

The Dutch Translations of Homoerotic Elements In Shakespeare's Sonnet 20



MA Thesis Translation Studies (Master Vertalen)
Utrecht University
Faculty of Humanities
Suzanne van den Berg (3342565)
First reader: dr. Cees Koster
Second reader: Jan Jaap Spies MA
06-2014

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I would like to thank my supervisor dr. Cees Koster for his feedback and support. He pointed me in the right direction and his vast knowledge helped me acquire the information necessary to write this thesis. His advice and critiques were invaluable and without them my thesis would not be what it is today. Furthermore, I would like to thank Jolise, Megan and especially Maaïke, who sat with me every workday and offered me snacks, coffee breaks and mostly kind words of support. If it were not for them my thesis would have taken at least twice as long. I would also like to thank my parents; my father for proofreading my thesis and helping me produce the best work possible, and my mother for helping me get past my insecurities and to keep going. Last but not least, I would like to thank my boyfriend, Adriaan, who supported me every day and reminded me to think critically and scientifically about my work.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	4
Corpus.....	5
Structure and Methodology	6
1. Shakespeare's Sonnets.....	8
1.1 Sonnets.....	8
1.2 Shakespeare	9
1.3 Publishing History.....	11
1.4 Historical Background.....	12
2. Sonnet 20.....	14
2.1 The Sonnet.....	15
2.2 Analysis.....	15
2.3 Conclusion	23
3. Homosexuality in the Netherlands (1811-2001).....	25
3.1 Homosexuality in the Late 19 th Century	25
3.2 Homosexuality in the First Half of the 20 th Century.....	26
3.3 Homosexuality in the Second Half of the 20 th Century	27
4. Burgersdijk's Translations.....	28
4.1 Introduction.....	28
4.2 Biography.....	28
4.3 Translator's Notes	29
4.4 Translation Norms	30
4.5 The Translation of Sonnet 20	31
4.6 Conclusion	40
5. Van Emde Boas' Translation.....	42
5.1 Introduction.....	42
5.2 Biography.....	42
5.3 Translator's Notes	43
5.4 Translation Norms	45
5.5 The Translation of Sonnet 20	45
5.6 Conclusion	54
6. Van der Krogt's Translation.....	55
6.1 Introduction.....	55
6.2 Biography.....	55
6.3 Translator's Notes	55
6.4 Translation Norms	56
6.5 The Translation of Sonnet 20	57
6.6 Conclusion	64
Conclusion	65
Works Cited	67
Appendix.....	70

Introduction

Shakespeare's sonnets are among the most popular of his work. As Anthony Hecht explains in his introduction to *The New Cambridge Shakespeare: The Sonnets*, although the sonnets are probably mostly read by young lovers, there are scholars and others who read the sonnets looking for an autobiographical component (1). These people are looking for a glimpse into Shakespeare's (love)life, which is not surprising considering the theme of the sonnets and the debate around Shakespeare's sexual preferences. As Stephen Booth famously said in *Shakespeare's Sonnets*: 'William Shakespeare was almost certainly homosexual, bisexual or heterosexual' (548). It is probably true that we will never know Shakespeare's sexual preferences with absolute certainty. There are, however, homoerotic elements to be found in the sonnets. This thesis therefore, does not try to answer the question whether or not Shakespeare was homosexual, but rather looks at the homoerotic elements that can be found in some of his sonnets. So these elements can be analysed in Dutch translations of Shakespeare's work.

In the previous 150 years the discourse around homosexuality changed drastically in the Netherlands. Ideas about homosexuality developed from an unspeakable sin to a disease to eventually a mostly accepted identity in Western Europe. The first comprehensive translation of Shakespeare's work in Dutch is from the late 19th Century when these developments first started and has been translated many times more since then. When these translators worked on Shakespeare's sonnets they were obviously confronted with the, supposedly, homoerotic nature of some of the work. Depending on their view on relationships between men, they probably had different reactions to the homoerotic elements. This thesis investigates if and how the changes in society's attitude towards

homosexuality are reflected in the translations. To do so, it tries to answer the following main question:

What did the different Dutch translators of Shakespeare's sonnets do with the (alleged) homoerotic dimension of the texts in their translations and to what degree does this reflect the ideas about homosexuality of their time?

In *Translating Poetry: Seven Strategies and a Blueprint* André Lefevere states: 'A comparison of a source text and various translations can shed light not only on the changes in a given civilization's attitude towards literature, but also on the changes in a society's attitude towards certain other topics' (115). This thesis comes from a different direction. It investigates if we can see changes in society in translations and not how translations can inform us about society. To answer this main question, the following sub questions will need to be answered: In what context were Shakespeare's sonnets written? Which homoerotic elements can be found in Shakespeare's sonnets? What was the attitude towards homosexuality in the Netherlands when the translations were made? Who were the translators? What did the translators say about their translations and Shakespeare's sonnets? Which choices did the translators make concerning the alleged homoerotic elements?

Corpus

The scope of Shakespeare's work is too big to allow a discussion of all his sonnets. Therefore, this thesis will limit itself to the discussion of one sonnet in particular: Sonnet 20. This sonnet was selected because it is used by both supporters and opponents of a homoerotic interpretation of Shakespeare's sonnets. It is, to say the least, considered to be ambiguous. As Stanley Wells explains in *Looking for Sex in Shakespeare*: 'Sonnet 20 has become a battleground in discussions of the relationship' (62).

There are also many different translations that could be discussed. There are at least twelve Dutch translations of Sonnet 20. Even though it would be very interesting to analyse them all, the scope of this thesis is too small to do so. To select which translations to analyse, all the available translations had to be collected. Eventually, three translations from three different eras have been selected for analysis. This choice was based on the times in which the translations were produced and the availability of commentaries written by the translators.

The first translation that will be discussed is also the first Dutch translation made of Sonnet 20. This translation is from 1878 by Burgersdijk, the first to translate Shakespeare's complete works into Dutch. Most later translators refer to Burgersdijk's translation and he was a key player in the discourse on Shakespeare in the Netherlands. The second translation is by Van Emde Boas and was published in 1951. This translation is interesting because Van Emde Boas was a sexologist and looked at the text from a psychological point of view. The final translation that will be discussed is from Van der Krogt, which was published in 1997. Van der Krogt is a musician and poet and because of this approached his translations from a different angle than the other two.

Structure and Methodology

The first chapter of this thesis will present the context in which Shakespeare's sonnets are discussed. This chapter will go into detail about Shakespeare's sonnets sequence, the history and reception of the publication and homosexuality in Shakespeare's time. The second chapter will analyse Sonnet 20 specifically. First there will be a general discussion of the sonnet line by line. What follows is a more in-depth look at possible homoerotic elements in the sonnet. Specific lines that are in the centre of the debate around Sonnet 20 will be discussed, as well as other sexual puns and connotations. In the third chapter the Dutch

historical context will be discussed by looking at the discourse around homosexuality from 1811 to 2001 (from the time sodomy was no longer punishable by death till the introduction of homosexual marriage). In the following three chapters the translations will be discussed.

First, the commentaries written by the translators will be discussed. As Anthony Pym explains in *Method in Translation History*:

The classical mistake, of course, is to read and compare miles of texts, writing a mess of notes on apparently significant differences, and never finding a way to say something coherent about the result. This trap can be overcome by analysing translations with respect to just one or two well defined levels or aspects, always in order to test clearly formulated hypotheses. (107)

To do this, these chapters will use three clearly recognisable units of comparison which are identified and elaborated on in chapter 2. These are the most important lines of the sonnet for a homoerotic reading. The translation of 'master mistress of my passion', the sexual puns and the couplet are the units that will be compared in each chapter. There will also be a general analysis which focuses on the interpretation of the homoeroticism in the sonnet but this is based more on the overall choices than specific lines. The two sections of analyses will be brought together in the last part of the chapter where it will become clear if the translator's choices reflect their time or not and to what extent. 'The changes made reflect with a reasonable degree of accuracy what the target-language writer accepts in the source text and what he rejects' (Lefevere 119).

It is important to note that the sonnet and translations are depicted in the spelling, layout and punctuation of the original text (for the sonnet this is the quarto edition) without changes made, except for one; numbering was added to the lines to facilitate the analysis. Furthermore, since this thesis does not deal with the autobiographical question of the sonnets, I will refer to the 'persona' when discussing the speaker of the sonnets which does not directly refer to Shakespeare, but the persona created by Shakespeare.

1. Shakespeare's Sonnets

1.1 Sonnets

The sonnet might be the most well-known form of Western poetry. The word sonnet derives from the Italian 'sonetto' which means 'little poem'. The Italian Giacomo da Lentini is seen as the creator of the sonnet. As William Kennedy writes in "European beginnings and transmission: Dante, Petrarch and the sonnet sequence": 'Giacomo's sonnets enact a ... process in terms of stanzaic combinations, where a unit of eight lines (the octave) joins with another stanzaic unit of six lines (the sestet), initiating a subtle change of tone, mood or attitude at its point of fusion' (85). This change of tone is known as the 'volta'. After its invention at the Sicilian court in the early 13th century, the sonnet has been adapted into many forms; the Petrarchan sonnet (or Italian sonnet) and the Shakespearian sonnet (or English sonnet) are the most famous. The Petrarchan sonnet has the same structure as the first sonnets by da Lentini, but as Meg Tyler states in "Contemporary poets and the sonnet" 'in the early Sicilian sonnets, rhyme was not used – repeated words were' (8). Unlike the Sicilian sonnets, the Petrarchan sonnet has a strict rhyming scheme: an octave rhyming abbaabba and a sestet rhyming cdecde or cdccdc. As Michael Spiller explains in *The Development of the Sonnet*, the European sonnet used this pattern until Thomas Wyatt departed from the form and reinvented the sonnet. The new form would eventually be known as the Shakespearian sonnet (3). The sonnet did not get Wyatt's name but Shakespeare's, because he was the most famous writer of the form. The Shakespearian sonnet consists of three quatrains rhyming: abab cdcd efef, and ends with a couplet: gg. In England, both the Petrarchan sonnet and the Shakespearian sonnet are commonly written in iambic pentameter. The Petrarchan sonnet is most famous for its romantic themes and

Petrarch's achievement of a sequence of 317 sonnets and forty-nine other poems in praise of his love for one woman, his Laura, though it was imperfectly understood, was the glass of fashion and the mould of form for European sonneteers from the Renaissance to the nineteenth century. (1)

Although the sonnet is often associated with love, sonnets can deal with many different themes.

1.2 Shakespeare

Shakespeare's sonnets were first published by Thomas Thorpe in 1609 and consist of 154 sonnets and the longer poem "A Lover's Complaint". His sonnets deal with love, but unlike most sonnets of his time Shakespeare's work shows many different aspects of love. The Petrarchan sonnet mostly dealt with the theme of love, in particular adoration. This subject matter was very popular at the time, so much so that there was even an anti-movement that mocked the idealised mistress of the Petrarchan sonnets. A well-known example of this is Shakespeare's Sonnet 130 which starts with 'my mistress eyes are nothing like the sun'. Michael Schoenfeldt explains in *A Companion to Shakespeare's Sonnets*: 'The collection as a whole provides a fascinating study of the various pathologies and occasional comforts of erotic desire' (4). This is exactly what makes Shakespeare's sonnets interesting as 'the difference is in the desired objects, as was said: for the first time in the entire history of the sonnet, the desired object is *flawed*, which leads to a new kind of self-questioning, leading in turn to new employment of the sonnet space' (Spiller 156).

The sonnets have often been divided into themes, although many critics do not agree on whether or not these poems were intended as a sequence or that Shakespeare composed them as individual verses and Thorpe was the one who thought they were better suited as a sequence, which was the fashion at the time (Schoenfeldt 3). Stanley Wells, for instance,

does not think the sonnets were intended as a sequence; 'it seems certain to me that ... the collection as a whole gathers together poems written over a long period of time ... and rearranges them in a sequence that only fitfully reflects their order of composition' (52). An aspect of the sonnets that has drawn a lot of attention is the fact that the first 126 address a man. These sonnets are called the 'Fair Youth' sonnets and are followed by the 'Dark Lady' sonnets. 'The first section comprises poems of praise and passionate devotion, not unmixed with reproach and self-disgust; the second section has mainly poems of rage and reproach, with a few conventional poems of praise and devotion' (Spiller 151). Besides the Dark Lady and the Fair Youth, the persona himself and the rival poet are characters in the sonnets.

The first seventeen sonnets are all addressed to the Fair Youth in which he is urged to procreate, because beauty such as his should not be lost when he dies. There have been speculations that these sonnets might have been commissioned because of its unusual theme. There are sonnets in which women are pressed to procreate, but for a man to ask this of another man is highly unusual. It is thought that perhaps the commissioners had a family member who they felt needed to be pressured into a heterosexual relationship. Some even think that Shakespeare met the Fair Youth through this work and then fell in love with him and that we can see the process of their relationships in the sonnets. Pequigney is one of these scholars and he is convinced that the relationship between the persona and the Fair Youth is a homosexual one. He is also one of the scholars that thinks the sonnets were published in their intended order as he explains in *Such is My Love*. The first 124 sonnets to the Fair Youth '[have] three divisions, corresponding to the three distinct phases of the growth of love (Sonnets 1-19), its maturity (Sonnets 20-99), and its decline (Sonnets 100-126)' (5). According to Pequigney the sonnets to the Dark Lady take place somewhere during the maturity of the love between the persona and the Fair Youth (5). Some even think that

Shakespeare was in love with both the Fair Youth and the Fair Lady and introduced them to each other. When the two met they fell in love and betrayed Shakespeare, which would explain the reproach in some of the sonnets (Wells 57).

