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Abstract
A prayer, or an appeal to the audiences? Speech acts and genres theory employed in analysis of translatological series (based on Polish equivalents of the Epilogue of William Shakespeare’s The Tempest)

Comparison of eight Polish translations of the final segment of the Epilogue in William Shakespeare’s The Tempest reveals an essential diversification in the contents of these translated versions. The differences appear in the identity of Prospero and in the discursive structure of his monologue. This article attempts to describe this diversification with the use of the categories of acts and genres of speech, since it is these that form the ‘construction material’ of utterances, including literary texts, creating diverse configurations in them. These categories of description, enabling insight into compositional actions done on simple forms of discourse, elevates the analysis of translation practices and consideration of the issue of equivalence of translation to a higher level of text organisation.
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Scholars analysing the content of Shakespeare’s The Tempest and the circumstances in which this play was written tend to emphasise its unique importance in the output of the English playwright of genius. A fruit of his very late years, the work is, in the general

\textsuperscript{1} I have used herein excerpts (modified and adapted) from my study: Teresa Dobrzyńska, “Wyznanie i prośba Prospera w epilogu Burzy (porównanie wersji oryginalnej z polskimi przekładami dramatu Szekspira)”, in, O języku dla Anny Wierzbickiej, ed. Jolanta Chojak, Zofia Zaron (Warszawa: Wydział Polonistyki UW, 2018), 77–98.
opinion of Shakespeare scholars, a summary of his intellectual and artistic experiences\(^2\); Prospero, the central protagonist, can be viewed as the author’s spokesman\(^3\), which is best visible in the concluding Epilogue. Its final lines are:

```
"EPilogue
Spoken by Prospero
(…)
But release me from my bands
With the help of your good hands:
Gentle breath of yours my sails
Must fill, or else my project fails,
Which was to please. Now I want
Spirits to enforce, Art to enchant;
And my ending is despair,
Unless I be reliev’d by prayer,
Which pierces so, that it assaults
Mercy itself, and frees all fault.
   As you from crimes would pardon’d be,
   Let your indulgences set me free”\(^4\).
```

The shape of this section is different to the preceding scenes which show the course of events. It differs from the characters’ dialogues not only in its monologue form but also in the exponent’s less obvious status. Although it is Prospero, the main character, who is speaking, his utterance expresses thoughts potentially attributable to the actor playing the part of Prospero or even to the author himself. In particular, the closing words of the Epilogue may seem to be an indirect statement by Shakespeare, represented for the purpose by the character he has created.

The ambiguity of the figure of Prospero in the Epilogue\(^5\) means that interpreters of the play, stage arrangers/producers and directors, as well as translators, have to take a specific position regarding several questions. Are the final lines of The Tempest merely

---

\(^2\) This conviction is reflected in, inter alia, the opinion of Róża Jabłkowska: evaluating the role of The Tempest and several late works of Shakespeare (written before The Tempest), she called them “an excellent epilogue of his creative and assiduous life”; see Róża Jabłkowska, “Wstęp”, in: William Szekspir [W. Shakespeare], Dzieła dramatyczne, vol. I: Komedia, trans. Stanisław Koźmiian and Leon Ulrich, ed. Stanisław Helszyński, Róża Jabłkowska, Anna Staniewska (Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy, 1964), 54.


\(^5\) Let us pay attention to the particular concept of the relationship between the person(a) and his utterance suggested by the rubrik ‘EPilogue. Spoken by Prospero’: otherwise, it might have been announced as ‘Prospero’s final speech’. In the latter case, the stage direction would have simply announced an utterance by the character situated in the play’s represented world. Yet, as programmed by Shakespeare, the character’s status is less obvious, leaving an opportunity to ascribe diverse roles to the individual speaking.
a farewell from the expelled Duke of Milan (one of the personae dramatis) to the island he had once arrived at resulting from certain dramatic events and which he had ruled for a number of years? Or is it perhaps the actor parting the world of fiction he has (co-)created in the theatre and addressing the audience, requesting them to approach his artistic achievements favourably? Or, rather, is it not the author himself – the one who creates, or brings to life, the reality represented on stage and who controls the development of the plot, now hiding under the mask of Prospero and wearing his stage costume – who is taking leave, through the words of the Epilogue, of his theatrical activities and the world, departing as someone who is anticipating the ever nearer end of his life and, as a writer, feels that his creative activity is coming to an end as well? It is worthwhile, therefore, to take a closer look at the original version’s discursive structure in order to see how these accumulated meanings have been reflected in Polish translations of the play.

