

TUDOMÁNYOS DIÁKKÖRI DOLGOZAT

Retranslating Emily Dickinson's "Success": A Comparative Analysis of Hungarian
Translations by Amy Károlyi and István László Géher

Emily Dickinson sikerverseinek újrafordítása: Károlyi Amy és Géher István László magyar
fordításainak összehasonlító elemzése

2024. december

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Collected data	5
Choosing the poems for comparative analysis	7
Emily Dickinson's stance towards (literary) success	10
Comparative analysis of five poems and their Hungarian translations	12
<i>67</i>	12
<i>696</i>	17
<i>713</i>	23
<i>866</i>	26
<i>1659</i>	29
Conclusions	32
Abbreviations	36
Works Cited.....	37

Introduction

Retranslation has been recognized as a form of competition between (literary) translators (Venuti 32). Besides the obvious motivation to correct the potential mistakes of a previous version (Venuti 26; Kappanyos 41), retranslators also aim to "take a stance towards the existing translation(s) by signalling departure from" them (Mihálycsa and Wawrzycka 1). Next to the foreign source text, translators may also consult the previous translation in their work process. In addition, they tend to justify their own translations "by establishing their differences from one or more previous versions" (Venuti 25). Therefore, the purpose of this translatory competition appears to be asserting one's own uniqueness.

Chesterman's "Retranslation Hypothesis" recognises the essence of this difference in terms of closeness of the retranslated texts to the foreign originals (21–25). Building his theory on the suggestions of Berman, Bensimon, and Gambier, Chesterman claims that first translations tend to be freer (22–23), one might say naturalising, domesticating versions (Peeters and Van Poucke 6; Mihálycsa and Wawrzycka 2), while retranslations "approximate more closely the original's constitutive difference" (Mihálycsa and Wawrzycka 2). Even so, Venuti considers retranslation to be a means of prevention for the target culture to domineer over the translated foreign text (36).

On the other hand, the context created by cultural relevance is quite decisive in the emergence of new translations, too. First translations may possess an introductory role for these foreign source texts (Mesić 8; Mihálycsa and Wawrzycka 2; Peeters and Van Poucke 6), however, being translations, their cultural relevance (e.g. interpretations or language use) is inevitably bound to the era in which they were created, thus, they may not adequately serve in contemporary cultural contexts (see Kappanyos). In this way, older translations should not be considered mere sources of error; Venuti suggests, they rather "open up new paths of invention" and interpretation (36–37); they can be seen "as both evidence of the failure [...] [and] the success of translation, [by their] [...] ability to keep a work alive" (Massardier-Kenney 78).

Conversely, in Hungary, Kappanyos claims that the literate public is not consciously aware of the true nature of translation (35–36). The translation process is considered a mere

“mechanic recoding” from one language to another (Kappanyos 36; my trans.). Therefore, retranslations are generally regarded “anomalies” that aim to correct a previous translator’s mistakes (Kappanyos 35–36), in spite of the fact that the widespread availability of new information of our time necessitates the emergence of new, contemporary translations (Kappanyos 47). Kappanyos recognizes the purpose of retranslation in “dynamically renew[ing] the relevance” of literary texts (35; my trans.). It must also be mentioned that, as has been observed in other linguistic contexts, the newer translations “do not always fare better in the target context” (Mesić 10).

In the case of poetry, Kappanyos identifies an innate translation consciousness in the Hungarian literary public (44–47). The given “language performance is clearly attributed to the translator; it has its own value and thus can be compared with other such performances created of the foreign original” (Kappanyos 45; my trans.), thus, the competitive nature of retranslation is even more apparent in poetry. In this way, poetry translation appears to centre around the person of the translator, who wishes to show his or her own differing “ideas” (Kappanyos 45) and interpretations of a given literary work. However, this competition does not seem eliminative; the frequent comparison of various performances rather facilitates an inspired, artistic coexistence of manifold versions.

Emily Dickinson’s poetry, although not too deeply rooted in the Hungarian canon, showcases the coexistence of several 20th century and contemporary translations. Decades after her (posthumous) recognition in the American literary context, her legacy was taken up by Hungarian poets and translators with Ágnes Gergely and Amy Károlyi being foremost in this effort. Two dedicated volumes were published to introduce Dickinson’s poetry to the Hungarian literary audience: *Emily Dickinson válogatott írásai. Károlyi Amy fordításai és tanulmányai*. Magvető Könyvkiadó, 1978; *Emily Dickinson versei*. edited by Győző Ferencz, Európa Könyvkiadó, 1989. Nowadays, it is rather literary journals that provide an outlet for contemporary translators to present their competing, personal interpretations. These are the following: *1749*; *2000*; *Alföld*, *Forrás*, *Napút Online*, *Parnasszus*, *VersumOnline*, *Vigilia*.

Dickinson’s style proved to be foreign enough for the American cultural audience, thus, her works require conscious choice of strategies from her Hungarian translators. As Kappanyos claimed, the Hungarian reader him- or herself often feels inclined to compare different translations of the same works (44), so the critical comparison of Dickinson’s translations is rooted and hence necessitated by this characteristic of poetry translation, too. Through Dickinson’s otherness, translators are essentially facing a dilemma between domestication and

foreignization, which clearly evokes Chesterman's "Retranslation Hypothesis." Even though it has been shown to be an insufficient frame for analysis (Peeters and Van Poucke 8), there is not any conceptual model that could replace Chesterman's hypothesis (Peeters and Van Poucke 11). It is "continuously criticised, [but] also [...] continuously present in the critical discourse on retranslation" (Peeters and Van Poucke 11). Therefore, Hungarian readers and critics of Dickinson's poetry could justly be curious to examine whether translators of the previous century chose to "dilute" Dickinson's unique voice when first introducing her in Hungary, and whether contemporary translations are closer to the original works. In this discussion, I aim to analyse and compare Amy Károlyi's and István László Géher's translations of five Dickinson poems featuring the theme of success to find out how their "performances" (Kappanyos 45) relate to the claims of the "Retranslation Hypothesis."

Collected data

For my project, I collected altogether 316 poems from Emily Dickinson's works that have been translated into Hungarian. My major sources were three volumes: *Emily Dickinson válogatott írásai. Károlyi Amy fordításai és tanulmányai*. Magvető Könyvkiadó, 1978; *Emily Dickinson versei*. edited by Győző Ferencz, Európa Könyvkiadó, 1989; and Bollobás, Enikő. *Vendégünk a végtelenből. Emily Dickinson költészete*. Balassi Kiadó, 2015. In addition, I also found translations in various electronic sources such as literary journals.

This corpus of poetry results from the contribution of eighteen translators; interestingly, with balanced gender participation¹: Zsuzsa Beney, *Enikő Bollobás*, *Mari Falcsik*, Győző Ferencz², *István László Géher*, Ágnes Gergely, *Adrienn Góz*, *Tamás Halmai*, Ernő Hárs, Amy Károlyi, *Gyula Kodolányi*, Judit Pór, *László Sujtó*, Magda Székely, *Géza Szőcs*, Eszter Tábor, István Tótfalusi, and Sándor Weöres. Based on the date of publication, I classify eight of the aforementioned translators (in italics) as our contemporaries.

¹ However, in this discussion, I chose not to examine the impact of the translators' gender because my thematic focus, the theme of Success in Dickinson's poetry, is not as closely related to the poet's gender identity as for example her love poems are. Moreover, Dickinson's literary values relating to success is reminiscent of those of her male contemporaries (see subchapter on *Emily Dickinson's stance towards (literary) success*). Therefore, the theme and the translators' closeness to Dickinson's originals may be examined irrespective of the question of the translators' gender, although it would undoubtedly provide an interesting subject matter for further research.

² Bollobás' monograph ascribes the translated Poem 49 ("I never lost as much but twice") to Győző Ferencz, however when compared to Judit Pór's translation, which is featured in Ferencz's volume, it becomes obvious that the two versions are the same. Therefore, Ferencz's authorship appears to be an editorial mistake in Bollobás's book, thus I cannot consider him a contemporary translator on my list.

Naturally, multiple translations have been made of certain poems, with as many as four versions in the case of Poem 441³ (“This is my letter to the world”) and Poem 536 (“The Heart asks Pleasure – first –”). The amount of poems featured in the different volumes and other literary sources reflects this inevitable recurrences as well. Károlyi showcases 125 poems in her book, Ferencz’s collection contains 186, Bollobás features 90 translations, and I gathered 113 from various literary journals and other sources. Furthermore, most translations originate from the first nine hundred Dickinson texts according to Thomas H. Johnson’s classification (*The Complete Poems of Emily Dickinson*).

Emily Dickinson is the poet of multiple poetic personas and thus of an abundance of subject matter as well. I assorted the collected poems into eight different, although evidently coexisting, themes: Death and Immortality, female identity, life-wisdom, love, nature, religion, self, and Success (for further details see appendix 1). Comparing the number of new translations to the old translations reveals a proportional popularity in Dickinson’s various subject matters (see table 1 below).

table 1

Theme	Old Translations	% in the theme	% in 227 old tr.	New (Re-) Translations	% in the theme	% in 132 new tr.
<i>Death and Immortality</i>	92	76%	40,5%	45	37,2%	34,1%
<i>Female Identity</i>	7	63,6%	3,1%	8	72,7%	6,1%
<i>Life-Wisdom</i>	58	67,4%	25,5%	31	36%	23,5%
<i>Love-Poetry</i>	20	68,9%	8,8%	16	55,2%	12,1%
<i>Nature</i>	71	73,9	31,3%	41	42,7%	31,1%
<i>Religious Poetry</i>	31	60,8%	13,6%	24	47%	18,2%
<i>Self-Poetry</i>	12	57,1%	5,3%	12	57,1%	9,1%
<i>Success</i>	23	79,3%	10,1%	9	31%	6,8%

³ Although Ralph W. Franklin’s numbering system prevails in contemporary Dickinson criticism, still, Thomas H. Johnson’s numbers are used in Hungary (Bollobás 18), hence I chose to refer to her poems by Johnson’s numbers, too.

