romeo and Juliet illustrates it to a point even in its form – as it is build and created through equal participation, through the actual and active *reciprocation*.

1 ROMEO If I profane with my unwortheist hand	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l
2 This holy shrine, the gentle fine is this:	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l
3 My lips, two blushing pilgrims, ready stand	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l
4 To smooth that rough touch with a tender kiss.	u	l	u	l	l	u	u	l	u	l
5 JULIET Good pilgrim, you do wrong your hand too much,	u	l	u	u	l	l	u	l	u	l
6 Which mannerly devotion shows in this;	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u	l
7 For saints have hands that pilgrims' hands do touch,	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	l	l
8 And palm to palm is holy palmers' kiss.	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l
9 ROMEO Have not saints lips, and holy palmers too?	l	u	l	l	u	l	u	l	u	l

given enough scholarly attention, leaving a vast field for future research. This is also the reason the majority of quotes provided were taken from the English sources.

² It is necessary to note, though, that the First Folio edition lacks the prologue same as it lacks the Dramatic Personae list for «The Tragedie of Romeo and Juliet», and the position of the Chorus sonnet seems unclear: though it is provided after the «Exeunt» note [ibid.], it is logically more closely connected to the previous scene than to the next one.

³ This honour belongs to Lord Henry Howard the Earle of Surrey, whose transformation of Petrarchan (also known as Italian) sonnet was presented to the English audience in 1557, when the «*Songes and Sonnettes*» collection published by Richard Tottel (the so-called «Tottel's Miscellany») appeared; while the Italian sonnet in its original form was introduced in England by Sir Thomas Wyatt (some of them were also published in «Tottel's Miscellany») [11, p. 39].

⁴ The embodied response of a woman, who is the recipient of a love sonnet was used by Philip Sidney in his 1580s songs of «*Astrophil and Stella*» to break the predictive monotony of unchangeable theme in a Petrarchan sonnet. As Schalkwyk notes, in «*Love's Labour's Lost*» this response is embodied on stage, demonstrating the inevitability of a response in the situation of addressing the sonnet to a woman, with women being able «not only to voice their displeasure but also to cause the disintegration of the sonnet itself» [12, p. 77]. It is an additional indication of Juliet's active role in reciprocating and supporting Romeo's courting, as she was the one to co-create the sonnet with him instead of disintegrating its mere possibility by her discouraging response or lack of thereof.

⁵ Schalkwyk considers the prologue to be the «shared voice of the theatre rather than the solitary voice [of a poet]» [ibid., p. 65], thus seeing in this another break from Petrarchan tradition of sonnets. As the third summary-sonnet belongs to the whole Chorus, the same argument could be as readily applied to it.

10 JULIET Ay, pilgrim, lips that they must use in prayer.	l	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l
11 ROMEO O, then, dear saint, let lips do what hands do;	u	l	u	l	l	l	l	u	l	l
12 They pray, grant thou, lest faith turn to despair.	u	l	l	l	u	l	l	u	u	l
13 JULIET Saints do not move, though grant for prayers' sake.	l	u	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l
14 ROMEO Then move not, while my prayer's effect I take.	u	l	l	u	u	l	u	l	u	l
15 Thus from my lips, by yours, my sin is purged.	l	u	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l
16 JULIET Then have my lips the sin that they have took.	l	u	l	l	u	l	u	l	u	l
17 ROMEO Sin from thy lips? O trespass sweetly urged!	l	u	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l
18 Give me my sin again.	l	u	u	l	u	l				
JULIET You kiss by th' book.							u	l	u	l

