лого), так и авторские (шутки о смерти, гиперболизация частей тела, алогизм поведения, каламбур, ложная этимология) приемы создания нонсенса. В группе «Перевернутый мир» бинарные оппозиции авторов отражают не только нормы, позволяющие функционировать в окружающей действительности, но и общественные нормы, позволяющие функционировать в социальной среде. В более общем смысле нонсенсы фольклора отражают способ познания действительности ребенком, нонсенсы Э. Лира и Л. Кэрролла отражают действительность в карнавальном ключе.

Список литературы

1. Бахтин М. М. Творчество Франсуа Рабле и народная культура Средневековья и ренессанса / М. М. Бахтин. – М. : Художественная литература, 1990. – 543 с.

2. Галинская И. Л. Льюис Кэрролл и загадки его текстов / И. Л. Галинская. – Режим доступа: http://volna.permlink.ru/volna/knigi/knigi/bib/bib/10/Carrol, свободный. – Заглавие с экрана. – Яз. рус.

3. Демурова Н. М. Льюис Кэрролл: очерк жизни и творчества / Н. М. Демурова. – М., 1979. – 200 с.

4. Колоннезе Дж. Нонсенс как форма комизма. Логический анализ языка. Языковые механизмы комизма / Дж. Колоннезе. – М. : Индрик, 2007. – С. 254–262.

5. Львов Р. М. Основы теории речи : учеб. пос. для студ. высш. пед. учеб. завед. / Р. М. Львов. – М. : Академия, 2000. – 248 с.

6. Падучева Е. В. Тема языковой коммуникации в сказках Л. Кэрролла / Е. В. Падучева // Семиотика и информатика. – М. : Языки русской культуры, 1997. – Вып. 35. – С. 184–226.

7. Цветкова М. В. Английское // Межкультурная коммуникация : учеб. пос. / М. В. Цветкова. – Н. Новгород : Деком, 2001. – С. 158–184.

8. Cammaerts E. The Poetry of Nonsense / E. Cammaerts. – London : Geage Routledge &Sons Ltd, 1925. – 86 p.

9. Carroll L. Alice`s Adventures in Wonderland. Through the Looking-Glass and What Alice Found There / L. Carroll. – Новосибирск : Сиб. унив. изд-во, 2007. – 232 с.

10. Mother Goose Rhymes. The Oxford Dictionary of Nursery Rhymes. – M. : Raduga, 1988. – 684 p.

11. Sewell E. The Field of Nonsense / E. Sewell. – London : Chatto & Windus, 1952. – 198 p.

12. Topsy Turvy World. English Humour in Verse. – M. : Progress, 1978. – 320 p.

TRANSLATION, TRANSLATION ENVIRONMENT AND SOCIAL ORDER: RUSSIAN TRANSLATIONS OF SHAKESPEARE

T.V. Buzina

В статье рассматривается проблематика переводов У. Шекспира, в частности, трагедии «Гамлет», на русский язык как в связи с намеренно используемой Шекспиром полисемией, так и в связи с сознательными и бессознательными комплексами представлений о человеке, сложившимися у переводчиков. Особое внимание уделяется влиянию советского политического режима на формирование психолого-антропологических представлений у переводчиков XX в.

The article considers the problem of translating W. Shakespeare (and *Hamlet* in particular) into Russian in connection with a) Shakespeare's deliberate polysemy and b) conscious and unconscious anthropological ideas of the translators themselves. Particular attention is paid to the influence of the Soviet regime on formation of the XXth century translators' ideas of the humanity.

Ключевые слова: Шекспир, Полевой, Пастернак, «Гамлет», полисемия, совесть, сознание.
Key words: Shakespeare, Polevoy, Pasternak, Hamlet, polysemy, conscience, consciousness.

This paper springs from a general scholarly interest that lies in exploring the rather large ideas of humanity, human condition, and human destiny at various stages of the human history, mostly in the modern time. Simply put, I want to know how a human being is understood and what this being's quest is, if any. Shakespeare is an indispensable part of such a context, and Harold Bloom provides an excellent explanation of why it is so. Shakespeare "will go on explaining us, in part because he invented us", writes Bloom, and it is a weighty observation [2, p. xx]. That is, Shakespeare's human is a model for our humanity.

