

**200 YEARS OF ROMANIAN *HAMLET* RETRANSLATION:
GHOSTS OF THE SOURCE TEXT?***Nadina Vişan**Daria Protopopescu***Abstract**

In discussing retranslation in his 1990 seminal article, Antoine Berman laid the foundation of what came to be known as the Retranslation Hypothesis. According to this rather controversial hypothesis, no first translation can do full justice to the original. Only a second, a third, or, say, a fifteenth target text might get to that point of grace where what has been lost in the first attempts will be at least partially recovered. In the present paper, we intend to check this hypothesis by looking at Romanian versions of Shakespeare's "poem unlimited" (Kermode, 2001), *Hamlet*. Our focus is on the translation of the exchange between Old Hamlet and Young Hamlet and on how the lexeme "ghost" and its "synonyms" fare in the target texts that have been produced by Romanian translators. In our comparative textual analysis, we make use of Berman's analytic of translation (Berman, 1984), which will provide the tools with which to evaluate the various target texts in our corpus. Another important goal of our analysis is tracing instances of intertextuality in translation, i.e., traces of "filiation" and/or "dissidence" (Zhang & Huijuan, 2018) between versions, which we take as compelling evidence in favour of the Retranslation Hypothesis.

Keywords

Hamlet, retranslation, intertextuality, explicitation, rationalization

* * *

"The greatest play in the English language has a ghost at its heart."

(Susan Owens, *The Ghost: A Cultural History*)

Introduction

THE current paper aims at investigating various translations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* into Romanian done over the past two hundred years. It is essential to mention from

the very beginning that in the practice of translating Shakespeare's plays into Romanian, there is a distinction between page-oriented translation, the so-called drama translation, and stage-oriented translation or theatre translation (see Bigliuzzi 2013, 5, and Zaharia 2018, 185).

Our paper covers more than two centuries' worth of translating tradition of *Hamlet* into Romanian. To this effect, we need to specify that we are aware of the existence of at least fifteen versions of *Hamlet* spanning a period that covers a little over two centuries from approximately 1820 to 2010. There are a few more translations that are stage oriented (for example, Nina Cassian's version, as yet undated and unpublished) to which we had no access as they are not available for public consultation. What we have noticed, however, is the tendency of Romanian directors to combine already existing page-oriented translations and adapt them according to their vision and needs.

From a chronological / historical point of view, we can split the translations of *Hamlet* into Romanian into four distinct periods that follow Romania's turbulent history. To this effect, we have identified a group of nineteenth-century translations, some of which have never been published (TT1 in Table (1) below). Interestingly, nineteenth-century translations of *Hamlet* into Romanian are, in fact, translations of adaptations of the play in German (TT1, TT3) or French (TT2 and TT4), so they are not direct translations of the English text. Three of the page-oriented translations (TT9, TT13 and TT15) were done by pairs of translators, as can be seen in Table (1) below. One important remark we need to make here is that there is a number of stage-oriented translations of *Hamlet* dating to the late 20th century. These translations were never officially published and they only circulate among theatre companies. In these particular cases, it seems to be a trend to have a combination of translations of *Hamlet* done by various translators (some of them are the page-oriented translations mentioned in Table (1) below), made to suit the needs of the cast or the director.

1. The Corpus

The earliest translation of *Hamlet* is an unpublished text by Ioan Barac (ca. 1820), a so-called manuscript translation, which appears to be based on German adaptations of the play. The same is true of Stern and Manolescu's translations. Similarly, the translation published by D. P. Economu in 1855 uses a famous French adaptation of *Hamlet* by Alexandre Dumas and Paul Maurice from 1847 (Zaharia 2018, 186–87, Ionoaia, in press). In order to better understand the idea behind the adapted translations, we need to provide some background information about the translations and translators. Ioan Barac, for instance, had legal training and had knowledge

of Latin, Hungarian and German, which explains why this first “translation” of *Hamlet* is actually a translation from a German adaptation, since Barac had no knowledge of English.

The early translations of the twentieth century are, in fact, the first ones to be done from English. It is also worth mentioning that both Manolescu’s (TT4) and Protopopescu’s second translation (TT8) are stage oriented, the latter being explicitly marked as such in its preface and in the cast of characters published at the beginning of the play instead of *Dramatis personae*. There are several other later stage-oriented translations of *Hamlet*. However, and this seems to be a widespread practice in Romanian theatre, they are mostly combined translations of already existing published texts compiled and adapted to fit the vision and needs of actors and directors. Table 1 provides an accurate chronology of the Romanian translations of *Hamlet*. We could not access Vasile Demetrius’s or Ionel Nicolae’s versions.