1.3 Publishing History

Shakespeare's sequence of 154 sonnets and poem were first published by Thomas Thorpe in 1609 under the name *Shake-speares Sonnets. Never before Imprinted*. This is not entirely true since sonnet 138 and 144 were printed earlier in *The Passionate Pilgrim* in 1599 by William Jaggard. Whether or not Thorpe was authorised to print is unknown, but Shakespeare was still alive at the time to object if it was not, which he did not do. It is not known when exactly Shakespeare wrote his sonnets but Francis Meres does mention the circulation of his 'sugred Sonnets among [Shakespeare's] private friends' in his *Palladis Tamia: Wit's Treasury* in 1598 (Hecht, 13).

The second publication of the Sonnets was John Benson's *Poems: Written by wil. Shake-speare. Gent.* In 1640. In this publication some of the sonnets were left out and others were re-ordered. Benson also edited the sonnets by changing masculine pronouns into feminine ones and he combined some of the sonnets into longer poems and added titles. His publication ended up as 72 poems. '[Benson] may ... be seen as the first of those who attempt to safeguard the Sonnets from the imputation of sexual inversion' (Pequigney 2). He was certainly not the last. A hundred years after the sonnets were first published, they were restored in their original form by Bernard Lintot in 1711. In this edition 'the title page asserts that "The Second Volume contain One hundred and Fifty Four Sonnets, all of them to his Mistress"' (Pequigney 3). Many more publications would follow.

1.4 Historical Background

Speaking of homosexuality before the late nineteenth century is difficult since the term was coined in 1892. Homosexuality was not thought of in the same way as we do today. Instead homosexual acts existed under many other names and forms such as sodomy and buggery. It was therefore impossible for men to think of themselves as homosexual. As Bruce Smith explains in *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England*: 'The structure of knowledge that impinged on what we would now call "homosexuality" did not ask a man who had sexual relations with another man to think of himself as fundamentally different from his peers' (11). In 1533 the 'Buggery Act' was instated which made sodomy (anal sex and bestiality) a capital offence. There are not many accounts of this punishment actually being given but that might be because of a lack in records.

The one salient fact about homosexuality in early modern England, as in early modern Europe generally, is the disparity that separates the extreme punishments prescribed by law and the apparent tolerance, even positive valuation, of homoerotic desire in the visual arts [and] in literature. (Smith 13-14)

Smith makes the distinction between homosexual acts and homoerotic desire. Homosexual acts or sodomy were punishable by death but homoerotic desire or very close friendships between men were accepted and even normal. This comes from the misogynist notion that women cannot offer men true friendship and understanding on an intellectual level. 'There was an established tradition in Europe that placed a higher value on the love relationship between men than on love between the sexes' (Schoenfeldt 17). Pequigney objects to critics who state that:

The love for [the Fair Youth] is (a) decent, "natural," nonamorous, as Sonnet 20 patently affirms, the friendship being of a conscious, idealized, "platonic," and now archaic type that flourished in the Renaissance; or else the love is (b) tinged with some kind of inactive eroticism. (3)

He is convinced of the homosexual nature of the relationship between the persona and the Fair Youth.

Margreta de Grazia in "The Scandal of Shakespeare's Sonnets", however, thinks that the current interest in the perceived homoerotic elements in the sonnets were not as much of an issue in Shakespeare's time and that the Dark Lady sequence was seen as much more scandalous (106). If this is the case, then why did Benson deem it necessary to change some of the sonnets? Robert Matz offers an explanation in "The Scandals of Shakespeare's Sonnets", which he wrote in response to de Grazia: 'Just as the sonnets to the woman may have taken too far an otherwise quotidian misogyny, so Shakespeare's sonnets to the young man seem, for some of their early readers, to have crossed a line in the otherwise culturally accepted expression of love between men' (489). As Schoenveldt points out since Shakespeare did not object to the publication and already showed some of his work to his friends 'it is reasonable to suppose that the poet would only have countenanced this kind of intimate distribution of his work if he felt it to be within the bounds of good taste' (13). On the other hand, Shakespeare might have thought that his work would remain among his friends and might have not seen it fit for publication.

2. Sonnet 20

Although scholars think most of the sonnets are addressed to the Fair Youth, many of them are gender-neutral. Sonnet 20 is one of the sonnets that clearly is about a man. In the sonnet the persona tells the Fair Youth that he has the appearance of a woman but none of women's bad qualities. He explains this seeming contradiction by stating that Nature (here personified as a woman) originally intended for him to be a woman, but made him so beautiful that she fell in love. It was then that Nature added something to the Fair Youth (a penis) and changed him into a man. The first two quatrains of the sonnet give a description of the Fair Youth's physical and mental qualities. The last quatrain and the couplet explain the difference between the Fair Youth's apparent feminine qualities and his male gender. 'The two sections have parallel movements; each begins by remarking the youth's feminine aspects and closes by distinguishing male from female reactions to his person' (Pequigney 32). In the last part the persona also explicitly states that since the Fair Youth is male their love will not be consummated. Many older critics have used this as evidence of the heterosexual friendship between the persona and the Fair Youth 'but at least since the 1960s reasons have been brought forward to argue that this sonnet does not deny the possibility of a sexual relationship' (Wells 64). On the other hand, it can be seen as a cover-up that was added because homosexual acts were not accepted in Shakespeare's time.

2.1 The Sonnet

Sonnet 20 in its original spelling:

1. A womans face with natures owne hand painted,
2. Haste thou the Master Mistris of my passion,
3. A womans gentle hart but not acquainted
4. With shifting change as is false womens fashion,
5. An eye more bright then theirs, lesse false in rowling:
6. Gilding the obiect where-vpon it gazeth,
7. A man in hew al Hews in his controwling,
8. Which steales mens eyes and womens soules amaseth,
9. And for a woman wert thou first created,
10. Till nature as she wrought thee fell a dotinge,
11. And by addition me of thee defeated,
12. By adding one thing to my purpose nothing.
13. But since she prickt thee out for womens pleasure,
14. Mine be thy loue and thy louses vse their treasure.

Sonnet 20 in its modern spelling as in *The New Cambridge Shakespeare; The Sonnets*:

1. A woman's face with Nature's own hand painted
2. Hast thou, the master-mistress of my passion;
3. A woman's gentle heart, but not acquainted
4. With shifting change, as is false women's fashion;
5. An eye more bright than theirs, less false in rolling,
6. Gilding the object whereupon it gazeth;
7. A man in hue, all hues in his controlling,
8. Which steals men's eyes and women's souls amazeth.
9. And for a woman wert thou first created,
10. Till nature as she wrought thee fell a-doting,
11. And by addition me of thee defeated,
12. By adding one thing to my purpose nothing.
13. But since she pricked thee out for women's pleasure,
14. Mine be thy love, and thy love's use their treasure.

2.2 Analysis

In this analysis of Sonnet 20, there will first be a general discussion of the sonnet line by line.

Then the correspondence between the content and the form of the sonnet will be looked at.

What follows is a more in-depth look at homoerotic elements in the sonnet. Specific lines

that are in the centre of the debate around Sonnet 20 will be discussed as well as other

sexual puns and connotations.

2.2.1 General

The first part of the sonnet, before the volta, gives a description of the characteristics of the Fair Youth. Shakespeare praises the femininity of the Fair Youth by contrasting him to actual women. He writes that he has a female face which was painted by Nature. Painting could be used as a poetic way to express that she created him. 'Painted' here can also mean: 'To apply colour to (the face or body); *spec.* to apply cosmetics to' (OED 3a). Unlike the faces of women, who use make-up, the Fair Youth's face has been painted by Nature i.e. his beauty is natural. The Fair Youth does not need the extra help of cosmetics since he is already bestowed with natural 'paint' (Blakemore Evans 132). The second line of the sonnet is

controversial and its various interpretations will be discussed in more detail in section 2.2.3.1. One of the readings is that the Fair Youth is just a man being addressed in the same way the mistresses of many other sonnets are. He is the male mistress of this passion i.e. sonnet. Besides a female face the Fair Youth also has the gentle heart of a woman. He, however, does not have an impulsive heart like women do. This comparison goes back to the humours. 'Women were generally considered as being of a phlegmatic humour, which was governed by the moon, and therefore, as compared to men, of a shifting, fickle, and changeable nature' (Blakemore Evans 133).

The second quatrain continues the description of the Fair Youth. His eyes are brighter than those of women and 'less false in rowling'. The comparison to women and its implications will be discussed in more detail in section 2.2.3.2. His gaze also gives whatever he looks at a golden glow. 'Gilding' here can convey the meaning of 'to cover or tinge with a golden colour or light (said esp. of the sun)' (OED 4a). If we take a look at the whole sonnet sequence, this line also contrasts the Fair Youth with a woman. In Sonnet 130 Shakespeare writes 'my mistress eyes are nothing like the sun', but his 'master-mistress' eyes are. Like the sun his eyes give a golden glow to whatever they look at. Although Shakespeare mocks these Petrarchan compliments in sonnet 130, the Fair Youth is deserving of them (Pequigney 33). Since Sonnet 130 is addressed to the Dark Lady, one might even go as far as to say that the persona finds the Fair Youth more beautiful or even more attractive than the Dark Lady. On the other hand, the love described for the Dark Lady and mockery of the unrealistic flattery of other sonnets in Sonnet 130 show that the relationship between the persona and the Dark Lady is more realistic. The love for the Fair Youth is idealised and impossible, while the love for the Dark Lady is real and attainable. Line 7, 'a man in hew al *Hews* in his controwling' can be interpreted in many different ways. One of the most common reading is that the Fair

Youth is a man in form or appearance and his appearance is superior to all. In the original print '*Hews*' was set in italics and with a capital letter, which has led to many speculations; more on this line in section 2.2.3.3. The Fair Youth's appearance catches men's eyes and astonishes women's souls. Another meaning of 'amazeth' can also be 'to infatuate' (OED 1). So, men do notice the Fair Youth's appearance, but he moves women on a deeper level. Even though the eyes are the window to the soul and 'according to the psychological theory of the period, erotic love is born of the visual apprehension of beauty' (Pequigney 34).

In the third quatrain the persona presents the reader with a myth of origin. He gives an explanation for how it is possible that the Fair Youth has a female face but a male body. Nature had planned for him to be a woman, but when she made *her* she fell 'a dotinge'. 'Adote' means 'to become silly or foolish; to be infatuated' (OED). Nature fell in love with the Fair Youth just like the persona has and turned him into the 'right' gender for her. As Helen Vendler explains in *The Art of Shakespeare's Sonnets*: 'To the speaker, it is inconceivable that anyone could fail to fall in love with that face, even if the beholder were of the same sex as the face' (128). Nature gives the Fair Youth an addition which 'defeats' the persona of the Fair Youth. In this context 'defeat' could mean: 'To do (a person) out *of* (something expected, or naturally coming to him); to disappoint, defraud, cheat' (OED 7a). By turning the Fair Youth into a man Nature disappointed the persona and cheated him out of the possibility of a 'normal' relationship. This addition, a penis, is not to the 'purpose' of the persona. More on this addition in section 2.2.3.4.

The persona writes that since the Fair Youth was designed for women's pleasure he will enjoy his love, while *they* can enjoy his 'treasure'. The debate and interpretations of the couplet will be discussed in section 2.2.3.5.

2.2.2 Form

The traditional Shakespearean or English sonnet is written in a iambic pentameter. Iambic pentameter is a metric form where the lines of a poem consist of ten syllables each with alternating stress. As the opposite of trochaic metre, in iambic lines an unstressed syllable is followed by a stressed syllable. In Shakespeare's sonnet sequence there are only two that do not strictly follow this metric form. Sonnet 87 has twelve lines consisting of eleven syllables and two with the standard ten. Sonnet 20 is the only sonnet in which every line has eleven syllables, but the metre is still iambic. This extra syllable gives the sonnet a feminine ending since the final syllable is unstressed.

The addition of an extra syllable is used to make the form of the sonnet a reflection of its content. The sonnet has a feminine form just like the Fair Youth does. The extra syllable also gives the sonnet an addition which makes it different from its original and intended form. A sonnet is supposed to be in iambic pentameter and the Fair Youth was supposed to be a woman. Nature bestowed something extra upon the Fair Youth, just as Shakespeare added something to his sonnet. The difference is that the addition to the sonnet makes it feminine, while the gift Nature gave to the Fair Youth made him male.

2.2.3 Homoerotic Elements

In this section possible interpretations of specific lines and words will be commented on. Interpretations from both ends of the debate will be considered. The first line that will be discussed is 'the Master Mistris of my passion' (with and without hyphen). The superiority of the Fair Youth to women and the comparison the persona makes will be discussed in the second section. What follows is a consideration of the possible meanings of the word 'hew' and the speculation the italicised and capitalised word has caused. Then some of the puns

about genitalia that can be found in the sonnet will be mentioned. Finally, the couplet and its possible implications will be discussed.