He sets forth permissions and prohibitions, he determines our limits and possibilities. If we live on earth and never think of "the undiscover'd country, from whose bourn // No traveller returns" (Hamlet, act 3, scene 1) Shakespeare is someone we look up to in any quandary. Bloom's quote also explains why, with all the wealth of Shakespearean criticism, there are regions gently tip-toed about, and it is those regions that present a particular challenge for a translator.

Translating is impossible without interpretation, and when it comes to Shakespeare, it applies to speakers of English as well as speakers of any other language his texts are translated into. We are all separated from Shakespeare by hundreds of years, and we project onto him our own ideas that might be borrowed from other cultures, and we still assume that this is, indeed, Shakespeare and, by extension, us. *Macbeth* gives an interesting example of just such a projection. When Macbeth discovers that he, indeed, did the dirty job for Banco and his descendants, he exclaims: *Rather than so, come, fate, into the list, // And champion me to th' utterance!* (act 3, scene 1).

The Oxford English Dictionary states that *champion* in this particular case means "to fight against." And this meaning is coined by Shakespeare [10, p. 31]. *Utterance*, in turn, means *extremity*, that is, death. However, if we turn to Shakespeare's Concordance we learn that the word *champion* is used about 30 times, and 29 out of those 30 it is a noun meaning *defender*. And the single instance when *champion* is used as a verb seems to be chosen by Shakespeare to give this word a directly opposite meaning [13]. (Of course, there were suggestions that it still means *to defend* [16, p. 78], but then there is the OED). However, when *champion* means *to fight against*, it depicts the kind of relation between a warrior and his fate that we can easily understand, the kind familiar to us from the Greek myths that we used to read as children, the kind that quite often serves as some sort of blueprint for interpreting the notion of fate in general. Yet, could there be another interpretation? After all, Macbeth is not a Greek warrior (He is not much of a Scottish thane either, but that's a different matter). The same Concordance informs us that Shakespeare used *utterance* quite often in the meaning of *saying*. That is, Macbeth might as well ask that fate come into the list to defend him as the said fate promised, that is, uttered before. What comes between the modern interpreters and this reading is the millennia-old concept of Greek fate that is inevitably hostile towards people and mostly implacable. We as readers and interpreters force our literary ideas on Shakespeare while he could have entertained on this matter rather different, and even diametrically opposed notions. In this case, a translator who feels that his/her job is to render a text word by word because s/he is paid per word, will most likely deprive the text of any poetic beauty but s/he just might hit onto a direct meaning long since lost or buried by various interpreters. Yet instances such as these lines from Macbeth demonstrate that Shakespeare's texts sometimes turn out to be convenient vehicles for interpreters' self-expression especially given the Bard's penchant for coining words and meanings and his fondness for a florid, highly ornate and sometimes difficult manner of writing (it is particularly obvious in his early works, such as *Romeo and Juliet*; in his later plays, his flamboyant writing style is significantly toned down).

In Russia, the cultural situation was such that translation formed a gigantic part of the country's cultural heritage, starting in the 10th century with the flood of translations, mostly from Greek. Even original Russian works were either based on translational models, or generously sprinkled with bits borrowed from various translated sources, notions of authorship being what they were, i.e., nonexistent. Translation has always been the instrument of education and enlightening, and it was practiced not only by people who made their living translating, but also by people who were authors in their own right. Arguably, this holds true from the 10th up to at least mid-19th century with poets such as Alexander Pushkin, Mikhail Lermontov, and Fedor Tiutchev taking considerable liberties with various poetic texts they translated into Russian. Many translators (and not in Russia only) considered it within their rights to amend and change original texts. However, such free treatment of the original is far from the phenomenon of a writer who uses translation as his or her own means of self-expression, whether consciously or not.

The phenomenon of author-translator is mostly known from its Soviet period, and it has often been said that the great Soviet school of translation flourished because writers could find no other outlet for their creativity, and oftentimes, no other means of supporting themselves. We have seen, however, that the roots of this phenomenon go deeper than the 20th century. And even the conflict between the state and the author was akin to a tradition in Russia from well before the Soviet period. In the tsarist Russia and in the Soviet Union alike, many writers were not translated for either ideological or aesthetic reasons. The imperial Russia would not allow translations of Beranger to be published, and the Soviet Union censorship would not permit the ideologically unsuitable works of Ezra Pound, or the aesthetically unacceptable poetry of Saint-John Perse to reach the Soviet readers.

