

George Volceanov

From Printed Text to Stage Version: Reshaping Shakespeare for Performance – *Edward III* at the National Theatre in Bucharest¹

Reshaping of the Shakespeare Canon in Romania

In the spring of 2005, in the Preface to the published version of my doctoral thesis dedicated to the enlargement of the Shakespeare canon in Romania, I described it as “the theoretical, or rather, historical and explanatory half of a larger project aimed at reshaping the notion of ‘Shakespeare canon’ in Romania” (Volceanov, 2005: 7). The practical half consisted of my translation of recently canonized texts, which had been published in 2002 and 2003.² At first, the project passed almost unnoticed in the book market: although fellow-academics from several universities in Romania warmly greeted the new translations, the professional literary critics refrained from reviewing these new Shakespearean texts.³ Yet, the Romanian version of *Edward III* won the Andrei Bantaş Foundation Award for the Best Translation of the Year. After the print run of the first edition of the two translations sold out, the project seemed to sink into oblivion. It was like nobody really cared whether Shakespeare had written 37, 38, 40, or 41 plays.

Things started to change for the better as early as the autumn of 2005, when Ion Caramitru, the newly appointed General Director of the National Theatre in Bucharest, first announced that *Edward III*, “a play recently ascribed to Shakespeare”, will be brought to stage by theatre director Alexandru Tocilescu in the 2006-2007 season (*Noul Adevărul*, 25 Nov 2005). This announcement was resuscitated in the summer of 2006 (*Realitatea românească*, 21 June 2006; *Cronica română*, 23 June 2006). Tocilescu and Caramitru had worked together in the celebrated production of *Hamlet* at the Lucia Sturza

¹ This article is the revised version of a paper given at the “Shakespeare and Europe: Nation(s) and Boundaries” International Conference held at the University of Iaşi, 14-17 November 2007. In this article, I shall confine myself to the discussion of the first two acts of *Edward III*, albeit I will refer, in passing, to emendations that were made in the text of other acts as well.

² William Shakespeare, John Fletcher, *Doi veri de stirpe aleasă / The Two Noble Kinsmen*, bilingual edition (Iaşi: Polirom, 2002); William Shakespeare, *Eduard al III-lea* (Piteşti: Paralela 45, 2003).

³ For a detailed discussion of the reception of newly canonized plays in Romanian literary magazines, see my article “The Ups and Downs of the Enlargement of the Shakespeare Canon: A Romanian Example” (Volceanov, 2006: 211-46).

Bulandra Theatre in the mid-1980s. It earned them international acclaim and Ion Caramitru rocketed to international stardom and got an OBE.

Alexandru Tocilescu's intention of directing a "new play" by Shakespeare was made public in media when he announced that he is in search of actors aged 25 to 45, with "heroic" features (*România liberă*, 13 Oct 2006; *Azi*, 17 Oct 2006). The actors in the cast of *Edward III* were selected on the basis of an audition – the candidates had to play brief excerpts of their own choice from Shakespeare's chronicle plays. Many of them came from rival companies. The much awaited "national premiere" has received a lot of hype ever since. *Curierul național* (18 Jan 2007), *Cotidianul* (21 Jan and 21 Feb 2007, 30 July 2007), *Formula AS* (24 Sept 2007), *România liberă* (25 Sept 2007) are just a few of the journals and weeklies that have assiduously written about "*Edward III* being rehearsed at the National Theatre." Sensing the readers' growing curiosity for the less known chronicle play, Paralela 45 Publishing House issued its second edition in the spring of 2007.

Director Alexandru Tocilescu proved to be a good connoisseur of Shakespeare's time and works in the interview published in the daily *Evenimentul zilei* (30 Jan 2007):

The Romanian spectators do not know this play; they will expect something completely new. And this is Shakespeare, the words are sublime, the text has sensational poetics. It is certain that he wrote most parts of the text [...]. In Shakespeare's time, playwrights worked jointly, some wrote love scenes, while others wrote battle scenes or scenes of intrigue. This play is constructed like a Hollywood script. (7)

During the same interview, just five days after the first rehearsal, Tocilescu said:

I've made no alterations to the text, it may seem a lengthy text but the overall impression depends on the quality of the actors' performance. If the long soliloquies are played properly, the audience will freeze and listen breathlessly to these extraordinary words. I'm not intent on cutting. If we bring the text to stage for the first time, shouldn't the spectators hear it all? (7)

Interestingly, in an appendix to the same interview, the leading actor Ion Caramitru expressed a slightly different view on the text of the play: "*Edward III* is not easy. Right now, we are deciphering and ennobling it. It's a long text; we'll have to decide where to make cuts" (*Evenimentul zilei*, 30 Jan 2007).

This paper tackles the way in which a printed "Shakespeare" is turned into a staged "Shakespeare" as the result of a collaborative effort among director, leading actor, troupe, dramaturge and translator. I have undertaken to

write this paper with the firm belief that today's theatrical practices replicate what was going on in Shakespeare's time, that writing drama is a collaborative process and it was not Shakespeare alone who wrote what we call, nowadays, "Shakespeare's plays".

Types of Textual Changes

The "page" text of *Edward III* underwent three basic types of changes during the rehearsals: (1) slight alterations (one or two-word alterations within a line, or the change of word-order within a line) which did not erase the translator's original intentions but rather enhanced the intelligibility of the text; (2) cuts; (3) additions to the original text. I shall provide some statistics to see to what extent the "stage" version deviates from the "page" text and I shall discuss *why* there had to be made changes to the initial "philological," or literary, version.

I hope the figures in the statistics stand proof for the fact that the Romanian printed version of *Edward III* observes the Schlegel-Tieck strategy of translation based on the preservation of the original prosodic structure and the principle of *stringency*.⁴ Throughout the translation of the play I tried to follow Leon Levițchi's proposal of translating one hundred lines of Shakespearean text into no more than 107 Romanian lines, a proposal he first formulated in 1955. I also hope that these figures will show that, notwithstanding several emendations, the "page" version has still passed the test of performability,⁵ being accepted by the director and the actors as the core, or backbone, of the final stage version.