As is known, translation of any text (and this statement is absolutely true for literary works) is a function of its interpretation; the latter, in turn, is dependent upon a number of factors, linguistic and non-linguistic, among them being the translators ideological assumptions. Critical in this respect, moreover, are the convictions or beliefs with respect to the tasks and purposes of interpretation, and the limits of freedom of reception or decoding. The outcome of a translation is not exclusively based on the translator’s excellent command of the language of the original and the target language, plus the situational realities the utterance refers to. Of critical importance is the appropriate reading of coherence associations in the text, recognition of the text’s genre and the conventionalised roles of sender(s)/producer(s) and recipient(s)/addressee(s) conjugated with it. The outcome is primarily conditional upon recognition, or arbitrary determination, of more general communication conditions determining the utterance’s purpose and linguistic form. In translations of artistic texts, these premises justify the discrepancies – sometimes astonishingly remarkable – of its individual translated versions. These discrepancies appear in spite of the translators’ endeavours to maintain a bond with the original and their endeavour to remain within the limits of a translation, rather than vague paraphrase.

---

6 Diverse receptive attitudes, ranging from a most attentive, if not full of the utmost care, reading of the intentio operis, to ‘making a free use’ of the text, were expressed by the speakers at a debate on the principles of reception of text, as published in Umberto Eco, Richard Rorty, Jonathan Culler, Christine Brook-Rose, Interpretation and Overinterpretation (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) 1992.

Works of outstanding quality usually provoke multiple translation attempts, which leads to the emergence of ‘translatological series’ oscillating between the ideal of faithfulness to the original (its maximally close rendering) and the need to take into account the current requirements of the target culture. If more and more texts join the series, the high status of the (re)translated work becomes (re)confirmed, whereas comparison of the different translated versions composing the series provides insight into the translation techniques used by the translators; they are taking part, as it were, in a process of peculiar rivalry. To quote a translation theorist,

“Translating verse, and literature in general, is not merely a means of transmitting the text’s meanings to those not knowing the other language. This activity is, and has always been, a noble rivalry that aims at achieving the best result possible and creating a perfect new text in a different language.”

A translatological series provides particularly beneficial conditions for observing interpretive discrepancies and various decisions made by the translators. Postmodernist currents in literary sciences now avoid approaching such instances in terms of the ‘unfaithfulness’ of translated versions and accept the translator’s footprints – his/her presence as the interpreter and subject intermediating in the communication (if not, to an extent, a separate creator of utterance) – as an obvious thing. Thereby, the translator

“… does not pretend anymore that s/he has left in the work being translated no trace whatsoever of his/her own system of ideological and aesthetic values, having never saturated the text with his/her own experience or knowledge, or marked it with norms of culture and rules and language s/he represents.

The literary translator becomes a co-author of the text being translated even when following the laudable humility-laden respect for the original work and its author. All the more so when s/he (validly and reasonably) considers translation as identical with creation, which thus positions him/her on an equal plane to the author. While the conception of translator as co-author, or the ‘other author’, understandably meets resistance, it is certainly the translator who gives a work the final shape through translation. Rather than transmitting or rewrapping the text, the translator re-shapes or re-models it, giving it a form, just like the author.”

The numerous Polish translations of Shakespeare’s The Tempest are one example of translatological series. Let us take a closer look at the composition of the final fragment of its Epilogue, the equivalents, as proposed by the respective translators,

---

of the final six-line segment of the original text. The translated versions discussed below include those by (in order of appearance) Józef Paszkowski\(^{11}\), Leon Ulrich\(^{12}\), Zofia Siwicka\(^{13}\), Władysław Tarnowski\(^{14}\), Jerzy S. Sito\(^{15}\), Maciej Słomczyński\(^{16}\), Stanisław Barańczak\(^{17}\), and Piotr Kamiński\(^{18}\). The first two were done in the second half of the nineteenth century (Paszkowski’s and Ulrich’s versions appeared in print in 1861 and 1895, respectively), both being still highly valued, republished by editors and used for stage purposes. The later translations have appeared since the middle of the twentieth century. The fragments I have selected for the present analysis are included in the Annex.

