



Reframing Shakespeare in Recent Translations of *The Tempest*

by Madalina Nicolaescu

1. THE 2008-2009 season witnessed two new productions of *The Tempest*, one in Bucharest and one in Ploiesti, each based upon a new translation. One translation commissioned for the prestigious Bucharest theatre- *Teatrul Mic*- was written by Ioana Ieronim, a well known poetess, a former ambassador in Vienna, a member on the board of the Soros Foundation for an Open Society and the current president of the Romanian Fulbright commission. The positions she has held are indicative of the ideological allegiances that her translation unveils. The second version, performed by the National theatre of Ploiesti was written and staged by Cristi Juncu, a young director. Of the two versions, only Ieronim's text was subsequently published. However, Juncu's translation received most of the accolades for its poetic qualities and lively dramatic rhythm.¹ Juncu's version also benefited from the cooperation with Ada Milea, an American-based, iconoclastic Romanian folk musician, who rewrote all the songs in the play as well as the masque in act four and provided the musical background for the performance.

Both Juncu and Ieronim set up their translation in opposition to previous versions produced in the socialist period, in particular to Leon Levitchi's canonical translation published in 1964. My thesis is that what they challenged about the previous translation is not only the use of an antiquated language that makes access to Shakespeare difficult for the present generation but also the inward looking, isolationist and basically ethnocentric agenda that informed it. The postmodern heterogeneity of the two recent translations, the wide variety of types of language used as well as the use of literal translations can be said to promote a new cultural and political identity that reaches beyond the national to become European. My understanding of a European identity, as opposed to an ethnocentric one, is informed by Habermasian conceptions on a post-national, cosmopolitan Europe, notions that have recently been much advertised in the Romanian mass media and in political speeches.²

1 Marina Constantinescu, "‘Voi zbura ca albinele’-Cronica dramatica"[I shall fly like the bees- theatrical review], *Romania Literara*, 13 (2009).

2 On constitutional patriotism and the postnational state see Jürgen Habermas, *The Inclusion of the Other. Studies in Political Theory* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1998).

2.

Leon Levitchi, the translator of the 1964 version of *The Tempest*, was professor at the English department of Bucharest University and editor of the canonical 9 volume translation of Shakespeare published in the socialist period. Before translating Shakespeare he translated A. Anikst's *History of English Literature* from Russian³, a book that was used as the major reference and as a doctrinaire set piece in teaching English literature at Bucharest University in the sixties. By 1964 Levitchi had also published an important Romanian-English dictionary and various books on teaching English grammar. Whereas Levitchi was primarily an academic and a Shakespearean scholar, Juncu and Ieronim have pursued careers in the public sphere and have had little contact with academic scholarship. Their respective translations are as much informed by the different cultural and political context in which they were produced as by their ideological and social positions.

Juncu's and Ieronim's challenge to and contestation of the canonical socialist Shakespeare (exemplified by Levitchi's version) involves the issue of contemporary audience's capacity to understand and enjoy the text as well as the type of political identity that a Romanian Shakespeare is supposed to construct. The political and cultural identity that the 2009 translations seek to construct is no longer an inward looking, ethnocentric one, but an outward looking, cosmopolitan European identity, promoting a new version of republican political values.⁴

Levitchi's enterprise in 1964 was to attempt a translation of the play in a language that represented a Romanian equivalent for the 17th century English of the Shakespearean text. This involved purging the target language of all Latinate modern words that were introduced into the Romanian language beginning with the 19th century and retrieving or even concocting correspondent words in "old Romanian", a language heavily influenced by the liturgical and clerical Slavonic. In a way Levitchi assumed the role of translator that Jean Michel Déprats, quoting George Banu, described of a "curator for the history of the language" who "re-

For recent developments of these concepts with respect to the European identity and cosmopolitanism see Ulrich Beck, *The Cosmopolitan Vision*, transl. Giaran Cronin (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006), Jeffrey T. Checkel and Peter J. Katzenstein, "The Politicization of European Identities", *European Identity*, eds. Jeffrey T. Checkel and Peter J. Katzenstein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) 29-52, and Dario Castiglione, "Political Identity in a Community of Strangers", *European Identity*, eds. Jeffrey T. Checkel and Peter J. Katzenstein (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) 52-81.

