THE RETRANSLATION OF *HAMLET*'S SOLILOQUY
IN ACT III, SCENE 1 – TO ADAPT OR NOT TO ADAPT

ELIANA IONOAIA*

Abstract. This paper sets out to analyse earlier translations of Hamlet, with a focus on Act I, Scene iii, Hamlet's famous soliloquy. The phrase "To be or not to be" is instantly recognizable not simply for theatregoers or students of literature and theatre and it has been (and continues to be) used intertextually by other writers as well as in popular culture. By looking at earlier translations and retranslations / revisions of the soliloquy (Economu 1855; Stern 1877, 1905) the paper examines the Romanian tradition of using indirect translation and retranslation / revision, not only to improve the rendering of the text, but also to adapt it to Romanian culture. The tensions between domesticating versus foreignizing choices are discussed.

Keywords: retranslation, foreignization, domestication, translation, adaptation

1. Introduction

The translation of dramatic texts has been a neglected area of translation studies, according to Susan Bassnett (2002: 123) since the dramatic text cannot be treated as a whole unit like a prose or a poetic text. Given that the very nature of dramatic texts requires performance, the separation of the two aspects of a play is inadvisable, if not impossible. Nevertheless, many of the translations of Shakespeare's plays created in nineteenth century Romania – texts meant to be read, rather than performed – acquired a high status, perhaps because of the adaptation, the domestication or foreignization of the text (in the first half and second half of the century, respectively), the focus on the Latin origin of the Romanian language,

---
* University of Bucharest, eliana.ionoaia@lls.unibuc.ro

the enriching of Romanian vocabulary and the ingraining of national ideologies performed by the translators. This paper rests on a foundation of conflict between target language (TL) versions of a source language (SL) text since I have analysed the competing or alternative translations published in the second half of the nineteenth century Romanian Principalities, so the texts have not only been read in parallel with the SL original, but also against each other. (Baer 2014: 341) For dramatic texts the need for retranslation occurs more rapidly than in the case of prose or poetry, given that they are texts meant for performance, not just reading, and the spoken language changes over a shorter period.

Canonical texts, dramatic or otherwise, require retranslation for a variety of reasons, among which the ageing of the language or the quality of the translation. Walter Benjamin argues that the translator's task is to approach the process of translation considering the likeness between the message of the source text (ST) and that of the target text (TT), striving to find an equivalence in terms of language. But any translation is an afterlife of "an original [that] undergoes a change." (Benjamin 1999: 73) The changes that occur in language lead to a need for re-translation: "What sounded fresh once may sound hackneyed later; what was once current may someday sound quaint." (Benjamin 1999: 73) The original text will not change in terms of language, even if its destiny within the canon of the source culture might; however, language evolves, so there is a need for renewed TL texts: "the mother tongue of the translator is transformed as well. While the words of poets endure in the SL, even the greatest translation is destined to become part of the growth of its own language and eventually to be absorbed by its renewal." (Benjamin 1999: 73) So translations become witnesses to the evolution of language. The quality of a translation is anchored in the fluency of the translation in both language and culture, as well as in the issue of the arbitrariness of language, given that a concept can be expressed in different languages through words that might hold different connotations in the minds of the readers. (Lowe 2014: 415)

D.P. Economu's 1855 version constituted an essential stage in the history of translation and provided the "trial of the foreign" for *Hamlet*, introducing the text and bringing it closer to the Romanian readership: "this trial, often an exile, can also exhibit the most singular power of the

translating act: to reveal the foreign work's most original kernel, its most deeply buried, most self-same, but equally the most 'distant' from itself." (Berman 2000: 385) So, arguably, Economu, a rather 'visible' translator 'tames' (domesticates) both the target audience and the source text through translation by adapting it and, to a certain extent, rewriting it to serve his purposes. Additionally, his is a relay translation, done via a French ST. According to Venuti (1995) "translation wields enormous power in the construction of national identities for foreign cultures (…) [and] enlists the foreign text in the maintenance or revision of literary canons in the target-language culture." (Venuti 1995: 19) Thus, striving for a national identity at a time of social and political turmoil Economu's translation encompasses neologisms that are meant to enhance the Romanian language and enrich the culture of the Romanian Principalities. But this same strategy of a neologism-laden translation leads to domestication and to a preference for the values and needs of the TL.

Lawrence Venuti discusses the approach a translator might take in confronting a text in terms of domestication and foreignization:

> the translator [can] choose between a domesticating method, an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to target-language cultural values, bringing the author back home, and a foreignizing method, an ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad. (Venuti 1995: 20)

If Economu is inclined to select domestication as a strategy, Adolphe Stern has a fondness for foreignization, attempting to bring in the values of the source language and culture into the target ones. By retaining the prosodic elements typical of Shakespeare's plays (iambic pentameter and blank verse) and toning down the vocabulary choices which are not as heavily weighted towards neologisms, Stern sets his retranslation (1877) and revision (1905) apart from Economu's version of *Hamlet*. Moreover, Adolphe Stern is also the first translator to use a ST in the original language.

2. Domesticating Tendencies

In nineteenth century Romania, the translations of Shakespeare's plays were shaped by the ideology, politics and national yearnings to "support Romania's ambitions of being located on the cultural, political and geographic map of Europe" (Zaharia 2012: 89) Moreover, many of these translations were indirect ones – taking intermediary translations in either German or French as the source text (Ioan Barac's work used the German text translated by Friedrich Ludwig Schroder, D.P. Economu's translation employed a French translation by Alexandre Dumas and Paul Meurice). These translations borrow, not so much from the English culture, but from the intermediary cultures, be it German or French; furthermore, the translators remove objectionable elements. The Economu's translation is part of the first phase (1820s-1860s) focusing on indirect translations and free adaptations and on the "standardization and unification of the literary Romanian language". (Zaharia 2011: 107)

In Lawrence Venuti's words the translated texts are imbued with "cultural political practice, constructing or critiquing ideology-stamped identities for foreign cultures, affirming or transgressing discursive values (…) in the target-language culture." (Venuti 1995: 19) Economu's translation uses the Cyrillic alphabet, but it still reveals the translator's interest in the Latinity of the Romanian language, thus Economu's work is imbued with the attempt to assert national identity and disjunction from the Slavic peoples surrounding the isles of Latinity that were the Romanian Principalities. The translator ingrains in the text his attempt "to create connections to other Latin countries in Europe" (Zaharia 2012: 95) by using words of French, Italian or Latin origin, as seen in the table below:

Latin	French	Italian	French and Latin	German and Latin	Italian and Latin
Fortuna [< lat. fortuna].	Ultragios din ultragiu (după fr. outrager).	Sforţa cf. it. Sforzare	Resignaţiune din fr. résignation, lat. resignatio, -onis.	Proect din germ. Projekt, lat. projectus.	Amor din lat. amor, it. amore.
Sufferi Lat pop. Sufferire (= sufferre).	Curagios din fr. courageux.	Tempesta din it. tempesta.	Flagelaţiune cf. lat. flagellatio, fr. flagellation].	Reflecsiune din fr. réflexion, lat. reflexio, -onis, germ. Reflexion.	
Deluviu Din lat. dil uvium	Sufferinţă Suferi + suf.-inţă (după fr. souffrance).	Inumerabil [cf. it. inumerabil e].	Injurie [< fr. injure, cf. lat. iniuria – nedreptate].		
Repaos Lat. *repausum.	Torment [< fr. tourment].		Insolenţă din fr. insolence, lat. insolentia.		
Incert (< lat. incertus)	Affront din fr. affront.		Inorant (< fr. ignorant, lat. ignorans)		
	Opresor din fr. oppresseur.		Procura din fr. procurér, lat. procurare.		
	Guvernant din fr. gouvernant.		Facil din fr. facile, lat. facilis.		
	Inflige din fr. infliger.		Conserva din fr. conserver, lat. conservare.		
	Voiajor din fr. voyageur.		Reflecsiune din fr. réflexion, lat. reflexio, -onis, germ. Reflexion.		
	Sucumba din fr. succomber.		Resoluţiune din fr. résolution, lat. resolutio, -onis.		
	Întreprindere Între-+prinde (după fr. entreprendre).		Eserciţiunea Din fr. exercice, lat. exercitium.		

This is not a comprehensive list, since the following words: *esista, chestiunea, admira, cerca [încerca], luptă, mare, înfuriat, cere, pace, inimă, fatal, crud, soartă, contra, înarma, dormi, somn, durere, combate, pune, a muri, fugi, om, a se naște, a putea, a visa, mirare* etc., also originate from Latin, French or Italian; however, they had belonged to the Romanian language for a while when Economu was working on his translation. Thus, these words do not reveal the desire of the translator to enrich Romanian with words of Latinate origin, and to distance it from Russian (or Slavic languages), German and Turkish. The list in the table contains 34 words of Romance origin out of which 11 can be found in the first 13 lines of the soliloquy, while the list above includes 26 such words. Out of 103 words in the first 13 lines of Hamlet's soliloquy, 37 are words of Romance origin, so 30%.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, starting with the 1848 Revolution, the cultural and social life in the Romanian Principalities underwent changes under the influence of the Western states. Thus, the tendency was to reject words of Greek, Turkish and Slavic origin was contrasted with borrowings from Romance languages. The spirit of the age was that of expressing the national consciousness and origins of which the inhabitants of the Romanian Principalities were proud. Thus, both original works of literature as well as those translated from Western cultures were meant to influence the national consciousness, to awaken the desire to strive for nationhood and the yearning for national ideals. In a sense, the constant borrowing of words from Romance languages and from Latin in the nineteenth century was meant to prove the Latinate origin of the Romanian language and to construct the national identity. This also led to the proposal of replacing the Cyrillic alphabet with the Latin one. (Draica web)

It was an attempt to escape the influence of the Russian and Ottoman Empires and to affirm the identity of Romanians as descendants of Dacians and Romans. Since the Ottoman Empire was slowly declining, the upper classes were looking towards the West, especially France, as models of nationhood. This reorientation the French education of many of the elites (Mihail Kogălniceanu, Vasile Alecsandri, C.A. Rossetti, to name but a few) who were Francophile. Therefore, these elites interspersed the language they used with words of French origin and many of these loanwords entered the corpus of the Romanian language (not all, and

even those that did changed their form). These cultural, political, and social elites were rejecting the Greek and Turkish vocabulary, not so much la Slavic one, which was already well-embedded in the language and its use was widespread among the population. Additionally, even the Greek and Turkish words were retained by the lower classes, either in rural or urban areas. French became the language *de rigueur* and, together with Latin and Italian, heavily influenced the vocabulary of the Romanian language in the nineteenth century. The changes that occurred within the make-up of the language were not forced but came about naturally. Nevertheless, in the case of D.P. Economu's translation, an effort was made to borrow as many neologisms as possible.

Twenty-two of the loanwords in the soliloquy are derived from French or French and Latin. The form of those words is not always familiar to the contemporary speaker of Romanian, given that they retained the form from French. Such is the case for *'resignațiune', 'flagelațiune', 'reflecsiune', 'resoluțiune'* and *'esercițiune'*. These neologisms retain the *-iune* suffix which closely parallels the French *-ion* (Todi 2005: 276); however, this suffix only rarely persisted, instead it was transformed into *-ie*, which was the form that lingered in the Romanian language in the twentieth century. There are some exceptions, as is the case with *promisiune* or *comuniune* (Todi 2005: 276), but in the case of the five neologisms mentioned above, *rezoluție, resignație / resemnare, flagelație / flagelare, exerciție / exercitare* and *reflecție / reflexive* a different form persisted. Finally, certain loanwords, such as *affront* and *sufferință* initially retained the double consonant from the language of origin (Todi 2005: 278), and this is something that was to be standardized and regulated later in the nineteenth century. Italian and Latin are two other sources for the loanwords used by Economu, but these languages do not account for as a high a percentage of the borrowings. Once again, the words are very close in form to the original. Moreover, some of the words that are still used in Romanian did not retain the initial meaning at the time of borrowing. These neologisms were meant to enrich the Romanian language, but they were in use simultaneously with synonyms of other origins, so they were not strictly necessary.

Subsequently, neologisms had to adapt to the Romanian language in terms of spelling and pronunciation. But midway through the nineteenth

century the Romanian vernacular was undergoing a process of transformation, vocabulary, spelling and alphabet-wise. However, avoiding words of Slavic origin seemed to be the rule of thumb, even when a marked preference for neologisms is not manifested. (Todi 2005: 277) Earlier translations from Shakespeare's works did not overuse neologisms (Todi 2005: 275), perhaps because there was no urgency at the time to strengthen, enrich and modernize the Romanian language. In the wake of the 1848 Revolution and with the renewed efforts to unite the Romanian Principalities, it was felt that a standardized and unified language was also needed.

Economu's translation, using the Cyrillic alphabet (not the hybrid transition alphabet which had started being used in the previous decade), provides evidence regarding the evolution of the literary Romanian language. (Todi 2005: 273) While the translator's contemporary audience could read the text written in the Cyrillic alphabet, that is no longer the case nowadays, therefore the text is not easily accessible, and it requires a concerted effort for the researcher to delve into the vocabulary choices made by D.P. Economu 166 years ago. Given the abundance of neologisms, the translation reveals the desire to enhance the Romanian vocabulary through Romance loanwords. Thus, Shakespeare's plays enhanced the vocabulary through novel modes of expression, either from English or from the intermediary languages of the source texts of nineteenth century translations. The translation also reveals a strategy of domestication through the choices of vocabulary made by the translator. The translation serves a purpose other than simply disseminating Shakespeare's work. So, the translator is in no way invisible since he imposes his own objectives on the translation.

The first line of the soliloquy is translated using mostly the word-for-word technique, since the words have equivalents in the TL; however, Economu adds "mai" and "that is" becomes "iată". Additionally, instead of using the older word of Latin origin "a fi", the translator opts for the neologism "a exista", the same goes for choosing "chestiunea" instead of "întrebare". Modulation changes the perspective as is the case in the second line of the soliloquy. When trying to render the meaning of "'tis nobler in the mind" the verb "to admire" is used in Romanian and for "to suffer" Economu uses a word that shares a common origin with

"resigned" with the meaning of stoic or long-suffering. Transpositions are present in both cases.