Scene	Original text	Romanian translation	Altered lines	Cuts	Additions
I.1	169	175	28	27	21
I.2	166	176	36	25	4
II.1	460	485	64	109	29
II.2	209	220	35	26	6

In the early phase of rehearsals (the text was read over and over again), the first changes started to appear. Most of the actors contributed to reshaping of the text with slight alterations that had to do with its euphony. Actors usually avoid alliterations, let alone cacophonous phrases.⁶ Other slight alterations

⁴ For the notion of *stringency* in Shakespearean translations, see Pujante.

⁵ For a discussion of performability, see Dimitriu.

⁶ For a Romanian professional actor it is quite difficult to utter, in performance, a line containing more than four [s] or [z] phonemes. The alliterative use of such sounds in Macbeth's soliloquies becomes cacophony in Romanian.

occurred at single-word level, where several archaic words were replaced by their modern counterpart, to make the text more comprehensible for today's spectators. For instance, the archaic "paing" gave way to "păianjen" in the translation of *spider* (2.1.285). The word "nohai" (hardly understandable today) was likewise replaced by "tătar" in the translation of *Tartar* (2.1.71). Some more alterations were made at the level of word-order. Inversion, convoluted syntax, aposiopesis and anacoluthon look good on page but, in practice, an actor needs to make himself clearly understood by the audience, so he will always demand clear speeches, constructed in precise, balanced syntax.⁷

Sometimes these alterations were more than personal bias, becoming part and parcel of director Tocilescu's coherent strategy of communicating with the audience. Tocilescu was aware that the English audience of Shakespeare's time was much closer (geographically and historically speaking) than a twenty-first century Romanian audience would be to the events that started and fueled the Hundred Years War. Therefore, he insisted on altering any possibly ambiguous word or line regarding the cause of and the participants in the war. Accordingly, the following alterations were made to the original script: Robert d'Artois' *love unto my country* (1.1.34) becomes "dragostea de Franța" (love unto France) and his *place the true shepherd of our commonwealth* (1.1.41 – a statement clearly made from a Frenchman's viewpoint) becomes "aducând în fruntea Franței noastre / Păstoru-adevărat" (thus, *France* again replaces the Romanian word for *commonwealth* – "obște"). Similarly, when Lord Audley announces that "the Duke of Lorraine" has come to see Edward (1.1.52), he is presented in Romanian as "solul Franței, ducele Lorena" (i.e. the French ambassador). France as the bone of contention in the play recurs in the Romanian stage version in translation of the line in which Edward claims *all the whole dominions of his realm* (1.1.83) – "ci vreau întreaga Franță". In this instance, the philological translation is more truthful to the original, reading "ci voi domnia-ntregii țări".

In his hot exchange with Lorraine, Edward speaks about *the crown that [Valois] usurps* (1.1.80); the Romanian stage version makes it clear that the English king specifically refers to the French crown ("coroana Franței"). While Artois asks Lorraine to convey his message to *his grace* (1.1.101), in Romanian the addressee is clearly mentioned as "Jean Valois".

France as an opposing pole of English interests reemerges in Act 1, Scene 2, during the encounter of the same Duke of Lorraine and King David of Scotland. Once again, the idea of French enmity is emphasized by the repeated insertion of the words *France* and *French* in the stage version. While in English David assures the French ambassador that the Scots will keep fighting against England *till your king / Cry out: 'Enough...'* (2.1.33-4), the Romanian stage version replaces *your king* with *the French king*.

⁷ A trick used by Romanian translators in the translation of older literary texts is syntactic inversion, with the auxiliary verbs placed after the conjugated verb in various verbal tenses; even if the translator uses present-day vocabulary, these inversions make the text look archaic.

During King Edward's ignoble attempt to seduce the Countess of Salisbury, the latter bitterly complains about her paradoxical situation: *Woe me unhappy, / To have escaped the danger of my foes / And to be ten times worse envired by friends* (2.1.413-15). The Romanian printed translation reads: "Vai, ce năpastă / Să scap de inamic spre-a fi lovită / De zece ori mai crunt de-ai mei prieteni." The stage version emends the word for word translation by using the word "scoțieni" (*Scots*) instead of "inamic" (*foes*) and "al nostru rege" (*our king*) instead of "friends."

The same precise language is used to define the other political powers indirectly involved in the war. When Audley and Derby meet after the latter's diplomatic mission to the German emperor, they both repeatedly refer to *the emperor* (2.2.7-8). The same word occurs several times in the dialogue between Derby and Edward (2.2.25, 36, 39). The Romanian stage version replaces "împăratul" and "cezarul" (a shorter synonym) with "germani" (*the Germans*) and "Kaiserul" (which needs not be translated).⁸

All the aforementioned alterations clearly indicate the director's desire to give a precise "local habitation and a name" to the setting and the actors of this story. Conversely, in his much-acclaimed stage version of *Hamlet*, Tocilescu had relocated Shakespeare's volatile Denmark as "imaginary geography" into an *Anyland*, in a subversive, anti-Communist reading of the play. For Tocilescu, the plot of *Hamlet* is open to any cultural space, while *Edward III* is a tale of love, honour and war that points to a specific culture; hence the importance Tocilescu attaches to the theme of honour and the Villiers episodes of Act 4.

Alterations within a line serve several purposes. One of them is to reshape a source-oriented text as a message comprehensible for every single spectator in an audience regardless of his/her education and cultural background. Even the present-day English readers apparently need a footnote to understand the meaning of the *skipping jigs* referred to by the Countess of Salisbury (1.2.12). Giorgio Melchiori, the Cambridge editor of the play, has taken pains to explain them as "lively grotesque dances to the tune of scurrilous ballads, typical of Scotland" (76). My source-oriented translation reads "gigă săltăreață," but the stage version makes this phrase more comprehensible, by simply using "dansuri săltărețe" (*skipping dances*).