3 Aleksandr Abramovici Anikst, *Istoria literaturii engleze* [The History of English Literature], transl. Leon Levitchi and Ioan Aurel Preda (Bucuresti: Editura stiintifica, 1961).

4 For the employment of the terms "inward looking ethnocentric identities" and "outward looking cosmopolitan identities" see Checkel and Katzenstein, "The Politicization of European Identities", 11.

kindles the existence of things that have been lost”.⁵ Mention must be made that while Déprats is largely in favour of “historicizing” translations as opposed to the domesticating “modernizing” ones, as the latter erase the temporal and cultural distance between Shakespeare’s plays and their modern re-writings, he is also highly critical of attempts to translate Shakespeare in Early Modern or even Medieval French.⁶ He dismisses such undertakings as well as all attempts to provide radically “local” equivalences to Shakespeare’s language as “literary curiosities” or as instances of “crazy inventiveness”.⁷ In the context of 1964, Levitchi’s historicizing and localizing approach to translating Shakespeare successfully negotiated between oppositional and normative views on Shakespeare. The oppositional camp, largely placed in the conservative values of the thirties, rejected a modern Renaissance Shakespeare in favour of a medieval one. Ion Vinea, an important translator of Shakespeare, who was initially not even allowed to sign his translations, adopted this ideology as an oppositional stance to the socialist appropriation of both Shakespeare and the Renaissance. Comparing his translations with French versions of Shakespeare, Vinea considered that the latter should not use even Racine’s language but the more antiquated idiom of Francois Villon.⁸ The interest of conservative Romanian thinkers in medieval culture and idiom corresponded to their investment in a pre-modern “authentic” Romanian and its popular culture free of modern foreign influences.

At the same time the norms for a Shakespeare translation set forth in the most important journals of the sixties insisted on the need to historicize translations in order to produce a “realistic” representation of Shakespeare’s world.⁹ This

5 George Banu, *Mémoires du théâtre* (Arles: Actes Sud, 1987), 13 - quoted in Jean-Michel Déprats, “Translation at the Crossroads of the Past and Present”, *Translating Shakespeare for the 21st Century*, eds. Rui Carvalho Homem and Ton Hoenselaers (Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi, 2004), 64.

6 Jean-Michel Déprats, “A French History of *Henry V*”, *Shakespeare’s History Plays: Performances, Translations, and Adaptations in Britain and Abroad*, ed. Ton Hoenselaers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 75-91.

7 Déprats, “A French History”, 81.

8 In his diary Vinea noted on 22 August 1955 the following thoughts in French “Je lis Froissart; le français ancien m’enchante. C’est dans ce français-là qu’on devrait traduire Shakespeare - et pas dans le français de Racine”. He further insisted that a Romanian translation of Shakespeare should use the “antiquated” language of Budai-Deleanu, an 18th century poet from Transylvania who wrote an epic poem *Tiganiada* and used a language imbued with words of Slav origin so as to sound like old Romanian. Vinea held that “in româna lui Budai-Deleanu ar trebui tradus Shakespeare si nu in româna lui Massimu si Laurian”(Shakespeare should be translated in Budai-Deleanu’s Romanian and not in Massimu’s and Laurian’s language), quoted in Mircea Vaida, “Ion Vinea, traducator” [Ion Vinea, Translator], *Secolul XX* 1 (1973), 153.

9 See Edgar Papu, “Ultimul *Hamlet* in romaneste” [The last *Hamlet* in Romanian],

involved translating, or rather rewriting Shakespeare in a Romanian language that would sound antiquated so as to produce an analogy to Shakespeare's discourse in Romanian. The doctrinaire Marxist view on Shakespeare translation easily cohabited with the nationalist ethos of the thirties: the antiquated Romanian to be employed came dangerously close to what the nationalists of the thirties considered to be the "authentic" (neaos) Romanian. An "authentically Romanian Shakespeare" would fill the lack of a corresponding early modern or pre-modern Romanian masterpiece.¹⁰