Table 1

A periodization of Romanian translations of *Hamlet*

Periods	Translations of <i>Hamlet</i> into Romanian
Nineteenth-century translations	Ioan Barac (cca1820) TT1 (TT= Target Text)
	D.P. Economu 1855 TT2
	Adolphe Stern 1877 TT3
	George Manolescu 1881 TT4 (stage-oriented)
Early twentieth-century translations up to the communist era	Victor Anestin 1908 TT5
	Ion Vinea 1938-1944 TT6
	Dragoş Protopopescu 1938 TT7
	Dragoş Protopopescu 1942 TT8 (stage-oriented)
Translations during the communist era	Maria Banuş and Vera Călin 1948 TT9
	Petru Dumitriu (IonVinea) 1955 TT10
	Ştefan Runcu (Aurora Cornu) 1962 TT11
	Vladimir Streinu 1965 TT12
	Leon Leviţchi and Dan Duţescu 1974 TT13
Post-communist, twenty-first-century translations	Dan Amedeu Lăzărescu 2009 TT14
	Violeta Popa and George Volceanov 2010 TT15
	Ionel Nicolae 2016 TT16

During the communist period, it is interesting to see that some translations were published under a different person’s name as is the case with the 1955 and 1962 versions (i.e., TT10 and TT11). The 1955 version, which appears under the name

of writer Petru Dumitriu, was, in fact, authored by poet Ion Vinea, who had translated Shakespeare between 1938 and 1944. He was acknowledged as the author in a subsequent republication of a volume comprising his translations of Shakespeare's plays in 1971 and later on in 2018. The 1962 version published under the name Ștefan Runcu is, in fact, the work of poetess Aurora Cornu (Martin 2020, 82) who took this pseudonym for translation purposes. Dan Amedeu Lăzărescu's translation of *Hamlet* was first published in 2009, years after his death. He was trained as a lawyer but embarked upon the great project of translating Shakespeare around the same time that Levițchi and Duțescu led the project of translating Shakespeare as well. However, since Levițchi and Duțescu had philological training, they never granted any attention to Lăzărescu's work and ignored it altogether. So, although, Lăzărescu's translation of *Hamlet* was published in 2009, it was done some time during the 1970's. After the fall of communism, we have a notable project of translating Shakespeare for the third millennium, led by George Volceanov, and from the translation of *Hamlet*, first published in 2010, we could tell that he attempted to update the language employed in his predecessors' versions.

2. Another Go at Cracking the Retranslation Hypothesis

In discussing retranslation issues for Romanian versions of *Hamlet*, we will focus on those target texts that have an English source text. In the broader acceptance of the term “retranslation,” all the versions mentioned above can count as forms of retranslation, but it would be counterintuitive to compare target texts that have different source texts for the purposes of this investigation, i.e., the checking of the Retranslation Hypothesis, as it was formulated by Berman in 1990.

It is common knowledge that the literature on retranslation relies on the so-called “Retranslation Hypothesis” (henceforth the RH), stated by Antoine Berman in a seminal article he wrote in 1990. Considered by many a universal of translation and criticized by many others, the RH acknowledges retranslation(s) as forms of repairing translation loss in a first, imperfect, version. In Berman's terms, no first translation can be the definitive translation (here, Berman uses the term “great,” which in itself is debatable). A second claim is that subsequent retranslations – whether consciously or unconsciously – seem to take the first version as a sort of point of reference, in that they strive to recoup losses inherent in this first version.

The points made by Berman in his famous article were amply discussed (Koskinen and Paloposki, 2010 and 2019, Van Poucke and Gallego, 2019) and were challenged in a series of studies (one of the most recent being Sharifpour and Sharififar,

2021), in which corpus translation studies play no small part (Dastjerdi and Mohammadi, 2013, Van Poucke, 2017, Oyali, 2018, Sanatifar and Etemadi 2021, *inter alia*), yet no conclusion has been definitively reached so far, partly because an evaluation is difficult to make and because methods differ. What is, after all, a “great” translation? What criteria should be used in identifying one?

To this effect, the present paper attempts to offer some answers by making use of more clearly defined patterns of investigation. We restrict our discussion by mainly investigating to what extent Berman’s claims are verifiable in the various Romanian versions of *Hamlet*, with a focus on “ghost” terms. With respect to the first, and the most notorious, claim of the RH, the present paper takes as point of reference Berman’s own criteria of evaluation. We have chosen thus to employ Berman’s “analytic of translation” – which pre-dates his retranslation article by six years – because we believe that Berman’s claim can be better understood and/or verified if integrated in the translational framework devised by Berman himself. In his 1984 study, Berman identifies a few “deforming tendencies” in translation that might impair the overall literary effect of the target text and might deform the (semantic) richness of the source text. He thus discusses the tendency of translators to overtranslate (to produce longer and more explicit target texts) or rationalize (to reorder the syntax of the source text when there is no need for it), or even to ennoble (to choose a marked lexical variant over the generic term) or impoverish (to choose an unmarked lexical variant over the marked one) the source text. By pointing out what a translator should not do, Berman provides clues about what a “great” translation should be. He then goes on to say, in his 1990 article, that a “great” translation can rarely be the first one. Revisions/ retranslations are therefore necessary, as they are all attempts to recapture the textual richness existent in the source text. In an attempt to preserve consistency with Berman’s considerations and further illuminate his much-debated claims, we intend to make use of Berman’s list of translation no-no’s and verify the first point of the RH.

With respect to the second point of the RH, we rely on a study recently published by Zhang & Huijuan (2018), which contributes to the foundation laid by Berman and, we believe, adds invaluable insight to it: the second point in the RH, which states that subsequent target texts take the first (or a previous) target text as a point of reference, is associated with the notion of “intertextuality in retranslation” (henceforth IR). IR is defined as any kind of relationship that ties together various target texts. Two particular instances of intertextuality are discussed and illustrated by Zhang and Huijuan: filiation, i.e., “textual similarities that reflect a filial stance of one translation towards another,” and dissidence, i.e., “textual differences that

indicate one translation is made to distinguish from or even compete against another” (2018, 4–5). IR can be identified at various textual levels, from lexical, semantic, syntactic levels to stylistic, narrative levels, where recurring or specific elements can be analyzed in various target texts so as to establish either filiation or dissidence. Translation strategies themselves can be investigated and taken as proof of filiation or dissidence, as Zhang & Huijuan point out (2018, 4). If instances of filiation or dissidence are traceable in at least some of the target texts in our corpus, it means that the claim that subsequent target texts benefit from a previous target text is verifiable. This, in turn, would mean that the second point of the RH is valid. Since our interest lies in looking at how the term “ghost” and its synonyms were (re)translated into Romanian, we will further restrict our investigation to the lexical level and to strategies in translation to which Romanian translators resort.

