TTR
Traduction, terminologie, re?daction

Dirk Delabastita and Lieven D'hulst, ed. *European Shakespeares. Translating Shakespeare in the Romantic Age*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 1993.

André Lefevere

Volume 6, numéro 2, 2e semestre 1993

Traduction, mixité, politique

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/037158ar
DOI : https://doi.org/10.7202/037158ar

Aller au sommaire du numéro

Éditeur(s)

Association canadienne de traductologie

ISSN

0835-8443 (imprimé)
1708-2188 (numérique)

Découvrir la revue

Citer ce compte rendu

Lefevere, A. (1993). Compte rendu de [Dirk Delabastita and Lieven D'hulst, ed. *European Shakespeares. Translating Shakespeare in the Romantic Age*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 1993.] *TTR*, *6*(2), 174–178. https://doi.org/10.7202/037158ar

Claire le Brun
Concordia University

Dirk Delabastita and Lieven D'hulst, ed. *European Shakespeares. Translating Shakespeare in the Romantic Age.* Amsterdam/ Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 1993.

For almost twenty years now, ever since it first organized its by now "historical" conference in 1976, the Department of Literary Studies at the University of Leuven has been one of the focal points in research on translation, under the aegis of José Lambert. With this book, the "second generation" makes its mark. It is edited by two of Lambert's former students, who are carrying on the work.

The most enjoyable overall impression one gets from reading this book is that, most prominently under the impulse of Dirk Delabastita, the "Leuven School" is finally beginning to shake off the lingering influence of (neo)positivism to be found in many of its early publications, to embrace a theoretical stance that is more in line

with current philosophy of science. The result is not just that their work is as conscientious and well-documented as ever, but that it has become more immediately arresting and more immediately conducive to further thinking and argument along the lines they suggest.

The new stance is illustrated not just by contributions written by members of the "Leuven School" themselves, but also by scholars "from outside" who are manifestly on the same wavelength. There are obvious echoes travelling back and forth, for instance, between the "Introduction," written by the editors, and the Hungarian scholar Peter Davidhazi's contribution entitled "Providing Texts for a Literary Cult. Early Translations of Shakespeare in Hungary."

The Introduction makes three important statements: that researchers tend to occupy extreme positions while trying to legitimize their points of view, that Shakespeare should be deemed to have been translated twice, once as a text for the theatre, and once as closet-drama, and that the two types of translations not only projected very different Shakespeares, but were also received very differently, and that Shakespeare's canonized status is not always conducive to open-minded research.

P. DAVIDHAZI subsumes what others in the volume, following Werner Habicht, call "translation for the page" and "translation for the stage" under "an interdisciplinary framework one could call the anthropology of literature" (p. 147). He charts the development of Shakespeare translations in Hungary by revealing the cultural agenda behind them, moving from "a means to alter and transform in order to adjust, subject, domesticate" (p. 154) to a strategy designed to "spread enlightenment and revive a national ethos" (p. 160) and beyond, to iconoclasm and secularization.

Though the spirit of Michel Foucault can be seen to be moving many a text included in this volume, Davidhazi is the only one to actually invoke the late *maître à penser* where he states that research into the collection's topic "should be based on the Foucaultian principle that no determining factor is fundamental and all one can expect to find is a network of reciprocal relations" (p. 148). Foucault seems to have displaced the Leuven School's early,

and to many readers sometimes unnecessarily zealous, because somewhat unreflected, fixation on (poly)systems theory. A few terms from the latter still surface, now and then, but only in the contributions of Leuven writers themselves, but polysystems theory no longer seems to exclusively shape even their contributions.

This — to my mind laudable — evolution is perhaps nowhere more clearly seen than in José LAMBERT's magisterial contribution entitled "Shakespeare en France au tournant du XVIIIe siècle. Un dossier européen." Lambert starts by regretting not only that the Shakespeare translated for the stage has been neglected, notwithstanding the fact that Ducis' translations held most of the stage for most of the nineteenth century in France. He then proceeds to contrast the French and the German models for Shakespeare translation, and to situate both within the Europe-wide struggle between Neoclassicism and Romanticism, in which, roughly speaking, the French Shakespeare represented the former, and the German Shakespeare the latter. But the most important point he makes is that the way Shakespeare was translated for both page and stage in France owes much, if not everything, to the way the French had been translating the Greeks for quite a while before they began to translate Shakespeare. He rightly blames the neglect of this important fact on a concept of history as a succession of events that will necessarily lead to amelioration — a decidedly positivistic concept, of course.