The Shakespeare criticism of the sixties registered few voices against the excessive "localization" of Shakespeare resulting from the search for equivalences and analogies. Petre Comarnescu was among the very few who questioned the search for an analogy with Romanian 17-18th century. He clearly pointed out the loss in the specificity and distinctiveness of Shakespeare's own historical and cultural context. Comarnescu was against the abundant use of archaisms in translations of Shakespeare's plays as they provide the "specific colour" of the past in Romanian history rather than the one in English history.¹¹

The most important opposition came from theatre people as directors would commission modernized translations for their stage productions. These stage versions were granted no institutional acknowledgement and were never published. Official criticism often found that the modernizing tendency was decadent, amoral or even "corruptive", as was the case with the 1965 *Troilus and Cressida*, whose production was close to being censured for "providing the Romanian public with a distorted image of Shakespeare's play".¹² From the perspective of party officials,

Gazeta literara, 19 (1965) and Aurel Curtui, *Hamlet in Romania* (Bucuresti: Minerva, 1971), 115. Curtui praises Levitchi's translations for their "unity of style" and the respect of "Shakespeare's specificity".

10 The first Romanian translator to write a version of Shakespeare in "authentic" Romanian was Dragos Protopopescu. In the foreword to his translation of *The Tempest* published in 1940, which started a series of Shakespeare translations, Protopopescu declared his intention to produce a "Romanian Shakespeare", who "no longer speaks English but Romanian", the latter being an "authentic" [neaos] Romanian language. Dragos Protopopescu, *Furtuna. Drama in 5 acte, cu un cuvint inainte*. [The Tempest. Drama in 5 Acts, with a Foreword] (Bucuresti: Fundatia pentru literatura si arta "Carol II", 1940) 14-15. George Calinescu, a foremost critic of the time, objected to Protopopescu's radical "indigenization of Shakespeare" [impamintenirea traducerilor lui Shakespeare] and called it a "fake". He likewise qualified Protopopescu's "authentic" Romanian language as artificial [o limba romaneasca neaoasa artificiala]. George Calinescu, "Dragos Protopopescu. Hamlet de W. Shakespeare. Traducere", *Adevarul artistic si literar*, 910 (1938).

11 Petre Comarnescu, "Note pe traduceri din Shakespeare" ["Notes on Shakespearean Translation], *Gazeta literara*, (1955) 32.

12 Vlad Mugur, "Prima noastra scena trebuie sa puna cel mai puternic accent in cultura teatrului a tarii" [Our first stage must place the strongest emphasis in the theatrical culture of the country], *Teatrul*, (1965) 8.

a Shakespeare distanced from the present was obviously politically safer than a Shakespeare projected as “our contemporary”.¹³

One consequence of the heavily historicizing approach to translation is the apparent evacuation of all political meaning from the text. Levitchi appears to abide by the norms for translating Shakespeare set in the early 20th century, when Ioan Botez warned translators and critics not to lower Shakespeare’s masterpieces to the mundane world of politics and power play.¹⁴ Similarly, George Calinescu, objected to the use of the word “politician” in D. Protopopescu’s version of *Hamlet*.¹⁵ This attitude to Shakespeare’s translations, largely derived from the German Romantics, was appropriated to a nationalist or socialist-populist agenda in the fifties and sixties. Levitchi’s use of a consistently antiquated Romanian that avoids the use of all neologisms imported into Romanian from French or Latin largely cancels out the linguistic variety of Shakespeare’s text resulting from his import of words from Latin, French, Spanish).¹⁶ As Levitchi’s translation strategies adhered to the modernist criteria of coherence and consistence dominant in the sixties, his monolingualism received great critical accolades at that time.¹⁷

13 Kott’s path breaking book *Shakespeare our Contemporary* was not even mentioned in academic discussions on Shakespeare but was avidly read by theatre people.