The third line is translated twice "The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune," becomes "care primește cercând fortuna ultragioasă" first and a few lines later "isbirile fatale ale crudei soarte". In the first case the domesticating strategy is used, revealing Economu's preference for neologisms, but this version also includes a reduction of the line since "the slings and arrows" are not conveyed in Romanian. The second version translates this "isbirile fatale" and uses older words of Latin origin to translate "outrageous fortune". The same strategy is adopted for lines 4 and 5. Therefore, we have two versions for "to take arms against a sea of trouble" which becomes "sforța ce se luptă pe o mare înfuriată" first and then "să se înarmeze contra unui deluviu de dureri". However, the first version also partly renders the meaning of the fourth line. The idiom "to take arms against" used in the infinitive in English is transposed into the Present Indicative and Present Subjonctive in the two versions: "ce se luptă" and "să se înarmeze". The word "sforța" is added in the Romanian translation to clarify the meaning. The metaphor "sea of troubles" is rendered once as "mare înfuriată" and once as "deluviu de dureri", the second version retaining the metaphor, whereas the first uses modulation. In the fifth line "by opposing end them" is transposed from the Gerund to Indicative Present in the one of the versions from the fourth line "se luptă", to the Present Subjonctive "să se înarmeze" in the other and finally retains the Gerund "combătându-le" in the third version. On the other hand, "end them" becomes "cere pace de la tempeste" and then "să pue un termen". In both cases the translation involves techniques such as modulation and transposition, as well as expansion. Thus, we are dealing with a case of overtranslation.

Line 7 "The heart-ache and the thousand natural shocks" is rendered in two lines: "O inimă curagioasă trebue oare să suffere" and "Să fugi de aceste turmente inumerabile". Thus, "the heart-ache" becomes "inimă curagioasă" while "the thousand natural shocks" is first transposed and modulated into a verb "să suffere" and then rendered by reduction and modulation through reversal of terms in "turmente inumerabile", while the adjective "natural" is never translated. Part of lines 8 and 9 is omitted: "'tis a consummation / Devoutly to be wish'd."

Line 12 "When we have shuffled off this mortal coil," is rendered as "când vor peri după fruntea noastră cugetarea și viața?" using expansion and adaptation. "Shuffled off this mortal coil," is rendered as "vor peri" reducing the English phrase to a verb that renders the overall meaning but fails at providing equivalent imagery and metaphors in the TL. It could be argued that Economu compensates for the previous reduction through the phrase "după fruntea noastră cugetarea și viața?", but he actually also adds to the meaning from the ST by using "fruntea" and "cugetarea". Line 13 "Must give us pause—there's the respect" is translated as "Îndoeala teribilă ce ne împinge către abisul deschis," so "îndoeala teribila" overtranslated "give us pause" whereas "there's the respect" is not translated, instead Economu adds "ne împinge către abisul deschis", a phrase that is not present in the ST. Line 14 "That makes calamity of so long life" is modulated and transposed with "și care face viața nenorocitului atât de lungă!", since "calamity" becomes "nenorocitului". Line 15 contains an expansion with the addition of "într-adevăr", while line 16 employs two shifts from singular in the ST to plural in the TT: "wrong" becomes "injuriile" and "contumely" becomes "affronturile".

Line 17 includes a mistranslation and an expansion, as well as shifts from the singular to the plural, since "The pangs of dispriz'd love, the law's delay," becomes "moliciunea legilor, profunda sufferință ce sapă în inima noastră amorul fără speranță și desprețuit". The word order is changed too since the first and second phrases are reversed. "Delay" is rendered through "moliciunea", which would be the opposite to the strictness of the law but would not render the idea of legal resolution or sentence being postponed. The "pangs of dispriz'd love" is expanded into "profunda sufferință ce sapă în inima noastră amorul fără speranță și desprețuit" which provides a paraphrase but also adds to the meaning from the ST. In line 22 the phrase "weary life" is conveyed through "drumu cel aspru și spinos" by expansion in the guise of using more than one word for "weary", while "life" is rendered through a metaphor by means of a word that could be connected to the metaphor of life seen as journey, path or road. Line 23 uses a transposition for the noun "dread" which is translated through a verb "nu sar teme" and it also employs expansion since the verb "strevedem" is also added. In line 25 the phrase "puzzles the will" is expanded and paraphrased as

"înghiață inimele și nimicnicește dorințele noastre", which is an instance of overtranslation and changes the meaning of the ST. Line 28 provides the reader with an instance of compensation since Economu moves the phrase "Thus conscience does make cowards of us all" to the end of the soliloquy: "din cei mai determinanți îndoeala face nişte laşi."

Thus, early translations reveal a struggle for autonomy and independence from oppressive regimes – Russian, Austro-Hungarian, Ottoman – and are domesticating in terms of method of translation, focusing on the need of the target culture and using numerous neologisms, while adapting the text. Economu's translation retains the plot, but there are interpolations in the text, the translator is in no way invisible. Additionally, Economu did not reveal that he had used a French text as an intermediary (I. H. Radulescu quoted by Todi 2205: 274) and he participated in the effort to consolidate the literary Romanian language. Thus, even when dealing with a text meant to be read, rather than performed, adaptation is still very much present, and we are dealing with cultural negotiation from the very beginning of the history of the translation of Shakespearean texts into Romanian.

3. Foreignizing Tendencies

In the second phase (1860s-1890s) of the history of Shakespearean translations into Romanian, the focus switches to direct translations and to "source-oriented strategies of translation". (Zaharia 2011: 107) The focus will be on Adolphe Stern's direct translation of *Hamlet* from 1877 and his revision from 1905. Adolphe Stern's choice of translation strategy was a foreignizing one that did not attempt a rapprochement between the source text and the target text in terms of culture, despite the overriding preference for domesticating strategies of the period. It was felt that domesticating translations would introduce new words of Latin and French origin into the Romanian language and that it would disseminate "Western culture in the Romanian principalities" and would synchronize "Romanian culture with the Western consciousness". (Zaharia 2018: 186) Nevertheless, despite arguing in favour of the usefulness of translating and imitating the models of foreign literatures in the Preface

to his 1877 translation, Stern, who was the first to translate *Hamlet* directly from English, supported the view that a translation should be faithful by rendering both meaning and form (iambic pentameter, blank verse). He was fastidious in his research when it came to selecting the edition of the text in the SL, since, in his view, Shakespeare's works and his genius were the property of the entire world. Stern moved away from the choices of previous and contemporary translators to adapt the text, or to use prosody typical of Romanian poetry or prose:

> "I could not imagine a translation of Shakespeare's work without the masculine lines, the harmonious rhythm of the original. For a long time I halted before the difficulties of such a translation, which I thought to be insurmountable. I finally made my attempt to present to the public a Hamlet in the blank verse (with the exception of the rhyming lines in III, 2) of the original. I was able to include the entire body of the original, without too many additions or omissions, within those constraints. In regards to the text, I have used the best commentaries and critical works. The few notes are included at the end of the book." (my translation; Stern Preface 1877: xxii)