In both the 20th and the 21st century, Dickinson's poems on Death and Immortality as well as the topic of nature appeared to be the most popular among Hungarian translators with her life-wisdoms being the third most translated. However, comparing the prominence of the different themes in these eras reveals a slight change in the focus of the translators. While Death, nature and life-wisdom poetry remained widely popular among the translators, an increase could be observed in the prevalence of Dickinson's religious, love, self-, and female identity poems. Furthermore, Dickinson's poems on Success appear to be the least inspiring for contemporary translators.

Choosing the poems for comparative analysis

Enikő Bollobás gives a list of the most anthologized and quoted Dickinson poems in the introduction of her monograph (19), which alone reflects the fact well that critics and the literary audience mostly tend to be interested in her unique representation and imagery of Death (with six on the list), while the popularity of Poem 199, 461, 754, and the volcano poems displays the fresh feminist approach towards her works. However, Bollobás claims that "if someone decides to delve into poems which are less frequently discussed, they will surely encounter equal richness of thought as that of her widely known and celebrated works" (16; my trans.). Therefore, I decided to choose the theme of Success as the focus of my research for it appeared to be a rather ignored topic among Dickinson's other texts in my statistics, too. Unpopular it may be, fame was unarguably a significant question in the life and poetry of this person who could "ne'er succeed" (Dickinson 35).

To study the retranslation of Dickinson's poetry, both a contemporary and a 20th century translator must be chosen as the basis of comparison. As mentioned before, Emily Dickinson had two major Hungarian translators in the past century, Ágnes Gergely and Amy Károlyi. Even so, it was Károlyi's volume (*Emily Dickinson válogatott írásai*) through which Hungarian readers could encounter Dickinson's poetry for the first time in a separate collection. In this way, Károlyi's translations can be considered an evident choice for my research's divided focus for the aforementioned volume frames Károlyi as the more prominent translator. Moreover, I highlighted eight people in my previous list as contemporary translators, but one poet stands out from this lineup as well. He is István László Géher, who claims to have translated several hundreds of Dickinson's poems in the last few decades, most of which have not been published but the translator generously provided me with access to his manuscripts. For this reason, I consider him

the most significant among his contemporaries, and choose his works to study in comparison with Károlyi's 20th century translations.

I collected twenty-one translations by Amy Károlyi (AK) that can be classified to the Success subject matter. These poems are observable in the table below (see list of abbreviations at the end of the paper):

table 2

POEM	TR1	S1	TR2	S2	TR3	S3	TR4	S4
35 (Nobody knows this little Rose –)	AK	1; 2						
67 (Success is counted sweetest)	ÁgnG	2; 3	AK	1; 2	TH	8		
98 (One dignity delays for all –)	AK	1						
288 (I'm Nobody! Who are you?)	AK	1; 2	IT	2	AdrG	5		
306 (The Soul's Superior instants)	AK	1;2 (identical); 3 (third and fourth stanza printed together)						
374 (I went to Heaven –)	AK	1; 2 (different stanza structure)						
401 (What Soft – Cherubic Creatures –)	AK	1; 2 (second stanza second line comma)						
435 (Much Madness is divinest Sense –)	AK	1; 2; 3						
441 (This is my letter to the World)	IT	2	ILG	10,1	MF	10,2	AK	1
486 (I was the slightest in the House)	AK	3						
563 (I could not prove the Years had feet –)	AK	1; 2; 3						
583 (A Toad, can die of Light –)	AK	1 (incomplete)						
627 (The Tint I cannot take – is best)	AK	1; 2						
696 (Their Height in Heaven comforts not –)	AK	1						
713 (Fame of Myself, to justify,)	AK	1; 2						
866 (Fame is the tint that Scholars leave)	AK	1						
891 (To my quick ear the Leaves – conferred –)	AK	1; 2						
1072 (Title divine – is mine!)	AK	1 (no dash in line six); 2; 3 (identical)						

POEM	TR1	S1	TR2	S2	TR3	S3	TR4	S4
1379 (His Mansion in the Pool)	AK	1						
1659 (Fame is a fickle food)	AK	1						
1746 (The most important population)	AK	1						

While collecting translated poems, I found five Géher (ILG) translations of Dickinson's works dealing with the topic of Success. These are listed in the table below (see list of abbreviations at the end of the paper):

table 3

POEM	TR1	S1	TR2	S2	TR3	S3	TR4	S4
441 (This is my letter to the World)	IT	2	ILG	10,1	MF	10,2	AK	1
601 (A still – Volcano – Life –)	GyF	2	ILG	10,1				
613 (They shut me in Prose –)	GSz	3	ILG	6,3	TH	11		
819 (All I may, if small,)	ILG	10,2						
1763 (Fame is a bee.)	ILG	6,3						

Comparing the two lists shows that there is only one poem (441) that was translated and published by both translators. However, Géher's manuscript augments the list by seventeen poems, thus the following poems were translated by both poets in the theme of Success: 67, 288, 306, 374, 401, 435, 486, 563, 583, 627, 696, 713, 866, 891, 1072, 1659, and 1746.

To reduce the scope of my research, I chose to examine five poems of varied length and form in the following comparative analysis. Exactly five poems stand out from the aforementioned list by the use of analogous keywords: success, glory, and fame. These are the following: 67 ("Success is counted sweetest"), 696 ("Their Height in Heaven comforts not –"), 713 ("Fame of Myself, to justify,"), 866 ("Fame is the tint that Scholars leave"), 1659 ("Fame is a fickle food"). Furthermore, they are also of varied length (one to four stanzas). Therefore, these five poems and their translations shall be chosen as the focus of my analysis for they are indeed diverse in length and form and exhibit a unifying use of related concepts.

Emily Dickinson's stance towards (literary) success

Even though Emily Dickinson's style and poetic imagery could not earn the acknowledgement of the contemporary literary public, her exclusion and seclusion from fame was in line with 19th century, American literary ideals. Leo Braudy argues that for Dickinson and her contemporary writers, such as Whitman, Thoreau, and Emerson, "the badge of true success was public neglect, because each served ideals higher than the satisfaction of the multitude" (463). Therefore, Dickinson's half chosen, half inflicted seclusion, which Bollobás likens to celibate priesthood (34), aimed to serve the world of literature, her unique poetry in devotion to artistic immortality (Crumbley 53). Even so, Crumbley suggests this fact frames Dickinson's approach as the "proper conduct of the artist" who truly believes in the above mentioned ideas (53). Through her metaphorical marriage to her own creativity (Bollobás 28), her life of "losses melted together to form a queenly diadem" (Károlyi 9; my trans.). Thus, Dickinson's figure can be considered the queen of the kind of poetry that seeks timeless literary values.

Crumbley and Finnerty both quote Poem 1427⁴ ("To earn it by disdaining it") as an example for Dickinson's philosophy on poetic Fame.

To earn it by disdaining it
Is Fame's consummate Fee
He loves what spurns him
Look behind – He is pursuing thee.

So let us gather – every Day
The Aggregate of
Life's Bouquet
Be Honor and not shame –

The poem opens with a prominent paradox ("To earn it by disdaining it") that personifies Fame to be a demanding, mystical force in one's artistic life. Crumbley suggests Dickinson's Fame ironically illuminates "the lives of those who court immortality by escaping the allure of momentary fashion and instead dedicate their creative lives to timeless art outside the public eye" (51). Therefore, this is not the Fame of a transient culture, but rather a brother to literary immortality which Dickinson sought through her aversion to publicity.

⁴ This and the following English poems are quoted from: Dickinson, Emily. *The Complete Poems of Emily Dickinson*. Edited by Thomas Herbert Johnson, Back Bay Books / Little, Brown and Company, 2021.

Finnerty, on the other hand, understands this poem as an evidence of Dickinson's unwillingness to take part in shallow celebrity culture, and later characterizes the poet as a "reluctant celebrity," who is "using publicityseeking [sic!] mechanisms to her advantage" (38). In his paper, Finnerty points out that Dickinson was aware of the workings of the newly forming celebrity culture, and even was fascinated by the lives of her literary contemporaries (25–38). However, she was clearly critical towards commercial society and refused to assume the role of the typical female celebrity of her time (Finnerty 40). Interestingly, however, Finnerty suggests that Dickinson was aware of and building on the fact that privacy could easily draw the attention of a literary audience in a culture dominated by the shallowness of publicity (36). In addition, her own "attention to the veiled and the sequestered" appears to prove for Finnerty that Dickinson did hope for publicity, but a more eye-catching, posthumous kind (48).