14 Botez rejects A. Stern’s translation of Hamlet using colloquial terms and justifies his objections on the ground that Shakespeare’s world is not that of the banal and commonplace but a refuge in another higher and more tempestuous world which requires a higher linguistic register. Otherwise the translation is a sacrilege. (“Shakespeare e un autor de refugiu din lumea realitatilor banale si apasatoare, de absorbiere a intregii noastre fiinte in alta lume vijelioasa si inalta... expresile d-lui Stern ne transporta intr-o alta vesela si hazlie si nu avem decit de multumit *Culturii nationale*, care contribuie cu atitea sacrilegii la raspindirea unei asemenea literaturi.”) [Shakespeare is an author of refuge from the depressing humdrum reality, who absorbs our entire being into a different, tempestuous and elevated world. ... Mr Stern’s idioms transport us into another funny and cheerful world and all we can do is to thank the publishing house *Cultura nationala* for the dissemination of such sacrilege]. Ion Botez, “Shakespeare in românește” [Shakespeare in Romanian], *Viata romaneasca*, 24 (1923) 276-294. This position was reiterated in 1964 by an influential critic, Alexandru Philipide: “Oamenii lui Shakespeare nu vorbesc cum se vorbește in viata de toate zilele—vorbesc metafore, poetic, sententios” [Shakespeare’s people do not use everyday language, they speak in metaphors, in a poetic and rhetorical language]. Alexandru Philipide, “In anul Shakespeare, o mare opera de cultura” [In the Shakespeare year, a work of great culture], *Scinteia*, 52 (1964) 2.

15 „Ce cauta politicianul in epoca lui Shakespeare? La noi cuvintul desteapta in minte un fel de viata publica inexistentă in epoca tratata in tragedie.” [There is no such thing as a politician in Shakespeare’s time. In our language the word conjures a kind of public life that did not exist at the time of the tragedy.] Calinescu, “Dragos Protopopescu”, 25.

16 I am employing the term Patricia Parker used in a conference on Shakespeare given at the New Europe College in Bucharest, 18 May, 2009.

17 Curtui, *Hamlet in Romania*, 115.

Levitchi's translation of the political vocabulary employed in Prospero's narrative of his expulsion from Milan (I.2.66-116 and 120-132)¹⁸ indicates how power relations and power politics are de-emphasized if not cancelled out as a result of the antiquated language employed. Levitchi's equivalents for words recurrent in Prospero's story such as: "commonwealth, government, substitution, manage, advance, extirpate" are selected from the vocabulary of fairy tales or popular ballads and carry hardly any political significance to the modern audience. "Commonwealth" is transposed in the nationalist idiom and becomes "tara" (my country), the equivalent of the German *Vaterland*, whereas "the manage of my state" (I.2.70) is translated by "sa aiba in grija tara (to take care for the country). The equivalents for "manage", "prerogatives" and "substitution" (Antonio's substitution of Prospero) do not belong to a political vocabulary either. Antonio's actions to "advance" courtiers (I.2.80) and to "extirpate" Prospero (I.2.125) are given poetic, archaic sounding words that obscure any reference to a concrete political action. The difficulties in understanding the language and the projection of the world of the play in a remote mythologized past, associated with heroic popular ballads has a depoliticizing impact: the Machiavellian pursuits in the play are muted down and the audience's awareness of the political institutions and forms of government involved in the action is lowered.

It is interesting to compare the differences between Levitchi's and Ieronim's or Juncu's translations for the lines in the same narrative

1. "and to him I put/The **manage of my state**, as at that time/Through all the signories, it was the first" (I.2.70-71, my emphasis) is translated as "I-**am dat in grija tara**, pe atunci/Intre **ducate** fruntea" in Levitchi versus "sa-mi **administrezte statul**; Milanul ocupa/Atunci un loc de frunte printre **signorii**" in Ieronim,
2. "The **government** I cast upon my brother/And to my **state** grew stranger, being transported/And rapt in secret studies" (I.2.75-77, my emphasis) is translated in Levitchi as: "I-**am dat pe mina cirma**, adincit/In lucruri tainice si-nstrainat/De-a **tarii trebi**" versus Juncu's "I-**am dat lui guver- narea**, lui Antonio/eu devenind tot mai **strain de stat**..."

One can notice how Ieronim's and Juncu's versions almost take over the political vocabulary employed in the Shakespearean text, whereas Levitchi replaces them with archaic words of Slav origin that have lost their political resonance to modern audiences.¹⁹

18 The Shakespeare edition used in this paper is the Arden Shakespeare: William Shakespeare, *The Tempest*. Arden Shakespeare, ed. Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden Vaughan (London: Thompson, 1998).