2.2.3.1 *Master Mistris of my Passion*

In the second line the Fair Youth is called 'the Master Mistris of my passion'. This line has been heavily debated. The explanations of this line range from proof of the homoerotic nature of the relationship with the fair youth, to evidence to exclude a homoerotic reading completely and everything in between (Blakemore Evans 132).

Firstly, the word 'passion' could mean different things. The meaning we might think of now, 'sexual desire or impulses' does not occur in English texts until 1648 (OED 8b), but the meaning of 'strong affection; love. Formerly also in *pl.*: amorous impulses or desires' (OED 8a) first found in 1590 is a plausible interpretation. Especially the 'amorous impulses or desires' give way to a homoerotic reading. Some critics refer to Thomas Watson's use of the word 'passion' as interchangeable with 'sonnet' to argue that there is no 'sexual desire' in the sonnet (Blakemore Evans 132). In this interpretation the Fair Youth would be addressed as the 'master mistress' of this sonnet. In that case passion means: 'A literary composition or passage marked by deep or strong emotion; a passionate speech or outburst' (OED 6d). For those who want to deny the homoerotic elements of the sonnet this definition would prove that it is simply a sonnet and the persona has no other passion for the Fair Youth. Watson's sonnets, however, are written as a romantic response to a mistress. If Shakespeare used the word 'passion' here in the same way Watson did, it still does not exclude a homoerotic reading (Pequigney, 32).

The possible meanings of the word 'passion' are clear; the first part of the line though: 'Master Mistris' is less so. It is important to note that many (modern) publications place a hyphen between 'master' and 'mistress' (modern spelling). By adding the hyphen some

readings of the line are eliminated. With a hyphen 'master' can no longer be an adjective to 'mistress'. 'Master' as an adjective to 'mistress' could mean that although the Fair Youth is like women, he is still their master (Pequigney 31). This interpretation would fit with the overall theme of the sonnet in which the Fair Youth is compared to women but superior to them. It is also no longer possible to see 'master' as 'used vocatively as a term of respect or politeness, or in substitution for the name of a man usually addressed as "master"' (OED 20). Readings that are also possible, with or without hyphen, are for instance the interpretation of Schmidt, the author of *Shakespeare-Lexicon*, who defines 'Master-mistress' as 'a male mistress, one loved like a woman, but of the male sex.' It is undeniable that the 'mistress' in sonnets is usually 'a woman loved and courted by a man; a female sweetheart' (OED 5). If the Fair Youth is a male version of this mistress it is hard to deny the love the persona expresses for him.

The interpretation of this line depends on the combination of 'master mistress' and 'passion'. If 'passion' is defined as another word for sonnet, then the Fair Youth can be the male version of the 'mistress' that is usually addressed in a sonnet. Some 'interpret "master-mistress" as merely emphasising the situation in which a "man" is being addressed in a way conventional to one of the many "mistresses"' (Blakemore Evans 132). He can also be the *superior* version of this mistress. Smith wonders if 'the young man [is] "the *master* mistress of my passion," as opposed to the persona's "lesser" mistress, the woman of sonnets 127 to 154?' (258). If 'passion' is defined as 'strong affection' or 'amorous desire' then the Fair Youth stirred these emotions in the persona. One would expect this of a mistress, but in this case it is a male mistress who is the master of all mistresses.

2.2.3.2 Comparison to Women

The persona praises the Fair Youth by comparing and contrasting him to women. He is like women but he is not the same; he is better. He has a woman's face, but it was painted by Nature not by make-up. He has a woman's heart, but it is less fickle. His eyes are brighter and he does not roll falsely. In this context 'rowling' is said 'of a person or a personal attribute or opinion: changeable, shifting, inconstant' (OED 7). Women are false and inconsistent. While the Fair Youth might look like them, he is more agreeable. The Fair Youth is the master of all mistresses as explained in section 2.2.3.1. 'The speaker's sterile play of the master/mistress against the putative falsity of women can be explained by his anger at women for not being the young man, at the young man for not being a (sexually available) woman' (Vendler 129).

2.2.3.3 Hews

The Fair Youth is described as being 'A man in hew al *Hews* in his controwling'. Two definitions of the word 'hew' can be used in this context. 'Form, shape, figure; appearance, aspect; species. '(OED 1a) or 'external appearance of the face and skin, complexion' (OED 2). The second definition is less likely because the complexion of the Youth has already been praised in the first line. Especially the second part of the line 'all *Hews* in his controlling' is open to many interpretations. Blakemore Evans names the possibilities:

1. Challenging or overpowering (by his perfect grace/form) all other graces/forms;
2. Having all other graces/forms contained in his grace/ form (i.e. his is the ideal grace/form);
3. (though he looks like a man, or a mere man), he has the power to adopt any grace/form he chooses;
4. (a fine-looking man) he enthral everyone;
5. (interpreting 'hue' as 'colour'), he has, through his complexion, power over all other complexions (causes others to blush or pale). (133)

Vendler thinks the word 'hew' is of great significance for the sonnet. 'Bizarre as it may appear, the poem seems to have been created in such a way as to have the individual letters of the word *h-e-w-s* (the Quarto spelling) or *h-u-e-s* in as many lines as possible' (129).

Another interesting thing about this line is the typesetting for the word "*Hews*". The capitalization of the word has caused many critics to think it might be referring to a man name 'Hughes' which would be pronounced as 'Hews'. If '*Hews*' refers to someone named Hughes could this be Mr. W.H. to which the sonnets are dedicated? This is all speculation and no one has been able to find a Hughes that could be linked to Shakespeare.

2.2.3.4 Puns

Sonnet 20 is full of puns referring to genitalia. The first pun is made in line 3. 'A womans gentle hart but not acquainted'. In the literal sense 'acquainted' means 'accustomed to do something; familiar *with* something from use, possession, or experience' (OED 4). There is also a pun in the line; the Fair Youth is 'not acquainted' i.e. does not have a quaint. 'Quaint' is an old version of 'cunt' or 'the female external genitals' (OED). Nature made an addition which caused this lack of a 'quaint'. She added 'one thing' which was 'nothing' to the purpose of the persona. 'Thing' quite obviously refers to the genitals as well (OED 11c). The 'nothing' of the persona's purpose might be the opposite of the 'thing' bestowed upon the Youth i.e. the female genitals. In this interpretation the persona says that he is interested in girls (and their genitals) and not in the 'thing' the Fair Youth has.

The Fair Youth came upon this thing because Nature 'prickt [him] out for womens pleasure'. 'Prick' means 'to designate by a puncture, to choose, to mark' (Schmidt 5). It is also a quite obvious pun on 'penis'. Woman can 'use' this newly added 'treasure' while the persona will settle for his love. Blackmore Evans points out that 'treasure' here could also mean 'semen' (134). In this interpretation Sonnet 20 is a logical follow up of the first

seventeen sonnets. The persona directly and indirectly refers to the Fair Youth's penis multiple times; as Pequigney notes 'such attention in itself might well argue something other than lack of interest in this organ' (34).

2.2.3.5 Couplet

In the couplet the persona explains that since the Fair Youth is male he will just enjoy his (platonic) love while women can enjoy his body. 'The issue here is easy enough to state but not so easy to decide: is Sonnet 20 a *denial* of sexual desire, or is it an *avowal*? The *literal sense* of what the persona says certainly indicates denial' (Smith 249). Many critics point out that a close bond between men was common in Shakespeare's time; Edmund Malone stated, in 1790 and this has 'remained the standard academic line ever since: "such addresses to men, however indelicate, were customary in our author's time, and neither imported criminality nor were esteemed indecorous"' (Smith 230). The argument goes back to Aristotle who wrote that men can be closer than women and men could ever be because they are more alike (Blakemore Evans 18). Matz describes a possible reading of the couplet as 'a distinction between the love of male friends and the physical, interested and "shifting" or momentary "love's use" between men and women (20.4, 14)' (487). Pequigney, on the other hand argues that sexual attraction is nowhere ruled out and that in fact the Fair Youth has stirred the persona's 'passion' (37).

2.3 Conclusion

In this section Sonnet 20 has been analysed in detail. The sonnet has been discussed line by line as well as its form. Homoerotic elements have been given specific attention. Although the homoerotic elements have been denied by many critics over the years the current discussion of Sonnet 20 takes them into consideration. With these interpretations in mind the Dutch translations will be analysed in the next section to see how the translators valued

these elements and how they dealt with them in their translations. In this chapter, the elements that will be analysed in the translations have been identified. The analysis will focus on all homoeroticism in the translations but three elements which can be easily identified will be discussed specifically: 'master-mistress of my passion', the sexual puns and the couplet. First, however, an historical background of the discourse on homosexuality in the Netherlands will be given.

3. Homosexuality in the Netherlands (1811-2001)

3.1 Homosexuality in the Late 19th Century

The word 'homosexualiteit' did not enter the Dutch language until 1892 as is stated in the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche taal*. Before that homosexual acts were known under many other names like 'sodomie' or 'onnoembare misdaad'. Before 1811, it was considered a serious crime. M. Salden explains in “Van doodstraf tot straffeloosheid” that homosexual acts were punishable by death in the Netherlands until 1811 when the French *code pénal* was instigated. Although the French left, the capital punishment on sodomy was not reinstated. In 1886 the Netherlands finally made its own penal code in which homosexual acts remained legal, this was mainly due to a liberal government at the time and did not mean that sodomy or homosexual relationship were generally accepted; they were still considered sinful. As Hekma explains, in “Profeten op papier, pioniers op pad”, homosexuals were still prosecuted sometimes for ‘openbare schennis van de eerbaarheid’ (offences against public decency), but in the privacy of their own home homosexual acts were legal (568). In the 1880's the Netherlands started a moral campaign against illicit sexual acts. This movement caused sexuality to be a topic of debate and the taboo on talking about sex was broken. This seems to be a paradox but the openness was used to impose sexual norms. ‘Nieuwe moralisten bevorderden een sociale discussie over seksualiteit, definieerden wat door de beugel kon en bestreden met ongemene felheid grensverleggingen’ (571). Before this time the topic was mainly shrouded in silence.

The increasing interest in natural sciences in the Enlightenment decreased the fear of god and there was more desire for rational thought and research. This trend continued and the medical sciences saw great developments (559-562). In the late 19th century homosexuality became of interest to the medical world. It became a topic of research and as

Johan Polak explains in *Goed verkeerd*: 'medici erkenden dat homoseksualiteit natuurlijk, maar tegelijkertijd ook ongewenst was' (24). The shift from act to identity occurred as Harm Oosterhuis describes in *De smalle marges van de Roomse moraal*:

De katholieke ontwikkelingen leken aan te sluiten bij de zogenaamde "medicalisering" van homoseksualiteit, die zich in Nederland eind negentiende, begin twintigste eeuw voordeed. De toenemende medische bemoeienis ging toen gepaard met een verschuiving in de aandacht van de zondige sodomitische daad naar de pathologische homoseksuele persoonlijkheid (5).

3.2 Homosexuality in the First Half of the 20th Century

In 1911, a century after homosexual act or sodomy was no longer illegal in the Netherlands, a new law, 248bis, was brought into operation. The law made homosexual contacts between or with minors (under the age of twenty-one) illegal again. The law was discriminatory because heterosexual contacts were legal from the age of sixteen. In this time sexual moral became increasingly important and Dutch society became more hostile towards homosexuality as Gert Hekma explains in *Homoseksualiteit in Nederland van 1730 tot de moderne tijd* (40). As a direct response to the new law the Nederlandsch Wetenschappelijk Humanitair Komitee (NWHK) was founded, an organisation which tried to promote the acceptance of homosexuality by education and scientific research. Knowledge and a gay community slowly developed in spite of the growing opposition. Prosecution of homosexuals began slowly and became most fierce in the 1950's because of a widespread concern about moral decay after the Second World War (41).

The difference between a homosexual identity and homosexual acts was still made. The homosexual identity was seen as an illness which could be cured, whereas homosexual act was sinful and a crime. The homosexual identity was thought to be curable and 'artsen [beijverden] zich om allerlei (psycho)therapieën voor seksuele perversen te ontwikkelen, wat in de twintigste eeuw z'n climax bereikte met castraties, hormoonbehandelingen en

hersenenoperaties' (Polak 24). During the German invasion, all sexual acts between members of the same sex were punishable with a maximum of four years in prison. After the war, the Cultuur- en Ontspannings Centrum (COC) was founded; this organisation strived for emancipation but also provided a community for homosexuals.

3.3 Homosexuality in the Second Half of the 20th Century

With the acknowledgement of the homosexual identity, the first steps towards acceptance were taken. Conservatives acknowledged that in some cases homosexuality could not be prevented and these people should not be judged as long as they refrained from acting on their urges. In fact, they should be pitied. 'Homoseksualiteit was voor sommige mensen nu eenmaal een noodlot, waar men zich maar beter bij kon neerleggen' (Goed verkeerd 139). Christian organisations and the COC openly discussed these issues and the COC emphasised the 'normal homosexual' who wanted to be a part of society (Goed verkeerd 140). Slowly the opinions about homosexuality changed and eventually in the 1960's the 'Grote Verandering', the sexual liberation, came about.