Another purpose served by word alteration is the achievement of unexpected comic effects. During his attempt to seduce the Countess, King Edward famously compares himself to the mythological hero Leander (2.2.150-55), and promises he will cross a *Hellespont of blood / To arrive at Sestos, where my Hero lies* (2.2.154-5). Ion Caramitru's Romanian speech replaces *Sestos* with "Sextos," in a scene in which everything is about sexual desire, an idea clearly expressed in the King's earlier speech (2.2.61-71), a soliloquy that,

⁸ A further attempt to differentiate the English from the French on stage was to avoid as much as possible Romanian forms of address and use "my lord" among the English characters and "milord" among the French ones.

with its sexual metaphors, clearly invites a Freudian reading: *The quarrel that I have requires no arms / But these of mine, and these shall meet my foe / In a deep march of penetrable groans...* (2.2.61-64).

But the funniest alteration occurs in a scene wherein King Edward asks his secretary, Lodowick, to write a poem that *may raise drops in a Tartar's eye, / And make a flint-heart Scythian pitiful* (2.1.71-2). The stage version replaced the more archaic "nohai" of the printed translation with "tătar", and replaced the reference to the Scythian (one that is allotted a footnote in Melchiori's Cambridge edition) (Melchiori 70) with an unexpectedly comic line, that reads "And may warm up a bit a polar bear". *Polar* and *Tartar* form a rhyme in Romanian. This emendation suits Ion Caramitru's performance, in which Edward as an imitator of Petrarchan courtly love poetry is made to seem at times unwittingly ridiculous.

* * *

It is common knowledge that, nowadays, almost no performance of a Shakespearean play is staged without cuts. Today both actors and spectators tend to complain about what they call lengthy speeches. Sean McEvoy says: "In Shakespeare's time, people were much more used than we are to listening to long and (to us) demanding passages of speech. Because most of them could not read [...] their ability to take in spoken language had to be more developed than ours" (14). This partly explains the actors' and directors' constant tendency to abridge longer cues. There is yet another explanation for the fashion of making cuts in Shakespeare's text: "[Shakespeare] wrote lines for actors to speak which had to be understood as soon as they were heard by the audience" (13). We must admit that a play by Shakespeare is full of allusions and references that make no sense, or little sense, to a twenty-first century spectator.

Accordingly, many brief cuts were made to do away with such allusions. The first act, which introduces the participants in the Hundred Years War and expounds their motives, cuts about thirty lines that merely have an ornamental function: Queen Isabel's offspring comes *from the fragrant garden of her womb* (1.1.14), King Edward is *your gracious self, the flower of Europe's hope* (1.1.15), Artois' counsels are compared with *fruitful showers* (1.1.42), and King Edward uses an ample conceit to compare himself with a vigilant nightingale that presses her breast against a thorn (1.1.108-113). Such metaphors and comparisons are dropped for the sake of a faster development of the plot. The lines in which Edward compares King David of Scotland to a snail (1.1.136-8) were initially cut but during a later stage of rehearsals Ion Caramitru decided that he should preserve that digressive speech. And this was not the only moment of vacillation in the process of textual reshaping.

The last cue of Scene 1, spoken by Prince Edward (1.1.160-9), is completely suppressed. It is a redundant comment on the preceding events and a

young man's promise of growing into an exemplary warrior and patriot, but allotting the final words in the scene to King Edward, who asks his son to accustom his *shoulders to an armour's weight*, enhances dramatic tension.

The second scene of the play, in which King David flees back to Scotland after he has unsuccessfully laid siege to Roxborough Castle and King Edward falls in love with the Countess at first sight, was cut by 25 lines. The main reason was to do away with redundancy: Montague informs the Countess that the King is approaching the castle (1.2.82-7), information already conveyed by the Scottish messenger in an earlier speech, in (1.2.48-55). King Edward and Warwick walk in right after Montague has finished his speech, which makes it unnecessary. Edward and Warwick are talking about the Scots, who have fled and are being pursued by the English soldiers, which is again a superfluous exchange (1.2.90-3). These small cuts increase the narrative pace on stage: the English king enters nearly as soon as the Scottish king has left, and war gives way to love. The other cuts in this scene were made in the Countess' lengthy speech in which she invites King Edward to stay overnight and *honour her roof*: she compares her castle in turn to a *country swain*, the *ground* and a *cloak* in embellished conceits (1.2.141-61). Half of these conceits were cut from the stage version.

From the first love scene (Act 2, Scene 1) almost 22 percent of the text was cut in the stage version. Lodowick's long opening soliloquy about King Edward's love for the Countess (2.1.1-24) was reduced to a six-line ballad. Thus, Lodowick, the secretary-poet, is constructed as a fool and a minstrel, too. Introducing a brief ballad instead of a long soliloquy clearly points to Alexandru Tocilescu's attempt to use varied means of expression and save the production from tediousness.

Six lines were cut from King Edward's first speech, in which he impersonates the Countess recounting the way in which David bragged and she herself imitated his bragging style:

'Even thus', quoth she, 'he spake' – and then spoke broad,
With epithets and accents of the Scot,
But somehow better than the Scot could speak.
'And thus quoth she' – and answered then herself –
For who could speak like her? – But she herself
Breathes from the wall an angel's note from heaven
Of sweet defiance to her barbarous foes. (2.1.29-35)

Why am I not surprised about this cut? In my monograph "*Methinks You're Better Spoken*": A Study in the Language of Shakespeare's Characters (2004), dedicated to their habit of mimicking one another, I noticed that *linguistic mimicry* may indicate psychological depth, the characters' ability to

overhear the other before overhearing themselves, as Harold Bloom would say.⁹ It may also stand for man's genuine feature of relishing the very idea of playfulness, of behaving like an eternal *homo ludens*. In Shakespeare's plays there are many instances of linguistic mimicry performed as apparently gratuitous acts. Art directors usually cut these seemingly static interludes that block and delay the forward movement of the plot. They seem to forget that these passages of suspended time and action, although somewhat irrelevant for the outcome of the plot, are the moments that may best reveal the hidden personality of characters, that they may shed light on their psychology. In fact, the Countess' theatrical talent commented on by Edward prepares the end of Act 2, Scene 2, in which she *stages* her attempted suicide to oppose the King's tyranny and manages to take him aback after successfully feigning obedience and compliance to her lord.¹⁰

