CONTENDING TRANSLATIONS OF THE TEMPEST IN PRESENT-DAY ROMANIA

George VOLCEANOV

Abstract

At the 2007 SHINE Conference held in Iaşi in November 2007, Professor Rodica Dimitriu gave a paper about differences between the stage-oriented version of Dragoş Protopopescu's translation (1940) and Leon Leviţchi's "philological" (i.e. more accurate but hardly performable) translation (1958) of William Shakespeare's ***The Tempest****. This paper may be construed as a sequel to Professor Dimitriu's article as I approach three recent translations of the same play (Dan Lăzărescu's posthumously published version, dated 2004; Ioana Ieronim's, issued in early 2009; and my own translation, issued in 2010), emphasizing the differences among them.*

Keywords: *The Tempest*, re-translation, strategy, competition, agenda, canonical status

Prologue

At the 2007 SHINE Conference held in Iaşi in November 2007, Professor Rodica Dimitriu gave a paper on *translation policies* and *translators' projects*, in which she emphasized the differences between the stage-oriented version of Dragoş Protopopescu's translation (1940) and Leon Leviţchi's "philological" (i.e. more accurate but hardly performable) translation (1958) of *The Tempest*. My paper may be construed as a sequel to Professor Dimitriu's article as I approach three recent translations of the same play (Dan Lăzărescu's posthumously published version, dated 2004; Ioana Ieronim's – issued in early 2009, and my own, issued in 2010). The paper examines the translators' strategies, the outspoken convictions (and principles) that underlie these strategies, the way in which and the extent to which they fulfil their readers' expectations. These three versions are, therefore, viewed as *literary* or *aesthetic* objects vying for a *canonical* status in the field of literary translation. I will assess the conflicting and mediating qualities of the three versions, or, in a more pedestrian jargon, their faithfulness to the original and/ or the translators' acts of betrayal, illustrating it/ them with several examples regarding prosody, vocabulary, style, denotation and connotation, etc. As every new translation is inevitably related to the history of previous translations, in a gesture of either acceptance or rejection of earlier texts, I will also tackle the translators' acknowledged or unacknowledged attitude toward their precursors

(actually, toward Leon Leviţchi's influential version, which *has been* the canonical translation of *The Tempest* in Romania for the past fifty years) – an attitude ranging from complete disrespect to previous translations to subtle ways of plagiarizing an illustrious precursor. And, insofar as Shakespeare himself has come to be considered a commodity in the supply side of culture, I am also intent on evaluating the short – and the long-term impact of these translations in the Romanian book-market and theatre as well as in the Romanian academe.

Enter Three New Translators

Dan Lăzărescu (1918-2002) holds an interesting position in the history of Shakespeare studies and translations in Romania. He was a professional lawyer and an amateur scholar and translator. His career somewhat resembles that of Eric Sams, the British civil servant turned into a Shakespeare scholar and musicologist much to the dismay of the professional Shakespeare scholars and musicologists. In the 1950s Lăzărescu translated *The Taming of the Shrew* as part of the first coherent national project aimed at having Shakespeare's *Complete Works* published in Romania. Of the seventeen translators that participated in the project, Leon Leviţchi came to be considered the leading Shakespeare scholar of his generation; he and his fellow-academic Dan Duţescu have been considered the most gifted translators of the past decades. A mute cold war ensued in the 1960s, when Leviţchi and Duţescu issued a bilingual Shakespeare anthology, in which all the selected fragments were translated by themselves; Lăzărescu responded with a 1,200-page fat book, a compilation of Shakespeare criticism titled *Introducere în shakespeareologie (An Introduction to Shakespeare Studies)*. Its abridged version was first issued in 1974; the second edition, with the original text restored, appeared in 2007. Throughout his career, Dan Lăzărescu turned a blind eye to all the achievements of his Romanian contemporaries: he never quoted, or referred to them. In 1982, when Leon Leviţchi started to issue a new series of *Complete Works* (the last volume came out in 1995) he commissioned his lifetime friend and colleague Dan Duţescu to contribute to it with several new translations. Lăzărescu remained a marginal figure in the canon. After the death of Leviţchi (1991) and Duţescu (1992), Lăzărescu started his own series of Shakespeare plays issued in paperback. He took his belated revenge by controlling the book-market with *his* versions of about half a dozen plays including *Macbeth*, *The Tempest*, *Hamlet*, and *Othello*. (Other titles in the series, namely, translations by Şt. O. Iosif, dated from the early twentieth century.)

One cannot deny that Dan Lăzărescu was a self-conscious translator, albeit not an exemplary one. His paperback one-play volumes are introduced by brief prefaces. The weak point of these prefaces is that the critical information is scarce and outdated. In the case of *The Tempest*, the consulted critical sources are Ernest Renan, G. Wilson Knight, Edward Dowden (i. e. nineteenth-century or early

twentieth-century sources), and the most recent of all, Jack Lindsay, with a study dated 1962 (Lăzărescu, 2004: 7-17). Lăzărescu pompously calls his brief forewords *Introduction*s. More space is allotted to the endnotes that accompany his translations (Lăzărescu, 2004: 197-213). Of the 33 endnotes, the most ample (of nearly three pages) is the one about the Bermudas. Two and a half pages are allotted to the endnote about Prospero's magic power and magic in general. Lăzărescu shows awareness of the characters' social position and of the different styles they use (Lăzărescu, 2004: 197-9). However, his translation does not manage to differentiate the higher from the humbler style in his characters' speeches.