As one can note, the translations of the final fragment of the Epilogue appear quite diverse in terms of composition and content of the consecutive sentences or phrases, unsurprisingly, particularly for a text whose argument is condensed and rather convoluted, and a text which is in verse. A translation opens different possibilities to match words and meanings; transferring a complicated meaning-imbued construction such as a theatrical play-text into a different linguistic space and into the area of a different cultural tradition is a complex semiotic operation, inevitably yielding gains and losses, and one that calls for considerate recognition, and for taking account, of the multiple determinants of the piece’s structure. For pieces in verse, translating also means the need to choose an adequate verse form, which requires recognition of the semantic function of the individual metric forms in the given literature. Even the aptest selection of the meter, measure or cadence implies inevitable modifications to the content of the text being translated. I do recognise the role of these parameters, seeing them as the factors that inform the diverse shaping of the Polish translations of The Tempest under discussion, as well as a certain content-related diversity from the original; yet these considerations will be now put aside. My present analysis focuses on the use of illocutionary acts and genres

---

\(^{11}\) William Szekspir [William Shakespeare], Burza. Komedija w pięciu aktach, transl. Józef Paszkowski, ed. Andrzej Tretiak (Kraków: Krakowska Spółka Wydawnicza [1921]) (the translation was made in 1861).


of speech. For language-related reasons, I will only provide an indicative summary of the results; for a minute discussion of the discursive structure of the final lines of the Epilogue as rendered in several Polish translations, I refer you to one of my earlier-published studies (in Polish).

When analysed for its discursive form, the final, six-line segment of the Epilogue realises, in the original, two communicative intentions and two model genre structures of utterance: CONFESSION and REQUEST. Anna Wierzbicka has proposed an explanation of the illocutionary act of REQUEST, depicting it as a collection of simple mental acts recorded in the meta-language of elementary semantic units she has adopted:

“REQUEST
I want you to do something good for me (X)
I am telling you this for I want you to do it
I don’t know whether you will do it because I know you don’t have to do what I want you to do”.

Clearly, REQUEST is an act of communication that reveals the social dimension of speech and confirms our dependence on others, being one of the verbal means enabling an individual’s action with help from other people, or various other beings, whom the requesting individual has addressed (in less typical cases, a personification of an abstract notion, or an anthropomorphised animal, can be targeted by the requester). When God is addressed, the act of REQUEST turns into one of PRAYER (of petition; a bidding one)? The nearness of these two acts means that insistent requests, founded on the assumption of the addressee’s responsive and supporting attitude and belief in his or her positive response, are at times metaphorically described as ‘praying’.

In an earlier study Wierzbicka defined the act of confession quite similarly: ‘I confess that p’ – with the following components to it, being simple mental acts:

“CONFESSION (I confess that p)
I say p (of myself)
I think you understand that I could desire that you not be aware that p”.

---


20 See: Dobrzyńska, Wyznanie i prośba Prospera w epilogu Burzy (porównanie wersji oryginalnej z polskimi przekładami dramatu Szekspira)“.

21 Wierzbicka, Genny mowy, 129.

In describing this act of speech in a broader context of conventionalised discursive behaviours, one may add that CONFESSION is an act of talking to somebody – but one which is not limited to conveying (a piece of) information, which makes this act different from ANNOUNCEMENT. In the case of CONFESSION, the (piece of) information being conveyed concerns and refers to the speaker, and is probably not known to any other people (possibly being the speaker’s secret); for these reasons, CONFESSION is close to CONFIDENCE (unbosoming oneself) – and to CONFESSION in the religious sense, where the penitent’s sins are confessed, the very act having a sacramental character, as a form of spiritual purification. CONFESSION is a voluntary act which may concern and refer to different things known to the speaker, and thus is not identical with ADMISSION, for in such a case the utterance would imply revealing something evil the speaker has done or committed (such as his/her misdemeanour, offence or crime); moreover, such an utterance might have been coerced. Furthermore, CONFESSION is targeted at a chosen individual who is treated as a confidant, which makes it different from the other public forms of notifying of somebody’s position or stance in respect of an issue, such as a STATEMENT or DECLARATION.