The sexual liberation led to the abolishment of law 248bis in the seventies. Homosexual acts were no longer a sin, crime or disease (Hekma, homoseksualiteit 73). The attitudes in society also changed quickly. The COC records on their website that in 1968 more than 35 percent of the Dutch population judged homosexuality negatively, while in the 1980s this figure dropped to below 10 percent (over ons). 'Nederland ontwikkelde zich van een achterblijver met een conservatieve moraal tot een voorloper met een moderne moraal, ook op seksgebied' (Hekma, homoseksualiteit 77). For many, the legalisation of homosexual marriages in 2001 is seen as the completion of homo-emancipation. Homosexuality, however, is still not fully supported by every part of society.

4. Burgersdijk's Translations

4.1 Introduction

Burgersdijk published his first translation of the sonnets in 1879. Almost ten years later Burgersdijk published his translation of the entire works of Shakespeare. In this work he adjusted some of his earlier sonnet translations. Consequently, there are two translations of Sonnet 20 made by Burgersdijk. Although some of the lines survived the reconstruction, i.e. remained the same, there are many differences between the two versions. In both publications Burgersdijk does not give the original sonnet, therefore the translation is presented as a substitute of the source text.

4.2 Biography

Leendert Alexander Johannes Burgersdijk (1828-1900) was a Dutch biologist who worked as a teacher of natural history. Burgersdijk is not the first translator of Shakespeare's sonnets, but he is the first to translate the entire work into Dutch. He also translated some Greek tragedies. Next to his translations he wrote multiple articles and books on natural history. For his outstanding work in the Dutch literary world he won the D.A. Thiemprijs in 1887.

As Cornelis Schoneveld explains in *Sea-Changes*, Burgersdijk was a big contributor to the fame of Shakespeare in the Netherlands. He worked hard to get his first translations of some of Shakespeare's plays in theatre and he did public readings of Shakespeare's work with introductions (165-167). A.S. Kok, who earlier translated some of Shakespeare's work, was harshly criticised by Burgersdijk who claimed that his translations 'resembles Sh. as much as a little toy horse resembles a horse from the Parthenon' (168). Throughout the years Burgersdijk published more and more on Shakespeare until in 1888, with the twelfth part of Shakespeare's complete work, he finished his magnum opus.

4.3 Translator's Notes

In both publications Burgersdijk wrote a commentary on the sonnets. In the commentary on his earlier translations Burgersdijk explains that he used the edition and reading by the German scholar Nikolaus Delius . He also looked at the German translation of the sonnets by Friedrich von Bodenstedt. Bodenstedt's translation of Sonnet 20 can be found in the appendix for further comparison.

In his first commentary Burgersdijk tries to defend Shakespeare's work. He brings up two arguments to convince the reader to not judge Shakespeare's work too harshly. The first is that the work is not autobiographical. 'Wat van de betrekking tusschen den dichter en zijne aangebedene gezegd werd, vatte men als voortbrengsel der dichterlijke fantasie op en niemand ergerde er zich aan of rekende het zich ernstig gemeend' (iii). The sonnets are purely meant as art and not a way to get to know the private life of the artist. If we read the sonnets as art than Shakespeare's honour remains intact (v). His second point is that while reading we should remember the time in which the sonnets were composed. 'Voor eene juiste opvatting dezer kleine gedichten is het noodig zich in gedachte te verplaatsen in den tijd waarin zij geschreven zijn, want, ... [Shakespeare] was toch ook een kind van zijn tijd en heeft, bepaald in deze gedichten, den smaak van zijn tijd gehuldigd' (iii).

In the second commentary Burgersdijk feels differently about the autobiographical nature of the sonnets. In a footnote he explains why he has rewritten his former work. While he was making his first translation he worked in no particular order and did not take the time for an intense study of the work.

Sedert heb ik den geheelen Shakespeare vertaald en in bijzonderheden bestudeerd, en ook de sonnetten meermalen ter hand genomen. Mijne denkbeelden over de sonnetten zijn hierdoor langzamerhand gewijzigd, veranderd, zooals uit de boven gegeven aantekeningen blijken kan. (263)

Now that Burgersdijk did more research and restored the sonnets to their original order, he thinks that Shakespeare wrote about his own experiences. '[I]n zijne tooneelwerken blijft de dichter steeds verborgen ... hier, in den sonnetten, spreekt hij wellicht in eigen persoon zijne ware gevoelens uit' (250). He sticks to his second point to defend Shakespeare though. He acknowledges that the way Shakespeare writes about the Fair Youth is reminiscent of a love relationship, but he reminds the reader this was common in Shakespeare's time. '... zij hier opgemerkt dat in zijn tijd de vriendschap niet zelden de taal der liefde sprak' (250). He also finds it necessary to defend other aspects of Shakespeare's life. He is mild towards Shakespeare cheating on his wife Anne Hathaway with the Dark Lady. He does call it a sin (which is a sign he was religious) but he also reminds the reader that this sin was common in that time (253). He also says that those who judge Shakespeare should keep in mind that his masterpieces would not have been created if he had a lived a life filled with piety: '... dan waren zijne onvergankelijke meesterstukken niet tot stand gekomen; alleen uit het leven kan het leven geboren worden' (254).

4.4 Translation Norms

In his second commentary Burgersdijk does not go into detail about what he thinks a translation should be. In his first commentary Burgersdijk is very clear about what he tried to accomplish with his translation. He wanted to give the readers of his translations the same pleasures as readers of the original text would have. 'Zij moet getrouw zijn in den vollen zin des woords, dat is, niet alleen den zin van het oorspronkelijke volkomen teruggeven, maar ook de eigenaardigheden van den dichter, zoowel in denkwijze, als in uitdrukking, zoodat de tint en geur der gedichten niet verloren gaan' (vi). He wanted the translations to be faithful to the source text and show the peculiarities of the persona. The translation, however, was not meant to show that it was a translation, i.e. the translator should have full command of

his language and produce the same beauty in the translation as in the original. Furthermore, Burgersdijk was not in favour of a modernisation of the sonnets. 'Men leide uit het gezegde niet af ... dat een gedicht uit lang vervlogen tijden in de ooren zou moeten klinken als een modern dichtstuk; neen, de vertaler moge over den geheelen taalschat beschikken' (vi). It seems strange then that Burgersdijk first adopted the different Sonnet order Bodenstedt used, but he was aware of this himself and produced the second translations. There remains another peculiarity Schoneveld also mentions:

There is one major particular point in which Burgersdijk implicitly contradicted his own general theory. This pertains to expressions in the original text which if translated literally would cause shame or irritation in the modern reader and so spoil the whole effect ... [F]rom a combination of sources it can be concluded that he restricted it mainly to matter of sexual decency. (178)

4.5 The Translation of Sonnet 20

Burgersdijk's translation of Sonnet 20 as found in William Shakespeare's sonnetten (1879):

1. U heeft, o heer-gebiedster van mijn harte,
2. Natuur een vrouwenaangezicht gegeven,
3. Een teeder vrouwenhart, doch dat geen smarte
4. Verwekt door vrouwlijk na verandring streven;
5. En ooggen, schitterend hel, doch zonder valscheid,
6. Die alles, waar ze op stralen, fraai vergulden;
7. Een vorm en tint, die door hun teedre malschheid
8. Steeds van bewondring man en vrouw vervulden;
9. Gewis is 't, dat natuur tot vrouw u vormde,
10. Maar onder 't scheppen zelve op u verliefde,
11. En zoo, verward, wijl hartstocht haar bestormde,
12. U man deed zijn en mij dus bitter griefde.
13. Moog', daar uw schoon de bliken boeit der schoonen,
14. Uw hart mijn liefde, uw kus haar smachten loonen!

Burgersdijk's translation of Sonnet 20 as found in the twelfth part of De werken van William Shakespeare (1888):

1. U heeft, o heer-gebiedster van mijn harte
2. Natuur een vrouwenaangezicht gegeven,
3. Dat bloost, – een vrouw'lijk hart, dat nimmer smarte
4. Verwekt door vrouw'lijk naar verand'ring streven,
5. Een oog met vrouwenblik, doch zonder valscheid,
6. Dat alles, waar 't op staart, als goud doet gloeien,
7. Een mannenvorm en tint, die door hun malschheid
8. Der mannen oog, der vrouwen ziele boeien;
9. Gewis is 't, dat Natuur tot vrouw u vormde,
10. Doch onder 't scheppen zelve op u verliefde,
11. En zoo, verward, wijl hartstocht haar bestormde,
12. U iets te veel, mij nutt'loos, schonk, mij griefde.
13. 't Zij; boeit uw schoon der vrouwen oog en zinnen,
14. Gun mij uw liefde, haar 't genot van 't minnen!

4.5.1 General Analysis

The two translations Burgersdijk produced do not follow Shakespeare's structure strictly. He sometimes changes the order of the lines or emphasises particular aspect while glossing over others. The second translation is structurally closer to the source text and conveys more of the content. The two translations will now be analysed line by line and then the three specific homo-erotic elements will be considered.

In the first two quatrains of the source text an image of the Fair Youth is created. This is done by comparing the Fair Youth to women and making him superior to them. Furthermore, the effect the Fair Youth has on men and women is described. In the translations this comparison is also made but in a different way. In the first two lines the Fair Youth's face and the relation to the persona is described:

A woman's face with Nature's own hand painted
Hast thou, the master-mistress of my passion;

The first two lines of the translations are identical:

U heeft, o heer-gebiedster van mijn harte,
Natuur een vrouwenaangezicht gegeven,

In the translations the order of the first two lines is reversed. The word order of the first and second line make them difficult to understand. At a first glance it seems as though the persona is saying that the Fair Youth gave a woman's face *to* Nature, which would be a peculiar change of the source text. 'U' is not the subject of the line, but the indirect object. The most logical reading of the line is: *aan* 'U heeft ... Natuur een vrouwenaangezicht gegeven'. Nature has given the face *to* the Fair Youth. In the source text Nature is an artist who created the Fair Youth's face, but in the translations it was a gift. Since his face was a gift and not painted, the superiority of the Fair Youth's naturally painted face to women's unnaturally painted faces is gone. In the second translation Burgersdijk adds that his face

'bloost' (blushes) in line 3 which can be seen as a natural paint. 'Blozen' can also express that the Fair Youth is healthy and/or rich (WNT 1). The comparison to women, however, is gone. The first line of the translations will be discussed in more detail in section 4.5.2.1.

After the description of the face of the Fair Youth, the persona then describes his personality in the same manner. He first states his heart is like a women's to follow up with how it is better:

A woman's gentle heart but not acquainted
With shifting change as is false women's fashion,

The first translation:

Een teeder vrouwenhart, doch dat geen smarte
Verwekt door vrouwlijk na verandering streven;

The second translation:

Dat bloost, - een vrouw'lijk hart, dat nimmer smarte
Verwekt door vrouw'lijk naar verand'ring streven,

The translations uses the same structure, but the nature of women is different. In the first translation the persona says that the Fair Youth's heart does not create or cause pain, unlike women who cause pain by striving for change. In the source text women are not accused of inflicting pain; women are fickle but not hurtful. In these lines Burgersdijk changes the image of Nature and hints at her later actions. Nature is a woman who caused pain by making changes. She hurt the persona by changing the gender of the Fair Youth. In line 3 of the second translation Burgersdijk uses 'nimmer' (never) instead of 'geen' (no). 'Nimmer' makes another reading of line 3 and 4 possible. By using 'nimmer', 'smarte' can be read as a verb and a noun, while in the first translation it could only be a noun. 'Smarten' as a verb means to cause pain or suffering. 'Smart(e)' as a noun means pain or sadness (van Dale). If Burgersdijk used it as a verb he states that the Fair Youth's heart never hurt anyone, this

would also mean that the verb 'verwerkt' does not denote 'smarte' but 'U'. In this case it would mean that the Fair Youth was created because a woman (Nature) was striving for change.

In the first lines of the second quatrain the comparison is extended to the Fair Youth's eye, which is used to say something about his appearance and his personality. He is also indirectly compared to the sun; his eyes seem to emit rays of sunshine giving everything he looks at a golden glow.

An eye more bright than theirs, less false in rolling,
Gilding the object whereupon it gazeth,

The first translation:

En oogen, schitterend hel, doch zonder valscheid,
Die alles, waar ze op stralen, fraai vergulden;

The second translation:

Een oog met vrouwenblik, doch zonder valscheid,
Dat alles, waar 't op staart, als goud doet gloeien,

In the first translation the Fair Youth is not explicitly compared to women. In line 5 there is no mention of women, while in the source text 'theirs' is used and the second translation is even more explicit with 'een oog met vrouwenblik'. In the second translation 'doch' articulates that 'valscheid' would be expected in his eye since it is like a woman's, but it is absent. 'Doch' is also used in the first translation, but since there is no mention of femininity in the Fair Youth's eyes the contrast is less clear. Both the translations describe qualities of the sun in the eyes of the Fair Youth, albeit in different ways. In the first, his eyes 'stralen' which is something the sun also does. In the second, the things the Fair Youth looks at glow like gold. 'Gloeien' gives the feeling that what the Fair Youth looks at emits warmth.