19 William Shakespeare, *Furtuna*, transl. Ioana Ieronim (Bucuresti: Fundatia Cul-

It is not surprising that the master- servant relation between Prospero and Ariel or Caliban should be softened in Levitchi's apolitical, idealizing reading. Prospero has to be the humanist magus or the enlightened leader "close to his people", as doctrinaire Marxist propaganda described progressive historical leaders. The contrast with the later translations is most striking. Even less significant phrases acquire political overtones in Juncu's version : Prospero's promise to Ariel : "I'll discharge thee" (I.2.299) is translated as "te eliberez" (I'll set you free) , where the word "eliberez" contains the root of the word "libertate" –freedom. Levitchi translates by "te las sa pleci" (I'll let you go away) which cancels out the issue of freedom and of Ariel's bondage. Interestingly Jean Michel Déprats 's version comes close to Juncu's as he translates the phrase by "je t'eliberai".²⁰ Juncu uses the same politically charged verb "a elibera" for Prospero's behest to Ariel to "release" the party so far kept "prisoners" (5.1.30).

Caliban's protest against Prospero's treatment is also muted in Levitchi: Caliban's strong words are given a bland equivalent: "You sty me/ In this hard rock"(I.2 342-43) as "ma surghiunesti pe stinca" (you banish me on this rock). Levitchi does not provide an equivalent for "sty". Furthermore the poetically sounding archaism -"surghiunesti" (banish) belongs to a register that most of the present generation has no access to and most probably cannot understand. As could be expected, Prospero's invective addressed to Caliban "filth as thou art" (I.2.346) is not translated in Levitchi's text. It is, however, given a powerful equivalent ("esti un gunoi"[you are a piece of garbage])in Juncu's version, which also gives an almost verbatim translation for Prospero's complaint about Caliban's "vile race" ("rasa ta primară"). The tension in the master-servant relation is emphasized in Juncu's version: Caliban's conclusion "I must obey" (I.2.373) is translated as "trebuie sa ma supun" (I must subject myself to his force). Levitchi, by contrast almost occludes this relation as he uses a term that is generally employed for the relation between little children and their parents: "Trebuie sa ascult" (I must listen to him). This infantilizes Caliban and reinforces Prospero's status as a well-meaning *pater familias*.

Juncu's collaboration with Ada Milea has not only involved an expansion of songs in the play, but also a political radicalization of positions. Caliban's song of freedom in act 2 is extended to insist on Prospero's tyranny and Caliban's dreams of liberty, revenge and rebellion. Interestingly Juncu's version, very much like all Romanian versions as well as many recent French ones (see those of Bonnefoy or

turala "Camil Petrescu" and Revista Teatrul Azi, 2009) As Juncu's version has not been published, I have used Juncu's own text, which he graciously let me use.

20 William Shakespeare, *La Tempête. Traduction nouvelle de Jean-Michel Déprats* (Montréal-sous-Bois : éditions Théâtrales, 2007)

Carrière),²¹ follow the standard practice in English editions up to the late eighteenth century and attribute to Prospero Miranda's reprimanding speech (1.2. 346-362) in which she dwells on her futile efforts to teach Caliban language.

3.

I would further like to consider the case of the translation of a translation, namely the translations of Gonzalo's description of the plantation he would like to establish on the island. The text is almost a verbatim translation of Montaigne's description of a utopian land in his essay *Les Cannibales* translated by Florio and further imported into the play with few but significant changes.²² As Jonathan Bate argues, Montaigne's utopia is in its turn an "imitation" of Ovid's description of the golden age.²³ In Shakespeare's text the evocation of the golden age is introduced by reference to topical issues such as setting up "plantations" in the New World (2.1.47).²⁴ The co-existence between present practices and those of the mythical ideal world, between western social and political structures and those of the "cannibals" described in Montaigne's essay, is further problematised by Shakespeare's introduction of the word "sovereignty" (2.1.157), a key issue in the play and in the political discourse of Shakespeare's time. Apart from these changes, Shakespeare takes over Florio's text which is itself a verbatim translation of Montaigne.