In the opening sentence of the foreword to her translation, in a rhetorical question, Ioana Ieronim implicitly declares herself a partisan of *innovation* in the field of literary translation: "Will William Shakespeare (1564-1616) have to be translated for each and every generation to come?" (Ieronim, 2009: 5). The answer is obviously *yes* insofar as Shakespeare's texts have come to be modernized and updated even in the English-speaking countries. And I think that the best part of Ioana Ieronim's endeavour to produce a new version of *The Tempest* is her self-conscious approach to the following issues of Shakespeare translations: 1) there is an ample, on-going process of re-translating Shakespeare both in Romania and elsewhere; 2) Shakespeare's text is an "interesting landmark" in the translator's attempt "to measure the super-simplification of our [i. e. present-day readers'] expression and perception of…" – of what, I cannot say, as the sentence is left unfinished; 3) the translator had to explore, step by step, "certain areas and colours of our language that yesterday still existed and seem to be still viable" – when faced with an author who used about 18,000 words in his works, "the translation implicitly becomes a test of (minimum) memory and validity of wider expressive areas of the Romanian language" (Ieronim, 2009: 5). To sum up these three assertions, Shakespeare has to be re-translated every now and then and, in the process, the translator certainly has to cope with difficult tasks by using all the resources of the target language.

Ioana Ieronim is aware that Shakespeare's language is often obscure, a quality that apparently makes the author the more fascinating *(ibid.)*. And she makes it clear that she does not believe in the distinction between writing and translating for page as opposed to writing and translating for the stage. "Shakespeare is, obviously, the playwright *par excellence*" (Ieronim, 2009: 6). Hence, the translator's claim that she has opted for an "oral style and clarity" in rendering the original into Romanian.

Ioana Ieronim likewise acknowledges the variety of styles and voices in Shakespeare's play, with "Caliban's poetic curses, imagination's cosmic and ritual flight with Prospero *(sic)*, the archaic, mannerist, deliberately artificial speeches of Ceres and Juno", all previously translated according to a tradition that "needs to be reconsidered at the beginning of this millennium" *(ibid.)* By reconsidering tradition

Ioana Ieronim means using free verse or, to put it bluntly, bad prose instead of the Elizabethan blank verse with its iambic pentameter that sounds so natural when uttered by great actors; or using free verse instead of finely shaped rhyming couplets in the goddesses' speeches.

Ieronim concludes her brief foreword calling the process of translating *The Tempest* "a privileged reading[1] (translation probably being the most profound reading in the solitude of the words), while the true reading will be that of the performance" (Ieronim, 2009: 7).

The translator justly contends that there should be no difference between Shakespeare for the page and Shakespeare for the stage. However, extra-textual, extrinsic clues suggest that, notwithstanding her claims, Ioana Ieronim has failed the stage-test: up to now she has re-translated and „updated" three Shakespeare plays (*Measure for Measure* for The National Theatre of Craiova, *King Lear* for The Bulandra Theatre, and *The Tempest* for Teatrul Mic in Bucharest) only to provide the drafts for Silviu Purcărete's, Andrei Şerban's, and Cătălina Buzoianu's stage versions of the respective productions. It seems that in translation, as in love, "the will is infinite and the execution confined", "the desire is boundless and the act a slave to limit", to quote Shakespeare's tragic hero from *Troilus and Cressida* (III. 2. 64-65). There is a huge gap between the translator's theoretical input, her aim at "oral style and clarity", on the one hand, and her practical output, consisting mostly of nearly unutterable lines.

Of the three translators discussed in this paper, I am the only one who has admitted that a translator should look back to his precursors not just to reject their merits but to look for the grains of gold that can be sifted from them as well. As a result of this method, about sixty lines or half-lines from Leon Leviţchi's translation of *The Tempest* have survived, or have been recycled, in my version. On the other hand, not a single line or collocation from Lăzărescu's translation has made it to my version. I must acknowledge Leon Leviţchi's formative influence on my entire career, and I have gone as far as to discuss my translation as a case of anxiety of influence and to express a moral dilemma: both accepting and rejecting my mentor's translation, and yet finally displacing and supplanting it is more than "Oedipal struggle"; it is a Shakespearean situation as well, if we were to go to the text of the play under scrutiny (Volceanov, 2008: 218). Before the Second World War, Dragoş Protopopescu, who gave us another memorable version of *The*

[1] As an experienced literary translator, I felt that I was in a privileged position whenever I had the opportunity to produce the first Romanian translation of a literary text (like, for instance, Shakespeare's *The Two Noble Kinsmen* and *Edward III*, or David Lodge's *Small World*): I felt that I was not just the first translator but also the first critic and interpreter of the respective text. In the case of a re-translation (as in the case of *The Tempest*) I did not regard the translation as a privilege but I rather felt a strong anxiety of influence due to the performance of my precursor, Leon Leviţchi. Ioana Ieronim dubiously „forgets" her illustrious precursor and implicitly claims that her translation is strictly based on her artistic and intellectual wrestling just with the original text. However, there is textual evidence to the contrary, an aspect I will discuss later.

Tempest, considered the ideal translator of Shakespeare to be a "Caliban who admits that his master has taught him how to speak" (Protopopescu, 1940: XIV). I have likewise admitted being a translator who learned his craftsmanship from a Prospero that I am now standing up against. "You taught me language, and my profit on't / Is I know how to…," of course, not to "curse", but to translate, if we were to paraphrase Caliban's words. (As Ioana Ieronim was translating the play at about the same time as I was, I could not consult her work before the completion of my translation.)