However, this choice also led to a less fluid, page-oriented text, rather than one aimed at performance: "Stern's translation was never performed on stage, failing to stir the interest of Romanian theatre practitioners. (…) by lacking fluency, it implicitly lacked the quality of performability, the text's appropriateness for the stage." (Zaharia 2018: 188)

Economu's translation from 1855 focuses on renewing the Romanian language through numerous neologisms. The vocabulary in Adolphe Stern's two versions 1877 and 1905 is more varied. Economu does not aim at closely following the SL text, especially since he used a French intermediary translation as ST. Economu's choice is to domesticate Hamlet's soliloquy, while Adolphe Stern makes a different choice in his two versions. Both the 1877 and the 1905 translations are focused on the prosody of the SL which is closely followed in the TL. Thus, the translations are foreignizing ones. Economu's overtranslations and expansions make it hard to keep up with the SL and TL texts in parallel. In the case of Adolphe Stern's translations, the reader can more easily identify and follow the parallel texts.

In terms of the metaphors in the SL text Adolphe Stern's is more faithful to the images used by Shakespeare in Hamlet's soliloquy. In the case of the original Shakespearean metaphor "The slings and arrows (of outrageous fortune)", the earlier of the translations fails to provide an equivalent conveying a truncated meaning through "isbiri fatale" (Economu 1855), while Stern manages to offer a more inspired solution, which he keeps in both versions: "praştii şi săgeţi" (Stern 1877, Stern 1905). Another original Shakespearean metaphor "sea of troubles" is expressed in two ways through expansion in Economu's translation: "mare înfuriată" and "deluviu de dureri" (1855) unsatisfactorily in the first instance and in a manner closer to the SL in the second; on the other hand, Stern's translations as "ocean de rele" (1877) and "mări de rele" (1905) parallel the imagery employed by Shakespeare. The "sleep of death" is translated as "somnul mortii" in all three versions since the idea behind the metaphor is the same in both SL and TL. The phrase "mortal coil" is expanded in the earlier translation: "vor peri după fruntea noastră cugetarea și viața?" (1855) and it is translated as "chinul pamantesc" (1877) or "chinul muritor" (1905) by Stern. This original Shakespearean metaphor is one that could still be refined even in Adolphe Stern's versions. Finally, the fourth original Shakespearean metaphor in the soliloquy, "the whips and scorns of time" is rendered as "flagelațiunile și ultragiile lumei" in Economu's 1855 translation, and through a reduction "a timpului urgie" by Stern in his 1877 version. The earlier version is improved in 1905 by translating the metaphor as "al vremei biciu şi hula".

The changes in terms of vocabulary between the 1877 and the 1905 versions are relevant in terms of the evolution of the language. The changes in terms of spelling („eată" – „iată", „miseriei" – „mizeriei", „Să'şi" – „Să-și", „De cât" – „Decât") or grammatical forms („A carnei" – „cărnii", „vieței" – „vieții") reveal that the standardization of the Romanian language was well on the way in the second half of the nineteenth century. If in the immediate aftermath of the 1848 Revolution, when efforts were being made towards the union of the Romanian Principalities, the language spoken in the various Romanian territories was seen as a marker of national identity, this held less sway in 1877 and by 1905 it was no longer such an obvious consideration. Some of the transformations

hold true to the earlier mentality. One category of changes refers to a rejection of words of Hungarian origin such as: „gând" or „gingaș", which become „cuget" or „frumos" (<Lat.) and „chin" which turns into „suferință" (< Fr.). However, the opposite process also occurs, as is the case with „teama" (< Lat.) which becomes „chibzuiala" (< Hu.). However, some of the modifications might be unexpected such as choosing to discard synonyms of Latin or French origin in favour of those of Slavic origin, which would not have been the case 20 years prior. Nevertheless, the reverse is also true: in some cases, words of Slavic origin are replaced by their synonyms of Italian or Latin origin, but it does not happen as often. In this case, the choices might be made for reasons related to the rhythm of the lines or for other stylistic purposes. The table below exemplifies these two opposing strategies:

< Fr. / Lat; <Lat. ✍ < Slav.			< Slav. / Bg, / Sb. ✍ < Lat.		
nedemni	Netrebnici	Fr / Lat, Slav	hula	Disprețul	Slav, It
Viață lungă	Trai așa de lung	Lat, Slav.	stavila	nodul	Slav, Lat
timpului	Vremei	Lat, Slav.	rumeneală	Faţă	Slav, Lat
urgie	Biciu și hulă	Lat, Slav and Slav	jicnire	nedreptatea	Serb, Lat
			nedomiri	Rătăci	Bulg, Lat
întârziere	Zăbava	Lat, Slav			
necunoscutul	Tainic	Lat, Slav			
Nu uita	Pomenește mi	Lat, Slav			

Adolphe Stern's translation from 1877 employs changes in word order and inversions in lines one and two, as well as a reduction in line one where "that is" turns into the interjection "eată", if back-translated this would turn into behold or lo in the SL. Starting from the third line, Stern chooses to move certain words into the next line in order to maintain the number of syllables in the iambic pentameter – in line three he moves the noun phrase at the end to the fourth line. The fourth line contains a transposition with the SL "opposing" transforming into the noun "resistență". By this point the Romanian version already has an extra line. A few lines later, the verb is moved from line 7 to line 8. In the eighth line, Stern employs a reduction since SL "natural" is not translated, and the noun at the end of the line is moved to the next one. From line 9, "consummation" is moved to line 10 and translated as "țel", which is not a close equivalent, therefore employing modulation. Line 11

is continued with "there's the rub" which has been moved to line 12 and translated with "stavilă" which changes the meaning of the original text. Line 14 corresponds to line 12 in the original. The metaphor and lexical field are not kept for SL "mortal coil" which is rendered with "chin pământesc", which is a solution that could still be improved. In line 15 SL "respect" becomes "teamă" and in line 16 "calamity" becomes "miserie", therefore the meaning is changed in the TL text. The SL line 15 is divided into two and become lines 17 and 18 in Romanian. Stern uses a reduction from "the whips and scorns of time" to "a timpului urgie", which approximates the meaning of the SL phrase, but does not cover the entire meaning. In line 20 "delay" is translated as "întârziere" and moved to the next line. In line 23, "patient" is rendered as "tăcut" and it corresponds to line 19 in SL, once again the meaning is changed.