Levitchi's consistently homogenizing approach to translating Shakespeare expurgates all the words corresponding to modern social and political practices as these words were imported into the Romanian language in the 19th century. They are all considered to be neologisms, and hence anachronistic equivalences of Shakespeare's early 17th century text. What Levitchi ignores is the fact that the words introduced into the Romanian language in the 19th century were already in use in the French and English of the 16th-17th century, a fact which evidences the cultural gap between the Romanian and the English/French cultures in the early modern period. His version of the description of the plantation provides

21 W. Shakespeare, *La Tempête-préface, traduction nouvelle et notes d'Yves Bonnefoy* (Paris : Gallimard, 1997) and W. Shakespeare, *La Tempête, adaptation française de Jean-Claude Carrière*. (Paris : Centre international de créations théâtrales, 1990).

22 Michel de Montaigne, "Des cannibales", *Essais*. Livre I. (Paris: Flammarion, 1989), 252-258.

23 Jonathan Bate, "From Myth to Drama", *Critical Essays on Shakespeare's "The Tempest"*, eds. Virginia Mason Vaughan and Alden Vaughan (New York, London : Macmillan, 1998), 41.

24 On the tension between topical concerns about "plantations" and the projection of a mythological golden age see also Jan Kott's essay "The Tempest – A Repetition", in Jan Kott, *The Bottom Translation: Marlowe and Shakespeare and the Carnival Tradition*, trans. Daniela Miedzyrzecka and Lillian Vallee (Evanston : Northwestern UP, 1987)

obscure archaisms, denoting practices and terms long forgotten, with the result that contemporary audiences cannot identify any recognizable reference to commerce, agriculture, succession, occupation or contract, not even to magistrates. Levitchi, therefore, by using an antiquated vocabulary, projects both Shakespeare's and Montaigne's texts and into a more remote and radically pre-modern, Eastern world. Unwittingly, he rehearses the isolation of the Romanian culture from the humanist European one.

Montaigne's construction of the utopia is an anthropological translation in modern terms of the experience of the Other (the Brazilian natives). His "translation" inscribes the difference of the Other, simply by adding negation: "nuls contracts, nuls successions, nuls occupations, nulle agriculture..."²⁵ Florio's version is, with a few insignificant exceptions, a verbatim translation and consequently preserves all the modern terms (magistrates, contracts, successions, traffike, occupation) duly adding the negation "no".²⁶ By suppressing these terms, Levitchi rejects the modern framework in which the golden age is envisaged in both Montaigne's and Shakespeare's texts. To give him due credit, however, his homogenizing approach does not cancel the tension in Shakespeare between the topicality of the issue of English plantations in America and the Ovidian golden age image: in one of the few instances of recourse to modern vocabulary Levitchi translates Gonzalo's plantation by "colonie"- colony. However, the bulk of his text contains archaisms that have to be looked up in an etymological dictionary—for example for "letters" he uses the word "azbuchie", which is the Slavonic for "abc", the beginning of the alphabet. The text thus becomes arcane, if not utterly intelligible to a modern audience that no longer uses the Slavonic letters, nor is familiar with terms borrowed from the Slavonic language. The translation evokes a cultural and political world that the modern audience finds to be far remote, remoter than Montaigne's projection of the world of cannibals.

It is interesting to compare this approach with recent French translations of Gonzalo's utopia. Pierre Leyris's 1991 version,²⁷ which Déprats accuses of reductive modernization,²⁸ abandons the mediation of translation and largely imports Montaigne's text. As the rest of the text is in fluent modern French (Leyris uses the French verb "coloniser" as an equivalent for Gonzalo's project to have a plantation on the island), the fact of partially quoting Montaigne albeit in modern spelling could be considered an instance of introducing heterogeneity and disso-

25 Montaigne, 258.

26 John Florio, *Montaignes Essays*. 1603. The respective passage is quoted in the appendix of the Arden edition of *The Tempest*, 304-5.