This paper is the third in a series of papers I have written to express a translator's viewpoint on issues derived from the act of translating *The Tempest*. As for the critical apparatus of my translation, it consists of a preface with much updated critical interpretations and 63 footnotes (this is, probably, the first Romanian translation of a Shakespeare play with footnotes to be issued in the past sixty years or so) based on various sources such as Stephen Orgel's latest one-play volume edition issued by Oxford University Press, Isaac Asimov's *Asimov's Guide to Shakespeare* (a book I strongly recommend to anyone who wants to build an accurate critical apparatus of a Shakespeare play), and Harold Bloom's *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*.

Shakespeare diluted: disregarding the Bard's prosody

In sheer contempt for Leon Levițchi's proposal put forward in the 1950s, that Romanian translators should do their best to observe the *principle of stringency* formulated by Tieck and Schlegel, Lăzărescu rendered Shakespeare's both blank verse and prose as… rhyming couplets, claiming that a secular tradition in Romanian drama did justify his bewildering choice (Lăzărescu, 2002: 8-10). His method actually resuscitated Şt. O. Iosif's habit of translating Shakespeare into rhyming couplets without observing the principle of stringency (the line for line translation).

So, after a hundred and fifty years of Shakespeare translations into Romanian in iambic pentameters, most of today's readers read a "Drydenized" version of the Bard's plays.

Lăzărescu translated the original 502 lines of Act I, Scene 2 into 687 lines. He translated the 96 lines of Act III, Scene 1 into 153 lines, and the 109 lines of Act III, Scene 3 into 151 lines of his own. By comparison, the same scenes in my translation add up to 524, 102, and 112 lines, respectively. The fact that his scenes consist of an odd number of lines proves that he was not consistent in his use of rhyming couplets, turning them, every now and then, into rhyming tercets. Ironically, of the three translations, Lăzărescu's alone appears in a bilingual edition, which emphasizes the weakness of his approach.

As for Ieronim's prosody or, rather, lack of prosody, insofar as prosody means "patterns of sound and rhythm in poetry and spoken language" (*Longman*, 2003: 1316) one can easily notice the complete lack of rhythm throughout her translation; Ieronim's free verse has lines ranging from 9 to 23 syllables.

At the International Micro-conference *Translation: Betrayal or Creative Statement?* held at the University of Bucharest on 12 September 2008, during a discussion about the way in which the Romanian translators observed, or did not observe, the *principle of stringency* in Shakespeare translations, Professor Angel-Luis Pujante suggested that we should measure stringency by counting not just the lines, but also the syllables of the original text and those of the translation. In a random excerpt from *The Tempest* (I. 2. 1-100), Shakespeare has 56 decasyllabic and 36 hendecasyllabic lines (which represent the norm with the iambic pentameter); Shakespeare's text also has slight deviations from the norm, with one 9-syllable line, 6 dodecasyllabic lines and one 13-syllable line. The sum total of syllables per one hundred lines is 1,050 syllables (with an average of 10.5 syllables per line).

Ioana Ieronim translates the one hundred-line sample-text into 104 lines, none of which has less than 10 syllables: there are 6 decasyllabics, 3 hendecasyllabic lines, 16 dodecasyllabic lines, 18 lines of 13 syllables, 17 fourteeners, 20 lines of 15 syllables, 11 lines of 16 syllables, 7 lines of 17 syllables, one line of 18 syllables, one of 19 syllables, 3 lines of 20 syllables, and one of 23 syllable (Ieronim, 2009: 16-21). Such a "pattern" can hardly be called free verse at all! The sum total is 1,453 syllables, with an average of 1.45 syllables per line. This ratio turns a play of 2,070 lines into one of 3,008 lines, thus increasing the duration of each performance, hindering its dynamics and compelling the director to make massive cuts and to jettison much of the original text. And, as Ioana Ieronim sees no difference between the page and the stage texts, her translation likewise increases the duration of reading.

Ioana Ieronim succeeds in outdoing Dan Lăzărescu in her total disregard for the principle of stringency: the latter's translation of the sample-text has 130 lines but only 1,367 syllables (Lăzărescu, 2004: 27-35). By comparison, my translation of the sample-text has 100 lines and 1,055 syllables (Volceanov, 2010: 279-82).

It is hard to accept the idea that by "modernizing" Shakespeare a present-day translator actually should mean turning some of his finest poetry into doggerel and prose.

The first stanza of Ariel's first song (I. 2. 374-80) is made up of lines consisting of 7 / 4 / 7 / 4 / 7 / 7 / 4 syllables. The Romanian version, a perfect example of doggerel, has lines with 7 / 7 / 8 / 8 / 9 / 9 / 4 syllables. Shakespeare's 7-syllable lines are all trochaic; Ieronim's lines are inconsistent both in point of length and stress – she expands all the lines except for the first and the last line, and she uses the iambic foot throughout the song (Ieronim, 2009: 34).

Ariel's famous song "Full fathom five thy father lies" (I. 2. 397-403) consists of 7-syllable lines except for the first one, which is an octosyllabic. In Ioana Ieronim's version we have the following line-length: 11 / 9 / 8 / 12 / 9 / 9 / 11 (Ieronim, 2009: 35). Prosodic inconsistency kills the poetic quality of this purple passage, one of the eerie and touching moments of the play (especially in performance). The translation vacillates between the trochaic foot of the original and the iambic foot. The rhymes added to these varying lines are much worse than the mechanicals' attempts at poetry in the prologue to the play-within-the play in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*.

In Romanian, the Epilogue, which in Shakespeare is made up of heptasyllabic and octosyllabic lines, becomes just another example of doggerel with lines whose length varies between nine and fourteen syllables (Ieronim, 2009: 113).