As we have already noticed, the two illocutionary acts in question and their corresponding acts of speech – that is, CONFESSION and REQUEST – fill the last segment of Prospero’s monologue (in The Tempest’s original version). Let us now take a look at how, in respect of realisation of these speech structures, the final lines of the play have been (re)shaped in Polish translations. My special focus will be on the ways in which the REQUEST/PRAYER opposition has been approached (possibly with its metaphorical equivalent of offering ‘prayers’ or ‘devotions’ to somebody as an entreaty).

*  

A detailed analysis of the eight translations of the final lines of the Epilogue makes it apparent that those by Paszkowski, Ulrich, Siwicka, and Kamiński exactly render the discursive structure of the original Prospero monologue - that is to say, the sequence of CONFESSION + REQUEST follows the original sequence. Other translators have made some modifications, though – such as removing the act of CONFESSION (as in Barańczak) or replacing the final REQUEST by an IMPERATIVE (Tarnowski), ANNOUNCEMENT of the expectations (Sito), or FORECAST (or denouncement) working as indirect APPEAL (Słomczyński). Słomczyński excels at making use of playing with indirect acts of speech based on implicatures; for instance, his translation has a rhetorical QUESTION which in fact is an indirect, and desperate, REQUEST to be released from the island. Ulrich, Słomczyński, Barańczak, and Kamiński add components not appearing in Shakespeare, such as a MAXIM or DICTUM, as an argument justifying the final REQUEST or APPEAL.

Reading the Barańczak version carefully, we notice that he completely ignores the PRAYER appearing in this segment (understood literally or metaphorically, as an equivalent of prayer). His translation tells us that response from “dusz wrażliwych, których litość / Rozgrzesza błąd i pospolitość [‘sensitive souls whose pity absolves error and commonness’]” is capable of rescuing one from despair. The absolution is not sacral here: it is tantamount to forgiveness or remission (of misconduct or errors), whereas the absolution or remission of sins consists (astonishingly enough) in giving applause. Słomczyński uses a similar rhetorical device: in his version, absolution boils down to the favourable response of the theatrical audience who are expected to award the actor (or the author) with applause.

The superseding of PRAYER in the translations of Słomczyński and Barańczak is a significant departure from the original, which is probably based on a belief that the prayer motif was a conventional element of the decorum in the playwright’s time, a motif that ought to be revised in our time. It is worth reminding ourselves in this context, however, that the great Shakespearean director Peter Brook has been an ardent advocate of a religious reading of the Epilogue. In his interpretation of this passage, Brook highlights the particular way in which Shakespeare depicts the spiritual power of prayer. Only a zealous prayer, piercing with the power of its verbs and genuine faith, can bring relief and is able to release Divine mercy; without such support, people are at the mercy of despair as their life nears the end. Brook believes that understanding Prospero’s last words as Shakespeare’s own reflection on prayer adds existential depth to the scene and means that Prospero becomes the author’s alter ego.

In the versions by Słomczyński and Barańczak, the Epilogue’s final passage emphasises the theatricality of the situation, which further implies that the despair Prospero referred to before expresses the artist’s desperation, or perhaps merely echoes the rhetorical figure of captatio benevolentiae – fishing for the audience’s benevolence, rather than determining the actual feeling or sentiments of an old man summing up his life. This desacralisation and enhancement of the theatrical perspective, in parallel to existential references smoothed out, form an essential trait of their translations.

The act of PRAYER appears in all the other examples; yet the translators render this act as a prayer said by Prospero himself (Tarnowski), the audience’s prayer for the intention of Prospero Sito and Słomczyński), or, prayer as such (Paszkowski, Ulrich, Siwicka, and Kamiński). It is a PRAYER addressed to God, or one that is intended to move merciful people; possibly, it is addressed to pity itself, which is an attribute of Divine mercy (such an understanding comes to one’s mind when looking at Paszkowski and Siwicka). A Christian comprehension of PRAYER most explicitly stands out in the Tarnowski version.

Analysing the role of prayer, let us note that Tarnowski writes “prayers take all the demerits away” and “full absolution”; before then, in Paszkowski, the motif of “remission

---

of crimes” was interrelated with the act of setting free. The idea was subsequently taken up by Siwicka and, finally, Kamiński. The religious sense of remission of sins is taken into account by Sito and Kamiński, whereas absolution through prayer – with a metaphorical ‘absolution’ expressed by applause – appears in Słomczyński. An ‘absolution through applause’, as the Epilogue’s punch-line goes in Słomczyński’s version, was taken over by Barańczak. In his rendering, though, the absolution requested by Prospero is exclusively metaphorical and means forgiving infringements or malpractices, the appeal for such forgiveness being targeted at sensitive people. This happens without the intervention of prayer; for the actor or playwright, the applause comes as confirmation of forgiveness, which also means acceptance.