In the first six lines of the first translation, the Fair Youth is described as feminine and only his personality (or heart) is different from women's i.e. not false or changing. His appearance is feminine and his eyes are brilliantly bright, but it is not described as superior. The second translation uses less adjectives to describe the Fair Youth but the contrast with women is clearer. By not emphasizing the contrast between women and the Fair Youth Burgersdijk makes his persona more interested in women, because they are not eclipsed by the Fair Youth.

In line 7 the Fair Youth's hue is described.

A man in hue all hues in his controlling,

In the first translation:

Een vorm en tint, die door hun teedre malschheid

In the second translation:

Een mannenvorm en tint, die door hun malschheid

Line 7 is open to many different interpretations. In his translations, Burgersdijk does not use any of the interpretations discussed in section 2.2.3.3. In the first translation, he writes that the Fair Youth's shape and hue amaze men and women alike by its 'teedre malschheid'. Burgersdijk uses the word 'teedre' twice to describe the Fair Youth, first for his heart and now for his 'malschheid'. Currently 'malschheid' is mostly used to describe tender meat, but in the *Woordenboek der Nederlandsche Taal* it says that it is also said 'van het menschelijk lichaam: mollig, zacht op het gevoel, niet mager en hard'¹ (5). It was also used as an adjective to describe a kiss. The usage of this word possibly reflects the standards of beauty of Burgersdijk's time. In the first translation there is no mention of the Fair Youth's form

¹ Of the human body: chubby, soft to the touch, not skinny or hard. (translation mine)

being male, while the second does mention it. Since the first also uses the adjective “teedre” he becomes even more feminine in this translation.

In line 8 the effect the Fair Youth has on men and women is described.

Which steals men’s eyes and women’s souls amazeth.

In the first translation:

Steeds van bewondring man en vrouw vervulden;

In the second translation:

Der mannen oog, der vrouwen ziele boeien;

Remarkably, in the first translation men and women have the same reaction to the Fair Youth. In the newer translation, the reaction men and women have to the Fair Youth’s “malschheid” is different. Both are interested, but on different levels. As in the source text, it are the eyes of the men that are drawn to him and women’s souls.

In the last quatrain the persona explains that Nature was making a woman but fell in love, which is why she turned the Fair Youth male. In this section the persona expresses his disappointment by the addition Nature gave the Fair Youth.

And for a woman wert thou first created,
Till Nature as she wrought thee fell a-doting,
And by addition me of thee defeated,
By adding one thing to my purpose nothing.

In the first translation:

Gewis is ‘t, dat natuur tot vrouw u vormde,
Maar onder ‘t scheppen zelve op u verliefde,
En zoo, verward, wijl hartstocht haar bestormde,
U man deed zijn en mij dus bitter griefde.

Only the final line is different in the second translation:

U iets te veel, mij nutt’loos schonk, mij griefde.

The persona says it is certain that Nature made the Fair Youth a woman but fell in love. Confused and overcome by 'hartstocht' she gave the Fair Youth too much. In the first translation, the addition is not mentioned. Burgersdijk only states that she made him male and by doing so hurt him deeply. Perhaps Burgersdijk felt the need to be explicit about the gender of the Fair Youth in this line, because the first part of his translation is more ambiguous. In his first commentary, he also stated that translations were allowed to change the source text if the content was of ill taste. It seems that Burgersdijk wanted to eliminate the sexual connotation (more on the translation of puns in section 4.5.2.3) In the second translation, Burgersdijk does mention the addition as "iets te veel" and this surplus is useless for the persona and hurt him. Burgersdijk uses three lines to explain the addition and only one to express the persona's disappointment. The persona of the first translation is hurt more severely by the addition: his pain is 'bitter'. The second explains why he is hurt: he cannot use the addition. In both translations Burgersdijk adds that Nature was confused. The mention of this confusion could imply a judgment of homo-sexual feelings. Feeling attracted to someone of your own gender (as Nature does for her creation) is explained as confusion and thus abnormal. Luckily Nature has the power to do something about this unfortunate situation as she can turn the object of her love to the 'right' gender.

The couplet will be discussed in the next part of this chapter because of the homoerotic elements.

4.5.2 Homoerotic Elements

4.5.2.1 Master Mistress of my Passion

The second part of Shakespeare's second line is the same in both translations.

o heer-gebiedster van mijn harte

in the first line of his translations. Burgersdijk writes 'heer-gebiedster' with a hyphen and by doing so eliminates some interpretations of the line (as were discussed in section 2.2.3.1). The hyphen makes it impossible for 'heer' to be an adjective that modifies 'gebiedster'. Burgersdijk does not translate 'master' with the Dutch equivalent 'meester' which both come from the Latin 'magister'(WNT). Instead he writes 'o heer-gebiedster' which makes it a direct address to the Fair Youth because of the 'o'. The 'o' might have been added to get the eleven syllables needed to create a feminine ending which Burgersdijk maintains throughout the sonnet. 'Heer' is similar to the English 'master', 'sir' or 'gentleman' and is often used in Dutch poetry to address a man. 'Gebiedster' on the other hand is an archaic way to address women in Dutch poetry. By using the word 'gebiedster' Burgersdijk uses the same poetic language as Shakespeare did when he used the word 'mistress'. It is likely that Burgersdijk interpreted 'master mistress' as male mistress and not as someone superior to other mistresses. The superiority to women in general is less emphasised.

The word 'passion' is also open to multiple interpretations. In the translation Burgersdijk has eliminated the interpretation of 'sonnet'. He translates 'passion' with 'van mijn harte' (of my heart). 'Gebiedster van mijn harte' is a line that could be found in Dutch love poetry of the time. As said section 4.3 on Burgersdijk notes, he was aware of the blurred lines between male and female in the sonnets. He states that many of the sonnets could be about a woman, which would sometimes even seems more likely to us (the readers of his work) (De werken van Shakespeare 250). It seems that the word 'passion' did not mean 'sonnet' for Burgersdijk and he interpreted the line as an expression of love. The amorous desire which the word 'passion' conveys is more specific than the general love expressed in Burgersdijk's translations.

4.5.2.2 Puns

In Shakespeare's Sonnet 20 there are many puns referring to genitalia. Pequigney saw this as an interest in this organ on the persona's side. Burgersdijk's persona is less fixated on this organ. The only thing that possibly refers to a penis is 'iets te veel'. Stating that the Fair Youth has a bit too much is not a pun but a euphemism. In the couplet of the source text it is the Fair Youth's 'treasure' women are interested in. Burgersdijk removes this pun and makes it more chaste, it is now his beauty which appeals to women.

4.5.2.3 Couplet

The two translations of the couplet are entirely different, therefore they will be discussed in separate sections. In the couplet the persona states that since the Fair Youth is a man he will settle for his love while he can share pleasures of the flesh with women.

But since she pricked thee out for women's pleasure,
Mine be thy love and thy love's use their treasure

Many have seen this as an explicit denial of a homosexual relationship.

4.5.2.3.1 The Couplet in the First Translation

The lines Burgersdijk used in his first translation:

Moog', daar uw schoon de blikken boeit der schoonen,
Uw hart mijn liefde, uw kus haar smachten loonen!

Whereas Shakespeare's persona is very negative about women throughout the sonnet, in this translation Burgersdijk calls them beauties. By doing so, he implies that the persona might also be attracted to the beauty of women. By using 'schoon' to describe the Fair Youth and women alike in this line, Burgersdijk again makes his Fair Youth more like women. The persona hopes that his heart will be rewarded with the Fair Youth's love and that women's urges and desires will receive his kiss. He sees the love and kisses of the Fair Youth as a

reward. Since there are no sexual puns in this translation and what the Fair Youth is ordered to do with women is reduced to kissing, this translation is more chaste than the source text.

4.5.2.3.2 The Couplet in the Second Translation

In the second translation Burgersdijk translated the controversial couplet to:

't Zij; boeit uw schoon der vrouwen oog en zinnen
Gun mij uw liefde, haar 't genot van 't minnen!

He admits that 'minnen' is pleasurable which makes one wonder if the persona has fantasised about making love to the Fair Youth. In the source text the pleasure is meant for women while in the translation the pleasure is *given* to women. This implies that this gift could also be given to a man, but the persona merely asks for his love.

The first two words of line 13 express acceptance on the persona's part. It seems as though he says to the Fair Youth: 'If Nature made you a man, so be it. I will be content with your love while you share other pleasures with women.' 't Zij' can also express 'and so it was done'. Just like in line 8, in line 13 the contrast between the effect the Fair Youth has on men and women is emphasised again. His beauty does draw the attention of men's eye but he touches women on a deeper level: her 'ziele' en 'zinnen'. The couplet of the second translation focusses more on the sexual relationships the Fair Youth can have with women than the first. It becomes evident that the persona of the second translation has thought more about the Fair Youth as a sexual creature.

4.6 Conclusion

It is possible that as a biologist Burgersdijk paid attention to the developments in the discourse on homosexuality. From his notes and translations it becomes clear that Burgersdijk, when it comes to sexual morals, was not ahead of his time. He was quick to defend Shakespeare's friendship with the Fair Youth as just that, a friendship and reminds

his readers that in Shakespeare's time close friendships between men were common. The fact that he calls Nature's attraction to someone of her own gender a confusion also shows that he thought of same-sex attraction as deviant. Furthermore, in both the translations he emphasises the friendship between the Fair Youth and the persona and not the possible sexual attraction. He does not make the Fair Youth superior to women and by doing so creates a persona that is less disappointed or jealous. Consistent with his time, Burgersdijk also does not make sexual puns even though he said in his first commentary that the writers' peculiarities and views should be portrayed in the translations; this apparently did not count for homoeroticism.

5. Van Emde Boas' Translation

5.1 Introduction

In 1951 Van Emde Boas published his dissertation, *Shakespeare's sonnetten en hun verband met de travesti-double spelen*, a medical and psychological study of Shakespeare's sonnets and two of his plays. In this work he translated some of Shakespeare's sonnets including Sonnet 20. These translations also were published separately, in *Keur uit Shakespeare's Sonnetten*. In this publication Van Emde Boas altered one line of Sonnet 20. In his dissertation, he provides the reader with the source text. In his other publication, however, he only provides the translations.

5.2 Biography

Coenraad van Emde Boas (1904-1981) was a Dutch psychiatrist and the first professor of sexology at the University of Amsterdam and later the University of Leiden. Van Emde Boas comes from a Jewish family, but it is unclear if he was an active practitioner of Judaism. He did, however, clearly identify as a Jew since he wrote articles about anti-Semitism after the Second World War. In *Coen van Emde Boas: zenuwarts, seksuoloog en verzamelaar van boeken* his son made an inventory of Van Emde Boas' collection and also included a biography. He explains that his father was a pioneer in the field of sexology and tried to break taboos surrounding sex, anti-conception and sexual hygiene. Van Emde Boas was active for many different organisations including the Dr. Aletta Jacobs Huis (where women and men could go for advice about birth control, sexual difficulties and marital problems) and the Nieuw-Malthusiaanse Bond (an organisation dedicated to improving birth control and sexual hygiene). For the Nieuw-Malthusiaanse Van Emde Boas travelled all over the Netherlands for lectures and sexual education meetings. These activities were not without

risks; Van Emde Boas met many opponents and was sometimes even threatened with physical violence often coming from the side of organised religion (7).

De opvattingen van Van Emde Boas waren ... niet alleen strijdig met de gevestigde academische ideeën; ze gingen ook in tegen veel van wat in andere kringen op dat moment aanvaardbaar werd geacht: algemeen maatschappelijk, kerkelijk, politiek, maar ook bijvoorbeeld in een toch op het oog vooruitstrevende beweging zoals de psychoanalyse. (7)

Furthermore, Van Emde Boas was a frontrunner in the fight for homo-emancipation and because of this he became an honourable member of the COC (10). Not only was he interested in sexology and psycho-analysis he was also interested in literature and even published his own poetry book, *Stemmingen*, in 1926. He combined these two interests in his dissertation on Shakespeare's Sonnets and their relation to two plays in which transvestism plays an important role.

5.3 Translator's Notes

Van Emde Boas did not write a commentary exclusively about the sonnets and his translations. His dissertation is an extensive medical and psychological study (of more than 500 pages) on Shakespeare. One of the main questions Van Emde Boas aims to answer is: What was Shakespeare's sexual orientation? From this main question it becomes clear that Van Emde Boas is in favour of an autobiographical reading of the sonnets. He feels that his research will add to the ongoing discussion because '[h]et gehele vraagstuk ... door bijna alle auteurs als een *schuldvraag* behandeld [is] en niet als een *psychologisch probleem*' (145). He also states that because of the subject matter many scholars have been influenced by their ideological preconceptions (146). Furthermore, as an advocate for equal rights, he mentions that the aversion to homosexuality is purely a sociological construct (154).