Adolphe Stern's 1905 retranslation manages to improve on the earlier version. In Line 2 Stern changes the word order to more closely mirror the line in the SL text. Line 3 follows the same word order as the 1877 version, which is slightly different than the SL word order, given the inversion. In line 6, "no more" is moved back, while in the 1877 version it was in line 7. Line 8 includes "firești" as translation for "natural" in SL line 7, which eliminates the reduction from the 1877 version. For the SL line 10 phrase "there's the rub", Stern finds another possibility and uses "nodul". However, the new version still does not do justice to the meaning of Shakespeare's expression. In SL line 15 "the whips and scorns of time", line 17 in the TL text resolves the reduction from the 1877 version. Stern uses "al vremei biciu și hulă" which closely parallels the SL meaning. The line is still not fluid as "biciu" does not have the right stress scheme. In line 20 the phrase "law's delay" becomes "zăbava legii", which works better with the rhythm of the iambic pentameter and no longer needs to be moved to the next line, as was the case with "întârziere" in the 1877 version. In Line 21 "insolința" is replaced by "trufia" whose sequence of unstressed, stressed, unstressed syllables works better. In line 22 "nedemni" becomes "netrebnici" and the rhythm of unstressed – stressed syllables has an improved flow. Line 23 in the SL text "of something" is conveyed as "de un ceva" in line 26 in the 1877 version which leads to a line of 21 syllables, while in the 1905 version the phrase is translated as "unui ceva", but the rhythm is still

not right, even though it comes closer to the number of syllables in the iambic pentameter (12 syllables). Romanian has fewer monosyllabic words with the right sequence of unstressed and stressed syllables. Thus, Stern's attempt to closely follow the iambic pentameter leads to a foreignizing strategy in translation.

Finally, another transformation in terms of vocabulary that I did not expect to occur so frequently is that words of French, Italian or Latin origin turn into other words from French, Italian or Latin. The surprising point is that the modifications are not uniform; sometimes the words employed initially in the 1877 version are neologisms, such as "conștiință", "forță", "resistență", "laș" or "insolință", but then Stern switched them with synonyms of similar or same origin but that had entered the Romanian language earlier. Additionally, the reverse is also true, as is the case of "a îndura" which is replaced with "a suferi". Lastly, Stern also replaces his initial word choices of Latin origin with other synonyms of Latin origin. Sometimes, the alternative comes from the same root word in Latin, or from closely related words in Latin, as is the case of "temere" / "teamă", "rugă" / "rugăciune" and "înarma" / "s'arma". In some cases, the Latin neologism is replaced by an older word of Latin origin: "nobil", "crud", "ocean", "amar", "reveni", which are replaced by "măreț", "crunt", "mare", "greu", "întoarce". Occasionally, the reverse process applies and Stern replaces the older word with another one of Latin origin that had entered the language more recently: "pământesc", "țărm" and "veșteji" become "muritor", "ținut" and "palid". Given that the choices made do not construe a homogeneous strategy, it can be argued that Stern's selection of synonyms caters to his desire to retain the prosodic aspects such as the blank verse and iambic pentameter which increased the stylistic coherence with the SL text. This evidence argues towards the foreignizing strategy in Adolphe Stern's translations.

< Fr. / It. / Lat. ☞ < Fr. / Lat.			< Lat. ☞ < Lat.		
îndurăm	Suferim	Fr, Lat	temere	teama	Lat *timere*
Conștiința	Cugetul	Fr / Lat, Lat	ruga	rugăciunea	Lat. *rogare vs rogatio -nis*
lași	Mișei	Fr, Lat	se înarma	s'arma	Lat *armare*
forță	vigoare	Fr / It, Fr /	mai nobil	mai măreț	Lat
Lat			crudei	cruntei	Lat
Prin resistență Înfruntându-le		Fr / It, Lat	ocean	mări	Lat
Insolința	Trufia	Fr / Lat, Lat	pămentesc	muritor	Lat
			amarul	greul	Lat
			revine	întoarce	Lat
			țerm	ținut	Lat
			veștejește	palida	Lat

On returning to his translation of Hamlet, Adolphe Stern felt he was able to improve the translation in the areas that required it, especially regarding the evolution of the Romanian language. He hoped the revised version would increase the value of his work, and despite the prosodic difficulties he retained the blank verse which lent the text its dramatic value, vigour, and liveliness, remaining faithful to the choices Shakespeare had made. (my translation and adaptation, Stern Preface 1905: iv)

Adolphe Stern was glad to undertake the revision of his 1877 translation at the urging of the editor. In fact, this is one of the reasons for retranslation – the fact that a publisher considers that earlier translations can stand improvements and that the market conditions are ripe for a new version in the TL:

> This is not necessarily related to problems of mistranslation or errors of omission or insertion of material not in the source text; it can also concern questions of style. Often, the publisher will have determined that extant translations lack literary quality, that a new rendering can bring out aspects of the text or author's 'voice' that were suppressed in earlier versions, or that the language of earlier translations is no longer accessible to the contemporary audience. (Lowe 2014: 416)

In fact, it could be argued the Stern's 1877 version of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* was already observant of the style of the ST and did not contain errors or mistranslations; however, around 30 years had passed since the previous edition. Current scholars of translation argue that the life of a

translation is around 50 years, while for theatre this may be halved since dramatic texts use the living language and the vernacular changes faster than the written language. In fact, the policy in terms of language usage had changed since 1877, which can be seen in the choices Stern makes in 1905. He changes the words used with synonyms of a different etymology.

Finally, in the conclusion to the Preface of the 1905 edition, Stern revealed that his expectations had been deceived in terms of seeing his translation of *Hamlet* performed in theatres. He criticized the choice of using indirect translations of the text for performance on the stage and he modestly urged others to undertake new and perhaps better translations that might be suitable for the stage. (my translation and adaptation, Stern Preface 1905: v-vi) Perhaps, the reason for the unsuitability of his translation for the stage was linked to the lack of adaptation in his two versions of the text, which reduced its performability.

4. Retranslation

A retranslation refers to the second and any other subsequent translations of a single source text into the same target language, either in its entirety or in part. (Gambier 1994: 413) It is the process of "updating texts, determined by the evolution of the target audience, their taste, their needs, their competences." (my translation, Gambier 1994: 413) Yves Gambier goes on to talk about retranslation as relay translation (done through an intermediary text), retrotranslation or backtranslation (the rendering of a translated text back into the original language of the ST) and revision (which includes few changes), adaptation (many modifications) and retranslation proper (numerous improvements). However, other theorists of translation reject the other possible types of retranslations arguing that only the first type is a true retranslation. They would argue that Stern's 1905 revision of his 1877 translation does not qualify, whereas the 1877 translation, completed 20 years after Economu's does. Stern's two texts are significantly different, with only 10 lines that do not suffer alterations in terms of word choice, but 3 of those lines do undergo changes in terms of spelling. Therefore, the 1905 version by Adolphe Sterne could be regarded as a retranslation in which the voice of the previous translation carries over, but the vocabulary is substantially different.