The dialogue is seemingly simple, casual and rather joking – fully befitting the situation and an absolute opposite to the Romeo's previous long-worded and Petrarchan in nature moaning addressed to Rosalinda. This piece is dynamic and witty, and the whole conversation is an unbreakable unity. The rhyming scheme clearly shapes the conversation as one of two equally participating and equally interested in each other people: a stanza for Romeo (*abab*), a stanza for Juliet (*cbcb*), which borrows the second rhyme in a parallel rhyming from the Romeo's previous part, the third shared stanza with quick repartees of both interlocutors (*dede*), and the final shared couplet presenting unification as the kiss (*ff*). The just-finished sonnet then continues for another (also shared) stanza (*ghgh*), which could have evolved into the second sonnet if not for the interruption by the Nurse. The rhyme here is shaping and symbolically uniting the dialogue, highlighting the equality and reciprocation of Juliet's flirting back. The conversation after the dialogue-sonnet and the second kiss are even initiated by her («*Then have my lips the sin that they have took*»), and the remark «*You kiss by th' book*» is both playful and daring. It is also important to note that Juliet's first stanza (lines 5-8) echoes Romeo's words with the identical rhyme, which makes the usage of identical rhyme here symbolically important, as well as the word «*kiss*» chosen for repetition in this respect. As to the inner rhyme found in the line 2, its main function seems to be the aesthetic one.

The meter is iambic pentameter typical for Shakespeare as are all the meter deviations found there: 3 cases of pyrrhic, 10 trochaic feet, and 8 spondees. Being partly the result of the peculiarities of the English language (frequent spondee due to monosyllable words, the appearance of trochaic feet at the beginning of a line when a line opens with a significant noun), it is equally the result of Shakespeare's preference for the natural rhythmical flow for this conversation⁶.

Let us now analyse how these prosodic peculiarities were reproduced in the four Ukrainian translations of the dialogue by Panteleymon Kulish, Vassyl' Myssyk, Abram Hozenpoud and Iryna Steshenko.

Kulish was the first to translate the drama «*Romeo and Juliet*» into the Ukrainian language (finished by 1881 [4, p. 61], but first published in 1901, in L`viv). The translation reproduces the rhyming scheme of the dialogue sonnet, but promptly breaks into couplets instead of the first stanza of the aborted second sonnet: *abab cbcb dede ff – bb gg*. The identical rhymes are also preserved, though partly, but as the Ukrainian tradition of rhyming does not employ them to the same extent they are used in the English verse, the partial reproduction is justified – even more so, considering Kulish evoked the same identical rhyme «*рпix*» in the line 15⁷. However, the aesthetic quality of the piece is lower if compared to the original: inner rhyming is neither preserved nor compensated by other phonic elements, some rhymes are rather weak (*живих-святих, молитви-тьми*), the rules of accentuation are occasionally violated to accommodate the iambic meter (*прочанін*), and many lexical choices were obviously made for the sake of rhyming purposes only. As to the rhythm itself, it can be considered as «domesticated» and is different from Shakespeare's recognizable one: instead of the neat original iambic pentameter the length of the lines varies from 11 to 13, with an occasional amphibrach at the end, only three trochaic feet, no spondee whatsoever and as many as 23 cases of pyrrhic [9, p. 31].

1 Ромео. Коли моя рука торкнулась недостойно	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u
2 до дивної краси, до святощів живих.	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	
3 Мої уста, прочане два, пристойно	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u		
4 ніжним цілунком най спокують сей рпix.	l	u	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	u	u	l	

⁶ As his other poetic pieces prove (for example, the «Murder of Gonzago» play-within-a-play found in «Hamlet»), Shakespeare is perfectly capable of creating a poetic piece with close to zero rhythmical changes within a iambic metrical scheme.

⁷ It is interesting to note here that Kulish focused on the word «рпix» as the operative one here, while Shakespeare highlighted the word «kiss» instead.

5 Джулета. Смирений прочанин аж надто зневажає	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u
6 ту руку, що мене підносить до святих.	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	
7 Торкатись і до них нам звичай при зволяє,	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u
8 Сьвятиню цілувать не має він за <i>гріх</i> .	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	
9 Ромео. Та-ж мають і святі уста, як і прочане !	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u
10 Джулета. В прочан уста – сьвятим творити молитви.	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	
11 Ромео. Нехай же на мою мольбу сьвята спогляне,	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u
12 Щоб ясно вірив я, без сумніваня тьми.	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	
13 Джулета. Хоч і прийняв мольбу, сьвятий ані здвигнеть ся.	u	u	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u
14 Ромео. О, не здвигнись же й ти ! Се дар тобі від серця.	l	u	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u
15 Через твої уста очистив ся мій <i>гріх</i> .	l	u	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	
16 Джулета. А я, прочанине, взяла його з твоїх.	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u	l	
17 Ромео. З моїх ? О гріх сьвятий ! Сияє мов у ризі.	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u
18 Верни-ж його мені.	u	l	u	l	u	l							
Джульета. Цілуєш як по книзі...							u	l	u	u	u	l	u