3. Analysis

The first point of investigation is the way in which Romanian target texts deal with the translation of the pair *Ghost/ghost*. For reasons of space, we do not provide back-translations for the texts discussed, but we do analyze the words and phrases of interest in detail. We differentiate between *Ghost* that appears in *Dramatis personae* and *ghost* that appears in the text of the play. In the characters’ list, *Ghost* is in the vicinity of *bona fide* proper names (Hamlet, Gertrude, Polonius, etc.) and other common nouns of the most generic kind (Players, Priest, etc.). Due to its being part of a *Dramatis personae* list, *Ghost* is thus granted a status similar to that of proper names themselves (capital letter, no determiner). Common nouns turned proper names are generally translated into the target language with an equivalent that is preserved as such throughout the play. This is a natural reflection of the original (Shakespeare himself employs the term *Ghost* consistently in the source text) and it is one of the simplest and easiest forms of equivalence in translation. It follows that the strategy employed by translators for the *Dramatis personae* term should be that of equivalence. We argue that a similar strategy of equivalence should also be employed in the case of the common noun *ghost* used in the rest of the text of the play, since this term should be paired with its “proper name” counterpart in terms of genericity. If one considers the set of synonyms available in Romanian for the pair *Ghost/ghost*, two terms are the likeliest candidates, because they appear as the most generic in Romanian: *stafie* (< Greek) or *fantomă* (< French). The other terms available are all marked variants in point of either register or frequency or cultural specificity. If you consider the list below, the last seven terms can be seen as culture-specific, as they

refer to various Romanian types of revenants: *spirit* “spirit” (< Latin), *spectru* “spectre” (< French), *umbră* “shadow” (< Latin), *duh* “spirit” (< Slavic, older form), *vedenie* “apparition” (< Slavic, older form, derived from the verb *a vedea* “to see”), *nălucă/nălucire* “illusion” (back-formation from a verb derived from Latin *lux*, meaning “light”) and its Slavic pair *năzăritură* “illusion” (back-formation from a Slavic verb *zarja* meaning “shine”), *arătare* “apparition” (< Latin), *fantasmă* “phantasm” (< French), *apariție* “apparition” (< French), *strigoi* “the (evil) spirit of a man whose sins have not been pardoned” (a derivation from Latin *striga*) and its Slavic pair *moroi* (< Slavic *mora*), *iazmă* “evil apparition” (< probably Slavic), *necurățenie* metaphorical use of “state of uncleanness” (< Latin), *pricolici* “evil spirit of dead person often taking the shape of an animal” (< Hungarian), *vidmă* “apparition, witch” (< Ukrainian), *vârcolac* “Romanian mythological being that eats the Sun and the Moon; apparition” (< Bulgarian).

Now, if we consider the table below, we can see that different strategies are employed in the translation of the *Ghost/ghost* pair:

Table 2
Versions of *Ghost/ghost*

ST (Source Text)	GHOST	HAMLET: Alas, poor ghost !
TT6 Ion Vinea 1938-1944 (1971)	DUHUL	HAMLET: Duh sârman!
TT7 Dragoș Protopopescu 1938	UMBRA	HAMLET: Sârmană stafie !
TT8 Dragoș Protopopescu 1942	STAFIA	HAMLET: Ah stafie sârmană . . .
TT9 Maria Banuș and Vera Călin 1948	FANTOMA	HAMLET: Sârmană umbră !
TT10 Petru Dumitriu (Ion Vinea) 1955, 1959	DUHUL	HAMLET: Duh sârman!
TT11 Ștefan Runcu (Aurora Cornu) 1962	SPIRITUL	HAMLET: Sârmane spirit !
TT12 Vladimir Streinu 1965	FANTOMA	HAMLET: O, duh sârman!
TT13 Dan Duțescu and Leon Levițchi 1974	DUHUL	HAMLET: Vai, biet Duh !
TT14 Dan Amedeu Lăzărescu 2009	SPECTRUL	HAMLET: Sârmană umbră !
TT15 Violeta Popa and George Volceanov 2010	STAFIA	HAMLET: Biet spirit , vai.