Again, I have been the only translator who has tried to comply with a traditional rule established by an illustrious predecessor. Leon Levițchi, the absolute champion of stringency in Shakespeare translation, failed to be consistent in this respect: he added a few extra lines to Ariel's song about Alonso's alleged death (10 lines for the original 8 lines in Act I, Scene 2), to the epilogue (24 lines for 20), or Stephano's sea-song in Act II, Scene 2 (10 lines for the original 9) (Levițchi, 1990: 363, 377, 411). I may contend that I have outdone (out-Levițchied) my mentor and managed to preserve the original number of lines (and syllables) of all the songs and of the epilogue (Volceanov, 2010: 295, 315, 365-66).

The Romanian Tempest; or, The Comedy of (Translation) Errors

I shall not go into a detailed micro-textual discussion of Dan Lăzărescu's translation. Such a task would be almost impossible insofar as the "translator" does not seem to care a bit about the source text and the idea of faithfulness to the original. His text cannot be dubbed either paraphrase or adaptation. It is, practically, a *different* story, in which the syntax and style of the characters' speeches are moulded into something dictated by the whim of the translator's rhyming couplets. This different story is also a diluted story, with a plethora of extra-syllables, extra-lines and extra-details that have nothing to do with the original.

I shall mention here, in passing, just three instances of Lăzărescu's "craftsmanship" and later I shall return to his version for comparison with the other translations. In the opening scene of the play he mistranslates the *boatswain* as *meşter* (Lăzărescu, 2004: 19-25), which, in back-translation, means either *handyman* or *foreman*, terms that have nothing to do with seamanship. Ariel's three and a half lines about hijacking the king's ship and putting it "safely in harbour", "in the deep nook, where once / Thou call'dst me up at midnight to fetch dew / From the still vex'd Bermudas" (I. 2. 226-9) are translated into nearly six lines, the back-translation of

which reads as follows: "As soon as you quelled the tempest / I stepped aboard to put / The king's ship safely in harbour / In the Bermudas / Where you once asked me to fetch Your Highness / Some raw herbs with dew drops on them" (Lăzărescu, 2004: 45). Bermudas as a point of reference is completely different in this version: Lăzărescu's translation removes the plot of the play from the Mediterranean and relocates it to the Caribbean Sea; and Ariel's form of addressing Prospero ("Your Highness") is also inadequate. Lăzărescu rewrites Shakespeare's script adding a lot of verbosity to each character's speeches.

The first four lines (in prose) of Trinculo's long speech uttered at his entrance in Act II, Scene 2, with his comic comparison between a "black cloud" and "a foul bombard that would shed its liquor" (II. 2. 18-21), are rendered into rhyming couplets which tell a completely different story (Shakespeare's Trinculo complains about the lack of a shelter in the face of harsh weather, while Lăzărescu's Trinculo deplores his loneliness). There is nothing comic in the latter's lament, which in back-translation reads "I can see the black clouds readying up / To bring again rain and storm" (Lăzărescu, 2004: 101).

Ioana Ieronim contends in her foreword that her translation departs from tradition, which means that her version "updates" not only the prosody but also the vocabulary and the style of previous translations. And, indeed, there are passages wherein Ioana Ieronim has departed from Leon Leviţchi's translation, correcting her precursor where he happened to be wrong. Here are a few such examples of emendations:

ANTONIO: *Noble Sebastian,*
Thou let'st thy fortune sleep – die, rather; wink'st
Whiles thou art waking. (II. 1. 213-5)

ANTONIO: *Sebastian, tu-ţi laşi*
Norocul să-aţipească şi să moară;
Clipeşti, deşi eşti treaz. (Leviţchi, 1990: 372)

ANTONIO: *Nobile Sebastian, tu*
Îţi laşi norocul să doarmă tun – să moară chiar,
Ţii ochii închişi, cu toate că eşti treaz. (Ieronim, 2009: 53)

Ioana Ieronim has obviously learned from a more recent English edition of the play what Leon Leviţchi failed to grasp, namely, that in this context to *wink* means *to keep one's eyes shut* (Orgel, 2003: 138n). As usual with Dan Lăzărescu, he is telling again a completely different story, a proverb about missed opportunities that may have disastrous effects.

CALIBAN: *Do* that good mischief *which may make this island*
Thine own forever, and I, thy Caliban,
For aye thy foot-licker. (IV. 1. 216-8)

CALIBAN: *Şi fă* isprava*; insula, atunci*
Va fi a ta pe veci, iar Caliban –
De-a pururi sclavul tău. (Leviţchi, 1990: 399)

CALIBAN: *Fă tu* buna faptă rea *prin care insula*
Să fie a ta pentru totdeauna, iar eu, Caliban
Pe veci al tău linge-cizmă. (Ieronim, 2009: 95)

Unlike L. Leviţchi, who translated *good mischief* as *feat* and avoided the use of a vulgar phrase for *foot-licker*, translating it as *slave*, I. Ieronim does not fail to exploit the comic effect of the oxymoron *good mischief*, but the Romanian phrase *linge-cizmă* (*boot-licker* in back translation) sounds far-fetched. Why, then, not *linge-picior (foot-licker)* or *linge-talpă (sole-licker)*? D. Lăzărescu strangely translated the same hyperbolic description of a flatterer as "mereu supus plecat", i. e. "forever a humble subject" (2004: 165); I myself have used *pupincurist*, the Romanian slang term that in back-translation means *arse-kisser* – a term that is both vulgar and pejorative, pointing especially to political flatterers (Volceanov, 2010: 347).