Anthony Pym (1998: 82) differentiates between "passive" and "active" retranslations, the first of which do not compete with other (re)translations due to geographical, political, and dialectological differences, whereas the second category competes for the same audiences. Retranslations are likely to occur when dealing with canonical texts or with texts that are complex and can be interpreted in conflicting manners. (Pym 1998: 82) Adolphe Stern's revision and re-editing of his 1877 retranslation of *Hamlet* reinforces the validity of the work he had done at the time, especially since it was undertaken at the request of a publisher. Stern's 1877 retranslation challenges the validity of Economu's work, which is marked negatively. (Pym 1998: 83)

Antoine Berman (1990) posits that the original language persists as long audiences retain an interest in the text, while translations age. Depending on the state of the language, the literature, the culture of the ST, retranslations might be undertaken quite quickly, if the previous translation no longer fits the circumstances. (my translation and adaptation, Berman 1990: 1) Furthermore, Berman also argues that first translations are lacking and perfectible, so later retranslations can make use of the existing version to get closer to the meaning of the ST and become an improved version in the TL. Building on Berman's ideas (1990), other theorists such as Chesterman (2000) puts forth the Retranslation Hypothesis that states that first translations using domestication strategies can never be great, and that subsequent retranslations, employing foreignization, will be closer to the meaning of the original text and more faithful to it as well. The hypothesis holds true in the case of Economu's translation and Stern's retranslation, with the first one being a domesticating version and the second one a foreignizing one.

Economu's work employed the Cyrillic alphabet, equally numerous neologisms and archaisms, was based on a relay translation and heavily emphasised the national need for a unified, renewed and standardised language. The replacement of the Cyrillic alphabet with the Latin one was officially implemented starting in the 1860s, but in the 1830s and 1840s a hybrid transition alphabet had already started being used and in the 1850S the schools in Wallachia were already employing the Latin one. So, the transition was achieved gradually rather than abruptly; nevertheless, there were still debates and those who rejected the change.

(Draica web) The 1848 Revolution prepared the changes to come through debates regarding the etymologic or phonetic systems that should be used to unify and standardize the spelling in Romanian. (Draica web) To give Economu his due, he also introduced *Hamlet* to Romanian audiences, which led to the public becoming acquainted with it and further interested in new versions of the text and in new translations from Shakespeare:

> For those who believe that initial translations tend to reduce the 'otherness' of the source text (e.g. Bensimon, 1990; Berman, 1990), a retranslation is considered to be more efficient in conveying the previously assimilated 'otherness' of the foreign material, because the target audience will have become acquainted with the text through the 'introduction-translation.' Others will note, however, how retranslations render the source text more accessible to the reader of the day (Rodriguez, 1990; Gambier, 1994). Hence an emphasis on the time factor: there is a continuous necessity for retranslation because earlier translations need to be updated. (Mathijssen 2007: 17)

Often, retranslations are undertaken in the case of canonical texts. Thus, Economu's translation was quaint in terms of language, alphabet and ideology by the time Stern undertook the 1877 retranslation.

Bassnett (2000) argues that the period for the 'ageing' of texts expires sooner in drama translation than in any other type of text:

> It is commonly held that plays require retranslating at regular intervals, usually every 20 years or so. There is no adequate explanation of this assumption, but it does seem that spoken language ages at a faster rate than written language, and since a play is essentially a transcript to be spoken, it follows that the ageing process will be more marked in a play translation than in other types of written text. (Bassnett 2000: 99)

Spoken language becomes outdated faster. Additionally, given that plays are meant to be performed, not just read, any retranslation of dramatic texts can become a vehicle for ideology in new retranslations that can adapt to the existing social, political and economic conditions: "A new translation may be justified because it fulfills a special need or function

in the receiving culture. This is often the case in the theater, when plays are translated and adapted for modern audiences." (Lowe 2014: 417-18)

Dramatic texts require constant retranslation, given the changes within the language, as Stern himself points out in the Preface to the revised edition of his translation. Thus, there are a plethora of translations of *Hamlet* not only in the 19th but also in the 20th century, as well as at least one other instance of a revision of the translation – Dragos Protopopescu's versions from 1938 and 1942. Some of the other translators who tackle Shakespeare's *Hamlet* are Victor Anestin, Dan Duțescu, Dan Amedeu Lazarescu, and George Volceanov, to name but a few.

5. Conclusion

In conclusion, a retranslation of *Hamlet* was needed due to the ageing of D.P. Economu's translation, whose language had become obsolete by 1877. Secondly, the use and simultaneous presence of the Cyrillic, hybrid transition and Latin alphabets proved problematic for later generations. Moreover, the presence of both neologisms and archaisms in the same text provides a further cause for retranslation. A fourth reason was the dubious quality of the translation in terms of rendering the meaning, the imagery, and the style of the SL text. This earlier translation is not as faithful as desired to the source text. Additionally, Economu's was a relay translation, using an intermediary French text as source. Furthermore, the ideological and political contexts were different in 1877 as opposed to 1855, since we are dealing the pre- and post-union periods. If prior to the union of the Romanian Principalities, the focus was on creating a national identity through enriching the language via loanwords from Romance languages, there was no urgency in this sense twenty years later and even less so in 1905 when Adolphe Stern was working on the second version of his translation. The changing circumstances speak "to the need for re-translation. Texts evolve as they cross cultural and temporal boundaries. Cultures themselves revise their guiding principles as contexts shift and assumptions collapse." (Lowe 2014: 414) Moreover, Economu's translation had achieved its goal, that of enriching the target language and culture: it had appropriated the "foreign text for domestic purposes".

(Venuti 1995: 22) Finally, given the strategy adopted in Economu's 1855 translation, once translations moved beyond the domestication stage typical of the first half of the nineteenth century, a retranslation that adopted a new strategy, that of foreignization, was needed. If Economu was very much visible in his translation, Stern becomes close to invisible in his.

The difference between a retranslation and a translation resides in the existence of

> "at least one previous translation, and a previous translator [whose] figure (…) either as a real-life person, as a mental image or a textual construction, is one obvious potential source of dependency for the second translator and the readers of the second translation alike, and this influence (…) may affect the translation process in a number of ways." (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015: 25)

This is true for Adolphe Stern's first (1877) and second (1905) translations. For the first translation Stern's choice of a foreignization strategy made the direction he took unlike that of Economu in his 1855 domesticating translation. However, when Stern was working on the 1905 version of Hamlet, he had to contend with his own voice from the previous translation. The focus of the two translators is different, therefore Stern had no difficulty in resisting Economu's 'voice', but the goal of both versions of *Hamlet* he created was the same, which led to tensions between his previous choices and his more recent ones. Usually, for the "retranslator (…) the first translator may be a predecessor to be outsmarted or improved on, (…) [someone to compete against in order] to showcase their talent and professional skill. The most obvious point of comparison of their success is the previous version." (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015: 26) Stern had to compete against Economu and himself. As Adolphe Stern himself suggested in the conclusion to the preface to the 1905 revision of his *Hamlet* translation – other translators may come up with better versions – thus, a valid reason for retranslation is linked to the idea that an improved translation could always be done by some other translator. He tried to improve his own work, and succeeded, but he also urged others to attempt to achieve the perfect / ideal translation.

Retranslation occurs quite often in the case of dramatic texts. Even in the case of prose, ageing texts require it since previous translations might become obsolete, which is exacerbated in the case of theatre. Translations and retranslations of dramatic texts can be either focus on performability or on readability, but they almost always employ adaptation. Stage-oriented (re)translation of dramatic texts will look towards the evolution of language, while those that are page-oriented might be more focused on the idea of the perfect translation. Either way, the translator has divided loyalties attempting to serve two masters: the source text and the intention of the author, on the one hand, and the target language and audience, on the other hand. The cultural trends at the time a (re)translation is undertaken influence the choices the translators make, making them more visible in the TT they create.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baer, Brian James (2014), "Translated Literature and the Role of the Reader" in Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter (Eds.), *A Companion to Translation Studies*, Wiley Blackwell, Chichester, West Sussex, pp. 333-346.