Other "jettisoned" passages consist, again, of conceits like the one in which King Edward compares the Countess' voice to a nightingale's and indirectly refers to the myth of Philomel and Tereus (2.1.107-114), an allusion whose meaning very few spectators might grasp nowadays. Much of the text that shows King Edward's comic attempts to step into the shoes of a Petrarchan poet has been preserved, including the long digression on the "flattering glass" (2.1.115-21), or the lengthy conceit that compares his mistress to the sun (2.1.156-66). Other passages have been dropped, especially in the psychologically charged encounter between the King and the Countess. The Countess' metaphor about her body and soul (2.1.238-41), her comparison between the King and a counterfeiter (2.1.256-60), several allusions to the *Old Testament*, to Sarah and Adam (2.1.264-71) are left out from the stage version. The stage version also drops the entire aside in Warwick's speech, wherein he summons up the courage to deliver his daughter the King's lustful message (2.1.374-84). Such a lengthy aside is hard to play in the presence of another character, and the brusqueness of his approach does enhance dramatic tension.

There are also cuts that might be labelled as "technical" cuts in the case of brief cues that, in response to the sound of a trumpet (in Act 2, Scene 2), comment on the arrival of the king. The king's sudden entrance makes such redundant lines useless.

The stage version of Act 2, Scene 2 cuts yet another tedious lengthy comparison set up between mistress and sun (2.2.67-71). The last cut drops a mythological allusion that Shakespeare's audience was well acquainted with: *Arise, true English lady, whom our isle / May better boast of than ever Rome might / Of her, whose ransacked treasury hath tasked / The vain endeavour of so many pens* (2.2.192-5). Today very few Romanian spectators would be aware

⁹ I am referring to Harold Bloom's theory about "self-change on the basis of self-overhearing" as the main indicator of a "psychology of mutability" in Shakespeare's plays, see Bloom 48-9.

¹⁰ For a detailed discussion of the notion of *linguistic mimicry* in Shakespeare's plays, coined by the Romanian scholar and translator Leon Levițchi, see Volceanov 2004.

that Shakespeare draws a parallel between the Countess of Salisbury and Lucrece, the symbol of married chastity.

Despite the seemingly numerous cuts, director Alexandru Tocilescu has kept his promise and has spared many lengthy speeches imbued with poetic language, which, in his opinion, should contribute to the aesthetic education of the audience and bring the actors rapturous applause. I shall list some of the speeches director Tocilescu considers to be purple passages that should be recited as great poetry: the arming of Prince Edward on the eve of the battle of Crécy, with its military ceremony (3.3.179-218); the description of the French army at Poitiers by Prince Edward and Lord Audley, in a fabulous mixture of visual images (4.4.39), followed by the Prince's extraordinary speech, with its abstract and paradoxical mathematics, according to which thousand millions mean as much as one does (4.4.40-65); Lord Audley's stoic considerations on death (4.4.134-49) and the Prince's distilled philosophy of life and death (4.4.150-62), with the sudden realization that *to live is but to seek to die, / And dying but beginning of new living* (4.4.159-60), a ubiquitous, universal truth shared by ancient Indians and Dacians, Calderon de la Barca, the German Romantics and Eminescu alike; King John's opening speech of the next scene, in which, on the eve of the battle of Poitiers, *the winds are crept into their caves for fear* (4.5.1-8); the description of the same French army by King John in his attempt to intimidate Salisbury, the prisoner he will let go to see his king at Calais (4.5.109-26) – Alexandru Tocilescu asked Șerban Ionescu, who plays the French king, to recite the lines describing the French army on *the lofty hill* as if he were reading a famous pastoral poem, *Sara pe deal (At Dusk on the Hill)* by the Romanian national poet Mihai Eminescu: the calmer the tone of his speech, the greater the plight of his tormented prisoner. Yet, above all, the most impressive long speech is uttered by the French Mariner that describes the horrors of war in the description of the naval battle of Sluys (3.1.141-85). This superb passage full of memorable images is graphically sustained, on stage, by shadow theatre. Curiously, this passage with echoes from both John Donne's early poems "The Storm" and "The Calm" and Thomas Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedy* (1.2.22-84) (Melchiori 112), seems to have been written by Shakespeare's anonymous co-author of *Edward III*, as if to remind us that great works may be the result of collaborative efforts.

* * *

The additions to the original text of the Romanian translations are not as numerous as the cuts and alterations. Most of them are personal contribution of the actors. One of the first lessons I learned during the rehearsals was that the younger an actor is, the more compliant he is to play a role *as it is* in the text he gets; conversely, the more experienced he gets, the more demanding he grows, contributing to the reshaping of the original text. With rare exceptions, the

additions to the final version have been made by the senior actors in the cast; Ion Caramitru's contribution is outstanding, representing about 80 percent of all the additions, and it will be discussed under a different heading.

The additions to the original were made for various purposes. As in the case of the alterations discussed earlier in the paper, director Tocilescu insisted on making things as clear as possible in the opening scene of the play, in the explanation of the Salic Law and the rise of the English king's claim to the French throne. King Edward's question, *Who next succeeded Philip le Beau?* (1.1.6), reads "Cine-a urmat la tron în Franța / Lui Filip cel Frumos?" (Who next succeeded Philip le Beau to the throne of France?). Another question, *But was my mother sister unto those [three brothers]?* (1.1.10), is made more explicit in the Romanian stage version, which reads: "Dar ei au fost cu toții patru frați, / Iar mama le-a fost soră" (But all in all there were four progenies, / And my mother was sister unto the other three). In his reply, Artois calls Isabel "a voastră mamă" (your mother) in the Romanian stage version, whereas in the English text she is simply referred to as *Isabel*. Where Artois shows that France *ought not admit a governor to rule / Except he be descended of the male* (1.1.24-5), the Romanian stage version adds the idea that *neither will rule the descendants of a woman* ("și nici urmași din neamul ei"). When King Edward learns his *pedigree* from Artois and decides to claim the French crown, the English noblemen all salute him with *Vive le Roi*, which does not occur in Shakespeare's text.