Compared to the Soviet Union, the Russian empire, however, had a more consistent view of a human being, even if that view was somewhat simplistic and naive. The Soviet Union was an essentially contradictory state. Constructed on the maxim that matter determines the mind, it nevertheless based its existence on the fact that an idea, a mental reality, could be used to transform the objective, material world, and the founders of Marxism even strove to posit explanations for this contradiction [12]. Claiming that material well-being is the primary need of any human, the young state nonetheless staked everything on the poor and the penniless working towards, and sacrificing themselves for, an idea that could only materialize several generations later, if ever. Oddly enough, the state was partially right on both counts but it mixed up the target audiences for both concepts. The dominance of the material over the spiritual is typical for almost any folk mentality, and the Russian folk mentality preserved this archaic notion well into the 19th and 20th centuries [4, p. 95–133]. The idea of sacrificing oneself for a spiritual idea belongs either to the Christian ethic, to which the Soviet state was avowedly hostile, or to the ancient European heroic paganism, and being elitist in its nature, this idea could only flourish among those people the Soviet state strove to eliminate as its class enemies. The Soviet state depended in its existence on a fine balance between people for whom matter determined the mind, and those for whom mind determined the matter. The primacy of matter was, of course, the official religion.

It is within these contradictory notions of what a human being is, that Soviet authors-translators labored on their Shakespeare when, let us not forget, Shakespeare is all about what it means to be human and what kind of humans we are.

Hamlet is undoubtedly one the most striking exploration of the subject. Some of the most influential interpretations were proposed by Johann Wolfgang Goethe [9, p. 210–211, 214–215], August Schlegel [15], Samuel Coleridge [5]. They were all fairly similar, although Coleridge was far less known in Russia than either Goethe or Schlegel. All three being the products of their time, they claimed that Hamlet was selected for a great mission, which he, being a weak creature, botched. Hence, Hamlet is a potentially figure to be just slightly amended to create a perfect human being.

Yet there was something in the very structure of the tragedy that made such interpretation sit uncomfortable with many readers and translators. On the one hand, such interpretations essentially promote the concept of an exceptional person who is allowed to do what others are not, thus foreshadowing Dostoevsky's Raskolnikov and Nietzsche's *Uebermensch*. In 1940, Fredson Bowers explored Elizabethan revenge tragedy and concluded that in its highest manifestations, it was guided by "vengeance is mine" principle and, therefore, all avengers appearing in artistically successful plays were doomed to failure [3, p. 217–258]. However, Bowers demurred from making any serious foray into studying *Hamlet*, which presents a question in and of itself. Apparently, Bowers felt that including *Hamlet* into the genre of revenge tragedy would take away some essential and traditional interpretational element, namely, it would equate Hamlet and all the other avenging characters and turn them *all* into trespassers against God's law while Hamlet was certainly not to be treated equally with, say, the Revenger from Middleton's (or Tourner's) *Revenger's Tragedy*. Hamlet was *entitled*. Hamlet, *the most human* of all Shakespeare's creatures, was *entitled* to his revenge, or else we don't agree to this kind of tragedy.

What is *Hamlet*? Hamlet is a play about a young (or not so young) man, son of the king of Denmark, who, for some reason, gets passed over when the throne is vacated; he

learns of his father's death, and this death of someone he considered almost godlike shutters his very ideas of what humans are; for Hamlet, his father's death clearly marks the moment when his own death starts to loom large in the future. Vengeance and yearning for immortality vie in his soul, and the way to solve both his problems is to kill the murderer. A king is more than a mere human being, he is half-godlike. There is a curious idea put forward in a wildly off-beat book *The Godless Shakespeare*, namely that when the witch hails Macbeth as "*king hereafter*" he understands this "hereafter" as "*all eternity*" [11, p. 99-100] and there are certain textual arguments to be made in favor of this reading. Similar argument could be applied to *Hamlet*, and it could be argued that in most of his tragedies, and in *Hamlet* in particular, Shakespeare presents a character**,** who strives to overcome his human nature, to assume the responsibility for the entire world, but his characters choose such a way that leads to more destruction and horror. *Hamlet* is not a story of someone who was too weak for the mission. This is the story of overreaching**,** set in clearly Christian terms from beginning to end.

Now what was done to this story in the Russian translations?