This suggestion, however, appears to forget the fact that Dickinson's seclusion was only partly self-inflicted, not to mention, even a posthumously sought success goes against "Fame's consummate Fee" of its disdain. It goes without saying that Emily Dickinson's true objectives cannot be retrieved, but critics (such as Amy Károlyi and Enikő Bollobás) clearly recognize Higginson's role in depriving Dickinson from a larger audience by not believing in the non-posthumous success of her works. Strictly speaking, Dickinson refused to make any kind of change to her style, too. Thus, the claim that she used privacy as a kind of marketing strategy that would favour her works' immortality after her death resounds as though she could have been "public" with the same authenticity to her style, and the only allure to her works resided in the poet's biographical peculiarity. Not to mention the fact that Dickinson made various statements in which she favoured her lack of publicity out of purely personal preferences (if not of her critical view on fame-driven society): e.g. "If fame belonged to me, I could not escape her – if she did not, the longest day would pass me on the chase – and the approbation of my Dog, would forsake me – then – My Barefoot-Rank is better –" (Letter 265). As Poem 713 argues, too, to Dickinson, self-justification of one's merit is above "All other Plaudit." One might say the authentic existence of poetry is enough justification for the brothers, lasting Fame and Immortality to cast their light on one's work without the author herself working for in-life or posthumous recognition. Dickinson "does not wish to write for the market, she writes for eternity" (Károlyi 115; my trans.)

Comparative analysis of five poems and their Hungarian translations

67

Success is counted sweetest
By those who ne'er succeed.
To comprehend a nectar
Requires sorest need.

Not one of all the purple Host
Who took the Flag today
Can tell the definition
So clear of Victory

As he defeated – dying –
On whose forbidden ear
The distant strains of triumph
Burst agonized and clear!

Poem 67 is among the few Dickinson works that were published during the poet's lifetime with the help, or rather enthusiasm, of Helen Hunt Jackson in the volume titled *A Masque of Poets* (1878), although with certain editorial modifications (Johnson xxx–xxxiii; Károlyi 123–125). The above cited version is the third known copy, which Dickinson sent “to T.W. Higginson in July 1862” (Franklin 146) and is quoted as a “definitive” version by editors and critics. Johnson suggests that Dickinson did not give any explicit consent to her friend's efforts of publication, even so he argues that the changes must have seemed “galling” to the poet (Johnson xxxii–xxxiii). Regardless, the peculiarity of publishing a text which clearly rejects a triumphant Success can be seen as a witty, frugal statement representing the poet's aversion to publicity. However, the poem does not only represent Dickinson's views on Success, but it reflects the poet's paradoxical life-philosophy, which Amy Károlyi's and Enikő Bollobás' worded in the following way based on both analyses and autobiographical information: “absence is replaced by the absent” (Károlyi 24; my trans.) for “experience compensates the absence and the loss” (Bollobás 116; my trans.).

Firstly, I will examine the form and structure of the poem. The text consists of three quatrains and follows an xaxa rhyme scheme (not present in the second stanza). For its metre, Dickinson utilized irregular iambs in seven (or in the first line of the second stanza, eight) and

six syllable lines. Therefore, the poem displays Dickinson's characteristic, irregularized common metre or church hymn form (see Károlyi 11 – 13). In addition, it also exhibits several eye-rhymes (e.g. the repetition of letter e in the first stanza). Syntactically, it contains three sentences with the longest spreading into two stanzas.

The Dickinsonian paradox truly takes a central role in the poem, which is also supported by a religious sounding code. With the word “count,” the onset evokes the ironic image of “reckoning as to money or property” (“Count”), thus attaches monetary gain to the concept of Success. The second sentence elaborates on the opening assertion with the metaphor of “sorest need,” yet the secondary meaning of “comprehend”, “to take in” (“Comprehend”), places the essential,, as Károlyi claims (8),, transubstantiation to the end of the first stanza. Therefore, “Sorest need” appears as a religious criterion to properly taking in the sweet nectar of Success; experience truly compensates the absence. The last two stanzas, on the other hand, set in the eternal present with the use of “today,” voice a socioreligious criticism. The majority of the victorious “purple Host,” which could be understood as Heavenly Host (Corn 239), is contrasted by the defeated singular's minority, whose defeat is twisted into a true religious triumph through experience. However, it must not be forgotten that for Dickinson, as Porter claims, “every ecstasy comes at full price” (152), the pain of “sorest need” is not entirely forgotten. The key adjective in the closure of the poem is clarity; it augments the importance of telling a concept's definition,, i.e. philosophizing,, and minimizes the agony of death.

In this way, Success appears in a complex metaphor in this poem highlighting the dichotomy of personal and a triumphant majority's opinion. Dickinson's speaker talks in a wise, religious-sounding aura of a Success of Experience that is superior to “material” or earthly victories for true understanding is attributed to the defeated in the context of philosophical discussions. This is clearly in line with Dickinson's ideas about disdaining Fame to acquire Immortality for her poetry. On the other hand, the poem also presents the view of the majority by the victorious “purple Host,” though critically by casting the light of superficiality to their scenic success.

Amy Károlyi and István László Géher made the following translations of the poem:

Amy Károlyi:

A siker annak édes,
Kit kerül a siker.
Megbecsülni a nektárt,
Ahhoz szomjazni kell.

A vesztesek zászlóinak
Zsákmányolója sem
Tudná úgy körülírni,
Hogy mi a győzelem,

Mint haldokló legyőzött,
Kinek zárt fülibe
A győzelmes rivalgás
Tisztán hasít bele.

István László Géher:

A Siker annak édes
Aki sikertelen –
Az becsüli a Nektárt,
Akinek nincs ilyen.

Mert semelyik lila ruhás,
Ki Zászlót nyert csatán
Nem érti úgy, mi a győzelem
A győztes harc után,

Mint a vesztes – szinte halott –
Ő hall győzelmi Dalt,
Kinek vérző fülében él
A messzi Diadal!

Regarding the poem's structure, the dominant approach of the translators appears to be either omission or compensation. Both translations follow the original's exterior structure, and preserve Dickinson's modified church hymn form but conform to Hungarian metric traditions by ensuring the iambic beat in the last complete metric foot. In the rhyme pattern, however, they are much more regular than the English version. Géher compensates this by the variation of syllable count, while Károlyi methodically repeats seven and six-syllable-long lines. The most prominent superficial difference in the two translations can be found in the typography; while Károlyi completely omits Dickinson's unique writing style, Géher compensates by adding an additional dash to the end of the second line (not present in any surviving manuscripts), and regarding capitalization, he finds inspiration in Version D of this poem provided in the Franklin volume (146).

The opening of the verse in the translations shows some minor contrasts, yet more importantly lacks the religious undertone of the original. Although, Károlyi's first line does not include the superlative voiced in the English poem, Géher retains her solution, only to alter the repetition in the second line. Károlyi in fact personifies Success by assigning a sense of activity

to the concept; “Kit kerül a siker” [By someone whom success avoids], while in the original, initially the lack of success is presented in neutral terms. Géher communicates the neutrality of “ne’er succeed” with “sikertelen” [lacking success]. Moreover, comprehension is translated as “(meg)becsül” [to value] in both translations. In this way, “the nectar” and Success are presented as valuable objects that are usually taken for granted, which is a fitting translation, however, the religious undertone is not noticeable here if one does not know the original; the statement remains general. In addition, Károlyi specifies the closure of the stanza: “sorest need” becomes “szomjazni” [dire thirst], which is quite suitable for a liquid nectar, although logically familiarizing in approach. Géher’s version, on the other hand, lacks “sorest” in meaning, and ends with the neutral “Akinék nincs ilyen” [By someone who has none].

Moreover, the third sentence opposes severity and neutrality in the two versions, while Géher’s translation presumably unintentionally also showcase feminized participants. Károlyi frames the “purple Host” as looters who undeservedly steal multiple flags off a raided castle (“A vesztesek zászlóinak / Zsákmányolója”), as opposed to *taking* the one treasured Flag in the original. Therefore, the religious undertone of the poem is omitted from the translation as her looters lack “the liturgical colour of penitence” (Corn 239) and the reference to the Heavenly Host, which is enhanced by the multiplicity of the flags, too. Géher’s version, on the other hand, preserves the original’s neutrality in these lines, too (“Ki Zászlót nyert csatán” [Who won a Flag in battle]), however, the “purple Host” turn into “lila ruhás” [purple clothed [people]], which expression in the Hungarian cultural context may call to the reader’s mind Pál Szinyei Merse’s famous painting entitled “Lila ruhás nő” [A lady in purple gown]. Therefore, the angelic presence in the original is exchanged with beautiful ladies. However, this phrase also has a secondary religious connotation that evokes the purple robe of Christian priests, yet the allusion might easily go unnoticed without further religious references.

The metaphor of philosophizing remains vocal in Károlyi’s translation, whereas Géher rather emphasizes a personal significance to the question. Károlyi uses the word “körülír” [paraphrase] instead of “tell,” meaning to describe in greater detail in other words, which is a fitting translation. However, this word in figurative language use can mean “to euphemize” as well according to the *A magyar nyelv értelmező szótára* [Hungarian Thesaurus Reference Book] (“Körülír”), which clashes with the prominence of clarity (present only in the last stanza in Károlyi’s translation). Géher writes “érti” [understands] instead of “tell,” which creates a private issue of the definition of victory rather than a question to discuss. Additionally, his last line semantically repeats the second line’s won battle.