Lorraine's vocabulary contains a few brief additions meant to underline his *otherness* in contrast with the English and the Scots he comes to interact with. This adds a comic tinge to a determined, dangerous warrior. He uses words like "Bonjour" and "Alors", and, wherever possible, he uses French pronunciation, as in the case of "rituel" (which displaces the Romanian "datină" of the printed translation). The same phonological trick is used by King John of France when he addresses the captive Salisbury in Act 4, Scene 5, uttering his name in four syllables.

Ion Caramitru's Emendations

Experienced actors, who have had the opportunity to play in several productions of Shakespeare's plays, have a natural tendency to contribute with emendations to the script. The venerable Mircea Albulescu,¹¹ originally cast as Warwick, had to retire due to the death of his wife, but the text that he had conscientiously emended is still used by Eusebiu Ștefănescu, who substitutes for him. Albulescu's emendations consist of judicious cuts and alterations. Șerban Ionescu, cast as the French king, is also well acquainted with Shakespearean

¹¹ I remember that the first play I ever saw was a tremendously successful production of *Troilus and Cressida*, directed by David Esrig, and featuring Mircea Albulescu as Achilles, at Teatrul de Comedie in Bucharest, in the early 1960s.

drama: he featured in no less than eight plays by Shakespeare, most notably in *King John* (as the Bastard), directed by Grigore Gonța at Teatrul de Comedie in Bucharest in the mid-1980s. He likewise contributed commonsensical emendations to the text of Acts 3 and 4.

Dame Simona Bondoc, cast as Queen Philippa, complained during rehearsals about the scarcity of her part (Shakespeare allots the Queen only 16 lines out of 243 in the only scene in which she appears). She suggested that the entrance of Edward and Philippa in Act 5, Scene 1, in which the King tries to appease the angry Queen (*No more, Queen Philippe, pacify yourself...* 5.1.1-7) should be introduced by a brief cue uttered by the Queen herself, which should elicit the King's attempt to *pacify* her. The translator and the dramaturge attending the rehearsals accordingly concocted an introductory speech from fragments of lines spoken by Queen Margaret in *2 Henry VI*. The last cue she utters when she meets the Black Prince and kisses him as he enters in triumph, bringing the French prisoners after the battle of Poitiers has, in addition to the original two lines (5.1.190-1), a brief comment on the theme of *fortuna labilis*, borrowed from *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, where Theseus exclaims: *Never Fortune / Did play a subtler game: the conquered triumphs, / The victor has the loss* (5.4.112-4). This addition is somehow in tune with Salisbury's earlier message, in which he foresees a French victory and the death of the Black Prince (5.1.109-56).

Ion Caramitru, the leading-actor in the cast, has an impressive Shakespeare record: he has played Hamlet twice (in the 1960s and the 1980s), Romeo, Malcolm, Julius Caesar, Feste, Ferdinand, Pericles, and other Shakespearean characters. It is no wonder that with such a long history of Shakespearean productions, Mr. Caramitru has done his best to "ennoble" the text of the Romanian translation. In his review of Eric Sams' edition of *Edward III*,¹² Jonathan Bate showed that, in many respects, King Edward III is the forerunner of Angelo in *Measure for Measure* and he also anticipates Hal's career and evolution from idleness to political and military glory. Structurally speaking, the Countess scenes in *Edward III*, ending in the King's realization of the folly of his attempt to seduce the Countess, prepare the way for Hal's descent from a prince to a prentice. They make possible his encounter with Falstaff.¹³ For critics and editors, Edward is a less three-dimensional character than Angelo, Hal, or Falstaff. It is quite difficult for an experienced actor who has played Hamlet, Feste, and Pericles to accept the idea of impersonating a less "complex" character. I think that Ion Caramitru's emendations, mostly additions to the original translation, aim at turning to his account the experience of his previous roles and refashioning Edward as a complex character, aesthetically equal in rank to other great Shakespearean heroes. These emendations do not

¹² See Sams.

¹³ See Bate 3-4.

undermine what may have been Shakespeare's intention, but rather enforce his intentions; they have a "Shakespearean" quality.¹⁴

I have already referred to some alterations made to Edward's speeches. Here I shall only tackle some of the additions made by Ion Caramitru and I shall contend that they are the outcome of his previous encounters with Shakespearean drama. I have detected three types of additions, each used for a specific purpose. First, some additions aim at introducing comic relief in scenes of high dramatic tension; this is an acknowledged feature of Shakespeare's drama, in general. Secondly, there are additions that enlarge, or expand, ideas: they take the shape of various types of lexical repetitions that are so frequently used by Shakespeare (epizeuxis, quantitative hendiadys, etc.) They have the function of stylistic accentuation and often turn the text into patterned speech, a feature specific of early Shakespeare works. Thirdly, some additions construct what A.C. Bradley named *inner dialogue* a century ago and Harold Bloom has more recently labelled as the process of *overhearing*, of self-reflection, of revealing one's depth psychology.

Caramitru once played Feste, and Feste describes himself as Olivia's *corrupter of words* (3.1.34). Caramitru-Feste likes to play with words and come up with unexpected gigs, like the lines about the *polar bear* and *Sextos* (*vide ante*). Such emendations shed light on the histrionic side of the King's personality. He names the banished Robert d'Artois, who has fled from France to England, not just *Earl of Richmond* (as Shakespeare's Edward does in 1.1.4), but also a *player*. Act 1, Scene 1, opens with a rugby game refereed by the King; Artois scores a try that triggers the King's decision to maintain not only his *seignior*y but also to accept him as a player in his "team." Here is another example of comic emendation: King Edward's *And bid the lords hold on their play at chess* (2.1.50) is turned into a public-oriented "Roagă-i pe lorzi să stea acolo unde sunt – / Să joace table, să învețe șah, / Să bea, să facă ce vor vrea" [And bid the lords to linger where they are, / To play backgammon, to learn chess, / To drink, to do whatever they want]. The reference to backgammon is not anachronistic, as it was played by the characters in *Arden of Faversham*, but it adds a note of familiarity to a Balkanic audience. I have translated Lodowick's question, *To whom, my lord, shall I direct my style?* (2.1.80 – where *style* is explained by Melchiori as *stylus* or *pen*)¹⁵ by substituting *quill* for *style* ("pana mea"). The word "pana," like many other words beginning with the letter *p*, has a strong sexual connotation in Romanian, especially when used in initial position in a sentence. Caramitru exploits its comic potential by adding a whole derisive line to the King's answer: "Ei, pana ta! Nu spun! Ghicește!" ("Your quill! I won't tell you! Try to guess to whom!"), where "quill" might as well be replaced