Sonnet 20 is discussed in detail by Van Emde Boas. He says that the sonnet is very important for his research and he explains the two sides of the debate, already discussed in

the analysis of Sonnet 20 in chapter 2. He claims both parties are right because Shakespeare is indeed not *homosexual* but he is not without homoeroticism either (278). He already expressed this idea earlier in his work: 'ik [ben] ervan overtuigd ... dat er in de verste verte geen sprake van is, dat Shakespeare tot de manifest homoseksuelen moet worden gerekend ... ik sta in dit opzicht volkomen achter degenen die in Sonnet 20 ... het meeste volstrekte alibi zien' (66-67). He agrees that Sonnet 20 proves that the relationship between Shakespeare and the Fair Youth was not a physical one, but he also sees the homoerotic implications of the Sonnet. 'Maar de *dubbele* ontkenning ... samen met de *drievoudige* vermelding van het voor de homoeroticus zo gewichtige orgaan in drie opeenvolgende regels ... moet iedereen te denken geven!' (281). With this Van Emde Boas already says what Pequigney would say thirty years later; Shakespeare seems very interested in the 'addition' given to the Fair Youth. Van Emde Boas comes to the conclusion that Shakespeare was a heterosexual with some strong homoerotic tendencies: '[Bij Shakespeare is] naast of onder een ogenschijnlijk vrij normaal heterosexueel liefdesleven een ongewoon sterke homoerotische onderstroming merkbaar' (200).

Van Emde Boas used his research on Shakespeare to advocate the acceptance of homosexuality. In "Levensrecht", an important magazine for and about homosexuals, a speech he gave is discussed. Van Emde Boas uses Shakespeare as an example of the fluidity of sexual orientation:

[Van Emde Boas] geloofde, dat zijn onderwerp misschien niet alleen van enig letterkundig-historisch belang was, maar er bovendien toe zou kunnen bijdragen om de kloof van wanbegrip te overbruggen, die tussen de heterosexuele en de "andere" wereld bestaat. Want juist Shakespeare, over wiens sexuele geaardheid in de psychologische en sexuologische wetenschap nog zozeer gestreden wordt, is een typisch bewijs er voor, dat deze kloof die in onze tijd zo oneindig veel leed veroorzaakt, in feite lang niet zo breed is als men veelal meent en overbrugd wordt door talloze overgangen. (1)

5.4 Translation Norms

In his dissertation Van Emde Boas uses his translations to clarify the English text. He does not discuss why he translated the way he did or what his thoughts about translation are. In his *Keur uit Shakespeare's Sonnetten* he explains some choices he made. One is about Sonnet 20, this is the only translation that is different from the ones in his dissertation. He explains that he changed line 8 according to a new insight. The different translations of line 8 will be discussed individually in section 5.5.2.

5.5 The Translation of Sonnet 20

Van Emde Boas' translation of Sonnet 20 as found in *Shakespeare's sonnetten en hun verband met de travesti-double spelen*:

1. Gij, Prins-Prinsesse van mijn Liefdeszangen
2. Hebt van Natuur, die 't eigenhandig maalde,
3. een vrouwelijk-teder aangezicht ontvangen,
4. Een vrouwehart, dat nooit losbandig dwaalde
5. – Als een, in valse wisseldrift bevangen –
6. Een oog, min vals, dat meer dan 't hare straalde,
7. Dat alles glans geeft, waar zijn blikken langen,
8. Toch: volop Man, waarnaast elk ander faalde,
9. Die mannen boeit en vrouwen houdt gevangen.
10. En tot een vrouw waart g'allereerst geschapen
11. Totdat Natuur, toen zij U schiep, verward werd
12. En tussen ons een afgrond heeft doen gapen
13. Daar een teveel dat mij niet past, Uw part werd.
14. Maar nu z'U schiep tot lust der vrouwenschare
15. Zij mijn Uw min en 't zingenot het hare!

5.5.1 General Analysis

Van Emde Boas' translation deviates from the traditional form by having fifteen lines. The extra line is caused by the extra line Van Emde Boas uses to express what Shakespeare did in his first two. The order of the lines is also not maintained. The images created sometimes

differ from the ones in the source text. The translation will now be analysed line by line and then the three specific homo-erotic elements will be considered.

The source text consists of two parts, in the first the Fair Youth is described. He is feminine but superior to women. His beauty causes men to look at him and women to be amazed. In the translation the Fair Youth is also described but he differs a bit from the Fair Youth of the source text. In the first two lines the Fair Youth's face is described:

A woman's face with Nature's own hand painted
Hast thou, the master-mistress of my passion,

In the translation:

Gij, Prins-Prinsesse van mijn Liefdeszangen,
Hebt van Natuur, die 't eigenhandig maalde,
Een vrouwelijk-teder aangezicht ontvangen,

It can be argued that like the feminine ending, the extra line emphasises the addition the Fair Youth was given. Van Emde Boas presents the source text with his translation. Especially because of the scientific nature of the dissertation, the translation is not presented as a substitute but as an aid for Dutch readers to understand the original. The *Keur uit Shakespeare's sonnetten*, however, does not include the source text. Dutch readers of this publication could thus think that Shakespeare himself deviated from the sonnet form and wrote 15 lines.

The translation adds a line but does copies the feminine line endings of Sonnet 20. To be able to maintain the eleven syllables per line Van Emde Boas added the adjective 'teder' in line 3 to describe the Fair Youth's 'woman's face'. In the translation it is not his heart (in line 4) which is gentle but his face. Van Emde Boas writes that the Fair Youth received a feminine and gentle face which Nature with her own hands 'maalde'. 'Malen', is an old-fashioned literary term which means to portray in words, colours and lines and more

specifically to draw, paint or describe (Van Dale). In another dictionary 'Malen' is described as art in which the figures are portrayed in colour (WNT 6). This is in line with the idea of Nature as an artist who created a painting i.e. the Fair Youth. The interpretation of paint as make-up is less clear, but because of 'eigenhandig' there still is an implied contrast between women and the Fair Youth. Nature made him herself and she did not get any external help, unlike others who do need external help and paint their faces in a different manner.

In the source text, line 3 and 4 describe the Fair Youth's heart and nature.

A woman's gentle heart, but not acquainted
With shifting change, as is false women's fashion,

This is expressed in lines 4 and 5 of the translation:

Een vrouwehart, dat nooit losbandig dwaalde
– als een, in valse wisseldrift bevangen –

In line 3 Shakespeare uses the word 'but' which expresses the contrast between the Fair Youth and women clearly. In the translation a distinction is created by the words 'nooit' and 'als'. The Fair Youth's heart has never wandered or strayed into 'losbandig' behaviour nor was he overcome by 'valse wisseldrift'. Like licentious, 'losbandig' can have the negative sexual connotation of looseness and low morality (Van Dale). Similar to Shakespeare, Van Emde Boas creates his own word by making a compound of the verb 'wisselen' and the noun 'drift'. The Fair Youth's feminine heart, unlike other hearts, is not overcome by a strong desire or urge for change. In the translation the comparison is more general than in the source text; it is less explicit that the Fair Youth is being compared to women.

In line 5 and 6 of the source text the eye of the Fair Youth is described and contrasted to women's. The Fair Youth's eyes are also indirectly compared to the sun by the use of the word 'gilding'.

An eye more bright than theirs, less false in rolling,

Gilding the object whereupon it gazeth,

In line 6 and 7 of the translation the comparison and contrast between the Fair Youth and women is the most clear.

Een oog, min vals, dat meer dan 't hare straalde,
Dat alles glans geeft, waar zijn blikken langen,

The addition of 'hare' makes it clear that the Fair Youth is being compared to women and not men, since it is a female possessive pronoun. In the translation the comparison between the sun and the Fair Youth's eyes is made earlier. 'Stralen' can mean to radiate or shine and is often used to describe a bright sun: 'een stralende zon'. The Fair Youth's eye gives a glow or glimmer to everything he looks at. This is expressed with the word 'glans' which does not necessarily convey the fact that it is a golden glow, but Van Emde Boas already made a connection to the sun by using 'stralen'.

In the last quatrain of the source text the persona explains that during the creation process Nature fell in love with the Fair Youth and turned him male:

And for a woman wert thou first created,
Till Nature as she wrought thee fell a-doting,
And by addition me of thee defeated,
By adding one thing to my purpose nothing.

Line 10 to 13 of the translation:

En tot een vrouw wart g'allereerst geschapen
Totdat Natuur, toen zij U schiep, verward werd
En tussen ons een afgrond heeft doen gapen
Daar een teveel dat mij niet past, Uw part werd.

In Van Emde Boas' translation he writes that Nature was confused during the creation and that is the reason the Fair Youth turned out male. Nature does not succumb to the same fate as the persona (falling in love with the Fair Youth); she was merely confused. Van Emde Boas' translation does not explain what caused this confusion. In her confusion Nature

opened an abyss between the persona and the Fair Youth by adding something to him that does not (be)fit the persona. The abyss creates an image of a great distance between the him and the Fair Youth. In the source text the relationship between the two is very close; in his translation Van Emde Boas creates an impassable distance between them. The disappointment expressed in the source text is not conveyed in the translation.

Line 8 and 9 are discussed individually in section 5.5.2 and the couplet and other homoerotic elements will be discussed in section 5.5.3

5.5.2 Line 8

Van Emde Boas made three different translations of line 7 (line 8 in the translations) (line 7 was discussed in 2.2.3.3).

A man in hue, all hues in his controlling

This is the only line that changes in *Keur uit Shakespeare's Sonnetten* and also has two different translations in the dissertation. The translation on page 36:

Toch: volop Man, waarnaast elk ander faalde

The translation on page 280:

Een malse tint, waarnaast elk ander faalde

The translation in *Keur uit Shakespeare's Sonnetten*:

Een vrouwetint, waarnaast elk ander faalde

The first translation on page 36 is based on the original text. In this translation the persona states that even though the Fair Youth is feminine, he is still a man. The line even stresses that he is very much a man by using 'volop'. The Fair Youth seems manlier in the translation than in the source text because of this. In the source text he only has a male form (even though he is very feminine he is still of the male gender), while in the first translation he is much more manly (even though he is feminine he is still very much a man).

In his dissertation Van Emde Boas discusses line 7 in more detail. He explains that some scholars, like Beeching and Pooler, think that 'a man in hue' was an editorial mistake and that the line should read 'a maiden hue' or 'a woman's hue' (279). Van Emde Boas thinks their arguments are strong (especially Beeching's 'a maiden hue') but decides to remain impartial in his translation: 'De vertaling wordt in dat geval opzettelijk wat indifferent gehouden' (279). Just like Burgersdijk he chooses the word 'mals' to describe the hue of the Fair Youth.

In *Keur uit Shakespeare's Sonnetten* Van Emde Boas explains the difference, in the notes on the first page: 'De tekst van deze vertalingen is gelijk aan die in mijn boek "Shakespeare's sonnetten en hun verband met de travesti-double spelen" met uitzondering van sonnet 20 (tweede versie) , waarin Pooler's emendatie voor de 8^e regel "a woman's hue" is overgenomen' (1). He explains that he used Pooler's correction to line 8 which changes 'a man in hue' to 'a woman's hue'. Charles Knox Pooler is a Shakespeare editor who published his edition of Shakespeare's sonnets, *The Works of Shakespeare: Sonnets*, in 1918. Pooler explains that he 'venture[s] to propose *woman's* for *man in*. This repetition seems to be justified by the emphasis, and to fill a gap in a series – "A woman's face... A woman's gentle heart... A woman's hue... And for a woman"' (24). Van Emde Boas does not explain why he prefers Pooler's version and not Beeching's. In his dissertation he does explain why he thinks 'a man in hue' is unlikely: 'regel 7 [is] ... niet alleen vanuit taalkundig oogpunt zeer duister, maar ook zuiver grammaticaal gezien op wel erg wonderlijke wijze ingelast in de opsomming van *lijdend voorwerpen* behorende bij het hulpwerkwoord "hast" in regel 2.'

In all of the translations the second part of the line is the same, but it has different effects because the first part is different. Van Emde Boas interpreted the second part of line 7 to mean that the Fair Youth's hue is superior to others. In the first translation he is

superior to other men, in the second translation he is superior to everyone else and in the final translation he is superior to women.

5.5.3 Homoerotic Elements

5.5.3.2 Master Mistress of my Passion

In line 2 of the source text the way the persona addresses The Fair Youth is subject to different interpretations (discussed in 2.2.3.1):

The master mistress of my passion

Van Emde Boas translated this to:

Prins-Prinsesse van mijn Liefdeszangen

‘Prins’ and ‘prinsesse’ like prince and princess are the Dutch words for royalty, specifically the children of the king and queen. In an older form ‘prinsesse’ was used to express that someone or something was most prominent or elevated above the rest (WNT 1β). Up until the 17th century it was also used similarly to the English ‘mistress’ to address women in literature (WNT 1γ). It seems that the interpretation Van Emde Boas wanted to emphasise is that the Fair Youth is a man addressed in the same way women are in sonnets. The fact that he also used the word ‘liefdeszangen’ supports this statement. ‘Zangen’ has a couple of different definitions retaining to music like ‘singing’ and ‘song’, but it can also be used figuratively for poetic art and poems (WNT 6). Van Emde Boas disambiguates the word passion by translating it with ‘liefdeszangen’; the Fair Youth is simply the subject of the poem and does not rouse any other kind of passion in the persona. It is not just a poem, however, it is a love poem. Van Emde Boas does acknowledge the love between the Fair Youth and the persona and writing a love poem to a man as if he were a woman is open to a homoerotic reading.