Lastly, the final stanza showcases differing imagery, while the translators seek the original's authenticity, too. Károlyi clearly omits Dickinson's structural peculiarity, although remains closer to the English text with "haldokló legyőzött" [dying defeated [person]]. Nevertheless, it must be mentioned that she writes "A vesztesek zászlóinak" [The losers' flags'] in the second stanza, which is more derogatory a term compared to the neutral [defeated [person]]. Yet Géher preserves the sentence structure, "Mint a vesztes – szinte halott –" [As the loser – almost dead –], while exclusively using the above more derogatory expression. Furthermore, to ease understanding, Géher also alters the structure of this last clause. The translation of "forbidden ear" is also worth of noting. In Károlyi's text, the ear is closed leaving it unspecified whether it was voluntarily closed or not. This mirrors Dickinson's refusal to change and her contemporaries' harsh criticism (see: Károlyi 12; 110–113). In Géher's version the injury is upon the ear as it is [bleeding], which signifies the original's agony. The "strains of triumph" retains its painful characteristics in Károlyi's translation with the use of "hasít bele" [pierces into], whereas Géher emphasizes the distance of triumph with "messzi" [far] in this line. Only Károlyi highlights the role of clarity in the poem, while Géher rather mirrors the perfect assonance of ear and clear with "dal" [song] and "diadal" [triumph].

Even though certain ambiguities are not present in the translations, the characterization of Dickinson's Success of Experience is generally conveyed well by both translators. Károlyi's Success appears as a personified figure (not foreign to Dickinson's corpus), and in the battle field metaphor, she puts greater emphasis on the defeated person's pain; a multiplied price is paid for ecstasy to be achieved in the metaphors. Géher's Success comes with less pain, however, he goes so far to claim that triumph in truth lives in the bleeding ear of the loser, which is a different but fitting image for Dickinson's paradox. A greater difference could be identified in the translation of "To comprehend." As both poets translated this word as [to value], Success is not assumed or taken in in either of the translations but merely valued correctly by those who lack fame. It is rather presented as a too often seen phenomenon, which might authentically echo the dichotomy between the speaker's personal and the supposed public's opinion, but does not connote deep change in the defeated as when taking in the Eucharist.

Altogether, the analysis shows that formally it is Géher who remains closer to Dickinson's original, however, regarding the poem's imagery, Károlyi appears to be more authentic. A glance at the translations' typography and form reveals that Géher aimed to preserve Dickinson's unique writing style, while Károlyi clearly took a domesticating approach, therefore, Géher is indeed formally closer to the original. The rhyming words in the closure of Géher's version may be seen as a fitting example

for that as they aim to reproduce Dickinson's clear assonance both in visuals and sound. Furthermore, Géher neutralizes the severity appearing in Károlyi's translation for the most part, yet through this approach, his text put less emphasis on the defeated person's "sorest need" and pain than Dickinson did. In addition, the religious connotations of the original poem chiefly are not present in the translations. Even though Géher makes a slight allusion to Christian priests in purple robes, the title of the aforementioned Szinyei Merse painting and the feminine image may be more dominant to Hungarian readers. The cultural addition neutralizes his approximation to original phrase. Moreover, only Károlyi retains the social characteristics of the discussion on defining "Victory", though the figurative understanding of her chosen word is further from Dickinson's emphasized clarity. However, it must be mentioned that only Károlyi's translation mentions explicitly the importance of this clarity, thus through the defeated minority's pain, the social vocality of philosophizing, and the stress on clarity Károlyi's translation appears to be closer to the original's imagery. Nevertheless, Dickinson's paradoxical image of defeated Success is transmitted well by both translators.

696

Their Height in Heaven comforts not –

Their Glory – nought to me –

'Twas best imperfect – as it was –

I'm finite – I can't see –

The House of Supposition –

The Glimmering Frontier that

Skirts the Acres of Perhaps –

To Me – shows insecure –

The Wealth I had – contented me –

If 'twas a meaner size –

Then I had counted it until

It pleased my narrow Eyes –

Better than larger values –

That show however true –

This timid life of Evidence

Keeps pleading – "I don't know."

The poem features Dickinson's modified church hymn form with its four quatrains showcasing irregular iambic metre and an imperfect xaxa rhyme pattern. The second stanza lacks rhymes altogether. The number of syllables in most stanzas varies between the numbers eight and six, however, the length of certain lines is reduced to seven syllables, when it should be eight. Ralph W. Franklin counts only one surviving version of the text.

The onset creates a background of grief by highlighting a loss of a certain "them." However, the speaker's statement contrasts sharply that of the lyrical I's in the Middle English poem *Pearl*, where the father *is* comforted by seeing his daughter as the bride of Christ. The stanza closes with the modern-sounding concept of "exclusion from comprehension" (Porter 149–152), a dominant feature in Dickinson's poetry: for Dickinson, the world lacks "an organizing vision", thus "the human condition" bars people from understanding Death or other such mysticism (Porter 149). Similarly in Poem 696, the speaker's finiteness prevents her from receiving comfort as she cannot see the grieved persons' glory.

However, it must also be mentioned that Dickinson's references to sight throughout the poem can be considered allusions to her own inherited eye disease. Between 1861 and 1865, she was suffering greatly from exotropia and thus had to shield her eyes from daylight (Bollobás 33). According to Johnson and Franklin, the date of origin of Poem 696 is 1863 (Johnson 537; Franklin 689), hence the closing "I can't see" in the first stanza can be understood as an example of the trope of blindness in Dickinson's poetry, and not simply the speaker expressing her lack of comprehension.

The second stanza exhibits a more complicated syntactic structure while using the American frontier as a metaphor for Heaven. The predicate of this sentence (i.e. "shows insecure") is revealed in the last line after several coordinate simile clauses, which makes the interpretation of these lines more difficult. In addition, the frontier can refer to "the newly or sparsely settled western regions of the United States during the wave of expansion in the 19th century" ("Frontier"). As Rudolph claims, the image of the frontier in American culture is threefold: 1) there is the optimistic view of the pioneers that regard the wilderness a possible expansion for their wealth or even Canaan itself (82); 2) the frontier can be seen as a place of hazards and tribulations that one is destined to overcome; 3) a more critical view recognizes the frontier as a metaphor for abstract, societal challenges (89–91) such as "the unsolved problems of peace and war" (91). Dickinson characterizes the frontier, her metaphor for Heaven, with the adjective "glimmering," which is in line with the first, optimistic view of the American wilderness. The speaker, on the other hand, shuns this supposed positive societal attitude by

emphasizing its insecurity, which is more reflective of the third, critical perception of the area. In this way, the glory of Heaven appearing in the first stanza is not merely reduced to a supposition, but also compared to the uncertainty of the wild frontier.

The third stanza elaborates this disagreement between the society's and the speaker's view. Her "wealth," she claims, may be belittled by others, either meaning earthly goods compared to the glory of Heaven, or simply worth and prosperity without any territorial expansion, yet she found contentment in the little. This is mirrored in Dickinson's Letter 265, too, as she writes: "– My Barefoot-Rank is better –". Furthermore, the first stanza's lack of comfort arches into content and afterwards even pleasure through a determined positive mindset: "counted it until / It pleased my narrow Eyes –."

Lastly, the fourth stanza continues the previous' comparison, although it does not settle the conflict between the recognized values and the speaker's wealth of "meaner size." As the larger values are allegedly considered true, the speaker's little wealth can be matched with the adjective "untrue", which may be understood as imagined. Nevertheless, the speaker's timid life cannot or does not wish to defend itself in front of the jury of these values as the poem closes on an elliptic "I don't know."

In short, Dickinson's peculiar Glory and Wealth are shown through a contrast of the speaker's smallness and the society's preference for "larger values." The speaker's contentment with her finite, small Wealth is in line with Dickinson's poetic philosophy that urges one to refrain from seeking Success. In addition, Dickinson also voices sharp societal criticism by comparing Heaven to the wild, uncertain frontier, and thus the seekers of larger values to the overly optimistic pioneers. Her "timid life of Evidence," however, is not made to give any overt justification of this life style; what matters is the speaker's contentment in the small.

Amy Károlyi and István László Géher made the following translations of this work:

Amy Károlyi:

Égi fenségük nem vigasz,
Zérus az égi fény –
A tökéletlen volt a jó,
Rajt túl nem látok én.

A feltevések háza,
A vibráló perem
A Talán földjét övező,
Bizonytalan nekem.

Beértem azzal, ami volt,
Ámbár szegényesebb,
Addig számlálgattam, amíg
Megörvendeztetett,

Jobban, mint bármilyen igaz
Látszatu nagy vagyon.
A való élet féltiben
Ódzkodik: „mit tudom”.

István László Géher:

Mennyek Magasa nem igéz –
Az Üdv – érdektelen –
Tökéletlenül jobb – a Mennyt
Nem látom – végesen –

A Feltevések Háza –
A Csillogó Határ,
Mi a Talánt körülveszi –
Bizonytalan – Homály –

Gazdag voltam – s elégedett –
Ha Csekélység jutott –
Addig számoltam, amíg – szűk
Szemem megnyugodott –

Jobb ez a fenti Kincsnél, –
Mely bármilyen Vagyon –
A Lét szerényebb Érve azt
Mondja, hogy – „nem tudom” –

As for the formal characteristics of the translations, both texts follow the original's chevy chase form with the last complete iambic feet, and they even employ irregularities in certain seven-syllable-long lines that end in a trochee or a spondee. On the other hand, the rhyme scheme is regularized in the Hungarian poems. Regarding typography, Dickinson utilizes countless dashes and capitalized words in her original, which are almost fully omitted by Amy Károlyi apart from a dash in the second line; the former are exchanged with regular punctuation marks. In contrast, István László Géher preserves Dickinson's peculiarity.