¹⁴ Ion Caramitru has proved throughout the rehearsals that he is endowed with a very good ear for discerning Shakespearean echoes; he and director Tocilescu have often commented on images, phrases, symbols that recur in both *Edward III* and *Hamlet*, and have not been detected by expert editors like Eric Sams and G. Melchiori.

¹⁵ See Melchiori 78.

by “arse”). A similarly derisive, and comic, addition occurs when he dismisses his secretary as soon as the Countess enters at 2.1.184. *Go, draw the same [battle plan], I tell thee in what form* (185) becomes, in the Romanian stage version “Ți-am spus să ieși! / Hai, mergi și faci precum ți-am explicat, / Găsește bani, ia meditații!” [I’ve told you to get out! / Move, go and do like I’ve explained you, / Get money and take private lessons]. The *private lessons*, like playing backgammon in public parks, point to another easily recognizable local custom of Romanian culture.

Next, I shall discuss a few instances in which Ion Caramitru reshaped his cues as patterned speech in, I would say, quite a Shakespearean manner. After listening to the French king’s message delivered by Lorraine, King Edward retorts *See how occasion laughs me in the face* (1.1.67). Caramitru emends the literary translation (“Norocul îmi surâde, chiar voiam...”) and accentuates the idea of a fortunate coincidence (“Ia uite, Doamne! Ce coincidență! / Ce veste bună!” – *i.e.* [O, God! What a coincidence! / Now, this is really good news!]). After Lorraine and Edward, in turn, draw their swords, the latter sharply utters his message for the French king and dismisses Lorraine with a brief order, *So, be gone* (1.1.114). Caramitru cuts the conceit in which Edward compares himself to a nightingale (*i.e.* 5.5 lines) simply stating (in two lines) that his drawn sword is his implicit message and simultaneously intensifies his dismissal of the French nobleman, thus enhancing the dramatic tension of the scene. *So, be gone* becomes “Hai, mișcă, du-te, ieși, / Ești liber, poți să pleci” (*C’mon, move, go, get out of here, / You’re free, you may leave*). When Montague enters immediately after Lorraine’s exit and brings the news of the Scots’ invasion, Edward simply inquires, *How stands the league between the Scot and us?* (1.1.122). Ion Caramitru once again accentuates dramatic tension, adding suspense by means of repetitions: “Ce s-a-ntâmplat? S-a întâmplat ceva? / Cum stăm cu pacea mea cu scoțienii?” (*What happened? Did something happen? How stands the league between the Scot and us?*)

When Lodowick, trying to compose a love poem at Edward’s order wavers and says *I have not to a period brought her praise* (2.1.130), the King retorts in a ten-line speech in which he digresses on the impossibility of using an *ending period* (132) in a case of infinite beauty. Caramitru’s Romanian emendation turns the *period* in a motif played in crescendo, with the rhetorical question “Ce punct să-i pui?” (*What full stop could you put?*) uttered thrice.

I shall provide a table with further examples of such additions. Someone, noting their frequency, might suspect Ion Caramitru of mannerism, but anyone familiar with famous lines like “Words, words, words...”, “Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow”, and “To die, to sleep; to sleep, perchance to dream” would exonerate him from such a blame.

THE ORIGINAL ENGLISH TEXT

But, sirs, be resolute... (1.1.156)

...invoke some golden Muse / To bring thee hither an enchanted pen / That may for sighs set down true sighs indeed... (2.1.65-7)

Read, lord, read, / Fill thou the empty hollow of mine ears / With the sweet hearing of thy poetry. (2.1.127-9)

That line has two faults, gross and palpable. (2.1.143)

For I had rather have her chased than chaste. (2.1.154)

...I cannot beat / With reason and reproof fond¹⁷ love away. (2.1.292-3)

Why dost thou tip men's tongues with golden words, / And peise their deeds with weight of heavy lead, / That fair performance cannot follow promise? (2.1.303-5)

... my sighs / Shall serve me as the vantage of the wind / To whirl away my sweetest artillery. (2.2.64-6)

No more: thy husband and the queen shall die. (2.2.150)

ION CARAMTRU'S EMENDED TEXT

Dar, lorzi, / Fiți neclintiți, fiți duri, fiți răi...
But, sirs, / Be resolute, be tough, be bad...

Să-ți chemi în ajutor și-o muză de aur / Să-ți dăruiasc-o pană fermecată, / Când scrii suspin, s-așterni suspin aieva. / *S-aud suspin.*

[...] *Let me hear a sigh.*

Ia zi, my lord, ia zi. *Hai zi!* / Cu graiul dulce-al poeziei tale / Umple-mi auzul. *Hai!*

[...] *Common! [...] Common!*

Nu, nu, nu, nu! Ai deja / Două greșeli vădite, grosolane.

No, no, no, no! [...]

C-aș vrea-o decizie, deschisă, fierbinte, aptă, iar nu castă.¹⁶

For I had rather have her resolute, open, hot, ready than chaste.

...nici judecata / Și nici muștrările nu-mi pot învinge / Iubirea de nebun. De nebun? De nebun.

[...] *fond love away. Fond love? Fond love.*

De ce-i dai omului vorbe-aurite, / Iar faptele cu plumb le-mpovărezi, / Ca să rămână-n urma promisiunii? / *De ce? De ce? De ce?*

[...] *Why? Why? Why?*

Vânt năprasnic / Suspinele, când voi lansa spre ea / Ghiulele dulci – *Ghiulele dulci – Ghiulele dulci.*

[...] – *sweetest artillery – sweetest artillery.*

Destul. *Am spus destul.* / Și soțul tău și-a mea regină mor.