Bassnett, Susan (1998), "Still Trapped in the Labyrinth: Further Reflections on Translation and Theatre" in Susan Bassnett and Andre Lefevere (Eds.), *Constructing cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, pp. 90-108.

Bassnett, Susan (2000), "Theatre and Opera" in Peter France (Ed.), *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation* Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 96-102.

Bassnett, Susan (2002), *Translation Studies*, 3rd edition, Routledge, London and New York.

Bassnett, Susan, Andre Lefevere, ed. (1998), *Constructing cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*, Multilingual Matters, Clevedon.

Benjamin, Walter, Hannah Arendt, ed. (1999), *Illuminations – Essays and Reflections*, Translated by Harry Zohn, Schockenbooks, New York.

Berman, Antoine (1990), "La Retraduction comme espace de traduction," *Palimpsestes* 13(4), pp. 1-7.

Berman, Antoine (2000), "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign" in Lawrence Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader*, Routledge, London and New York, pp. 284-297.

Bermann, Sandra, Catherine Porter, eds. (2014), *A Companion to Translation Studies*, Wiley Blackwell Chichester, West Sussex.

Chesterman, A. (2000), "A causal model for Translation Studies", in M. Olahan (Ed.), *Intercultural Faultlines: Research Models in Translation Studies I: Textual and Cognitive Aspects*, St. Jerome, Manchester, pp. 15-27.

Draica, Dumitru (2014), "Despre Scrierea Limbii Române cu Alfabet Latin", *Revista de Lingvistică și Cultură Românească*, Nr. 29, online at: https://limbaromana.org/revista/despre-scrierea-limbii-romane-cu-alfabet-latin/

France, Peter, ed. (2000), *The Oxford Guide to Literature in English Translation*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Gambier, Yves (1994), "La retraduction, retour et détour" *Meta: journal des traducteurs / Meta: Translators' Journal*, vol. 39, no. 3, p. 413-417.

Koskinen, Kaisa, Outi Paloposki (2015) 'Anxieties of influence. The voice of the first translator in retranslation', *The Target* 27:1, Special issue on voice in translation, Alexandra Assis Rosa and Cecilia Alvstad (Eds.), pp. 25-39.

Lowe, Elizabeth (2014), "Revisiting Re-translation: Re-creation and Historical Re-vision" in Sandra Bermann and Catherine Porter (Ed.), *A Companion to Translation Studies*, Wiley Blackwell, Chichester, West Sussex, pp. 413-424.

Mathijssen, Jan Willem (2007), *The Breach and the Observance. Theatre retranslation as a strategy of artistic differentiation, with special reference to retranslations of Shakespeare's Hamlet (1777-2001)*, Utrecht: s.l.. https://www.narcis.nl/publication/RecordID/oai%3Adspace.library.uu.nl%3A1874%2F22151/uquery/retranslation/id/1/Language/NL

Nicolaescu, Madalina, Maria-Sabina Draga Alexandru, Eds (2012), *Shakespeare: Translation and The European Dimension*, Ed. Prouniversitaria, București.

Pym, Anthony (1998), *Method in Translation History*, St. Jerome, Manchester.

Shakespeare, William (1855), *Hamlet, Principele Danemarcei; Dramă In Cinci Acte Si Optu Părți De La Shakespeare*, D.P. Economu (Transl.), București.

Shakespeare, William (1877), *Hamlet Prințul Danemarcei, Tragedie In 5 Acte*, A. Stern (Transl.), Tipografia Dorotea, Bucuresci.

Shakespeare, William (1905), *Hamlet*, A. Stern (Transl.), Editura Librăriei Leon Alcalay, București.

Shakespeare, William (1988), *Hamlet*, 3rd Ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Todi, Aida (2005), "O Traducere Românească Din Secolul Al Xix-Lea: Hamlet, Principele Danemarcei (1855) 2005, *Comunicare Interculturală Şi Integrare Europeană*, Academia Romana, Iasi, Http://Www.Philippide.Ro/Pages/Comunicare%20interculturala_2005.Htm

Venuti, Lawrence (1995), *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*, Routledge, London and New York.

Venuti, Lawrence, (ed.), (2000), *The Translation Studies Reader*, Routledge, London and New York.

Zaharia, Oana-Alis (2011), "The First Romanian Translations of Hamlet", *American, British and Canadian Studies* 2, pp. 106-120.

Zaharia, Oana-Alis (2012), "The European Dimension of Shakespeare's Plays: Rewriting Macbeth and the Romanian 1848 Revolution" in Madalina Nicolaescu and Maria-Sabina Draga Alexandru (Eds.), *Shakespeare, Translation and The European Dimension*, Ed. Prouniversitaria, București, pp. 89-102.

Zaharia, Oana-Alis (2018), "Nineteenth-Century Romanian Translations: *Hamlet* for the Page or for the Stage", *Studia Litteraria Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis* 13, Z. 3, S. 185-194.

6. Annex 1

William Shakespeare – Act III, Scene I	trad. D.P. Economu (1855)	Transliterated by me: Hamlet
To be, or not to be, that is the question: Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune, Or to take arms against a sea of troubles And by opposing end them. To die – to sleep, No more; and by a sleep to say we end The heart-ache and the thousand natural shocks That flesh is heir to: 'tis a consummation Devoutly to be wish'd. To die, to sleep; To sleep, perchance to dream – ay, there's the rub:		A esista sau a nu mai esista, iată chestiunea. Ce trebue dar să admirăm? **Resignaţiunea** care primeşte cercând **fortuna ultragioasă** sau **sforţa** ce se luptă pe o mare înfuriată şi cere pace de la **tempeste**? O inimă **curagioasă** trebue oare să **suffere** isbirile fatale ale crudei soarte sau să se înarmeze contra unui **deluviu** de dureri, şi combătându-le să pue un termen? Să mori! Să dormi! Nimic alt mai mult şi în urmă să numai **sufferi**! Să fugi de aceste **turmente inumerabile** pentru care omul să naşte? Să mori! Să dormi! Să dormi. – Cine ştie poate să şi visezi. – Nu e de mirare.
For in that sleep of death what dreams may come, When we have shuffled off this mortal coil, Must give us pause – there's the respect That makes calamity of so long life. For who would bear the whips and scorns of time, Th'oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely, The pangs of dispriz'd love, the law's delay, The insolence of office, and the spurns That patient merit of th'unworthy takes, When he himself might his quietus make With a bare bodkin? Who would fardels bear, To grunt and sweat under a weary life, But that the dread of something after death, The undiscovere'd country, from whose bourn		– Şi ce vise am avea în somnul morţii când vor peri după fruntea noastră cugetarea şi viaţa? Îndoeala teribilă ce ne împinge către abisul deschis, şi care face viaţa nenorocitului atât de lungă! Şi cine într'adevăr ar **sufferi flagelaţiunile şi ultragiile** lumei, **injuriile opresorilor, affronturile** orgoliosului, moliciunea legilor, profunda **sufferinţă** ce sapă în inima noastră **amorul** fără speranţă şi despreţuit, **insolenţa guvernanţilor**, dispreţul ce **inflige inorantulu** meritului sufferind când vârful unui pumnal îşi **procură** aşa de bine şi aşa de **facil repaosul**! Cine n'ar lepăda greaoa sarcină d'a larme, cine ar mai inunda cu sudori şi lacrămi drumu cel aspru şi spinos, dacă nu sar teme de ceva ce avea strevedem dincolo de moarte! Acel tărâmu necunoscut, acea lume misterioasă, de unde nu s-a reîntorsu nici un **voiajor**, inghiaţă inimele şi nimicniceşte