The onset of the poem reveals already that Géher took a more interpretive approach in his translation. While Károlyi retains the grief of losing unnamed loved ones (“Égi fenségük nem vigasz,” [Their heavenly/celestial grandeur is no consolation]), Géher's speaker rejects Heaven

in general terms: “Mennyek Magasa nem igéz –” [Height of Heavens does not charm me]. In this way, “Glory” is translated as “Salvation,” which seem “érdektelen” [lacklustre] in his poem. Károlyi understands the poem’s recognized keyword as “[a]n effulgence of light such as is associated with conceptions of heaven” (“Glory”): “égi fény” [heavenly/celestial light], which is equalled with “zérus,” a synonym of the Hungarian zero. Interestingly, Dickinson uses a word originating from Old English here, nought (“Nought”), thus Károlyi foreignizes the poem with the adoption of a latinized expression. Géher generalizes in the following lines as well by turning the originals past tense into present tense. Nevertheless, the “exclusion from comprehension” and Dickinson’s reference to her disease are present in both his and Károlyi’s translation, he merely solves Dickinson’s ambiguity by specifically naming Heaven as the object that the speaker “can’t see.” Károlyi, in contrast, remains more ambiguous in the last line of the stanza.

The second stanza shows a contrast of subjectivity and objectivity in the two versions. The “Glimmering Frontier” in Károlyi’s translation is a [vibrant/vibrating edge], which exhibits a neutral or negative connotation rather than the positivity of a glimmer. Therefore, the speaker’s aversion is voiced already in the second line, erasing the conflict between the speaker’s private and the public opinion. Géher ends the stanza without any explicit reference to the speaker; his translation remains generalized, although reusing some of Károlyi’s solutions. Thus, the contrast of the more authentically translated “Csillogó Határ” [Sparkling Border] and the “Bizonytalan – Homály –” [Insecure – Haze –] resound as the revelation of truth rather than a personal opinion. Nonetheless, Heaven is reduced to a supposition in both versions, just the allusion to the American frontier vanishes in the Hungarian cultural context.

Moreover, Géher’s third stanza employs a different arch of emotions than that of the original. Dickinson writes: comfort – content – please; Károlyi translates: vigasz [solace] – beér [settle for] – megörvendezett [gladden]; and Géher chooses: igéz [charm] – elégedett [satisfied] – megnyugodott [calmed/eased]. Károlyi’s expressions transmit the stages of the original’s emotional process well, however, it must be said that her version does not explicitly mention the ambiguous wealth and makes no reference to sight, which the previous stanza misses, too: “To Me – shows insecure –”, “Bizonytalan nekem.” [Is insecure to me]. Géher, on the contrary, retains a reference to richness and the self-critical “narrow Eyes,” though places the distress of the first stanza here with “megnyugodott” [calmed/eased] implying a previous such state. This suggests that the speaker was once displeased about her [meager] richness.

The last quatrain mirrors Károlyi's preserved ambiguity and Géher's generalizing interpretive approach, too. The syntax in the new translation is much clearer, yet this is the only place where Dickinson's contrast of her speaker's and the majority's opinion survives: "Jobb ez a fenti Kincsnél" [This is better than the upper Treasure]. However, the speaker is not put in front of a jury, she says ("mondja") her "I don't know" in the context of philosophizing (observed in Poem 67, too), by the use of "Érve" [its reason], suggesting her "timid life" needs no validation. Károlyi preserves the cross-stanza syntactic structure of the original and authentically criticizes "larger values:" "bármilyen igaz / Látszatu nagy vagyon." [whatever large wealth that seems true]. Even so, she specifies "timid life" as [real life] that appears afraid ("A való élet féltiben"), suggesting that the truth in fact is in the speaker's wealth of meaner size. Although the utterance of "I don't know" is not put in front of a jury in her translation either, her stylistically more light-hearted "mit tudom" [dunno] rejects the need of defence, too.

In the characterization of Glory, both translators convey the original's accentuation on the speaker's smallness compared to heavenly highness, although their emphases are not as pure as Dickinson's. In Károlyi's translation, the falsity and zeroness of "larger values" are highlighted to prove the personal value to the speaker's preference for small imperfection, still her [real life] at the closure of the poem seems afraid to speak her own truth. In this sense, worry and fear is coupled with Dickinson's commitment to the small when seeing the dominance of false "Wealth," while Dickinson represents total content. Géher's translation specifically puts the opposition in the context of salvation and worldly imperfection, though conveys the lack of inner need to vocally justify the speaker's choice for living a small life well. However, the calmed narrow eye in his third stanza suggests that there was a time when the speaker could not contend with her meaner-sized wealth, rather than mourning the loss of loved ones. Furthermore, by leaving out the reference to American frontier, Dickinson's criticism towards "larger values" are softened in the translations. Altogether, the translators put a little sense of doubt next to the emphasis on speaker's preferred smallness.

To conclude, the translations of Poem 696 reveals a contrasting approach of Károlyi's preserved ambiguity and Géher's more "reader-friendly," interpretive translation, while Géher also aimed to retain Dickinson's unique form. Even though both translators regularized the poem's rhyme scheme, Géher can be considered formally closer to the original by his dashes and capitalized words. However, in the case of this poem, it is not as easy to decide which translator is closer to Dickinson in terms of imagery. In the first and last stanza, Károlyi appears to be more authentic as she consistently preserved the ambiguity, the speaker's grief, the cross-

stanza syntax, the positive appearance of “larger values,” whereas the meaning in Géher’s text is narrowed down to a speaker shunning Heaven specifically. However, in the middle stanzas, the translations are equally approximating and abstracting from the original through certain translocations of meaning. Károlyi voices the speaker’s aversion to “The House of Supposition” earlier, thus, leaves out the conflict between the majority and the singular speaker in the second stanza. Géher’s translation, on the other hand, generalizes the personality of the stanza, and poses the conflict rather as the revelation of truth. In addition, Dickinson’s frontier metaphor is not present in either translations, even though Géher’s “Csillogó Határ” [Sparkling Border] is closer to the original than Károlyi’s solution. In the third stanza, Károlyi presents Dickinson’s arch of emotions well with appropriate verbs, yet she places the “Wealth” and the reference to sight solely to the last stanza. Géher, in contrast, builds the emotional arch of the poem differently, thus his translation is further from the original here, though he preserves the image of “Wealth” and Dickinson’s allusion to sight. In this way, the analysis poses the question whether an interpretive approach with certain changes in imagery and authentic formal otherness, *or* ambiguity with the loss of some secondary meaning in a domesticized form can be considered “closer” to the original, when essentially both translations convey the peculiar, contented “smallness” of the speaker.

713

Fame of Myself, to justify,
 All other Plaudit be
 Superfluous – An Incense
 Beyond Necessity –

 Fame of Myself to lack – Although
 My Name be else Supreme –
 This were an Honor honorless –
 A futile Diadem –

The above poem, although showcases a complicated syntactic structure, highlights the speaker’s “inner order” (Bollobás 14; my trans.) over any “other Plaudit.” Regarding its form, it consists of two common metre quatrains with eye-rhymes in the even lines. In addition, the third line in the first stanza is irregular with its seven syllables. The Franklin variorum only counts one version of this poem.

Indeed, the structure of the sentences aggravates comprehension, however, certain insertions clarify the meaning: “‘If I can justify my fame to myself, then...’ and ‘If my fame lacks justification, then although...’” as Susan Kornfeld suggests (n. pag.). Therefore, “self-esteem takes precedence over the appreciation of the public” (Kónyi 50) if the writer deems herself talented. In fact, Fame is likened to a religious ceremony with the incense, yet Dickinson argues that Melchior’s gift is unnecessary; in truth, it does not make the child greater in Bethlehem. Thus without (being aware of one’s) artistic merits, “it seems to be dishonest to accept the celebration of the public” (Kónyi 50).

Furthermore, the rejection of Fame is in line with Dickinson’s secluded, literary priesthood (Bollobás 34). “The prevailing taste in the 19th century deprives her of success, yet behold, she does not wish to write for the market, she writes for eternity” (Károlyi 115; my trans.). Dickinson’s “timid life” (Poem 696) can seem out of order to the majority, yet for her, order comes from within, through self-justification. As mentioned before, through dedicating her life to the sole purpose of writing poetry, she becomes “the queen of the world she herself created” (Károlyi 13; my trans.), where neighbourhood prevails (Bollobás 14). In her “majestic hospitality [...], she shares her life with the companions of her queenly self: likewise with her friends and the participants of her inner world” (Bollobás 34; my trans.). Therefore, the Diadem of baseless Fame truly appears futile. This explicitly echoes Dickinson focus on immortal artistic values over the fleeting success her culture could provide, and even highlights the importance of the poet believing in her works’ immortal value, if it can truly be justified.

Amy Károlyi and István László Géher made the following translations of the poem:

Amy Károlyi:

Magam hírét sürgősen,
Hogy igazolja más,
Ez fölösleges tömjén,
Oktalan tapsolás.

Önnön hírem, ha nem lelem,
Bár nevem lenne fény –
Ez a dicsőség dicstelen,
Ez olcsó diadém.

István László Géher:

A Hírnév – Öngazolás –
A Méltatás – üres –
Belélegezni – Tömjén –
Kapni – fölösleges –

Ha nincs Hírnevem – meglehet
Egyszer elnyerem Én –
Teher lenne a Fejemen –
Egy sivár Diadém –

Structurally, both translations follow the original, although, there is an apparent difference in typography. Károlyi and Géher equally preserve the English poem's iambic metre and syllable count with the irregular, spondaic third line, yet their rhymes sound more regular than Dickinson's. Additionally, Károlyi retained only one of the original's six dashes, while Géher compensated by adding six more. The capitalized letters are also present in Géher's version, but Károlyi omitted them in this translation as well.