Here is another instance of a slight improvement of meaning in I. Ieronim's version:

MIRANDA: *I do not know /* One of my sex… (III. 1. 49-50)

MIRANDA: *Eu nu cunosc făpturi* de-un neam cu mine… (Leviţchi, 1990: 382)

MIRANDA: *Eu nu cunosc* nici o altă femeie… (Ieronim, 2009: 69)

L. Leviţchi uses an ambiguous phrase, which in back-translation, reads "beings akin to me"; Ieronim's version (in back-translation: *any other woman*) is again closer to Shakespeare's intention, but both translators (prudishly?) avoid the word *sex* in their translations and choose to paraphrase it. D. Lăzărescu's "Chip de femeie n-am văzut vreodată" (2004: 119) means "I've never seen a woman's face" (which, incidentally, makes me wonder why Shakespeare avoids the word woman in Miranda's speech: should we read it as expressing a virgin's modesty?). Finally, my version reads "Eu nu cunosc făpturi *de-un sex cu mine*" (Volceanov, 2010: 322), which is almost the literal translation of Miranda's original statement.

So, I. Ieronim has doubtless consulted more recent critical editions of *The Tempest*, and yet, her translation displays plenty of clumsy solutions that echo L. Leviţchi's earlier errors. One of them might simply be explained in terms of sheer coincidence:

PROSPERO: *...Hast thou forgot*
The foul witch Sycorax, who with age and envy
Was grown into a hoop*?* (I. 2. 257-9)
This blue-eyed *hag was hither brought with child,*
And here was left by th' sailors. (I. 2. 269-70)
... she died

And left thee there, where thou didst vent thy groans
As fast as mill-wheels strike. (I. 2. 279-81)

PROSPERO: *...Uiţi de Sycorax,*
Hidoasa hârcă, ce de ani şi pizmă,
S-a prefăcut în cerc de bute*?*
Însărcinată, cloanţa cu ochi vineţi
A fost adusă-aici…
...Murind ea într-acestea,
Tu ai rămas ca să te-ntreci în geamăt
Cu aripile morilor de vânt. (Leviţchi, 1990: 359)

PROSPERO: *...Ai uitat-o pe scârba de*
Sycorax, scorpia care de bătrâneţe şi gelozie
Era cocârjată ca vreascul*?*
Zgripţora cu ochii albaştri *fiind grea,*
Matrozii au depus-o aici.
...şi a murit
Şi te-a lăsat acolo; slobozeai gemete
Dese cum bate roata morii. (Ieronim, 2009: 28-9)

I. Ieronim emends Leviţchi's incorrect use of *wind-mill* and restores the *mill-wheel* of the original, but she perpetuates the mistake of the *blue eyes (ochii albaştri)*, a phrase in which the epithet refers not to the colour of the eyes proper, but to the condition of a pregnant woman's eye-lids (Orgel, 2003: 116n). I. Ieronim translates Shakespeare's *envy* as *jealousy*, which makes no sense in the context. She also has a very strange choice for the translation of *sailors*, using the word *matrozi* (a word with a double etymology, borrowed from both German and Russian, which in Romanian certainly sounds like a Russian word, hence out of context). D. Lăzărescu correctly uses *pizmă* for envy, compares Ariel's groans with *zgomotul morii*, i. e. *the noise of a mill* (it might be *any* kind of mill), and drops the colour of the hag's eyes from his translation (2004: 47-9). As for myself, I have closely followed Stephen Orgel's clue and inserted a footnote about the particular meaning of *blue-eyed* in this context and in John Webster's *The Duchess of Malfi* (Volceanov, 2010: 289).

Elsewhere I. Ieronim emends Leon Leviţchi's translation of *crabs* as follows:

CALIBAN: *I prithee let me bring thee where* crabs grow*,*
And I with my long nails dig thee pig-nuts… (II. 2. 161-2)

CALIBAN: *La* mere acre*-am să te duc, şi trufe*
Cu ghearele-am să-ţi scurm… (Leviţchi, 1990: 380)

CALIBAN: Te rog, vino, te duc unde *cresc crabii*;
Şi cu unghii lungi îţi scurm cartoafe… (Ieronim, 2009: 65)

I. Ieronim's reading of *crabs* echoes recent editorial developments; "crabs were not considered good to eat – their sourness was proverbial – and Caliban may well be promising Stephano shellfish instead" (Orgel, 2003: 150n). I. Ieronim is right to assume that Caliban refers to crustaceans rather than to crab apples; but she still has serious problems with her use of punctuation marks, with her choice of words and euphony… D. Lăzărescu echoes L. Leviţchi's choice, reading crabs as "sour apples" and has Caliban say, rather, inadequately: "I want to show you a huge tree / Full of crab-apples…" (Lăzărescu, 2004: 111). The back-translation of my version, "Am să-ţi arăt unde găseşti creveţi", reads "I'll show you where to look for shrimps" (Volceanov, 2010: 319).

However, there are passages in I. Ieronim's version which prove that, at times, her "translation" is simply a paraphrase of Leviţchi's earlier translation; the occurrence of similar gross errors in both translations arouses suspicions about I. Ieronim's method of *unacknowledged* "borrowing", which places it on the verge of plagiarism.