As pointed out by Nicolaescu (2012, 290), of the many variants mentioned above, Vinea's target text (TT6/10) appears to be the one that was the most influential for subsequent versions. If we are to use Pym's term, Vinea's translation could be seen as a landmark for subsequent target texts, having become a real "pseudo-original" (2004, 90). However, as Nicolaescu (2012, 288–89) remarks, Vinea's text is, in fact, characterized by a tendency towards localization and archaization, which is verified by the use of the lexeme *duh* "ghost, spirit," a noun taken from Slavic and rarely used unless it appears in set phrases (like, for instance, *Sfântul Duh* "the Holy Ghost," or *Duhul Lămpii* "the genie of the Lamp"). From this point of view, it might be argued that both TT12 and TT13 are indebted to TT6/10, having chosen to employ a similar term. In point of consistency, as seen in the table above, only TT6/10, TT8, TT11 and TT13 manage to employ a similar equivalent for the *Ghost/ghost* pair. TT7, TT9, TT12, TT14 and TT15 use different terms for *Ghost* and *ghost*, respectively, which is marked by italics in the table above. One of the reasons for inconsistent lexical choices in translation is, without doubt, dictated by prosody. More than that, we have noticed that in TT7, even the "proper name" *Ghost* appears translated inconsistently: it alternates between UMBRA and STAFIA, which, to our mind, is a breach of equivalence and translation norms. Interestingly enough, TT8 seems to be an improvement on TT7 (as both versions belong to the same translator). TT8 appears as a revised version of TT7 and in that it qualifies as a "better" translation from Berman's point of view. It is more consistent and does away with a lot of the instances of rationalization we noticed in the previous version.

An interesting problem is posed by the translation of *ghost* employed with a different tinge of meaning in the source text (see Table 3). As pointed out by Schmidt in his lexicon, Shakespeare employs the noun *ghost* with five meanings: a) the spirit of a deceased person, b) a supernatural being, c) a spectre, d) life, soul (like in *give up the ghost*) e) a dead body ("I'll make a ghost of him that lets me," *Hamlet* 1.4.85) (1971, 453). All Romanian translators chose to attempt equivalence and managed to translate the pun – using the strategy of PUN-PUN, see Delabastita's typology of pun-translation (1993, 192) – but only TT7, TT8, TT11, TT13 and TT15 are consistent in that they make use of the same lexeme that has been employed for the translation of *Ghost* (the *Dramatis personae* term). It comes as no surprise that these are almost the same target texts that have been consistently translating the pair *Ghost/ghost* in the previous example (see Table 2). We believe that consistency is crucial in the translation of this pun. It follows that TT7, TT8, TT11, TT13 and TT15 manage full equivalence, while the others manage only partial equivalence.

Table 3

Versions of *I'll make a ghost of him*

ST	Hamlet: Unhand me, gentlemen. By heaven, I'll make a ghost of him that lets me! (act I, scene 4)
TT6 Ion Vinea 1938-1944 (1971)	Hamlet: Jos mîna, domnii mei! Fac un strigoi din cel ce-mi ține calea p. 176
TT7 Dragoș Protopopescu 1938	Hamlet: Lăsați-mă! Pe ce-am mai sfânt, fac stăfie Din cine-mi stă în cale la o parte! p. 41
TT8 Dragoș Protopopescu 1942	Hamlet: Lăsați-mă, pe ce-am mai sfânt, fac stăfie Din cine-mi stă în cale! La o parte! p. 31
TT9 Maria Banuș and Vera Călin 1948	Hamlet: Dați-mi drumul. În numele cerului, nălucă fac din orișcine îmi stă în cale. p. 45
TT10 Petru Dumitriu (Ion Vinea) 1955	Hamlet: Jos mîna, domnii mei! Fac un strigoi din cel ce-mi ține calea p. 41
TT11 Ștefan Runcu (Aurora Cornu) 1962	Hamlet: Prieteni, dați-mi drumul! Jur, spirit fac din cel care mă ține! p. 201
TT12 Vladimir Streinu 1965	Hamlet: Drumul, gentilomi! Strigoi îl fac pe cine-mi stă-mpotrivă! p. 67
TT13 Leon Levițchi and Dan Duțescu 1974	Hamlet: Jos mîna, domnii mei. Jur să-l preschimb în duh pe-acela care Mă va opri! p. 29
TT14 Dan Amedeu Lăzărescu 2009	Hamlet: Lăsați-mă, vă rog, Sau fac strigoi din cel ce mă oprește! p. 81
TT15 Violeta Popa and George Volceanov 2010	Hamlet: Dați-mi drumul, domnilor. Care-mi stă în cale, jur că-l fac stăfie ! p. 348

Additionally, it would be interesting to trace instances of filiation by looking at the use of such special lexemes as the very marked variant *strigoi*: following TT6/10 (Vinea's influential version), TT12 and TT14 employ the same lexeme for the translation of the pun. As none of the other translations evince similarities, it becomes apparent that TT6/10 is a sort of landmark for subsequent versions and that IR is indeed at play here.

It is also worth looking at the syntax of the Romanian versions. While most target texts employ the canonical VERB NOUN pattern (*fac un strigoi/stăfie/duh* "(I'll) make a ghost"), TT9, TT11 and TT12 opt for topicalization (NOUN VERB) and place emphasis on the noun (*nălucă/spirit/strigoi fac* "a ghost (I'll) make"). This particular strategy which can be interpreted as rationalization makes these three versions stand out as the "dissidents" of the set.

Another interesting pair of phrases is *spirit of health/goblin damned*, which appears to be crucial for understanding Hamlet's doubts in deciding whether the apparition is either benevolent and trustworthy or evil, not to be trusted, a revenant (Nicolaescu 2001, 58). It thus appears that the use of *spirit* has a positive connotation, which again should be consistently marked in translation. It is important to point out that the two phrases are not symmetrical in point of syntax and style (no repetition, no symmetry, no chiasmus, etc. is employed in the source text, although, as pointed out in the literature (Kermode 2001, 128), repetition and hendiadys are quite abundant in *Hamlet*). This means that Shakespeare probably avoided figures of repetition or parallelism purposefully in this case, which is a feature that should also be rendered in translation.