The original's complex syntax, on the other hand, was apparently challenging to transmit to the Hungarian language, as the two translators' approach result in differing images that nevertheless accentuate the importance of artistic self-justification. Károlyi aimed to clarify the structure of the sentences while Géher utilized the dashes to emphasize the original's fragmentation, though his syntax is still more clearer than Dickinson's. The clauses in the onset of the poem are mixed up in Károlyi's translation, and her reference to self-justification remains implicit: "Magam híret sükségtelen, / Hogy igazolja más," [It is unnecessary for others to justify my fame]. It must be mentioned as well that her synonyms for superfluity are all fitting: "sükségtelen" [unnecessary], "fölsleges" [redundant], "oktalan" [unreasonable], though the latter is an insertion. Géher, in contrast, lists equations in his first stanza, using the dashes to tie together the paired concepts. His first line ambiguously implies that Fame is merely self-justification *or* that self-justification is the true Fame. However, with his third line, he seems to acknowledge certain good characteristics of appraisals ("Belélegezni – Tömjén –" [To Inhale – [it is] Incense –]) by alluding to the rich aroma of the resin that conjures up the presence of a Judeo-Christian church. This emphasizes the importance of the self, too, for the familiarizing verb "Belélegezni" might refer back to "Hírnév" in the first line. Still, the speaker suggests superficiality in the given ("Kapni" [to get]) religious ceremonies ("üres" [empty]), specifying the ambiguous onset as self-justification is the true Fame: "Kapni – fölsleges –" [To receive – [it is] superfluous].

Furthermore, in the second stanza, Károlyi conveys with interpretive smoothness the meaning residing in the above analysis, while Géher further complicates the equations in the first stanza. Károlyi retains the original's conflict between outer and inner recognition; "Önnön hírem, ha nem lelem, / Bár nevem lenne fény –" [If I cannot find my own fame, / Yet were my name light], and even puts the speaker under the limelight of a stage. In the closing lines, she shuns the diadem of such spotlight over the diadem of self-justification. Géher's last stanza uses fame in the traditional sense of the word, even though the very first line states self-justification is the truest form of Fame. The second line of this quatrain ("meglehet / Egyszer elnyerem Én

–” [perhaps / Once I will win it]) possesses a uniquely hopeful tone compared to the closing “sivár Diadém –” [bleak Diadem], which is more in line with the first stanza’s emphasis on self-justification. Regardless, Géher’s translation closes on rejecting the burdensome diadem of traditional Fame, too, which is in line with Letter 265: “If fame belonged to me, I could not escape her.”

In short, neither translation can be truly considered closer to the original for Géher’s is amplifying Dickinson’s fragmentation through added ambiguity and Károlyi’s is in domesticized, interpretive style. The comparison of the translations’ forms reveals a clear contrast of foreignization and domestication, which, at first glance, could resemble the claims of the “Retranslation Hypothesis”. However, half of Géher’s thought dividing dashes are inspired additions to the text; Dickinson builds her poems on the unuttered thoughts and logical connections, while Géher translation’s provide seemingly clear, though in truth quite richly ambiguous equations. In contrast, Károlyi, similarly to her other translations, domesticized Dickinson’s typography and sentence structure. In terms of imagery, Károlyi might be considered to be closer to the original, especially because of the second line in Géher’s last stanza, yet her translation is so interpretive that it changes the inner structure of the text. In this translation, she appears to be more reader-friendly, which is clearly far from the original’s emphasis on the unuttered. Therefore, I do not regard either Géher’s inspired poem or Károlyi’s interpretive solution to be closer to the original in the case of Poem 713, although the rejection of unjustified Fame is apparent in both versions.

866

Fame is the tint that Scholars leave
Upon their Setting Names –
The Iris not of Occident
That disappears as comes –

Similarly to the poems discussed previously, this quatrain is in an imperfect common metre (see Bollobás 59–60). It uses eight- and six-syllable long lines and showcases eye-rhymes in the even lines rather than a true xaxa rhyme scheme. Several words are capitalized while dashes are used as punctuation marks. In addition, there is only one version recognized in R. W. Franklin’s collection of this text.

Beside the subject matter of Fame, the image of the Sun takes a prominent place in this work. While Fame is compared to a small fraction or colour (“tint”) of the world, the life of a scholar is raised to possess a natural, solar circularity with “Setting Names.” The closure of the poem, however, is ambiguous. On the one hand, the colour of the tint is likened to the sunset’s Iris colour upon the sky, also suggesting a closeness to death. Moreover, “not of Occident” can be understood as an adjective of the Iris tint, meaning non-western, not relating to the real celestial body. Therefore, this small tint appearing on the Scholar’s name is distanced in temporariness from the Sun’s, and life’s, circular movement, which echoes the fleeting nature of Fame. Dickinson’s contemporary culture would offer to a poet compared to literary immortality earned through rejecting Fame. On the other hand, the last line may also be seen as a relative clause modifying the “Occident.” Thus, Fame becomes a permanent tint on dying or dead scholars’ names contrasted by the temporariness of their lives (“disappears as comes”). This understanding rather reflects the immortal Fame appearing in Poem 1427 that pursues literary works of permanent value. In this way, Poem 866 can be seen as a complex metaphor containing both the critical and the self-justifying sides to Dickinson’s stance towards (literary) fame.

To certain extent, this poem could be considered to prove Finnerty’s suggestion that Dickinson consciously worked for her posthumous recognition. It is the “Setting Names” that are tinted by the colour Iris of Fame, which is not granted in life. In this way, the value of one’s work is shown to be simultaneously starting to cast a purple-tinted light on artists’ names with their passing away. However, as mentioned before, consciously seeking a posthumous fame is not the complete rejection that Poem 1427 would urge. Therefore, this poem merely communicates a Dickinsonian wisdom that describes the ongoing process of how literary immortality is acquired.

Amy Károlyi and István László Géher made the following translations of this poem:

Amy Károlyi:

Tudósnak szín s fény a hír
 Lenyugvó nevükön –
 Nem a napnyugta írisze,
 Mely jön és elsuhan.

István László Géher:

A halott Tudós hűlt Nevén
 A Hír színe lobog –
 Ez nem Nyugat Lilája, mely
 Felfénylik s elragyog –

Towards the poem's structure and form, both regularizing and foreignizing approaches could be observed. The original quatrain's iambic metre was preserved in both versions, although the translators reduced the first line to a seven-syllable-long trochaic line. Concerning its rhyme pattern, however, it was Géher who regularized the xaxa scheme, while Károlyi did not employ any rhymes in her translation. Yet in typography, she inserted traditional punctuation marks and omitted the capitalized letters, whereas Géher chose to keep Dickinson's peculiar writing style.

Interestingly, both translators favoured the latter understanding of the poem perhaps to highlight Dickinson's argument for seeking immortal values. In Károlyi's version, a sense of radiance is added to the tint of Fame on the scholars' names, which is quite fitting to the Sun metaphor: "Tudósnak szín s fény a hír / Lenyugvó nevükön –" [For a scholar fame is colour and light / On their setting names]. Géher, in contrast, omitted the image of the Sun from the onset of the poem; switching up the order of the images, the colour of Fame is given the characteristics of a flag flying on the scholar's cooled, dead body. In this way, the name of a scholar is equalled with the body, rather than a human body being likened to a natural process. The poem closes on a similar note in both versions. Károlyi keeps the word Iris in her translation, which through its airy movements in the last line ("jön és elsuhan" [comes and swooshes away]) makes the setting, transient Sun look like a swift eye. The Sun finally appears in the last lines of Géher's translation, too, although the reference remains vague: "Ez nem Nyugat Lilája, mely / Felfénylik s elragyog –" [This is not the West's Purple, which / Lights up and then extinguishes]. In addition, through the closing lines, the reader might reconsider the flying of the flag ("lobog") in the second line to be understood as a blazing [fire], which implicitly evokes the image of the Sun. Either a swift eye or an ephemeral light, both are considered temporary to the colour of Fame upon the late scholars' names.

In conclusion, from the two translations of Poem 866, Károlyi's solution appears to be closer to the original in terms of its imagery, while the formal differences of the two versions raise the question of what the true essence of Dickinson's style is. The ambiguity of the original poem is narrowed down to one understanding in both translations, therefore, this detail does not count as a decisive factor in determining closeness to the original. Károlyi explicitly preserved the image of the Sun, decay's comparison to natural processes, and the colour Iris, whereas Géher's translation appears to be more generalizing by rather evoking the image of a blazing flame. Nevertheless, both poems stress the permanence of scholarly fame over a fluctuating phenomenon. In terms of its form, Géher adopted Dickinson's capitalizations and use of dashes as before, but regularized the poem's eye rhymes. Károlyi, on the other hand, took a foreignizing

approach by the lack of rhymes in her translation, while she domesticized the typography. This fact poses the question of what shall one consider more essential to Dickinson's style: her twisted rhymes or the unusual typography. However, this might be a mere forced binary.

1659

Fame is a fickle food
Upon a shifting plate
Whose table once a
Guest but not
The second time is set

Whose crumbs the crows inspect
And with ironic caw
Flap past it to the
Farmer's corn
Men eat of it and die

The above poem is structurally the most unique from the chosen five. It consists of two five-line stanzas without any rhyme pattern, and the occasional iambs are probably due to the language's natural flow rather than a sign of a metric pattern. Moreover, the third and the four lines are reduced in both stanzas to five and three syllables respectively, whereas the other lines are all six-syllable-long. Its typography is not as peculiar either, except for the lack of punctuation. Of this text, only Susan Dickinson's transcription survived (Franklin 1483).