No traveller returns, puzzles the will, And makes us rather bear those ills we have Than fly to others that we know not of? Thus conscience does make cowards of us all, And thus the native hue of resolution Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought, And enterprises of great pitch and moment With this regard their currents turn awry And lose the name of action. –Soft you now! The fair Ophelia! Nymph, in thy orisons Be all my sins remember'd.		dorințele noastre. Înaintea acestei nopți spiritul spăimântat **conservă** relele reale subt care **sucumbă** din preferință, de cât relele **incerte** ale mormântului pe care nu le cunoaștemu, în fine **reflecsiunea** rece, imparțială, resfrângânduse cu rasele sale pălite asupra **resoluțiunei**, coloare ardință și scânteindă, anulează ori ce **întreprindere**, oprește **esercițiunea proectelor** noastre celor mai importante, și din cei mai determinanți îndoeala face niște lași.

7. *Annex 2*

William Shakespeare – Act III, Scene I	trad. Adolphe Stern (1877)	trad. Adolphe Stern (1905) – traducere revizuită
To be, or not to be, that is the question: Whether 'tis nobler in the mind to suffer The slings and arrows of outrageous fortune, Or to take arms against a sea of troubles And by opposing end them. To die –to sleep, No more; and by a sleep to say we end The heart-ache and the thousand natural shocks That flesh is heir to: 'tis a consummation Devoutly to be wish'd. To die, to sleep; To sleep, perchance to dream— ay, there's the rub: For in that sleep of death what	A fi, sau a nu fi, **eată** întrebarea. De e **în gând mai nobil a'ndura** A **crudei** soarte praștii și săgeți, Sau a **se înarma** în contra unui **Ocean** de rele, și a le curma **Prin resistență?** – A muri, – A dormi, – Nimic mai mult; – ș'a ști că printr'un somn Sfârșim acele mii de **chinuri** și Dureri, **cari sunt** *a carnei* **moștenire**, – O, e un țel mult de dorit! A muri, – A dormi; – a dormi! poate a visa? –	A fi sau a nu fi, *iată* întrebarea. De-i **mai măreț în cuget a răbda** A **cruntei** soarte praștii și săgeți, Sau a **s'arma** contra-unei **mări** de rele Și **înfruntându-le** a le curma. A muri, a dormi, nimic mai mult. Ș-a ști. că printr'un somn sfârșim acele Mii de dureri și **suferinți** *firești* **Ce's moștenirea** *cărnii*. – E un țel Mult de dorit ! – A muri – a dormi; Dormi, – poate a visa ? – Ah, *iată* **nodul**! Căci visurile ce *ne pot veni* În somnul morții, după ce-am scăpat De chinul **muritor**, **fac să ne** oprim.

dreams may come, When we have shuffled off this mortal coil, Must give us pause—there's the respect That makes calamity of so long life. For who would bear the whips and scorns of time, Th'oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely, The pangs of dispriz'd love, the law's delay, The insolence of office, and the spurns That patient merit of th'unworthy takes, When he himself might his quietus make With a bare bodkin? Who would fardels bear, To grunt and sweat under a weary life, But that the dread of something after death, The undiscovere'd country, from whose bourn No traveller returns, puzzles the will, And makes us rather bear those ills we have Than fly to others that we know not of? Thus conscience does make cowards of us all, And thus the native hue of resolution Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought, And enterprises of great pitch and moment With this regard their currents turn awry And lose the name of action. – Soft you now! The fair Ophelia! Nymph, in thy orisons Be all my sins remember'd.	Da, *eată* **stavila** ; căci visurile Ce *ne-ar putea veni* în somnul morţii, Când am scăpat de chinul **pămentesc**, *Ne fac să ne* oprim. *Aceasta'i* **teama**, Ce dă *miseriei* o **viaţă lungă**. Căci cine-ar suferi a **timpului Urgie**, a **tiranului jicnire**, Nesocotirea celui mândru, junghiul Amorului **despreţuit**, a legei **Intârziere**, **insolinţa** slujbei, Şi **hula** ce-o aruncă cei **nedemni** Pe meritul **tăcut**, când ar putea **Să'şi** facă pacea **sea** cu un pumnal? Cine-ar purta poveri, ar asuda Si geme **sub amarul** *vieţei*, dacă O groază **de un ceva** după moarte – **Necunoscutul ţerm** de unde nu **Revine** nici un călător – , nu ne-ar **Nedomiri** voinţa, şi ne-ar face Să **îndurăm** mai bine relele Ce le avem, *de cât* să alergăm La altele ce nu le ştim. Aşa Ne face **conştiinţa laşi** pe toţi. Fireasca **rumeneală**-a hotărârii Se **vestejeşte** astfel prin gândirea Cea **lânceda**, şi întreprinderi pline De **forţă** şi măduvă, se abat, Prin **astă temere**, din cursul lor, Si perd al faptei nume. – Dar tăcere! Ofelia **frumoasă**. – Nimfă, **nu Uita pecatele'mi** în **ruga** ta.	*Aceasta-i* **chibzuiala** care dă *Mizeriei* un **trai aşa de** lung. Cine-ar purta al **vremei biciu şi hulă**, Şi **nedreptatea 'mpilătorului**, Nesocotirea celui mândru, junghiul Amorului **respins**, **zăbava** legii, **Trufia** slujbei si **dispreţul** celor **Netrebnic**i pentru **răbdătorul** merit, Dac'ar putea, <u>să-şi</u> facă **singur** pacea Cu un pumnal ? Cine-ar purta poveri, Spre-a geme ş'asuda **sub greul** *vieţii*, Dacă groaza **unui ceva** după moarte – **Ţinutul tainic** din al cui **ho'ar** Nu se **întoarce** nici un călător – Nu ne ar **rătăci** voinţa, asttel Să **suferim** mai bine relele Ce le avem, *decât* să alergăm La altele ce nu le ştim. – Aşa Ne face **cugetul mişei** pe toţi, Ş'aşa firească **faţă** a hotărârii **Ia palida culoare** a gândirii. Şi întreprinderi pline de **vigoare** Şi măduvă s'abat din cursul lor, Prin **teama asta**, şi perd numele De faptă. – Dar tăcere ! – **Gingaşa** Ofelie. – Nimfă, **pomeneşte'mi** toate **Păcatele** în **rugăciunea** ta.