Table 4

Versions of *a spirit of health, or goblin damned*

ST	Be thou a spirit of health , or goblin damned , (act 1, scene 4)
TT6 Ion Vinea 1938-1944 (1971)	De ești duh sfânt sau blestemat strigoi, p. 175
TT7 Dragoș Protopopescu 1938	... De ești duh bun, sau duh împielit, p. 38
TT8 Dragoș Protopopescu 1942	De ești duh rău sau binecuvântat, p. 29
TT9 Maria Banuș and Vera Călin 1948	De-ai fi spirit binefăcător sau duh necurat, p.44
TT10 Petre Dumitriu (Ion Vinea) 1955	De ești duh sfânt sau blestemat strigoi, p. 39
TT11 Ștefan Runcu (Aurora Cornu) 1962	De ești un spirit bun sau unul rău, p. 199
TT12 Vladimir Streinu 1965	Blașine duh sau iazmă blestemată, p. 63
TT13 Leon Levițchi and Dan Duțescu 1974	De ești duh bun sau osîndit; p. 27
TT14 Dan Amedeu Lăzărescu 2009	Ești oare-o umbră binefăcătoare Sau ești un sol al iadului? p. 77
TT15 Violeta Popa and George Volceanov 2010	Tu, spirit bun ori demon blestemat, p. 347

Some of the Romanian translators choose to employ different syntax for the adjectives used as epithets. In Romanian, the canonical order is ADJECTIVE NOUN,

but a non-canonical variant is possible (NOUN ADJECTIVE), where the adjective is postposed. Thus, TT6/10 (Vinea's translation) *duh sfânt sau blestemat strigoi* "ghost holy or damned revenant" manages a chiasmus of the type noun-epithet-epithet-noun. TT7 and TT8 (Protopopescu's first and second versions) change strategy: in TT7 Protopopescu uses the same lexeme for *spirit/goblin* and opposing postposed epithets: *duh bun sau duh împielițat* "ghost good or ghost devilish," while in TT8 he reverses the order of the epithets (just as TT6/10 did): *duh sfânt sau blestemat strigoi* "ghost holy or damned revenant." Interestingly enough, TT9 makes use of the Latin word (*spirit*) in Romanian thus managing equivalence and placing it in opposition with its Slavic counterpart (*duh*): *spirit binefăcător sau duh necurat* "spirit beneficent or ghost unholy." TT11 also retains the noun *spirit* as the common term for both entities and makes use of repetition, choosing as recurrent element the indefinite article and its pronominal substitute: *un spirit bun sau unul rău* "a spirit good or one bad." TT12 rationalizes the syntax and does away with the adverbial of condition, opting for a vocative construction: *Blajine duh sau iazmă blestemată* "oh, meek ghost or goblin damned." His lexical choices are the Slavic *duh* which is used with a positive connotation and the very rare, culture-specific, obsolete *iazmă*, which makes this particular fragment sound poetic and archaic. TT13 undertranslates using the same head noun *duh* and associating it with two opposing adjectives: *duh bun sau osîndit* "ghost good or doomed." TT14 overtranslates and explicitates by asking a direct question instead of hypothesizing: *Ești oare o umbră binefăcătoare/Sau ești un sol al iadului?* "Are you a shadow beneficent/ Or are you a herald of hell?" Finally, TT15, opts for a structure that we deem closest to what Shakespeare wrote, although TT15 is also guilty of rationalization since it gives up the conditional clause in favour of a vocative marked by the second person singular pronoun *tu* "you": *Tu, spirit bun ori demon blestemat* "you, spirit good or demon damned." In this translation, *spirit* is placed in opposition with *demon*, which seems to be close to the lexical choices made in the source text, since the word *goblin* does not, in fact, have a Romanian equivalent. In point of IR, while most target texts seem to use a similar syntactic structure (the shortened form of the adverbial conjunction of condition, *de* "if" and a conditional clause, plus various combinations of nouns cum epithets), TT12, TT14 and TT15 seem to adopt a stance of dissidence by employing vocative constructions (TT12 and TT15) or direct interrogation (TT14).

It would be interesting to see whether the lexeme *spirit* is consistently translated in other contexts. Let us consider the table below:

Table 5

Versions of *perturbed spirit*

ST	Hamlet: Rest, rest, perturbed spirit! (act 1, scene 5)
TT6 Ion Vinea 1938-1944 (1971)	Hamlet: O, pace ție, suflet chinuit! p. 184
TT7 Dragoș Protopopescu 1938	Hamlet: O, fi pe pace, duh fără odihnă! p. 53
TT8 Dragoș Protopopescu 1942	Hamlet: Ah, fi pe pace, duh fără odihnă... p. 42
TT9 Maria Banuș and Vera Călin 1948	Hamlet: Potolește-te, duh fără odihnă. p. 53
TT10 Petru Dumitriu (Ion Vinea) 1955	Hamlet: O, pace ție, suflet chinuit! p. 53
TT11 Ștefan Runcu (Aurora Cornu) 1962	Hamlet: O, pace ție, spirit chinuit! p. 212
TT12 Vladimir Streinu 1965	Hamlet: Așteaptă-n pace, suflet nempăcat! p. 87
TT13 Leon Levițchi and Dan Duțescu 1974	Hamlet: Te-alină, duh neogoit! p. 38
TT14 Dan Amedeu Lăzărescu 2009	Hamlet: Fii liniștit, năprasnic duh! p. 25
TT15 Violeta Popa and George Volceanov 2010	Hamlet: Odihnă, ție, spirit frământat! p. 355