No more. I've said no more. [...]

¹⁶ The literary translation had preserved *chased* (*hărțuită*) of the original text.

¹⁷ *Fond* here means *foolish*, according to Melchiori 88.

The third type of additions made by Ion Caramitru has to do with the double function of the Shakespearean dialogue, which is concomitantly *inner* and *outer*. Many of Caramitru's additions fashion a protagonist that not only communicates with the other characters but often speaks with himself. These additions are mostly spoken as asides, as a dialogue with the self.

THE ORIGINAL ENGLISH TEXT	ION CARAMITRU'S EMINDED TEXT
<i>What strange enchantment lurked in those her eyes, /... /... /.../ To gaze on her with doting admiration?</i> (1.2.102-6)	Ce farmece se ascundeau în ochii /... /... /... / De stau uitându-mă la ea năuc? (<i>Ce tată fericit! E-a ta?</i>) [...] <i>A happy father! Is she yours?</i>
<i>Lest, yielding here, I pine in shameful love, / Come, we'll pursue the Scots. – Away, Artois.</i> (1.2.117-8)	Spre-a nu ceda iubirii ce-mi dă ghes, / Făcându-mă de râs – <i>că ești frumoasă!</i> – / Plecăm îndată / Să-i urmărim pe scoțieni. – Artois, pe cai! [...] <i>– because you're beautiful! – [...]</i>
<i>...Who smiles upon the basest weed that grows / As lovingly as on the fragrant rose.</i> (2.1.165-6)	Căci soarele-i zâmbește și-unui scai / La fel ca trandafirului de mai. / <i>Scai – mai. Mai – scai.</i> [...] <i>Grows – rose. Rose – grows.</i>
<i>Love cannot sound well but in lovers' tongues. / Give me the pen and paper...</i> (2.1.183-4)	Iubirea sună bine doar în gura îndrăgostiților. / <i>Dar în sfârșit... Ia dă-mi hârtia, tocul...</i> [...] <i>But anyway... [...]</i>
<i>Ah, lady, I am blunt, and cannot strew / The flowers of solace in a ground of shame.</i> (2.1.198-9)	<i>E foarte grav ce mi se-ntâmplă – / Domniță, cum să vă explic, nu pot...</i> <i>I am in very serious trouble – [...]</i>
<i>Like as the wind doth beautify a sail / and as a sail becomes the unseen wind...</i> (2.1.280-1)	<i>Hmmm, hmmm! / Ca vântul ce însuflețește vela / Și vela parcă preschimbătă-n vânt...</i> <i>Hmmm, hmmm! [...]</i>
<i>O, that she were as is the air to me! / Why, so she is; for when I would embrace her, / This do I, and catch nothing but myself.</i> (2.1.289-91)	Ah, liberă de-ar fi ca aerul! / De fapt așa e: Ea este aer – dau s-o-mbrățișez / Și tot ce prind e doar făptura mea <i>stupidă.</i> [...] <i>my stupid self.</i>
<i>A kind of voluntary gift thou proferest, / That I was forward to have begged of thee.</i> (2.1.300-1)	(<i>Ce coincidență!</i>) / De bună voie îmi oferi un dar / Pe care-oricum voiam să ți-l cerșesc. (<i>What a coincidence!</i>) [...]
[After Warwick has sworn he would do anything to cure the King's grief] <i>Say that my grief is no way medicinal / But by</i>	<i>Aiurea! În sfârșit – Mă rog – / Să zicem că durerea-mi are leac / Doar dacă-ți pierzi și-ți întinezi onoarea.</i>

<i>the loss and bruising of thine honour.</i>	<i>Nonsense! Anyway – Well – [...]</i>
(2.1.323-4)	
<i>Thus from the heart's abundance speaks</i>	<i>Cred c-am luat-o razna, ceva mă-ndeamnă</i>
<i>the tongue: 'Countess'... (2.2.38)</i>	<i>să spun "contesă"...</i>
	<i>I think I'm going crazy, [...]</i>
<i>Why, there it goes: that very smile of hers</i>	<i>Uite, vezi, asta se-ntâmplă mereu, /</i>
<i>/ Hath ransomed captive France...</i>	<i>Înseamnă că, doar cu un zâmbet, a</i>
(2.2.103-4)	<i>răscumpărat / Captiva Franță...</i>
	<i>This is the way it happens every time [...]</i>

In each of these additions Edward seems to be speaking with himself, showing surprise, doubt, self-appraisal (as in *my stupid self*), seemingly aware of his abnormal behaviour (as in *I think I'm going crazy*), assessing the consequences of his deeds or the reactions of those around him, even vainly amusing himself with his sudden realization that he can rhyme words, as in *rose-grows*. The Romanian equivalent is, moreover, hilarious, as the rhyming words are *rose and thorn*, which form an unexpected rhyme. All these instances hopefully substantiate the hypothesis according to which Ion Caramitru – the Hamlet-Caramitru – did his best to add psychological depth to Edward's character.

Besides the three aforementioned types of additions, I have also discerned additions that bring in a tinge of informal style, of colloquialism to the overall poetic style of the play. The King's dialogue with Lodowick in the scene in which the two of them try to write *the perfect* love poem fitting the King's desires and the Countess' beauty (2.1) are sprinkled, in the Romanian stage version, with brief colloquial phrases like, *Now, look; you're nuts; Now, watch this; that's silly; O, no* – all of which turn the blank verse of the original text into modern everyday speech.