27 W. Shakespeare. *The Tempest / La Tempête, texte anglais et traduction de Pierre Leyris* (Paris: Flammarion, 1991).

28 Déprats, "Translation at the Crossroads", 76.

nance. The strategy could also be aimed at foregrounding the Frenchness of the text to a French audience, thus re-appropriating Shakespeare's text. Déprats's own option is to retain the flavor of the old text by means of syntax and word order. At the same time he translates the English "translation" of Montaigne's text back into French. In a private interview Déprats insisted on the fact that he wanted to translate Shakespeare and not Montaigne, yet that a French audience would instantly recognize the latter's presence in Shakespeare's text.²⁹ Consequently the French translation of the play no longer recuperates some of Montaigne's words included in the English version, but provides a translation. For example the word "traffic" in "no kind of traffic/ Would I admit"(II.1.149) is translated with the word "traffic" by Leyris, who echoes Montaigne's text, but with "commerce" by Déprats. The latter provides the word that best captures the meaning it has in the text ("car je n'y addmetrais / Aucune espèce de commerce")³⁰ and thereby indicates the changes the meanings of words have undergone.³¹ Similarly "letters" is not translated by "lettres" as in Leyris (nul n'y saurait/Ses letters)³², but by "Personne ne saurait lire"³³. Déprats's approach comes close to an intra-linguistic approach, a form of translation from early modern French to modern French which maintains, however, the markers that signify the temporal alterity of the text.

Ieronim's and Juncu's approach is a highly postmodern, eclectic one that contrasts sharply with the homogenized antiquated language Levitchi employed. Some of the words are taken over *verbatim*, as for example "contract" and "occupation", for which Levitchi had provided obscure archaic equivalents. The literal translation establishes a continuity between Montaigne - Florio- Shakespeare and the Romanian version. This continuity emphasizes the links between norms and concepts in Western humanistic culture (Montaigne and Shakespeare) and those in the Romanian culture. Ieronim's and Juncu's "post-integration" policy (that is, after the integration of Romania to the EU) rejects the previous radical localization of Shakespeare with its assertion of "authentic" Romanian values, set up as different from those of modern Western culture. The 2009 translations are keen to identify links and continuities with Western culture without being either imitative or derivative. At the same time they foreground the political issues and tense power relations in the play. The political stance of the two translators is thus the very opposite of that adopted by Levitchi or other translators of the fifties and sixties.

29 Ottawa, 6.10.2009.

30 Déprats, *La Tempête*, 40.

31 Footnote 149 in the Arden edition explains that the meaning of the word "traffic" is business, commerce.

32 Leyris, *The Tempest/ La Tempête*, 123.

33 Déprats, *La Tempête*, 40.

Juncu's and Ieronim's translations are not simply modernizing versions of Shakespeare's text - though the use of contemporary Romanian, which would be easily accessible to present day audiences, was a major reason for their undertaking the translation project. Ioana Ieronim makes clear the stakes in cultural policy that she had in mind when she embarked upon the re-translation of the play. She opposes the elitist positions of the former socialist translations that used a poetic language full of archaisms and which required special literary and philological knowledge to decode. Such language, says Ieronim, voicing the very elitist attitude she wants to depart from, is "bound to be (falsely) obscure to the present public, who is mainly used to reading text messages on their cell phones and who have a much more limited attention span for the spoken text." By way of contrast, her "translation is in a simple, straightforward language and is, thus, better attuned to the expectations and skills of a public fashioned by global culture."³⁴ However, both Ieronim and Juncu make extensive use of archaisms or "literary" sounding words that connote a past remote culture. To go back to the example of Gonzalo's utopia, Ieronim uses as an equivalent for the term "service", the word "robie", which is derived from the word "rob", signifying in pre-modern Romanian society a serf or slave. Her equivalent for the early modern French and English "service" (II.1.151) is localized and refers to the feudal relationship of bondage between a serf and his lord in Romania. She also makes use of words of Slav origin, which are now fallen completely into disuse. For example, her equivalent for the word "release" (V.1.12), discussed above, is the word "slobozenie" -- an archaism for "liberty", derived from the Bulgarian word "sloboden" and which up to the early 19th century meant "free", "autonomous", "capable of enjoying all civic rights". Both Ieronim and Juncu use archaisms derived from the Slavonic alongside Latinate neologisms. The word is "osinda" (derived from the verb "osonditi" in Slavonic) is alternatively used with the word "tortura" (torture) for reference to Prospero "tormenting" his prisoners (II.2.15 and V.1.104). Thus, the pre-modern historical reality the archaisms conjure is juxtaposed with the present social and rather topical political practices that the neologisms refer to. Past and present are thus yoked together in a heterogeneous inclusive universe.