Traces of filiation can be identified between TT6/10, TT11 and TT15 both in point of syntax (the use of the Dative second person singular pronoun *ție* “to you” and of the adjective *chinuit* “tormented” or the noun *spirit* “spirit”), however TT6/10, which is considered to be the most prestigious, albeit archaizing, version, is almost the only one which employs the noun *suflet* “soul,” not borrowed by any of the other target texts, apart from TT12. In fact, nowhere in *Hamlet* is the word *soul* used in association with the Ghost. The use of this particular phrase, *suflet chinuit* “tormented soul,” seems to be in consonance with the observation made by Nicolaescu regarding the tendency of this version to domesticate and localize the Shakespearean text, bringing it closer to the perception of the Romanian readership and “explaining” it to the understanding of this readership (2012, 57): while one of the meanings of the Romanian noun *spirit* is that of “ghost,” no such meaning is available for *suflet*, which is frequently related to philosophy and religion (“eternal, life-giving force of divine origin”). The translation of *spirit* by *suflet* thus forces a particular interpretation on ghosts as entities with soul (see Catholic and, possibly, Orthodox views

on ghosts) as opposed to the Protestant view (ghosts are soulless, evil creatures) (Owens 2017, 49–51). TT12 seems to borrow both the noun *suflet* “soul” and the noun *pace* “peace” from TT6/10, opting for explicitation: the repetition *rest, rest* is translated as *așteaptă-n pace* “wait in peace.” In fact, as a clear example of translation loss, none of the target texts analyzed here preserves the repetition in this case. Instances of filiation can be also traced between TT7, TT8, TT9, TT13 and TT14, all of which opt for the noun *duh*. TT7, TT8 and TT9 even make use of the same phrase, i.e., *duh fără odihnă* “ghost without rest/peace.” TT13 might be seen as dissident when employing rare epithets such as *neogoit* “unsoothed,” while TT15 makes use of the epithet *frământat* “troubled” which, just like its English counterpart, is part of a set phrase: *suflet frământat* “troubled soul,” thus subtly hinting at, but not openly supporting, a religious interpretation.

In fact, the first mention of the Ghost in *Hamlet* is by using a deictic demonstrative and a common noun (*this thing*), resumed later by *this dreaded sight . . . this apparition*. All three phrases can be seen as forming a [+proximous] deictic chain where another feature seems to be [-animate]. The Ghost is perceived as an abomination, a paradox, a thing that walks and talks, a presence and yet an absence, as Nicolaescu notices:

The “thing,” *this thing* (notice the use of the deictic *this* to instantiate its presence in the here and now) is at the same time “nothing.” It is both a presence and an absence. Furthermore, it is both visible and invisible. When invisible, there is no knowing whether the “thing” is absent or present. It may be present and see us while we do not see it. (Nicolaescu 2001, 54)

What happens in translation? Table 6 shows that the only target text (apart from TT1 which is an adaptation from German) that chooses to translate *this thing* by *lucru* “thing” is TT6/10, while none of the other target texts employ this literal translation. This is because in Romanian the noun *thing* is not used to express anything but inanimate entities and cannot be used in the plural so as to convey vagueness as it is in English (“He said things to me” cannot be translated with *Mi-a spus lucruri*. The translation needs to explicitate for it to make sense in Romanian: *Mi-a spus tot felul de lucruri neplăcute*. “He said all sorts of unpleasant things to me.”) This is why explicitation is one important strategy in the translation of *this thing* (“that phantom,” “the apparition,” “the wonder,” etc.). TT12 even resorts to ennoblement by translating *this thing* with *moftul acela* “that trifle.” Notice that the [+proximous] feature of the demonstrative is replaced by [+distal], which is an instance of impoverishment (to use another of Berman’s terms) and modifies the semantics of the original. A second strategy here is omission (Ø), which is possible since Romanian is a null-subject language and the subject can be left out (not lexically realized). But this creates translation loss that is impossible to repair, since both the deictic demonstrative

and the noun *thing* have meaning in the source text. In point of filiation or dissidence, it becomes apparent that TT6/10, the version that is supposed to be the most influential of all, is not a source of inspiration in this case.