The onset of the poem conjures up the image of a transitory, frugal feast. Fame is the food itself, however, every component is described as insecure; the food is fickle, the plate is shifting, and the table, peculiarly, gets set once and no more. In the second stanza, a somehow wiser murder of crows appears, who belittle the above feast with a caw.

The image in the last three lines, however, appear ambiguously. The crows indeed reject the food of Fame and fly towards a simple cornfield. The farmer appears as a God-like figure, synonymous with the Gardener metaphor, thus, the birds are indeed raised above humanity for they know the feast God and nature provide is more supreme than the fickle food of Fame. It is the very last line where the ambiguity resides: it is unclear what the pronoun "it" refers to the

crumbs of Fame or the simple corn, yet the act of eating is posed to be as severe as the original sin: “Men eat of it and die.” If it refers to the crumbs, then the feast of Fame is set for unspecified creatures that are above humanity since it is only the crumbs that they can seek. However, the underlying meaning remains critical towards humanity, too, if it refers to the corn. This understanding suggests that humans pursued nourishment in Fame so much so that God and nature’s unchanging food became deadly to them.

Furthermore, it must be mentioned it is quite peculiar how men are exclusively mentioned in this last line. Naturally, it could denote the whole of humanity as well, although if it is a gendered use, the speaker gains a wise, female speaker’s voice. Like the cawing murder of crows, she speaks above the struggle and Fame in the dominantly masculine culture of the 19th century. Therefore, this poem can clearly be understood to represent Dickinson’s critical view of her own society who is in pursuit of such uncertain, impermanent success.

Amy Károlyi and István László Géher made the following translations of this poem:

Amy Károlyi:

Síkos tálcán a hír
Fortélyos élelem,
Asztala egyszer
Megterül,
De másszor nem.

Morzsáit gúnyosan
Károgó varjuhad
A gabonába
Keveri,
Ki eszi, belehal.

István László Géher:

Kétes Étel – a Hír –
Tányérja ingatag –
Vendégül lát
Bőségesen –
Aztán semmit se ad.

Morzsáit a varjú
Sandán megfigyeli –
Korpába károgást
Kever –
S meghal, aki eszi –

Comparing these works to the original’s form reveals that both translators decided to regularize the poem, but to a contrasting tradition. While Károlyi fitted the poem to the Hungarian punctuation traditions, Géher followed Dickinson’s general stylistic tendencies with the use of dashes and capitalized nouns, which are in this case completely missing from the original. The stanzas are formed by five lines in both versions; however, the number of syllables is more varied. Károlyi’s last line in the first stanza is only four syllables long, but otherwise she follows

the English poem's structure and does not strive to conform to a clear iambic metre either. Géher, on the other hand, varies the syllable count more, perhaps to compensate for the use of iambic rhymes in the second and fifth lines. Moreover, Károlyi employs imperfect rhymes in her translation, too, in the said lines.

The characterisation of Fame's feast appears quite similar in the two translations. Both Károlyi and Géher characterize the food as an active agent. Károlyi calls it "fortélyos" [cunning] while in Géher's version it is the "Kétes Étel" [dual/ambiguous food] itself that gives its hospitality to an unspecified addressee. The plates do not hold the food securely in either version; they are "síkos" [slick] or "ingatag" [unstable]. In addition, both feasts are described as a one-time event: "Asztala egyszer / Megterül, / De másszor nem." [Its table is set / Once / But not another time]; "Vendégül lát / Bőségesen – / Aztán semmit se ad." [Offers its hospitality [to you] / Abundantly / Then does not give anything]. Therefore, both translations highlight the critical insecurity of Fame worded in the original.

The second stanza seems to include a mistranslated word in both versions, although the translators' approach towards the last line's ambiguity differs. Károlyi remains closer to the original in the onset of the stanza ("Morzsáit gúnyosan / Károgó varjuhad" [Its crumbs scornfully / The cawing murder of crows], while in Géher's poem it is only one crow that "inspects the crumbs leeringly." The expression mistranslated by both translators is "flap past it" which means "[t]o make way by flapping the wings" according to the Oxford English Dictionary ("Flap, V., Sense 8.a."). Even though flap can mean "[t]o strike with the flat of the wing; also to drive off (etc.) by flapping," too ("Flap, V., Sense 2.b."), the preposition "past" clearly indicates that the crows merely flutter their wings to get to the corn, and not beat the crumbs. A more fitting translation would be e.g. "elröppen [tőle]." Nevertheless, it is rather the latter meaning that the translators used in their poem by the word "kever(i)" [mix(es)]; the crumbs of Fame are mixed with grain or bran. The Hungarian language does not have gendered pronouns, so the female speaker's criticism towards the male population is evidently left out from the translation, which could be a fascinating subject for another paper discussing the role of gender in the translation of Dickinson's poetry. However, what is more important here is that the presence of God, the farmer is also omitted from the poems. In this way, the issue of eating is not likened to the original sin. Furthermore, in Károlyi's version, the ambiguity of the last line is solved by specifying it is mere crumbs that the scorned humanity can reach from the mystical feast of Fame. In this way, in Károlyi's version, Fame appears to be mere remnants mixed into their food, which eventually cause their death, in contrast to the literary immortality

Dickinson urges in her other works. Géher, in contrast, keeps the original's ambiguity: it is a possible interpretation that crow's caw mixed with bran is the fatal food of humanity. In this way, neither mystic Fame nor the leering birds supply ample food to the inert humanity. Dickinson's wise crow turns into a malignant magician, and her suggestion to turn towards nature's simplicity is exchanged by the image of a hopeless, fame-driven, barren world.

To summarize, the translators' markedly different approaches towards formal uniqueness and ambiguous imagery of Poem 1659 aggravate the possibility and perhaps even the need to classify one translation to be closer to the original. Károlyi,, as she tended to do in her other translations,, favours domestication more in her translation process by inserting (imperfect) rhymes to the poem, yet she varies the syllable count more. Géher adds clearer assonances to this translation, too, and emphasizes Dickinson's general style with extra dashes and capitalizations. Therefore neither is closer to the original's form. In the characterization of Fame's feast, the translators provide two fitting Hungarian versions. The imagery of the second stanza, however, is changed through the above mentioned mistranslated word. In addition, the presence of God and thus the religious, depraved severity of eating Dickinson's unspecified "it" are missing from the translations. Károlyi resolves Dickinson's ambiguity in her solution, while Géher does not do so, but works with another image than that of the original. In this way, the narrowed meaning and Géher's added understanding deter one to regard either translation truly closer to the original over the another.

Conclusions

Altogether, the analyses showed that the "Retranslation Hypothesis" truly is an "insufficient" frame (Peeters and Van Poucke 8) for the comparison of the Hungarian translations of Emily Dickinson's poetry by Amy Károlyi and István László Géher. In contrast to the hypothesis' claims that retranslations are inevitably closer to the original text, Géher's solutions cannot be considered purely closer to Dickinson's original either in form or content. However, the comparisons' results highlight several issues to be considered in the study of retranslations.

First and foremost, it has become evident that closeness to the original by itself is a way too general reference point for the translation of poetry. The translations of Poem 67 have already expressed the need of considering closeness to form and imagery separately as the "victor" of those categories did not overlap. In fact, it showed that formal closeness may not

pair with approximation to the original's imagery. Incidentally, Károlyi's closeness in the use of poetic images clearly disproved the "Retranslation Hypothesis."

However, identifying the closest formal solutions required one to force Dickinson's style into binarities. Generally, Géher appeared to aim to convey Dickinson's peculiar typography that somewhat fragments the poetic style in his translations, which Károlyi domesticized altogether. In this sense, Károlyi's translations "got caught," as Kappanyos put it (41; my trans.); the lack of Dickinson's formal uniqueness truly appears to be an aspect that "the existing translation does not convey effectively" and thus, necessitates retranslation (Kappanyos 36; my trans.). It must also be mentioned that Géher's objective to transmit Dickinson's peculiar typography developed into an overcompensating approach, i.e. in certain poems he put an even greater emphasis on Dickinson's general style and thus utilized her peculiarities in texts that do not originally include such elements. Therefore, even though Géher's translations are foreignizing, those poems cannot be considered closer to the original. However, regarding rhymes, Géher consistently took a domesticating approach of regularization, while Károlyi was more foreignizing in Poem 866 and to a certain extent in Poem 1659, too. In this way, the focus on formal approximation does not seem to count with the phenomenon of overcompensation and rather forces one to question whether the peculiarity of rhymes are more prominent in Dickinson's style than the use of dashes and the random capitalization of words, when these factors, in truth, clearly appear together in the original. To solve this dilemma, one would have to rely on their subjective taste, which is not sufficient to prove the universality of a hypothesis.

Yet Dickinson's elliptic syntax and wording, a feature which relates to both form and content, seems to be an aspect in which both translators "get caught" (Kappanyos 41; my trans.). Essentially, the poets provided texts which may be found easier to comprehend through their specifications and by smoothing out the syntax (especially in the case of Poem 713). Even though, Géher clearly wished to highlight the originals' fragmentation by retaining Dickinson's typography, this characteristic remains visual and is not too internalized in the language use; e.g. his translations of Poem 696 and 866 are in fact clearer than Károlyi's. This poses the question whether Dickinson's claimed "incomprehensibility" is an element that is untranslatable or simply something that calls for new translations. A reader-response theory based research could be conducted to examine the comprehensibility of the discussed translations and originals, thereby testing the above analyses' assertions.