Similarly, Cristi Juncu pits phrases and even lines imported from Levitchi's version up against abrasively modern and topical readings of Shakespeare's text. Juncu's version for the term "occupation" in Gonzalo's speech is "locuri de munca" (jobs, employment) clearly making reference to employment. (Ieronim translates the word verbatim ("ocupatie")- establishing an uninterrupted link between Montaigne's and Shakespeare's texts and the 20th century Romanian version of the play) The job market and issues related to employment are further echoed by

34 Ioana Ieronim, *Furtuna*, 7

Juncu's translation of "all men idle"(II.1.155) –"toti someri" (all men unemployed), Juncu choosing to foreground the modern meaning of the word "idle" over the older one.³⁵ Juncu deliberately forces the Shakespearean text to release modern meanings which, nevertheless, distance rather than appropriate or domesticate the play. At the same time, blatantly modern words or topical allusions are juxtaposed with archaisms or old "poetic" phrasing. The resulting dissonance questions any simple assumption about continuities between past and present, between west and east in the present day reception of Shakespeare.

In conclusion, the comparison of these recent translations with Levitchi's text, written in the socialist sixties, highlights the way Shakespeare translation involves a continuous re-writing in keeping with the political and cultural context in which it is re-located. Furthermore, Romanian translations of *The Tempest* can be regarded as sites or even as vehicles for the negotiation and re-definition of national and/or European identities in Romania. The 1964 version can be described as an ethnocentric version, designed to fashion a Romanian pre-modern equivalent of Shakespeare, thereby filling a gap in the Romanian history of literature. The monolingualism of this version, in which antiquated words derived from the Slavonic language are used for Latinate terms in the English text, not only places Shakespeare in a more remote medieval period but also occludes the multilingualism of his discourse. At the same time the consistent avoidance of neologisms, particularly of those belonging to a political vocabulary, provides a highly depoliticized Shakespeare. The artificially antiquated language and the medieval, radically East-European Shakespeare that it fashions, unwittingly rehearses the isolation, enforced during the Ceausescu period, of the Romanian cultural identity in relation to the European one.

In contradistinction to this version, the recent translations of *The Tempest* can be said to promote a post-national, cosmopolitan agenda, likely to be conducive to the construction of a European identity. The heterogeneity of these recent translations brings out the Shakespearean multi-linguism that Levitchi's homogeneous version tended to occlude. At the same time, their post-modern approach to the historical and cultural alterity of Shakespeare's text foregrounds a certain inclusiveness that allows for dissonant perspectives and registers. Ieronim and Juncu can be described as rewriting the play from the perspectives of the new cosmopolitan values and the pro-EU political commitment that informs much of the public sphere in Romania, marking the shift in political and cultural vision that has occurred since the socialist period.

While adopting a more demotic position in translation that ensures an easy access to Shakespeare, their versions are much closer to the source text. They

35 This example cannot be put down as case of mistranslation. In a private interview (Bucharest, 15.04.2009), Juncu confessed that he took special pains to study the Arden edition in order to avoid any slippages in his translation.

abound in verbatim translations that echo the Shakespearean text, at the same time sounding highly topical. The large amount of *ad literam* translations of words derived from a political vocabulary (such as *government, administer, sovereignty, prerogatives, substitution, agent, conferring power, extirpate*) in the two recent versions of *The Tempest* significantly increases the political poignancy of the play to present-day Romanian audiences in contrast to Levitchi's version that eschewed all topical political issues. Moreover, the phrases translated verbatim highlight the imports in Shakespeare's text of fragments from Florio's and Montaigne's texts as well as the further interlinguistic and intercultural continuities between the respective texts and the Romanian re-fashioning of Shakespeare.

All in all, one can conclude that recent Romanian rewritings of Shakespeare project him as an iconic figure of contemporary European cosmopolitanism and redeploy him in support of the present project of fashioning new "integrated" identities in Europe's margins.

Madalina Nicolaescu
Bucharest University