Table 6

Versions of *this thing*

ST	Marcellus: What, has this thing appeared again to-night? Barnardo: I have seen nothing . act 1, scene 1	Back-trans-lation
TT1 Ioan Barac (cca1820)	Bernfeld: Spune-mi de s-au mai arătat lucrul acela și în noaptea aceasta. Elrich: Încă n-am văzut nimica .	that thing nothing
TT2 D.P. Economu 1855	- [omitted]	
TT3 Adolf Stern 1877	Marcel: Părut'a iar năluca , astă noapte? Bernardo: Nu am văzut nimic . p. 7	the illusion nothing
TT4 Victor Anestin 1908	Marcellus: Ce mai e, a apărut fantoma iar în astă noapte? Bernardo: N'am văzut nimic . p. 10	the phantom nothing
TT6 Ion Vinea 1938-1944 (1971)	Marcellus: S-a mai ivit o dată lucru acela ? Bernardo: Eu n-am văzut nimic . p. 148	that thing nothing
TT7 Dragoș Protopopescu 1938	Marcellus: Văzuși ceva din nou? Barnardo: Nimic! Nimic... p. 9	something nothing, nothing
TT8 Dragoș Protopopescu 1942	Marcellus: Ați mai văzut minunea ?... Barnardo: Încă nu ... p. 3	the wonder not yet
TT9 Maria Banuș and Vera Călin 1948	Marcellus: Spune! Și'n astă noapte s'a arătat? Bernardo: N'am văzut nimic . p. 22	∅ nothing
TT10 Petru Dumitriu (Ion Vinea) 1955	Marcellus: S-a mai ivit o dată lucru acela ? Bernardo: Eu n-am văzut nimic . p. 7	that thing nothing
TT11 Ștefan Runcu (Aurora Cornu) 1962	Marcellus: Ce, arătarea a venit din nou? Bernardo: Eu n-am văzut nimic . p. 173	the apparition nothing
TT12 Vladimir Streinu 1965	Marcellus: Eh, moftu-acela a mai ieșit ast-noapte? Bernardo: Eu n-am văzut nimic . p. 7	that trifle nothing
TT13 Leon Levițchi and Dan Duțescu 1974	Marcellus: În noaptea asta s-a ivit din nou? Bernardo: Eu n-am văzut nimic . p. 5	∅ nothing
TT14 Dan Amedeu Lăzărescu 2009	Marcellus: Fantoma a venit la miez de noapte? Bernardo: Nu, n-am văzut nimic... p. 31	the phantom nothing
TT15 Violeta Popa and George Volceanov 2010	Marcellus: Hai, zi, s-a arătat și-n noaptea asta? Barnardo: Eu n-am văzut nimic . p. 326	∅ nothing

Conclusion

A brief look at the translation of the lexeme *ghost* and some of its synonyms indicates that our attempt to check the first point of the RH can be seen as successful since TT6/10 (Vinea's translation), taken as a point of reference for subsequent target texts, shows a number of inconsistencies (or deforming tendencies, such as explicitation, rationalization, etc.) that come to be repaired in later versions. Most instances analysed (with the exception of the last one) also prove that TT6/10, probably due to its being reprinted many times, remains an important landmark for subsequent versions, which either borrow (filiation) or depart (dissidence) from it constantly. This seems to indicate that IR is at play and that the second point of the RH is supported.

Our paper has analyzed various Romanian target texts by using Berman's approach to literary translation in the hope of gaining further insight into the principles lying at the basis of what later came to be known as the Retranslation Hypothesis. Strictly from this particular perspective, we believe that our textual analysis proves that Berman's proposal regarding translation loss and gain is worth revisiting and pondering. Ultimately, the aim of this paper has been to demonstrate that such a translational analysis can provide new angles for investigating textual richness and semantic "limitlessness" in *Hamlet*.

Bibliography

- Berman, Antoine. 1984/2000. "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti and Mona Baker, 284–89. New York: Routledge.
- Berman, Antoine. 1990. "La retraduction comme espace de la traduction." *Palimpsestes* 4: 1–7.
- Bigliuzzi, Silvia. 2013. "Introduction." In *Theater Translation in Performance*, edited by Silvia Bigliuzzi, Paola Ambrosi, and Peter Kofler, 1–26. New York: Routledge.
- Dastjerdi, Hossein Vahid, and Amene Mohammadi. 2013. "Revisiting 'Retranslation Hypothesis': A Comparative Analysis of Stylistic Features in the Persian Retranslation of *Pride and Prejudice*." *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics* 3, no. 3: 174–81.
- Delabastita, Dirk. 1993. *There's a Double Tongue. An Investigation in the Translation of Shakespeare's Wordplay with Special Reference to Hamlet*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Ionoaia, Eliana. (in press). "The Retranslation of Hamlet's Soliloqui in Act III, scene 1 – to Adapt or not to Adapt". *Analele Universității din București – Limbi și Literaturi Străine*, vol. I., 2020.