Here is a conspicuous case in which the coincidence is no longer… coincidental:

ARIEL: Jove's *lightning, the precursors*
O'th' dreadful thunder-claps*, more momentary*
And sight-outrunning were not… (I. 2. 201-3)

ARIEL: *…mai iute, mai năprasnic*
Ca fulgerul lui Zeus*, vestitor*
Al trăsnetului *crunt…* (Leviţchi, 1990: 357)

ARIEL: *Fulgerele lui* Zeus *ce trag după ele*
Înfricoşatele trăsnete *n-au fost niciodată*
Mai repezi, mai presus de vedere… (Ieronim, 2009: 25)

Leviţchi strangely uses *Zeus* instead of *Jupiter*, while the whole mythological background of the play points to the Roman mythology, not to the Greek one (Shakespeare prefers the names of Iris, Ceres, Juno, Neptune and so on to those of Eos, Demeter, Hera or Poseidon). And here is another inexplicable error: the word *thunderclap* describes an acoustic phenomenon, not the *thunderbolt*. Quite curiously, both Leviţchi and Ieronim translate the English thunderclap as *trăsnet*, which, in back-translation, means *thunderbolt*. Shakspeare points out that the speed of light is higher than the speed of sound, an aspect that both translators fail to render into poetic imagery. And Ieronim curiously echoes her predecessor by naming Zeus instead of Jupiter! Moreover, she gets contaminated by this name and, unlike Leviţchi, resumes it in V. 1. 45, where Prospero remembers how he "rifted *Joe*'s stout oak": "Cu trăsnetul am despicat stejarul lui *Zeus*" (Ieronim, 2009: 99). Leviţchi's correct translation reads "Crăpând stejarul mândru al lui *Joe*" (Leviţchi, 1990: 402). As usual, D. Lăzărescu keeps telling us a different story. In his version, Ariel's nonsensical report reads, "I kindled the fire with fire thunderbolts and lightning" (2004: 43) – which is the epitome of absurdity. And he renders

Shakespeare's "I rifted Joe's stout oak" as "I rifted *the* oaks in the field" (2004: 173). The mythical reference is dropped. Here I have been, probably, the first to give an accurate Romanian translation of the lightning followed by thunderclaps in I. 2. 201-3: "Ca fulgerul lui Jupiter, ce-anunţă / Sinistrul tunet care va să vină" (Volceanov, 2010: 287).

Here is another startling coincidence as regards the perpetuation of an error:

PROSPERO: *Sea-water shalt thou drink; thy food shall be*
The fresh-brook mussels*, withered roots, and husks*
Wherein the acorn cradled. (I. 2. 463-5)

PROSPERO: *Vei bea din apa mării, hrana ta –*
Muşchi*, cupe ce-au ascuns pe vremuri ghinda*
Şi rădăcini uscate. (Leviţchi, 1990: 365)

PROSPERO: *De băut o să ai apă de mare; de mâncat*
Muşchi *de pârâu, rădăcini uscate şi teacă*
De ghindă. (Ieronim, 2009: 38)

Both Leviţchi and Ieronim mistake the *mussels*, which are, in fact, shells – "fresh water mussels are inedible" (Orgel, 2003: 126n) – for *moss*, the "very small green plant that grows in a thick soft furry mass on wet soil, trees, or rocks" (*Longman*, 2003: 1070). While Leviţchi simply translates the *mussels* as *moss*, Ieronim specifies that it is *brook-moss*; D. Lăzărescu hits the nail on the head and blunders by saying *tree-moss*. In my version, I have followed Stephen Orgel's suggestion (Volceanov, 2010: 298).

I have shown elsewhere that self-censorship was commonplace in the Romanian translations of Shakespeare's plays published back in the 1950s: Leviţchi was the son of an Orthodox priest, and this biographical detail, combined with another factor – the fact that he was not a member of the Communist Party – made him cautious in the translation of religious terms (Volceanov, 2006: 225-6). Leviţchi often chose to omit or paraphrase such terms. That is why I was not surprised to see that he translated the first line of Gonzalo's opening speech in Act III, Scene 3, "By'r lakin, I can go no further" in which *lakin*, or *lady kin*, is a mild form of "by our Lady" (Orgel, 2003: 163n), as "Mă iartă, oasele mă dor, stăpâne" (Leviţchi, 1990: 388), i. e. "Forgive me, Sir, my bones are aching" (with *bones* standing for *feet* or *legs)*; Ieronim's version, "Zău că nu sunt în stare să mai merg", meaning "I truly can't walk any more", is as secular as her forerunner's, doing away with the presence of a solemn vow in Gonzalo's speech. Lăzărescu, who translated the play after 1990, had no reason to shun the religious word, so he expands it by paraphrase: "Pe Sfânta Maică-a Domnului" ("By Our Lord's Sacred Mother"). My translation reads: "Jur pe Madona" ("I swear by Our Lady"). It adds a bit of local colour to an action involving mainly Italian characters; and I find it natural to use words like the French *milord* or the Italian *signor* in the translation of a Shakespeare chronicle or comedy.

And here is one last example of coincidental interpretation:

PROSPERO: *If I have too austerely punished you*
Your compensation *makes amends*... (IV.1.1-2)

PROSPERO: *Pedeapsa de ţi-a fost prea grea, ispaşa*
Te răsplăteşte-*acum*... (Leviţchi, 1990: 393)

PROSPERO: *Dacă te-am pedepsit prea aspru,*
Are să te consoleze răsplata *mea*... (Ieronim, 2009: 85)

Both Leviţchi and Ieronim translate Prospero's *compensation* as *reward* (the former uses a verbal form, the latter a noun), a strange choice, indeed, insofar as an unjust punishment cannot possibly be followed by a reward; the right word to use in case of injury or damage (as in Ferdinand's case) is *compensation*, which is of Latin origin and has its Romanian counterpart *compensaţie*. The term was probably avoided by the two translators because, to them, it may have sounded not poetic enough… Ieronim emphasizes the idea of comfort; her translation means: "If I have punished you too severely, / My reward will comfort you". Lăzărescu likewise translates *compensation* as *reward* in his rhyming couplet: De te-am silit la munci necuvenite, / Acum ţi-or fi cu toate *răsplătite*… (Lăzărescu, 2004: 149), which means "If I forced you to unduly labours, / They will be now rewarded." I have been the first to translate Shakespeare's *compensation* as *compensation*: "Dacă ţi-a fost pedeapsa mult prea aspră, / În *compensaţie* acuma-ţi dau…" (Volceanov, 2010: 337).