5.5.3.3 Puns

In Van Emde Boas' translation there are some indirect references to genitalia and sex. In line 13 Nature gave the Fair Youth something too much which does not 'past' the persona:

By adding one thing to my purpose nothing

In the translation:

Daar een teveel dat mij niet past, Uw part werd

The verb 'passen' can be used in many different manners, a few that fit the context will be discussed. In one of the possible interpretation 'passen' can be used as 'suit', 'match', 'befit' or 'belong' (Van Dale 2, 3, 4). The line would read that the Fair Youth has something too much which does not suit the persona. The persona does not match with or belong to a man but is better suited for women. Another possible meaning of the word is 'fit', in this way 'passen' is often used for clothes or to express whether an item fits into something (Van Dale 1). In this interpretation the line can become quite graphic. The addition does not fit the persona because it only fits the female reproductive organs and not his.

In line 13 Van Emde Boas also uses the word 'part'. 'Part' is not a direct pun but it does indirectly refer to the male sex organ. The Dutch word 'part' is etymologically related to the English word 'part'. In English 'part' is often used in the combination 'private parts' and in Dutch this link can also be made. Another word for 'part' is 'deel' and 'deel' is used in the combination 'edele delen' to denote genitalia. Van Emde Boas, however, does not use the word 'deel' (although it could replace 'part' and retain the eleven syllables in the line) which means there is no pun here. The words 'part' en 'deel', however, are so closely related to each other that it is very likely a Dutch reader does make the connection to 'deel' and subsequently to genitalia. 'Part en deel' is even a commonly used tautology. Nonetheless, it still remains that Van Emde Boas did not choose the more obvious pun 'deel' and puts less

emphasis on sexual puns in his translation than the source text, even though he was aware of them as he stated in his notes.

5.5.3.4 Couplet

Critics who deny a homoerotic reading of the sonnets often cite the couplet as evidence. In it the persona states that since the Fair Youth's is a man, he should please women but give his love to him.

But since she pricked thee out for women's pleasure,
Mine be thy love and thy love's use their treasure

Van Emde Boas translated this line with:

Maar nu z'U schiep tot lust der vrouwenshare
Zij mijn Uw min en 't zingenot het hare!

In *Keur uit Shakespeare's Sonnetten* these lines were printed in reversed order, most likely by accident. The translation stays very close to the source text. Van Emde Boas does not make a pun as the source text has with 'pricked', but repeats that the Fair Youth was created by Nature. The persona in the translations has the 'min' of the Fair Youth while women get his 'zingenot'. 'Min' as a noun can be used to describe many different types of love. It can be love between friends, between members of the opposite sex or, in the way Burgersdijk used it, physical love (Van Dale, 4). By using the word 'min' Van Emde Boas makes the love between the Fair Youth and the persona ambiguous. The end of the line, however, makes 'min' as physical love unlikely. This type of pleasure is already reserved for women. It would be illogical to say 'give me your physical love and them sexual pleasure' since it is the same thing.

5.6 Conclusion

Van Emde Boas was very much ahead of his time and a frontrunner in homo-emancipation. His personal interest in sexuality and his acceptance of different sexualities, however, does not become very clear from his translation. This is probably due to the fact that he saw Shakespeare as a heterosexual with homoerotic tendencies and not as a homosexual. His free sexual morality does become clear from the fact that in the couplet he is not afraid to be explicit. Van Emde Boas is friendlier about women than Shakespeare. The Fair Youth is superior to women but not as much as in the source text.

6. Van der Krogt's Translation

6.1 Introduction

Van der Krogt's translation of Shakespeare's sonnets were published in 1997. The translations are accompanied by a short preface with background information and Van der Krogt ends his work with eight rules he tried to follow while translating. In his publication Van der Krogt also provides the source text so his translation does not function as a substitute.

6.2 Biography

Arie van der Krogt (1952) is a songwriter and poet from the city of Rotterdam. He works as a civil servant for the city of Rotterdam in the department of urban development. Many of his songs are about the city of Rotterdam. Furthermore, he translates poetry. Not only did he translate all of Shakespeare's sonnets, he also translated sonnets by Christina Rossetti and other poems.

6.3 Translator's Notes

Van der Krogt starts his publication of Shakespeare's sonnets with a brief preface. In it he begins by explaining why he wanted to translate Shakespeare's work after so many others went before him. He feels he has something to add because he is not a literary scholar but a songwriter. Furthermore, he explains that he thinks many critics are afraid of the emotional power of the sonnets and focus too much on the (possibly) autobiographical components.

'Van belang is niet de identiteit van de hoofdfiguren, maar de intensiteit van de woorden'

(1). Van der Krogt does not seem very concerned about the possible homoeroticism of Shakespeare, as he explains in an interview with NRC:

Dat is in het begin van de Renaissance gewoon, dat je je liefde vooral projecteert op jonge jongens. Dat is bij Da Vinci zo, en ook bij Michelangelo. Er bestaan theorieën over de vraag: is hij wel of niet homoseksueel. Oscar Wilde

verklaart hem helemaal tot homoseksueel, dat komt hem weer goed uit. En die koningin Victoria-types ontkennen dat, en nemen dan sonnet 20: zie je wel, hij is geen homoseksueel, want de vriend moet eigenlijk een vrouw zijn. Ik denk dat het er in Shakespeare's tijd niet zoveel toe deed.

In the same interview, however, Van der Krogt does say that the persona is in love with the Fair Youth. So he did interpret the feelings the persona has for the Fair youth as more than friendship.

In general, Van der Krogt does not seem in favour of an autobiographical reading of the sonnets. When he talks about the sonnets he always refers to 'de dichter' (the poet) and not Shakespeare. He does not use this to excuse the content of the sonnets. In the interview he states that 'het leuke van Shakespeare is dat het zo inspirerend is, en dat iedereen een eigen interpretatie van zijn werk kan hebben. Dan moeten zedenmeesters niet zeggen dat dit of dat te ver gaat.' By saying that moralists should not judge some interpretations of the sonnets it becomes clear that he himself does not judge them.

6.4 Translation Norms

In his afterword, Van der Krogt explains to which standards he held his translation. He formulated eight rules which he tried to follow in his translation.

1. De sonnetvorm moet gehandhaafd blijven, met het gehanteerde metrum, bestaande uit regels van vijf normale jamben of de door Shakespeare gebruikte variaties daarop. Met andere woorden: de sonnetten moeten gezongen kunnen worden.
2. Het rijmschema wordt overgenomen, maar halfrijm is toegestaan.
3. De inhoud van de vertaling moet overeenkomen met de belangrijkste betekenis van het origineel. Andere betekenissen dienen waar mogelijk in de vertaling hun weerslag te krijgen.
4. Alliteraties, binnenrijmen, paradoxen, woordspelingen en taalgrappen vereisen een creatieve vertaling.
5. De vertaalde tekst moet gemakkelijk leesbaar zijn.
6. Shakespeare verdient een poëtische vertaling.
7. De emotionele kracht van het origineel moet voelbaar blijven.
8. De erotiek van de sonnetten mag niet worden afgezwakt. (80)

Rule 3, 7 and 8 are about the content of the sonnets. Van der Krogt wants to show the main meaning of the source text in his translation and when possible as many other interpretations. Furthermore, he wants his translation to have the same emotional power and not gloss over aspects that some have thought undesirable in the past. He does not want to weaken the eroticism of the sonnets, which proves that he does not find these elements of the sonnets objectionable.

The other five rules are about the style of the translation. Van der Krogt wants to translate the sonnets in the form of a sonnet and with the same metre and peculiarities Shakespeare put in them. He also wants the translation to be easily read and poetic, like a song text.

6.5 The Translation of Sonnet 20

Van der Krogt's translation of Sonnet 20 as found in *William Shakespeare Sonnetten*:

1. Natuur gaf jou een vrouwelijk gezicht,
2. Mijn Meester-Meesteres voor wie ik schrijf,
3. Een vrouwenhart ook, zacht, maar niet gericht
4. Op vals gedraai, waartoe een vrouw soms neigt.

5. Haar oog bedriegt, terwijl het jouwe blinkt;
6. Al wat het ziet, laat zich met goud verrijken;
7. Een man, die met zijn pracht haar pracht verdringt,
8. Waar mannen steeds en vrouwen stil naar kijken.

9. Je zou eerst als een vrouw worden geboren,
10. Maar de natuur beviel je en ze deed
11. Er nog iets bij: zo heb ik je verloren,
12. Want net dat 'iets' is niet aan mij besteed.

13. Zo pikte zij jou uit voor vrouwenpret;
14. Schenk mij jouw liefde, kruip met hen in bed.

6.5.1 General Analysis

Van der Krogt succeeded in making his translation easily readable. He uses modern and simple words and the structure of his sentences also gives no difficulties understanding what

is said. As a consequence, the text is also less complicated i.e. less layered. The top layer (first meaning) of the sonnet is clearly conveyed but some of the ambiguities have been eliminated. He presents the source text and his translation with white lines between the three quatrains and the couplet. By doing so, Van der Krogt creates four distinct units which stand on their own, while in the source text only the couplet stands out.

In the first quatrain, the source text describes the Fair Youth's face and heart and creates a contrast with women (which is continued in the second quatrain). Van der Krogt's translation only makes the comparison to women once. The first line of Van der Krogt's translation is less detailed than the source text:

A woman's face with Nature's own hand painted

In the translation:

Natuur gaf jou een vrouwelijk gezicht

The Fair Youth was given 'een vrouwelijk gezicht' by Nature. A feminine face creates a different image than 'a woman's face'. In the translation the Fair Youth has a face with feminine qualities while in the source text he has the face of a woman. This subtle difference makes it easier to think of this Fair Youth as a man. The metaphor of Nature as an artist who created the face is gone, instead the face was a gift. Furthermore, because much of the information of the source text is omitted, there is also no contrast made between the Fair Youth and women. He merely has the same type of face. In this line the Fair Youth is also addressed with 'jou' instead of the more archaic or polite 'gij' and 'u'. The persona does not seem to be a distant admirer but a personal friend (or lover). Line 2 of the translation is entirely devoted to the translation of 'master mistress of my passion' and will be discussed in section 6.5.2.1.

In line 3 and 4 the Fair Youth's heart and nature is described, by again comparing and contrasting him to women.

A woman's gentle heart, but not acquainted
With shifting change, as is false women's fashion

In the translation:

Een vrouwenhart ook, zacht, maar niet gericht
Op vals gedraai, waartoe een vrouw soms neigt.

Just like in the source text Van der Krogt's translation makes a strong contrast between the Fair Youth and women. He emphasises that the Fair Youth is like women by using the word 'ook'; not only does he have a feminine face he also has the heart of a woman. After stating what is similar between the Fair Youth and women he names the differences. Unlike women the Fair Youth's soft heart is not aiming for 'gedraai'. 'Gedraai' is used in a few different contexts; it is often used to describe changing of opinions many times (for politicians specifically) and it can be also be used for someone who beats about the bush and is not straightforward about what they think (Van Dale). In the translation it is not women who are false but the 'gedraai'. Van der Krogt also nuances these statements by saying women are only *sometimes* inclined towards this behaviour.

In the second quatrain, the Fair Youth's eye is described and the effect he has on men and women. In lines 5 and 6 he is indirectly compared to the sun and it is emphasised once more that he is better than women.

An eye more bright than theirs, less false in rolling
Gilding the object whereupon it gazeth

In the translation:

Haar oog bedriegt, terwijl het jouwe blinkt
Al wat het ziet, laat zich met goud verrijken

In line 5 Van der Krogt is not mild against women anymore. Women are not inconsistent or shifting, but their eyes 'bedriegen' (deceive, lie or cheat) while the Fair Youth's eye shines bright. In this line the translation focusses on what is different and not on the aspects in which the Fair Youth is similar to women but better. In the source text his eyes are *more* bright and *less* false while in the translation his eyes are bright while women's are deceitful. Furthermore, the Fair Youth's eye 'blinkt'. 'Blinken' is often said of gold. The Fair Youth's eyes 'verrijken' everything they see with gold. 'Verrijken' can mean to enrich, improve or add value (Van Dale). The imagery Van der Krogt uses is uncommon in Dutch. The Fair Youth's eyes are like gold and enrich what they see with gold as well. The idea of the Fair Youth's eyes being bright as the sun is not expressed.

In lines 7 and 8 the reader finds out that the Fair Youth is undoubtedly a man and the effect he has on men and women is described.

A man in hue all hues in his controlling,
Which steals men's eyes and women's souls amazeth

Van der Krogt makes the Fair Youth clearly superior to women. He even emphasises their superiority an extra time in line 7.

Een man, die met zijn pracht haar pracht verdringt,
Waar mannen steels en vrouwen stil naar kijken.

The interpretation of line 7 Van der Krogt uses, is the first interpretation mentioned in section 2.2.3.3: 'Challenging or overpowering (by his perfect grace/form) all other graces/forms' (Blakemore Evans 133). It is in the translation, however, not all other beauties the Fair Youth is superior to, but only female beauty. In line 8 uses the similar 'steels' and 'stil' for assonance. The effect the Fair Youth has on women and men is almost the same, or at least on the same level: the eyes. In the source text, he amazes women's souls while men merely look, in the translation both men and women look.

Men look at him secretly and women turn quiet by his beauty. By making men look secretly the image is created that, even though they do not want to admit it, even men are intrigued by the Fair Youth's beauty.

How the Fair Youth ended up as a man and not a woman is explained in the couplet. Nature fell in love with her creation and she had the power to make the object of her desire into the right sex. This change disappointed the persona because now he cannot be with the Fair Youth in the way he wants to.