As we can see, the applause motif appearing at the Epilogue’s end can be found in the translations of Słomczyński and Barańczak, anticipating, as it were, the applause given by the audience at the end of the play’s production. Interestingly, the motif is a product of the Polish translator’s invention, and is based on the suggestion hidden in Prospero’s REQUEST: “But release me from my bands / With the help of your good hands”.

The translation of Barańczak, which excels against the others with its stylistic adroitness and cohesive structure of utterances – while, however, heavily modifying the crucial meanings of the original – does not reflect the final APPEAL or REQUEST for restoring freedom. This is the case also with the renderings by Ulrich, Tarnowski, and Słomczyński: none of them finds an equivalent for the “set me free” phrase, which Peter Brook finds so delightful. Brook goes as far as supposing that these might have been the very last words Shakespeare uttered as an author.25

The analysis I have proposed has shown the potential usefulness of categories such as acts and genres of speech in the evaluation of translation techniques and estimation of the adequacy of translations in terms of use of elementary speech structures. Taking into consideration the comparisons of the translated versions under discussion, one can try to evaluate these Polish translations of The Tempest in terms of rendering the arrangement and content of Prospero’s CONFESSION and his final REQUEST. Expressing the lust for freedom in the original, the content of the REQUEST is trivial in some of the translations: Barańczak’s Prospero seeks applause, Słomczyński’s – quite similarly – speaks of absolution through applause.

It appears that the criteria of faithfulness to the discursive structure of the original and the genre forms appearing in it have not been met by Barańczak’s stylistically accurate version. This eminent translator, nevertheless, once indicated the necessity for the meticulous observance and rendering of the original’s key features which form its ‘semantic dominant’26. Apparently, in this particular case, he considered it more legitimate

25 Brook, Wolność i łaska. Rozważania o Szekspirze, 79.
26 See: Stanisław Barańczak, Ocalone w tłumaczeniu (Kraków: Wydawnictwo a5, 2004).
to highlight the last words spoken on the stage as those uttered by the actor communicating with the audience. In contrast, if we respect the argument proposed by Brook, the Polish translations of Paszkowski and Siwicka better render the meanings he suggests. Siwicka’s translation, moreover, includes the motif of storming? pity through prayer, thus accurately rendering the original depiction. The piercing confession reading “I rozpacz jeno została mi w końcu [Despair is what I’m finally left with]” offers a potential for applying different interpretations of the ‘ending’, corresponding to the polyphonic structure of the character of Prospero in the play’s Epilogue.

ANNEX

I. Epilogue transl. by Józef Paszkowski:

(…)

“Zerwałem z duchów lotną rzeszą,
Czary na pomoc mi nie spieszą, –
Więc przyjdzie trawić czas w rozpaczy,
Chyba mnie litość zbawić raczy,
Gdy ją modlitwa wzruszy szczera,
która najgrubsze błędy ściera. –
Chcąc odpuszczone mieć swe zbrodnie,
Przebaczcie, puścić mnie swobodnie!”
(Szekspir, Burza, 175)

II. Epilogue trans. Leon Ulrich:

(…)

“Na moje czary każdy z was jest głuchy
I rozpacz tylko czeka na mnie wszędzie,
Jeśli modlitwa w pomoc nie przybędzie:
Modlitwa bramy litości otwiera
I błędów dawnych pamiętać zaciara,
Jak sami chcecie grzechów odpuszczenia,
Tak mi przebaczenie moje przewinienia”.
(Szekspir, Burza, 238)

III. Epilogue trans. Zofia Siwicka:

(…)

“Chciałem was bawić. Teraz się wyzbywam
Zaklętych duchów, z czarów sztuką zrywam,
I rozpacz jeno została mi w końcu.
Chyba że modły będąym obrońcą,
Co szturm przypuszczę do samej litości
I zmaż wszelkie niedoskonałości.
Jako mieć chcicie odpuszczone zbrodnie,
Tak, ze swej łaski, puśćcie mnie swobodnie”.

(Szekspir, Burza, 136)

IV. Epilogue trans. Władysław Tarnawski:

(...)