Even though the most basic features of Romeo and Juliet's co-created sonnet are reproduced through the rhyming scheme and shared stanzas/line, due to the multiple violations (including the lexical changes/additions) we cannot speak of the proper rendering of the complex dialogue-sonnet in this case. We share Kochur's view that Kulish's translation is at present more of a literature and translation fact and may be considered old-fashioned [2, p. 44], but it is also true that at the time of production it was a significant literary event, and its influence is easily traced in the later translations.

In the translation by Myssyk (1932) [6, pp. 21-22], the rhymes are mostly masterful (*рукою-заспокою, ганиши-прочани ж, юначе-наче*), and though the inner rhyming is not preserved, the aesthetical value of the verse is mostly reproduced through the euphony. It is a pity the translator did not preserve the identical rhyming, which results in a change of the rhyming scheme (*abab cdcd efef gg hih*), or the symbolic focus it put on the kiss shared by the lovers. But at least the structure of the shared sonnet with its start of another shared (though aborted) sonnet as soon the previous finishes is preserved, as is the laconic and dynamic quality of witty repartees with its iambic pentameter. Though the length of the words in the Ukrainian language enriches the rhythm with 17 cases of a pyrrhic foot, 3 trochaic feet and only 1 spondee, it is acceptable for a translation into Ukrainian, alongside with the lengthening of every other line by one syllable.

1 Ромео. Коли згнѣбив негідною рукою	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u		
2 твою красу небесну – ось пеня:	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l			
3 вустами грубий доторк заспокою –	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u		
4 цими прочанами святими я.	l	u	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l			
5 Джульетта. Прочанине, даремно руку ганиш,	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u	l	u		
6 що лиш побожність виказала цим;	u	u	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l			
7 рук у святих торкаються – прочани ж:	l	u	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u		
8 руки торкнутися – цілунок їм.	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l			
9 Ромео. Хіба святі й прочани уст не мають?	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u		
10 Джульетта. Їх мають, щоб молитися, вони.	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	u	u	l			
11 Ромео. Хай же вуста за руки одвічають:	l	u	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u		
12 свята, надій на сум не оберни!	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l			
13 Джульетта. Святі не рушаться, хоч і зважають.	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	u	u	l	u		
14 Ромео. Так стій же, поки дар вуста приймають.	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u	l	u		

15 Твої уста зняли вину з моїх.	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	
16 Джульєтта. Вона тепер вже на мені, юначе.	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u
17 Ромео. Вина із уст моїх? О, любий гріх!	u	l	u	l	u	l	l	l	u	l	
18 Віддай! Джульєтта. Цілуєш, як по книзі наче.	u	l									
			u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u

On the whole, the key prosodic features of the dialogue-sonnet were reproduced without violating the sense of the conversation, and the dialogues sounds natural despite the occasional syntactically awkward phrases («рук у святих торкаються – прочани ж») caused by the rhyming and equilinearity requirements.

In the translation by Hozenpoud (1937) the rhyming scheme of the dialogue-sonnet is perfectly reproduced (*abab cbc b dede ff b g b g*), including the reproduction of the identical rhymes (partially – with the identical rhyming as well, and partially – with the regular rhymes) and the same introduction of the identical rhyme to the line 15 that is present in the Kulish's translation. Moreover, even the focus on «*гріх*» instead of «*kiss*» is the same. Aesthetically, the translation is on a bit lower level than that of Myssyk due to some weak rhymes (*негідна-бідні, пiлiгpимiв-цими*) and generally lower level of euphony/ease of pronunciation (e.g., «*суворо дотик рук своїх*»). The inner rhyming has not been preserved either, and the occasional syntactically awkward phrases («*уста в святих – не тільки в пiлiгpимiв*») as well as accentuation mistakes («*ганiш*») can also be found, but the rhythm, on the other hand, is even less influenced by the restrictions imposed by the peculiarities of the Ukrainian language than in Myssyk's translation: a iambic pentameter with 13 cases of pyrrhic, 4 trochaic feet and 1 spondee, and every other line lengthened by 1 syllable [8, p. 9].