I. Ieronim's "innovative" translation cannot boast only emendations of an earlier translation and inexplicable (or, sometimes, explicable) coincidences, but also huge blunders of its own. There has been a new fashion in the Romanian teenagers' jargon to use American interjections like *wow*, *ouch*, or *geez* instead of their corresponding Romanian ones. I. Ieronim, in her translation of Ariel's song, likewise renders the bell's knell *ding-dong* (I. 2. 404) as… *ding-dong* (Ieronim, 2009: 35)! Lăzărescu drops both the onomatopoeia and the song's burden from his translation; I have used what I have considered to be the adequate Romanian onomatopoeia, "bing-bang" (Volceanov, 2010: 295).

Prospero fondly calls Ariel "my *bird*" (IV. 1. 184), a term of endearment used for a youngster (cf. Orgel, 2003: 183n); later he names him *chick* (V. 1. 316), yet another affectionate epithet. I. Ieronim translates the first term literally, "pasărea mea" (Ieronim, 2009: 93), thus missing the emotive modality at work in Prospero's utterance; the second term is correctly paraphrased as "drăgălaşul meu" (Ieronim, 2009: 112), i. e. "my dear li'l Ariel". Lăzărescu, as usual, drops both epithets from his translation, while I have translated it as "puiuţ" ("chick") (Volceanov, 2010: 345, 363), which is, indeed, a term of endearment used for little children in Romanian.

Physics turns out to be once again one of I. Ieronim's weak points when she translates the following passage from Prospero's famous soliloquy on his magic power:

PROSPERO: *Ye elves of hills, brooks, standing lakes, and groves,*
And ye that on the sands with printless foot
Do chase the ebbing *Neptune*... (V. 1. 33-5)

PROSPERO: *Voi elfi din munţi, pâraie, lacuri, crânguri,*
Voi care pe nisipuri alergaţi fără de urmă,
Gonindu-l pe Neptun în flux... (Ieronim, 2009: 99)

The verb *ebb* refers to the water's flowing away from the shore – that is why the elves can *chase* Neptune; in I. Ieronim's version, the elves chase Neptune while he is flowing onto the shore, which, of course is illogical – that would mean that the elves do chase him from off shore towards the coast, which contradicts Shakespeare's poetic (and physical) image! Lăzărescu's vague translation drops all the details about the *printless* feet on the sands, preserving only the image of the elves "chasing great Neptune": "Şi-l urmăriţi pe marele Neptun" (Lăzărescu, 2004: 173). I have restored the time of the *ebb* in the translating it "reflux" (Volceanov, 2010: 351).

The way the word *cell* from *The Tempest* should be translated into various languages is, perhaps, an intriguing topic. *Cell* is a small, one-room dwelling, with monastic implications. Prospero refers to his cell several times throughout the play. Sometimes the word is accompanied by the epithet *poor* as in "full poor cell" (I. 2. 20) or "my poor cell" (V. 1. 301). It is a place that lacks luster and luxury, a dwelling that does not seem to have been erected by Prospero himself, who is no handyman but a white-collar type of person; its modest appearance also suggests that it was not created by magic, so it is quite likely to be a kind of natural shelter, probably a cavity in a rock, a grotto or a cave. In his translation, L. Leviţchi opted for *peşteră*, the Romanian word for *cave*. He also used the word *grotă (grotto)* once (Leviţchi, 1990: 352, 410). Lăzărescu translated cell as *cave (peşteră)* in Act I, but in Act V he strangely rendered it as *iatac* (an archaic word of Turkish origin meaning *bedroom*). When, back in 1998, I translated Lawrence Durrell's non-fictional work *Prospero's Cell*, I applied L. Leviţchi's suggestion. The flip side of this choice was that in 2001, when I got a British Council award for this very translation, someone in the British staff back-translated the title as *Prospero's Cave*.

I. Ieronim vacillates between conflicting solutions. In her translation, the *cell* becomes *bârlog* (a *den* in I. 2. 20), *căsuţă* (a *little house* in I. 2. 39), and *colibă (cabin)* throughout Act V (Ieronim, 2009: 17, 18, 104, 111-12). The latter term has a strong literary connotation in Romanian, making one think of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Leslie Fiedler would certainly be deeply offended to see Prospero, the synecdoche for colonialism, placed next to an Afro-American hero.

The Truth behind the Aesthetic Competition

Shakespeare has been a "profitable commodity" in the cultural marketplace for centuries (Bristol, 1998: 201). It is difficult to imagine that today a translator would engage in translating a play by Shakespeare just for fun, exercise, or glory. Royalties have always been stimulating in a literary activity; the greater the impact of a translation on the book-market and the theatre, the larger the translator's financial incentives. I can hardly believe in a translator's hidden political agenda (a territory explored by fellow-academics for whom Cultural Materialism has become a fashion and a religion); but I overtly admit that every translator has an economic agenda. That is why, in the final section of my paper I shall try to assess the impact of these recent translations as merchandise.