The first Russian translation of *Hamlet* was done by a certain Mikhail Vronchenko, a military engineer and a translator who aimed at as faithful a translation as possible [7, p. 317]. He introduced Shakespeare to the Russian literary elite but did nothing more. The most influential 19th century Russian translation of *Hamlet* was done by Nikolay Polevoy, a journalist and a second-rate writer. His translation was wildly off the mark. He radically shortened the play**,** bringing Hamlet to the foreground. And he drastically changed the play's scale. Where Hamlet envisions himself a titan bearing the weight of the entire world on his shoulders, Polevoy's Hamlet is a mere police officer chasing a criminal who happens to be of royal blood. Just like Hamlet, we should note. Where the prince of Denmark says: *Time is out of joint. Oh, cursed spite // That ever I was born to set it right!* (act 1, scene 5) in Polevoy's translation, Hamlet's nearly cosmogonical quest turns into a criminal prosecution:

Oh cursed crime! Why ever
Was I born to punish thee!

Accordingly, Polevoy no longer needed the metaphysical framework and the metaphysical obstacles that Hamlet pondered so gloomily.

Shakespeare	**Polevoy**
What a piece of work is a man*! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculties! in form and moving how express and admirable! In action how like an angel! in apprehension how like a god! The beauty of the world, the paragon of animals!* ***And yet to me what is this quintessence of dust****?*	***What grandeur is man's****! So noble of mind, infinite of faculties, charm in shapes: this is the spirit of heaven, the ornament of the world, paragon for the rest of nature!... and for me?* ***What is to me this essence of clay****?*

(act 2, scene 2)

This text is an almost verbatim quote from Pico della Mirandola who saw man as a self-determining entity who could, through the exercise of his own will, choose any form of life from plant to animal to angel to the unity with God the Father [14, p. 249]. When we compare Pico to Shakespeare, we can clearly see that Hamlet loses this metaphysical optimism, and what stands in the way, is his mortality. And it is immortality in some shape that he will try to achieve. In his translation, however, Polevoy doesn't seem to notice the crucial quote from the Bible, the single word "dust" which immediately introduces the theme of mortality, the central theme in *Hamlet*. Polevoy's man is still fashioned of clay, but it is his grandeur that comes to the foreground, and the element of being created (*piece of work* with all its ironic connotations that ring so clear for today's reader) and inevitable death ("Dust thou art, and to dust thou shalt return," Gen., 3:19) are gone.

Consequently, when Hamlet delivers his probably most famous monolog, "To be or not to be," the readers are in for some surprise:

> Thus *conscience* does make cowards of us all,
> And thus the native hue of resolution
> Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought,
> And enterprises of great pith and moment
> With this regard their currents turn awry
> And lose the name of action.
>
> (act 3, scene 1)

The key word here is "conscience." Vronchenko, being conscientious (pun intended) translated as: *Thus conscience does make us always shy*. Ironically, both the English *conscience* and Russian *so-vest'* have similar internal structure: they refer to possessing certain knowledge, in this particular case, the knowledge of right and wrong.

To begin with, Polevoy creates a Russian-language monster: "horrible consciousness of a shy thought" whose meaning is unclear even to native speakers. What is most important, however, is that conscience as such is gone from this excerpt. Not that Polevoy's choice was completely unfounded; after all, following the conscience line we read:

> *And thus the native hue of resolution*
> *Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought.*

However, this very pale cast is the result of thinking motivated by conscience. Conscience makes us think about right and wrong. Other types of thinking could include: will I get away with it? Will I be proclaimed king? etc. Remove conscience, and the moral and metaphysical dimensions of the text disappear with it. Consequently, what Polevoy ultimately offers his readers is a not a metaphysical titan who contemplates breaking through the commandments and norms set for ordinary humans, but, as we have said before, a police officer who cannot scrounge up enough courage to do his duty. He has no grand pretenses, his ineptitude is his most notable feature, and even that ineptitude is more fitting for a policeman than for a prince of Denmark. Such a Hamlet is by all means a permissible figure under any political regime.

Whatever the literary merits of Polevoy translation, his use of *thought* instead of *conscience* in "To be or not to be" turned out to be an attractive option. Vronchenko, Kroneberg, K.R. (pen name of Grand Duke Konstantin Konstantinovich Romanov of the Russian Imperial family), and Nikolai Rossov (stage name of actor Nikolai Pashutin who was mostly famous of his performance of the title role in *Hamlet* [8, p. 325]) used *conscience* but this version never took. *Thought* continued to appear in the translations of Hamlet up to and including Pasternak's.