1 Ромео. Коли тепер моя рука негідна,	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u
2 Торкнулась недостойно рук святих,	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u	l	
3 Мої вуста – два пiлiгpими бiднi –	u	l	u	l	l	u	u	l	u	l	u
4 Спокутують цілунком ніжний гріх.	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u	l	
5 Джульєтта. Проте, даремно, любий пiлiгpиме,	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u
6 Ганиш суворо дотик рук своїх,	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	
7 Адже у тих, кого зовуть святими,	l	u	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u
8 Нам цілувати руки – це не гріх.	l	u	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	
9 Ромео. <i>Уста – в святих, не тільки в пiлiгpимiв.</i>	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u
10 Джульєтта. Так, пiлiгpиме, – тільки для псалмів.	l	u	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	
11 Ромео. Тоді дозволь мені вустами цими	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u
12 Твоїх торкнутись... смерті час приснів!	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	
13 Джульєтта. Як згодяться святи – стоять нерушно!	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u	l	u
14 Ромео. Нерушна будь – моїм чуттям послушна.	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u
15 Тепер твої уста зняли мій гріх.	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	
16 Джульєтта. Ви вільні від гріхів – це ваш рятунок.	l	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u	l	u
17 Ромео. Тепер гріховність на вустах твоїх.	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	
18 Візьму її...	u	l	u	l							
Джульєтта. Мов з книжки поцілунок					u	l	u	u	u	l	u

It could have been a good variant of translation, if not for some lexical choices. If some phrases (used probably for the sake of rhyming) just seem illogical and senseless («*смерті час приснів*», Juliet's exclamation in line 13), the other half violates the underlying principle of the shared sonnet: equality and mutual interest, reciprocity. Romeo initiates the conversation and the first kiss, while Juliet immediately develops it and gives an opening for the second one. Hozenpoud changes their roles and basic principle of counteraction by making Romeo an aggressor («*моїм чуттям послушна*»), and Juliet distancing herself with honorific «*Ви*» alongside with – judging from her words in this translation – being a passive recipient of Romeo's attention, not an active participant of their co-created sonnet.

Steshenko's translation [7, p. 335] also distorts the principles of the shared sonnet, but in this case it is done through violating the rhyming scheme (*abab cdcd ee ff gh ii jj*). It violates the impression of unity of the lovers'

conversation, when they move from the paired stanzas through a shared stanza to a shared line. Steshenko transforms the conversation into a sequence of separate cues-events (*ee ff*), breaking the moment of kiss altogether (*gh*). It's impossible to talk about the peculiarities of reproduction of the dialogue-sonnet here, because the sonnet itself with its complicated form is not reproduced, neither is the inner or identical rhyming. The rendering of rhythm is acceptable for the English-Ukrainian translation: a iambic pentameter with 17 cases of a pyrrhic, three trochaic feet and no spondee, and every other line longer by a syllable, but on the whole it does not change the fact that the sonnet is lost.

1 Ромео Коли торкнувсь рукою недостойно	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u
2 І осквернив я цей оltар святий,	u	u	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	
3 Уста – два пілігрими – хай пристойно	u	l	l	u	u	l	u	u	u	l	u
4 Цілунок ніжним змиють гріх тяжкий.	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	
5 Джульєтта О пілігриме, в тім гріха немає –	u	u	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u
6 З молитвою торкатись рук святих:	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	u	l	
7 Такий привіт нам звичай дозволяє.	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u
8 Стискання рук – то поцілунок їх.	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	l	
9 Ромео Але, крім рук, ще дано й губи їм...	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	
10 Джульєтта Так, для молитви, любий пілігрим...	l	u	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	
11 Ромео О, то дозволь мені, свята, й устами	l	u	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u
12 Молитися побожно, як руками!	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	u	u	l	u
13 Джульєтта Нас незворушно слухають святі.	l	u	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	
14 Ромео Не рухайся ж, дай відповідь мольбам!	u	l	u	u	u	l	u	u	u	l	
15 Твої уста очистили мій гріх...	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	u	u	l	
16 Джульєтта Взяли твій гріх мої уста з твоїх.	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	
17 Ромео Мій гріх?.. В твоїх словах я докір чую!	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u	l	u
18 Верни ж мій гріх.	u	l	u	l							
Джульєтта Мов з книги ти цілуєш...					u	l	u	u	u	l	u