Lambert's final point is also well taken: that the translation of Shakespeare for the stage came to lead a life totally independent from that of translations of Shakespeare for the page, and that the former translations reached a much wider audience, and can therefore be said to have been more influential, than the latter. Lambert drives the point home as follows: "la génération romantique qui fait tant de cas de Shakespeare et du théâtre n'a jamais dominé le monde théâtral" (p. 37). He also concedes, however, that the attempt to translate Shakespeare was instrumental in grounding new theatrical conventions in France: the convention of the historical drama (while noting that it was Dumas translating Shakespeare who "réussi[ra] en 1829 le drame romantique avant (sous le nez de) Victor Hugo") and that of the closet-drama, or "théâtre de la lecture."

Werner HABICHT's contribution revisits the German Tieck/Schlegel translation of Shakespeare, contesting the commonly held view that the translation is "Romantic" and opposing to it his own view that "the style and tone of the finished result is in general harmony with the diction of "classical" serious drama of the entire Goethe era" (p. 45). In doing so, Habicht exposes perhaps the greatest power of translation: the power to project images, and images that stay and keep their power, even if they can be shown to have no grounding at all in reality. He goes on to explore the consequences of the image of Tieck/Schlegel as "romantic drama" for subsequent literary history, contrasting it with the competing translation made by Johann Heinrich Voss and his sons, who emphasized the peculiarities of style and meter Schlegel suppressed, in spite of his professed allegiance to the theory of "organic poetry." Habicht ends by raising the very interesting, indeed intriguing point of the Voss translations as a (possible) source of inspiration for Schleiermacher's very influential essay on translation.

Wolfgang RANKE somewhat deflates the "newness" of the translation for the page/translation for the stage opposition by quoting a sentence written by Johann Friedrich Schink in 1781: "Ein anderes ist es, Shakespeare für den Leser, ein anderes ihn für den Zuschauer zu übersetzen" (p. 165), while not only upholding, but reinforcing its validity by comparing the translations of *Macbeth* made by Wagner (faithful, but without resonance), Bürger (made for Schröder's productions, influential in establishing Shakespeare as a "Volksdichter" of the type propagated by Herder) and Schiller (made to suit the stylized manner of production in vogue at the Weimar theatre under the stewardship of Goethe).

Norbert GREINER, whose title is disfigured by one of the few typos in the book: "The Comic Matric of Early German Shakespeare Translation," deals with the neglected field of the translation of Shakespeare's comedies. He convincingly argues that comedy translations of Shakespeare have been neglected because "Comedy was unsuitable for an aesthetic debate on a national scale. It provided too little in the way of uplifting material for scholarly discourse, let alone cultural paradigms" (p. 203). The German "Bürger" who wanted to move ahead in the world had no time for potentially deflating laughter. Following Gottsched, he was bound to regard the "Schaubühne als moralische Anstalt" (p. 207), and to

applaud the kind of comedy created by Gellert and Iffland, and only that kind of comedy, "radically purged of uncongenial elements and based on a moral philosophy founded on the followers of Shaftesbury and his 'moral sense' theory" (p. 206). From Wieland to Tieck/Schlegel and beyond German translators did translate Shakespeare's comedies, but more out of a sense of duty and always with the hidden agenda of making them conform as much to the Gellert-Iffland paradigm as they possible could. Greiner concludes by showing, in a most illuminating manner, that the reception of Shakespeare's comedy on its own terms is to be found not in the translations, but in the work of Ulrich Bräker as well as in Lenz's Hofmeister and Soldaten.

With the exception of Dirk Delabastita's contribution on Shakespeare translations in the Netherlands, the other contributions collected in this book appear to have been written on the basis of a scholarly stance that is closer to (a local variant of) the (neo)positivistic paradigm than to the alternative paradigm emerging in the contributions commented on above. While they display scholarship and erudition of the highest order, they tend to inform more than stimulate. The contributions of the other type do both. Hence the difference. It is to be hoped that the Leuven School will not just go on in its new direction, but also choose its outside collaborators accordingly. If it does, the next volumes produced under its aegis will be even better and more enlightening than the one under review here.

André Lefevere
University of Texas at Austin