- Kermode, Frank 2001. *Shakespeare's Language*. London: Penguin Books Limited.
- Koskinen, Kaisa, and Outi Paloposki. 2010. "Retranslation." In *Handbook of Translation Studies*, vol. 1, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, 294–98. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Koskinen, Kaisa, and Outi Paloposki. 2019. "New Directions for Retranslation Research: Lessons Learned from the Archeology of Retranslations in the Finnish Literary System." *Cadernos de Traduções* 39, no. 1: 23–44. doi:10.5007/2175-7968.2019v39n1p23.
- Martin, Anca-Simina. 2020. "A Quantitative Analysis of the Romanian Translations of Shakespeare's Bawdy Puns." *Metacritic Journal for Comparative Studies and Theory* 6, no. 2: 64–86, <https://doi.org/10.24193/mjctst.2020.10.04>.
- Nicolaescu, Mădălina. 2001. *Meanings of Violence in Shakespeare's Plays*. București: Editura Universității București.
- Nicolaescu, Mădălina. 2012. "Translations of Shakespeare in Romania – Going from Local to Global?" *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 20, no. 3: 285–96. doi:10.1080/0907676X.2012.702398.
- Owens, Susan. 2017. *The Ghost: A Cultural History*. London: Tate Publishing.
- Oyali, Uchenna. 2018. "The Retranslation Hypothesis and Lexical Borrowings in Bible Translations into Igbo." *Lebende Sprachen* 63, no. 1: 84–100. doi:10.1515/les-2018-0005.
- Pym, Anthony. 2004. *The Moving Text: Localization, Translation and Distribution*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sanatifar, Mohammad Saleh, and Mahboobeh Etemadi. 2021. "One Step Closer to the Theorization of Berman's Hypothesis: Analysis of Farsi (Re)translations of *The Little Prince*." *Journal of Foreign Language Teaching and Translation Studies* 6, no. 1: 75–96. doi:10.22034/efl.2021.272059.1074.
- Schmidt, Alexander. 1971. *Shakespeare Lexicon and Quotation Dictionary*, vol. 1. New York: Dover Publications.
- Shakespeare William. ca. 1820. *Amler, Prințul de la Dania. O tragedie in cinci perdele. După Sakespeare*. Translated by Ioan Barac. Library of the Romanian Academy, Ms. 209, n.d.
- Shakespeare William. 1855. *Hamlet, principele Danemarcei; dramă in cinci acte si optu părți de la Shakespeare*. Translated by D. P. Economu. București: Imprimeria lui Ferdinand OM.
- Shakespeare William. 1877. *Hamlet prințul Danemarcei. Tragedie în 5 acte*. Translated by Adolphe Stern. București: Editura Librăriei Leon Alcalay.
- Shakespeare William. 1881. *Hamlet, tragedie în 5 acte și 13 tablouri*. Translated by George Manolescu. The National Theatre of Bucharest Library, Ms. 124.
- Shakespeare, William. 1908. *Hamlet*. Translated by Victor Anestin. București: Editura Librăriei Alcalay & Co.
- Shakespeare, William. 1938. *Hamlet*. Translated by Dragoș Protopopescu. București: Fundația pentru literatură și artă "Regele Carol II".
- Shakespeare, William. 1942. *Hamlet*. Translated by Dragoș Protopopescu. București: Editura SOCEC &Co., S.A.R.

- Shakespeare, William. 1948. *Hamlet*. Translated by Maria Banuș and Vera Călin. București: Editura de stat.
- Shakespeare, William. 1955. *Hamlet*. Translated by Petru Dimitriu (Ion Vinea). București: Editura de Stat pentru Literatură și Artă.
- Shakespeare, William. 1962. *Hamlet*. Translated by Ștefan Runcu (Aurora Cornu). București: Editura pentru Literatură.
- Shakespeare, William. 1965. *Tragedia lui Hamlet, prinț de Danemarca*. Translated by Vladimir Streinu. București: Editura pentru Literatură.
- Shakespeare, William. 1971. *Teatru Shakespeare. Henric al V-lea. Hamlet. Othello. Macbeth. Poveste de iarnă*. Translated by Ion Vinea. București: Editura Univers.
- Shakespeare, William. 1974. *Hamlet*. Translated by Leon Levițchi and Dan Duțescu. București: Editura Univers.
- Shakespeare, William. 2009/2016. *Hamlet*. Translated by Dan Amedeu Lăzărescu. București: Editura Pandora M.
- Shakespeare, William. 2010. *Hamlet*. Translated by Violeta Popa and George Volceanov. Pitești: Editura Paralela 45.
- Sharifpour, Pardis and Masood Sharififar. 2021. "An Investigation of Retranslation Hypothesis in English Translations of Rumi's Poetry." *Translation Review* 111, no. 1: 26–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07374836.2020.1860843>.
- Van Poucke, Piet. 2017. "Aging as a Motive for Literary Retranslation." *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 12, no. 1: 91–115. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1075/tis.12.1.05van>.
- Van Poucke, Piet, and Guillermo Sanz Gallego. 2019. "Retranslation in Context." *Cadernos de Traduções* 39, no. 1: 10–22. doi:10.5007/2175-7968.2019v39n1p10.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 2008 (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Zaharia, Oana Alis. 2018. "Nineteenth-century Romanian Translations: *Hamlet* for the Page or for the Stage." *Studia Litteraria Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis* 13, no. 3: 185–94.
- Zhang, Huanyao, and Ma Huijuan. 2018. "Intertextuality in retranslation." *Perspectives: Studies in Translation Theory and Practice* 26, no. 4: 576–92. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2018.1448875>.

Nadina Vișan is Professor in the English Department, University of Bucharest, Romania. Her main interests lie in the direction of historical linguistics and translation studies. She is the author of *A Discourse Representation Theory Analysis of the Perfect in English and Romanian* (University of Bucharest Publishing House, 2006) and *Elements of English Lexicology* (University of Bucharest Publishing House, 2015) as well as co-author of *New Perspectives on English Grammar* (Institutul European Publishing House, 2014).

Contact: nadina.vișan@lls.unibuc.ro

Daria Protopopescu is Associate Professor in the English Department, University of Bucharest, Romania. Her main interests lie in the direction of historical linguistics, terminology and translation studies. She is the author of the book *Elements of English Terminology* (University of Bucharest Publishing House, 2013) and co-author of *New Perspectives on English Grammar* (Institutul European Publishing House, 2014). Her research areas include terminology, translation studies, syntax and the history of the English language.

Contact: daria.protopopescu@lils.unibuc.ro



This work can be used in accordance with the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license terms and conditions (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode>). This does not apply to works or elements (such as images or photographs) that are used in the work under a contractual license or exception or limitation to relevant rights.