Ieronim's translation was issued by a publishing house specialized in printing Romanian and foreign drama and drama criticism. Its target-readers are theatre-goers, critics, actors, directors. The initial 300-copy print run has been distributed in the foyer of the National Theatre in Bucharest and at the seat of UNITER in Bucharest. As such, it cannot compete with D. Lăzărescu's translation, which, in a cheap paperback edition, has been distributed since 2004 through the major bookshop chains, in several print runs. For years on, it has been the only available edition in print, hence, the pupils' and undergraduates' fodder and surrogate of a Shakespeare reading. At the Students' Fourteenth National Shakespeare Symposium held in April 2008 at the "Dunărea de Jos" University of Galaţi, in a round-table discussion that tried to answer the question "What / Whose 'Shakespeare' Do Undergraduates Read?," teachers and students complained alike about the distorted sense of Shakespeare's art the younger generation gets from reading D. Lăzărescu's translations. That Romanian academics abhor them is substantiated by the fact that Monica Matei-Chesnoiu, the editor of *Shakespeare in Romania: 1950 to the present*, simply turns a blind eye to all of Dan Lăzărescu's translations of Shakespeare's plays, ignoring him as a translator in her rather exhaustive list of Shakespeare translations published in Romania in the past sixty years.

My recently published translation of *The Tempest* is, alongside the Sonnets, the spearhead of a new Shakespeare series to be issued by Paralela 45 Publishing House between 2010 and 2016. The second volume contains the first Romanian translation of Shakespeare's three *Hamlet*s: the "bad" quarto of 1603, the "good" quarto of 1604, and the 1623 "folio" version of the play. It was launched in April 2010 during the International Shakespeare Festival held in Craiova. This new series of works by Shakespeare, backed by our academic community, will presumably succeed in sweeping away D. Lăzărescu's hotly contested (but well-selling) translations.

I. Ieronim's translation was originally commissioned by Teatrul Mic in Bucharest; my translation was originally commissioned by Teatrul Tineretului (The Youth Theatre) of Piatra Neamţ. The latter project was cancelled due to the recent economic crisis; however, the translation has been included on the list of texts

waiting for staging at the National Theatre in Bucharest. So, this version is likely to gain a canonical status in the world of theatre-goers sometime in the future. Of the ten productions of *The Tempest* staged in Romania between 1950 and 2008, none used D. Lăzărescu's version and it is highly unlikely that a Romanian director will ever stage this play in rhyming couplets. There have been two productions based on L. Leviţchi's "philological", not very performable text, and three based on Nina Cassian's stage-adaptation. Cassian's version was never printed: it was too free an adaptation to be published as "Shakespeare"[2].

References and bibliography

Asimov, I. 1993. *Asimov's Guide to Shakespeare*. New York: Wings Books.

Bloom, H. *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human.* 1999. New York: Riverhead Books.

Bristol, M. 1998. *Big-time Shakespeare*. London and New York: Routledge.

Durrell, L. 1998. *Peştera lui Prospero (Prospero's Cell)*, translated by Volceanov, G. Bucureşti: Univers.

Ieronim I. 2009. Preface to Shakespeare, W., *Furtuna*, translated by Ieronim I. Bucureşti: Fundaţia Culturală „Camil Petrescu", Revista *Teatrul Azi*, Supliment.

Lăzărescu, D. A. 1974. *Introducere în shakespeareologie.* Bucureşti: Univers.

Lăzărescu, D. A. 2002. Introduction to Shakespeare, W., *Macbeth*, translated by Lăzărescu D. A. Târgovişte: Pandora-M.

Lăzărescu, D. A. 2004. Introduction and notes to Shakespeare, W, *The Tempest / Furtuna*, translated by Lăzărescu D. A. Târgovişte: Pandora-M.

Lăzărescu, D. A. 2007. *Introducere în shakespeareologie*, Second edition. Craiova: Sim Art.

Leviţchi L. (ed.). 1990. Shakespeare, W., *Furtuna*, in *Opere*, Vol. 8. Bucureşti: Univers.

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. 2003. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Matei-Chesnoiu, M. (ed.). (2008). *Shakespeare in Romania: 1950 to the present*. Bucureşti: Humanitas.

Orgel, S. (ed.). 2003. Introduction and notes to Shakespeare, W., *The Tempest*. London and New York: Oxford University Press.

Protopopescu, D. 1940. "Foreword, Or, Wrestling with Shakespeare", in Shakespeare, W., *Furtuna*, translated by Protopopescu, D. Bucureşti: Fundaţia pentru Literatură şi Artă.

[2] Of the 254 Romanian Shakespeare productions of the past sixty years listed by Monica Matei-Chesnoiu (2008: 259-370), only 96 used *canonical* translations (by canonical I mean the translations included in the most prestigious Romanian editions of Shakespeare's works, the 1955-1961 ESPLA and the 1982-1995 Univers editions). The inadequacy of "philological" translations for staging purposes is obvious in most cases.

Volceanov, G. 2006, 'Appropriating through Translation: Shakespeare Translations in Communist Romania,' in Popescu Fl. (ed.), *Translation Studies: Retrospective and Prospective Views*, Galaţi: Editura Fundaţiei Universitare Dunărea de Jos, 206-18.

Volceanov, G. 2008. 'A Critique of Leon Levitchi's "Philological" Translation of *The Tempest*,' in *Translation Studies*, 1, (3): 217-228.

Volceanov, G. (ed.). 2010. Shakespeare, W., *Furtuna*, in *Opere*, Vol. 1. Piteşti: Paralela 45.

The author

George Volceanov is Associate Professor of English Literature at "Spiru Haret" University in Bucharest. He is a distinguished translator and lexicographer. He has translated works by William Shakespeare, Thomas Heywood, John Webster, Lawrence Durrell, David Lodge, John Updike, Philip Roth, Gore Vidal, etc. He is the recipient of several translation awards. He has written dozens of articles and essays on Shakespeare's life and works, contributing, via critical texts and literary translations, to the enlargement of the Shakespeare Canon in Romania. He is the general-editor of the new Shakespeare series launched by Paralela 45 Publishers in 2010.