Furthermore, establishing closeness to imagery proved to be problematic as well in regard of the five poems studied above. Retaining Dickinson's ambiguities or cultural/religious

undertones appeared to be challenging for the translators, for these ambiguities were oftentimes specified and the references omitted. Yet it must be mentioned that somewhat different, new imagery, ambiguities, or cultural references were frequently found in the place of these, which encumbered the clear identification of the closest solution.

In addition, it shall not be forgotten that my reference point in evaluating the translations' closeness to the originals' poetic images was unavoidably subjective. As Peeters and Van Poucke claim "[c]loseness', so to say, is in the eye of the beholder" (9); I compared the translators' solutions to my own understanding of Dickinson's poems, which may not necessarily coincide with the analyses of another person, let alone the translators. As Orlando says in Shakespeare's *As You Like It*: "[t]here was no thought of pleasing you when she was christened" (Act 3 Scene 2 line 147); it goes without saying that they were most probably aiming to convey their own understanding in their translation process and not mine or even Dickinson's for that cannot fully be retrieved. Nevertheless, it can be possible that another critic would find a clearer winner in the comparison of the translations' images, yet this fact does not erase the prominence of subjectivity in determining closeness of imagery, which then again would undermine the authenticity of proving the hypothesis.

Therefore, the question justly arises whether we should try to categorize and consider any of the translations closer to Dickinson's original at all. As András Kappanyos argued "the observable linguistic performance in poetry translation is essentially built on ideas," i.e. the translator's creative inspiration (45; my trans.). However, this can be considered true for the invention of poetry as well, and not just for its translation. In this way, the above comparisons fundamentally juxtaposed three sets of poetic ideas: Dickinson's, Károlyi's, and Géher's, of which the latter two was undoubtedly based on the American poet's linguistic performance. As poetic ideas are indisputably personal, one cannot authentically determine which is closest to the original since their reference points are inevitably going to be subjective, too, as shown above.

However, proving Peeters and Van Poucke's observation that the translators person is "com[ing] to the fore" (17), one can draw certain conclusions based on how the translators present the ideas that of the originals. Specifically, what kind of ideas Károlyi and Géher have of Dickinson's texts, how Dickinson appears in the Hungarian versions. Károlyi's Dickinson speaks in a whispery voice with gravity, who is playful enough in certain cases not to care about rhyming her poetry. Her syntax is clear, though on occasion uses a few dashes, but her emphasis is on a metaphorical, ambiguous, highly personal imagery. Géher's Dickinson, in contrast,

resounds less softly (e.g. “felfénylik s elragyog” vs. “jön és elsuhan” in Károlyi); her visually fragmented texts with frequent capitalizations and dashes contain confident, ambiguous revelations that are embellished with an xaxa rhyme pattern. And neither is foreign in the original corpus. “The two translations complement each other,” writes Ágnes Gergely in the comparison of Károlyi’s and her translation of Poem 67 (n. pag.; my trans.), but it is no less true about István László Géher and Amy Károlyi. The two complement each other, and thus shall be read together.

Abbreviations

TR: translator

Translators:

Mari Falcsik	MF
Győző Ferencz	GyF
István László Géher	ILG
Ágnes Gergely	ÁgnG
Adrienn Góz	AdrG
Tamás Halmai	TH
Amy Károlyi	AK
Géza Szócs	GSz
István Tótfalusi	IT

S: source

Sources:

Károlyi	1
Ferencz	2
Bollobás	3
1749	5
2000 2020/1	6,3
Forrás 2022/11	8
Parnasszus 2018/2	10,1
Parnasszus 2022/4	10,2
VersumOnline	11

Works Cited

- Bollobás, Enikő. *Vendégünk a végtelenből. Emily Dickinson költészete*. Balassi Kiadó, 2015.
- Braudy, Leo. *The Frenzy of Renown: Fame and Its History*. Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Chesterman, Andrew. "A causal model for translation studies." *Intercultural faultlines*. Routledge, 2017. 15–27.
- "Comprehend, V., Sense III." *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford UP, March 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/6507241506>.
- Corn, Alfred. "Dickinson's Paradoxical Losses." *Conversant Essays: Contemporary Poets on Poetry*, edited by James McCorcle, Wayne State University Press, 1990, pp. 235–240.
- "Count, N. (1), Sense 3." *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford UP, March 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/1084591998>.
- Crumbley, Paul. "Emily Dickinson's Funeral and the Paradox of Literary Fame." *The Emily Dickinson Journal*, vol. 26 no. 2, 2017, pp. 51–69. *Project MUSE*, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1353/edj.2017.0014>.
- Dickinson, Emily. *The Complete Poems of Emily Dickinson*. Edited by Thomas Herbert Johnson, Back Bay Books / Little, Brown and Company, 2021.
- Dickinson/Higginson Correspondence: 7 June 1862 (Letter 265)*. Dickinson Electronic Archives. <https://archive.emilydickinson.org/correspondence/higginson/1265.html>. Accessed 9 Nov. 2024.
- Ferencz, Győző ed. *Emily Dickinson versei*. Európa Könyvkiadó, 1989.
- Finnerty, Páraic. "'If fame belonged to me, I could not escape her': Dickinson and the Poetics of Celebrity." *The Emily Dickinson Journal*, vol. 26, no. 2, 2017, pp. 25– 50. *Project MUSE*, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1353/edj.2017.0013>.
- "Flap, V., Sense 2.b." *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford UP, June 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/4689775615>.
- "Flap, V., Sense 8.a." *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford UP, June 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/2598102254>.

- Franklin, Ralph Waldo ed. *The Poems of Emily Dickinson: Variorum Edition*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. 1998.
- “Frontier, N., Sense I.4.a.” *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford UP, September 2023, <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/1008421469>.
- Gergely, Ágnes. *Tigrisláz: Tíz óra a magyar versfordításról (2002–2007)*. Petőfi Irodalmi Múzeum. 2013, https://reader.dia.hu/document/Gergely_Agnes-Tigrislaz-14286. Accessed 11 Nov. 2024.
- “Glory, N., Sense 6.” *Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford UP, March 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/3224513516>.
- Johnson, Thomas Herbert ed. *The Poems of Emily Dickinson: Including Variant Readings Critically Compared with All Known Manuscripts*. The Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press, 1955.
- Károlyi, Amy. *Emily Dickinson válogatott írásai. Károlyi Amy fordításai és tanulmányai*. Magvető Könyvkiadó, 1978.
- Kónyi, Judit. *Emily Dickinson and the Bypasses of Publication*. 2014. Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem, PhD dissertation. <https://doi.org/10.15774/PPKE.BTK/2015.004>.
- Kappanyos, András. “Kényszer és kihívás: mivégre fordítunk újra.” *Alkalmazott Nyelvészeti Közlemények*, vol. 16, no. 1, 2023, pp. 35–48. ProQuest, <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/kényszer-és-kihívás-mivégre-fordítunk-újra/docview/2926202904/se-2>. Accessed 2 Oct. 2024.
- Kornfeld, Susan. “Fame of Myself, to justify,” *the prowling Bee*. 11. Aug. 2013, <https://bloggingdickinson.blogspot.com/2013/08/fame-of-myself-to-justify.html>
- “Körülír.” *A magyar nyelv értelmező szótára*. Kézikönyvtár, <https://www.arcanum.com/hu/online-kiadvanyok/Lexikonok-a-magyar-nyelv-ertelmezo-szotara-1BE8B/k-359B8/korulir-38D15/>
- Massardier-Kenney, Françoise. “Toward a Rethinking of Retranslation.” *Translation Review*, vol. 92, no. 1, 2015, pp. 73–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07374836.2015.1086289>. Accessed 2 Oct. 2024.

- Mesić, Veronika. "Revisiting the retranslation hypothesis: A case study of two Croatian translations of James Joyce's *Ulysses*." *Hieronymus: Journal of Translation Studies and Terminology*, vol. 7, 2020, pp. 6–36. <https://doi.org/10.17234/Hieronymus.7.2>. Accessed 2 Oct. 2024.
- Mihálycsa, Erika, and Jolanta Wawrzycka. "Introduction: Retranslation: 'None the Worse for Wear However' (U 16.1465)." *European Joyce Studies*, vol. 30, 2020, pp. 1–32. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48730632>. Accessed 2 Oct. 2024.
- "Nought." *Online Etymology Dictionary*. <https://www.etymonline.com/word/nought>. Accessed 9 Nov. 2024.
- Peeters, Kris, and Piet Van Poucke. "Retranslation, thirty-odd years after Berman." *Parallèles*, vol. 35, no. 1, 2023. 3–27.
- Porter, David. *Dickinson, the Modern Idiom*. Harvard University Press, 1981.
- Rudolph, Earle Leighton. "The Frontier in American Literature." *Jahrbuch Für Amerikastudien*, vol. 7, 1962, pp. 77–91. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41155004>. Accessed 25 Oct. 2024.
- Shakespeare, William. *As You Like It*. A Magyar Shakespeare Olvasó Felület. <https://shakespeare.kre.hu/>. Accessed 11 Nov. 2024.
- Venuti, Lawrence. "Retranslations: The Creation of Value." *Bucknell Review*, vol. 47, no. 1, 2004, pp. 25–38. ProQuest, <https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/retranslations-creation-value/docview/201683587/se-2>. Accessed 2 Oct. 2024.