And for a woman wert thou first created,
Till Nature as she wrought thee fell a-doting,
And by addition me of thee defeated,
By adding one thing to my purpose nothing.

The translation:

Je zou eerst als een vrouw worden geboren,
Maar de natuur beviel je en ze deed
Er nog iets bij: zo heb ik je verloren,
Want net dat 'iets' is niet aan mij besteed.

In Van der Krogt's translation Nature is not confused, but she is not in love either. The Fair Youth merely 'beviel' her, an emotion less strong than love. Van der Krogt makes a pun with 'bevallen' which can mean both give birth and be content with/like (Van Dale). Nature gave birth to the Fair Youth and then added something and she also liked the Fair Youth which is the reason she added something. This addition, however, is 'niet besteed aan' the persona. In Dutch this is commonly said about things someone does not appreciate. The persona lost the Fair Youth because the thing that makes the Fair Youth male is wasted on him. The Fair Youth would not have been lost if he had remained a woman, then he could have had a relationship with the persona. The disappointment expressed in the final quatrain of the translation is comparable to what is expressed in the source text.

6.5.2 Homoerotic Elements

6.5.2.1 *Master Mistress of my Passion*

In line 2 of the source text the Fair Youth is called:

The master-mistress of my passion

Van der Krogt translated this to:

Mijn Meester-Meesteres voor wie ik schrijf

Van der Krogt translates 'master mistress' with the etymologically very closely related 'meester-meesteres'. The possible meanings of 'meesteres' in Dutch make it likely that Van der Krogt used 'meester' to denote the male version of a 'meesteres' and does not use it as teacher, boss or leader in a certain field (Van Dale). 'Meesteres' can also mean teacher, but the most likely interpretation of the word in this context is beloved (Van Dale 4). The Fair Youth is addressed as a male mistress. Van der Krogt translates 'passion' with 'voor wie ik schrijf', i.e. the Fair Youth is the one the persona is writing the sonnet for. It seems that Van der Krogt interpreted 'passion' to mean 'sonnet' and not 'amorous desire'. The use of the word 'meesteres', however, still gives the line some homoeroticism.

6.5.2.2 *Puns*

Van der Krogt indirectly refers to male genitalia three times, only one time less than Shakespeare (as was discussed in section 2.2.3.4). The first time in line 11 by stating that the Fair Youth got 'er nog iets bij'. 'iets' remains vague and what that something is not mentioned, but the context makes it clear that he is referring to the thing men have which distinguished them from women. In line 12 the addition is emphasised once more and referred to as 'iets' again. This time Van der Krogt adds quotation marks to put extra emphasis on the word. The quotation marks also make it clear that 'iets' refers to something

one cannot mention directly. Without actually saying the word 'penis', Van der Krogt makes it very clear that that is the organ which stands in the way of a relationship between the Fair Youth and the persona.

The third pun Van der Krogt makes is more explicit. In line 13 he preserved the pun on male genitalia that Shakespeare made with 'pricked'. He translates 'pricked' with 'pikte'. The verb 'pikken' can mean many different things but here it is most likely used as pick, choose or take (Van Dale). As a noun, however, 'pik' is slang for 'penis' just like 'prick'. Van der Krogt uses the pun to say that Nature chose the Fair Youth for women's pleasure and she did so by giving him a 'pik'. By using these puns he stays very close to the source text and makes the persona mention the Fair Youth's genitalia three times. Van der Krogt does what he said in rule 8; he does not try to hide the eroticism by keeping the sexual puns.

6.5.2.3 Couplet

In the couplet the persona expresses that since the Fair Youth is made for the pleasure of women, he will settle for his love while he can consummate this love with women.

But since she pricked thee out for women's pleasure,
Mine be thy love and thy love's use their treasure.

In the translation:

Zo pikte zij jou uit voor vrouwenpret;
Schenk mij jouw liefde, kruip met hen in bed.

The translation of the source text is very close to the source text. The first word of the translation, however, shifts the tone of the couplet. In the source text the usage of the word 'but' expresses that if things were different the persona could use his treasure, but since he is a man he will be pleasurable to women and not to him. There is only one thing standing in the way of the relationship with the Fair Youth: his gender. In the translation the word 'zo' does not express how the relationship would be if the Fair Youth was a woman.

In the last line of the couplet, 'kruip met hen in bed' is more explicit than 'use their treasure'. What exactly is meant by 'treasure' is not entirely clear although one can guess. 'In bed kruipen' is a commonly used expression in Dutch for sleeping with someone (Van Dale). The Fair Youth should give his love to the persona and have fun in bed with women.

6.6 Conclusion

Van der Krogt's translation stays close to the source text. His translation is modern and easily readable, which was his aim. He believed that love was often aimed at young men in Shakespeare's time and that this was not an issue. It is also not an issue for him. Van der Krogt does not try to cover up (homo)eroticism in his translation which he also mentions in his commentary. In Van der Krogt's time homosexuality and sexuality in general was accepted in the Netherlands and this is also the case in his translation.

Conclusion

To conclude, this thesis set out to answer the question what the different Dutch translators of Shakespeare's sonnets did with the (alleged) homoerotic dimension of the texts in their translations and if that represented the ideas about homosexuality of their time. Specifically, this thesis analysed three translations, from three different eras, of Sonnet 20, because this sonnet is in the centre of the debate around a homoerotic reading of Shakespeare's work. It tried to answer this question by giving the historical context in which the translations were produced, analysing what the translators wrote about their work themselves and analysing the translations in general and three homoerotic elements specifically.

In general, all three translations showed signs of the times they were created in. In his commentary Burgersdijk bent over backwards to excuse Shakespeare's work. He clearly did not approve of homosexuality, as was the standard in his time. In his first translation Burgersdijk eliminated all direct or indirect references to sex while in his later work he became a bit more lenient. He still judged Shakespeare's choices but he also thinks that without them his work would not have been so brilliant. This change becomes most clear in the translation of the couplet where he first uses kissing but later is not afraid to mention love making. Furthermore, he calls Nature's homoerotic love for her creation a confusion and does not emphasise the superiority of the Fair Youth to women.

Van Emde Boas differed the most from the mind-set of his time. He was a frontrunner in homo-emancipation and sexual education in general. During his life, however, the ideas about homosexuality were slowly changing. Van Emde Boas approached the text from a different angle than the other two. His dissertation was a psychological analysis of Shakespeare's work and the translations were probably made to facilitate the readers

understanding of the texts. Even though he did not judge homosexuality, he did not think Shakespeare was a homosexual which his translation shows. Van Emde Boas' translation does not actively eliminate a homoerotic reading, but he does not focus on it either, e.g. the emphasis is less on the addition (of a penis) given to the Fair Youth.

Van der Krogt's translation is the closest to the source text in certain aspects; where the other two sometimes change the order of the lines or imagery used, Van der Krogt does not deviate as much. In his time homosexuality was commonly accepted in the Netherlands which might explain his faithfulness to the text. In his commentary he even states that he wants to keep the eroticism in his translations. He is also the one who maintained the most sexual puns in his translation and is the most explicit.

When working on Shakespeare it is easy to drown in the amount of (re)sources available. It has been the aim to be as relevant as possible and leave out unimportant details, but it can easily have happened that important issues were merely glossed over while others have gotten too much attention. The same is true for the analysis of the translations. The analysis was focussed on homoerotic elements, but sometimes also strayed from the path by discussing (maybe too many) other interesting details.

Unfortunately, given the timeframe and scope of this thesis, it was not possible to analyse more translations. For further research it can be recommended to look at all the Dutch translations of Sonnet 20. Specifically translations that were written in response to other translations are interesting. For instance, Verwey (1933) who made a translation in response to Decroos (1930) and Messelaar (1958) en Van Elden (1959) who are from the same time as Van Emde Boas but produced very different translations. It would also be interesting to look for homoerotic elements in other sonnets of Shakespeare or even in his complete works.

Works Cited

- Booth, Stephen. 1977. *Shakespeare's Sonnets*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- COC. 'Over ons'. <http://www.coc.nl/over-ons> (25-06-2014).
- De Geïntegreerde Taalbank. 'Woordenboek der Nederlandsche taal'. <http://gtb.inl.nl> (25-06-2014).
- De Grazia, Margreta. 1991. "The Scandal of Shakespeare's Sonnets". Ed. James Schiffer. *Shakespeare's Sonnets: Critical Essays*. London: Routledge. 90-112.
- Hekma, Gert. 1982. "Profeten op papier, pioniers op pad". *Spiegel Historiael* 17:10. 566-571.
- Hekma, Gert. 2004. *Homoseksualiteit in Nederland van 1730 tot de moderne tijd*. Amsterdam: Meulenhoff.
- Kennedy, William. 2011. "European beginning and transmission: Dante, Petrarch and the sonnet sequence". Ed. Cousins, A., Howarth, P., *The Cambridge Companion to the Sonnet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 84-104.
- Lefevere, André. 1975. *Translating Poetry: Seven Strategies and a Blueprint*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Matz, Robert. 2010. "The Scandals of Shakespeare's Sonnets". *ELH* 77:2. 477-508.
- Meijer, Martijn. 'Sonetten: Liedjes voor Marco Borsato'.
<http://retro.nrc.nl/W2/Lab/Profiel/Shakespeare/sonnetten.html> (25-06-2014).
- Oosterhuis, Harry. 1992. *De smalle marges van de Roomse moraal*. Amsterdam: Universiteit van Amsterdam.
- Oxford English Dictionary. <http://www.oed.com> (25-06-2014).
- Pequigney, Joseph. 1985. *Such Is My Love: A Study of Shakespeare's Sonnets*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Polak, Johan. 1989. *Goed verkeerd*. Ed. Hekma, G., Kraakman, D., van Lieshout, M., Radersma, J. Amsterdam: Meulenhoff.
- Pym, Anthony. 1998. *Method in translation history*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Salden, M. J. M. 1982. "Van doodstraf tot straffeloosheid". *Spiegel Historiae* 17:10. 559-565.
- Schoenfeldt, Michael. 2007. *A Companion to Shakespeare's Sonnets*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Schoneveld, Cornelis. 1996. *Sea-changes: Studies in Three Centuries of Anglo-Dutch Cultural Transmission*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- "Shakespeare's Sonnetten en de travesti-double spelen". *Levensrecht*. 1947:13. 1-3.
- Shakespeare, William. 1790. *The Plays and Poems of William Shakespeare*. Ed. Malone, Edward. London.
- Shakespeare, William. 1879. *Shakspeare's sonnetten*. Trans. Burgersdijk, Leendert. Utrecht: Beijers.
- Shakespeare, William. 1888. *De werken van William Shakespeare*. Trans. Leendert Burgersdijk. Utrecht: Spectrum.
- Shakespeare, William. 1918. *The Works of Shakespeare: Sonnets*. Ed. Pooler, Charles. London: Methuen."
- Shakespeare, William. 1996. *The New Cambridge Shakespeare: The Sonnets*. Ed. Evans, Blakemore. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shakespeare, William. 1997. *Sonnetten*. Trans. Van der Krogt, Arie. Rotterdam: Donker.
- Smith, Bruce. 1991. *Homosexual Desire in Shakespeare's England*. Chicago: The University of Chigaco Press.
- Spiller, Michael. 1992. *The Development of the Sonnet*. London: Routledge.

- Tyler, Meg. 2011. "Contemporary poets and the sonnet". Ed. Cousins, A., Howarth, P., *The Cambridge Companion to the Sonnet*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 6-24.
- Van Dale. <http://www.vandale.nl> (25-06-2014).
- Van Emde Boas, Coenraad. 1951. *Keur uit Shakespeare's sonnetten*. Amsterdam: Wereldbibliotheek.
- Van Emde Boas, Coenraad. 1951. *Shakespeare's sonnetten en hun verband met de travesti-double spelen*. Amsterdam: Wereldbibliotheek.
- Van Emde Boas, Walter. 2002. *Coen van Emde Boas: zenuwarts, seksuoloog en verzamelaar van boeken*. Amsterdam: Universiteitsbibliotheek.
- Vendler, Helen. 1997. *The Art of Shakespeare's Sonnets*. Harvard University Press.
- Wells, Stanley. 2004. *Looking for Sex in Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix

The German translation of Sonnet 20 made by Bodenstedt:

55.

Du hast ein Fraungesicht, das die Natur
Dir selbst gemalt, Herr·Herrin meiner Liebe! ¹⁹
Ein mildes Frauenherz, doch ohne Spur
Von weibisch·laun'schem Wechsel seiner Triebe.
Ein hellres Aug' und minder falsch im Rollen,
Den Gegenstand vergoldend drauf es scheint.
Und Mann und Frau muß Dir Bewundrung zollen,
Der Beider Macht und Zauber in sich eint.
Zum Weib warst Du zuerst bestimmt, doch machte
Dann die Natur, selbst ganz verliebt in Dich,
Den Zusatz, der mein Hoffen um Dich brachte,
Dir Gaben leihend, nutzlos ganz für mich.
Da sie Dich schmückte für der Frauen Liebe:
Weiß' mir Dein Herz und ihnen Deine Triebe.

Shakespeare, William. 1866. *Sonette in Deutscher Nachbildung von Friedrich Bodenstedt*.

Berlin: Geh. OberHofbuchdrucker.