The Romanian stage version brings an interesting innovation to the English text and its literary Romanian translation. During the same dialogue between the King and his secretary, the former calls out twice (2.1.149 and 166): "Warwick, vinul" (*Warwick, bring some wine*). The Countess enters at 2.1.184, Lodowick exits at 2.1.194, the King confesses to his carnal desire and the Countess exits at 2.2.293, and Warwick finally appears at 2.1.294, bringing in wine. His first speech, in which he inquires about his sovereign's sadness, ends with the addition *Let's drink*. This slight addition to Shakespeare's text can be discussed from at least two viewpoints. On the one hand, it brings to our mind the famous scene in *1 Henry IV* (2.4), in which the idle Prince Hal keeps teasing Francis the tapster. Edward is a similarly idle fellow, with a penchant not only for seducing other men's wives but also for drinking, a human feature much disfavoured by Voltaire, who criticized Shakespeare for his royal drunkards. On the other hand, the King's hot passion may also be explained as the result of sexual desire fuelled by drinking. It is not a sober, reasonable man that asks a

father to act as a pimp but an intoxicated man, who is shown constantly drinking in the first two acts of the play. This interpretation is endorsed by King John's characterization of Edward as *a belly-god, / A tender and lascivious wantonness* (3.3.155-6).

Conclusion

1. The unique experience of the rehearsals I shared with the director and the actors participating in this Shakespeare project has persuaded me that a theatrical production requires more than an author / a translator. Drama is a collaborative art and a show is the result of a collaborative process. Many Shakespeare critics and biographers have commented on the fact that Shakespeare was a privileged dramatist, writing with the ear of an actor for fellow-actors whose talents he knew well and for whom he wrote accordingly. At present, I wonder whether those actors actually contributed themselves to their parts with bits of dialogues and their favourite images, or other idiosyncratic preferences. According to some literary historians, Will Kemp may have fallen into Shakespeare's disgrace because he improvised too much, deviating from the text written by Shakespeare. But I think that his fellow-actors did participate in the shaping of dialogue and character. Many figments of Shakespearean *intertextuality*, the recurrence of many internal echoes in Shakespeare's plays may be the result of this kind of collaborative process. (I also came to ask myself whether much of Marlowe's rant is not, actually, due to the artistic temperament and inclinations of Edward Alleyn).

2. Despite the numerous emendations to the Romanian literary translation of *Edward III*, the play to be premiered at the National Theatre in Bucharest is not a free adaptation, inasmuch as it does not cut entire scenes, does not excise characters and does not add new characters and new scenes. The stage version closely follows the development of the original plot in its logical sequence.¹⁸

3. The main difference between the literary translation and the stage version of a Shakespeare play in a foreign language is that, due to small cuts and additions, the regular iambic pentameter gives way to a more flexible free verse, which preserves the iambic rhythm but imitates much better everyday speech. At this point, the result of a Romanian rewriting of a translation for stage and the translation strategy advocated by Angel-Luis Pujante in Spain overlap. Small world...

4. After viewing the Tocilescu-Caramitru production of *Hamlet*, many British critics commented on the excellent quality of the Romanian text (which they could only infer from the Romanian audience's favourable response), while

¹⁸ For a real adaptation, see Molière's heavily refashioned *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, premiered at the National Theatre of Bucharest in early 2007.

British fellow-actors who viewed it in Great Britain complained that foreign actors are always luckier than they are: foreigners are allowed to reshape Shakespeare's text according to their own will, while English-speaking actors are doomed to eternally play it as it was passed down to them for four centuries.¹⁹ I think that the emendations to the literary translation serve the interests of both Shakespeare and the Romanian audience, and that the Romanian premiere of *Edward III* will turn out to be more than just a local cultural event.

5. The alterations within the lines, consisting mainly of changes in word-order or the use of a synonym instead of the original word, may turn out to be fruitful suggestions for the translator, with a view to a future printed version.

6. The collaboration between the translator of *Edward III* and the dramaturg that helped the reshaping of the play-text for the stage may lead to setting up a team involved in a national project, a new *Complete Shakespeare* series for the third millennium, in a modernized language, intended for both reading and performance.

As of June 2009 the play has been performed thirty-nine times at the Great Auditorium of the National Theatre in Bucharest and in the autumn of 2009 the production will go on tour to Greece and Bulgaria.

Works Cited

- Bate, Jonathan. "Writ by Shakespeare." *TLS* (17 Jan 1997): 3-4.
- Bloom, Harold. *The Western Canon*. London: Papermac, 1996.
- Caramitru, Ion. Personal communication. 25 January 2007.
- Dimitriu, Rodica. "Shakespeare in Twentieth Century Romania: Translations Policies and Translators' Projects." *The SHINE Conference*, 14-17 November 2007, Iași.
- McEvoy, Sean. *Shakespeare: The Basics*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Melchiori, Giorgio. "Edward III." *The New Cambridge Shakespeare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Pujante, Luis-Angel. "The Schlegel Model and Shakespearean Translation in Spain." *The SHINE Conference*, 14-17 November 2007, Iași.
- Sams, Eric. *Shakespeare's Edward III*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Shakespeare, William, John Fletcher. *Doi veri de stirpe aleasă / The Two Noble Kinsmen*. Trans. George Volceanov. Iași: Polirom, 2002.
- . *Eduard al III-lea*. Trans. Georg Volceanov. Pitești: Paralela 45, 2003.
- Volceanov, George. "*The Eye Sees Not Itself but by Reflection*": *A Study in Shakespeare's "Catoptrics" And Other Essays*. Bucharest: Editura Universitară, 2006.
- . *The Shakespeare Canon Revisited*. București: Niculescu, 2005.

¹⁹ See Caramitru.

---. *“Methinks You’re Better Spoken”: A Study in the Language of Shakespeare’s Characters*. Iași: Institutul European, 2004.

Periodicals:

Azi (17 Oct 2006): 7 (blurb).

Cotidianul (21 Jan 2007): 3 (blurb).

Cotidianul (21 Feb 2007): 8 (blurb).

Cotidianul (30 July 2007): 12 (blurb).

Cronica română (23 June 2006): 5 (blurb).

Curierul național (18 Jan 2007): 16 (blurb).

Evenimentul zilei (30 Jan 2007): 7. (interview)

Formula AS (24 Sept 2007): 16 (blurb).

Noul Adevărul (25 Nov 2005): 8 (blurb).

Realitatea românească (21 June 2006): 14 (blurb).

România liberă (13 Oct 2006): 8 (blurb).

România liberă (25 Sept 2007): 8 (blurb).