Pasternak's translation principles in general are a fascinating issue in themselves [the sentence seems awkward; perhaps. Valentin Berestov once recorded a remarkable conversation between Boris Pasternak and Anna Akhmatova. Akhmatova suggested that Pasternak write a 20th century *Faust* to which Pasternak replied: "Very well, I will translate it." Berestov saw in this exchange Pasternak's unshakable conviction that Goethe's poem covered the developments of European mind since the poem's creation and well into the 20th century [1]. However, a work of art is not merely a philosophical treatise, it is also its embodiment in a unique form. Pasternak's statement, therefore, could also be taken to imply the remarkable freedom with which the Russian poet was prepared to treat the German text; translation for him was as much an independent creation as following the original's intentions.

If we turn to the excerpts we considered when looking at Polevoy's translation, we will see that Pasternak still loses the element of being made, created, shaped by God to die in the end, but the element of mortality, the Biblical quote is there.

Shakespeare	**Pasternak**
What a piece of work is a man*! how noble in reason! how infinite in faculties! in form and moving how express and admirable! In action how like an angel! in apprehension*	***What a miracle of nature is man****! How nobly he reasons! How infinite of faculties! How precise and wonderful in his constitution and movements! In actions to like an*

how like a god! The beauty of the world, the paragon of animals! ***And yet to me what is this quintessence of dust****?*	*angel! Nearly equal to God in his understanding! The beauty of the universe! The crown of all the lives!* ***Yet what to me is this quintessence of dust****?*

Hamlet now does suffer from being mortal. But is he also now a being ready to assume God-like qualities and thus through functioning like a god to become a god in some way?

Time is out of joint. Oh, cursed spite
That ever I was born to set it right!

Pasternak leaves his Hamlet in stunned confusion:

The binding thread of days is torn;
How could I get the pieces together sewn?

There is no sense of grand mission in this Hamlet, just a sense of being slightly stumped at the task. Note also the substitution of thread for joint. Thread is a more mythological, more timeless, and a more endless image. It exists outside of time and space. Joint, on the other hand, is something that is very precisely located and can possibly have only one form, otherwise it's existence is pointless. One tiny image change bespeaks the failure of Pasternak's effort. He was a poet who could write: "I will shout to the children in the yard: 'my dears, what millennium is it now?'" He did not have that acute feeling for today, for the moment of now, for the historical and the temporary that embodied eternal truths about a human being in a particular historical shape. His was the realm of eternity and timelessness.

Shakespearean tragedy, on the other hand, could only be conceived as a joint, in a particular time, with a particular human condition in mind, not as an endless thread that has to be randomly tied together. Yet, what precludes Hamlet from performing this task in Pasternak's version is, again, not conscience but thought: *Thus thought makes cowards of us all...*

There is no moral quandary. There is unexpected task that looms greater and greater as one ponders it.

The desire for action is perceived as something very Hamletesque in the Russian culture, the tradition laid down by Ivan Turgenev in his essay "Hamlet and Don Quixote" where he considers Hamlet to be a man of reflection rather than action [17]. This action is to be construed on a gigantic scale, an overturning of the entire world. If Polevoy simply removed the grand scale, Pasternak brought it back but in on aspect only: in the aspect of the task, not in the personality of the one tasked with the deed. Unexpectedly, the spiritual world of Shakespeare, the Christian world of earthly crime and punishment in the hereafter, the world based on striving for deification, gave way to the world of a man who doesn't really live within the grand spiritual quandaries of Hamlet. He is thinking. He is the eternal man of the intelligentsia who cannot finish his uncle off, brain him with a candlestick, run him through with a sword, in short, take a swift and decisive action that ends all "upon this bank and shoal of time." Oddly enough, Pasternak creates a typically Soviet Hamlet: visibly opposed to his uncle, all ready to take action, thinking too much, being suppressed in the long run – these are all things that the opposition to the Soviet regime could see in *Hamlet* as a play and Hamlet as a character. Paradoxically, they turned a blind eye to the fact that Hamlet was not at all oppressed by the system because it was a different system he was dealing with. Unlike people who translated the *Tragedy of Hamlet, Prince of Denmark*, Hamlet was on very top of the social hierarchy, and he and Claudius were equal opponents in their lethal struggle. Pasternak, and many other translators and interpreters, substituted political for religious (doing it quite subconsciously, most likely), and turned Hamlet into a Soviet citizen who *could* be suppressed by other people and the world. In Shakespeare, on the contrary, the only thing Hamlet was suppressed by was his own ambition (and ambition in Shakespeare and in Elizabethan England is a separate issue [6]). In other words, in Hamlet, Pasternak recreated the Soviet man such as the Soviet regime would want to see that