“Niech mi pomogą wasze dłonie,
Niech wasz życzliwy oddech wionie
W me żagle; gdy się to nie stanie,
To już po całym m o i m planie,
A tym rozrywka wasza była.
Och, czarów zdałaby się siła,
Inaczej w rozpacz popaść muszę,
Chyba że modły zbawią duszę,
Te bowiem swą potężną władzą
Wszelakie przewinienia gładzą.
Jeżeli chcicie tej pociechy,
Aby wam przebaczone grzechy,
I mnie dać pełne rozgrzeszenie”.

(Szekspir, Burza, 139)

V. Epilogue trans. Jerzy S. Sito:

(...)

“Słowa moje nic nie znaczą
i mój koniec jest rozpaczą.
Teraz o modlitwy proszę.
One mnie uwolnić mogą;
one z mroku mnie wywiodą,
ich wspomnienie w sercu noszę.
A jak chcicie odpuszczenia
grzechów, równie niecierpliwie
czekam łaski w y z w o l e n i a”.

(Shakerspeare, Burza, 156)

VI. Epilogue trans. Maciej Słomczyński:

(...)

“Więc po cőż ma wasz czar mnie chłostać
Każąc na wyspie tej pozostać?
Niech mnie wyzwolą wasze ręce,
Abym nie cierpiał nigdy więcej;
Niez żagle wydmie wasze tchnienie,
Bym znalazł zadośćuczynienie
Ja, który was zabawi chciałem
I taki tylko zamys miałem.
Sam tu zostałem. Żaden dłużej
Duch mi już więcej nie usłuży
I Sztuka moja nic nie znaczy:
Więc rzecz zakończę tę w rozpaczy,
Jeśli modlitwy waszej mocą
Nie przybędziecie mi z pomocą;
Gdyż ona, przewyższając litość,
Rozgrzesza każdą pospolitość.
   Kto chce podobnej zaznać łaski,
   I mnie rozgrzeszy przez oklaski”.
     (Shakespeare, Burza, 131)

VII. Epilogue trans. Stanisław Barańczak:

(...)  
“Opadły czarodziejskie stroje,
O własnych tylko siłach stoję,
A te są nikłe. Wy jedynie
Zdecydujcie, czy odpłynie
Do Włoch mój statek, czy pustkowie
Będzie mi domem. Lecz, widzowie,
Skorom odzyskał dawne księство
I zdrad wybaczył bezceństwo,
Niech wyobraźni waszej władza
Na wyspie mnie już nie osadza.
Klaśnjicie w dłoni – moc zaklęta
Przyćśnie i spadną ze mnie pęta;
Zaśmiejcie się – a wasze tchnienie
Żagiel mój wydmie i na scenie
Spełni się sztuki zamiar prawy:
Dobrej dostarczyć wam zabawy.
Bez armii duchów, płaszczaka, księgi
Czarodziej ze mnie niezbyt tęgi
I skończyć przyjdzie mi w rozpaczy –
Chyba że prośba to coś znaczy
Dla dusz wrażliwych, których litość
Rozgrzesza błąd i pospolitość.
Każdy z nas ma do łaski prawo,  
Więc mnie rozgrzeszcie – bijąc brawo”.  
(Shakespeare, Burza, 129)

VIII. Epilogue trans. Piotr Kamiński:

(...) 
“Już moje czary się prześniły,  
Znowu mam własne, wątłe siły.  
Dziś w waszych rękach moje życie:  
Albo mnie tutaj uwięźcie,  
Albo do Neapolu płynę.  
Zdrajcy wszak odpuściłem winę  
I tron mi oddał – więc zabierzcie  
Mnie z tej bezludnej wyspy wręcznie.  
Bym mógł odzyskać wolność drogą,  
Niech wasze dłonie mnie wspomogą,  
A oddech wasz niech pchnie po fali  
Mój żagiel. To mój plan ocali,  
By was zabawić. Już nie zdołam  
Czarów przypomnieć, duchów zwołać,  
Ale choć z tego rozpacz, drżenie,  
Przecie w modlitwie ukojenie.  
Wyjedna skarga przenikliwa  
Tę łaskę, która grzechy zmywa.  
By wasze zbrodnie były wymazane,  
Niech z waszej łaski dziś wolnym się stanę”.

(Shakespeare, Burza, 181)
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