To sum up, no translator rendered all the prosodic peculiarities of Shakespeare's famous dialogue-sonnet, and some translators (Hozenpoud, Steshenko) either decided to omit rendering its symbolic and relationships-shaping value or neglected to see its importance within the play. On the other hand, all the translators managed to reproduce at least some elements of the shared sonnet quite successfully. In terms of rendering the functions of dialogue-sonnet's key prosodic peculiarities discussed above and the formal features of the Shakespeare's sonnet, the translation by Myssyk may be considered the best one out of the four Ukrainian translations analysed.

References:

1. Аникст А. Творчество Шекспира / А. А. Аникст. – М. : Художественная литература, 1963. – 616, [4] с.
2. Кочур Г. Кілька уваг про Василя Мисика та його переклад «Ромео та Джульєтта» / Г. Кочур // Прапор. – 1988. – № 9. – С. 42-46.
3. Торкут Н. Трагічне крещендо шекспірової музи / Н. М. Торкут // Шекспір В. Трагедії : Пер. з англ. / В. Шекспір ; передмова і примітки Н. М. Торкут. – Харків : Фоліо, 2004. – С. 3-38.
4. Шаповалова М. Шекспір в українській літературі / М. Шаповалова. – Львів : видавниче об'єднання «Вища школа», 1976. – 212, [4] с.
5. Шведов Ю. Ф. Вільям Шекспир. Исследования / Ю. Ф. Шведов ; под редакцией проф. Я. Н. Засурского. – М., Изд-во Моск. ун-та, 1977. – 394, [4] с.
6. Шекспір В. Ромео і Джульєтта / В. Шекспір ; пер. з англ. В. Мисик ; упор. М. Таран-Мисик ; «Прапор» // Прапор. – 1988. – № 9. – С. 3-41.
7. Шекспір В. Ромео і Джульєтта / В. Шекспір ; перекл. з англ. І. І. Стешенко // Вільям Шекспір. Вибрані твори в двох томах. Том II / В. Шекспір ; післямова О. О. Смирнов. – К. : Мистецтво, 1952. – С. 279-418.
8. Шекспір В. Ромео і Джульєтта : трагедія на 5 дій / Вільям Шекспір ; з англійської переклав А. Гозенпуд. – К. : Мистецтво, 1937. – 199 с.
9. Шекспір У. Ромео та Джульєтта / У. Шекспір ; переклад П. А. Куліша ; передмова і пояснення Др. Ів. Франко. – Львів : Українсько-руська видавничка спілка, 1901. – 132 с.
10. Mr. William Shakespeares Comedies, Histories & Tragedies : Published according to the True Originall Copies [Electronic Resource] / William Shakespeare ; pr. by Isaac Iaggard, and Ed. Blount. – London, 1623. – 907 p. – [Cited 2014, 11 Jan.]. – Available from : http://internetshakespeare.uvic.ca/Library/facsimile/book/SLNSW_F1/

11. Sarker S.K. Shakespeare`s Sonnets / Sunil Kumar Sarker. – Delhi : Nice Printing Press, Atlantic Publishers & Distributors. – 1998. – 437 p.
12. Schalkwyk D. Speech and Performance in Shakespeare`s Sonnets and Plays / David Schalkwyk. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2002. – 267 p.
13. Shakespeare W. The tragedy of Romeo and Juliet / W. Shakespeare // The complete works of William Shakespeare [The Cambridge edition text] / edited by W. A. Wright, with a preface by C. Morley. – Garden City, New York : Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1936. – Pp. 315–350.
14. Smith E. The Cambridge Introduction to Shakespeare / Emma Smith. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2007. – 166 p.
15. Whittier G. The Sonnet`s Body and the Body Sonnetized in Romeo and Juliet / Gayle Whittier // Shakespeare Quarterly. – Vol. 40. – № 1 (Spring). – 1989. – Pp. 27-41.