man while Shakespeare offered possibilities for just an opposite interpretation. Pasternak's Hamlet is determined by the world around him, he is, therefore, at heart a philosophically materialist creature; Shakespeare's Hamlet is convinced he rules the entire universe; in philosophical terms, he is an idealist.

Shakespeare's tragedy requires delving into certain religious issues which are out of place in this paper, but the fact remains: Soviet translators, Pasternak included, were far more deeply influenced by the Soviet reality and conformed with it far more than they would have realized, and at least the character of Hamlet is interpreted and translated as a Soviet, not a Shakespearean, man whose tragedy is anachronistically Soviet (or even Russian, if we think back to Turgenev's essays privileging the insanely active Don Quixote versus the – allegedly – passive Hamlet) in its origins. This does not mean any willing and conscious agreement with the Soviet, imperialistic view of humans and their condition, but rather, this means the drastic influence the Soviet regime proved able to exercise even on its opponents, an influence the degree of which is almost uncomfortable to gauge and describe because it forces us to reconsider our notions concerning the origins and significance of many ideas and interpretations coming from the Soviet scholars and authors whom we presumed to be untouched by the Soviet ideology.

References

1. Berestov V. Novy Faust / V. Berestov // Nedelya. – 1989. – № 25 (1525). – Access mode: http://www.akhmatova.org/articles/berestov5.htm, free. – Title from screen. – English.

2. Bloom H. Shakespeare: the Invention of the Human / H. Bloom. – Yale University press, 1998. – 745 p.

3. Bowers F. Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy / F. Bowers. – Princeton, 1966. – 288 p.

4. Buzina T. Dostoevsky and the Social and Metaphysical Freedom / T. Buzina. – Edwin Mellen Press, 2003. – 326 p.

5. Coleridge S. T. Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, Beaumont And Fletcher. Notes and Lectures / S. T. Coleridge. – Acces mode: http://www.gutenberg.org/files/25585/25585-h/25585-h.html, free. – Title from screen. – English.

6. Esler A. The Aspiring Mind of the Elizabethan Young Generation / A. Esler. – Durham, NC, 1966. – 266 p.

7. Gamlet. Antologiia russkikh perevodov. 1828–1880. – Moscow, 2006. – 319 p.

8. Gamlet. Antologiia russkikh perevodov. 1883–1917. – Moscow, 2006. – 326 p.

9. Goethe J. W. Teatral'noe prizvanie Vil'gel'ma Meistera / J. W. Goethe. – Leningrad, 1976. – 296 p.

10. Malless S. Coined by Shakespeare: Words and Meanings First Penned by the Bard / S. Malless, J. McQuain. – Springfield, Mass., 1998. – 273 p.

11. Mallin E. S. Godless Shakespeare / E. S. Mallin. – London – New York : Continuum, 2007. – 132 p.

12. Marks K. K kritike gegelevskoi filosofii prava / K. Marks. – Access mode: http://anthropology.rchgi.spb.ru/marx/marx_t1.htm, free. – Title from screen. – English.

13. Open Source Shakespeare. – Access mode: http://www.opensourceshakespeare.com, free. – Title from screen. – English.

14. Pico della Mirandola. Rech' o dostoinstve cheloveka / Pico della Mirandola // Estetika Renessansa : in 2 vol. – M., 1981. – Vol. 1. – P. 248–265.

15. Schlegel A. W. Lectures on Dramatic Art and Literature / A. W. Schlegel. – Access mode: http://www.gutenberg.org/dirs/etext04/8ldal10.txt, free. – Title from screen. – English.

16. Shakespeare W. Macbeth. Edited by Kenneth Muir for the Arden Shakespeare series / W. Shakespeare. – London, 1951. – 196 p.

17. Turgenev I. S. Hamlet i Don Quixote / I. S. Turgenev // Turgenev I. S. Sobr. soch. : in 16 vol. – M., 1964. – Vol. 8. – P. 169–192.